

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

L- Lazarists

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

L

La'adah

(Heb. *Ladah'*, **לָאָדָא** *order*; Sept. **Λααδά** v. r. **Μαδάθ**), the second named of the two sons of Shelah (son of Judah), and founder ("father") of Mareshah, in the lowlands of Judah (1 Chronicles 4:21). B.C. cir. 1873.

La'adan

(Heb. *Ladan'*, **לָאָדָן** *arranger*), the name of two men.

1. (In ^{<1327>}1 Chronicles 23:7-9, Sept. **Λεαδάν** v. r. **Ἐδάν**, Vulg. *Leedan*; in ^{<1327>}1 Chronicles 26:21, **Λεδάν** v. r. **Λαδάν**, **Λααδάν**, *Ledan*.) The first named of the two sons of Gershom, the son of Levi; elsewhere called LIBNI (^{<1327>}1 Chronicles 6:17).

2. (Sept. **Γαλααδάς** v. r. **Λαδάν**, **Λαδάν**, Vulg. *Laadan*.) Apparently the son of Tahan and father of Ammihud, of the posterity of Ephraim (1 Chronicles vii 26). B.C. post 1612.

Laanah.

SEE WORMWOOD.

Labadie, Jean De,

a French enthusiast, and the founder of the religious sect known as *Labadists*. was born at Bourg, in Guienne, Feb. 13, 1610. Educated in the Jesuits' school at Bordeaux, he entered their order, began the study of theology in 1626, and soon distinguished himself as a preacher. Struck with the abuses existing in the Romish Church, he clamored for reform. but, meeting with no encouragement in his order, he left it to join the Fathers of the Oratory in 1639, and very shortly afterwards the Jansenists. In 1640 he was appointed canon of Amiens, and at once inaugurated various reforms. He held conventicles for the purpose of Bible reading, and administered the Lord's Supper in both kinds to the people. To prevent his progress, he was removed in 1646, and sent as preacher and inspector to the convents of the third order of St.

Francis in Guienne. Still persecuted by the Jesuits, he joined the Reformed Church at Montauban in 1650, and entered the Protestant ministry under very auspicious circumstances. In 1657 he became pastor in Orange, and in 1659 in Geneva. In both situations he exerted himself to the utmost for the restoration of apostolic religion on Pietistic principles, and gained many partisans, especially in Geneva. In 1666 he became pastor of a Walloon church in Middelburg, but, by the machinations of his enemies, was obliged to leave it, and in 1669 went to Amsterdam, where his followers soon formed a distinct religious sect, known as LABADISTS. Peter Yvon was one of their preachers. Having been expelled from the country as a separatist, Labadie went in 1670 to Hereford, where, through the influence of his disciple, the learned Anna Marie von Schurmann (who appears to have become his wife afterwards), he was protected by the princess Elizabeth. But, again driven away (in 1674) by the authorities as an Anabaptist, he went successively to Bremen and Altona. Here he managed, with the assistance of Peter Yvon and De Lignon, to hold private meetings and to disseminate his doctrines. He died at Altona Feb. 13, 1674. His principal works are, *Le herault du grand roi Jesus* (Amst. 1667, 12mo):- *Le vseitable exorcisme, ou l'unique moyen de chasser le Diable du monde Chretien* (Amsterd. 1667, 12mo):-*Le chant royal du roi Jesus-Christ* (Amsterd. 1670, 12mo):-*Les saintes Decades* (Amst. 1671, 8vo):-*L'empire du St. Esprit* (Amst. 1671, 12mo): — *La reformation de l'iglise; La jeune religieuse; L'carrivee apostolique; Abregy du Christianisme* (transl. into German, Frankf. 1742); etc.

According to their confession of faith (*Declaration d. reinen Lehre u. d. gesunden Glaubens d. Joh. de L.*, etc., Heref. 1671), the Labadists did not entirely differ from the Reformed Church, whose symbolic books they accepted. They supported themselves by manual labor. and, after the example of the primitive Church, possessed everything in common; they insisted that great stress is to be laid on the internal light, and that it alone can make the outer revelation intelligible. They, however, declared against infant baptism; also against the second baptism of the Anabaptists; and rejected the observance of the Sabbath on the plea that for them life was a perpetual Sabbath, etc. The reproach of immorality which some Roman Catholic writers have preferred against them is unfounded; they recognised and honored the institution of matrimony. After Labadie's death his followers removed to Wiewert, in the duchy of Cleves, but gained few adherents, and the sect gradually disappeared about the middle of the 18th

century. At the opening of the 18th century they attempted to establish themselves in the United States of America; a few of their number settled on the banks of the Hudson River as missionaries, but they do not seem to have taken a special hold. See A. Pauli and J. Hund, *Antilabadie* (Hamm, 1671,4to); L. G. Engelschall, *Richtige Vorurtheile d. heutigen Welt* (1716), p. 652-682; Dr. Schotel, *A. M. v. Schurmann* (Hertogenb. 1853); Arnold, *Kirchen u. Ketzergesch*, ii, 680; Hagenbach, *Gesch. der Reformation*, 4:407 sq.; Gobel, *Gesch. d. christl. Lebens in d. Rheinisch-Westpholischen evangel. Kirche* (Coblenz, 1852), vol. ii; *Zeitschr. d. histor. theol.* 1853, 1854.

Labadists.

SEE LABADIE.

Labagh, Peter, D.D.,

a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born in 1773 in New York city, of French and Hollandish descent. After receiving his classical education from Dr. Peter Wilson, of Hackensack, N. J., his theological studies were pursued under Drs. Froeligh and Livingston, professors of theology in the Reformed Dutch Church. He was licensed in 1796, and immediately went to Western New York on a tour of missionary exploration, and afterwards proceeded on horseback to Kentucky, where he organized a Church in Mercer County. Returning to New York, he settled as a pastor in Greenbush, Rensselaer County, where he remained until 1809, and then removed to the united churches of Shannock and Harlingen. He retained the pastorate of the latter Church until 1844. He died among his own people in 1858, revered and beloved by all. Dr. Labagh possessed an active, acute, and powerful mind, rapid in its movements, sound in its conclusions, and distinguished by great accuracy of judgment. In ecclesiastical assemblies he was always a leading debater and counsellor. In the endowment of the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, and in all the great movements of his denomination, he was a vigorous and successful worker. He was a clear, strong, and experimental preacher. During the great revival of 1831 his Church experienced a work of grace which "shook the whole community for miles around." This was the crowning glory of his long ministry. His latter years were spent in patriarchal retirement. He was cheerful, happy, overflowing with good-humor, mother-wit, and strong common sense, and, above all, with a deep

piety which illumined his ministry and consecrates his memory. A Memoir of him was published in 1860 by Rev. John A. Todd, D.D. (12mo). (W. J. R. T.)

La'ban

(Hebrew *Laban'*, ^ˆb| ; *white*, as frequently; comp. Simonis, *Onon*. V. T. p. 100; Septuag. *Λάβαν*, but *Λοβόν* in ^{<0100>}Deuteronomy 1:1; Josephus *Λάβανος*, *Ant.* i, 16, 2), the name of a man and also of a place.

1. An Aramwean herd-owner in Mesopotamia, son of Bethuel (^{<0125>}Genesis 28:5), and kinsman of Abraham (^{<0145>}Genesis 24:15, 29), being a grandson (^ˆBenot simply "son," as usual; see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 216) of Nahor (^{<0125>}Genesis 29:5). During the lifetime of his father, and by his own consent, his sister Rebekah was married to Isaac in Palestine (^{<0125>}Genesis 24:50 sq.). B.C. 2024. **SEE REBEKAH.** Jacob, one of the sons by this marriage, on leaving home through fear of Esau, complied with his parents' wishes by contracting a still closer affinity with the family of his uncle Laban, and while seeking the hand of his daughter Rachel at the price of seven years' toil, was eventually compelled by Laban's artifice to marry first his oldest daughter, Leah (Genesis 29). B.C. 1927-1920. **SEE JACOB.** When Jacob, having fulfilled the additional seven years' service thus imposed upon him, and six years more under a contract to take care of his cattle (in which time he managed to repay his overreaching uncle by a less culpable stratagem), was returning by stealth across the Euphrates, Laban pursued him with intentions that were only diverted by a preternatural dream, and, overtaking him at Mt. Gilead, charged him with the abduction of his daughters and the theft of his household gods, which Rachel had clandestinely carried off, and now concealed by a trick characteristic of her family, but was at length pacified, and formed a solemn treaty of amity with Jacob that should mutually bind their posterity (Genesis 30, 31). B.C. 1907. Niemeyer (*Charakt.* ii, 246) has represented Laban in a very odious light, but his conduct appears to have been in keeping with the customs of the times, and, indeed, of nomades in all ages, and compares not unfavorably with that of Jacob himself. (See Kitto, *Daily Illustra.* vol. i; Abulfeda, *Anteislam*, ed. Fleischer, p. 25; Hitzig, *Geschichte Israel* [Lpz. 1869], p. 40, 49 sq.; Ewald, *History of Israel* [transl. London, 1869], i, 346 sq.) — Winer, ii, 1 sq. "The mere possession of teraphim, which the Jews at no time consistently condemned (comp. Judges 17, 18; ^{<0193>}1 Samuel 19:13; ^{<0101>}Hosea 3:4), does not prove Laban to have been an

idolater; but that he must have been so appears with some probability from 31:53 ('the gods of Nahor'), and from the expression **ΥΤαῖ ἡσάν** 30:27; A. V., 'I have learnt by experience,' but properly 'I have divined' or 'learnt by an augury' (comp. 14, 15; ^{<1078>}1 Kings 20:33), showing that he was addicted to pagan superstitions."

2. A city in the Arabian desert, on the route of the Israelites (Deuteronomy i, 1); probably identical with their twenty-first station, LIBNAH (^{<0830>}Numbers 33:20). Knobel's objections (*Erklar. ad loc.*) to this identification, that no discourses of Moses at Libnah are recorded, and that the Israelites did not return to that place after reaching Kadesh, are neither of them relevant. He prefers the *Itauara* of ancient notice (*Notit. Dignit. i, 78 sq.; Itauarra* of the *Peutinger Table, 9:e; Avapa* of Ptolemy, 5:17, 5), between Petra and Aela, as having the signification *white* in Arabic (Steph. Byz. s.v.).

Lab'ana

(**Λαβανά**), one of the chief Temple-servants whose "sons" returned from the captivity (1 Esdr, 5:28); evidently the LEBANA **SEE LEBANA** (q.v.) of the Hebrew list (^{<1078>}Nehemiah 7:48).

Labarum

Picture for Labarum 1

Picture for Labbarum 2

is the name given to the old standard or flag of Christian nations. Its derivation is uncertain, but it has variously been considered as coming from **λαβεῖν, λάιφη, λαφυρον**, *luboro*, etc. Some, with Prudentius, pronounced both as short; others (Alt.helm, *De laud. Viry.*) considered the first as long. Sozomen has it **λάβωρον**; Chrysostom, **λάβουρον**. (Comp., on the etymology, Gretser, *De Cruce*, lib. iii.) We find this name already applied to the Roman standard in coins of the republic and of the first emperors, especially on those connected with the wars against the Germans, Sarmatians, and Armenians. The labarum obtained its Christian signification under the emperor Constantine the Great. who, after his conversion, placed the image of the cross on his standards, and caused it to be received at Rome as the **σωτήριον τροπαῖον**. Henceforth it was considered as **σημεῖονπολεμικὸν τῶν ἄλλων τιμώτερον**. it was

carried in advance of the other standards, looked upon as an object of adoration by the Christian soldiery, and was surrounded by a guard of fifty picked men. Eusebius, who describes it with great particularity (in *Vita Constantini*. li, cap. 30, 31; Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiast.* A.D. 312, No. 26), relates that Constantine was induced to place the Christian symbol on the Roman standard by having in vision seen a shining cross in the heavens. (This vision may be denied or variously explained from subjective causes; compare the article *SEE CONSTANTINE*, and Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* ii, § 2.) The Roman labarum consisted of a long gilt spear, crossed at the upper end, and a crown towards the top, made either of gold or of precious stones, and bearing the monogram of Christ (thus or .) which the emperor afterwards wore also on his helmet. From the spear was suspended a square piece of silken veil, on which the likeness of Constantine and of his sons was embroidered with gold. According to Prudentius (in Symmachus, i, 486), the image of Christ was embroidered on it. During the reign of Julian the labarum was made in its original shape, and bore the image of the emperor, along with those of Jupiter, Mars, and Mercury, but the standard of Constantine was restored under Valentine and Gratian. The labarum remained the standard of Rome until the downfall of the Western Roman Empire, under the names of *labarum*, *crux*, and *vexillum ecclesiasticum*. The standards at present in use in some ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church still consist of a spear, with a cross-piece, to which is attached a cloth covered with embroidery or painting. The most renowned masterpiece of Christian art, Raphael's *Madonna del Sisto*, was originally made and used for this purpose. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. 8:s.v.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ii, 261 sq.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquites*, s.v.; Walcott, *Sacred Archeology*, s.v.; Voisin, *Diss. crit. sur la Vision de Constantin* (Paris, 1774). (J. H.W.)

Labat, Jean Baptiste

a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Paris in 1663. He joined the Dominicans in April, 1685, went as professor of philosophy to Nancy in 1687, and afterwards devoted himself exclusively to preaching. He landed at La Martinique Jan. 29, 1694, and was immediately put in charge of the mission at Macouba. While attending to his ecclesiastical duties, he made himself very useful in the colony as engineer, agriculturist, and even as diplomatic agent, and rendered great service against the English when they attempted taking the island in 1703. Most of his colleagues having died of yellow fever and other diseases brought on by the climate, he

returned to Europe to seek for others, and arrived at Cadiz Oct. 9, 1705. He intended returning soon to the West Indies, but was sent to Rome by his superiors, and was retained there until 1709; he afterwards remained at Civita Vecchia until 1716, and finally returned to Paris, where he died, Jan. 6, 1738. He wrote *Nouveau Voyage aux Iles de l'Amerique* (Paris, 1722, 6 vols. 12mo; La Haye, 1724, 6 vols. 12mo; 1738, 2 vols. 4to; 2d ed. Paris, 1742, 8 vols. 12mo; transl. into Dutch, Amsterd. 1725. 4 vols. 12mo; German, Nuremb. 1783-87, 6 vols. 8vo), and some other historical and miscellaneous works. See *Journal des Savants*, Oct., Nov., and Dec. 1730; Echard, *Script. ord. S. Domin.* ii, 806; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 28:333.

Labbe, Phillippe

a celebrated French Jesuit, was born at Bourges July 10, 1607. He joined the order in 1623, and became professor of ethics, philosophy, and moral theology, first at the College of Bourges, where he had been educated, and afterwards at Paris, where he settled in 1643 or 1644. After teaching theology for two years in that city, he turned himself exclusively to literary labors. He died at Paris Mar. 25, 1667. Labbe was a man of extensive learning, uncommon memory, and great activity. Sotwel, Niceron, and Moreri consider him as the author of seventy-five different works, some of them quite insignificant, however. His chief claim to renown rests on his Manual of Councils, which was completed by Gabriel Cossart, and published at Paris in 1671 (16 vols. in 17, folio; to some copies an 18th vol. is added, containing Jacobatius *de Conciliis*). The most complete edition was published under the title *SS. Concilia, ad regiam editionem exacta, quae olim quarta parte prodiit auctior. Studio Philip. Labbei, et Gabr. Cossartii. Nunc verb integre, insertis Stephani Baluzii et Joannis Harduini additanentis, plurimis prmterea undicunque conquisitis monumentis, notis insuper ac observationibus, firmiori fundamento conciliorum epochas praecepuefulcientibus, longe locupletior et emendastior exhibetur. Curante Nicolao Coleti* (Venet. 1728, 23 vols. fol.). *Et supplementum J. D. Mansi* (Lucre, 1748-52, 6 vols.; in all, 29 vols. fol.). This is the most complete collection extant of the Councils of the Church. It was reprinted, with the supplement incorporated, and edited by Mansi, at Florence (1757-98, 31 vols. folio)-a much esteemed and accurate edition; but it only reaches to the year 1509, while the edition by Coletus brings the councils down to 1727. Among his other works the most important are, *SS. Patrum theologorum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum*

utriusque Testamenti Bibliotheca chronologica. Cum pinacotheca scriptorum Soc. Jesu (Par. 1659, 16mo): *-L'etymologie de plusieurs mots Francois, contre les abus de la secte des Hellenistes du Port-Royal* (Paris, 1661, 12mo): *-Bibliotheca bibliothecarum* (3d edit. Roth. 1678, 8vo): — *De Byzantine historie scriptoribus* (Byzantine Histories, i): — *Nova Bibliotheca MSS. Librorum* (1657, 2 vols. fol.): — *De Scriptoribus Eccles. Dissertatio* (2 vols. 8vo); etc. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 28:338; Darling, *Cyclopcedia Bibliographica*, ii, 1751; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, 9:944. (J. N. P.)

Labben.

SEE MUTH-LABBEN.

Labis

(*λαβίς*, or *λαβίδιον*, a spoon), an implement used in the Greek Church for the purpose of administering the elements in the Lord's Supper. Difficulties in the administration of the wine were fancied to arise in the Middle Ages, in order to meet which *the fistule eucharisticce* were introduced; and subsequently the practice of dipping the bread in the wine, so that both might be administered together. The Latin Church at length withdrew the wine altogether; and the Greek Church, mingling both elements, administered them at once with a *λαβίς*, or *spoon*. *SEE FISTULE.*

Labor

(properly *db̄*; *abad'*, to work, Gr. *ἐργάζομαι*; also *l m̄*; *amal'*, to toil, Gr. *κοπιάω*; and other terms). From Genesis ii, 15 (where the same word *db̄* is used, A. V. "till"), we learn that man, even in a state of innocence, and surrounded by all the external sources of happiness, was not to pass his time in indolent repose. By the very constitution of his animal frame, exercise of some kind was absolutely essential to him (comp. ^{<1612>}Ecclesiastes 5:12). In ^{<1618>}Genesis 3:19, labor, in its more rigorous and exhausting forms, is set forth as a part of the primeval curse, "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread;" and doubtless there is a view of labor which exhibits it in reality as a heavy, sometimes a crushing burden (compare ^{<1616>}Genesis 35:16). But labor is by no means exclusively an evil, nor is its prosecution a dishonor (comp. ^{<1612>}Psalms 103:23, 24). It is the prostration of strength, wherewith is also connected the temporary

incapacity of sharing in the enjoyments of life, and not labor itself, which constitutes the curse pronounced on the fallen man. Hence we find that, in primitive times, manual labor was neither regarded as degrading nor confined to a certain class of society, but was more or less prosecuted by all. By the institution of the Sabbath, moreover, one seventh of man's brief life was rescued from labor, and appropriated to rest of body and to that improvement of the mind which tends to strengthen, invigorate, and sustain the entire man. *SEE SABBATH.*

Labor was enjoined on all Israelites as a sacred duty in the fourth commandment (^{<0210>}Exodus 20:9; ^{<0613>}Deuteronomy 5:13); and the Bible entertains so high a respect for the diligent and skilful laborer, that we are told in ^{<1229>}Proverbs 22:29, "Seest thou a man skilled in his work, he shall stand before kings" (comp. also *ibid*, 10:4; 12:24,27). Among the beautiful features which grace an excellent housewife, it is prominently set forth that "she worketh willingly with her own hands" (^{<2813>}Proverbs 31:13). With such an honorable regard for labor, it is not to be wondered at that when Nebuchadnezzar carried the Jews away into captivity, he found among them a thousand craftsmen and smiths (^{<1244>}2 Kings 24:14-16; ^{<2337>}Jeremiah 29:2). The ancient rabbins, too, regarded manual labor as most honorable, and urged it upon every one as a duty, as may be seen from the following sayings in the Talmud: "He who does not teach his son a craft is, as it were, bringing him up to robbery" (*Cholin*, 105); "Labor is greatly to be prized, for it elevates the laborer, and maintains him" (*Chagiga*, 5; *Nedarim*, 49, b; *Baba Bathra*, 110, a). *SEE HANDICRAFT.*

The Hebrews, like other primitive nations, appear to have been herdsmen before they were agriculturists (^{<0042>}Genesis 4:2,12,17, 22); and the practice of keeping flocks and herds continued in high esteem and constant observance as a regular employment and a social condition (^{<0016>}Judges 1:16; 4:11; ^{<3074>}Amos 7:14; Luke ii, 8). The culture of the soil came in course of time, introducing the discovery and exercise of the practical arts of life, which eventually led to those refinements, both as to processes and to applications, which precede, if they do not create, the fine arts (^{<0352>}Genesis 26:12; 33:19). Agriculture, indeed, became the chief employment of the Hebrew race after their settlement in Canaan; it lay at the very basis of the constitution. both civil and religious, which Moses gave them, was held in great honor, and was carried on by the high as well as the humble in position (^{<0061>}Judges 6:11; ^{<0915>}1 Samuel 11:5; ^{<1199>}1 Kings 19:19). No small care was bestowed on the culture of the vine, which grew

luxuriously on the hills of Palestine (^{<218D>}Isaiah 5:2, 5; ^{<1213>}Matthew 21:33; ^{<4134>}Numbers 13:24). The vintage was a season of jubilee (^{<0927>}Judges 9:27; ^{<2531>}Jeremiah 25:30; ^{<2160>}Isaiah 16:10). The hills of Palestine were also adorned with wellcultured olive-gardens, which produced fruit useful for food, for anointing, and for medicine (^{<2376>}Isaiah 17:6; 24:13; ^{<6231>}Deuteronomy 24:20; ^{<3277>}Ezekiel 27:17; ^{<1025>}1 Kings 4:25; ^{<2846>}Hosea 14:6, 7). Attention was also given to the culture of the fig-tree (^{<1200>}2 Kings 21:7; ^{<1328>}1 Chronicles 27:28), as well as of the date-palm (^{<0234>}Leviticus 23:40; ^{<0016>}Judges 1:16; 4:5; 20:33; ^{<6343>}Deuteronomy 34:3), and also of balsam (^{<0481>}Genesis 43:11; ^{<2277>}Ezekiel 27:17; 37:25; ^{<2482>}Jeremiah 8:22).
SEE AGRICULTURE.

Laborantes

(*laborers*), a name sometimes given to the *copiatce* or *fossarii*, on the assumption that the Greek word **κοπιᾶται** is taken from **κόπος**, *labor*. — Farrar, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v. **SEE COPIATA; SEE FOSSARIT.**

Laborde, Vivien

a French priest, born at Toulouse, Nov. 1, 1680, flourished at Paris under the patronage of cardinal De Noailles. He died March 5, 1748. His works are, *A Treatise on the Essence:-Distinction and Limits of the Spiritual and Temporal Powers: -Familiar Conferences*; and other religious works of value.

Labouderie, Jean

a celebrated French theological writer, was born at Chalinargues, Auvergne, Feb. 13, 1776. He became vicar of Notre Dame, Paris, in 1815, and early distinguished himself more as a writer than a preacher. He was particularly conversant with the Hebrew language. He died as honorary grand vicar of Avignon at Paris, May 2, 1849. Among his works are *Pensees theoloyiGues* (Clermont, 1801. 8vo):- *Considerations adressees aux aspirants au ministere de l'eglise de Geneve, faisant suite a celles de 111. Empetaz sur la divinite de Jesus-Christ, avec une riponse it quelques questions de M. Delloc*, etc. (Paris, 1817, 8vo):*Precis historique du Methodisme* (1818, 8vo): — *Le Christianisme de Montaigne* (1819, 8vo): -*Vies des Saints* (1820,3 vols. 24mo): — *Le Religion Chrutievne* (1826, 8vo): -*Notice historique sur Zwingle* (1828, 8vo); etc. See Hoefler, *Noun. Biog. Generale*, 28:395.

Laboureur, Le Jean

a French priest, born at Montmorency in 1623, became one of the almoners of the king, and died in 1675. He wrote several valuable works on the history of France.

Labrador

a peninsula of north-eastern America, is bounded on the east by the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by the Dominion of Canada and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, on the west by the Hudson Bay and James Bay, on the north by the Hudson Strait. Area about 500,000 sq. miles. The peninsula formerly was a part of the territory belonging to the Hudson Bay Company, and with the remainder of this territory was in 1869 sold to the government of the Dominion of Canada. The interior of the country is almost entirely unknown. The population, comprising Indians, Esquimaux, and a few Europeans, amounts to about 4000. It is believed that Labrador is identical with the *Helluland* (stone-land) which about the year 1000 was discovered by Leif, the son of Eric the Red. On June 24, 1497, it was again discovered by John and Sebastian Cabot. It was visited in 1500 by the Portuguese G. Cortereal, who called it *Tierra del Labrador* (land for labor), and in 1576 by the Englishman M. Frobisher. In 1618 Hudson explored a part of the coast. The country, which has a rugged coast, and is surrounded with many small islands, does not allow an extensive cultivation; for, although the vegetation is only in the northern part so limited as it is throughout Greenland, the winters are even more severe, and during the short summers the mosquitoes are even more troublesome than in Greenland. The population of the interior, which consists of Red Indians, is very small; the Esquimaux, who inhabit the north-eastern and the western coast, are a little more numerous, and support themselves by fishing seals, etc. If these animals fail them a famine is brought on, or they are forced to penetrate farther into the interior, where they are apt to encounter the Red Indians, their irreconcilable enemies for centuries.

The first attempt to establish a mission on the coast of Labrador was made by the Moravians in 1752, when J. C. Erhardt was killed by the Esquimaux. In 1771 the Moravians succeeded in establishing the station of Nain, to which in the course of the following ten years the stations of Okak and Hoffenthal (Hopedale) were added. The mission met here with the same difficulties as in Greenland. Thirty-four years after the establishment of the

first mission an extensive revival took place, in consequence of which the Esquimaux connected with these stations were gained to Christianity. For the Esquimaux living more to the north, Hebron was founded in 1830. In 1864 the station of Zoar was established for the tract of land lying between Nain and Hoffenthal. All the Esquimaux in this part of Labrador are now Christians. Only north of Hebron a few pagans are still living, for the conversion of whom in 1871 the station of Rama, situated on the Bay of Nullatorusek (a little north of lat. 59 N.) was founded. Famine and epidemics have greatly reduced the number of the Esquimaux in Labrador. In 1870 the station of Nain numbered 239, Okak 339, Hoffenthal 250, Hebron 219, and Zoar 109 souls, while the number of missionaries and attendants was 45. The acquaintance of the natives with European necessities forced the missionaries to charge themselves with the importation of some of these articles. Subsequently this trade was transferred to special agents. In the mean while, commercial interests have caused a number of Europeans to settle on the coast of Labrador, and a number of trading-posts to be established. Besides the Moravians, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has begun missionary efforts on the southern coast, and the Roman Catholic Church has endeavored to gain an influence upon the Red Indians of the interior. See *Newcomb, Cyclopedia of Missions*; Grundeman, *Missionsatlas*; Romer, *Geschichte der Labrador-Mission* (Gnadau, 1871). (A. J. S.)

Labrousse, Clotilde Suzan Courcelles De,

a French religious enthusiast, was born at Vauxain, Perigord, May 8, 1747. While quite young she adopted exaggerated mystical notions, thought herself called to become a saint, and was so anxious to leave this world for a better one that she made an attempt at suicide when but nine years old. Her ascetic practices were very severe, and became still more so as she grew up, yet did not seem to have any injurious effect on her health. At the age of nineteen she became a nun of the third order of St. Francis, and soon after declared that she had received a mission to travel through the world to convert sinners, but was detained in the convent by her superior. She then wrote a history of her life, which she addressed to M. de Flamarens, bishop of Perigueux, without effect. The MS., however, attracted the attention of Dom Gerle, prior of the Chartreuse of Vauclaire, who entered into correspondence with the authoress in 1769, and she afterwards declared, when he was elected a member of the National Assembly, that she had predicted it to him. When the Revolution broke

out, M. Pontard, constitutional bishop of Dordogne, attracted her to Paris, where she prophesied against the court of Rome, and in favor of the civil constitution of the clergy. She subsequently returned to Perigord, and left there to go to Rome, thinking to convert the pope, cardinals, etc., to her views, and to induce them to renounce temporal power. On her way she addressed the people wherever an opportunity offered. In August, 1792, she arrived at Bologna, whence she was driven by the legate. At Viterbo she was arrested and taken to the castle of San Angelo. In 1796 the French Directory interfered to obtain her liberation. but she preferred remaining, as she had been very kindly treated; but when the French took Rome in 1798 she left the prison and returned to Paris, where she died in 1821. She persisted to the last in believing herself inspired, and actually succeeded in gathering a small circle of adherents. Labrousse wrote *Propheties concernant la Revolution Frangaise, suivies d'une Pirediction qui annonce la fin du monde* (for 1899) (Paris, 1790, 8vo): — *Lettre de Milk. de Labrousse* (Paris, 1790, 8vo). Pontard published a *Recueil des Ouvrages de la celebre Ille. Labros-. se* (Bordeaux, 1797, 8vo). See Mahul, *Annuaire necrolog.* 1822; Arnault, Jay, Jouy et Norvins, *Biog. nouv. des Contemp.*; Querard, *La F'rance Litteraire.-Hoef'er, Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 28:418.

La Brune, Francois De.

SEE LA BRUSE, JEAN DE.

La Brune, Jean De

a French Protestant minister, flourished in the second half of the 17th and the early part of the 18th century. After the revocation of the edict of Nantes he went as pastor to Basle; later he became minister at Schoonoven, in Holland. He is particularly celebrated as a writer, but many of the works which have generally been attributed to him are now believed to be the production of Franois de la Brune, also a Protestant French pastor, who flourished about the same time; went to Amsterdam in 1685, and, on account of heterodox opinions, was suspended from the ministry in 1691. We have under the name of La Brune, among other works, *Morale de Conficius* (Amst. 1688, 8vo):-*Calvin's Tritite de la Justfication* (ibid, 1693, 8vo; 1705, 12mo): — *Hist. du Vieux et du Nouveau Test. en vets* (1731, 8vo).-Hoef'er, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 28:423.

Lacarry, Giles,

a French Jesuit, who was born at Castres in 1605, and died in 1684, is noted as the author of several works on the history of his country. See *General Biographical Dictionary*, s.v.

Lace

(*lytæ* *peathil'*, from being *twisted*), the blue *cord* with which the high-priest's breastplate was attached to the ephod (^{<1233>}Exodus 28:28, 37; 39:21, 31; rendered "riband" ^{<4153>}Numbers 15:38); spoken of gold 'wire' (^{<1243>}Exodus 39:3), the *chain* for attaching a cover to its vessel ("bound," ^{<4195>}Numbers 19:15); a strong "thread" of tow (^{<1749>}Judges 16:9), or measuring-"*lisne*" of flax (^{<2418>}Ezekiel 40:3); also of the *string* by which the signet-ring was suspended in the bosom ("bracelet," ^{<1388>}Genesis 38:18, 35); finally (*κλωσμα*, a *spun* thread, like *pathil* above, for which it stands in ^{<4156>}Numbers 15:36), a *cord* (Ecclus. 6:30).

Lacedaemo'nian

(*Λακεδαιμόνιος*, 2 Macc. 5:9 elsewhere *Σπαρτιάτης*). an inhabitant of Lacedaemon or Sparta, in Greece, with whom the Jews at one time claimed kindred (1 Macc. 12:2, 5, 6, 20, 21; 14:20, 23; 15:23). *SEE SPARTA*.

Lacey, William B., D.D.,

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born about 1781. He entered the ministry in 1813 as missionary of Chenango County, N.Y.; in 1818 he became rector of St. Peter's Church, Albany. He labored there upwards of twenty years. his ministrations being crowned with great success. Subsequently he became professor in the University of Pennsylvania, and president of a college at Laceyville, Pa. He died October 31, 1866. Dr. Lacey wrote a number of text-books for schools and colleges which were deservedly popular in their day. particularly his *Rhetoric* and *Moral Philosophy*. During the last ten years of his life he employed his leisure hours in revising a *History of the English Church prior to the Time of the A Monk Augustin*, and some of his choicest sermons and other MSS. See *Ann. Ch. Rev.* 1867, p. 647.

La Chaise Or La Chaize D'aix, Francois De,

Pere, a celebrated French Jesuit and noted confessor of Louis XIV, was

born of a noble family at the castle of Aix Aug. 25, 1624. He was educated at the College of Roanne, became a Jesuit, and afterwards went to complete his studies at Lyons, where he subsequently taught philosophy with great success. Having been appointed professor of theology, he was soon called away from Lyons to direct the establishment of his order at Grenoble, but almost immediately returned with the office of provincial. Finally, on the death of father Ferrier, he succeeded him as confessor of the king in 1675. Madame de Montespan was then at the height of her favor, and all the efforts of father Ferrier, Bourdaloue, Bossuet, and Mascaron had proved ineffective against her. La Chaise proceeded more cautiously than his predecessors, and proved more successful. Never directly contradicting his royal penitent, he knew how to gain him to his views by slow but steady advances. Whenever he saw the king disposed to throw off his easy yoke, he would feign sickness and send some priest of strict and uncompromising principles to the king, who, being positively refused absolution once by father Deschamps, would, after such experiments, submit the more readily to the wily Jesuit. The latter, moreover, was an agreeable companion as well as an easy confessor. Madame de Montespan, weary of the contest with La Chaise and Madame de Maintenon, retired finally into a convent. The queen dying a few years afterwards, La Chaise is said to have given the king the idea of a morganatic marriage, and even to have performed the ceremony. Yet, in spite of all he had done for her, Madame de Maintenon (q.v.) does not appear to have ever been very friendly towards the Jesuit; perhaps because he prevented a public recognition of her marriage; perhaps also because she knew that in helping her he had worked only for himself. When Madame de Maintenon founded the institution of St. Cyr, La Chaise, Racine, and Boileau were commissioned to revise its rules. The former opposed the rule that teachers should be required to take anything more than the simple vows, and carried his point, though subsequently this was changed, and they became subject to the rule of St. Augustine. After the death of the queen and of Colbert, the actions of the king were entirely governed by La Chaise and Madame de Maintenon. Both agreed against the Protestants, and their joint efforts brought on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The Jesuit, indeed, tried to conciliate the king and the pope when the difficulties arose about the declaration of the clergy in 1682, and the famous four propositions, and even appeared more inclined to side with the temporal than with the spiritual monarch; but he again balanced the account by advocating the dragonnades as a sure means of reclaiming erring consciences. He died Jan.

20, 1709. In the famous quarrel between Fenelon and Bossuet, La Chaise sided with the former, as far, at least, as he dared without offending the king. He even affected great regard for Quesnel, though, when it is remembered that he caused the works of that writer to be condemned, the sincerity of his regard may be doubted; but it was his principle to attack individuals, not parties, and he therefore found it convenient, as a true Jesuit, to praise men whom, on account of their very principles, he secretly sought to destroy. *SEE JANSENISM*; *SEE JESUITS*. He was a shrewd, persevering politician, and did much good to his order, but pere La Chaise cannot be lauded either as a great man or as a good priest. The kindest comment ever made on his character is that by Voltaire, who speaks of him as " a mild person, with whom the ways of conciliation were always open." He obtained the king's protection for the College of Clermont, since called College Louis-le-Grand, and received for his order a fine estate to which his name was given, and which is now the cemetery of " *Pere la Chaise*" at Paris. He wrote *Peripateticae quadruplicis philosophie Placita rationalis*, etc. (Lyons, 1661, 2 vols. fol.) : — *Humane sapientie Propositiones propugnatae Lugduni in collegio Soc. Jesu* (Lyons, 1662, fol.): — *Reponse a quelques difficultes proposees a un theologien*, etc. (Lyons, 1666, 4to); etc. See Saint Simon, *Memoires*; Madame de Maintenon, *Correspondance*; Voltaire, *Siecle de Louis XIV*; Benoit, *Hist. de l'Edit de Nantes*; Jurieu, *Politique du Clerge de France*; Sismondi, *Hist. des Frangais*, vol. 25, 26, and 27; Regis de Chantelauze, *Le Pere de la Chaise* (Lyons, 1859, 8vo); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 28:483. See Louis XIV.

La Chapelle, Armand Boisbealeu De,

a French Protestant writer, was born at Ozillac (Saintonge) in 1676. He was a student at the college of Bordeaux when the revocation of the Edict of Nantes obliged him to retire to England, where he was received by his grandfather, pastor of the Walloon Church at London. In 1694 he was ordained, and soon afterwards sent to Ireland. Subsequently he became successively pastor of Wandsworth, in the neighborhood of London, in 1696; of the chapel of the French artillery in that town in 1711; and finally pastor of the Walloon Church of the Hague in 1725. He died August 6.1746. La Chapelle wrote *Reflexions au sujet d'un systemepretendu nouveau sur le mystere de la Trinite* (Amst. 1729, 8vo):-*Examen de la maniere de precher des Protestants Fancais*, etc. (Amsterd. 1730, 8vo): — *Rponse a Mr. Mainard, ancien chanoine de St. Sernin de Toulouse, au*

sujet d'une conference sur la religion, etc. (La Haye, 1730, 4to): — *Entretien au sujet de la Lettre d'un Theologien sur le mystere de la Trinite* (La Haye, 1730, 8vo): — *Lettre d'un theologien Reforme a un gentilhomme Lutherien* (Amst. 1736, 2 vols. 12mo); it is also known under the title *Lettres sur l'ouvrage de controverse du P. Schafmacher: Memoires de Pologne*, etc. (Lond. 1739, 12mo): — *Description des ceremonies observees a Romne depuis la mort de Clement XII jusqu'au couronnement de Benoit XIV, son successeur*, etc. (Paris, 1741, 12mo): — *De la Necessite du culte public parmi les Chretiens* (La Haye, 1746, 8vo; Frankfort, 1747, 2 vols. 12mo; transl. into Dutch, Amst. 1748, 8vo; into German, Breslau', 1749, 8vo; Lpz. 1769, 8vo). It is a defence of the course of the French Protestants in holding their assemblies *du desert* in spite of the edicts of the king:— *Vie de Beausobre* (in Beausobre's *Remarques sur le Nouveau Testament*, vol. ii). He wrote also in *La Bibliotheque Anglaise, ou histoire litteraire de le Grande Bretagne* (Amst. 1717-27, 15 vols. 12mo): — *Bibliotheque raisonnee des Ouvrage es es Savants de l'Europe* (Amst. 1728-53, 52 vols. 12mo): — *Nouvelle Bibliotheque, ou histoire litteraire des principaux ecrits qui se publient* (La Haye, 1738 sq., 19 vols. 12mo). He also translated into French some works of Dition, Steele, Bentley, and Burnet. See Querard, *La France Litteraire*; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*. 28:507. (J. N. P.)

La'chish

Picture for Lachish 1

(Heb. *Lakish'*, *vrkæ* prob. *impregnable*, otherwise *smitten*; Sept. in Joshua and Kings *Λαχίς*; in Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Jeremiah *Λαχείς* v. r. *Λαχίς*; in Isaiah *Λαχείς* v. r. *Λαχίς* or *Λαχίς*; in Mic. *Λαχείς*; Josephus *Λαχίς*, *Ant.* 8:10, 1; also *Λάχεισα*, *Ant.* 9:9, 3), a Caananitish royal city (⁽⁶²¹⁾Joshua 12:11) in the southern part of Palestine, whose king Japhia joined the Amoritish confederacy against Joshua (⁽⁶⁰⁰⁾Joshua 10:3, 5); but he was taken (⁽⁶⁵⁵⁾Joshua 15:25), and his city destroyed by the victorious Israelites, in spite of the re-enforcement of the king of Gezer (⁽⁶⁵⁵⁾Joshua 15:31-35, where its great strength is denoted by the *two days'* assault). *SEE JOSHUA*. From these last passages it appears to have been situated between Libnah and Eglon; but it is mentioned between Joktheel and Bozkath, among the cities of the Philistine valley or plain of Judah (⁽⁶⁵⁵⁾Joshua 15:39). It is mentioned in connection with Adoraim and Azekah as having been rebuilt, or rather fortified, by Rehoboam against the

Philistines (^{<4119>}2 Chronicles 11:9), and seems after that time to have been regarded as one of the strongest fortresses of the kingdom of Judah (for hither Amaziah was pursued and slain, ^{<2149>}2 Kings 14:19; ^{<4257>}2 Chronicles 25:27), having for a time braved the assaults of the Assyrian army under Sennacherib on his way to Egypt (^{<2814>}2 Kings 18:14,17; 19:8; ^{<4439>}2 Chronicles 32:9; ^{<2311>}Isaiah 36:2; 37:8); but was at length taken by Nebuchadnezzar, at the downfall of the kingdom of Judah (^{<2347>}Jeremiah 34:7). It was reoccupied after the exile (^{<4613>}Nehemiah 11:30). The affright occasioned by these sudden attacks was predicted by the prophet Micah (^{<3101>}Micah 1:13), where this city, lying not very far from the frontiers of the kingdom of Israel, appears to have been the first to introduce the idolatry of that commonwealth into Judaism. A detailed representation of the siege of some large Jewish city by Sennacherib has been discovered on the recently disinterred monuments of Assyria, which is there called *Lakhisha*, and presumed to be Lachish (Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 152), although it does not appear from the Biblical account that this city yielded to his arms; indeed, some expressions would almost seem to imply the reverse (see "thought to win them," ^{<4439>}2 Chronicles 32:1; "departed from Lachish," ^{<2918>}2 Kings 19:8; and especially ^{<2347>}Jeremiah 34:7). Col. Rawlinson even reads the name of the city in question on the monuments as *Lubazna*, i.e. Libnah (Layard, *ut sup.* p. 153, note). Rawlinson also thinks that on the first attack at least Sennacherib did not sack the city (*Herodotus*, i, 481, note 6). At all events, it would seem that, after the submission of Hezekiah, Sennacherib in some way reduced Lachish, and marched in force against the Egyptians (Joseph. *Ant.* 10:1, 1; comp. ^{<2311>}Isaiah 20:1-4). Rawlinson maintains (*Herodotus*, i,477) that Sennacherib attacked Lachish a second time, but whether on his return from his Egyptian campaign, or after he had paid a visit to Nineveh, cannot now be determined. **SEE HEZEKIAH**. It is specially mentioned that he laid siege to it "with all his power" (^{<4439>}2 Chronicles 32:9), and here "the great king" himself remained, while his officers only were dispatched to Jerusalem (^{<4439>}2 Chronicles 32:9; ^{<2817>}2 Kings 18:17). **SEE SENNACHERIB**. This siege is considered by Layard and Hincks to be depicted on the slabs found by the former in one of the chambers of the palace at Kouyunjik, which bear the inscription "Sennacherib, the mighty king, king of the country of Assyria, sitting on the throne of judgment before (or at the entrance of) the city of Lachish (Lakhisha). I give permission for its slaughter" (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 149-52, and 153, note). These slabs contain a view of a city which, if the inscription is

correctly interpreted, must be Lachish itself. The bas-reliefs depict the capture of an extensive city defended by double walls, with battlements and towers, and by fortified outworks. The country around is represented as hilly and wooded, producing the fig and the vine. Immense preparations had evidently been made for the siege, and in no other sculptures were so many armed warriors drawn up in array against a besieged city, which was defended with equal determination. The process of the assault and sack are given in the most minute and lively manner. The spoil and captives are exhibited in full, the latter distinguished by their Jewish physiognomy, and by the pillaged condition of their garments. On a throne in front of the -city is represented the Assyrian king giving orders for the disposal of the prisoners, several of whom are depicted as already in the hands of the executioners, some being stretched naked on the ground in order to be flayed alive, while others were slain by the sword. (See Layard's *Monuments of Nineveh*, 2d series, plates 20-24.) **SEE CAPTIVE.**

Picture for Lachish 2

Picture for Lachish 3

Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v.) state that in their time Lachish was a village seven miles south (" towards Darom") of Eleutheropolis. The only place that has been found by travellers at all answering to the scriptural notices is *Unm-Lakis*, on the left of the road between Gaza and Hebron, situated " upon a low round knoll, now covered confusedly with heaps of small round stones, with intervals between, among which are seen two or three fragments of marble columns, wholly overgrown with thistles; a well to the south-east, below the hill, now almost filled up, having also several columns around it" (Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, ii, 388). This locality, notwithstanding it is somewhat more distant from Beit-Jibrin (Eleutheropolis) than the *Onomasticon* calls for, and likewise to the *south-west*, and notwithstanding the imperfect agreement in name (several of the letters being different in the Heb. and Arabic, in addition to the prefix *Um* [which, however, may only denote its importance as a mother-city]), Raumer and Grosse (in the *Studien us. Krit.* 1845, i, 243 sq.) incline to identify with that of Lachish, on the ground of its proximity (see ~~Genesi~~ Joshua 10:31-36) to Eglon (Raumer, *Beitrag zur biblischen Geographie*, 1843, p. 23). With this conclusion Schwarz concurs (*Palestine*, p. 85), as also Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 329), and Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii, 356); but Ritter is undecided (*Erdkunde*, 16:131). By "Daroma," also, Eusebius

may have intended a place of that name, mentioned in the Talmud, and placed by hap-Parchi two hours south of Gaza (Zunz in *Begj. of Tudela*, by Asher, ii, 442). of account of the weakness of Um-Lakis (see, however, Porter, *Handbook*, p. 261), Mr. Petrie prefers the adjacent site of *Tell Hesi*, where ancient remains have been found (*Pal. Explor. Quarterly Statement*, 1890, p. 159 sq.).

Lachmann, Karl

a distinguished German philologist, was born at Brunswick March 4, 1793. He studied at the universities of Leipzig and Gottingen, and in 1811 founded, together with Bunsen, Dissen, and Ern. Schulze, the Philological Society. In 1813 he entered the army as a volunteer, but, having left it at the conclusion of the war, he became professor at the University of Berlin in 1827, and member of the Academy of that city in 1830. He died at Berlin March 13, 1851. His philological works are distinguished for profound learning and able criticism. He confined himself mainly to editions of classical authors, but he also published an edition of the Greek New Testament (Berlin, 1831; 3d ed. 1846; in a larger form, 1846-50). In this edition of the New-Testament Scriptures in the original, " he aimed," says Dr. W. L. Alexander (*Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop.* ii, 769), " at presenting, as far'as possible, the text as it was in the authorized copies of the 4th century, his design being, not to compare various readings with the received text, but to supply a text derived from ancient authorities directly and exclusively. Relinquishing the possibility of ascertaining what was the exact text of the original as it appeared in the autographs of the authors, he set himself to determine the oldest attainable text by means of extant codices. For this purpose he made use of only a very few MSS., viz. A, B, C, P, Q, T, Z, for the Gospels; D, G, H, for the Epistles; the ante Hieronymian Latin versions, and the readings of Origen, Irenaeus, Cyprian, Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer; and for the Apocalypse, Primarius. Under the Greek text the editor cites his authorities, and at the bottom of the page he gives the Vulgate version edited from two codices of the 6th century, the Fuldensis and the Amiantinus, preserved in the Laurentian Library at Florence... On its first appearance, his work and the principles on which it was based were subjected to much hostility, but his great services to the cause of N.T. criticism are now universally admitted. That he narrowed unreasonably the sphere of legitimate authority for the sacred text, that he was sometimes capricious in his selection of authorities, and that, while he did not always follow his authorities, he at other times followed them even

in their manifest errors and blunders, may be admitted. But, after every deduction from the merits of his work is made which justice demands, there will still remain to Lachmann the high praise of having been the first to apply to the editing of the Greek N.T. those sound principles of textual criticism which can alone secure a correct and trustworthy text. In this he followed, to a considerable extent, the counsel of the illustrious Bentley, uttered more than a century before (whence some, who sought to discredit his efforts, unworthily mocked him as 'Simia Bentleii'); but he owed nothing to Bentley beyond the suggestion of the principles he has followed; and he possessed and has ably used materials which in Bentley's time were not to be had." (Comp. Lachmann's exposition of his principles in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830, p. 817-845; also a review of Scrivener's [*Collation of the Gospels*, Cambr. 1853, 8vo] strictures on Lachmann's edition of the N.-T. writings in Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1853, July, p. 365 sq.) See Hertz, *Lachmann; eine Biographie* (Berlin, 1851, 8vo); Tregelles, *Printed Text of the Greek N.T.* p. 97 sq.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biogq. Generale*, 28:532; Pierer, *Universal Lexikon*, 9:954. **SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.**

Lacombe, Pere,

a celebrated Roman Catholic monastic, a native of Savoy, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, first as the spiritual adviser and confessor of Madame Guyon, and afterwards as a zealous follower of the eminent French female Mystic. In 1687, when the Quietism of Molinos, which Lacombe ardently espoused, was condemned, pere Lacombe was imprisoned, and he died in prison in 1699. During his imprisonment he became very much depressed in mind, and finally lost his reason. This gave rise to the statement made in our vol. 3:p. 1039, that "he died in a madhouse." His relation with Madame Guyon had been very intimate, and this was quite natural when we consider that the former confessor became an ardent follower of Madame, and no doubt the scandal to which their associations had given rise, as well as the imprisonment, made Lacombe a great sufferer in his last days. He wrote *Analyse de l'oraison mentale*, which in 1688 was forbidden. **SEE GUYON.** (J. H. W.)

Lacombe, Dominique

a French prelate of note, was born at Montrejean (Haute Garonne) July 25, 1749, and was educated in the college at Tarbes, which he entered in 1766. In 1788 he became rector of a college at Bordeaux, but energetically

embracing the principles of the Revolution in 1789, he solemnly declared in favor of separation of Church and State, and was elected in consequence curate of St. Paul at Bordeaux. Sent to the Assembly, he took quite a prominent part in politics until the decretal prohibiting all ecclesiastical dress was published (April 7, 1792), when he forthwith ceased his service to the state, and returned to Bordeaux to assume the duties of his ecclesiastical functions. In 1797 he was elected metropolitan of Bordeaux, and in 1802 was one of the twelve bishops nominated by the emperor Napoleon, as whose zealous partisan Lacombe is known after his elevation to the episcopacy of Angouleme. He died April 7, 1823. See *Annales de la Religion*, 15:134; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Genrale*, 28:541.

Lacordaire, Jean Baptiste Henri,

a noted Roman Catholic theologian of this century, the reviver of the Dominican order, and a most distinguished pulpit orator of modern France, was born at Recey-sur-Ource, in the department Cote-d'Or; March 12, 1802. He was educated for the legal profession, first at Dijon, where he obtained the highest honors, and afterwards (1822) at Paris, and in 1824 he began practice as an advocate, and rose rapidly to distinction. Lacordaire was at this time, like most of the youth of France, a Deist of the Voltaire school, but Lamennais' *Essai sur l'indifference*, which fell into his hands, decided the youthful lawyer to devote himself thereafter to the cause of the Christian religion, which he felt satisfied must form the basis of all social life. He immediately abandoned his profession, and entered the College of St. Sulpice, and in 1827 received holy orders. Montalembert, Lacordaire's biographer, however, would have us believe that this sudden change from atheism to orthodox Christianity "was due to no man and to no book, but solely to a sudden impulse of grace, which opened his eyes to the sin and folly of irreligion." Shortly after his ordination he was offered the position of auditor of the rota at the court of Rome, an office which at once confers the title of monsignore, and is always a step to the episcopate, and often to a cardinal's hat; but he declined it peremptorily. His first appointment was that of almoner in the College of Hilly, also known as the College of Henry IV. Here he became personally acquainted with the abbe Lamennais, and speedily the youthful priest and the learned theologian formed a close and intimate alliance, which was interrupted only by the departure of Lamennais from the Church in 1833. One of the first, and perhaps most important, results of the friendly alliance of these three men was the establishment, after the July revolution of 1830, of the *Journal L'Avenir*,

"an organ at once of the highest Church principles and of the most extreme radicalism." *SEE LAMENNAIS*. Count Montalembert has furnished us a life-like portrait of Lacordaire at this time; and, although much allowance must be made for the passionate exclamations of a friend, it deserves at least our notice. "It was in November, 1830, that I saw him for the first time in the cabinet of the abbe Lamennais, four months after a revolution which had appeared for a moment to confound in a common ruin the throne and the altar, and one month after the establishment of the *Journal L'Avenir*. That journal had for its motto ' *God and Liberty* !' It was the intention of the founders that it should regenerate Catholic opinion in France, and seal its union with liberal progress. He was twenty-eight years of age; he was dressed as a layman, the state of Paris not then permitting priests to wear their clerical costume. His slender figure, his delicate and regular features, his chiselled forehead, the sovereign carriage of his head, his black and sparkling eye, an indescribable union of high spirit, elegance, and modesty in his whole appearance, were only the outward tokens of a soul which seemed ready to overflow, not merely in the free conflicts of public speaking, but in the effusions of intimate friendship. The brightness of his glance revealed at once treasures of indignation and of tenderness; it sought not merely enemies to combat and overthrow, but also hearts to win over and subdue. His voice, so vigorous and vibrating, took often accents of infinite sweetness. Born to combat and to love, he already bore the stamp of the double royalty of soul and of talent. He appeared to me charming and terrible, as the type of enthusiasm for good, of virtue armed in defence of the truth. I saw in him one of the elect, predestinated to all that youth most desires and adores — genius and glory." The articles published in the *Avenir* speedily provoked the displeasure of the episcopate, and an early opportunity was sought to bring the transgressors to grief. This was found in an intemperate attack written by Lacordaire against Louis Philippe. Both Lacordaire and Lamennais were cited before a jury for trial in January, 1831; the former, however, pleaded the cause of the journal with so much eloquence and ability that both the accused were acquitted. Thus encouraged, they adopted more vigorous measures to secure liberty of education, in the face of an energetic opposition from the university. They announced that they would open a free school in the French capital, and actually began teaching in May, 1831. The police, however, soon put an end to this bold movement, and, as one of their number was a count (Montalembert), they were accused before a court of peers, and fined 100 francs. A short time after the papal see openly

declared its opposition to them by an encyclical censure which Gregory XVI issued Sept. 18, 1832. Rejecting all their dogmas, it declared " the whole idea of the regeneration of the Church absurd, liberty of conscience a delirium, freedom of the press fatal, and inviolable submission to the prince a maxim of faith." Even before this papal censure had been publicly proclaimed the three chief editors of *L'Avenir* had gone to Rome, to prevent, if possible, any severe measures on the part of the pope. It was at this time that Lamennais first decided to turn from the corruptions of Rome — from the corpse which he saw clearly it was in vain to attempt to resuscitate. Not so, however, was Lacordaire affected. His imagination had been vividly impressed by the imposing ceremonies and glorious traditions of the Romish Church, and he was prepared at once to submit to it " sicut cadaver." " The miseries, the infirmities," says Montalembert, in his biography of Lacordaire, "inseparable from the mingling of everything human with that which is divine, did not escape his notice, but they seemed to him as if lost in the mysterious splendor of tradition and authority. He the journalist, the citizen of 1830, he the democratic liberal, had comprehended at the first glance not only the inviolable majesty of the supreme pontificate, but its difficulties, its long and patient designs, its indispensable regard for men and things here below. The faith and the duty of the Catholic priest had at once elevated that noble heart above all the mists of pride, above all the seductions, all the temptations of talent, above all the intoxication of strife. With the penetration which faith and humility confer, he passed beforehand upon our pretensions the judgment which has been ratified by time, that great auxiliary of the Church and of truth. It was then, I venture to believe, that God marked him forever with the seal of his grace, and that he gave him the assurance of the reward due to the invincible fidelity of a truly priestly soul." Hereafter the man Lacordaire is lost in the churchman, the active and inquiring intellect confined, if not extinguished, by the official religion. His *bondafide* retraction of course drew upon him not only estrangement from his master, whose intellectual philosophy he had never really adopted, and whose retraction was never more than formal, but the reproach of worldliness. It was due in reality, however, to a precisely opposite cause. His heart was identified with the cause of the Church, and only his intellect with the Free-Church theory. "Do not let us chain our *hearts* to our ideas," he said quite earnestly: and he evidently felt the delight in submission which always accompanies a sacrifice of self for something one thinks higher and better than self. He thought he had detected a pride of systematic philosophy in the views of

his master, Lamennais, and this had, he said, often galled and fretted him. He believed that the Church, in condemning Lamennais and his school, had delivered him (Lacordaire) " from the most terrible of all oppressions, that of the human intellect;" and henceforth, though tender and respectful to his master in the adversity of papal disfavor, he really loved the Church the better for having humbled himself before her decision, just as he would have loved God better for having bowed his own self-will to the divine volition. The Church, he held, was higher than his intellect. His spirit, he fancied, had gained in vital power by humbling his own intellect before the mind of the Church. And so he embraced the first opportunity that presented itself to convince the papal see of his sincerity. Lamennais had just appeared before the public in his *Paroles d'un croyant*, and the book was selling extensively, and finding a very large circle of readers. Here was an opportunity to break a lance in defence of Rome; and, though the attack in this instance had to be directed even against his own former master, he hesitated not to enter the lists. He replied to Lamennais' book by his *Considerations sur le systeme philosophique de M. Lamennais*, a work which proved a total failure, and which Montalembert, the associate of Lacordaire-his bosom apostate from Lamennais-is obliged to admit as having been anything but successful. New honors, notwithstanding, soon sought out the devoted adherent to the cause of the Ultramontanes, first (in 1833 and 1835) in the offer of the editorship of the journal *L'Univers*, then lately established to further the Ultramontane principles, and later in the proffer of a professor's chair at the University of Louvain. He desired none of these-the pulpit and the convent cell he had decided should be his future place of resort, " to speak and to write, to live a solitary and studious life " he says in a letter of 1833, " such is the wish of my whole soul."

In the spring of 1833 he preached for the first time in public. It was in the great church of St. Roch, in Paris. "I was there," says M. Montalembert, "with MM. de Courcelles, Ampere, and some others, who must remember it as I do. He failed completely, and, coming out, every one said, ' This is a man of talent, but he never will be a preacher.' Lacordaire himself thought the same." His failure was very much like that of Sheridan, D'Israeli, Robert Hall, and many other orators-an incentive to become great. In the beginning of 1834 he delivered his famous *Conferences* in the College Stanislas, the humblest of the colleges of Paris, where he had been appointed as lecturer to the students, and where his failure at St. Roch was now recompensed by a great success, his audience oftentimes amounting to

from 500 to 600 persons. In the year following (1835) we find him installed preacher at Notre Dame, and for once it was acknowledged that "France had a living preacher who knew how to fascinate the intellect, kindle the imagination, and touch the heart of the most cultivated and of the most illiterate. Whenever Lacordaire was announced to preach in Notre Dame the cathedral was surrounded, long before the doors were open, by an immense and heterogeneous crowd. Before he appeared in the pulpit, the vast nave, the aisles, and the side chapels were thronged with statesmen and journalists, members of the Academy and tradesmen, working-men and high-born women, sceptics, socialists, devout Catholics, and resolute Protestants, who were all compelled to surrender themselves for the time to the irresistible torrent of his eloquence" (R. W. Dale, in *Contemporary Review*, May, 1868, p. 2).

Only two years after his appointment to Notre Dame, Lacordaire suddenly fixed the wonder of the multitude again upon him by relinquishing the career of distinction which had so lately opened to him, and by journeying to Rome, "with the principal design," as he himself tells us in one of his letters, "of entering the Dominican order, with the accessory design of re-establishing it in France." This opens a new phase in the life of Lacordaire. "It was always the mark of Lacordaire's character," says a writer in the *Spectator* (Lond. Dec. 7, 1867), "that all his deepest feelings, like moral caustic, burnt inward, so that he complained from the beginning of life to the end that even the deepest friendship he knew led him not into society, but into solitude," and it is in solitude that his days are mainly spent after his sudden retreat from Notre Dame in 1837. Henceforth his "inner life" is a story of the inward progress of self-humiliations-self-crucifixions, as he called them, measuring them by the standard of Christ's sufferings. In the complete self-sacrifice of the monk, in the absolute life in God to which he now resigned himself, he believed he could alone find the true source of a new life for human society. If Christ's self-sacrifice was the source of human redemption, the orders which set forth that self-sacrifice most perfectly to the world contained the true life-blood of the world; and henceforth his life and that of his followers became one long passion of self-immolation, in which the spirit was trained by the sharpest voluntary penances to regulate every inward movement by the ideal of Christian humility or humiliation. What Lacordaire's biographer reverently calls "holv follies" were of daily occurrence. "Will you," he said one day on the Campagna to his disciple, pere Besson, "suffer something for the sake of

him who has suffered so much for us?" and, showing him a thorn-bush, they both at once precipitated themselves into it, and came out covered with blood. How this was "suffering for Christ's sake" Lacordaire does not explain; but he seems to have thought that all suffering, needless or needful, voluntary or involuntary, was a lesson in love for Christ. "All his mysticism," says his biographer, "reduced itself to this one principle, to suffer; to suffer in order to expiate justice, and in order to prove love." And henceforth his life as a monk was a burning fire of religious passion and penance, all intended to teach him, as he thought, to enter more deeply into crucified love: "His thanksgiving after mass was generally short; in making it he most often experienced very ardent emotions of love to God, which he went to appease in the cell of one of his religious. He would enter with his countenance still radiant with the holy joy kindled at the altar; then, humbly kneeling before the religious, and kissing his feet, he would beg him to do him the charity of chastising him for the love of God. Then he would uncover his shoulders, and, whether willing or unwilling, the brother was obliged to give him a severe discipline. He would rise all bruised from his knees, and, remaining for a long time with his lips pressed to the feet of him who had scourged him, would give utterance to his gratitude in the most lively terms, and then withdraw with joy on his brow and in his heart. At other times, after receiving the discipline, he would beg the religious to sit down again at his table, and prostrating himself on the ground under his feet, he would remain there for a quarter of an hour, finishing his prayer in silence, and delighting himself in God, as he felt his head under the foot that humbled him. These penances were very often renewed, and those who were chosen to execute them did not resign themselves to the office without difficulty. It was a real penance to them, especially at first; they would willingly have changed places with him. But gradually they became used to it, and the father took occasion of this to require more, and to make them treat him according to his wishes. Then they were obliged to strike him, to spit in his face, to speak to him as a slave. 'Go and clean my shoes; bring me such a thing; away with you, wretch!' and they had to drive him from them like a dog. The religious whom he selected to render him these services were those who were most at their ease with him; and he returned by preference to such as spared him least. His thirst for penances of this description appears the more extraordinary from the fact that his exceedingly delicate and sensitive temperament rendered them insupportably painful to him." To Protestants this sounds like the rehearsal of an unreal moral tragedy, a rehearsal which

must have done far more to bewilder the minds of those who were guilty of these artificial, cruel, and unmeaning insults to one they loved and revered than to deepen his own love for his Lord. Yet in scenes like these were fostered the roots of his life as a Dominican friar-the spirit less of a modern Catholic thinker than of a mediaeval monk. But if his change to a monastic seclusion from the turmoils of Paris life must appear strange to a Protestant reader, greater still will ever be the task to explain how this advocate of liberty of conscience and the impropriety of the interference of the civil power for the punishment of heretics could find it in his heart to resuscitate an order which has more crimes and cruelties to answer for than even the infamous sect of the Assassins-an order whose founder was the very incarnation of persecution. Just here also it may not be out of place to allude to the uncritical manner in which Lacordaire composed a life of St. Dominic -the founder of the Inquisition-entirely ignoring all those historians who have detailed and *proved* the atrocious cruelties perpetrated by that saint and his followers (*Vie de Saint Doninuce*, Paris, 1840-4, 8vo).

In 1840, after a three-years' novitiate in the convent of Quercia, Lacordaire took the vows of the order of St. Dominic, and in 1841, with shaved head and clad in the white robe of his order, which had not been seen in France for half a century, he once more ascended the pulpit of Notre Dame. From this time his voice was frequently heard within the walls of that great cathedral of the capital of the French, as well as in many other parts of France. Thus, in 1847, he preached in the cathedral church of Nancy the funeral sermon of general Drouot, by many (e.g. Ste.-Beuve) pronounced a masterpiece of pulpit oratory. In the first election which succeeded the Revolution of 1848 he was chosen one of the representatives of Marseilles, and took part in some of the debates in the Assembly; but he resigned in the following May, and withdrew entirely from political life. In 1849, and again in 1850 and 1851, he resumed his courses at Notre Dame. To immense audiences, such as no orator in France had ever been able to call together before, he delivered in these eventful years a series of discourses on the communion of man with God, on the fall and the restoration of man, and on the providential economy of the restoration, which, together with earlier discourses, have been collected in three volumes, under the title of *Conf/renzces ude Notre Dame de Paris* (1835-50; a selection! was published in English dress by Henry Langdon, N. York, 1871, 8vo). His last public discourse at Paris he delivered at St. Roch in February, 1853.

To some of his remarks the imperial government took exception; and Lacordaire, finding himself restricted in that freedom of speech of which he had been throughout life a steady and powerful defender, never again preached in Paris; but at Toulouse—the birthplace of St. Dominic and the burial place of St. Aquinas — he delivered in 1854 six discourses on life—the life of the passions, the moral life, the supernatural life, and the influence of the supernatural life on the public and private life of man—which his biographer (Montalembert) pronounces "the most eloquent, the most irreproachable of all." Offered the direction of the school and convent of Soreze, he withdrew to that noted retreat of the Dominicans, and there died, Nov. 21, 1861. Besides the works alluded to—the *Conferences* and *Considerations philosophiques* - Lacordaire wrote a *Memoire pour le retablissement en France de l'ordre des freres precheurs* (1840). His correspondence with Madame Swetchine (by Falloux, 1864), with Montalembert (1863), and with a young friend (by l'abbe Perreire, 1863), as well as all his other writings, were published as *Guvres completes* in 1851, 1858, and 1861, in 6 vols. 8vo and 12mo. He was elected a member of the Academy in 1860 as successor to M. de Tocqueville, upon whom he pronounced a eulogy—the customary inaugural address—which was his last public address.

Of the ability Lacordaire displayed in his works a writer in the *Brit. and For. Evang. Rev.* (Oct. 1863), p. 726 sq., thus comments: "As a writer, Lacordaire has not the slightest pretensions to compete with Lamennais, one of the greatest writers of French prose. His loose, declamatory, theatrical style is in every respect far inferior to the simple, grand, nervous eloquence of Lamennais. We also venture to affirm that, in too many of his discourses, instead of explaining the Word of God simply and familiarly to the people, he goes out of his way to attack what he terms the prevailing doubt and scepticism of the age, and attempts to guide his hearers to a positive divine faith by the utter annihilation of the natural reason. In many of his discourses, too, he falsifies history for the purpose of making it coincide with his Romanist prejudices. He absolutely refuses to recognise any good whatever in former systems of religion and philosophy. Without the pale of the Romish Church all is evil, within it everything is good. As to human reason, he cannot endure it. ' That which at present ruins everything,' he says, ' that which causes the world to ride insecurely at anchor, is the reason.' 'Our intelligence appears to me like a ship without sails or masts on an unknown sea.' 'Societies are tottering when the

thinkers take them in hand, and the precise moment of their downfall is that wherein they announced to them that the intellect is emancipated.' And while human reason is thus summarily condemned, the infallibility of the Church is asserted and defended in the most absolute manner. 'The Catholic doctrine,' he says, 'resolves all questions, and takes from them even the quality of questions. We have no longer to reason, which is a great blessing, for we are not here to reason, but to act, and to build up in time a work for eternity.'"

See Montalembert, *Le Pere Lacordaire* (Paris, 1862, 8vo); Lomenie, *Le Pere Lacordaire* (1844); Lorrain, *Biographie historique de Lacordaire* (1847); Chocarne, *Innere Life of Pere Lacordaire* (transl. by Father Aylward; Lond. and New York, 1867, 8vo); Villard, *Correspondence inedite et biographie* (Par. 1870, 8vo); Kirwan, *Modern France* (1863); and the *Revze des dexu Mondes*, May 1, 1861: Sain te-Beuve, *Causeries du Luudi*, i, 208 sq.; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* Oct. 1863, art. iii; *Contemporary Rev.* May, 1868, art. i. NI. Edmond Scherer, in the *Literature Contenzporaine*, also treated of pere Lacordaire, but with special regard to his ability as a writer. His estimate of the noted Dominican is rather unfavorable, perhaps even unjust. Of the discourses of Lacordaire, he maintains that they are "unreadable" (p. 166). See also *Blackwood's Magazine*, Feb. 1863; *Lond. Quart. Review*, July, 1864. (J. H. W.)

Lacroix, Claudius,

a noted Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, was born at the village of St. Andre, province of Limburg, in 1652. He became master of philosophy in 1673, and immediately after joined the Order of Jesuits. He taught moral theology first at Cologne, then at Miunster; became doctor of theology in 1698, and died June 1, 1714. He wrote a commentary on Busenbaum's *Moral Theologie* (Cologne, 1719, 2 vols. folio). **SEE BUSENBAUM.**

Lacroze, Mathurin Veysiere De

a distinguished French Orientalist, was in turn a merchant, a medical student, and a Benedictine monk. Finally, having abjured Romanism, he retired to Prussia, where, in 1697, he became librarian to the king. He died at Berlin in 1739. His principal works are *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes* (La Haye, 1724, sm. 8vo):- *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie et d'Arminie* (La Haye, 1739, sm. 8vo). See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.*

Lactantius, Lucius Coelius (Or Cecilius) Firmianus,

one of the early Latin fathers, called by Jerome (*Catal.* c. 80) the most learned man of his time, and, on account of the fine and rhetorical culture which his writings evince, not unfrequently named the Christian Cicero (or, as Jerome has it, "Fluvius eloquentime Tullianse"), was formerly supposed to have been by birth an African, but is now generally believed to have been of Italian birth, a native of Firmum (Fermo), on the Adriatic, Italy. He was born probably near the middle of the 3d century; his parents, according to his own account, were heathens, and he only became a Christian at a somewhat mature age (comp. *De Ira Dei*, c. 2; *Instit. Div.* 7:2), certainly before the Diocletian persecution. Lactantius pursued his rhetorical studies in the school of the celebrated rhetorician and apologist Arnobius of Sicca, in proconsular Africa, and it is thus, in all probability, that arose the notion that Lactantius was of African birth. While yet a youth Lactantius gained celebrity by the publication of a poetical work called *Symposion*, a collection of a hundred riddles in hexameters for table amusement. But it was his eloquence that secured him really great renown, and he was heard of by Diocletian, and by him called to Nicomedia as professor of Latin eloquence. This city was, however, inhabited and visited mainly by Greeks, and Lactantius found but few pupils to instruct. This afforded him plenty of leisure, and he welcomed it as an opportunity to devote himself largely to authorship. Thus he continued at Nicomedia ten years, while the Christians were not only persecuted by the emperors with fire and sword, but also assailed by the heathen philosophers with the weapons of science, wit, and ridicule. Against so many outrages Lactantius felt impelled to undertake the defence of the hated and despised religion, and the more as he thought he had observed that they proceeded, at least in part, from ignorance and gross misunderstandings. It was during this defence of Christianity, in all probability, that he became himself a convert to the true faith, and thus may it be accounted for that Constantine called him to his court in Gaul as preceptor (after 312 says Dr. Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:956) of his son Crispus, whom Constantine afterwards (326) caused to be put to death. Eusebius tells us that even in this exalted position he remained so poor as often to want for the necessaries of life. He must have been quite old when he arrived in Gaul, for he is then already spoken of as a gray-haired old man, and he is supposed to have died at the imperial residence in Treves shortly after his pupil Crispus, about 330. It has often been a matter of great perplexity to antiquarians to account for the fact that Lactantius escaped

personal injury during the Diocletian persecution. Some think, and this seems to be reasonable, that Lactantius escaped suffering for his faith because he was generally regarded as a philosopher, and not as a Christian writer; and, indeed, to judge from his *De Opificio Dei*, he appears to have been more attracted by the moral and philosophical aspects of Christianity than by the supernatural and the dogmatic. In fact, in all the theological works of Lactantius is manifest the influence of his early studies of all the masterpieces of ancient rhetoric and philosophy, and he may be defined as a Christian pupil of Cicero and of Seneca. (Comp., on the inclination of the early Christian teachers in the Roman empire to style themselves "philosophers," *Brit. Quart. Rev.* July, 1871, p. 9, col. 1.) Jerome even says of him (*Epist.* 83, *ad Paulinuns* [alias 84 *ad Magnum*]), "Lactantius wrote seven books against the Gentiles, and two volumes on the work and the anger of God. If you wish to read these treatises, you will find in them a compendium of Cicero's Dialogues." He had entered more deeply into Christian morals than into Christian metaphysics, and his works offer none of those learned and profound expositions of the dogmas which we find in Clement of Alexandria or in Origen. Lactantius, however, has been called, as we already hinted, the Christian Cicero, on account of his resemblance to this celebrated classical writer in the elegance and finish of his style, but still more on account of having made himself the advocate and propagator of the great moral truth of Christianity, while carefully avoiding all dogmatic speculation; thus also did Cicero advocate all the great practical truths of the best philosophical systems of antiquity, but set little store by whatever was purely metaphysical.

In learning and culture Lactantius excelled all the men of his time; in the words of Jerome, he was "omnium suo tempore. eruditissimus." His writings betray a noble unconsciousness which forgets itself in striving to reach its lofty aim. The modesty of his claims and of his estimate of himself is exhibited and embodied in the facts of his life. Although at the court of the greatest prince on earth, and by his position invited to luxurious indulgence, he voluntarily preferred a poverty which not only excluded superfluities, but also often dispensed with the necessaries of life. Some have represented that he pushed his austerities even to an unauthorized extreme. "I shall think that I have sufficiently lived," he writes, "and that I have sufficiently fulfilled the office of a man, if my labor shall have freed any from their errors, and directed them in the way to heaven."

Lactantius was a layman and a rhetorician, and yet he displays in his

writings in general-and they were not few-such a depth and extent of theological knowledge as could scarcely have been expected. It is surprising with what penetration and precision he handles many intricate subjects. Warmth of feeling, richness of thought, and clearness of apprehension are impressed upon all his literary productions. His expressions are always lucid, considerate, and well arranged. Nowhere does the reader feel an unpleasant tone of pedantry or affectation; everywhere he is attracted by the impress of genuine learning and eloquence. In harmony and purity of style, in beauty and elegance of expression, he excels all the fathers of Christian antiquity, if we except Ambrose in some of his letters, and Sulpicius Severus. His reputation in this respect was so celebrated in the earliest times that men loved to call him the Christian Cicero. So much for form and diction. The case is quite otherwise with the exposition of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity in detail. In the midst of admirable philosophical developments, as with other writers of this class, we meet with many mistakes, many erroneous views and half-truths, for which Gelasius classed his writings with the Apocrypha. If the judgment above expressed is thus, in some measure, modified, yet is his merit not much diminished. That is to say, there are at bottom almost entirely such anomalies as he met in the older writers before him, and which the Church had not yet distinctly excluded by a more precise definition of the doctrines in question. What strikes us more unpleasantly is that we miss the establishment of Christianity by proof from its own dogmas, which he himself had promised to give; we sympathize with Jerome in the wish, " Utinam tam nostra confirmare potuisset, quam facile aliena distinxit."

Dr. Schaff gives the following summary of the doctrinal views of Lactantius (*Church Hist.* 3:957): "His mistakes and errors in the exposition of points of Christian doctrine do not amount to heresies, but are mostly due to the crude and unsettled state of the Church doctrine at the time. In the doctrine of sin he borders upon Manichaeism. In anthropology and soteriology he follows the synergism which, until Augustine, was almost universal. In the doctrine of the Trinity he was, like most of the ante-Nicene fathers, a subordinationist. He taught a *duplex nativitas* of Christ, one at the creation, and one at the incarnation. Christ went forth from God at the creation as a word from the mouth, yet hypostatically."

Works. — We will briefly notice his works in order:

1. *Divinarum Institutionurn*, libri vii (Divine Institutes, seven books), a comprehensive apology for the Christian religion, which, on account of the elegant style in which it is written, has been favorite reading, and is said to have appeared in more than a hundred editions. His motive for writing this work he thus assigns himself: Since men, by their own fault bewildered, can no longer find the way back to truth, his object is to point it out to them, and, at the same time, to confirm in it those who have already reached it. He feels himself the more impelled to this because his predecessors in this field-and names particularly Tertullian and Cyprian - had not, in his opinion, satisfied the requirements of the case on all sides, and had performed their task neither with the requisite learning and thoroughness, nor with the suitable adornment of art and scientific depth. To this unfortunate circumstance he ascribes it that the Christian religion was held in such contempt, and with the educated classes was as good as totally unknown. When, with all the power of language and genius which he eminently possessed, Lactantius promises to make a defence of the faith, the precedence in this respect must by all means be conceded to him; in beauty of form and splendor of diction he surpasses all; but Jerome justly refuses to admit the same in respect to the weight of the contents and the solidity of the proofs. The work is dedicated to Constantine the Great-if the passage is not an interpolation-whom he extols with the highest reverence, and praises as the first Christian prince, and the restorer of righteousness. Consequently, it was written at the time when he, advanced in years, was already at court; but the Church was still sighing under a severe persecution, evidently that of Licinius, since the author refers to that of Diocletian as having long since died out. This brings us to the year 320, although he had, as elsewhere appears from his own words, formed the purpose and the plan at a much earlier period. Some suppose that the work was commenced in Bithynia and completed in Gaul after a lapse of twenty years. Others, from an allusion which it contains to the Diocletian persecution-" Spectatae sunt enim spectanturque adhuc per orbem penne cultorum Dei," etc. (v, 17, § 5), suppose it to have been written before Lactantius went to Gaul.

The seven books into which this work is divided form seven separate treatises. The first book is inscribed *De fallsa religione*. He designedly leaves untouched the principal question in regard to the *existence* of a supreme Providence, and takes his departure from the proposition that there is *one God*, and that, according to our idea of his essence, of his

relation to the world under him, and of that to him, there *can be but one*. He proceeds then to confirm this dogma by the authority of the prophets (of which, however, he makes more use in his programme than in his performance; and which, indeed, would have been only a *petitio principii*), by the utterances of the poets, the philosophers, and the sibyls—all of whom consent in one and the same truth; and this, at least, is good as an *argumentum ad hominem*, though he seems to allege it as having a higher and proper force of proof. The last half of the book consists in the ludicrous exposure and sarcastic confutation of the mythological system of deities in general and in detail, as recognised by its advocates.

The second book, *De orgiine erroris*, demonstrates the manifold absurdity with which mankind, while all nature impels them to the knowledge of the one God, and a law of necessity teaches every one instinctively to seek him, are nevertheless so blinded as to wander away to the worship of idols. He confutes the spurious grounds by which particularly the educated class among the heathen sought to excuse or justify idolatry, and shows how this whole pagan religion, more closely considered, is only a reflex of their thoroughly materialized and secularized habit of mind. But since the heathen used especially to appeal to the antiquity of their cultus and to venerable tradition, the author meets them in this wise: In matters of religion every one must see for himself; error, though ever so full of years, has, by its old age, acquired no right, and must give way to the truth so soon as she establishes against it her primitive and indefeasible claims. He proceeds, with constant reference to the diverging opinions of the philosophers, to develop from the holy Scriptures the history of the creation and of the origin of idolatry. According to him, this originated in its first germ from Ham, who lay under his father's curse. Among his posterity the loss of the knowledge of the true God first prevailed; this passed over into Sabaism or Parseeism (worship of the heavenly bodies); spread itself in this form first in Egypt, and thence among the neighboring people. In its further progress it included the deification of men, an externally pompous worship, and finally developed itself into idolatry proper, which, cherished and promoted by the influence of daemons, and strengthened by means of other arts, by oracles, magic, etc., leavened the whole life of the pagan nations. The truth of this intimate connection of the daemon realm with the heathen polytheistic worship, and with the phenomena pertaining thereto, lies visibly before us, says Lactantius, in the Christian power of exorcism; and with this he concludes.

The third book, *De falsa sapientia*, exposes the heathen philosophy as nugatory and false. The etymology of the word philosophy indicates, says he, not the possession of wisdom, but a striving after it; and in its ultimate result it leaves us nothing but mere opinions, upon whose grounds or groundlessness it can give us no trustworthy criterium, and consequently no certainty. The result of all philosophy, therefore, when brought into relation to our highest end, is unsatisfying and useless. Our heart thirsts after happiness, and this eager, fervent impulse no human wisdom can satiate. The reason why it cannot is this: because, torn away from its union with religion, the fundamental condition of happiness, it must necessarily become external, onesided, and abstract. He finally points out in detail this result of all philosophy in the history of the different schools, none of which has found the truth, or could find it, because their formal principle had already misplaced the way to the desired goal. Therefore—and this is the natural conclusion — to still his thirst for knowledge, man must not turn himself to these, but to God's own revelation.

The fourth book, *De vera sapientia*, proposes to prepare the way to this goal. Starting with the principle already enunciated, but here set forth more in detail, that (genuine) wisdom and religion are, in the last analysis, one, they may, only in our conception, be held asunder as distinct, abstract elements, but in reality and in life ought never to be separated. The heathen philosophy and religion, in which this unnatural antithesis and separation occurred, were therefore, for this simple reason, false. The true unity of the two is found only in Christianity. In order to exhibit this principle as a fact, he reviews the history of our religion. After having briefly, but as much as he deemed requisite for his purpose, spoken of the prophets, he proceeds to develop the doctrine, after his fashion, of the person of Jesus Christ, from the first, the eternal birth of the Logos from the Father, and from the second, his incarnation in time; he establishes the truth of these, together with his Deity and his Messianic office, from his life, his miracles, and the prophets, with reference almost always to the Jews only; but finally he shows to the heathen how the very idea of true ethical wisdom in some sort includes in itself the incarnation of the lawgiver, that so a perfect example may be given of the possibility of keeping the law. The necessities of man required this in order to a mediation between God and man; and the lowly life of Christ, his sufferings, and even his death on the cross, are in perfect harmony with this design.

The fifth book, *De justitia*, unfolds first the author's motives and object.

Then, entering upon the subject itself, he teaches how, anciently, in the times called by the heathen the Golden Age, the one God was honored, and with his worship justice bore sway; and how, in the sequel, in connection with polytheism, all sorts of vice came trooping in, but with Christ a kind of golden age has again appeared through the propagation of righteousness. He further shows how near this lies to all, and that only through wilfulness it can fail to be known; and how the heathen, in open contradiction to the idea of religion, to reason, and to every sentiment of right, hate the Christians, and persecute and torment them even to the death. Were the Christians fools, one should spare them; if wise, imitate them. That they are the latter is made clear by their virtuous behavior and their unflinching constancy. It is true the wisdom and righteousness of God condescend to clothe themselves in the appearance of folly, partly that thus the wisdom of the world may be convinced of its nothingness, and partly that the righteous man may be helped forward on the narrow way to his reward. The pretexts offered by the heathen in justification of their treatment of the Christians, as that they sought to bring them to a sober mind, etc., were, he maintains, utterly empty, because, in the first place, this treatment was in itself unsuitable, and, in respect to the Christians, who knew very well how to defend their cause with all soberness, it was contemptuous and destructive of its own object; but, in the second place, these pretexts were contradicted and falsified by the Romans' contrary practice of toleration towards other and extremely despicable and senseless religions. Rather it was abundantly clear that nothing but a fierce hatred against the truth impelled to those bloody deeds of violence and cruelty.

The sixth book, *De vero cultu*, treats of the practical side of true religion. A merely external worship, like that of the heathen, is absolutely worthless, and only that is true in which the human soul offers itself to God. As all the philosophers agree in saying there are two ways for man, one of virtue, the other of vice; the former narrow and toilsome, leading to immortality; the latter easy and pleasant, leading to destruction: the Christians call them the way to heaven and to hell, and eagerly prefer the former, that at the last they may attain the enjoyment of the blessedness in which it ends. The philosophers could not find the way of virtue, because at the outset they had formed to themselves an utterly different idea of good and evil, and therefore always sought it where it is never to be found — on earth instead of in heaven. The Christians, who walk in the light of revelation, have the clew of the truth, the eternal, unchangeable law of God, adapted to the

nature of man. which unfolds our duties both towards God (*officia pietatis*) and towards man (*officia humanitatis*). Lactantius then proceeds to treat of the virtues which are embraced in the fundamental principle of genuine humanity—pity, liberality, care for the widow, the orphan, the sick, the dead, etc.; finally, of self-government and the moderation of the desires and appetites, particularly of chastity in wedlock and out of it; and, last of all, of penitence or penance (*poenitentia*), and the true service of God. The former he treats as a *satisfaction*, and in the latter he does not rise above the merely ethical, Rationalistic position, although, through his whole exposition, he makes references, by way of contrast, to the divergent views of the philosophers.

The seventh and last book, *De vita beata*, has for its subject the chief end of man. He gives us briefly his own conception of the great end of our existence, thus: "The world was made that we might be born; we are born that we might know the Creator of the world and of ourselves; we know him that we may honor him; we honor him that we may receive immortality as the reward of our effort, because the honoring of God demands the highest effort; we are rewarded with immortality, that we, like the angels, may forever serve the supreme Father and Lord, and may form unto God an ever-during kingdom: that is the sum and substance of all things, the secret of God, the mystery of the world." After this follows the proof of the immortality of the soul, pursued through ten distinct arguments, with the refutation of objections. He then proceeds with an attempt to show under what condition the natural immortality of the soul becomes at the same time a blessed immortality. With this he connects his views in regard to the time and the signs of the end of the present world to the last judgment, to the millennial reign, to the general resurrection and the transformation of this world. On the superabounding delights and glories of the millennium he enlarges with special satisfaction and copious eloquence. In conclusion, he congratulates the Church upon the peace which Constantine has given her, and calls upon all to forsake the worship of idols and to do homage to the one true God.

2. *An Epitome of the Institutes*, dedicated to Pentadius, is appended to the larger work, and is attributed to Lactantius by Jerome, who describes it as being even in his time ἀκέφαλος. All the early editions of this abridgment begin at the sixteenth chapter of the fifth book of the original. But in the 18th century a MS. containing nearly the entire work was discovered in the royal library at Turin, and was published by C. NM. Pfaff, chancellor of the

University of Tiibingen (Paris, 1712). Walchius and others have doubted the genuineness of this *Epitomse*, but Jerome's assertion appears to us conclusive.

3. *De Ira Dei* (On the Anger of God). It has often been observed how the Greek philosophy, and, following its lead, the heretical Gnosis, could not reconcile justice and goodness. This had also struck Lactantius, and awakened in him the thought of proving in this treatise that the abhorrence of evil and primitive justice are necessary and fundamental attributes of the divine Being. In the judgment of Jerome, this work is composed with equal learning and eloquence. Its date is probably somewhat later than that of the *Institutes*.

The system both of the Epicureans and of the Stoics excluded all reaction of God against the wicked. The former, in order not to disturb God's indolent repose; the latter, in order not to transfer to the idea of God human characteristics, would know nothing of any vital or essential manifestation of the Deity in the course of the world or towards mankind. Lactantius showed how, on the contrary, in the worthy idea of God's essence and operation, the conception of providence cannot be wanting; and how, moreover, complacency towards the good has, as its natural counterpart, the detestation of its opposite, the evil. Besides, religion is incontestably founded in the nature of man; but, if we assume that God is not angry with the wicked, or does not avenge the transgressions of his commands, from religion are withdrawn, by consequence, its rational motive and all its foundations. If there is a moral distinction among actions, it is impossible that God should stand affected in the same manner towards the one as towards the other, and that without its being necessary, in consequence, to ascribe to God likewise passions or affections which consist in a weakness, as, for example, fear. When Epicurus objects that God could punish if punish he must-without any emotion within himself, Lactantius replies: the view of the evil must of itself provoke the will of any being who is good to a counter emotion, and it cannot be indifferent to the lawgiver how his precepts shall be observed. The disproportion of the external fortunes of the good and the bad in the present life proves nothing to the contrary when we consider the proper attitude and essence of virtue, etc. The whole he confirms by declarations of the prophets, and especially of the sibyls.

4. *De Opificio Dei, vel formatione hominis* (On Creation).-This is thought

to be the first-fruits of the Christian genius of Lactantius, since, judging from the introduction, the persecution was still in progress. The book is dedicated to a certain Demetrianus, who, having been his disciple, was now an officer of state; it is especially directed against the prevailing philosophy, and therefore the presentation of the subject is kept, in form and spirit, upon this basis. The subject of the treatise is the organization of human nature, which Cicero, he says, has more than once superficially touched upon in his philosophical writings, but never thoroughly investigated. He first draws a general parallel between the organism of the beasts and that of man; to the latter God, in connection with an apparently scantier outfit, has given, in his reason, a pre-eminence far outweighing all the superiority of the beasts in physical force. When philosophy, particularly the Epicurean, reminds us of the helplessness of human infancy, of man's weakness and early dissolution, the author shows, on the other hand, that these objections rest upon a one-sided mode of regarding, partly the phenomena in question considered absolutely, and partly the essence and the end of man and of his nature (c. 1-4). Having thus, in a preliminary way, disposed of these possible objections against his subsequent exhibition of the subject, he proceeds to his proper business, the consideration of the human body as the habitation and organ of the soul. He indulges in a detailed investigation and analysis of its wonderful structure; shows the beauty and symmetry of its several limbs, their adaptation to their corresponding functions, and their admirable connection with the totality of the organism. Hence he establishes, what the Epicureans denied, that a divine creation, and an ordering and guiding providence, are active throughout the universe (c. 5-17). In conclusion, he dilates upon the essence of our soul, upon its distinction from spirit (*animus*), and, finally, upon its propagation. He here reviews the opposing philosophical theories, and declares himself thoroughly opposed to generationism or traducianism (c. 17-20). In this treatise he has caught the grand idea, and furnished the leading materials of Paley's famous teleological argument; and, what is more surprising, has anticipated some of the most striking and comprehensive ideas of modern scientific and zoological classification.

5. *De mortibus persecutorum* (On Martyrdom). — Le Nourry was of opinion that this treatise does not belong to Lactantius. In the only codex which we have of it, it bears, not the inscription Firmiani Lactantii, but Lucii Caecilii, which is never given to our author by the *ancient* writers. We must confess that, without being aware of this judgment of Le Nourry,

we had already, upon a careful reading of the treatise, come to the same conclusion from internal evidence. Mohler, on the other hand, maintains its genuineness; in confirmation of which he refers to the facts:

(1) that Jerome refers to a work of Lactantius under the name *De Persecutions*, which, says he, indicates a similar subject matter with the work in question;

(2) that it is dedicated to a certain Donatmls, like that *De Ira Dei*, and the writer shows himself to have been an eyewitness of the transactions in Nicomedia under Diocletian. These reasons certainly are not very strong; but, meanwhile, it is a curious question whether the Donatus addressed in this treatise as a professor may not have been the first Donatus of heretical notoriety. Mohler further adds that the style is the same as that of Lactantius's other works. From this we must strongly dissent. The style is harsher, more rugged, and broken and irregular-often obscure. It frequently reminds one of Tacitus; whereas the genuine Lactantius rarely departs from an imitation of the clear, smooth, flowing, and copious style of Cicero, whom he had chosen for his special model of eloquence.

In the early editions of Lactantius *De mortibus persecutorum* is altogether wanting. It was first printed by Stephen Baluze in his *Miscellanea*, vol. ii (Paris, 1679), from a very ancient MS. in the Bibliotheca Colbertina. Its authenticity as the *De Persecutione Liber Unus* of Lactantius, mentioned by Jerome, is maintained by Baluze, Heumann, and others. Among the latest authorities in favor of accepting the production as a genuine work of Lactantius we count Mohler (see below) and Dr. Philip Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* 3:958, note 2). Against accrediting this treatise to Lactantius are prominent, besides Nourry (in the Append. to ii, 839 sq. of Migne's edition of Lactantius), Pfaff, Walch, Le Clerc, Lardner, Gibbon, Burckhardt, and others.

The object of this work is to show the truth of the Christian religion historically, from the tragical fate of all those who have persecuted the Church of Christ. It gives a very detailed description of several scenes in the persecutions of Nero, Domitian, and Valerian, but especially dwells upon the later times, those of Diocletian and his imperial colleagues Galerius and Maximin, and shows how avenging justice overtook them all. This work, if genuine, furnishes highly important contributions to ecclesiastical history. Among other things, its author, whoever he may be, declares that Peter and Paul preached the Gospel at Rome, and established

a *temple iof God* there, where they both suffered martyrdom.

6. *Lost Writings.* — The Symposium of Lactantius has probably perished, though some have surmised that the *AEnigmcata*, published under the name of *Symposius*, is really the youthful composition of Lactantius. Jerome mentions besides an *Itinerarium* in hexameters, two books to *Asclepiades*, eight books of letters to Probus, Severus, and Domitian, all of which are lost. It appears from his own words (*Instit.* 7:1, sub fin.) that he had formed the design of drawing up a work against the Jews, but we cannot tell whether he ever accomplished his purpose.

Several other pieces still extant, but which have been erroneously ascribed to Lactantius, are, *De Phaenice*, in elegiacs, a compilation of tales and legends on the farfamed Arabian bird; it is probably of a later date (see Wernsdorff, *Poetce Lat. Minores*, 3:283): — *Symposium*, a collection of one hundred riddles, more likely the work of a certain Caelius Firmianus:— *De Pascha ad Felicem Episcopum*, now generally considered as the work of Venantius Honorianus Clementianus Fortunatus, in the 6th century: — *De Passione Domini* (printed in G. Fabricius's *Poet. Vet. Eccles. Op. Christiana*, Basle, 1564; and in *Bibl. Patr.* Lugdun. 1677), in hexameters, worthy of Lactantius, but bearing in its language the impress of a much later age.

The *Editio Princeps* of Lactantius was printed at the monastery of Subiaco, by Sweynheym and Pannartz, in 1465, and is one of the earliest specimens of typographical art; the same printers published two other editions (Rome, 1468, 1470), the latter under the direction of Andrew, bishop of Aleria. A number of editions have been published since; the most important are by Gallseus (Lugd. Bat. 1660, in a series of *Variorum Classics*, 8vo), C. Cellarius (Lpz. 1698, 8vo), Walchius (Lpz. 1715, 8vo), Heumann (Gitting. 1736, 8vo), Btinemann (Lpzg. 1739, 8vo), Le Brun and Lenglet du Fresnoy (Paris, 1748, 2 vols. 4to), F. Ea St. Xaverio (Rome, 1754-9), and Migne (Paris, 1844, 2 vols. royal 8vo). A convenient manual edition was prepared by O. F. Fritzsche for Gersdorfs *Bibliotheca Patrum eccles. selecta* (Lips. 1842), vols. 10:xi. See Jerome, *De Viris Ill.* p. 79, 80; Chronic. Euseb. ad ann. cccxviii, *Comment. in Eccles.* c. 10; *Comment. in Ephes.* c. 4, *Ad Paulin. Epist.*; Lactant. *Divin. Instit.* i, 1, § 8; 5:2, § 2; 3:13, § 12; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 5:232; Schonemann, *Bibl. Patr. Lat.* vol. i, § 2; Bahr, *Gesch. d. Romisch. Litterat.* Suppl. Band, 1e Abtheil. § 9; 2e Abtheil. § 38-46; Bahr, *Die christlich-rom. Theologie*, p. 72 sq.;

Franciscus Floridus, *Subcesivarumm. Lect.* liber ii, ch. iv; Lenain de Tillemont, *Histoire Eccles.* vol. vi; Dupin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs eccles.* i, 295; Brooke Mountain, *A Summary of the Writings of Lactantius* (Lond. 1839); Mohler, *Patrologie*, i, 917-933; Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. sacres*, ii, 494 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* vol. 3:§ 173; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 160-163; *Christian Review*, 1845, p. 415 sq.; Woodham, *Tertullian*, p. liii; Leckey, *Hist. Europ. Morals*, i, 493 sq. Excellent articles may also be found, especially on the writings of Lactantius, in Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* ii, 701; and Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:158. On the Christology of Lactantius, consult Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. i, vol. ii, p. 192 sq.; Lamson, *The Church in the first three Centuries*, p. 183 sq.; Bull, *On the Trinity* (ii, Index); Neander, *Chr. Dogmas; Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theol.* 1871, vol. 4:art. xiii.

Lactinia,

a term used in the Church law of fasts to denote whatever is obtained as an article of food from the mammalia, viz. milk, butter, grease, cheese. Eggs are usually included with these articles. Abstinence from such food was required in the Western Church during Lent, while the more stringent customs of the Greek Church extended the prohibition to all other fasts. Thomas Aquinas uses the following language: "In jejuniis quadragesimali interdiceretur universaliter etiam ova et lactinia, circa quorum abstinentiam in aliis jejuniis diversae consuetudines existunt apud diversos." The Laodicean and Trullan (A.D. 691) councils made stringent requirements on the subject. Certain papal dispensations, granted as late as A.D. 1344 and A.D. 1485, show that even in certain parts of the Western Church this abstinence was practiced in many fasts besides Lent. In some Catholic countries general dispensations on this point have become permanent by long custom and positive decree, especially on the ground of health and necessity.

In the English Church the only abstinence that was ever enforced was from flesh-meat, in the reign of queen Elizabeth; but its object was rather the promotion of state interests, "to promote fisheries, to maintain mariners, and set men a fishing;" and was dispensed with by virtue of licenses, which were sold, according to the rank of the applicants, by the curates, under an act of Parliament passed in the fifth year of her [Elizabeth's] reign (Walcott, *Sacred Archceol.* p. 273, Fasts; comp. Hook. *Ch. Dictionary*, article Abstinence). "With us," says Wheatly (Hook, *Church Diet.* p. 9), "

neither Church nor State makes any difference in the kinds of meat; but, as far as the former determines in the matter, she seems to recommend an entire abstinence from all manner of food till the time of fasting be over; declaring in her [Ch. of Engl.] homilies that fasting is a withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food from the body for the determined time of fasting." See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex*, s.v. **SEE ABSTINENCE**; **SEE FASTS**.

Lacunary Roofs

The ceiling of churches in early times was often composed of lacunary work, i.e. it was divided into several panels called *laquearia* or *lacunaria*, and these were richly gilded and otherwise ornamented. Jerome often speaks in his writings of the lacunary golden roofs. See Farrar, *Eccl. Dict.* s.v.

Lacu'nus

(rather LACCUNUS, **Λακκούδης**, Vulg. *Caleus*), one "of the sons of Addi," who had married a foreign wife after the exile (1 Esdr. 9:31); doubtless the CHELAL **SEE CHELAL** (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (^{<510B>}Ezra 10:30).

Lacy, John

an English mystical writer, flourished in the beginning of the 18th century. He joined the French prophets upon their appearance in London, and professed to have supernatural revelations. His principal works are, *Warnings of the Eternal Spirit by the Mouth of his Servant John, surnamed Lacy* (London, 1707, sm. 8vo):-*A Relation of the Dealings of God to his unworthy Servant since the Time of his believing and professing himself inspired* (London, 1708, small 8vo). He is also supposed to be the author of *The general Delusion of Christians touching the Ways of God revealing himself to and by the Prophets* (1713, 8vo); reprinted a few years since. See Darling, *Encyclop. Bibliogr.* vol. ii, s.v.

Lad

(**ῥ[ῆ]** **ἄρ[η]**, *na'ar*, often rendered "young man," etc.; N.T. **παιδάριον**, a *little child*, the last occurring only ^{<400B>}John 6:9, and "child" in ^{<4016>}Matthew 11:16; both terms being originally without respect to sex). The Heb. word occasionally thus rendered in the Auth.Vers., although occasionally

standing for a *girl* or maiden (^{<0244>}Genesis 24:14, 16, 28, 55; 34:3, 12; ^{<0215>}Deuteronomy 22:15 sq.), for which the fem. noun (*nr[ׁ]i naarah'*) is usually employed, properly denotes a *boy*, being prob. a primitive word. It is spoken of an infant just born (Exodus ii, 6; ^{<0715>}Judges 13:5, 7; ^{<0901>}1 Samuel 4:21), of a boy not yet full grown (^{<0216>}Genesis 21:16 sq.; 22:12; ^{<0376>}Isaiah 7:16; 8:4), and of a youth nearly twenty years old (^{<0349>}Genesis 34:19; 41:12; ^{<1007>}1 Kings 3:7; ^{<1005>}2 Samuel 18:5, 29). *SEE CHILD*, etc.

La'dan

(Γαδάν v. r. Λαλάν, and even Ἀσάν, Vulg. *Dalarus*), one of the Temple servants whose descendants had lost their pedigree after the exile (1 Esdr. 5:37); evidently the DELAIAH *SEE DELAIAH* (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (^{<1510>}Ezra 2:60).

Ladd, Francis Dudley,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1820. When only eight years of age he showed marked indications of piety, but it was not until his fifteenth year that he joined the Church, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. George Shephard, now professor in Bangor Theological Seminary. With a view to prepare for the ministry, he entered Bowdoin College at the age of seventeen, and graduated with honor in 1841; then studied theology at Bangor Seminary, and was ordained at Farmington in 1846. In Nov., 1851, he received and accepted a call from the Penn Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa. During the war he labored incessantly for the good of the soldiers, but fell a prey to disease contracted in the camps, whither he had gone several times, and died July 7, 1862. See Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1863, p. 184.

Ladd, William

an American philanthropist, born at Exeter, New Hampshire, in 1778, was one of the originators of the American Peace Society, of which he became president. He died in 1841. Ladd was editor of the *Friend of Peace* and the *Harbinger of Peace*, and wrote several essays on that subject.

Ladder

Picture for Ladder 1

Picture for Ladder 2

($\mu\lambda\sigma\mu\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\tau\mu'$, a staircase, perh. from ל ל ע ; to raise up; Sept. $\kappa\lambda\iota\mu\alpha\zeta$; the Arab. *sullamnun* has the same signification) occurs only once, in the account of Jacob's vision in his dream at Bethel (~~1~~Genesis 28:12), where the "ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it," represented the Gospel dispensation, the blessings of which the patriarch's posterity were to inherit; the Redeemer himself being this mystic channel of intercourse between heaven and earth (John i, 51). (See Lang, *Visio Scalce Jacob*, Alt. 1699; Schramm, *De Scala Jacobcea*, F. ad O. 17-.) Scalingladders for war ($\kappa\lambda\iota\mu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$) are mentioned in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. 5:30). That this was a contrivance known from the earliest times, we have abundant evidence on the monuments of Thebes, where attacks on fortified places are represented as being made by soldiers provided with scaling-ladders (Wilkinson, i, 390). (For illustration, see opposite page.) Similar scenes are frequently depicted on the Assyrian monuments (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 284). **SEE FORTIFICATION.**

Ladder Of Tyrus, The

($\eta\ \kappa\lambda\iota\mu\alpha\zeta\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon$; Vulg. *a terminis Tyri*, possibly reading $\kappa\lambda\iota\mu\alpha$), one of the extremities (the northern) of the district over which Simon Maccabneus was made captain ($\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$) by Antiochus VI (or Theos) very shortly after his coming to the throne; the other being "the borders of Egypt" (1 Macc. 11:59). The Ladder of Tyre (ל צ אml ws rwx , see Reland, *Palest.* p. 343), or of the Tyrians ($\eta\ \kappa\lambda\iota\mu\alpha\zeta\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$), was the local name for a high mountain, the highest in that neighborhood, a hundred stadia north of Ptolemais, the modern Akka or Acra (Josephus, *War*, ii, 10, 2). The rich plain of Ptolemais is bounded on the north by a rugged mountain ridge which shoots out from Lebanon and dips perpendicularly into the sea, forming a bold promontory about 300 feet in height (Russegger, p. 3,143, 262; Ritter, *Palest. sund Syr.* 3:727, 814 sq.). The waves beat against the base of the cliff, leaving no passage below. In ancient times a road was carried, by a series of zigzags and staircases, over the summit, to connect the plain of Ptolemais with Tyre-hence the origin of the name *Scala*

Tyrionum, "Ladder of Tyre." It was the southern pass into Phoenicia proper, and formed the boundary between that country and Palestine (Kenrick, *Phoenicia*, p. 20; Reland, p. 544). The road still remains, and is the only one along the coast. A short distance from it is a little village called Nakuirah, and the pass is now called *Ra's en-Nalcurah* ("the excavated promontory"), doubtless from the road which has been "hewn in the rock" (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 389; see also Pococke, i, 79; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3:89; Stanley, p. 260, 262). The location of the Ras en-Nakhurah agrees very nearly with the above position defined by Josephus, as it lies 10 miles, or about 120 stadia, from Akka, and is characterized by travellers as very high and steep. Both the Ras en-Nakhurah and the *Ras el-Abyad*, i.e. the White Cape, sometimes called Cape Blanco, a headland six miles still farther north, are surmounted by a path cut in zigzags; that over the latter is attributed to Alexander the Great. It is possibly from this circumstance that the latter is by some travellers (Irby, Oct. 21; Wilson, ii, 232; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 346; etc.) treated as the ladder of the Tyrians. But by the early and accurate Jewish traveller, hap-Parchi (Zunz, in *Benj. of Tudela*, p. 402), and in our own times by Robinson (iii, 82), Mislin (*Les Saints Lieux*, ii, 9). Schwarz (p. 76), Stanley (*Syr. and Pal.* p. 264), the Ras en-Nakhurah is identified with the ladder; the last-named traveller pointing out well that the reason for the name is the fact of its "differing from Carmel in that it leaves no beach between itself and the sea, and thus, by cutting off all communication round its base, acts as the natural barrier between the Bay of Acre and the maritime plain to the north—in other words, between Palestine and Phoenicia" (comp. p. 266).

Ladislas

(*Vladislas, Vladislaf, Uladislas*) II, king of Poland (1386-1434), known also under the name of *Jagiello* or *Jagello*, deserves a place in our work on account of his introduction of Christianity into the Polish dominions. He was born in Lithuania in 1348, the son of Olgerd and grandson of Gedimin, great princes of Lithuania. He succeeded his father in 1386, and, by the noble influence of his pious Christian wife Hedvig, was influenced to embrace Christianity; a short time after all Lithuania became Christian, and when Poland came under his sway Christianity became the dominant religion there. He died in Grodek, near Lemberg, Galicia, May 31, 1434.
SEE LITHUANIA; SEE POLAND.

Ladislaus, King Of Naples

(A.D. 1386-1414), succeeded to the throne on the violent death of his father, Charles III. Born in 1376, he was ten years old at the time of his accession to the disputed crown. Louis of Anjou, to whom queen Joanna, the predecessor of Charles III, had bequeathed the kingdom, was his competitor. Ladislaus and Louis were of nearly the same age. Each was left under the guardianship of a widowed mother, and each had on his side the authority of one of the two rival popes, between whom Christendom was divided, and whose mutual excommunications, extending to their respective adherents, were the scandal of the age.

The reign of Ladislaus is historically important from its intimate connection with the great events of the time in Church and State. At an early age he developed that restless energy and that unscrupulous ambition which made him a model for Machiavelli's "Prince." When but sixteen years old, his mother Margaret committed him to the barons of her party to make his first essay in arms. His marriage with the richest heiress of Sicily put into his hands an immense dowry, which he employed to prosecute his designs, securing, when it was expended, from the venal pontiff a divorce from his wife, whom he bestowed upon one of his favorites.

By means of the papal sanction and his own energy he recovered Naples from the Angevin party (1400). The faction opposed to him felt the full weight of his vengeance. His security was increased by a second marriage, which the pontiff, Boniface IX, proposed. His ambition was excited by the tempting offer of the Hungarian crown, made by those who, dissatisfied with Sigismund (subsequently emperor), had seized and imprisoned him. His expedition proved unsuccessful, and his absence from Naples inspired anew the hopes and efforts of the Angevin party. His prompt return (1403) defeated their attempts. The most powerful of the disaffected nobility felt the weight of his vengeance. Many were thrust into prison. Numbers were strangled. Others fled. Wholesale confiscation enriched the royal treasury. A reign of terror prevailed throughout the kingdom.

Jealous of his powerful ally, Boniface IX showed himself no longer disposed to co-operate with the tyrant; but at this juncture he died. In spite of letters from the king of France deprecating a new election, that Christendom might be united under one pontiff (the French prelates supported as rival pope Benedict XIII, q.v.), the cardinals chose Innocent VII (q.v.) as his successor. Ladislaus, whose policy was opposed to the

reunion of Christendom, hastened to Rome to congratulate him upon his accession. He had designs, moreover, upon Rome itself, torn by Guelph and Ghibelline factions. Dissembling his purpose, he proposed himself as mediator, and secured a strong hold upon the government of the city, while his royal title was solemnly confirmed.

Turning from Rome, he led his army to Southern Italy (1406), but was repelled by the valor of the Ursini. The new pope already regarded him with mistrust. At his instigation the Roman factions were brought into collision. Alarmed for his safety, the pope fled. Ladislaus ordered his generals to take possession of the city, but they were repulsed. The citizens, inclining to favor the exiled pontiff, recalled him to Rome. Ladislaus, whose attention had again been diverted to Southern Italy, where a marriage with the widow of Raymond de Ursini had accomplished more than arms, now advanced in open hostility, resolved to regain his control of the city. He was embittered against the pontiff, who resented his unscrupulous spoliation of churches and monasteries, as well as other revenues of the Church, and who complained, moreover, of his conspiracy and treason against himself. The charges against the king were drawn up in sixteen articles, and on the ground of these he was declared to have forfeited his kingdom, as well as the fiefs which he held of the Church, and was excommunicated by the Church. Ladislaus, however, succeeded in calming the papal resentment, and a treaty was effected which restored him to his former power and privileges; but as he evaded all the provisions which conflicted with his ambition, the excommunication would have been renewed had not Innocent died suddenly (Nov. 6, 1406).

Gregory XII, successor of Innocent VII, pledged himself on his election to promote the unity of the Church. His disinclination to meet his rival in conference was encouraged by Ladislaus, who assured him of protection. The unscrupulous proceedings of the king stood in need of the papal sanction, and he was willing to make some efforts to secure a pope for himself. Gregory XII disappointed the expectations of his cardinals. Alarmed by the sedition at Rome, he fled to Viterbo (August 3, 1407), and afterwards to Sienna and Lucca. Ladislaus seized the occasion to make inroads upon the States of the Church. Gregory complained of his conduct, and menaced him with the thunders of the Church. He found himself forced, however, to accept the plausible excuses of the king, whose support he needed. Ladislaus now resolved to prosecute his long-cherished desire of possessing himself of Rome. By means of force and treachery he

succeeded in his project. On the 25th of April, 1408, Rome opened its gates to him, and the tyrant of Naples was welcomed by the shouts of the people.

Gregory exulted in the king's success. He hoped himself to be able now to return to Rome. He was encouraged to refuse his assent to the appointment of the council proposed to be held at Pisa, which he justly feared might prove fatal to his claims. Meanwhile Ladislaus prosecuted his ambitious plans. He hoped to secure possession of Sienna and Florence. For several months he prosecuted his plans by diplomacy and threats; but the cautious resistance of the republics, and the hostile attitude of the Pisan Council, which was now (March, 1409) in session, disconcerted him. The new pontiff, Alexander V, elected by the council, favored the pretensions of Louis of Anjou, the rival pretender to the throne of Naples. The latter, followed by an army, and surrounded by his partisans, entered Italy and secured a lodgment in Rome. Ladislaus, in the height of his passion, swore to annihilate the authors of his calamity. He provided for the security of Gregory, who had been holding a council in Aquileia, rival to that of Pisa, and ordained his recognition as pontiff throughout the kingdom. He then proceeded in force to Rome, of which he quickly regained possession.

Alexander V, indignant at the king's course, made up a catalogue of his crimes, and ordered Ladislaus before him to hear the sentence which pronounced his forfeiture of his throne. Regardless of the summons, Ladislaus prosecuted his measures of violent rapacity, amassing the means to continue the war. But at this juncture he lost possession of Rome. With treachery within and the forces of Balthasar Cossa without, the city yielded to the allies, and the papal authority was re-established within its walls.

The sudden death of Alexander V (May 3, 1410) opened the way to the election of Balthasar Cossa himself, the sworn foe of Ladislaus, under the title of John XXIII. Leaving Bologna, which he had ruled as a despot under the title of legate, he advanced in triumph to Romn. Ladislaus was now confronted by all Italian pope and a French army under Louis. The sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him, but, reckless of spiritual terrors, he marshalled his forces and prepared for the conflict. The battle took place May 19, 1411, near Ponte-Corvo, and, after a desperate contest, the forces of Ladislaus were defeated. Instead of being disheartened by reverse, however, he exerted himself successfully to bring into the field a new army largely composed of the fragments of the old. In a

short time, by a liberal use of money, he had greatly profited by the respite which his enemies, too sluggish to pursue their advantage, allowed him. Retracing his disasters, he said that on the first day his crown and personal liberty were endangered, on the second, he feared only for his kingdom; on the third, his foe could only waste himself.

John XXIII had exulted in the defeat of his foe. The joy at Rome was expressed by pageants and processions; but the popes soon discovered that he had been too precipitate in his demonstrations. He encouraged the hopes of Louis, but declined to aid him by arms. He contented himself with sending Ladislaus (August 11, 1411) a summons to appear before him as a heretic and favorer of schism, and with publishing a crusade against him. But the withdrawal of Louis from Italy left Ladislaus without a competitor, and of a sudden the pope saw himself almost helpless in the hands of Ladislaus, and in constant fear of his ravages and assaults. Anxious for peace, he proposed a compromise with Ladislaus. The latter was to abandon the anti-pope, Gregory XII, and drive him from the kingdom. The pope was to confirm the king in possession of his dominions, to which other possessions were to be added, and was to be appointed gonfaloniere of the Church, and to be paid specified sums of money. Thus John XXIII sacrificed his ally to his foe, and Ladislaus did the same. The noble ingratitude and treachery were endorsed by the public recognition of the legitimacy of the pontiff on the part of Ladislaus, who ascribed his new and more correct apprehensions to the instruction of the Father of light. Gregory was forced to flee to Rimini, and a man interview between Ladislaus and the pope, the latter received from the former marks of profound homage.

To this hollow compromise mutual distrust succeeded. The pope sought to recover his old allies, -he exculpated himself to Louis, and again denounced the king of Naples. The latter responded by hostile demonstrations. The council which the pope had meanwhile convoked at Rome was considered by him as depending on the appointment and authority of that of Pisa, and, as hostile to his interests, he hoped to disperse it. The prospect of gaining some advantage over his old foe, Sigismund of Hungary, now elected emperor, was also kept in view. Gathering his forces, he approached Rome. The faithlessness and feebleness of the papal forces facilitated its capture. The pope and cardinals fled. From place to place they wandered, yet even Florence dared not entertain them from fear of the vengeance of Ladislaus. John XXIII besought help of Sigismund, which was finally

granted on the stipulation that the pope should immediately convoke a General Council. *SEE JOHN XXIII.*

Ladislaus meanwhile gave full scope to his vengeance. Rome trembled with terror. Some of her most distinguished citizens were sacrificed to his revenge. The States of the Church came into his hands. Sienna and Florence felt themselves threatened. John XXIII fortified himself at Boulogne, and gathered forces about him. Even here he (did not feel himself safe. His cardinals prepared for flight, and some deserted him. The citizens sought to hide their treasures, and fled, some to Venice, or other places not yet threatened.

There appeared no longer hope of effectual resistance to the advance of Ladislaus. All Italy seemed about to be forced to submit to his sway. But at this juncture, while lingering at Perugia, he was smitten by a mortal disease. A slow fever wasted his strength, but (lid not subdue his thirst for vengeance. He had destined the Ursini, who had obstructed his capture of Rome, and whom he had promised to spare, as victims. They visited him in his sickness, and were thrust into prison by his orders. This gross violation of faith excited general indignation. The murmurs of the soldiers constrained him to pause in his purpose of vengeance. As his disease progressed his passions became more fierce. Returning by way ,of Ostia to Naples, the officers who accompanied him were on the watch to prevent him from ordering the Ursini to be cast overboard into the sea. When he reached his capital he was no longer master of himself. Every word that escaped him was an order for some fatal arrest. He charged his sister, the princess Joanna, to see that Paul de Ursini be put to death. For the last three days of his life his mind was occupied only with thoughts of vengeance. With fearful cries he was heard to ask, "Is Paul dead?" sometimes calling for his dagger that lie might stab himself. He could only be calmed for the moment by his sister's treacherous assurance that his orders should be executed.

In the midst of his paroxysms Ladislaus died, Aug. 6 or 8, 1414. Naples was relieved of a tyrant and Italy of a terror that had disquieted her for years. History may account Ladislaus a modern Herod. All that was unscrupulous, cruel, and depraved seemed to be incarnate in him. He alternated between private lust and public violence. In his own age he was the most notorious representative of the vigor and craft of the Italian "prince." *SEE NAPLES.*

See, for notices more or less extended of the deeds or career of Ladislaus, Van der Iardt, *A Monstrelet's Chronicles*; Niern, *Life of John XXIII* ; Poggi, *Braccioliei's Writings*. Also the works of the earlier as well as the later Italian historians, including Sismondi and Proctor. The most extended and connected account of his life, perhaps, is that given by d'Egly, *Wistoire des Rois des Deux Siciles*. He seems to have carefully sifted his authorities, and he devotes over 200 pages of his second volume almost exclusively to Ladislaus. (E.H. G.)

Ladvocat, Jean Baptist,

a noted French theologian and author, was born at Vancoulcurs in the early part of the 17th century, and was educated first at Ponta-Mouson, afterwards in Paris at the Sorbonne, where he subsequently became a professor. In 1751 he was appointed to the chair, founded at his suggestion in the Sorbonne by the duke of Orleans, for the interpretation of the Old-Testament Scriptures according to the Hebrew text. He died in 1765. Ladvocat wrote *Dictionnaire Geographique portatif*: — *Dictionm.. Historique portatif des grands honemles* (2 vols. 8vo: this is an abridgment of Moreri, and is full of errors). He also wrote a Hebrew Grammar for the use of his pupils. *Tractctfus de Conciliis in Genere*; and *Lettre dans laquelle il examine si les Textes originaux de l'Ecriture sont corrumptus et si la Vulgate leur est preferable*. Ladvocat was, as an expositor of Scripture, a zealous disciple of Houbigant. He was also a correspondent of Dr. Kennicott, whose great work he zealously promoted, and he collated many MSS. for him in the Royal Library at Paris. Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, 6:506.

Lady is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following terms in the original: **trbḡ** (*gebe'reth*, fern. of a **rybḡ** a nighty man), applied to Babylon as the mistress of nations (^{<2475>}Isaiah 47:5, 7; elsewhere a "mistress," as opposed to a maid-servant, ^{<1164>}Genesis 16:4, 8, 9; ^{<1172>}2 Kings 5:3; ^{<1173>}Proverbs 30:23; ^{<1937>}Psalms 123:2, ^{<2342>}Isaiah 24:2); **hrc**; (*saruta'*, fem. of **rci** noble; the same as the name given to Sarai), a noble female (^{<1052>}Judges 5:29; ^{<1718>}Esther 1:18; elsewhere a "princess," spec. the king's wives of noble birth, ^{<11113>}1 Kings 11:13, different from concubines, comp. Cant. 6:8; "queen," ^{<23423>}Isaiah 49:23; "princess" among provinces, ^{<2001>}Lamentations 1:1); **κυρία** (fem. of **κύριος**, *lord* or *master*), mistress, occurs only as an epithet of a Christian female (^{<10012>}2 John 1:1, 5), either as an honorable title of regard, or as a fem. proper name CYRI *SEE CYRI*.

(q.v.).

Lady Chapel,

a chapel dedicated to the Virgin Mary ("Our Lady"), and usually, but not always, placed eastwards from the altar when attached to cathedrals. Henry VII's chapel at Westminster is the lady chapel of that cathedral.

Lady Day.

SEE ANNUNCIATION, FEAST OF.

Lady Fast,

a species of penance, voluntary or enjoined, in which the penitent had the choice of fasting once a week for seven years on that day of the week on which *Lady Day* (q.v.) happened to fall, beginning his course from that day, or, of finishing his penance sooner by taking as many fasting-days together as would fall to his lot in one year.

Lady Of Mercy, Our.

a Spanish order of knighthood, instituted in 1218 by James I of Aragon, in fulfilment of a vow made to the Virgin, during his captivity *in* France, for the redemption of Christian captives from among the Moors; and to this end each knight, at his inauguration, was obliged to take the *vow* that, if necessary for their ransom, he would remain himself a captive in their stead. Within the first six years of the existence of the order no fewer than 400 captives are said to have been ransomed by its efforts. On the expulsion of the Moors from Spain the labors of the knights were transferred to Africa. Their badge is a shield party per fess gules and or, in chief a cross pattee argent, in base four pallets gules for Aragon, the shield crowned with a ducal coronet. The order was extended to ladies in 1261.

Lady Of Montesa, Our

an order of knighthood, founded in 1317 by king James II of Aragon, after the abrogation of the Order of the Templars, for the protection of the Christians against the Moors. By permission of pope John XXII, James of Aragon used all the estates of the ex-Templars and of the Knights of St. John situated in Valencia for this new order, which king James named after the town and castle of Montesa, its head-quarters. The order is now

conferred merely as a mark of royal favor, though the provisions of its statutes are still nominally observed on new creations. The badge is a red cross edged with gold, the costume a long white woolen mantle, decorated with a cross on the left breast, and tied with very long white cords.

Lady Psalter.

SEE ROSARY.

La'el

(Heb. *Ladl'*, **l aē**; *for or of God*, i.e. created by him; otherwise *to God*, i.e. devoted to him; occurs also in ^{<8376>}Job 33:6, where the Auth.Vers. has "in God's stead;" Septuag. **Λαήλ**), father of Eliasaph, which latter was chief of the family of the Gershonites at the Exode (^{<0123>}Numbers 3:24). B.C. ante 1657.

Laetare Sunday

called also MID-LENT, is the fourth Sunday of Lent. It is named *Laetare* (*to rejoice*) from the first word of the Introit of the mass, which is from ^{<250>}Isaiah 54:1. The characteristic of the services of the day is joyousness, and the music of the organ, which throughout the rest of Lent is suspended, is on this day resumed. Laetare Sunday is also called *doninica de rosa*, because it is the day selected by the pope for the blessing of the Golden Rose. See Siegel, *Handbuch d. christl.-Kirchlichen Altermthuer*, 4:366, 367.

Laevinus, Torrentinus,

commonly called TORRENTIN. a Dutch theologian, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century, was a native of Ghent, and was educated in the University of Louvain in law and philosophy. After an extended tour in Italy, he became successively canon of Liege, vicar-general to the bishop of Liege, and finally bishop of Antwerp, from which he was transferred to the see of Mechlin, where he died in 1595. At Louvain Torrentin founded a Jesuitical college, to which he bequeathed his library and a large collection of curiosities.

Lafaye

(also known by the Latin name *Fayus*), ANTOINE, a French Protestant

minister, was born at Chateaudun about the middle of the 16th century. He became professor of philosophy at Geneva in 1570, and rector in 1580. He was transferred to the chair of theology in 1584, and died in 1615. In 1587 he took part in the composition of the Preface to the French translation of the Bible. His works are, *De vernaculis Bibliorum inrterpretationibus et sacris vernacula lingua peragendis* (Genesis 1572,4to): — *De Verbo Dei* (Genesis 1591, 4to):-*De Traditionibus, adversus pontificios* (Genesis 1592, 4to): — *De Christo mediatore* (Genesis 1597, 4to): — *De Bonis Operibus* (Genesis 1601, 4to):-*Geneva liberata, sea narratio libelrationis illius quae divinitus immissa est Geneva* (Geneva, 1603,12mo): — *Enchiridion Dipufationumn theologicarum* (Genesis 1605, 8vo) : — *e Vita et Obitu Beza Hypomnemats* (Geneva, 1606, 4to): — *Commentarii in Ecclesiasten* (Genesis 1609, 8vo): — *Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos* (Genesis 1608, 8vo) : — *Comment. in Psalm os xlix et lxxxvii* (Genesis 1609, 8vo) : — *Comment. in priorem Epistol. ad Timotheum* (Geneva, 1609, 8vo): — *Emblemata et Epigrammata selecta ex stromatis peripateticis* (Genesis 1610, 8vo). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Genrale*, 28:686.

Lafitau, Joseph Francois,

a French Roman Catholic missionary of the Order of the Jesuits, born at Bordeaux in 1670, labored for many years among the Iroquois tribe of American Indians. He died in 1740. Lafitau is especially noted for his archaeological researches, among which is *Masters des sauvages Americains compar ees aux mroeurs des premiers temps* (Paris, 1723, 2 vols. 4to). He wrote also *Histoire des decouvertes et des conquetes des Portugais dans le nouveau neolde*.

La'had

(Heb. *id.* **dhi** ך in pause **dhi** ; prob. *oppressor, otherwise* /aene; Sept. **Λάδ** v. r. **Λαάδ**, *Vulg. Laad*), the second named of the two sons of Jahath, of the family of Zerah, grandson of Judah (~~1~~1 Chronicles 4:2). B.C. post 1612.

Lahai-Roi.

SEE BEER-LAHAI-ROI.

Lah'mam

(Heb. *Lachmas'*, **smj** | | prob. an erroneous reading for *Lachmam'*, **μmj** | | *their bread*, which is read in some MSS., and which the Vulg. and Auth. Vers. follow, Septuag. **Λαμός**, Vulg. *Lehemam*), a city in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Cabbon and Kithlish (^(165D)Joshua 15:40), probably situated among the Philistines west of the Highlands of Judaea. A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary*, s.v., by a series of arguments resting essentially upon the insecure foundation of the mere *order* of the names in Joshua, seeks to identify Lahmam with the *el-Humam* mentioned by Smith in the list in Robinson's *Researches* (iii, Append. p. 119); but of this place there is no other trace save perhaps the name *Tell-Imamn* on Zimmerman's *Map*, some six miles to the S.E. of the vicinity of the other associated names, and apparently out of the bounds of the group, if not of the tribe itself. Lahmam is possibly the present *Beit-Lehia*, a short distance N.E. of Gaza (Robinson, 3:Append. p. 118; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 115).

Lah'mi

(Heb. *Lachmi'*, **ymjēl** | | *my bread*; Septuag. **Λεεμέι** v. r. **Λοομί, Λαχμί**, etc.; Vulg. *Bethlehemites*), a person named (^(130E)1 Chronicles 20:5) as being the brother of (Goliath, and slain by Elhanan, one of David's heroes; but prob. a corrupt reading for BETH-LEHEMITE, as in the parallel passage (^(121B)2 Samuel 21:19). **SEE ELHANAN**. It would seem that both these passages should be restored so as to read thus: "Elhanan, the son of Jair (or Dodo) of Bethlehem, slew the brother of Goliath of Gath, whose spear-handle was like a weaver's beam." **SEE JAIR**.

Laidlie, Archibald, D.D.,

a noted minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Kelso, Scotland, Dec. 4, 1727. After graduating at the University of Edinburgh he was ordained to the Gospel ministry in 1759, and became pastor of the Scotch Church in Cushing, Holland, where he officiated four years, and as a member of the ecclesiastical courts of that country was held in high repute. He there became acquainted with the Dutch Church and language, and was providentially prepared for his ministry in America. The litter controversy concerning the use of the Dutch language in preaching in the Reformed Church of this country was practically settled by the call and acceptance of Dr. Laidlie as pastor of the Collegiate Church of New York.

He was the first minister called to preach in the English tongue in this denomination. His first sermon was delivered April 15, 1764, from ~~1~~2 Corinthians 5:11. It was two hours long, most carefully prepared, and delivered to an immense audience with great effect in the Middle Dutch Church, which was set apart for his use on a part of each Sabbath day. This event marks a new era in the history of the Reformed Dutch Church, and which Dr. Livingston declared " should have begun a hundred years before." It would have saved the Church a civil lawsuit, a weary ecclesiastical strife, and a century of growth. Trained in the Scotch theology, and warmly devoted to the Dutch Church, Dr. Laidlie's evangelical and powerful ministry resulted in great spiritual blessings. He was a winner of souls. A great revival crowned his ministry. Crowds waited upon his preaching. His pastoral tact and success were remarkable. His brief ministry *was* interrupted during the Revolutionary War, when he retired to Red Hook, and died there in 1778, at the age of fifty-one, a victim of consumption. His memory is held in great esteem. He was prudent, wise, devout, a peacemaker, and a dauntless herald of the truth. The circumstances of his call, the critical period of his advent, the learning, wisdom, grace, and success of his ministry, have made his name historical in his Church. He left no printed books, but his " works do follow him." It is related that one of his aged parishioners once said to him, soon after he came to New York, "Ah! dominie, we offered up many an earnest prayer in *Dutch* for your coming among us, and the Lord has heard us in *English*, and has sent you to us." But his coming illustrated another phase of contradictory human nature in those who had most strenuously insisted upon the retention of the language of the mother country. Some of these very people, offended and baffled by their more sensible co-worshippers, actually left the Dutch Church and joined the Episcopal, saying as they departed, "If we must have English, we will have all English." Among them were the Stuyvesants, Livingstons, and other eminent families of the city, who have ever since been connected with the latter denomination. — Dr. Thos. De Witt, *Historical Discourse* (1856) Dr. Gunn, *Life of Dr. Livingston*; Sprague, *Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit*, vol. ix. (W. J. R.T.)

Lainez

(or LAYNES), Francisco, a Portuguese Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Lisbon in 1656. His true name was *Francisco Troyano*. He joined the Jesuits in 1672, and was sent to the coast of Malabar in 1681. He landed at Goa, and settled at Catur, in Madura. It is claimed by his order

that he baptized there 13,600 inhabitants. After a residence of twenty-two years in India he returned to Rome in 1703, and was appointed bishop of Meliapur. In 1708 he started again for India, and arrived at Goa September 25, 1709. Here he now had many difficulties with the civil authorities, and finally retired to the Jesuits' establishment at (Chandernagore, where he died, June 11, 1715. He wrote, *De Jensio Indicarum Mn issionumn Madurensis et Carnotensis*, etc. (Rome, 1707, 4to):- *Carlta esotita de Madure aos padres da companhia missionarios ecerca do V. . P .Joko de Brito*, translated into French in the *Lettres edifiantes et curieuses*, ii, 1-56; and in the *Mercure*, under the title *Lettre du P. 'Itrauois de Loynes, jesuite*, etc. (March, 1695). See Barbosa Machado, *Bibliothecat Lusitana*; P. Prat, *Vie de Jean de Brito* (2 vols. 8vo); Franco. *Imagem da virtude uro noviciado de Coimbra* (2 vols. fol.); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog.* ^{<0E04>}*Genesis* 30:41.

Laiaez,

lago, a celebrated Spanish Jesuit, was born at Almancario. near Siguenca, in Castile, in 1512, and was educated at the high-school of Alcala. In his nineteenth year he was attracted to Paris by the renown of Ignatius, and at once became one of his most ardent followers. He accompanied Loyola on his journey to Rome, and there obtained from pope Paul III the appointment to a professor's chair in the " Collegium della Sapienza." On the death of the great leader of the Jesuitical order (in 1556) Lainez was elected his successor, and became general of the order (June 19, 1557). A cardinal's hat and other high positions he refused, determined to devote all his time and energy to the interests of the new order. In the Council of Trent, where, with Salmeron, he represented his order, he took an active part, and opposed the doctrine of Seripando on justification. Lainez appeared on the field of controversy more with a work on the subject than with a speech. He had the greatest number of the divines on his side. He also took a leading part in that council in the discussion concerning the divine right of bishops and the infallibility of the pope. The historians have preserved a very full report of his speech on this point. It contains the most extravagant assertions of pontifical power and authority. Lainez maintained that Jesus Christ is sole ruler of his Church; that when he left the world he constituted Peter and his successors his vicars; that, in consequence, the pope is absolute lord and master, supreme and infallible; that bishops derive from him their power and jurisdiction; and that, in fact, there is no power whatever in the Church excepting that which emanates from him, so

that even general councils have no authority, are not infallible, do not enjoy the influence of the Holy Spirit, unless they are summoned and controlled by papal authority (compare Pallav. lib. 18:s. 15; Sarpi, lib. 7:s. 20; Le Plat, 5:524). Lainez also took an active part (in 1561) in the Conference of Poissy (q.v.), where he aimed to conciliate the Huguenots (q.v., especially p. 392). At Venice he afterwards expounded the Gospel of St. John for the express edification of the nobility; and, aided by Lippomano, he succeeded in laying the foundation of a college of Jesuits. He devoted great attention to the schools, and directed the thoughts of his order towards education, well aware that man is most influenced during his whole life by his early impressions. In some parts of Germany—at Ingolstadt for instance—the Jesuits soon acquired the reputation of most successful teachers. This new direction given to the order by Lainez came near, however, involving them in serious difficulties: the Jesuits had at first attached themselves to the doctrinal views of the Thomists; but, desiring to be independent in doctrine as well as life, the Inquisition soon found reasons to criticise the freedom with which they pursued their speculations on this point, and Lainez himself was suspected by the Spanish Inquisition (see Llorente, 3:83). He died at Rome Jan. 19, 1565. It was under the guidance of Lainez that the spirit of intrigue entered freely into the society. He possessed a peculiar craftiness and dexterity in managing affairs, and was frequently led by it into low and unworthy tricks. His ruling passion was ambition, which he knew well how to conceal under a veil of humility and piety. By his artful policy he transformed the character of the Jesuitical order into a terrible army, that, for the sake of advancing its own interests, shrunk from no attempt to gain its ends; an order which has become a reproach to the Church that gave it birth. The Jesuits in the 19th century are recognised as a bold band—an order which dares to undermine states, to rend the Church, and even to menace the pope. *SEE JESUITS*. Lainez wrote several theological works, but none of them had been completed, and nothing from his pen, except some speeches, has ever been printed. See Michel d'Esne, *Vie de Lainez* (Douai, 1597); Nicolini, *Hist. Jesuits*, p. 506 sq.; *Versuch einer neuen Gesch. des Jesuiterordens*, vol. ii; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 3:90, n. 20; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy, 16th and 17th Centuries*, i, 145, 153, 163, 399, 585; Hardwick, *Hist. Ref.* ch. viii; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:31; and for the Roman Catholic version, Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen Lexikon*, 6:316. (J. H. W.)

Laing, James

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Berry Holes of Blain, Perth County, Scotland, in 1785, and was educated at the University of Glasgow, where he graduated with distinction in 1816. After teaching for some time, he determined to devote himself to the ministry, and in 1825 was licensed by the Glasgow Relief Presbytery. May 8, 1830, he emigrated to the United States; was ordained by Washington Classis in 1832, and was installed pastor of the Church in Argyle, N. Y. In 1834 he removed to Andes, where he died Nov. 15, 1858. " Mr. Laing was a man to be esteemed, loved, and trusted—a laborious pastor and ' Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile.' " — Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1867, p. 359.

Lavish

(Heb. *La'yish*, **לַיִשׁ** ^{<07184>}Judges 18:14, 27, 29; ^{<0254>}1 Samuel 25:44, a *lion*, as in ^{<2306>}Isaiah 30:6, etc., in pause **לַיִשׁ** text **לַיִשׁ** ^{<0185>}2 Samuel 3:15, with **לַיִשׁ** local **לַיִשׁ** ; ^{<07187>}Judges 18:7; ^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:30; Sept. **Λάις** in Samuel, **Λαϊσά** in Judges, **Λαϊσά** in Isaiah; Vulg. *Lais*, but *Laisa* in Isaiah), the name of at least one place and perhaps also of a man.

1. A city in the extreme northern border of Palestine (^{<07187>}Judges 18:7, 14, 27, 29), also called LESHEM (^{<0694>}Joshua 19:47), and subsequently, after being occupied by a colony of Danites (^{<0694>}Joshua 19:47; ^{<07187>}Judges 18:27 sq.), also DAN (^{<07189>}Judges 18:29; ^{<2406>}Jeremiah 8:16), a name sometimes given to it in anticipation (^{<0144>}Genesis 14:14; ^{<0341>}Deuteronomy 34:1; comp. Jahn, *Einleit.* II, i, 66; Hug, in the *Freibulrsq. Zeitschr.* 5:137 sq.). It lay in a fruitful district, near the sources of the upper Jordan (Josephus, *Ant.* 8:8,4), four miles from Paneas towards Tyre (Eusebius, *Onomast.*). Saadias and the Samaritan version falsely give, instead of Dan (in ^{<0144>}Genesis 14:14), "Paneas" (see Winer, *Diss. de vers. Saem.* p. 54), which also Jerome (at ^{<2775>}Ezekiel 27:15, and ^{<3084>}Amos 8:14) gives as an equivalent. Laish was long the seat of a corrupt worship of Jehovah (^{<07184>}Judges 18:14 sq.), and as it fell within the kingdom of Israel, Jeroboam established there the idolatry of the golden calf (^{<1128>}1 Kings 12:28 sq.).

The occupation of this place by the Sidonians is easily accounted for. Sidon was a commercial city. Situated on the coast, with only a narrow strip of plain beside it, and the bare and rocky side of Lebanon impending over it, a large and constant supply of food had to be brought :from a distance. The

plain around Laish is one of the richest in Syria, and the enterprising Phoenicians took possession of it, built a town, and placed in it a large colony of laborers, expecting to draw from it an unfailing supply of corn and fruit. Josephus calls this plain " the great plain of the city of Sidon" (*Ant.* 5:3, 1). A -road was made across the mountains to it at an immense cost, and still forms one of the main roads from the seacoast to the interior. Strong castles were built to protect the road and the colony. Kulat esh-Shukif, one of the strongest fortresses in Syria, stands on a commanding hill over the place where the ancient road crosses the river Lcontes, and it is manifestly of Phoenician origin. So also the great castles of Banias, four miles east of Laish, and Hunin, about six miles west of it, were founded by the Phoenicians, as is evident from the character of their architecture (*Porter. Handbook*, p. 444, 447; *Robinson, Researches*, 3:50, 2, 371, 403). It is most interesting to discover, after the lapse of more than three thousand years, distinct traces of the wealth and enterprise of the Phoenicians around the site and fertile plain of Laish. *SEE DAN.*

2. A place mentioned in ^{<2300>}Isaiah 10:30, where the prophet, in describing the advance of the Assyrian host upon Jerusalem, enumerates Laish with a number of other towns on the north of the city. It is not quite certain whether the writer is here relating a real event, or detailing a prophetic vision, or giving a solemn warning under a striking allegory; but, however this may be, the description is singularly graphic, and the line of march is pointed out with remarkable minuteness and precision. Aiath, Migron, and Michmash are passed; the deep ravine which separates the latter from Geba is then crossed; Ramah sees and is afraid—" Gibeah of Saul is fled." The writer now, with great dramatic effect, changes his mode of description. To terror and flight he appends an exclamation of alarm, representing one place as crying, another as listening, and a third as responding—"Lift up thy voice, daughter of Gallim ! *Hea.ken, Laishah!* Alas, poor Anathoth !" The words **hvy] iybæph** are rendered in the A.V., "Cause it (thy voice) to be heard unto Laish' — that is, apparently, to the northern border-city of Palestine; following the version of Junius and Tremellius, and the comment of Grotius, because the last syllable of the name which appears here as Laishah is taken to be the Hebrew particle of motion, "to Laish" (agreeably to the Hebrew accent), as is undoubtedly the case in ^{<0780>}Judges 18:7. But such a rendering is found neither in any of the ancient versions, nor in those of modern scholars, as Gesenius, Ewald, Zunz, etc.; nor is the Hebrew word here rendered " cause it to be heard" found elsewhere in that voice,

but always absolute — "hearken" or "attend." There is a certain violence in the sudden introduction amongst these little Benjamite villages of the frontier town so very far remote, and not less in the use of its ancient name, elsewhere so constantly superseded by Dan (see ^{<2486>}Jeremiah 8:16). Laishah was doubtless a small town on the line of march near Anathoth (see Lowth, Umbreit, Alexander, Gesenius, ad loc.).

Many, therefore, understanding a different place from Dan (Rosenmiiller, *Alterth.* III, ii, 191; Hitzig and Knobel, *Comment.* ad loc.), regard it as the *Laisa* (Ἐλασσά, Cod. Alex. Ἀλασσά) mentioned in 1 Macc. 9:5; but Reland has shown that the city of Judah there referred to is Adasa, and the form of the word in Isaiah does not warrant this interpretation (see Gesenius, *Comment.* ad loc.). This Adasa has been discovered by Eli Smith in the modern ruined village *Adasa*. immediately north of Jerusalem (Robinson, *Researches*, 3, Append. p. 121).

A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary* plausibly suggests that the Laishah in question may be found in the present little village *El-Isawiyeh*, in a valley about a mile N.E. of Jerusalem (Robinson, *Researches*, ii, 108), beautifully situated, and unquestionably occupying an ancient site (Tobler, *Topographie von Jerusalem*, ii, § 719).

3. A native of Gallim, and father of Phalti or Phaltiel, to which latter Saul gave David's wife Michal (^{<0254>}1 Samuel 25:44; ^{<1085>}2 Samuel 3:15, in which latter passage the text appears to have read **W**, *Lush*). B.C. ante 1062. "It is very remarkable that the names of Laish (Laishah) and Gallim should be found in conjunction at a much later date (^{<2303>}Isaiah 10:30)" (Smith). "This association of names makes it more than probable that Laishah was founded by Michal's father-in-law, who, according to the custom of those times, gave it his own name. The allusion to the *lion* which it involves is interesting: for this neighborhood was another of the favorite haunts of that animal. It was by such ravines as wadys Farah and Seliem that it was wont to 'come up from the swelling of Jordan' (^{<2409>}Jeremiah 49:19); in the opposite direction we have a further trace of it in the Chephirah ('young lion,' now Kefir) of western Benjamin (^{<0307>}Joshua 9:17; 18:26); northward, we find it encountering the disobedient prophet on his return from Bethel (^{<1133>}1 Kings 13:24); while in the pastures of Bethlehem to the south we see it vanquished by the superior prowess of the youthful David (^{<0974>}1 Samuel 17:14-17)."

Laishah

(Heb. *La'yeshah*, לַיִשׁ] *j* i.e. *Laish*, with *h* paragogic, ^{<300>}Isaiah 10:30).
SEE LAISM, 2.

Laity,

the people as distinguished from the clergy. The Greek word λαϊκός, derived from λαός (Latin synonyme *plebs*), *people*, and signifying *one of the people*, is retained in the Latin *laicus*, from which *latity* is derived. In the Sept. λαός is used as the synonyme of the Hebrew עַם; *people*. As synonymes of these Scripture terms we may also cite the words "faithful," "saints," and "idiotae" (q.v.). Comp. Riddle, *Christiana Antiquities*, p. 188 sq., 274, 275; Vinet, *Pastoral Theology* (N. Y. 1854), p. 345. In the O.-T. Scriptures we find allusions to the *laity* in Deute. 18:3, where upon them is laid the obligation to pay a tithes to the priest when offering sacrifice; and in Ezekiel's vision of the new Temple, where "the ministers of the house" (οἱ λειτουργοῦντες) are to boil the sacrifices of the laity (^{<364>}Ezekiel 46:24). So also in 1 ChrQn. 16:36, "all the laity said Amen, and praised the Lord," when Asaph and his brethren had finished the psalm given to them by David; see likewise ^{<122>}2 Kings 23:2, 3; ^{<168>}Nehemiah 8:11; ^{<230>}Isaiah 24:2; ^{<300>}Hosea 4:9. In the N.-T. Scriptures this distinction seems to have been ignored by Christ and his apostles, for, although there are passages in which the laity are spoken of as a class, it is nowhere intimated that they were not allowed to exercise the prerogatives of the clergy in a great measure. Coleman (*The Apostolical and Primitive Church* [Phila. 1869, 12mo], p. 230; compare p. 226 [6]), one of the best authorities on Christian antiquities, holds that in the early stages of Christianity "all were accustomed to teach and to baptize," a practice to which Tertullian (born about A.D. 160) soon objected (*De Praescript.* ch. xli). From the writings of the early fathers, it is evident, moreover, that only in the 2d and 3d centuries, after the general establishment of the churches, a stricter distinction was inaugurated. The introduction of the episcopal office, however, first definitely settled the position of the layman in the Church. As early as A.D. 182, or thereabouts, we find Clement of Rome pointing to the laity as a distinct class. In a letter of his to the Corinthians respecting the order of the Church, after defining the positions of the bishops, priests, and deacons respectively, he adds, ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται, "the layman is bound by the laws which belong

to laymen" (*Ad Corinth. i*, 40). A little later, Cyprian (born about the beginning of the 3d century) uses the words "clerus" and 'plebs" as of the two bodies which make up the Christian Church (Ep. IX). But the idea that the priesthood formed an intermediate class between God (Christ) and the Christian community first became prevalent during the corruptions that ensued upon the establishment of the prelaicy. Gradually, as the power of the hierarchy increased, the influence which the laity had exercised in the government of the Church was taken from them, and in 502 a synod held at Rome under Symmachus finally deprived the layman of all activity in the management of any of the affairs of the Church (compare Coleman, *Apostolic and Primitive Church*, p. 118).

In the Church of the Reformers a very different spirit prevailed. All Christians were looked upon as constituting a common and equal priesthood. Still the desire of making a visible distinction often led even the Protestant Church astray, and to this day the question remains unsettled in some churches how far the laity ought to share in the government of the Church; and hence the depth of the distinction implied in the use of the word "clergy" and "laity" varies with the "Church" views of those employing them. Some very strict Protestants prefer the words "minister" and "people" instead of clergy and laity.

Farrar (in his *Eccles. Diet.* p. 349 sq.) thus draws the line of distinction between the clergy and laity of the Protestant Church: "It is for the sake of the people that the ordinances of religion, and the clergy as the dispensers of them, exist; they are called to bear the burdens of the Church, as they receive its benefits. It is, however, questioned by some how far the professional distinctions between clergy and laity are desirable. As religious *teachers*, the clergy may be expected to be more especially occupied in fitting themselves for that office in qualifying themselves to explain, and to enforce on others, the evidences, the doctrines, and the obligations; but they are not to be expected to understand more of things surpassing human reason than God has made known by revelation, or to be the *depositories* of certain mysterious speculative doctrines; but 'stewards' of the mysteries of God,' rightly dividing (or dispensing, ὀρθοτομοῦντες) the word of the truth. The laity are in danger of perverting Christianity, and making it, in fact, two religions, one for the initiated few, and one for the mass of the people, who are to follow implicitly the guidance of the others, trusting to their vicarious wisdom, and piety, and learning. They are to beware of the lurking tendency which is in the hearts of all men to that very error which

has been openly sanctioned and established in the Romish and Greek churches the error of thinking to serve God by a deputy and representative; of regarding the learning and faith, the prayers and piety, and the scrupulous sanctity of the 'priest' as being in some way or other transferred from him to the people. The laity are also to be constantly warned that the source of these errors lies in the very tact of thus regarding the clergyman as a *priest* (in the sacerdotal sense of that term), as holding a kind of mediatorial position, one which makes him something distinct from, and therefore no rule for themselves; a view which, while it unduly exalts the clergy, tends most mischievously to degrade the tone of religion and morals among the people, by making them contented with a less measure of strictness of life and seriousness of demeanor than they require in their ministers. Laymen need also to be reminded that they constitute, though not exclusively, yet principally, 'the Church;' the clergy being the *ministers* of the Church' (~~4815~~ 1 Corinthians 3:5); that it is for the people's sakes that the ordinances of religion, and the clergy, as dispensers of the same, exist; that they are the 'body of Christ;' that on them rests the duty of bearing the burdens, as they receive the benefits of the Church; and, finally, that there is no difference between them and the clergy in Church standing, except that the clergy are the officers of each particular church, to minister the Word and sacraments to that portion of its members over whom they are placed." *SEE CLERGY; SEE LAY REPRESENTATION; SEE LAY PREACHING; SEE MEDIATOR; SEE MINISTRY; SEE PASTORAL OFFICE; SEE PRIEST.* (J.H.W.)

Lake

(λίμνη, *apool*), a term used in the N.T. only of the Lake of Gennesareth (~~4815~~ Luke 5:1, 2; 8:22,23, 33), and of the burning sulphurous pool of Hades (~~4815~~ Revelation 19:20; 20:10, 14,15; 21:8). The more usual word is *sea* (q.v.). The principal lakes of Palestine, besides the above Sea of Tiberias, are the Dead Sea and the Waters of Merom. See each in its place.

Lake, Arthur

a distinguished English prelate, was born at Southampton about 1550, and was educated at Winchester School, and at New College, Oxford, of which latter he was chosen fellow in 1589. He became successively archdeacon of Surrey in 1605, dean of Worcester in 1608, and finally bishop of Bath and Wells in 1616. He died May 4,1626. Lake made important donations to the

library of New College, and founded a chair for Hebrew and for mathematics in that institution. He was a very learned man, especially versed in the ancient fathers, and very successful as a preacher. After his death there were published several volumes of his sermons: *Exposition of the First Psalm*; *Exposition of the Eighty-First Psalm*; and *Meditations—all of which were collected and published in one volume, under the title Ninety-nine Sermons, with some Religious and Divine Meditations* (Lond. 1629, fol.) — *Theses de Sabbato* (at the end of Twisse on the Sabbath): — *On Love to God* (Tracts of Angl. Fathers, 4,39). See Wood, *Athenoc Oxonienses*; Chalmers, *General Biogr. Dictionary*; Walton, *Life of Bp. Sanderson*; Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, 6:509; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, ii, 1755; Allibone, *Dict. Encycl. and Amer. Authors*, ii, 1048.

Lake, John, D.D.

a noted English prelate, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was bishop of Sodor and Man in 1682; was transferred to Bristol in 1684, and in 1685 to Chichester. In 1689 he was ejected for nonconformity. He died about the close of the 17th century. Lake published only a few sermons (1670, 4to; 1671, 4to, etc.). See *Defence of Bp. Lake's Profession*, etc. (1690, 4to).-Allibone, *Diet. English and American Authors*, ii, 1048.

Lakernacher, Johann Gottfried

a German theologian and Orientalist, was born at Osterwyck, near Halberstadt, Nov. 17, 1695, and was educated at the universities of Helmstadt and Halle. In 1724 he was appointed professor of Greek, and in 1727 of Oriental literature at Halle. He died March 16, 1736. His works are, *Elementa linguae Arabicce* (Helmst. 1718, 4to), a work which has been highly commended for its intrinsic value as an introduction to the study of the Arabic language: -*Observationes philologicae, quibus varia praecipue S. Codicis loca ex antiquitatibus illustrantur* (pars i-x, ibid, 1725-33, 8vo, and often): — *Antiquitates Graecosrum Sacrae* (ibid, 1734, 8vo).-Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, ii, 223.

Lakin, Benjamin

a Methodist minister, was born in Montgomery Co., Md., Aug. 23, 1767; was converted in 1791, and shortly after entered the ministry. His first

station was Hinkston Circuit (Nov. 6, 1794); he joined Holston Conference in 1795, and was appointed to Green Circuit. " Diligently and successfully Mr. Lakin labored in the Lord's vineyard until 1818, when his health and strength so far failed him that he was obliged to retire from the active ranks of the ministry.... He was at first placed on the list of supernumerary preachers, but soon after on the superannuate roll. This relation to his Conference he sustained until his death," Feb. 5, 1849. See Prof. Samuel Williams, in Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, 7:267 sq.

Lakshmi

is the name of a female Hindu deity, the consort of the god Vishnu (q.v.). According to the mystical doctrine of the worshippers of Vishnu, this god produced the three goddesses Brahmi, Lakshmi, and Chandika, the first representing his creating, the second his preserving, and the third his destroying energy. This view, however, founded on the superiority of Vishnu over the two other gods of the Hindu triad-Brahmi or Saraswati being generally looked upon as the energy of Brahma, and Chandika, another name of Durga, as the energy of Siva-is later than the myth, relating to Lakshmi, of the epic period; for, according to the latter, she is the goddess of Fortune and of Beauty, and arose from the Ocean of Milk when it was churned by the gods to procure the beverage of Immortality, and it was only after this wonderful occurrence that she became the wife of Vishnu. When she emerged from the agitated milk-sea, one text of the Ramayana relates, " she was reposing on a lotus-flower, endowed with transcendent beauty, in the first bloom of youth, her body covered with all kinds of ornaments, and marked with every auspicious sign. ... Thus originated, and adored by the world, the goddess, who is also called *Padma* and *Sri*, betook herself to the bosom of Hari-i.e. Vishnu."

A curious festival is celebrated in honor of Lakshmi on the fifth lunar day of the light half of the month Magha (February), when she is identified with Saraswati, the consort of Brahma, and the goddess of learning. In his treatise on festivals, Raghunandana, a great modern authority, mentions, on the faith of a work called *Samwatsara-sandipa*, that this divinity is to be worshipped in the forenoon of that day with flowers, perfumes, rice, and water; that due honor is to be paid to inkstand and writing-reed, and no writing to be done. Wilson, in his essay on the *Religious Festivals of the Hindus* (*Works*, ii, 188 sq.), thus describes the celebration: "On the morning of the 2d of February the whole of the pens and inkstands, and the

books, if not too numerous and bulky, are collected, the pens or reeds cleaned, the inkstands scoured, and the books, wrapped up in new cloth, are arranged upon a platform or a sheet, and strewn over with flowers and blades of young barley, and that no flowers except white are to be offered. After performing the necessary rites... all the members of the family assemble and make their prostrations-the books, the pens and ink, having an entire holiday; and, should any emergency require a written communication on the day dedicated to the divinity of scholarship, it is done with chalk or charcoal upon a black or white board." There are parts of India where this festival is celebrated at different seasons, according to the double aspect under which Lakshmi is viewed by her worshippers. The festival in February seems originally to have been a vernal feast, marking the commencement of the season of spring.

La'kum

(Heb. *Lakkum'*, מלוקי; according to Gesenius, *way-stopper*, i.e. fortified place; Sept. Λσκούμ v. r. Δωδάμ and ἸΑκρον, Vulg. *Lecum*), a place on the northeastern border of Naphtali, mentioned after Jabneel in the direction of the Jordan (~~19:33~~ Joshua 19:33), and therefore probably situated not far south of Lake Merom. "he Talmud (*Megilloth*, lxx, 1) speaks of a *Lakium* (μυγμα), perhaps the same place (see Reland, *Palest.* p. 875). The site of Lakkum is possibly indicated by the ruins marked on Van de Velde's *Map* adjoining a small pool east of *Tell-Akbarcth* and south-east of Safed.

Lalita -Vistaria

is the name of one of the most celebrated works of Buddhistic literature. It contains a narrative of the life and doctrine of Buddha Sakvamuni, *SEE BUDDHA*, and is considered by the Buddhahists as one of their nine chief works treating of Dharma, or religious law. It is one of the developed sutras of the Mahayana system. An edition of the Sanscrit text, and an English translation of this work by Bilbu RI.jendralal Mitra, is publishing under the auspices of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. A French translation from the Thibetan has been made by Ph. Ed. Foucanx. In Chinese there are two translations of it. See E. Burnouf; *Introduction a l'Histoire du Buddhisme Indien* (Par. 1844); and W. Wassiljew, *Der Buddhismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur* (St. Petersburg, 1860).

Lallemant, Jacques Philippe

a French Jesuit, was born near Abbeville about 1660, and died in 1748. He published a remarkable work entitled *The true Spirit of the new Disciples of Saint Augustine* (1706 sq., 4 vols.). He also wrote *Moral Reflections, with Notes, on the New Testament* (1714, 11 vols.).

Lallemant, Pierre

a mystical French writer, was born at Rheims in 1622, and died in 1673. He published *The Spiritual Testament* (1672), and other works of a like character.

La Luzerne, Caesar Guillaume De.

a distinguished French prelate, was born at Paris July 7, 1738. Intended for the Church by his family, he studied at the seminary of St. Magloire, and while yet quite young had several benefits bestowed upon him through family influence. In 1754 he was made canon *in minoribus* of the cathedral of Paris, and in 1756 abbot of Mortemer. In 1762 he graduated with distinction, and was immediately appointed grand vicar to the archbishop of Narbonne, and in 1770 (June 24) was finally raised to the bishopric of Langres. This position securing him a seat in the States with the nobility, he took an active part in political events, and tried to conciliate the claims of the third estate with those of the nobility and clergy. He subsequently opposed the declaration of rights placed at the head of the new constitution, and spoke in favor of making the right of veto granted to the king more decisive. At the close of August, 1789, he became president of the Assemblée Constituante, but, after witnessing the excesses of the 5th and 6th of October, he retired to his diocese. Here he strenuously opposed the civil constitution of the clergy, and was obliged in 1791 to leave France. He went successively to Switzerland and Austria, and finally settled at Venice in 1799, and remained there until the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France. He was made cardinal July 28, 1817, and minister of state. The see of Langres having been restored, La Luzerne was reappointed to it, but legal difficulties prevented his assuming its direction. In 1818 he was the only bishop called to the council of ministers to contrive the ratification of the concordat of the preceding year. Although strongly attached to the liberties of the Gallican Church, La Luzerne earnestly advocated a strict compliance with the letter of the Concordat. He died June 21, 1821. Besides the *Oraison fuinebre de*

Charles Emmanuel III, roi de Sardaigne (1773, 4to and 12mo), and the *Oraison funebre de Louis XV, roi de France* (1774, 4to and 12mo), he wrote a number of pastoral instructions, etc., and political pamphlets. Most of his writings were collected and published under the style (*Eaeres de Al. de La Luzerne* (Lyons and Paris, 1842, 10 vols. 8vo). See *Le Moniteur*, July 26, 1821; *Ami de la Religion et du Roi*, 28:225-233; Matiul, *Annuaire Necrologique*, 1821, p. 239; Qulerard, *La France Litteraire*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:38. (J. N. P.)

La'ma

(λαμά, ^{<1746>}Matthew 27:46, which is also read in the best MSS. at ^{<4154>}Mark 15:34, where the received text has λάμμα; the Heb. has both forms, hml ; and hMl ; *lam'mah, for what*; the Syriac version has *lemono*), a term signifying *why* (as the context explains it, ἵνατί, by which also the Sept. interprets), quoted by our Saviour on the cross from ^{<1271>}Psalms 22:1 [2 in the Hebrew].

Lamaism

Picture for Lamaism

(from the Thibetan *b-Lanma* [pronounced *Lama*], *spiritual teacher* or lord) is the Thibetan form of *Buddhism* (q.v.), blended with and modified by the religions which preceded it in that portion of China. Among these was the belief in the "Mystic Cross," which originated in the circumstance that an Indian prince of the Litsabyi or Lichhavyi race, being conquered in war, sought refuge in Thibet, where he became king. The Lichhavyis of Vaisili professed belief in "Swasti." Swati is a monogrammatic sign formed of the letters *Su* and *Ti*, and "Suti" is the Pall form of the Sanskrit "Swasti," a compound of *su* (well) and *asti* (it is); so that "swasti" implies complete resignation under all circumstances, which was the chief dogma of the fatalists who called themselves *Swastikas*, or followers of the Mystic Cross. These people were also annihilationists; hence their Thibetan name of Mu-steps-pa or Finitimists. They were grossly atheistical and indecent in dress, but called themselves "Pure-doers," and the synonymous title *Punya*, "the pure," was carried with them into Thibet, and became modified into *Pon* or the "Bons." This form of faith continued for nine centuries, until Buddhism was generally introduced about the middle of the 7th century. Even then the followers of the Mystic Cross were still powerful.

History. — Buddhism was probably introduced into Thibet during the reign of Asoka, who propagated that religion with ardor upwards of two thousand years ago. In B.C. 240, at the close of the third synod, numerous missionaries were dispatched to all surrounding countries to spread the doctrines of Sakyamuni. But the more formal history of Buddhism in Thibet begins with king Srongtsan Gampo (born A.D. 617, died 698), who sent to India his prime minister Thumi Samnbhota, with sixteen companions, to study letters and religion. He had the sacred books translated into Thibetan, and issued laws abolishing all other religions, and directing the establishment of this one. His wives, the one a Nepalese, the other a Chinese, greatly assisted him in these enterprises. He met, however, with only tolerable success, and the religion did not greatly flourish. Under king Thisrong-de-tsan (A.D. 728-786) Buddhism was more successful in Thibet, overcoming the efforts of the chief's to crush the "new religion." This prince induced great teachers from Bengal and Kafiristan to reside in Thibet. They superseded the Chinese priests, who were the earliest Buddhist missionaries. A public disputation on religions, which was ordered by the king, greatly increased the influence of the Indian priests. Large monasteries were erected, and a temple at Samye, and the translation of sacred books into the vernacular was more energetically conducted. King Langdar or Langidharma tried to abolish Buddhism, and in his efforts to do so commanded the destruction of all temples, monasteries, images, and sacred books pertaining to that religion. The indignation against these efforts was so intense that it resulted in the murder of the king in A.D. 900. His son and successor was also unfavorably disposed towards Buddhism, and gradually the new religion lost many adherents, and those still remaining faithful even suffered persecution.

From A.D. 971 dates the revival of Buddhism, or the second general effort to propagate this religion in Thibet, under Bilamgur Tsan, who rebuilt eight temples, and under whom the priests who had fled the country returned, and fresh accessions were made from the priesthood of India. Among those from India came in A.D. 1041 the celebrated priest Atisha. In the 12th or 13th century the modification of Buddhism known as the Tantrika mysticism was introduced. Considerably later a great impetus was given to Buddhism by the celebrated reformer Tsonkhapa (born A.D. 1357), who endeavored, about the opening of the 15th century, to unite the dialectical and mystical schools, and to put an end to the tricks, pretended miracles, and other corruptions of the priesthood. He published new works on

religion; but, so far as regards the marked similarity between the ceremonial of the Chinese Buddhists and some Christian sects, Schlagintweit says that "we are not yet able to decide the question as to how far Buddhism may have borrowed from Christianity, but the rites of the Buddhists enumerated by the French missionary (Huc) can for the most part either be traced back to institutions peculiar to Buddhism, or they have sprung up in periods posterior to Tsonkhapa" (q.v.).

Sects.-According to Schlagintweit, there was no division of Lamaism into sects previous to the 11th century. Subsequently, however, there arose numerous subdivisions of the people, nine of which still exist, which are reputed orthodox, though there is not much known about them. In distinction from the other sects which Tsonkhapa labored energetically to supersede, he ordered his disciples to wear a yellow dress instead of red, the color of the older religionists, and, to make the distinction still greater, he provided a peculiar pattern for a cap, also to be made of yellow cloth.

1. The eldest of the primitive sects is the *Nyigmapa*. The lamas of Bhutan and Ladak belong to this sect, and they adhere to ancient rites, ceremonies, and usages such as obtained among the earliest Chinese priests. They acknowledge some sacred books not included in the Kanljur or T'anjur hereinafter mentioned.

2. Another ancient sect is the *Uregyepa*, or the disciples of Urgyen, who differ from the first in their worship of Amitabha as Padma Sambhava.

3. A sect founded by Bromston (born A.D. 1002) observe only "precepts" and not "transcendental wisdom." This sect wear a red dress.

4. The *Sakyapca*, whose particular tenets are not known, but who wear a red dress also.

5. The *Gelukpa* (Galdanpa or Geldampa) adhere to the doctrines of Tsonkhapa, and this sect is now the most numerous in Thibet.

6. The *Kargyutpa*, leave Prajna Parimita, resting in their observance of the Aphorisms (Sutras) and in the "succession of precepts."

7. The *Karmapa*, and,

8. *Brikungpa*, are not much known.

9. The *Brugpa* (Dugp or Dad Dugpa) have a particular worship of the thunderbolt (Dorge) which fell from heaven in Eastern Thibet. This sect observe the Tantrika mysticism.

In addition to the above there is the "*Bon*" religion, the followers of which are called *Bonpas*. They own many wealthy monasteries. They are probably the descendants of those who did not originally accept Buddhism, but preserved the ancient rites and superstitions of the country.

Sacred Books. — Lamaism has a voluminous sacred literature. Originally it consisted almost wholly of translations, but after this it developed rapidly all indigenouselement, especially after the 14th century, under the impulse given to it by Tsonkhapa. The commentaries on the sacred text are frequently in the vernacular. But the great works are a compilation of Sanskrit translators, containing sacred and profane publications of different periods. These are respectively translations of "the commandments" and of the doctrines of Sakyamuni, in which are embraced philosophy, logic, rhetoric, and Sanskrit grammar. The principal of these translations date from about the 9th century. Minor ones are probably of later origin, but the modern arrangement of the works is probably not older than the present century. These collections were printed in 1728-46, by order of the regent of Lhasa, and are now printed at many of the monasteries. They are entitled "*Kanjur* and *Tanjur*;" according to Müller, the proper spelling is *Bkah-hgyur* and *Bstan-hgyur*.

The *Kanjur* consists of the following sections:

- 1.** *Dulva* (Sanskrit, *Vinaya*), or discipline;
- 2.** *Sher-phjin* (Sans. *Prajnaparamita*), or philosophy and metaphysics;
- 3.** *Phalchhen* (Sans. *Buddhavata Sangha*), or the doctrine of the Buddhas, their incarnations, etc.;
- 4.** *dKon brTsegss* (Sans. *Ratmakuto*), or the collection of precious things;
- 5.** *mDo ssDe* (Sans. *Sutrantra*), or the collection of Stitras;
- 6.** *Mjang dass* (Sans. *Nirvana*), or the liberation from wordily pains;
- 7.** *rGjud* (Sans. *Tantras*), or incantations, etc." (Chambers). There are many editions of the *Kanjur*, varying from 100 to 108 volumes folio. It embraces 1083 distinct works. Massive as this code is, editions of it have

been printed at Peking, Lhasa, and other places. These have been sold for sums ranging as high as £600, or, when men deal in kine, for 7000 oxen. A most valuable analysis of this immense Bible is given in the *Asiatic Researches*, volume 20, by Alexander Csoma de Koros, a Hungarian who made his way to Thibet on foot for other purposes, but became an enthusiastic student of the Thibetan Scriptures.

The *Tanjur* is a collection of treatises in 225 volumes, elegantly printed at Peking, containing translations from Sanskrit and Prakrit, on dogmas, philosophy, grammar, medicine, and ethics, with Amara's *Rosha* or vocabulary, and fragments of the Mahabharata and of other epic poems. The work of the great reformer, the history of Buddhism, lives of saints, and all sorts of works on theology and magic, fill the libraries. But the Thibetans also possess annals, genealogies, and laws, as, for instance, the "Mirror of Kings" (translated into Mongolic by Ssanang Ssetsen, and into German by Schmidt), or Bodhimor ("Way to Wisdom"), and works on astronomy and chronology" (Appleton).

Among the native sacred literature of Thibet is the historical book called *Mani Kanmbum*, containing the legendary tales of Padmapani's propagation of Buddhism in Thibet, and the origin and application of the sacred formula "*Om Mani Padesa Hum.*" It contains a description of the wonderful region Sukhavati, where Amitabha sits enthroned, and where those are who most merit blissful existence; a history of creation; prayers to Padmapani, and the advantages of frequent repetition of Om Mani; the meaning of that sacred sentence; an account of the figurative representations of Padmapani, and of his images, which represent him with faces varying from three to one thousand. It contains, moreover, the ethics and religious ordinances of Buddhism; biography; a description of the irresistible power of "Om Mani," etc., and tells how it secures deliverance from being reborn; legends, translations of sacred books, etc. This has been translated into Mongolian.

Grades of Initiation. — The Buddhist community is divided into three classes. The first or highest is known in Thibet as True Intelligence, or *Chang Chub*, meaning "the perfect" or "accomplished;" and *Chang Chhub Sempali*, or "Perfect Strength of Mind," because the graduate has accomplished the grand object of life, which is the perfect suppression of all bodily desire and complete abstraction of mind. These are the Bodhisatwas of Sanskrit (or, in Chinese. *Pusas*), who are incipient

Buddhas, rising by self-sacrifice and their good influence over their fellow-men to the highest goal. Every age produces a number of these Bodhisatwas. The second class comprises those having "individual intelligence" or self-intelligence, the *Pratyeka*, who turn not out of the way. The third is the *Sravaka* or auditor (listener).

Orders of Beings. — The self-existent Adi Buddha, by five spontaneous acts of divine wisdom, and by five exertions of mental reflection (*dhyān*), projected from his own essence five intelligences of the first order, known as the *Pancha Dhyani-Buddha*, or "Five celestial Buddhas," whose names are *Vairochana*, *Akshobya*, *Ratna Sambhava*, *Amitabha*, and *Amogha Siddha*. These five intelligences of the first order created "five intelligences" of a second order, or *Bodhisatwas*, who "become creative agents in the hands of God, or serve as links uniting him with all the lower grades of creaturely existence." The *Lokeswaras* (Jigten Baugchuk), or "Lords of the World," are also acknowledged in Thibetan Buddhism. All these are celestial beings, the spontaneous emanations from the Deity, who have never been subject to the pains of transmigration.

Inferior to these are the created or mortal beings, divided into six classes, named *Droba Rikdruk*, or "Six advances or progressors," because their souls advance by transmigration from one state to a better one, until they finally attain absorption, and are no longer subject to transmigration. These six are:

1. *Lha*, or gods;
2. *Lha ma yin*, Titans;
3. *Mi*, which equals man;
4. *Dudro*, brutes,
5. *Yidok*, goblins;
6. *Myalba*, the damned.

The hells are eight cold and sixteen hot, and are favorite subjects of Chinese and Thibetan painters. The punishment is not everlasting, but after expiation the person may be born again.

Objects of Worship. — In early periods Lamaism confined its worship to the triad Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha, and pious reverence was shown to the relics of former Buddhas, as well as to those of Sakya himself and his principal disciples; but there is no mention of the elaborate system of Dhyani Buddhas, Padmapani, etc., earlier than about A.D. 400. Primitive

Buddhism is now stated to have been undoubtedly atheistic, but was in later ages greatly modified.

Sakyamuni is worshipped in Ladak as "Shakya Thubba," yet there is a legend to the effect that at the end of twenty-five centuries from the present time he is to be superseded by a more benign Buddha, called *Maitreya*, or *Mi-le*. The people, however, worship others equally with Sakya, though there is reason to believe that the worship is of later date, as Fa Hian is the first who makes mention of it. He speaks of it as extant at the time of his visit in A.D. 400. These other deities are Padmapani, Jamya, and Chanirazik (or Padmapani, Manju Sri, and Ava Lokiteswara); and though the people still confirm an oath by appealing to the three supremacies of the Buddhist triad, yet, when they undertake any enterprise or begin a journey, their prayers for success are almost invariably addressed to Padmapani. The mystic sentence "*On Mani Padma Hum*" is repeated in worship, and is constantly heard as one moves through the country. It has been variously translated as "Oh, the jewel in the lotus!" and "Hail to him of the jewel and the lotus!" and "Glory to the lotus-bearer Hum!"

Padmapani is a "Dhyani Bodhisattva," and of all the gods is most frequently worshipped, because he is a representative of Sakyamuni, and guardian and propagator of his faith until the appearance of the Buddha Maitreya. He is the patron deity of Thibet, and manifests himself from age to age in human shape, becoming Dalai Lama (see below) by the emission of a beam of light, and ultimately is to be born as the most perfect Buddha — not in India, where his predecessors became such, but in Thibet. He has a great many names, and is represented in various figures, sometimes having eleven faces and eight hands, the faces forming a pyramid ranged in four rows, each series being of a different complexion, as white, yellow, blue, red; sometimes he is represented as having one head and four arms.

Co-regent with Padmapani is Manju Sri, who diffuses religious truth, bearing a naked sword as symbolic of power and acumen; he is lord of the intellect, and the author of the joy of the family circle, and is deputy governor of the whole earth. The representations of him in Thibet, as in Mongolia, make him to have innumerable eyes and hands, and even ten heads, crowned, and rising in the form of a cone, one above another; he is often represented as incarnate in the person of some Dalai Lama as Padmapani.

It must not be supposed, however, that these are the only objects of worship in Thibet. The earliest worship of that country was a species of nature or element worship; and, as Lamaism ingrafted the ancient gods and spirits of the former inhabitants on itself, the poorer people still make offerings to their old divinities, the gods of the hills, the woods, the dales, the mountains, the rivers, and have field, family, and house divinities. Lamaism was, besides this, greatly affected by its contact with the *Shamanism* (q.v.) of the Mongolians.

These gods are particles of the Supreme Intelligence, and, though they are many, they are all a multiplication of the one God. The Thibetan name for deity is *Sha*, the equivalent of the Sanskrit *Deva*. They assist man, each having his own sphere, within which he reigns supreme. These gods are both male and female.

There are, besides these, malignant gods, called "Da," or *enemy*, and "Geg," *devil*. The most malignant of them are, 1. Lhamayin, to whom many ill-natured spirits are subject. They cause untimely death. 2. The Dudpos, or judges of the dead. These try to prevent the depopulation of the world by prompting evil desire, by becoming beautiful women. They disturb devout assemblies. They are, of course, antagonized by the more benevolent deities, among whom some become specially famous, as the *Drag-sheds*, "the cruel hangmen," who are subdivided into eight classes. Legends concerning them abound.

Doctrines. — According to Csömä (in the *Bengal Society Journal*, 7:145), the higher philosophies are not popularly understood, yet the people of Thibet are in general tolerably familiar with the doctrine of the Three Vehicles (Triyana), a dogma of the Mahayani school, explained in the Thibetan Compendium called *Lamrim*, or "The gradual Way to Perfection." The argument of the book is to the effect that the Buddha dogmas are intended for the lowest, middle, and highest people, and they are graded accordingly. In the matter of creeds, for instance, there is the following order. The lowest people must believe in God, future life, and that the fruit of works is to be earned in this life, while the middle class are to know (1) that every compound is perishable; (2) that all imperfection is pain, and that deliverance from bodily existence is the only real happiness. A person of the highest class, in addition to all the foregoing, must know that from the body to the Supreme Soul nothing is existent but himself; that he will not always be, nor ever cease absolutely from being.

In moral duties there is a like gradation. The vulgar are to practice ten virtues, to which the middle class are to add meditation, wisdom, etc.; while the superior class must, in addition to the foregoing, practice the six transcendental virtues. In their ultimate destiny this gradation pursues these classes, the lowest being admitted to become men, gods, etc., the next having hope of rebirth in Sukhavati, without pain or bodily existence, and the best expecting to reach themselves Nirvana, and to lead others thereunto also. The priests who take the vows called Dom can alone hope for this.

A more popular code, however, is necessary for simpler people, and hence the following eight precepts commonly obtain:

1. To seek to take refuge only with Buddha.
2. To form in one's mind the resolution to strive to attain the highest degree of perfection, in order to be united with the Supreme Intelligence.
3. To prostrate one's self before the image of Buddha to adore him.
4. To bring offerings before him, such as are pleasing to any of the six senses, as lights, flowers, garlands, incense, perfumes, all kinds of edibles and drinkables, stuffs, cloth, etc., for garments, and hanging ornaments.
5. To make music, sing hymns, and utter the praises of Buddha, respecting his person and doctrines, love or mercy, perfections or attributes, and his acts or performances for the benefit of all animal beings.
6. To confess one's sins with a contrite heart, to ask forgiveness for them, and to resolve sincerely not to commit the like hereafter.
7. To rejoice in the moral merits of all animal beings, and to wish that they may thereby obtain final emancipation or beatitude.
8. To pray and entreat all Buddhas that are now in the world to turn the wheel of religion (or to teach their doctrines), and not to leave the world too soon, but to remain here for many ages or *kalpas*.

Buddhism in Thibet, as elsewhere, accepts the doctrine of *metempsychosis*. The forms under which any living beings may be reborn are sixfold, enumerated previously as among the inferior objects of worship. Good works involve rebirth, just as bad ones do. Shinje, "the Lord of the Dead," determines the end of life and the form of the rebirth. He has a wonderful

mirror, which reflects the good and bad actions of men, and a balance in which to weigh them. When being in any one form must cease, he sends his servants to bring the soul before him for the announcement of the form it shall next assume. If the servant bring the wrong person the mirror shows it, and the soul is dismissed.

The object of rebirth being the expiation of sins, atonement for them may lessen these if made in this life, as will also the subduing of evil desires, the practice of virtue, and confession. The Mahavana school says that confession confers entire absolution from sins. So also Thibetan Buddhism now considers it. Confession, however, includes repentance and promises of amendment. Various ceremonies accompany the avowal. Consecrated water must be used, which, however, can only be rendered fit by the priests by a ceremony called *Tvisol*, or "Entreaties for ablution." Abstinence from food and recitation of prayers are also observed, but the commonest form is that of a simple address to the gods. The confessors who deliver from sins are generally Buddhas who preceded Sakyamuni, or holy spirits equal in power to Buddhas. There are thirty-five of these eminent in this work, known as the "thirty-five Buddhas of Confession," beautifully colored images of whom are found in the monasteries, and to whom prayers are made in the Thibetan liturgy.

Regarding the future abode of the blessed, Lamaism differs from other Buddhism. Nirvana (annihilation) is not carefully pointed out, and the sacred books say it is impossible to define its attributes and properties. But to those failing to obtain Nirvana, or unconscious existence, the next best state that can be offered is *Sukhavati*, entrance upon which exempts from rebirth, but not from absolute existence. Thibetans do not now generally distinguish between the two, the great stress being laid on the deliverance from rebirth. This region is located towards the west, in a large lake, the surface of which is covered with lotus-flowers of rare perfume, and of red and white color. Devotion is kindled by birds of Paradise, food and clothing being had for the wishing. Human forms may be assumed and laid aside at pleasure. These are on their way to be Buddhas.

Priesthood. — The first organization of the Thibetan clergy dates from A.D. 726-786, and the present hierarchical system from about the 15th century. In A.D. 1417 the Lama Tsonkhapa founded the Golden Monastery, but the Dalai Lama at Lhasa and the Panchen Rinpoche, both credited with divine origin, gained greater influence than that of Golden.

The *Dalai Lama* (Grand Lama) is an incarnation of the "Dhyani Bodhisattwa" Chenrisi, who becomes reincorporated by a beam of light which leaves him and enters the person selected for the descent. The "Panchen," on the other hand, are incorporations of the father of Chenrisi, who was named Amitabha. The first to assume the title of "His precious Majesty," and the first Dalai Lama, was Gedun Grub (1389-1473). With the fifth Dalai Lama the *temporal* government was extended over all Thibet. These Dalai Lamas are elected by the priests, but since A.D. 1792 these elections have been greatly influenced by the Chinese government at Peking. Next below the Dalai Lamas are the superiors of monasteries, called *Khanpos*. They are appointed by the Dalai Lamas for a term of three or six years, and some of them are considered to be incarnations. The third in grade are the superintendents of choral songs and the music of the divine services, and are termed *Budzad*. Next succeeding are the *Gebkoi*, who are elected by the monks to maintain order; below the Gebkoi are the *abbots*. The sixth in order is the *Lama*, a title which literally pertains only to "superior" priests, but, by courtesy, is now applied to all Buddhist priests. The *Tsikhan* are astrologers, who marry, are fortune-tellers, conjure evil spirits, etc. Their instruments are an arrow and triangle.

In the organization of the orders there is a code of some two hundred and fifty rulers. Celibacy and poverty have had much to do in the formation of the character of the priesthood. The vow to lead a life of celibacy is rarely revoked. While the priests personally must continue poor, the monasteries may be wealthy, and they actually have great revenues. Living on alms, most is collected about harvest time. Fees from funerals, marriages, illness, etc., are among their resources. The property of the monasteries is free from taxation.

The elder son generally becomes a lama. In 1855 the total number of lamas, as estimated in the *Bengal Society Journal*, was 18,500, in twelve monasteries of Eastern Thibet. In Western Thibet Cunningham estimates one to every thirteen laymen, while in Spiti they number one to seven of the population.

These priests till the gardens attached to the monasteries, revolve prayer cylinders, carve blocks, and paint. They are often illiterate, and, though most of them know how to read and write, they do not care to acquire knowledge. Their dress and caps are of double felt with charms between the folds, or they wear large straw hats. The head lama's cap is generally

low and conical, though some are hexagonal, and others like a miter. They wear also a gown, which reaches to the calves of their legs; this has a slender girdle and an upright collar. They wear also trowsers, and boots of stiff felt. They carry rosaries containing 108 beads, made of wood, pebbles, or bones. Their amulet boxes contain images of deities, relics, and objects dreaded by evil spirits.

Buildings and Monsuments. — The priests live in monasteries, each of which receives a religious name. The architecture is similar to that of the houses of the wealthy. The entrance faces either the south or east. They are always decorated with flags. They sometimes consist of one large house, several stories high, and in other cases of several buildings with temples attached. In their exterior appearance they are much inferior to those of other countries.

The temples have nothing imposing about them. The roofs are flat or sloping, with square holes for windows and skylights. The walls are towards the quarters of the heavens. The north side should be colored green, the south side yellow, the east side white, the west red. They are not always, however, in this order. The interior of the building is generally one large room, with side halls decorated with paintings, images, etc. The side halls contain the library, the volumes of which are on shelves, and sometimes wrapped in silk. In the corners are statues of deities, the religious dresses of the priests, musical instruments, and other articles of sacred appointment. "The Lamaic temples are of Indo-Chinese form, square, fronting the east in Thibet and the south in Mongolia. They are often cruciform. There are three gates, and three interior divisions, viz., the entrance-hall, the body of the edifice with two parallel rows of columns, and the sanctuary with the throne of the high lama" (Appleton). For a description of two of the largest lama temples in China, see Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese*, 2:457 sq.

The *Chodtens* are monuments from eight to fifteen feet, or even sometimes forty feet high. They are receptacles for the offerings of the people, and repositories of relics, and are very much revered by the lamas. They are set up in the temples, and are moulded from metals, or even of clay and straw.

The *Man* is a wall six feet long and four or five feet broad, of sacred use. Derchoks and lapchas are sacred flags and heaps of stones. Prayers are inscribed on the flags, and the people seem ever eager to make new lapchas.

Images, etc. — The representations of deities and other sacred personages are copied everywhere. From the earliest period relics and images of Buddha have been honored and worshipped with simple ceremonies, as prostrations, presentation of flowers, perfumes, prayers, and hymns. At the present day, Buddhas preceding Sakvamuni, as well as the Dhyani Buddhas, a host of gods, spirits deified, priests of local reputation, are all represented in images or pictures. The "Gallery of Portraits" has drawings of over three hundred saints.

The lamas have a monopoly of the manufacture of these, as they are efficacious only after the performance of certain ceremonies at many junctures in their preparation, and these the lamas alone know how to perform. Pictures must be commenced on prescribed days; on certain other days the eyes must be painted, etc. Drawings and paintings are traced with pinholes, through which powder is sifted; they are bordered by several strips of silk, of blue, yellow, red, and other colors. Statues and bass-reliefs of clay, papier-mache, bread-dough, (or metals, or even of butter run in a mould, are made. The best executed contain relics, as ashes, bones, hair, rags, and grain; these are sometimes contained in a hole in the bottom of the image.

The images and statues of the Buddha, Bodhisattwas, and the Dragsheds differ greatly from each other. *Sakyamuni* is represented in many attitudes, with one hand uplifted or holding an alms-bowl, as sitting, or as recumbent. *Padmapani* has sometimes eleven faces and a thousand hands. "*Melha*, the god of fire, when driving away evil spirits, rides a red ram, and has a horrible countenance;" but he is represented in many other attitudes. The Bodhisattwas have a shining countenance. and are seated on a lotus-flower. The Dragsheds who protect against evil spirits are fierce-looking, of dark complexion, and sometimes have a third eye in the forehead, to represent their wisdom. They are almost naked, but wear a necklace of human skulls, and have rings on their arms and ankles. They have in their hands various instruments symbolic of their power. The *Dorje*, or thunderbolt, "may best be represented by four or eight metallic hoops joined together so as to form two balls," which are on a staff, with points projecting. The *Phurbu*, or "nail," the *Bechon*, "*club*," and *Zagpa*, or "snare" to catch evil spirits, and the *Kapâla*, or drinking-vessel, which is a human skull, are among these sacred instruments.

Forms of Worship. — The religious services consist of singing, accompanied with instrumental music, offerings, prayers, etc. The offerings are of clarified butter, flour, tamarind-wood, flowers, grain, peacock feathers, etc. There are no blood-offerings, as any sacrifices entailing injury to life are strictly forbidden in the Buddhistic faith. Drums, trumpets made of the human thigh-bone, cymbals, and flageolets, are among the sacred musical instruments.

The *Prayer cylinder* is an instrument peculiar to the Buddhists. It is called "khorben" (Hardy says *hGorlas* or *Tchukor*, according to Huc=*turning-prayer*). It is generally of brass, enveloped in wood or leather. A wooden handle passes through the cylinder, forming its axis, around which is rolled the long strip of cloth or paper on which is the prayer of printed sacred sentences. A small pebble or piece of metal, at the end of a short chain, facilitates the rotation of the cylinder in the hand. Large cylinders near the monasteries are kept in motion by persons employed for the purpose, or by being attached to streams of running water like a mill-wheel. Each revolution, if made slowly, and from right to left, is equivalent to the repetition of the sentences enclosed. (Generally the inscription is only a repetition of the sentence "Om mani padma hum." There is also a sacred drama.

Sacred Days and Festivals. — The monthly festivals are four, and are connected with the phases of the moon. No animal food must be eaten, but ordinary avocations need not be discontinued. There are particular festivals for each month, and three great annual festivals. "The *Log gSsar*, or the festival of the new year, in February, marks the commencement of the season of spring, or the victory of light and warmth over darkness and cold. The Lamaists, like the Buddhists, celebrate it in commemoration of the victory obtained by the Buddha Sakyamuni over the six heretic teachers. It lasts fifteen days, and consists of a series of feasts dances, illuminations, and other manifestations of joy; it is, in short, the Thibetan Carnival. The second festival, probably the oldest festival of the Buddhistic Church, is held in commemoration of the conception or incarnation of the Buddha, and marks the commencement of summer. The third is the *water-feast*, in August and September, marking the commencement of autumn" (Chambers).

Ceremonies. — *Tvisol*, or prayer for ablution, is among the most sacred of Buddhist rites. The "ceremony of continued abstinence" is performed once

or twice a year, and occupies four days, prayers being read in praise of Padmapani.

Rites are also observed for the attainment of supernatural faculties called *Siddhi*, of which eight classes are distinguished: the power to conjure; longevity; water of life; discovery of hidden treasures; entering into Indra's cave; the art of making gold; the transformation of earth into gold; the acquiring of the inappreciable jewel.

This *siddhi*, however, cannot be obtained without certain austerities, observances, and incantations. The latter must be repeated a fixed number of times, as, for instance, 100,000 times a day. Meditation is always necessary.

Peculiar ceremonies are observed for securing the assistance of the gods: these are the rite *Dubjed*, or making ready a burnt-offering, which has various names and is differently observed, as the "sacrifice for peace," the "rich sacrifice," to secure good harvests; the sacrifice for power, to obtain influence or success; the "fierce sacrifice," to secure protection from untimely death, etc. Incantation of *Lungta*, or "the horse of the wind," is powerful for good, as is also the talisman *Changpo*, which protects from evil spirits. The evil spirits are limited in their mischief by the magical figure *Phurbu*, a triangle drawn on paper covered with charms. Among the multitudinous ceremonies are those performed in cases of illness. Each malignant spirit causes some particular disease: *Rahu* inflicts palsy, others cause children to fall sick, etc. Charms, noisy music, and prayers accompany what rude medicine is administered.

"Baptism and confirmation are the two principal sacraments of Lamaism. The former is administered on the third or tenth day after birth; the latter, generally when the child can walk or speak. The marriage ceremony is to Thibetans not a religious, but a civil act; nevertheless, the lamas know how to turn it to the best advantage, as it is from them that the bridegroom and bride have to learn the auspicious day when it should be performed; nor do they fail to complete the act with prayers and rites, which must be responded to with handsome presents" (Chambers).

"The bodies of rich laymen are buried, and their ashes preserved, while those of the common people are either exposed to be devoured by birds or eaten by sacred dogs, which are kept for the purpose, and the bones are pounded in mortars, and given to the animals in the shape of balls. Rich

persons about to die are assisted by lamas, who let out the soul by pulling the skin from the skull and making a hole in it. Religious services for departed souls are said in the ratio of payment received. The mode of the funeral is determined by astrology" (Appleton).

Great importance is attached to astronomy, and tables of divination are in high esteem, as are soothsayers' formulas.

Holy Places. — "The principal holy place in Thibet is Lassa, with the monasteries Lha-brang, the cathedral; Ra-mo-tshhe (great circuit), wherein is the Chinese idol of Fo; and Moru (pure), having a celebrated printing-office. Near the city is Gar-ma-khian (mother cloister), wherein bad spirits are personated, and about a mile distant a three-pointed hill, with the chief of all monasteries and palaces, called Potala (Buddha's Mount), occupied by about 10,000 lamas in various dwellings. Several fine parks and gardens adorn the environs of the holy city. Among the thirty great lamaseries in the neighborhood are Sse-ra (golden), on the road to Mongolia, with Buddha's scepter floating in the air, and 15,000 lamas; 'Brass ssPunggs (branch-heap), founded by the reformer, with a Mongolic school, 300 sorcerers, and 15,000 lamas; and dGal Dan (Joy of heaven), also built by the reformer, whose body sometimes converses with the 8000 lamas. On the road to Ssu-tchuan is Lha-ri (god mountain), with a fine temple; there is another sacred place in the metropolis of Kham; others at Issha-mDo (two ways), Djaya, etc., with printing offices; many others on the roads to Peking, besides the northern monastery; all containing an incredible number of monks, under Khutukhtus and lower lamas; so that father Huc counts 3000 monasteries in U alone; others 84,000 monks in U, Tsang, and Kham, of the yellow sect, hermits, beggars, and vagabonds not included. About 120 miles south-west from Lassa, near the confluence of the Painorm with the great gTsangpo-tshhu (Sanpu), is the second metropolis of Lamaism, viz. bKra-Shiss-Lhun-po (mount of grace), also called bLabrang, with five great cenobies, many temples, palaces, mausoleums, pyramids, and the like. In the neighboring city there is a Chinese garrison. About midway between the two bLa-brangs there are three rocky islands in a lake, called gYang-brog (happy desert; Yambro on English maps), which contain temples, a magnificent palace, and thousands of monks and nuns, subject to the rDo-rDje-Phag-mo (saint, or adamantine sow), a female Khutukhtu, who becomes incarnated with a figure of a sow's snout on her neck, in consequence of her having escaped from Lassa during the troubles of the regency in the shape of that animal. The Chinese believe her to be the

incarnate Ursa Major. On the road to Nepaul there are the sNar-thang monastery, where the Kanjur was printed; and Ssaskya, mentioned above, now the see of the red-capped Gong-rDogss (high lord) Rin-po-tshhe, who is hereditary. On the road to Bhotan are the monasteries Kisu and Gantum Gumba of Turner, and many others, swarming with lamas, some filled with Annis (nuns). Bhotan is subject to the Dalai, but there are also three red-capped Rin-po-tshhe. The metropolis is bKra-Shiss Tshoss rDsong (gloria salutis fideique arx, Turner's Tassisudon), under an incarnate great lama and a secular Dharma-rajā, who rules over six districts, with about 10,000 lamas and 45,000 families. In Sikkim the aboriginal Leptchas have many mendicant lamas who practice magic, the other tribes being pure Buddhists. Buddhism flourished in Nepaul as early as the 7th century of our aera. It now exists there with Brahminism and Mohammedanism, so that Nepaul has also a double literature. In Kunawar, and elsewhere on the Upper Sutlej, there are many great monasteries of both the yellow and the red caps, living in peace with each other. At Sunnam there is a great library, a printing establishment, and a gigantic statue of Buddha. Ladakh became Buddhist before our era; its history is even less known than that of Thibet. Although invaded by Moslems (about 1650), it has many lamas, both male and female. In China there are two Buddhistic sects, viz. that of Fo, since A.D. 65, fostered by the government, very numerous, but without hierarchy, each monastery being under an abbot, who is a citizen of the 12th class; and the Lamaists, organized, as in Thibet, under the ministry of foreign affairs, with three Khutukhtus at Pekin, one of whom is attached to the court, while another's diocese is in South Mongolia, and the third governs the central one of their great monasteries. The most celebrated temples in the eighteen provinces are one on the U-tai-shan (five-topped mountain), in Shan-si, and one in Yunnan. In Si-fan, or Tangut, about the Koko-Nor, Lamaism flourished under the Hia at the close of the 9th century. The great reformer was incarnated in Amdo. The great cenoby of ssKubum was visited and endowed by Khanghi, and has a celebrated university. Mongolia is the paradise of lamas, they forming about one eighth of its population. Its patriarch, the Gegen-Khutukhtu, a Bodhisattwa of Maitreya, is equal in rank to both Thibetan popes, resides at Urga, on the road between Pekin and Kiachta, lat. 48° 20', with about 20,000 monks, and has attained the highest Khubilghanism by sixteen incarnations, having been first the son of Altan Khakhan of the Khalkas, and having once died (1839), after a visit to Pekin, either by poison or from licentiousness. The Urgan cenoby owns

about 30,000 families of slaves. The cathedral at Kuku Khotun, among the Turned, is under an incarnate patriarch, now second to the preceding. Most cenobies and temples now extant in Mongolia were built or restored after the second conversion. A Khutukhtu rules over the celebrated establishment of the 'five towers.' Dyo Naiman Ssuma, the summer residence of the second Pekin Khutukhtu, contains 108 temples and a famous manufactory of idols. Many other abodes of lamas are scarcely inferior to those we have mentioned. The desert of Gobi contains many such establishments. Sungaria contains numerous ruins of Lamaism, on the Irkish and elsewhere, among which those of Ablai-Kut, near Usk-Kamenogorsk, are most renowned, because the first fragments of the holy canon were brought thence to Europe about 1750. The Torguts have built many sacred places since their return from the west. A few lamas were found among the Buryats (in Russia), near Lake Baikal, about 160 years ago, as missionaries from Urga. Now almost all of them south of the lake are Lamao-Shamanites, and have wooden temples. The Calmucks between the Don, Volga, and Ural are forbidden to maintain intercourse with the Delai, although they keep up a Lamaic worship in Shittini-urgas (church tents)."

Government. — "Since the restoration of the power of the Dalai by the emperor Khian-lung, all the decrees of government are issued in the name of each of the two high lamas, in their respective dioceses; but the real power is in the hands of the emperor, whose two Tatchin (great mandarins) reside at Lassa, with Chinese garrisons in the neighborhood, to watch both the ocean of holiness and the Tsang-vang, who, as vicar of the emperor, administers the affairs of the country. The lower offices only are hereditary. The annual tribute of the two high lamas is carried every third year to Peking by caravans."

Literature. — See, besides the sacred books mentioned above, and the works cited under BUDDHISM *SEE BUDDHISM*, A. Cunningham, *Ladak, Physical, Statistical, and Historical* (London, 1854); Csoma de Koros, in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, Bengal, 1:121-269; 2:57, 201, 388; 3:57; 4:142; 5:264, 384; 7 (part 1), 142; 20:553-585; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, 2:88 sq.; Hue et Gabet, *Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet, et la Chine* (Paris, 1852); Hodgson, *Illustrations of the Literature and Religion of the Buddhists* (Serampore, 1841); Koppen (Fr.), *Die Lamaische Hierarchie*, etc. (Berlin, 1859);

Schlagintweit, *Buddhism in Tibet* (Lpzg. and London, 1863). *SEE THIBET.* (J.T.G.)

La Marck, Evrard de

cardinal bishop and lord of Liege, was born about 1475. His personal qualities, as well as the services rendered to the Church of Liege by his ancestors, caused him to be chosen bishop of that city in 1506. He at once applied to Rome for approbation, and, on the reception of the papal bull of installation by pope Julius II, repaired to Liege, where he was received with great enthusiasm. He confirmed the privileges of the city, which he governed with such wisdom that, while war was raging outside, his diocese continued to enjoy undisturbed peace. He restored the old discipline of St. Hubert, first bishop of Liege, and devoted himself to the spiritual and temporal improvement of his charge. In acknowledgment of services he had rendered to Louis XII in the affairs of Italy, he was made bishop of Chartres. Francis I even promised to procure him a cardinal's hat, but a protege of the duchess of Angouleme obtaining it in his stead, he entered in 1518 into the league of Austria against France, and even warred against his own brother, Robert de la Marck, who had made peace with Francis I. In the Diet of Frankfort he advocated the nomination of Charles V as emperor of Germany, and was rewarded with the archbishopric of Valencia. In 1521 he was created cardinal, and thereafter became a zealous opponent of the Reformation. According to Abraham Bzovius, he appointed in each district men on whom he could rely to ferret out and punish all heretics. A great many were found and punished by exile or death, while their possessions were sequestered. He is said to have cruelly tortured Protestant theologians. He had at first welcomed Erasmus, who dedicated to him his paraphrase on the Epistle to the Romans, but turned about and called him a heathen and a publican when he saw him incline towards the new doctrines. In 1529 he was called to Cambrai, where the *Ladies' Peace* was concluded. In 1532 he equipped at his own expense a body of troops to war against the Turks. Appointed legate *a latere* in 1533, he labored with new zeal to uproot all heresy. For this object he assembled a synod at Liege in 1538, but the priests, dissatisfied with his austerity, declared against him. He hoped to subdue their opposition, but suddenly died, February 16, 1538. See Chapeauville, *Hist. des Carдинаux*, volume 3, chapter 5 and 6; Auber, *Histoire des Carдинаux*. 3:331, Louis Doni d'Attichy, *Flores Cardinalium*, volume 3; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:52. (J.N.P.)

La Marck, Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet

CHEVALIER DE, a very distinguished French naturalist, deserves a place here on account of his connection with the celebrated theory of the "Variation of Species," lately so generally made known by the English naturalist Darwin. *SEE MAN, ORIGIN OF*. La Marck was born at Barenton, in Picardy, August 1, 1744, and was intended for the Church; he entered, however, the army, but accidental injury led him to adopt the mercantile profession. During his leisure hours he studied the natural sciences, and in 1778 finally came before the public with a work on botany, which secured him the position of botanist to the king. In 1793 he was made a professor of natural history in the "Jardin des Plantes." He died December 20, 1829. His greatest work is his *Histoire des Animaux sans Vertebres* (Paris, 1815-22, 7 volumes, 8vo; 2d ed. Paris, 1835, etc.). In *Philosophie Zoologique* (Paris, 1809, 2 volumes, 8vo), and some other of his productions, he advanced extremely speculative views, which, since Darwin's rise, have become the consideration of scientific scholars. So much is certain, that La Marck was the first (if we except a few obscure words of Buffon towards the close of his life) to advocate "Variation of Species." For a more detailed account and a complete list of his works, see Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:55-62). (J.H.W.)

Lamb

Picture for Lamb

is the representative of several Hebrew and Greek words in the A.V., some of which have wide and others distinctive meanings. *SEE EWE*.

1. The most usual term, **cbK**, *ke'bes* (with its transposed form **bCK**, *ke'seb*, and the feminines **hcbBak** *kibсах'*, or **hcbKi** *kabs, kabsh'*, and **hBcKa** *kisbah'*), denotes a male lamb from the first to the third year. The former, perhaps, more nearly coincide with the provincial term *hog* or *hogget*, which is applied to a young ram before he is shorn. The corresponding word in Arabic, according to Gesenius, denotes a ram at that period when he has lost his first two teeth and four others make their appearance, which happens in the second or third year. Young rams of this age formed an important part of almost every sacrifice. They were offered at the daily morning and evening sacrifice (⁽¹²⁹⁸⁾Exodus 29:38-41), on the Sabbath day (⁽¹²⁸⁹⁾Numbers 28:9), at the feasts of the new moon

(^{<0281>}Numbers 28:11), of trumpets (^{<0292>}Numbers 29:2), of tabernacles (^{<0293>}Numbers 29:13-40), of Pentecost (^{<0298>}Leviticus 23:18-20), and of the Passover (^{<0216>}Exodus 12:5). They were brought by the princes of the congregation as burnt-offerings at the dedication of the tabernacle (Numbers 7), and were offered on solemn occasions like the consecration of Aaron (^{<0103>}Leviticus 9:3), the coronation of Solomon (^{<1321>}1 Chronicles 29:21), the purification of the Temple under Hezekiah (^{<1421>}2 Chronicles 29:21), and the great Passover held in the reign of Josiah (^{<1457>}2 Chronicles 35:7). They formed part of the sacrifice offered at the purification of women after childbirth (^{<0116>}Leviticus 12:6), and at the cleansing of a leper (^{<0140>}Leviticus 14:10-25). They accompanied the presentation of first-fruits (^{<0232>}Leviticus 23:12). When the Nazarites commenced their period of separation they offered a he-lamb for a trespass-offering (^{<0462>}Numbers 6:12), and at its conclusion a he-lamb was sacrificed as a burnt-offering, and a ewe-lamb as a sin-offering (5:14). A ewe-lamb was also the offering for the sin of ignorance (^{<0463>}Leviticus 4:32). *SEE SACRIFICE.*

2. The corresponding Chaldee term to the above is *rMaaenmmar'* (^{<1510>}Ezra 6:9, 17; 7:17). In the Targum it assumes the form *armyaæ*

3. A special term is *hl f; taleh'* (^{<0109>}1 Samuel 7:9; ^{<2355>}Isaiah 65:25), a young sucking lamb; originally the young of any animal. The noun from the same root in Arabic signifies "a fawn," in Ethiopic "a kid," in Samaritan "a boy," while in Syriac it denotes "a boy," and in the feminine "a girl." Hence "*Talitha kumi*," "Damsel, arise!" (^{<1054>}Mark 5:41). The plural of a cognate form occurs (*yl æt'ell*) in ^{<2401>}Isaiah 40:11.

4. Less exact is *rKi car*, a fat *ram*, or, more probably, "wether," as the word is generally employed in opposition to *ayil*, which strictly denotes a "ram" (^{<1524>}Deuteronomy 32:14, ^{<1100>}2 Kings 3:4; ^{<2306>}Isaiah 34:6). Mesha, king of Moab, sent tribute to the king of Israel 100,000 fat wethers; and this circumstance is made use of by K. Joseph Kimchi to explain ^{<2310>}Isaiah 16:1, which he regards as an exhortation to the Moabites to renew their tribute. The Tyrians obtained their supply from Arabia and Kedar (^{<2372>}Ezekiel 27:21), and the pastures of Bashan were famous as grazing-grounds (^{<2398>}Ezekiel 39:18). *SEE RAM*

5. Still more general is *axotson*, rendered "lamb" in ^{<0121>}Exodus 12:21, properly a collective term denoting a "flock" of small cattle, sheep and

goats, in distinction from herds of the larger animals (^{<2107>}Ecclesiastes 2:7; ^{<6515>}Ezekiel 45:15). *SEE FLOCK.*

6. In opposition to this collective term the word *hc, seh* is applied to denote the individuals of a flock, whether sheep or goats; and hence, though "lamb" is in many passages the rendering of the A.V., the marginal reading gives "kid" (^{<01217>}Genesis 22:7, 8; ^{<01218>}Exodus 12:3; 22:1, etc.). — Smith, s.v. *SEE KID.*

7. In the N.T. we find *ἀρνίον* (strictly the diminutive of *ἀρῆν*, which latter once occurs, ^{<02101>}Luke 10:1), a *lambkiss*, the almost exclusive word, *ἄμνος* being only employed in a few passages, directly referring to Christ, as noticed below.

It appears that originally the paschal victim might be indifferently of the goats or of the sheep (^{<01213>}Exodus 12:3-5). In later times, however, the offspring of sheep appears to have been almost uniformly taken, and in sacrifices generally, with the exception of the sin-offering on the great day of atonement. Sundry peculiar enactments are contained in the same law respecting the qualities of the animal (^{<02231>}Exodus 22:30; 33:19; ^{<03227>}Leviticus 22:27). *SEE PASSOVER.*

In the symbolical language of Scripture the lamb is the type of meekness and innocence (^{<03106>}Isaiah 11:6; 65:25; ^{<02108>}Luke 10:3; ^{<01215>}John 21:15). *SEE SHEEP.*

The hypocritical assumption of this meekness, and the carrying on of persecution under a show of charity to the souls of men, and bestowing absolutions and indulgences on those who conform to its rules, appears to have given rise to the application of this otherwise sacred title to Antichrist (^{<06311>}Revelation 13:11): "And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns *like a lamb*, and he spake as a dragon." This evidently has reference to the ostensibly mild and tolerant character of the pagan forms of religion, which nevertheless, in the end, were found cooperating with the relentless secular power. It finds a fit counterpart in the Jesuitical pretensions of Romanism. *SEE ANTICHRIST.*

Lamb

(as a Christian emblem), the symbol of Christ (^{<01044>}Genesis 4:4; ^{<01218>}Exodus 12:3; 29:38; ^{<03101>}Isaiah 16:1; Jeremiah 53:7; ^{<01035>}John 1:36; ^{<01019>}1 Peter 1:19; ^{<06318>}Revelation 13:8), who was typified by the paschal lamb, the blood of

which was sprinkled on the door-posts and lintel of the doors like a Taucross, to preserve the Hebrews from destruction. In very old sepulchres the lamb stands on a hill amid the four rivers of Paradise, or in the Baptist's hand. It sometimes carries a milk-pail and crook, to represent the Good Shepherd. In the 5th century it is encircled with a nimbus. In the 4th century its head is crowned with the cross and monogram. In the 6th century it bears a spear, the emblem of wisdom, ending in a cross; or appears, bleeding from five wounds, in a chalice. At last it is girdled with a golden zone of power and justice (^{<23105>}Isaiah 11:5), bears the banner-cross of the resurrection, or treads upon a serpent (^{<6814>}Revelation 18:14). At length, in the 8th and 9th centuries, it lies on a throne amid angels and saints, as in the apocalyptic vision. When fixed to a cross it formed the crucifix of the primitive Church, and therefore was afterwards added on the reverse of an actual crucifix, as on the stational cross of Velletri. In 692 the council in Trullo ordered the image of the Savior to be substituted for the lamb. Jesus is the Shepherd to watch over his flock, as he was the Lamb, the victim from the sheep. Walafrid Strabo condemns the practice of placing near or under the altar on Good Friday lamb's flesh, which received benediction and was eaten on Easter day. Probably to this custom the Greeks alluded when they accused the Latins of offering a lamb on the altar at mass in the 9th century. In ancient times the pope and cardinals ate lamb on Easter day.

Lamb Of God

(ἀμνὸς Θεοῦ, ^{<802>}John 1:29,36; so of the Messiah, *Test. xii Patr.* pages 724, 725, 730), a title of the Redeemer (compare ^{<483>}Acts 8:32; ^{<6019>}1 Peter 1:19, where alone the term ἀμνός is elsewhere employed, and with a like reference). This symbolical appellation applied to Jesus Christ, in ^{<802>}John 1:29, 36, does not refer merely to the character or disposition of the Savior, inasmuch as he is also called "the *Lion* of the tribe of Judah" (^{<6815>}Revelation 5:5). Neither can the appellation signify the *most excellent* lamb, as a sort of Hebrew superlative. The term lamb is simply used, in this case, to signify *the sacrifice*, i.e., *the sacrificial victim*, of which the former sacrifices were typical (^{<4062>}Numbers 6:12; ^{<4862>}Leviticus 4:32; 5:6, 18; 14:12-17). So the prophet understood it: "He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter" (^{<2517>}Isaiah 53:7); and Paul: "For even Christ, our Passover," i.e., our *Passover lamb*, "is sacrificed for us" (^{<4817>}1 Corinthians 5:7; comp. Peter 1:18, 19). As the *lamb* was the symbol of sacrifice, the Redeemer is called "the Sacrifice of God," or the divine Sacrifice (^{<8014>}John 1:14; comp.

1 ~~<412>~~ John 20:28; ~~<412>~~ Acts 20:28; ~~<412>~~ Romans 9:5, ~~<412>~~ 1 Timothy 3:16; ~~<412>~~ Titus 2:13). As the Baptist pointed to the divinity of the Redeemer's sacrifice, he knew that in this consisted its efficacy to remove the sin of the world. The dignity of the Sacrifice, whose blood alone has an atoning efficacy for the sin of the world, is acknowledged in heaven. In the symbolic scenery, John beheld "a LAMB, as it had been *slain*, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God," i.e., invested with the attributes of God, omnipotence and omniscience, raised to the throne of universal empire, and receiving the homage of the universe (~~<412>~~ 1 Corinthians 15:25, ~~<412>~~ Philippians 2:9-11; ~~<412>~~ 1 John 3:8; ~~<412>~~ Hebrews 10:5-17; ~~<412>~~ Revelation 5:8-14). See the monographs on this subject cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, page 52.

In the Romish Church the expression is blasphemously applied in its Latin form to a consecrated wax or dough image bearing a cross, used as a charm by the superstitious. *SEE AGNUS DEI*.

Lamb, John

D.D., an English divine and antiquary, was born about 1790. He was made master of Corpus Christi College in 1822, and in 1837 was honored with the deanery of Bristol. He died in 1850. Lamb published *Hist. Account of the XXXIX Articles*, 1553-1571 (Cambridge, 1829, 4to; 2d ed. 1835, 4to); etc. See *Lond. Gentl. Mag.* 1848, part 2, page 55; 1850, part 1, page 667; *Christian Remembrancer*, June 1829.

Lamb, Thomas

an English Baptist minister and strict Calvinist, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He died about 1672. He is noted as the opponent of John Goodwin, the bold defender of Arminianism, whose *Redemption Redeemed* (London, 1651, fol.) Lamb answered in a work entitled *Absolute Freedom from Sin by Christ's Death for the World*, etc. (London, 1656, 4to).

Lambdin William,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Talbot County, Maryland, June 4, 1784; was converted at sixteen; removed to Pittsburg in 1805; joined the Baltimore Conference in 1808; was on various circuits and stations until 1815; then local till 1822, then in Pittsburg Conference until 1830; then local at Wheeling until 1842; then in

Memphis Conference, Tennessee, where he labored until he was superannuated in 1848. He died in Henry County, Tennessee, May 22, 1854. Lambdin was an able and faithful minister of the Word, and served the Church long and successfully. — *Annals of the Methodist Episcopal Church South*, 1855, page 348.

Lambert Von Hersfeld,

or ASCHAFFENBURG, an eminent German historian of the 11th century, was born, it is supposed by some, at Aschaffenburg, about 1034. In 1058 he entered the convent of Hersfeld, the school of which was at that time one of the most celebrated in Germany, and in the same year, 1058 was ordained priest. Shortly after he went on a journey to Jerusalem, without the consent or knowledge of the abbot of his convent. After his return in the following year, Lambert devoted himself to literary pursuits, yet as an inmate of the convent which he had entered before his departure for the Holy Land. He was in great favor among his superiors, as is evinced by the fact that he was sent to visit the convents of Sigeberg and Saalfeld, newly-established institutions. The precise date of his death is not ascertained probably about 1080. His works, which are numerous, are especially valuable as giving a clear perception of the state of letters in his times. His first work was a heroic poem, which is now lost. He then wrote a history of the Convent of Hersfeld, which contains valuable information for the history of the 11th century, but unfortunately we possess only fragments of this work. These were published by Mader from a Wolfenbüttel Codex: comp. *Vetustas, sanctimonia, potentia atque maiestas ducum Brunsvicensium ac Lynenburgensium domus* (Helmstadt, 1661-4), page 150; and again in *Antiq. Brunsvic.* page 150. This same codex was also published by M.G. Waitz, 7:138-141. His third work is a history of Germany in two parts. The second part is the most complete, as well as the most interesting: it begins with the reign of Henry IV, and extends to the election of king Rudolf. It is believed by some that this work, treating contemporary events, was written at different periods, whenever anything occurred which seemed to the author important enough to be mentioned. It appears, however, to have been concluded about 1084. Lambert's works are remarkable for purity of style and elegance of diction, as well as for learning and accuracy. Milman (*Lat. Christianity*, 8:333) says that he occupies as a historian, "if not the first, nearly the first place in medieval history." Hase (*Ch. History*, page 182), however, thinks that Lambert was too little acquainted with the ways of the world to make a proper

chronicler. Speaking of his German history, Hase says that it is "just such a picture of society as might be expected from a pious monk who had made a pilgrimage to the holy sepulcher, and looked out upon the world and his nation from the small stained window of his cell." in his allusions to the difficulties which occurred between the temporal and ecclesiastical powers, Lambert shows a rare degree of impartiality, although necessarily yielding to some extent to the effects of his position as a monk, as well as of the troubles of the times. Some of his writings were translated into German by Hegewisch, and his whole works by F.B. v. Bucholz (Frankf. 1819); also, more recently, by Hesse, in the *Geschichtschreiber deutscher Vorzeit. d. XI Jahrh.* (Berl. 1855, 6 volumes). See Frisch, *Comparatio critica de Lamberti Sch. annal., etc., Diss. inaug. Monachii* (1830, 8vo); Stenzel, *Fränkische Kaiser*, 1:495, 2:101 sq.; Piderit, *Comment. de Lamb. Schafneb.* (Hersf. 1828, 4to), Hesse, *Recension. Jen. Lit. Zeift.* 1830, No. 130; Wilman, *Otto III Exkura*, 6, page 214; Hirsch and Waitz, *Chr. Corbej.* page 36, Giesebrecht, *Annales Alahenses* (Berlin, 1841); Floto, *Kaiser Heinrich I V*; Grünhagen, *Adalbert v. Bremen*, 1854; Ranke, *Abhh. d. Berlin., Akad.* von 1854, page 436 sq.; Witt, *Ueber Benzo* (Marburg, 1856); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:166 sq.

Lambert Of Maestricht,

a martyr and a saint of the Romish Church, commemorated on September 17, was born at Maestricht, Holland, towards the middle of the 7th century; was educated by Theodard, bishop of that see, whom he succeeded in office when that prelate died a martyr in 668. The major domus Ebroin was then in war with the Merovingian dynasty, and persecuted all its supporters. Upon Lambert also fell his displeasure, and he deprived him of his bishopric, and appointed Faramund in his place. Lambert remained for seven years (674-81) in the Convent of Stablo, where he led a life of penitence and humiliation. When Pepin d'Heristal, after killing Ebroin, became the head of the kingdom, Lambert was restored to his bishopric. The ancient historians relate that he was killed by a Frankish chieftain named Dodo, out of revenge. Two relatives of Dodo attempted to seize on the goods of the Church, and were killed by Lambert's nephew; Dodo, in return caused Lambert himself to be murdered at Liege. Subsequent writers attempted to render this history more interesting. They say that he was murdered by Dodo on account of the freedom with which he reproved Pepin d'Heristal for his improper intimacy with Alpais, a sister of Dodo. Siegbert of Gemblours and others say that on

one occasion he refused at the king's table to bless Alpais's cup with the sign of the cross, and, seeing that he would be killed for this, he forbade his followers defending him, and said to them, "If you truly love me, love Jesus, and confess your sins to him; as for me, it is time that I should go to live in communion with him." After saying which, he knelt down, and, while praying for his enemies, was killed with a spear. It was on the 17th of September, 708 (709 according to the Bollandists; others say 697 or 698). So great was the veneration in which Lambert was held by his contemporaries, that in 714 a church was built in commemoration of him at Liege. His successor in the bishopric was Hubert. Biographies of Lambert were written by Godeschalk, deacon of the Church of Liege in the middle of the 8th century, Stephan, bishop of Liege in 903, a canon called Nicholas, about 1120) and a monk named Reiner. See A. Butler, *Lives of the Saints*; F.W. Rettberg, *K. Gesch. Deutschlands*, 1:558 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:165; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:323, 324.

Lambert, Chandley

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Alford, Berkshire County, Massachusetts, in 1781, and converted at Lansingburg, New York, March 27, 1804. He entered the Black River Conference in 1807, labored with great zeal and success for twenty years, was superannuated in 1827, and died at Lowville, N.Y., March 16, 1845. Lambert was a man of great integrity and usefulness. His mind was superior and well stored with information, and his preaching eminently practical and full of the Holy Ghost. Many souls were converted through his labors. — *Black River Conference Memorial*, p. 128. (G.L.T.)

Lambert, Francis

(generally known as *Lambert of Avignon*, the name of his native place), also called JOHN SERRANUS, a French theologian, and one of the early apostles of the Reformation, was born in 1487. At the age of sixteen he became a Gray Friar, was then ordained priest, and preached for a while with great success. He soon, however, tired of the world, and, thinking to find peace of mind in stricter seclusion, he asked permission to join the Carthusians. Refused by his superiors, he left his order in 1522, and embraced the doctrines of Luther, whose writings he had secured and carefully studied. On a visit to Switzerland he was received by Sebastian de Monte Falcone, prince-bishop of Lausanne, and went to Berne and Zurich,

where he had a public conference with Zwingle. He thereupon cast aside the dress of his order, took the name of John Serranus, and began preaching the reformed principles in the several cities of Switzerland and Germany. In 1522 he held public conferences at Eisenach, and was greatly instrumental in propagating the Reformation in Thuringia and Hesse. In January, 1523, he joined Luther at Wittenberg, where he wrote his commentaries on Hosea and other books. In 1524 he went to Metz, and afterwards to Strasburg, where he remained until called to Hombourg by the landgrave, Philip of Hesse, in 1526. Here, in a synod held in October of the same year, he argued in Latin, and Adam Craton, or Crafft, in German, against the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church as defended by Nicholas Herborn and John Sperber. The latter were declared vanquished and driven out of Hesse. The convents were closed up, and their revenues employed to establish four hospitals and a Protestant academy at Marburg. Lambert became its first professor of theology. In 1529 he took part in the Conference of Marburg between the theologians of Switzerland, Saxony, Suabia, and other southern German provinces. He died April 18, 1530. All the writers of his time agree in calling him a learned, industrious, and upright man. His numerous works are now very scarce; among the most important are *Commentarius in Evangelium Lucae* (Wittemberg, 1523, 8vo; Nuremberg and Strasburg, 1525, 8vo; Frankfort, 1693, 8vo): — *In Cantica canticorum Salomonis libellus*, etc. (Strasburg, 1524, 8vo): — *De fidelium vocatione in regnum Christi, id est Ecclesiam*, etc. (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo): — *Farrago omnium fere rerum theologiarum* (1525?), consisting of 385 propositions arranged into thirteen chapters, and which contain the whole theological system of the author: — *In Johelem prophetam*, etc. (Strasb. 1525, 8vo): — *In Amos, Abdiam, et Jonam, et Allegoriae in Jonam*, (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo): — *In Micheam, Naum et Abacue* (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo): — *Theses theologicae in synodo Homburgensi disputatae* (Erfurt, 1527, 4to and 8vo): — *Exegeseos in Apocalipsim libri vii* (Marburg, 1528, 8vo): — *De Symbolo foederis numquam rumpendi quam communionem vocant; Fr. Lamberti Confessio*, etc. (1530, 8vo; translated into German, 1557, 8vo): — *Commentarii in quatuor libros Regum et in Acta Apostolorum* (Strasb. 1526; Frankft. 1539): — *De Regno, Civitate et Domo Dei ac Domini nostri J.C.*, etc. (Worms, 1538, 8vo). See J.G. Schelhorn, *Amaenitates Litterariae*, 4:307, 312, 324, 328, 10:1235, Seckendorf, *Commentarius de Lutheranism*, lib. 2, sect. 8; Freher, *Theatrum Virorum Doctorum*, 1:104; Bayle, *Hist. Deuteronomy Dit.* 2:708 sq.; J. Tilemann, *Vitae Professorum theologiae*

Mapurgensium; Abraham Scultet, *Annales AEvangeliæ*, ann. 1526; Le Long, *Biblioth. Sacra*; J.F. Hekelius, *Epistolæ Sigular.* manip. primus; Nicéron, *Memoires*, 39:234 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:132; Baum (Johann W.), *Lambert v. Avignon nach seinem Leben*, etc. (1840); Schrockh, *Kirchhelgeschichte s. d. Ref.* 1:380, 434; 2:219.

Lambert, George

a Presbyterian minister, was born January 31, 1742, at Chelsea, England. In 1767 he became a student at the theological school under the charge of Reverend James Scott, at Heckmondwicke, England. He pursued his studies there for five years, and then accepted the charge of a church at Hull, April 9, 1769, where he continued his ministrations until his death, March 17, 1816. Mr. Lambert was a minister of more than ordinary power and success, attaching to himself, by his intellectual vigor, moral worth, and Christian excellence, not only his own people, but also numerous members and ministers of other denominations. He published two volumes of his sermons, *On various useful and important Subjects, adapted to the Family and the Closet*. Lambert was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society, and preached its first anniversary sermon in May, 1796. See Morison, *Missionary Fathers*, page 375 sq.

Lambert, Johann Heinrich

a noted German philosopher and mathematician, was born August 29, 1728, at Mühlhausen, Alsace, of a French Protestant family. His talents and application to study having gained him friends, he obtained a good education, making remarkable progress in mathematics, philosophy, and Oriental languages. In 1756-58 he visited Holland, France, and Italy, and while residing in the first-named country appeared in print with his *Sur les proprietes remarquables de la route de la lumiere*, etc. In 1764 Frederick the Great summoned him to Berlin, and made him a member both of the Council of Architecture and of the Academy of Sciences. He died in that city September 25, 1777, leaving behind him the renown of having been the greatest analyst in mathematics, logic, and metaphysics that the 18th century had produced. Lambert was the first to lay a scientific basis for the measurement of the intensity of light in his *Pyrometrie* (Augsburg, 1760). and he discovered the theory of the speaking-tube. In philosophy, and particularly in analytical logic, he sought to establish an accurate system by bringing mathematics to bear upon these subjects, in his *Neues Organon*,

oder Gedanken über die Erforschung und Beziehung des Wahren (Lpzg. 1764, 2 volumes). Of his other works, we may mention his profound *Kosmologische Briefe über die Einrichtung des Weltbaus* (Augsb. 1761), and his correspondence with Kant. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:151 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Graf, *Lambert's Leben* (1829); Huber, *Lambert nach s. Leben u. Wirken* (1829).

Lambert, John

an English reformer, lived in the reign of Henry the Eighth, and was for a time minister of an English company at Antwerp. After his return to England he was charged with heresy because he rejected the dogma of transubstantiation. He was tried before the king and bishops, and, upon refusing to recant, was burned at Smithfield, November 20, 1538. Lambert was distinguished for his learning. He wrote a *Treatise on the Lord's Supper* (edited by John Ball, London, 1538, 16mo): — *Treatise on Predestination and Election* (Canterbury, 1550, 8vo). See Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation*, 1:406; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1051.

Lambert, Joseph

a French ecclesiastic and moralist, was born in Paris in 1654. He took sacred orders when thirty years old, and flourished afterwards as prior of Saint-Martin-de-Palaiseau. He died January 31, 1722. Among his best works are *L'Annee evangelique, ou homilies sur les Evangiles* (Paris, 1693-1697, 7 volumes, 12mo, and often) — *Instruction sur le symbole* (Par. 1728, 2 volumes, 12mo, and often). See, for a full list of his writings, Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:150.

Lambert, Ralph

D.D., a prelate of the Church of England, lived in the latter part of the 18th century. He was successively dean of Down, and bishop of Dromore and of Meath. He is noted especially for his plea in favor of depriving Presbyterian ministers of all power to celebrate marriage. Some of his *Sermons* were published in 1693, 1702, and 1703. The date of his death, or other particulars of his life, are not at hand. — Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1052 Reid, *Hist. Irish Presb. Church*, 3:38.

Lambert, St., de, Charles Francois

marquis, a noted French infidel and poet, a contemporary and collaborer of Voltaire on the French *Encyclopaedia* (q.v.), was born at Vezelise, in Lorraine, in 1716 or 1717. About 1750 he went to Paris, and soon found associates in Rousseau, Voltaire, Grimm, and other celebrated French infidels of Voltaire's day. He became especially celebrated as a poet, his productions were greatly lauded by Voltaire, and, finally, he was made a member of the French Academy. As a philosopher, however, he did not really appear before the public until 1797, when he published *Les Principes des Maeur chez toutes les nations, ou Catechisme universel* (1797-1800). He died February 9, 1803. St. Lambert's personal history fully coincides with the doctrines he espoused. Ignoring all need of religion, his morals were truly Epicurean, and we need not wonder to find that his celebrity was first gained by the publication of his criminal intercourse with a woman, and the birth of an illegitimate child.

As to a more detailed description of St. Lambert's philosophical system, it may suffice to say here that it very much resembles that of Helvetius, whom St. Lambert slavishly followed. Thus he teaches, in treating of man's *nature*, and his *duties* with regard to human nature, that "man, when he first enters upon the stage of life, is simply an organized and sentient mass, and that, whatever feelings or thoughts he may afterwards acquire, still they are simply different manifestations of the sensational faculty, occasioned by the pressure of his various wants and necessities. With regard to ethics, he maintains that, as man possesses only sensations, his sole good must be personal enjoyment, his only duty the attainment of it; and that, as we may be mistaken as to what objects are really adapted to promote our pleasure, the safest rule by which we can judge of duty in particular cases is public opinion." In his *Catechisme Universel* he divides the whole mass of man's duty into three classes — his duty to himself, to his own family, and to society at large; while the duties of religion are never mentioned, and the very name of God is altogether excluded. Condorcet's fundamental doctrine of ethics — the present perfectibility of mankind, both individually and socially, by means of education — St. Lambert proposed to substitute in place of the sanctions both of morality and religion, as the great regenerating principle of human nature (compare Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, page 111). See Puymaigre, *Saint Lambert* (1840); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v. (J.H.W.)

Lambeth Articles

SEE ARTICLES, LAMBETH.

Lambruschini, Louis

an eminent Italian prelate and statesman, was born at Genoa May 16, 1776. Having entered the Order of Barnabites, he became bishop of Sabine, then archbishop of Genoa; was sent to France as papal nuncio during the reign of Charles X, and finally created cardinal September 30, 1831. Pope Gregory XVI appointed him abbot of Santa Maria di Farfa, secretary of state for foreign affairs, librarian of the Church, grand prior of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, grand chancellor of the order of St. Gregory, and prefect of the congregation of studies. Opposed to all innovations, Lambruschini took an active part in all the religious and political persecutions which marked the pontifical career of Gregory XVI, and became consequently very unpopular. In 1845 he surrendered the direction of public instruction to cardinal Mezzofante. On the death of Gregory XVI in 1846, Lambruschini came very near being elected pope. Pius IX appointed him member of the states council, and restored him to the secretaryship and librarianship of the Vatican. In 1847 he was also made bishop of Porto de San Rufina and of Civita Vecchia, chancellor of the pontifical orders, and subdean of the sacred college. When the revolution broke out in Italy Lambruschini was in danger, and fled to Civita Vecchia, but, not finding more security there, he returned to Rome. In 1848 he fled first to Naples, and afterwards joined, Pius IX at Gaeta. He re-entered Rome with the pope in 1850, and was appointed cardinal of the papal household. He is said to have then advised measures of moderation, which were rejected by cardinal Antonelli. He died May 12, 1854. His principal works were translated into French, under the title *Meditations sur les Vertus de Sainte Therese, precedees d'un abrege de sa vie* (Paris, 1827, 18mo): — *Sur l'Immaculee Conception de Matrie, dissertation polemique* (Paris and Besançon, 1843, 8vo): — *Devotion au Sacre Coeur de Jesus*, etc. (Par. 1857, 18mo). See *Dict. de la Conversation*; Bourquelot et Maury, *La Litterature Francaise Contemp.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:175. (J.N.P.)

La'mech

(Heb. *Le'mek*, עַמֵּי , *taster*, otherwise a *vigorous* youth, in pause *La'mek*, . עַמֵּי ; Septuag. and N.T. Λάμεχ; Josephus Λάμεχος, *Ant.* 1:2,2), the name of two antediluvian patriarchs.

1. The fifth in descent from Cain, being the son of Methusael, and father of Jabal, Jubal, Tubal-cain, and Naamah (^{<0018>}Genesis 4:18-24). B.C. cir. 3776. He is recorded to have taken two wives, Adah and Zillah; and there appears no reason why the fact should have been mentioned, unless to point him out as the author of the evil practice of polygamy. The manner in which the sons of Lamech distinguished themselves as the inventors of useful arts is mentioned under their several names (q.v.). The Targum of Jonatlan (ad loc.) adds, that his daughter was "the mistress of sounds and songs," i.e., the first poetess; which Jewish tradition embellishes by saying that all the world wondered after her, even the sons of God, and that evil spirits were born of her (*Midrash* on Ruth, and *Zohar*). Josephus (*Ant.* 1:2, 2) relates that the number of Lamech's sons was seventyseven, and Jerome records the same tradition, adding that they were all cut off by the Deluge, and that this was the seventy-and-sevenfold vengeance which Lamech imprecated.

The most remarkable circumstance in connection with Lamech is the poetical address which he is very abruptly introduced as making to his wives, being, indeed, the only example of antediluvian poetry extant (^{<0023>}Genesis 4:23, 24):

*Adah and Zillah, hear my voice;
Wives of Lamech, listen to my say!
For a man I slew for my wound,
Even a youth for my bruise:
If sevenfold Cain was to be avenged,
Then Lamech seventy and seven.*

It has all the appearance of an extract from an old poem, which we may suppose to have been handed down by tradition to the time of Moses. It is very difficult to discover to what it refers, and the best explanation can be nothing more than a conjecture. It is the subject of a dissertation by Hilliger in *Thesaurus Theologico Philol.* 1:141, and is discussed at length by the various commentators on Genesis. See also Hase, *De Oraculo Lamechi* (Brem. 1712); Schroder, *De Lamecho homicida* (Marb. 1721). The

Following is a synopsis of ancient and modern views. " Chrysostom (*Hom. 20 in Gen.*) regards Lamech as a murderer stung by remorse, driven to make public confession of his guilt solely to ease his conscience, and afterwards (*Hom. in Psalm 6*) obtaining mercy. Theodoret (*Quaest. in Genesis 44*) sets him down as a murderer. Basil (*Ep. 260 [317], § 5*) interprets Lamech's words to mean that he had committed two murders, and that he deserved a much severer punishment than Cain, as having sinned after plainer warning; Basil adds, that some persons interpret the last lines of the poem as meaning that, whereas Cain's sin increased, and was followed after seven generations by the punishment of the Deluge washing out the foulness of the world, so Lamech's sin shall be followed in the seventy-seventh (see ~~4183~~ Luke 3:23-38) generation by the coming of him who taketh away the sin of the world. Jerome (*Ep. 36, ad Damasum, t. 1, page 161*) relates as a tradition of his predecessors and of the Jews that Cain was accidentally slain by Lamech in the seventh generation from Adam. This legend is told with fuller details by Jarchi. (See Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.) According to him, the occasion of the poem was the refusal of Lamech's wives to associate with him in consequence of his having killed Cain and Tubal-cain; Lamech, it is said, was blind, and was led about by Tubalcain; when the latter saw in the thicket what he supposed to be a wild beast, Lamech, by his son's direction, shot an arrow at it, and thus slew Cain; in alarm and indignation at the deed, he killed his son; hence his wives refused to associate with him; and he excuses himself as having acted without a vengeful or murderous purpose. Onkelos, followed by Pseudo-Jonathan, paraphrases it, 'I have not slain a man that I should bear sin on his account.' The Arab. Ver. (Saadias) puts it in an interrogative form, 'Have I slain a man?' etc. These two versions, which are substantially the same, are adopted by De Dieu and bishop Patrick. Aben Ezra, Calvin, Drusius, and Cartwright interpret it in the future tense as a threat, 'I will slay any man who wounds me.' Luther considers the occasion of the poem to be the deliberate murder of Cain by Lamech. Lightfoot (*Decas Chorogr. Marc. praem. § 4*) considers Lamech as expressing remorse for having, as the first polygamist, introduced more destruction and murder than Cain was the author of into the world" (Smith). Shuckford, in his *Connections*, supposes that the descendants of Cain had lived for a long time in fear of vengeance for the death of Abel from the family of Adam; and that Lamech, in order to persuade his wives of the groundlessness of such fears, used the argument in the text, i.e., if any one who might slay Cain, the murderer of his brother, was threatened with

sevenfold vengeance, surely they must expect a far sorer punishment who should presume to kill any of us on the same account. Others regard Lamech's speech as a heaven-daring avowal of murder, in which he had himself received a slight wound. Some have even sought to identify Lamech with the Asiatic deity *Lemus* or *Leames* (see Movers, *Phoen.* 477; Nork, *Bibl. Mythol.* 1:235). Herder, in his *Hebrew Poetry*, supposes that the haughty and revengeful Lamech, overjoyed by the invention of metallic weapons by his son Tubal-cain, breaks out in this triumphal song, boasting that if Cain, by the providence of God, was to be avenged sevenfold, he, by means of the newly-invented weapons, so much superior to anything of the kind known at that time, would be able to take a much heavier vengeance on those who injured him. This hypothesis as to the occasion of the poem was partly anticipated by Hess, and has been received by Rosenmüller, Ewald, and Delitzsch. Pfeiffer (*Dif. Scrips. Loc.* page 25) collects different opinions up to his time with his usual diligence, and concludes that the poem is Lamech's vindication of himself to his wives, who were in terror for the possible consequences of his having slain two of the posterity of Seth. This judicious view is substantially that of Lowth (*De S. Poesi Heb.* 4:91) and Michaelis, who think that Lamech is excusing himself for some murder which he had committed in self-defense ("for a wound inflicted on me"), and he opposes a homicide of this nature to the willful and inexcusable fratricide of Cain. Under this view Lamech would appear to have intended to comfort his wives by the assurance that he was really exposed to no danger from this act, and that any attempt upon his life on the part of the friends of the deceased would not fail to bring down upon them the severest vengeance (compare Dathe and Rosenmüller, *ad loc.*; see also Turner's *Companion to Genesis*, page 209). "That he had slain a man, a *young* man (for the youth of one clause is undoubtedly but a more specific indication of the man in the other), and this not in cool blood, but in consequence of a wound or bruise he had himself received, is, if not the only possible, certainly the natural and obvious meaning of the words; and on the ground apparently of a difference between his case and that of Cain's — namely, that he had done *under* provocation what Cain had done *without it* he assures himself of an interest in the divine guardianship and protection immeasurably greater than that granted to Cain. This seems as plainly the import of Lamech's speech as language could well make it. But if it seems to imply, as it certainly does, that Lamech was not an offender after the type and measure of Cain, it at the same time shows how that branch of the human family were becoming familiar with strife and

bloodshed, and, instead of mourning over it, were rather presuming on the divine mercy and forbearance to brace themselves for its encounters, that they might repel force with force. The prelude already appears here of the terrible scenes which, after the lapse of a few generations, disclosed themselves far and wide — when the earth was filled with violence, and deeds were every day done which cried in the ear of heaven for vengeance. Such was the miserable result of the human art and the earthly resources brought into play by the Cainite race, and on which they proudly leaned for their ascendancy; nor is it too much to say that here also, even in respect to the poetic gift of nature, the beginning was prophetic of the end." *SEE ANTEDILUVIANS.*

2. The seventh in descent from Seth, being the son of Methuselah, and father of several sons, of whom apparently the oldest was Noah (~~1065~~ Genesis 5:25-31; ~~1308~~ 1 Chronicles 1:3; ~~1186~~ Luke 3:36). B.C. 3297-2520. He was 182 years old at the birth of Noah, and survived that event 595 years, making his total age 777. His character appears to have been different from that of his Cainite namesake (see Dettinger, in the *Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol.* 1835, 1:11 sq.). "Chrysostom (*Seran.* 9 in *Gen.*, and *Hom.* 21 in *Gen.*), perhaps thinking of the character of the other Lamech, speaks of this as an unrighteous man, though moved by a divine impulse to give a prophetic name to his son. Buttman and others, observing that the names of Lamech and Enoch are found in the list of Seth's, as well as of Cain's family, infer that the two lists are merely different versions or recensions of one original list-traces of two conflicting histories of the first human family. This theory is deservedly repudiated by Delitzsch on *Genesis* 5."

Lamennais, Félicité Robert

Abbe de, a Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, occupies a distinguished place in the ecclesiastical, political, and literary history of France of the 19th century. He was born of a noble family at St. Malo, in Bretagne, June 6, 1782. In his boyhood, his clerical tutor having fled to England on the outbreak of the Revolution, he and his brother continued their studies together with singular independence. It is said that when only twelve years old he was able to read Livy and Plutarch with ease. "In 1794, having been sent to live with an uncle, this relation, not knowing what to do with a wilful boy, used to shut him up for whole days in a library consisting of two compartments, one of which, called 'Hell,' contained a

large number of prohibited books, which little Robert was enjoined not to read. But the lad already cared for none but books of reflection, and finding some of these on the prohibited shelves, that division became his favorite. Long hours were thus spent in reading the ardent pages of Rousseau, the thoughtful volumes of Malebranche, and other writers of sentiment and philosophy. Such a course of reading, far from producing its usual effects of precocious vainglory and unbelief on so young a mind, served rather to ripen his judgment, and to develop that religious fervor which was a part of his nature" (*English Cyclopaedia*). He soon took a decidedly religious course, and, though offered a mercantile career by his father, chose the clerical profession. Before, however, entering upon the studies of the sacred office, he accepted in 1807 the position as teacher of mathematics in the college of his native place.

To promote practical piety, he published in 1808 a translation of the ascetic *Guide Spirituel* of Louis de Blois. In reference to the Concordat of Napoleon, he wrote *Reflexions sur l'etat de l'eglise en France pendant le dix-huitieme siecle et sur la situation actuelle* (1808). He here denounces the materialism propagated by the philosophers of the 18th century, bitterly deploras the apathy thence induced to religion, and expresses much hope from the beneficent influence of the Concordat, and declares the laws of religion and morality to be the supreme laws of life. The imperial censorship, however, detected a dangerous independent tendency in this work, especially in the demand for ecclesiastical synods and conferences, and the issue of the first edition was suppressed. After having received the clerical tonsure (in 1811), he published, in defense of the papal authority and against Napoleon, *Tradition de l'eglise sur l'institution des eveques* (Paris, 1814). From retirement in England, whither he had been obliged to flee during the Hundred Days, Lamennais returned to France (in 1816) in full sympathy with the Restoration, and entered more ardently than ever upon the work of disseminating his earlier opinions. He was ordained priest in 1817, and in this year began the publication of his *Essai sur l'indifference en matiere de religion* (Paris, 1817-1820, 4 volumes). This work, of which Lacordaire said that it caused its author to rise, in a single day, like a new Bossuet above the horizon, thoroughly aroused public attention to the author and his principles, attracted many readers by the eloquence of its style, and has passed through many editions. The work belongs to the Catholic reactionary school of philosophy, to which Joseph de Maistre had given the leading impulse. The author first points out

certain perilous tendencies of the age which seem to threaten another revolution, and notices the various systems of religious indifference. He next asserts the absolute importance of religion to the individual and the state. The inquiry concerning the ground of certainty in matters of religion is then met by postulating *authority* — that is, the *consenting testimony* of mankind as the only ground. This testimony finds its interpretation by divine appointment in the Catholic Church, and finally in the pope. This whole scheme proceeds upon the basis of skeptical philosophy, which denies to the individual reason the possession of certainty concerning any truth, whether scientific, philosophic, or religious, and which takes refuge for the attainment of religious certainty in a *common consent* divinely guided. It thus becomes the duty of the state, for the security of its own welfare and that of the individual, to enforce by every moral and physical means the decisions of this authoritative Church. Here was an attempt to win back both prince and people to the absolute submission demanded by Gregory VII and Innocent III. The French Church was alarmed at so extreme a position, and disavowed its own champion. A *Defense de l'Essai sur l'indifference* was issued by the author. In 1818 Lamennais joined hands for a brief period with certain Royalists in founding the "Conservateur;" but afterwards, in sympathy with another coterie called the *drapeau blanc*. his severity in writing against the management of the university invited the attention of the police authorities. In 1824 he visited Rome, and was received with distinction by pope Leo XII; he is said to have declined a cardinalship, as he had previously declined a bishopric which had been urged upon him by the ministry at Paris. In *La Religion considerée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre civil et politique* (Paris, 1825-26, 2 volumes) he first began to exhibit that freedom of thought, reaching to the last boundary of revolution (but which, however. independent of Church interests, abandons nothing in spiritual faith). It contained an attack upon Gallican principles, and upon some measures of the king, which brought him again before the courts. Defended by the legal skill of Berryer, he was let off with a fine of thirty francs. There is a manifest prognostication of the coming disturbance, of the breach between the hierarchical authority and the spirit of the times in his *Progres de la revolution et de la guerre contre l'église* (1829).

The July revolution completed, the Church must now be saved by bringing it into harmony with the demands of civil liberty, and to serve such an end Lamennais enters upon the second period of his career. With the

cooperation of Lacordaire (q.v.) and Montalembert (q.v.) he founded the journal *L'Avenir*, which had for its motto "God and Freedom," and for its guiding thought concerning the Church that the latter can save itself from the ruin which waits on political absolutism only by freeing itself from all relations with the state, and from the corruptions of hierarchical luxury, while it is to flourish only through the voluntary devotion of its adherents, and in harmony with laws which secure for the people freedom of education and worship. He preached such a doctrine enthusiastically, and believed that Rome would receive it. He was present at Rome in 1831 with Lacordaire and Montalembert, and sought to win the representatives of the French, Russian, Austrian, and Prussian courts to his views. An audience was granted by the pope only on condition of silence concerning the matters agitated. When, however, Lacordaire had presented a scheme of these views in writing, the French bishops, on April 22, 1832, presented an outspoken opposition to them. A few extracts from an encyclical letter condemnatory of such principles which was issued by Gregory XVI on August 15, 1832, best explains the peculiar position assumed by the writers of *L'Avenir*: "From this infectious source of indifferentism," says the encyclical, "flows that absurd and erroneous maxim, or, rather, that madness, which would insure and guarantee to all liberty of conscience. The way is prepared for this pernicious error by the free and unlimited liberty of opinion which is spreading abroad. to the misfortune of civil and religious society, some asserting with extreme imprudence that it may be productive of certain advantages to religion." And afterwards it adds: "With this is connected that lamentable liberty which we cannot regard with too much horror, the liberty of the press to publish all sorts of writings, a liberty which some persons dare to demand and extol with so much noise and ardor." A copy of it was sent with special explanations to Lamennais by cardinal Pacca, who urged him to render submission to the authority he had himself so highly extolled, and, as if to make even more explicit the meaning of the encyclical of which he was the transmittent, added, "The doctrines of the *L'Avenir* upon the liberty of worship and the liberty of the press are very reprehensible, and in apposition to the teaching, the maxims, and *the policy of the Church* [the italics are ours]. They have exceedingly astonished and afflicted the holy father; for if, under certain circumstances, prudence compels us to tolerate them as lesser evils, such doctrines can never be held up by a Roman Catholic as good in themselves, or as things desirable." Strangely enough, as it must appear to Protestant ideas, the three editors of *L'Avenir* — Lamennais and his two

younger coadjutors, Lacordaire and Montalembert submitted to the papal see, and, of course, to evince their sincerity, discontinued the publication of *L'Avenir*. But Lamennais having afterwards, in certain smaller articles, expressed himself in a spirit contrary to the views of the encyclical, he received a letter from the pope on the subject, and thereupon, in a formal way, subscribed a submission, December 11, 1833, at the palace of the archbishop of Paris. In the *Affaires de Rome* (see below), however, he declared that this submission on his part had been made only for the sake of peace, and that, in truth, the welfare of the people must be considered before that of the Church. In 1834 *Paroles d'un croyant* appeared, which passed in a few years through 100 editions, and was translated into many languages. In this work a new spirit is manifest. In earnest language the former and existing evils of society are deplored, while in a style of prophetic ardor the future is anticipated. A new Christianity, based on the principles of the New Testament, in a revolutionized democratic state is sought. A certain ideal external form was still Lamennais' hope. He had idealized the Church, and would now seek a like panacea in a social reorganization (see *Brit. and For. Evangel. Review*, October 1863, page 731). This work was severely condemned by a special decree of Gregory XVI, August 7, 1834.

In the *Affaires de Rome* (Paris, 1836) Lamennais enters fully upon the final period of his life. He here breaks completely and irrevocably with the Church; declares the Roman hierarchy, of which he had long been the champion, to be incompatible with a true Christianity and a true humanism, and hereafter Lamennais was regarded by the Church authorities as an apostate. Like Luther, Ulrich von Hutten, and many other great men, Lamennais had been completely disenchanted by the sight of the corruptions of Rome in her very stronghold. "His strong and clear vision saw in her but a corpse which it was vain to attempt to resuscitate; a conglomerate religion made up of Christianity perverted by Jewish symbolism, and degraded and sensualized by Oriental and classical mythology and philosophy. Yet he hesitated long before he could make up his mind to deny his whole previous life, to forsake and repudiate what he had formerly defended, to become an antagonist of the Church of which he had formerly been the bulwark and the champion; and it required a year's meditation and self-examination, amid the woods of his paternal domain of La Chesnaye, before he resolved finally and forever to break with the Church of Rome. In a worldly point of view, he had everything to lose and

nothing to gain by the course which he pursued, and it required no ordinary courage, no small portion of the martyr-spirit to act as he acted" (*For. and Brit. Evang. Review*, October 1863, page 730). In 1837 he began to edit a daily journal, *Le livre de Peuple*. His work, *Le Pays et le Gouvernement* (1840), was obnoxious to the authorities, and caused the author two years' imprisonment and a fine of 2000 francs. The most important and elaborate work of the latter days of Lamennais is his *Esquisse d'une Philosophie*, in 4 volumes (Paris, 1840-46); a work eloquent and religious in tone, and exhibiting the author's general philosophical conceptions in this later period of his life. Here the authoritative ground of certainty is found, not in the common testimony of mankind, but in the *common reason*. Philosophy is understood in a broad sense, having for its range the facts of general being; it is not merely a matter of psychology or metaphysics. The *method* of this philosophy is the assumption of certain foundation truths which all mankind admit. Absolute existence is not capable of proof, and in like manner God and the world are two fundamental assumptions. God has in his own essence necessity and variety. He is an eternal conscious Ego. He has the triune attributes of power, intelligence, and love, which in Scripture language are expressed as the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. God has society within himself, is the type of all society, and the three attributes produce and explain the laws of whatever is outside of God. These attributes are recognized as controlling elements through every development of this philosophical system. Creation is not emanation, but the original divine *ideas* are made real by *God's free power*. This is not Pantheism or Dualism. Matter arises under the mysterious power of God in the *limitation* of individuals. Properly speaking, matter is not a distinct entity; it is but a limitation of that which exists. Time and space, the modes of *our* existence, are the limitations of eternity and immensity, which are the modes of God's existence. The nature of the universe is to be determined by the aid of the disclosures of science, but the laws of its existence and operation in the forms of inorganic, organic, and intellectual being are determined by the application of the principles inherent in the three divine attributes. Man is the most elevated of the beings known to us. The great problem concerning man is the origin of moral evil. This is to be explained as a *limitation* of the free moral agent in his communion with God. Thus, although hurtful to the subject, the actuality of moral evil does not introduce any positive disorder into the universe regarded as a realization of the divine ideas. The true purpose of man's life is to free himself from this state of isolation, of negation in *self*, and come into entire

harmony with the divine will. The application of this system to the several faculties and pursuits of man is developed at large. Hope for the world thus lies in the development of the people. Religion and nature will issue in one when fully disclosed. Everything in the work seems to proceed from a religious, but no longer churchly stand-point.

Lamennais' *Discussions Critiques et pensees diverses sur la Religion et la Philosophie* (Paris, 1841) gives the author's views on social questions. In place of the Church authority whose claims he formerly advocated, he would now have the democratic theocracy honored. This is in great measure a retraction of his work *Sur l'indifference en matiere de Religion*. Of similar import is *La Religion du passe et de l'avenir du Peuple* (1842). It is no longer the future of the Church of which he speaks, but of the people. His Church is now the religion of brotherly love, and he will have it rise upon the ruins of both Romanism and Protestantism. *Amschaspands et Darvans* (1843), and *Les evangiles, traduction nouvelle avec des notes et des reflexions* (1846), were issued professedly as a defense for the people against a mythological and superstitious credulity. Lamennais was greatly interested in the February Revolution, and exerted his influence to prevent acts of violence against the Church and religious interests. Gratitude for his services in this regard led to his election to the Assembly from the department of the Seine, and in his seat he always sided with the Left. He is said to have spoken but once, and that in opposition to the dictatorship of Cavaignac. He undertook the editorship, conjointly with Pascal Duprat, of the journal *Le Peuple Constituant*. He was grieved by the violence of the Red Republicans, though still steadfast in his hope of the democracy; and was forced into retirement by the coup d'etat, meeting with disappointment in this direction likewise. Nothing, however, availed to change the views he had in later years adopted, and the Church sought in vain, through the influence of relatives, to recall him to her faith on his dying bed. He died at Paris, in the Rue du Grand Chartres, February 27, 1854. He had refused to see a minister, and his will ordered that no formal ceremony should attend his burial. He wished his body to be placed in the corbillard des pauvres, or pauper's hearse, and this direction was complied with. His remains were followed by a few friends, as Beranger and Garnier Pages, and also, notwithstanding the police prohibition, by a large number of the people, who gathered at the cemetery Pere la Chaise. No prayer was uttered, nor last word said, and the remains were placed in the common grave, without cross or stone to mark their resting-place. Lamennais was small of stature,

though of attractive physiognomy; somewhat slow and hesitating in speech, with something of the Bretagne dialect; less able with his tongue than with his pen. His family had lost most of their property in the first Revolution, and he himself a large part of his own through misplaced confidence. In later years he resided mostly on a small estate in Lachesnaye, near Dinan, in Bretagne.

As a literary character, Lamennais occupied a prominent place in the revival of style under the Restoration. His era succeeds that of Chateaubriand, and corresponds with that of Madame de Stael and Joseph de Maistre. He was an earnest if not profound thinker, but especially brilliant as a writer. He had the culture of art combined with the vehemence of passion, though the latter element perhaps too often expressed itself in the manner of declamation. As a theorist in social philosophy he had a counterpart in Benjamin Constant, who took his stand-point in individual liberty, while Lamennais set out from the assumption of a consenting unity in society and religion. It has been claimed that his steadfastness to this primary principle explains the variation of position which changed political circumstances seemed to necessitate, causing him to be at one time all for the Church, at another all for the people. There were, at all events, three distinct periods in his career, in the first of which he was Ultramontanen in the second he sought to mediate between the Church and democratic ideas; while at the last he cast off all churchly control, and became a chiliastic prophet of the democracy.

M. Guizot, in the second series of his *Meditations on the Actual State of Christianity*, thus portraiture Lamennais "This apostle of universal reason was at the same time the proudest worshipper of his own reason. Under the pressure of events without, and of an ardent controversy, a transformation took place in him, marked at once by its logical deductions and its moral inconsistency; he changed his camp without changing his principles; in the attempt to lead the supreme authority of his Church to admit his principles he had failed; and from that instant the very spirit of revolt that he had so severely rebuked broke loose in his soul and in his writings, finding expression at one time in an indignation full of hatred leveled at the powerful, the rich, and the fortunate ones of the world; at another time in a tender sympathy for the miseries of humanity. The *Words of a Believer* are the eloquent outburst of this tumult in his soul. Plunged in the chaos of sentiments the most contradictory, and yet claiming to be always consistent with himself, the champion of authority became in the

state the most baited of democrats, and in the Church the haughtiest of rebels. It is not without sorrow that I thus express my unreserved opinion of a man of superior talent — mind lofty, soul intense; a man in the sequel profoundly sad himself, although haughty in his very fall. One cannot read in their stormy succession the numerous writings of the abbe de Lamennais without recognizing in them traces, I will not say of his intellectual perplexities — his pride did not feel them — but of the sufferings of his soul, whether for good or for evil. His was a noble nature, but full of exaggeration in his opinions, of fanatical arrogance, and of angry asperity in his polemics. One title to our gratitude remains to the abbe de Lamennais — he thundered to purpose against the gross and vulgar forgetfulness of the great moral interests of humanity. His essay on indifference in religious questions inflicted a rude blow upon that vice of the time, and recalled men's souls to regions above. And thus it was, too, that he rendered service to the great movement and awakening of Christians in the 19th century, and that he merits his place in that movement, although he deserted it."

One of Lamennais' last and most earnest injunctions was that certain papers, which contained his latest sentiments, should be published without alteration or suppression; but the religious advisers of his niece (who was also his housekeeper) so far wrought on her susceptibility as to cause her to refuse to give up the papers to the persons whom Lamennais had authorized to superintend their publication. The matter was in consequence brought before the proper legal tribunal, when the judges directed (August, 1856) that the papers should be handed over for publication in their integrity.

The first edition of Lamennais' collected works was published under the title (*Euvres complètes* (Paris, 1836, 12 volumes, 8vo). Several editions have appeared since. See Paganel, *Examen critique des Opinions de l'Abbe de Lamennais* (2d edit. 1825, 2 volumes, 8vo); H. Lacordaire, *Considerations sur le Systeme Philosophique de M. de Lamennais* (1834, 8vo); E. Lerminier, *Les Adversaires de Lamennais* (in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1834); Robinet, *Etudes sur l'abbe de Lamennais* (1835); Madrolle, *Histoire secrète du Partie et de l'Apostasie de M. de Lamennais* (1843); Lomenie, *JM. de Lamennais* (1840); Sainte-Beuve, *Critique et Portraits Litteraires*, 5 (Paris, 1846); and, by the same author, *Portraits Contemporains* (1846), 1:134-191; E. Renan, *Lamennais et ses ecrits* (in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, August, 1857); Morell, *Hist. Modern*

Philosophy, pages 527-37; Damiron, *Essai sur l'histoire de la Philosophie en France au 19eme siecle* (1828), pages 105-197; Haag, *Les Dogmques Chretiens*, 1:449 sq.; *Foreign Quar. Rev.* April 1838; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1843, page 382 sq.; *Westminster Review*, April, 1859; 1866, page 174; *Revue Chlreienne*, volume 14, No. 3, page 173. See also the excellent articles in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:178-184; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:182 sq.

Lamennais, Jean Marie Robert de

a French theologian, brother of the preceding, born at St. Malo about 1775, flourished as canon of the diocese of Rennes, and was the founder of the order known as *Les freres de Lamennais de Ploermel* (compare Herzog, *Real-Encyklopl.* 4:509). He wrote several works on religious subjects, but they are of no particular value. In the preparation of *Tradition de l'eglise sur l'institution des eveques* he greatly assisted his brother. He died in 1860. — Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary*, page 1362.

Lament

(represented by numerous Heb. and several Gr. words, of which the principal are **l bā**; *abal'*, to mourn; **hna**; *anah'*, to sigh; **hnh**; *nahuh'*, to wail; **dp̄s**; *saphad'*, to smite the breast in token of violent grief; **ʿWq**, *kun*, to strike a mournful tune; **hkB**; *bakah'*, to weep; **θρηνέω**, to wail aloud; **κόπτω**, to cut, i.e., beat the bosom, etc., in violent bursts of grief; with their derivatives). The Orientals are accustomed to bewail the dead in the most passionate manner, and even hire professional mourners, usually women, to perform this ceremony more effectually at funerals. **SEE BURIAL**; **SEE GRIEF**, etc.

The **hnyqā** *kinah'*, *elegy*, or *dirge*, is not mentioned in the earliest Hebrew writings. The first example of it which we meet with, and also one of the most beautiful and pathetic, is the lament of David over Saul and Jonathan (^{<1017>}2 Samuel 1:17-27). Notwithstanding, it is natural to suppose that, from an early period, and not on rare occasions, the Hebrew poetic spirit found utterance in this class of compositions. The *kinah* is mentioned as a frequent accompaniment of mourning in ^{<1080>}Amos 8:10: "I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation" (**hnyqā**)
Jeremiah wrote a lament on the death of Josiah, which, as we are informed, was added to the collection of *kinoth* or *dirges* existing at that time (^{<1455>}2

Chronicles 35:25; compare also ^{<2072>}Jeremiah 7:29; 9:9,16,19). In ^{<1088>}2 Samuel 3:33, 34, is preserved the brief but touching lament of David over Abner (q.v.).

The *kinah* was of two sorts, *historical and prophetic*. The laments of David and Jeremiah already mentioned are of the former sort. In the prophetic writings, and especially in Ezekiel, we meet with the prophetic lament, which had reference to some calamity yet future, but vividly anticipated and realized. Thus ^{<3270>}Ezekiel 27:2, "Son of man, take up a *lamentation* for Tyrus," etc. In this case the prophet himself is told to raise his lament, as if the city had already been overthrown. In others he gives to his prophecy the form of a lament, to be used when the predicted calamity has actually taken place. The calamity is so inevitable that the preparations for bewailing it may be now begun. (Comp. ^{<3500>}Ezekiel 19:1,14; 26:17; 27:32; 28:12; 32:2,16. So ^{<3181>}Amos 5:1.)

The only other passage in which ^{hnyqæ} or its cognate verb ^{^næq} (*hkonen*), is found, is ^{<3200>}Ezekiel 2:10 where we read of a "roll of a book, ^{rpse} ^{tLgæ} (*megillath sepher*), being spread out before the prophet;" and there was written therein lamentations, ^{µynæ} (*kinim*), and mourning, and woe." It is a remarkable coincidence, but probably nothing more, that immediately before the book of Ezekiel there stands in most of the versions of the Hebrew Scriptures a ^{hLgæ} or *roll*, which answers quite to this description. Those who regard the book of Lamentations as belonging to the class of prophetic laments might probably find in this coincidence a confirmation of their views.

The opinion just mentioned, that the book of Lamentations was written *proleptically* in view of the destruction of Jerusalem, and belongs to the class of prophetic *kinoth*, as intended to describe that event prophetically, is an ancient opinion, held and defended by critics of no mean reputation, is not now so generally entertained as formerly. The prophetic laments are usually very brief; or, if they include more than a few verses, always tend to pass into distinct prophecy, and rarely keep up to the close their character as *laments* (^{<3277>}Ezekiel 27:27, etc.). Perhaps the most perfect example is the lament in ^{<3382>}Ezekiel 28:12-19; but even there we meet with a "Thus saith the Lord" (verse 12). It is therefore, *prima facie*, improbable that an elegiac composition so lengthened and elaborate as the book of Lamentations should bear a distinctively prophetic character; though, on

the other hand, its assumed prophetic character might be said to justify this extended wail. Moreover, in the book itself there is not the slightest indication that it does bear such a character; and the most ancient tradition — that contained in the Sept. — gives to it a historical foundation. It is, indeed, an old conjecture, that the book of Lamentations is identical with the lament which Jeremiah composed on the death of Josiah (^{<1455>}2 Chronicles 35:25); but this, if its main or only purpose, is quite inconsistent with the fact that throughout the entire book there is not a single allusion to the death of Josiah. Only once is mention made of the king, "the anointed of the Lord" (^{<2400>}Jeremiah 4:20), and the reference is evidently not to Josiah. *SEE LAMENTATIONS, BOOK OF.*

Lamentations, Book Of,

one of the books of the O.T. commonly assigned to Jeremiah, and consisting of a remarkable series of threnodies. In many respects it is peculiar and almost unique in the sacred canon. *SEE BIBLE.*

I. Title. — The Hebrew name of this book, *hkyæEykah'*, "How," is taken, like those of the five books of Moses, from the Hebrew word with which it opens, and which appears to have been almost a received formula for the commencement of a song of wailing (compare ^{<1019>}2 Samuel 1:19-27). The Rabbins remark upon this title, "Three prophets have used the word *hkyæ* with reference to Israel: Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. To what are they to be likened? To three bridesmen (*γυνῆδες* = *Μυρτηφόροι*) who have seen the afterwards widowed wife in three different stages. The first has seen her in her opulence and her pride, and he said, "Oh, how shall I bear alone your overbearing and your strife?" (^{<1800>}Deuteronomy 1:2). The second has seen her in her dissipation and dissoluteness, and he said, 'Oh, how has she become a harlot!' (^{<2302>}Isaiah 1:21). And the third has seen her in her utter desolation, and he said, 'Oh, how does she sit solitary!' (^{<2300>}Lamentations 1:1)" (Introduction to *Echac Rabathi*).

Later Jewish writers usually designate the book by the more descriptive title *t/nyqæKinoth'*, "lamentations" =dirge, a term which they found in ^{<2472>}Jeremiah 7:29; 9:10, 20; ^{<1455>}2 Chronicles 35:25, and which already had probably been applied familiarly to the book itself. *SEE LAMENT.*

The Septuagint translators found themselves obliged, as in the other cases referred to, to substitute some title more significant, and adopted *θρηνοι*

Ἰερεμίου as the equivalent of the latter Hebrew term. The Vulgate gives the Greek word, and explains it (*Threni, id est, Lamentationes Jeremiae Prophetæ*). Luther and the A.V. have given the translation only, in "*Klagelieder*" and "*Lamentations*" respectively.

II. Position. — In the present Hebrew Bible the book of Lamentations stands in the Hagiographa (*Kethubim*) between Ruth and Ecclesiastes. The Jews believe that it was not written by the gift of prophecy, but by the Spirit of God (between which they make a distinction), and give this as a reason for not placing it among the prophets. In the arrangement adopted for synagogue use, and reproduced in some editions, as in the Bomberg Bible of 1521, it stands among the five *Megilloth* after the books of Moses, or books of Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song. This position of the book probably had a liturgical origin, as it is read in their synagogues on the ninth of the month Ab, which is a fast for the destruction of the holy city. In the ancient Hebrew copies, however, this book is supposed to have occupied the place which is now assigned to it in most versions, namely, after Jeremiah. Indeed, from the manner in which Josephus reckons up the books of the Old Testament (*Contra Apion*, 1:8), it has been supposed that Jeremiah and it originally formed but one book (Prideaux, *Connection*, 1:332). The Septuagint groups the writings connected with the name of Jeremiah together, but the book of Baruch comes between the prophecy and the Lamentation. On the hypothesis of some writers that Jeremiah 53 was originally the introduction to the poem, and not the conclusion of the prophecy, and that the preface of the Sept. (which is not found either in the Hebrew or in the Targum of Jonathan) was inserted to diminish the abruptness occasioned by this separation of the book from that with which it had been originally connected, it would follow that the arrangement of the Vulg. and the A.V. corresponds more closely than any other to that which we must look upon as the original one.

III. Form. — The structure of this book is peculiarly artificial, being strictly poetic, and in many portions acrostic.

(1.) Chapters 1, 2, and 4 contain 22 verses each, arranged in alphabetic order, each verse falling into three nearly balanced clauses (Ewald, *Poet. Büch.* page 147); 2:19 forms an exception, as having a fourth clause, the result of an interpolation, as if the writer had shaken off for a moment the restraint of his self-imposed law. Possibly the inversion of the usual order of [and p in chapter 2, 3, 4, may have arisen from a like forgetfulness.

Grotius (ad loc.) explains it on the assumption that here Jeremiah followed the order of the Chaldaean alphabet. Similar anomalies occur in Psalm 37, and have received a like explanation (De Wette, *Psalm* page 57). It is, however, a mere hypothesis that the Chaldaean alphabet differed in this respect from the Hebrew; nor is it easy to see why Jeremiah should have chosen the Hebrew order for one poem, and the Chaldaean for the other three.

(2.) Chapter 3 contains three short verses under each letter of the alphabet, the initial letter being three times repeated.

(3.) Chapter 5 contains the same number of verses as chapters 1, 2, 4, but without the alphabetic order. The thought suggests itself that the earnestness of the prayer with which the book closes may have carried the writer beyond the limits within which he had previously confined himself; but the conjecture (of Ewald) that we have here, as in Psalm 9 and 10, the rough draught of what was intended to have been finished afterwards in the same manner as the others, is at least a probable one.

IV. Author. — The poems included in this collection appear in the Hebrew canon with no name attached to them, and there is no direct external evidence that they were written by the prophet Jeremiah earlier than the date given in the prefatory verse which appears in the Septuagint, which is as follows: "And it came to pass, after Israel had been carried away captive, and Jerusalem had become desolate, that Jeremiah sat weeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and said." This has been copied into the Arabic and Vulgate versions; but as it does not exist in the Hebrew, Chaldee, or Syriac, it was regarded by Jerome as spurious, and is not admitted into his version. This represents, however, the established belief of the Jews after the completion of the canon. The Talmud, embodying the earliest traditions, has: "Jeremiah wrote his book, the book of Kings, and the Lamentations" (*Baba Baethra*, 15, a). Later Jewish writers are equally explicit (*Echa Rubb.* introd.). Josephus (*Ant.* 10:5, 1) follows, as far as the question of authorship is concerned, in the same track, and the absence of any tradition or probable conjecture to the contrary leaves the consensus of critics and commentators almost undisturbed. (See below.) An agreement so striking rests, as might be expected, on strong internal evidence. The poems belong unmistakably to the last days of the kingdom or the commencement of the exile. They are written by one who speaks, with the vividness and intensity of an eye-

witness, of the misery which he bewails. It might almost be enough to ask who else then living could have written with that union of strong passionate feeling and entire submission to Jehovah which characterizes both the Lamentations and the Prophecy of Jeremiah. The evidences of identity are, however, stronger and more minute. In both we meet, once and again, with the picture of the "Virgin-daughter of Zion" sitting down in her shame and misery (^{<2515>}Lamentations 1:15; 2:13; ^{<2447>}Jeremiah 14:17). In both there is the same vehement outpouring of sorrow. The prophet's eyes flow down with tears (^{<2516>}Lamentations 1:16; 2:11; 3:48, 49; ^{<2491>}Jeremiah 9:1; 13:17; 14:17). There is the same haunting feeling of being *surrounded* with fears and terrors on every side (^{<2522>}Lamentations 2:22; ^{<2465>}Jeremiah 6:25; 46:5). In both the worst of all the evils is the iniquity of the prophets and the priests (^{<2524>}Lamentations 2:14; 4:13; ^{<2450>}Jeremiah 5:30, 31; 14:13,14). The sufferer appeals for vengeance to the righteous Ju dge (^{<2564>}Lamentations 3:64-66; ^{<2412>}Jeremiah 11:20). He bids the rival nation that exulted in the fall of Jerusalem prepare for a like desolation (^{<2502>}Lamentations 4:21; ^{<2492>}Jeremiah 49:12). The personal references to Jeremiah's own fate, such as we know it from his book of Prophecies and Kings, are not wanting (comp. ^{<2521>}Lamentations 2:11, and 3, with ^{<2456>}Jeremiah 15:15 sq.; 17:13 sq.; 20:7; ^{<2534>}Lamentations 3:14 with ^{<2497>}Jeremiah 20:7; 3:64-66 with ^{<2478>}Jeremiah 17:18; 5 with 4:17-20). As in the Prophecies, so here, the iniquities of the people are given as the cause of the exile and the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple (compare 1:5, 8, 14, 22; 3:39, 42; 4:6, 22; 5:16 with ^{<2432>}Jeremiah 13:22-26; 14:7; 16:10 sq.; 17:1 sq.), their sinful trust in false prophets and iniquitous priests, their relying on the safety of Jerusalem, and on the aid of powerless and treacherous allies, etc. What is more, his poetical and prophetic individuality pervades the whole so unmistakably that it seems hardly necessary to refer to the numerous parallel passages adduced by Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Keil, De Wette, Jahn, Bleek, and others. If contents, spirit, manner, individuality, are any guarantee at all, then Jeremiah is the author, and sole author of the book before us. He even seems to refer to his other book (comp. 2:14; ^{<2443>}Jeremiah 14:13). But were any further proof needed, we would certainly find it in the very diction and phraseology common to both works, and peculiar to them alone (comp. **ywdi** ^{<2512>}Lamentations 1:22, and ^{<2488>}Jeremiah 8:18; **tj pw dj p** ^{<2534>}Lamentations 3:47, and Jer. 24:17; 48:43; **ym[th rbc**, ^{<2521>}Lamentations 2:11, and ^{<2464>}Jeremiah 6:14, and 8:11; **bysm rwgm**, ^{<2522>}Lamentations 2:22, and ^{<2465>}Jeremiah 6:25, and

frequently the very frequent use of *rbv, dyra* *μπαῖη [mDān]* both; phrases like "I became a mockery all day long," ^{<2184>}Lamentations 3:14, and ^{<2185>}Jeremiah 20:7, etc.: the use of the *y* parag., and other grammatical peculiarities. See Keil, *Einleit. in das A. T.* § 129).

The only exceptions to this unanimity of opinion as to the authorship of Lamentations are Hardt, who, for reasons of his own, ascribed the five different elegies to Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and king Jehonja respectively, and, in our own time, Conz and Thenius. The last holds that only Lamentations 2 and 4 belong to Jeremiah (the former written in Palestine, the latter in Egypt), the three others, however, having been written by Jeremiah's contemporaries and disciples. His reasons for this assumption are, that Jeremiah *could* not have treated the same subject five times; that 2 and 4 are different from 1, 3, 5, which are less worthy of Jeremiah's pen; that the three latter do not quite fit Jeremiah's own circumstances; and, finally, because there is a difference in the alphabetical structure (see above) of 1 and of 2-4. These objections to Jeremiah's exclusive authorship seem about as tenable as Hardt's Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and consorts. The first two points are not worth consideration; the third is answered by the simple proposition that they are poems, and not a historical narrative which we have before us, and that therefore a certain license must be given to the poet in the use of broad similes in his generalizinos, and in his putting himself sometimes in the place of the whole people as its spokesman and chief mourner. And if; finally, the structure differs in 1 from 2 and 4, then it may as well be asked why 3, which is not supposed to be written by Jeremiah, is like 2 and 4, which are allowed to be written by him? If somebody has imitated the structure in 3, why has it not been also imitated in 1 and 5? A further refutation of this attempt to take away two fifths of Jeremiah's authorship — supported by no investigator as we said — has been given by Ewall, and we have indeed only mentioned it for the sake of completeness. Bunsen, it is true (*Gott inn der Gesch.* 1:426), indicates Baruch as probably the author, in part at least, of Lamentations; but thi is sevidently a mere conjecture.

V. Occasion. — The earliest statement on this point is that of Josephus (*Ant.* 10:5, 1). He finds among the books which were extant in his own time the lamentations on the death of Josiah, which are mentioned in ^{<485>}2 Chronicles 35:25. As there are no traces of any other poem of this kind in the later Jewish literature, it has been inferred, naturally enough, that he

speaks of this. This opinion was maintained also by Jerome, and has been defended by some modern writers (Usher, Dathe, Michaelis, *Notes to Lowth*, Prael. 22 [Michaelis and Dathe, however, afterwards abandoned this hypothesis, and adopted that of the later date]; Calovius, *Prolegom. eid Thren.*; De Wette, *Einl. in das A. Test.*, Klagl.). It does not appear, however, to rest on any better grounds than a hasty conjecture, arising from the reluctance of men to admit that any work by an inspired writer can have perished, or the arbitrary assumption (De Wette, 1.c.) that the same man could not, twice in his life, have been the spokesman of a great national sorrow. (The argument that 3:27 implies the youth of the writer hardly needs to be confuted.) Against it we have to set (1) the tradition on the other side embodied in the preface of the Septuagint; (2) the contents of the book itself. Admitting that some of the calamities described in it may have been common to the invasions of Necho and Nebuchadnezzar, we yet look in vain for a single word distinctive of a funeral dirge over a devout and zealous reformer like Josiah, while we find, step by step, the closest possible likeness between the pictures of misery in the Lamentations and the events of the closing years of the reign of Zedekiah. The long siege had brought on the famine in which the young children fainted for hunger (^{<25121>}Lamentations 2:11,12, 20; 4:4, 9; ^{<12518>}2 Kings 25:3). The city was taken by storm (^{<25117>}Lamentations 2:7; 4:12; ^{<44317>}2 Chronicles 36:17). The Temple itself was polluted with the massacre of the priests who defended it (^{<25123>}Lamentations 2:20, 21; ^{<44317>}2 Chronicles 36:17), and then destroyed (^{<25116>}Lamentations 2:6; ^{<44319>}2 Chronicles 36:19). The fortresses and strongholds of Judah were thrown down. The anointed of the Lord, under whose shadow the remnant of the people might have hoped to live in safety, was taken prisoner (^{<25124>}Lamentations 4:20; ^{<44315>}Jeremiah 39:5). The chief of the people were carried into exile (^{<25105>}Lamentations 1:5; 2:9; ^{<12511>}2 Kings 25:11). The bitterest grief was found in the malignant exultation of the Edomites (^{<25121>}Lamentations 4:21; ^{<44317>}Psalms 137:7). Under the rule of the stranger the Sabbaths and solemn feasts were forgotten (^{<25104>}Lamentations 1:4; 2:6), as they could hardly have been during the short period in which Jerusalem was in the hands of the Egyptians. Unless we adopt the strained hypothesis that the whole poem is prophetic in the sense of being predictive, the writer seeing the future as if it were actually present, or the still wilder conjecture of Jarchi that this was the roll which Jehoiachin destroyed, and which was rewritten by Baruch or Jeremial (Carpzov, *Introd. ad lib. V. T.* 3, 100. 4), we are compelled to come to the conclusion that the coincidence is not accidental, and to adopt the later, not

the earlier of the dates. At what period after the capture of the city the prophet gave this utterance to his sorrow we can only conjecture, and the materials for doing so with any probability are but scanty. The local tradition which pointed out a cavern in the neighborhood of Jerusalem as the refuge to which Jeremiah withdrew that he might write this book (Del Rio, *Proleg. in Thren.*, quoted by Carpzov, *Introd.* 1.c.), is as trustworthy as most of the other legends of the time of Helena. He may have written it immediately after the attack was over, or when he was with Gedaliah at Mizpeh, or when he was with his countrymen at Tahpanhes. Pareau refers chapter 1 to ³⁴⁷⁶Jeremiah 37:5 sq.; chapter 3 to ³⁴⁸⁰Jeremiah 38:2 sq.; chapter 4 to ³⁴⁸⁴Jeremiah 39:1 sq., and ¹²²⁰2 Kings 25:1 sq.; chapter 2 to the destruction of the city and Temple; chapter 5 is admitted to be the latest in order, and to refer to the time after that event. Ewald says that the situation is the same throughout, and only the time different. "In chapters 1 and 2 we find sorrow without consolation; in ch. 3 consolation for the poet himself; in chapter 4 the lamentation is renewed with greater violence; but soon the whole people, as if urged by their own spontaneous impulse, fall to weeping and hoping" (*Die Poetischen Bucher*). De Wette describes the Lamentations somewhat curtly, as "five songs relating to the destruction of the city of Jerusalem and its Temple (chapters 1, 2, 4, 5), and to the unhappy lot of the poet himself (chapter 3). The historical relation of the whole cannot be doubted; but yet there seems a gradual ascent in describing the condition of the city" (*Einleitung*, § 273).

There can hardly be any doubt, however, as to the time to which these threnodies refer. A brief glance at the corresponding portions in the books of Kings and Chronicles affords decisive evidence that they speak, one and all, of the whole period from the beginning of the last siege by Nebuchadnezzar to its terrible end. This has also, from the Sept. and the Midrash downwards, been the almost unanimous opinion of investigators (Carpzov, Eichhorn, Jahn, Bertholdt, Birmelius, Horrer, Riegler, Pareau, etc.). It would seem to be equally clear that these poems belong, broadly speaking, to no particular phase of the great epoch of terrors, but that, written probably within a very brief space of time (more especially does this appear to be the case with the first four), they portray indiscriminately some woeful scene that presented itself "at the head of every street," or give way to a wild, passionate outcry of terror, misery, despair, hope, prayer, revenge, as these in veheement succession swept over the poet's soul.

Yet it has been suggested (and the text has been strained to the utmost to prove it) that the successive elegies are the pictures of successive events portrayed in song; that, in fact, the Lamentations are a *descriptive* threnody—a drama in which, scene after scene, the onward march of dread fate is described, intermixed with plaints, reflections, prayers, consolations, such as the chorus would utter in grave and measured rhythms, accompanied by the sighs and tears to which the spectators would be moved by the irredeemably doomed heroes and actors. Thus, for instance, it has been maintained that the first chapter speaks of Jehoiachin's capture and exile (Horrer, Jahn, Riegler, etc.), upon which there is this to be observed, that a mere glance at 1 Kings 24 shows that such scenes as are described in this first elegy (famine, slaughter of youths, etc.) do not in the least agree with the time and circumstances of Jehoiachin, while they do exactly correspond with the following chapter of Kings, in which the reign under Zedekiah, with all its accompanying horrors, to the downfall of the city and empire, are related with the severe calmness of the historian, or rather the dry minuteness of the annalist. Neither can we, for our own part, see that "gradual change in the state of the city" which De Wette sees in the consecutive chapters; nor can we trace the gradual progress in the mind of the people that is in the first two chapters, heaviest, forever inconsolable grief; in the third, the turning-point (the classical *peripety*); in the fourth and fifth, the mind that gradually collects itself, and finally finds comfort in fervent prayer—which is Ewald's ingenious suggestion, to which Keil assents, as far as "a general inner progress of the poems" goes. To our, and, we take it, to every unbiased view, each of the elegies is complete, as far as it goes, in itself; all treating the same, or almost the same, scenes and thoughts in ever new modes. In this respect they might, to a certain degree, be likened to the "*In Memoriam*" and the second movement of the "*Eroica*" — the highest things to which we can at all compare them in the varied realms of song. The general state of the nation, as well as of the poet, seem not much different from the first to the last, or, at all events, the fourth poem. It would certainly appear, moreover, as if, so far from forming a consistent and progressive whole, consciously leading onward to harmony and supreme peace, they had not even been composed in the order in which they are before us now. Thus, e.g., the fourth chapter is certainly more akin to the second than to the third. Accident, more than a settled plan, must have placed them in their present order. But the history of this collection and redaction is one so obscure that we will not even venture on a new speculation concerning it.

VI. Contents. — The book is a collection of five elegies sung on the ruins of Zion; and the fall of Judaea, the destruction of the sanctuary, the exile of the people, and all the terrors of sword, fire, and famine in the city of Jerusalem, are the principal themes upon which they turn in many varied strains. We may regard the first two chapters as occupied chiefly with the circumstances of the siege, and those immediately following that event; in the third the prophet deplores the calamities and persecutions to which he was himself exposed; the fourth refers to the ruin and desolation of the city, and the unhappy lot of Zedekiah; and the fifth and last seems to be a sort of prayer in the name, or on behalf, of the Jews in their dispersion and captivity. More particularly,

1. Chapter 1. The opening verse strikes the key-note of the whole poem. That which haunts the prophet's mind is the solitude in which he finds himself. She that was "princess among the nations" (1) sits (like the *JUDAEA CAPTA* of the Roman medals), "solitary," "as a widow." Her "lovers" (the nations with whom she had been allied) hold aloof from her (2). The heathen have entered into the sanctuary, and mock at her Sabbaths (7, 10). After the manner so characteristic of Hebrew poetry, the personality of the writer now recedes and now advances, and blends by hardly perceptible transitions with that of the city which he personifies, and with which he, as it were, identifies himself. At one time it is the daughter of Zion that asks, "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" (12). At another, it is the prophet who looks on her, and portrays her as "spreading forth her hands, and there is none to comfort her" (17). Mingling with this outburst of sorrow there are two thoughts characteristic both of the man and the time. The calamities which the nation suffers are the consequences of its sins. There must be the confession of those sins: "The Lord is righteous, for I have rebelled against his commandment" (18). There is, however, this gleam of consolation that Judah is not alone in her sufferings. Those who have exulted in her destruction shall drink of the same cup. They shall be like unto her in the day that the Lord shall call (21).

2. Chapter 2. As the solitude of the city was the subject of the first lamentation, so the destruction that had laid it waste is that which is most conspicuous in the second. Jehovah had thrown down in his wrath the strongholds of the daughter of Judah (2). The rampart and the wall lament together (8). The walls of the palace are given up into the hand of the enemy (7). The breach is great, as if made by the inrushing of the sea (13). With this there had been united all the horrors of the famine and the

assault-young children fainting for hunger in the top of every street (19); women eating their own children, and so fulfilling the curse of ~~(18)~~ Deuteronomy 28:53 (20); the priest and the prophet slain in the sanctuary of the Lord (ibid.). Added to all this, there was the remembrance of that which had been all along the great trial of Jeremiah's life, against which he had to wage continual war. The prophets of Jerusalem had seen vain and foolish things, false burdens, and causes of banishment (14). A righteous judgment had fallen on them. The prophets found no vision of Jehovah (9). The king and the princes who had listened to them were captive among the Gentiles.

3. Chapter 3. The difference in the structure of this poem, which has already been noticed, indicates a corresponding difference in its substance. In the two preceding poems Jeremiah had spoken of the misery and destruction of Jerusalem. In the third he speaks chiefly, though not exclusively, of his own. He himself is the man that has seen affliction (1), who has been brought into darkness and not into light (2). He looks back upon the long life of suffering which he has been called on to endure, the scorn and derision of the people, the bitterness as of one drunken with wormwood (14, 15). But that experience was not one which had ended in darkness and despair. Here, as in the prophecies, we find a Gospel for the weary and heavy-laden, a trust, not to be shaken, in the mercy and righteousness of Jehovah. The mercies of the Lord are new every morning (22, 23). He is good to them that wait for him (25). The retrospect of that sharp experience showed him that it all formed part of the discipline which was intended to lead him on to a higher blessedness. It was good for a man to bear the yoke in his youth, good that he should both hope and quietly wait (26, 27). With this, equally characteristic of the prophet's individuality, there is the protest against the wrong which had been or might hereafter be committed by rulers and princes (34-36), the confession that all that had come on him and his people was but a righteous retribution, to be accepted humbly, with searchings of heart, and repentance (39-42). The closing verses may refer to that special epoch in the prophet's life when his own sufferings had been sharpest (53-56), and the cruelties of his enemies most triumphant. If so, we can enter more fully, remembering this, into the thanksgiving with which he acknowledges the help, deliverance, redemption, which he had received from God (57, 58). Feeling sure that, at some time or other, there would be for him a yet higher lesson, we can enter with some measure of sympathy even into the

terrible earnestness of his appeal from the unjust judgment of earth to the righteous Judge, into his cry for a retribution without which it seemed to him that the Eternal Righteousness would fail (64-66).

4. Chapter 4. It might seem, at first, as if the fourth poem did but reproduce the pictures and the thoughts of the first and second. There come before us once again the famine, the misery, the desolation that had fallen on the holy city, making all faces gather blackness. One new element in the picture is found in the contrast between the past glory of the consecrated families of kingly and priestly stock (A. Vers. "Nazarites"), and their later misery and shame. Some changes there are, however, not without interest in their relation to the poet's own life and to the history of his time. All the facts gain a new significance by being seen in the light of the personal experience of the third poem. The declaration that all this had come "for the sins of the prophets and the iniquities of the priests" is clearer and sharper than before (verse 13). There is the giving up of the last hope which Jeremiah had cherished when he urged on Zedekiah the wisdom of submission to the Chaldaeans (verse 20). The closing words indicate the strength of that feeling against the Edomites which lasted all through the captivity (verses 21, 22). She, the daughter of Edom, had rejoiced in the fall of her rival, and had pressed on the work of destruction. But for her, too, there was the doom of being drunken with the cup of the Lord's wrath. For the daughter of Zion there was hope of pardon when discipline should have done its work, and the punishment of her iniquity should be accomplished.

5. Chapter 5. One great difference in the fifth and last section of the poem has already been pointed out. It obviously indicates either a deliberate abandonment of the alphabetic structure, or the unfinished character of the concluding elegy. The title prefixed in the Vulgate, "*Oratio Jeremiae Prophete*," points to one marked characteristic which may have occasioned this difference. There are signs also of a later date than that of the preceding poems. Though the horrors of the famine are ineffaceable, yet that which he has before him is rather the continued, protracted suffering of the rule of the Chaldaeans. The mountain of Zion is desolate, and the foxes walk on it (verse 18). Slaves have ruled over the people of Jehovah (verse 8). Women have been subjected to intolerable outrages (verse 11). The young men have been taken to grind, and the children have fallen under the wood (verse 13). But in this also, deep as might be the humiliation, there was hope, even as there had been in the dark hours of

the prophet's own life. He and his people are sustained by the old thought which had been so fruitful of comfort to other prophets and psalmists. The periods of suffering and struggle which seemed so long were but as moments in the lifetime of the Eternal (verse 19), and the thought of that eternity brought with it the hope that the purposes of love which had been declared so clearly should one day be fulfilled. The last words of this lamentation are those which have risen so often from broken and contrite hearts: "Turn thou us, O Lord, and we shall be turned. Renew our days as of old" (verse 21). That which had begun with wailing and weeping ends (following Ewald's and Michaelis's translation) with the question of hope: "Wilt thou utterly reject us? Wilt thou be very wroth against us?"

VII. *General Character.* —

1. It is well to be reminded by the above survey that we have before us, not a book in five chapters, but five separate poems, each complete in itself, each having a distinct subject, yet brought at the same time under a plan which includes them all. It is clear, before entering on any other characteristics, that we find, in full predominance, that strong personal emotion which mingled itself, in greater or less measure, with the whole prophetic work of Jeremiah. There is here no "word of Jehovah," no direct message to a sinful people. The man speaks out of the fullness of his heart, and, though a higher Spirit than his own helps him to give utterance to his sorrows, it is yet the language of a sufferer rather than of a teacher. There is this measure of truth in the technical classification which placed the Lamentations among the Hagiographa of the Hebrew Canon, in the feeling which led the Rabbinic writers (Kimchi, *Praef. in Psalm.*) to say that they and the other books of that group were written indeed by the help of the Holy Spirit, but not with the special gift of prophecy.

2. Other differences between the two books that bear the prophet's name grew out of this. Here there is more attention to form, more elaboration. The rhythm is more uniform than in the prophecies. A complicated alphabetic structure pervades nearly the whole book. It will be remembered that this acrostic form of writing was not peculiar to Jeremiah. Whatever its origin, whether it had been adopted as a help to the memory, and so fitted especially for didactic poems, or for such as were to be sung by great bodies of people (Lowth, *Praef.* 22), it had been a received, and it would seem popular, framework for poems of very different characters, and extending probably over a considerable period of time. The 119th Psalm is

the great monument which forces itself upon our notice; but it is found also in the 25th, 34th, 37th, 111th, 112th, 145th — and in the singularly beautiful fragment appended to the book of Proverbs (~~2110~~ Proverbs 31:10-31). Traces of it, as if the work had been left half finished (De Wette, *Psalmen*, ad loc.), appear in the 9th and 10th. In the Lamentations (confining ourselves for the present to the structure) we meet with some remarkable peculiarities.

It has to be remembered, too, that in thus speaking the writer was doing what many must have looked for from him, and so meeting at once their expectations and their wants. Other prophets and poets had made themselves the spokesmen of the nation's feelings on the death of kings and heroes. The party that continued faithful to the policy and principles of Josiah remembered how the prophet had lamented over his death. The lamentations of that period (though they are lost to us) had been accepted as a great national dirge. Was he to be silent now that a more terrible calamity had fallen upon the people? Did not the exiles in Babylon need this form of consolation? Does not the appearance of this book in their canon of sacred writings, after their return from exile, indicate that during their captivity they had found this consolation in it?

The choice of a structure so artificial as that which has been described above may at first sight appear inconsistent with the deep, intense sorrow of which it claims to be the utterance. Some wilder, less measured rhythm would seem to us to have been a fitter form of expression. It would belong, however, to a very shallow and hasty criticism to pass this judgment. A man true to the gift he has received will welcome the discipline of self-imposed rules for deep sorrow as well as for other strong emotions. In proportion as he is afraid of being carried away by the strong current of feeling will he be anxious to make the laws more difficult, the discipline more effectual. Something of this kind is traceable in the fact that so many of the master-minds of European literature have chosen as the fit vehicle for their deepest, tenderest, most impassioned thoughts the complicated structure of the sonnet; in Dante's selection of the *terza rima* for his vision of the unseen world. What the sonnet was to Petrarch and Milton, that the alphabetic verse-system was to the writers of Jeremiah's time, the most difficult among the recognized forms of poetry, and yet one in which (assuming the earlier date of some of the Psalms above referred to) some of the noblest thoughts of that poetry had been uttered. We need not wonder that he should have employed it as fitter than any other for the

purpose for which he used it. If these Lamentations were intended to assuage the bitterness of the Babylonian exile, there was, besides this, the subsidiary advantage that it supplied the memory with an artificial help. Hymns and poems of this kind, once learned, are not easily forgotten, and the circumstances of the captives made it then, more than ever, necessary that they should have this help afforded them.

De Wette maintains (*Comment. über die Psalm.* page 56) that this acrostic form of writing was the outgrowth of a feeble and degenerate age dwelling on the outer structure of poetry when the soul had departed. His judgment as to the origin and character of the alphabetic form is shared by Ewald (*Poet. Bich.* 1:140). That this is often the case cannot be doubted; the 119th Psalm is a case in point. It is hard, however, to reconcile this sweeping estimate with the impression made on us by such Psalms as the 25th and 34th; and Ewald himself, in his translation of the Alphabetic Psalms and the Lamentations, has shown how compatible such a structure is with the highest energy and beauty. With some of these, too, it must be added, the assignment of a later date than the time of David rests on the foregone conclusion that the acrostic structure is itself a proof of it (comp. *Delitzsch, Commentar über den Psalter*, on Psalm 1, 10). De Wette, however, allows, condescendingly, that the Lamentations, in spite of their degenerate taste, "have some merit in their way." Other critics have been more enthusiastic in their admiration of this book. Dr. Blayney remarks, "We cannot too much admire the flow of that full and graceful pathetic eloquence in which the author pours out the effusions of a patriotic heart, and piously weeps over the ruins of his venerable country" (*Jeremiah*, page 376). "Never," says an unquestionable judge of these matters, "was there a more rich and elegant variety of beautiful images and adjuncts arranged together within so small a compass, nor more happily chosen and applied" (*Lowth, De Sacra Poesi Hebr. Praelect.* 22). The poet seizes with wonderful tact those circumstances which point out the objects of his pity as the subjects of sympathy, and founds his expostulations on the miseries which are thus exhibited. His book of Lamentations is an astonishing exhibition of his power to accumulate images of sorrow. The whole series of elegies has but one object — the expression of sorrow for the forlorn condition of his country; and yet he presents this to us in so many lights, alludes to it by so many figures, that not only are his mournful Atrains not felt to be tedious reiterations, but the reader is captivated by the plaintive melancholy which pervades the whole.

3. The power of entering into the spirit and meaning of poems such as these depends on two distinct conditions. We must seek to see, as with our own eyes, the desolation, misery, confusion, which came before those of the prophet. We must endeavor also to feel as he felt when he looked on them. The last is the more difficult of the two. Jeremiah was not merely a patriot poet, weeping over the ruin of his country. He was a prophet who had seen all this coming, and had foretold it as inevitable. He had urged submission to the Chaldaeans as the only mode of diminishing the terrors of that "day of the Lord." And now the Chaldaeans had come, irritated by the perfidy and rebellion of the king and princes of Judah; and the actual horrors that he saw, surpassed, though he had predicted them, all that he had been able to imagine. All feeling of exultation in which, as a mere prophet of evil, he might have indulged at the fulfillment of his forebodings, was swallowed up in deep, overwhelming sorrow. Yet sorrow, not less than other emotions, works on men according to their characters, and a man with Jeremiah's gifts of utterance could not sit down in the mere silence and stupor of a hopeless grief. He was compelled to give expression to that which was devouring his heart and the heart of his people. The act itself was a relief to him. It led him on (as has been seen above) to a calmer and serener state. It revived the faith and hope which had been nearly crushed out.

4. There are, perhaps, few portions of the O.T. which appear to have done the work they were meant to do more effectually than this. It has presented but scanty materials for the systems and controversies of theology. It has supplied thousands with the fullest utterance for their sorrows in the critical periods of national or individual suffering. We may well believe that it soothed the weary years of the Babylonian exile (comp. ³⁰⁰⁵Zechariah 1:6 with ³⁰¹⁷Lamentations 2:17). When the Jews returned to their own land, and the desolation of Jerusalem was remembered as belonging only to the past, this was the book of remembrance. On the ninth day of the month of Ab (July), the Lamentations of Jeremiah were read, year by year, with fasting and weeping, to commemorate the misery out of which the people had been delivered. It has come to be connected with the thoughts of a later devastation, and its words enter, sometimes at least, into the prayers of the pilgrim Jews who meet at the "place of wailing" to mourn over the departed glory of their city. It enters largely into the nobly-constructed order of the Latin Church for the services of Passion-week (*Breviar. Rom. Feria Quinta. "In Caena Domini"*). If it has been comparatively in the

background in times when the study of Scripture had passed into casuistry and speculation, it has come forward, once and again, in times of danger and suffering, as a messenger of peace, comforting men, not after the fashion of the friends of Job, with formal moralizings, but by enabling them to express themselves, leading them to feel that they might give utterance to the deepest and saddest feelings by which they were overwhelmed. It is striking, as we cast our eye over the list of writers who have treated specially this book, to notice how many must have passed through scenes of trial not unlike in kind to that of which the Lamentations speak. The book remains to do its work for any future generation that may be exposed to analogous calamities.

VIII. *Commentaries.* — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book of Lamentations exclusively, to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Origen, *Scholia* (Greek, in *Opp.* 3:320); Ephrem Syrus, *xplanactio* (Syr., in *Opp.* 5:165); Jerome, *In Lamentations* (in *Opp.* [*Suppos.*] 14:227); Theodoret, *Interpretatio* (Greek, in *Opp.* 2:1); Paschalius Batbertus, *In Threnos* (in *Opp.* page 1307); Hugo 1 St. Victor, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* 1:103); Aquinas, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* 2); Bonaventura, *Explicatio* (in *Opp.* 1:428); Albertus Magnus, *Comintentarii* (in *Opp.* 8); (Ecolampadius, *Enarrationes* [including Jeremiah] (Argent. 1533, 4to); Clenard, *Meditationes* (Paris, 1536, 8vo); Bugenhagen, *Adnotationes* (Vitemb. 1546, 4to); Quinquaboreus, *Adnotationes* (Paris, 1556, 4to); Palladius, *Enarratio* (Vitemb. 1560, 8vo); Pintus, *Commentarius* [including Isaiah and Jeremiah] (Lugd. 1561, etc., fol.); Strigel, *Commentarius* (Lips. et Brem. 1564, 8vo); Selnecker, *Auslegung* (Lps. 1565, 4to); Calvin, *Praelectiones* [includ. Jer.] (Flankft. 1581, 8vo; in French, Spires, 1584, 8vo; in English, London, 1587, 12mo, etc.); Taillepied, *Commentarii* (Paris, 1582, 8vo); Panigarola, *Adnotationes* (Verona, 1583; Rome, 1586, 8vo); Agellus, *Catena* (Romans 1589, 4to); J. Ibn-Shoeib, *μϰϰΒ Ι / q* (Ven. 1589, 4to); Sam. de Vidas, *vWrPε* (Thessalon. 1596, 8vo); Figuero, *Commentaria* (Lugd. 1596, 8vo); Makshan, *bl ē / gy* (Cracow, s.a. [about 1600], 4to); Alscheich, *μϣmε n / μϣr ε D* (Venice, 1601, 4to); Navarrette, *Commentatsriat* (Cordub. 1602, 4to); Bachmeister, *Explicatio* (Rost. 1603, 8vo); Broughton, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Genev. 1606, 4to; also in *Works*, p. 314); A Jesu Maria, *Interpretatio* (Neap. 1608, Colossians Agrip. 1611, 8vo); Delrio, *Commentarius* (Lugdun. 1608,

4to); Polan, *Commentarius* [including Jer.] (Basil. 1608, 8vo); A Costa de Andrada, *Commentarii* (Lugd. 1609, 8vo); De Castro, *Commentarii* [including Jeremiah and Bar.] (Par. 1609, fol.); Topsell, *Commentarius* (London, 1613, 4to); Sanctius, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Lugd. 1618, fol.) ; Hull, *Exposition* (Lond. 1618, 4to); Ghisler, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Lugd. 1623, fol.); Tarnovius, *Commentarius* (Rostock, 1627, 1642; Hamb. 1707, 4to); Peter Martyr, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1629, 4to); Udall, *Commentarie* (Lond. 1637, 4to); De Lemos, *Commentarius* (Madrit. 1649, fol.); Tayler, *Commentarii* [Rabbinical] (London, 1651, 4to); Fowler, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Vitemb. 1672, 1699, 4to); Hulsemann, *Commentarius* [includ. Jer.] (Rudolph. 1696, 4to); Benjamin Allessandro, *ἱερὸν* (Venice, 1713, 4to); C. B. Michaelis, *Notae* (in *Adnot. phil. exeq.* Halle, 1720, 3 volumes, 4to) ; Riedel, *Uebersetz.* (Wien, 1761, 8vo); Lessing, *Observationes* (Lipsiae, 1770, 8vo); Birmel, *Anm2erlhgen* (Weimar, 1781, 8vo); Schleusner, *Curae* (in Eichhorn's *Repert.* part 12, Lips. 1783); Horrer, *Bearbeitung* (Halle, 1784, 8vo); Blayney, *Notes* [including Jer.] (Oxf. 1784, 8vo, etc.); Lowe and Wolfssohn, *Anmerkungen* (Berlin, 1790, 8vo); Hamon, *Commentaire* (Par. 1790, 8vo); Pareau, *Illustratio* (L. Bat. 1790, 8vo); Libowitzter *ἱερὸν* (Korez, 1791, 8vo); Schnurrer, *Observationes* (Tub. 1793, 4to); J. H. Michaelis, *Observationes* [includ. Jer.] (Goitting. 1793, 8vo); Gaab, *Beitrage* [includ. Song of Solomon and Eccles.] (Tubing. 1795, 8vo); Volborth, *Uebersetz.* (Celle, 1795, 8vo); Otto, *Dissertatio* (Tub. 1795, 4to); Wetzler, *ἱερὸν* (Sklon, 1797, 8vo); Lundmark, *Dissertatio* (Upsal. 1799, 4to); Hasselhuhn, *Dissertationes* (Upsal. 1804, 4to); Deresir, *Erklärung* [including Jer. and Bar.] (Frkft. a. M. 1809, 8vo), Hartmann, *Uebersetz.* (in Justi's *Blumen*, etc., Giess. 1809, 2:517 sq.); Welcker, *Uebers.* [metrical] (Giess. 1810, 8vo) Bjorn, *Threni* [including Nah.] (Havn. 1814, 8vo); Riegler, *Anmerkungen* (Erlangen, 1814, 8vo); Jacob-Lissa, *ἱερὸν* [including Cant.] (Dyrhenf. 1815-19, 4to); Erdmalnn, *Specimen*, etc. (Rost. 1818, 8vo); Conz, *Klaglieder* (in Bengel's *Archiv.* 4 [Tüb. 1.821.], page 146 sq.), Fritz, *Exegesis* [on chapter 1] (Argent. 1825, 4to); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia*, (Lpz. 1827, 8vo) Goldwitzer, *Anmerk.* (Sulzb. 1828, 8vo) Wiedenfeld, *Erlaut.* (Elberf. 1830, 8vo); Koch, *Anmerk.* (Menz, 1835, 8vo); Kalkar, *Illustratio* (Havn. 1836, 8vo); Lowenstein, *Er'kliirung* [metrical] (Frkft. 1838, 8vo); Cureton, ed. Tanchum Jerus. *ἱερὸν* (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Pappenheim, *Uebersetz.* (Bresl. 1844, 8vo); Hetzel, *Anmerk.* (Lpz. 1854, 8vo); Neumann, *Auslegung* [includ. Jeremiah]

(Lpz. 1858, 8vo); Engelhardt, *Auslegung* (Lpzc. 1867, 8vo); Von Gerlach, *Erklärung* (Berl. 1868, 8vo); Henderson, *Commentary* [includ. Jer.] (London, 1851; Andov. 1868, 8vo). *SEE POETRY, HEBREW; SEE COMMENTARY.*

Lamfridus

SEE LANTFREDUS.

Lami

SEE LAMY.

Lami, Giovanni,

an Italian writer of note, was born at Santa Croce, Tuscany, in 1697. He studied law at the University of Pisa, and for a time practiced his profession at Florence. But his fondness for literature, and especially classical and ecclesiastical erudition, interfered with his professional pursuits, and he became an author. He first wrote in defense of the Nicene Creed concerning the Trinity, and against Leclerc and other Socinian writers. He contended that the Nicene dogma concerning the Trinity was the same as that held by the early promulgators of Christianity in the apostolic times. His work is entitled *De recta patrum Nicenorum fide* (Venice, 1730). In 1732 he was made librarian of the Riccardi Library, and professor of ecclesiastical history in the Florence Lyceum, and while in this position he published *De Eruditione Apostolorum* (1738), a sort of continuation of his former work. In 1740 Lami began to publish a literary journal, entitled *Novelle Letterarie*, which he carried on till 1760, at first with the assistance of Targioni, Gori, and other learned Tuscans of his time, with whom he afterwards quarrelled, and he then continued the work alone. During his position as librarian he made a selection of inedited works, or fragments of works, from the manuscripts of the Riccardi Library, which he published in a series entitled *Delicic Eruditorum* (Florence, 1736-69, 18 volumes, 8vo). He also edited the works of the learned John Meursius, in 12 volumes, folio. He wrote short biographies of many illustrious Italians of his age, under the title of *Memorabilia Italorum eruditione praestantirum quibus praesens seculum gloriatur* (Florence, 1742-48, 2 volumes, 8vo), and published in Greek the letters of Gabriel Severus, archbishop of Philadelphia, in Asia Minor, and of other prelates of the Greek Church: *Gabrielis Severi et aliorum Gracorum recentiorum*

Epistolce (Flor. 1754. 8vo). A *History of the Eastern Church from the Council of Florence to 1439*, he left unfinished. Lami died in 1770. He was a great hater of the Jesuits, and wrote many satires against them. Memoirs of his life were published by Fabroni (*Vitae Italorum*, volume 16) and Fontanini (Flor. 1789, 4to). See *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:216 sq.; Sax, *Onomasticon*, 6:490.

Lamietiere, Theophile Brachet De,

a noted French theologian, was born about the year 1596. He studied at the University of Heidelberg, and afterwards practiced law at Paris. He soon, however, tired of the bar, and devoted himself to theology. Having become elder of the Protestant Church at Charenton, he took an active part in all the religious controversies of the times, and was one of the most prominent members of the political assembly of La Rochelle in 1690, whither he had been sent by the Consistory of Paris. He subsequently went with La Chapelliere to Holland, to ask aid of the states-general for the Protestants of France. We next find him at the Assembly of Milhau in 1625, and in 1627 at Paris, where he was arrested as an agent of the duke of Rohan. He was condemned to death, but his life was spared on account of the threatening attitude which the inhabitants of La Rochelle assumed, in retaliative, towards the person of one of their prisoners, a relation of P. Joseph (the confessor and secret agent of Richelieu). He was finally released, and even received a pension from Richelieu on the condition of using every exertion to reunite the different Protestant churches. He now became the pliant tool of Richelieu, and was excommunicated by the Church of Charenton in 1644 for not having partaken of the Lord's Supper in twelve years. He finally joined the Roman Catholic Church, April 2, 1645. The remainder of his life was employed in writing against Protestantism. He died in 1665, despised alike by Protestants and Romanists. His principal works are. *Discours des vrayes raisons pour lesquelles ceux de la religion en France peuvent et doivent resister par armes a la persecution ouverte* (1622, 8vo); very scarce, as it was condemned to be burned by the public executioner: — *Lettre a M. Rambours pour la reunion des evangeliques aux catholiques* (Paris, 1628, 12mo): — *De universi orbis Christiani pace et concordia per cardinalem duces Richelium constituenda* (Par. 1634, 8vo; transl. into French, 1635, 4to): — *Le Moyen de la paix Chretienne* (Par. 1637, 8vo): — *La Necessite de la Puissance du Pape en l'Eglise* (Paris, 1640, 8vo): — *Le Catholique reform* (Paris, 1642, 8vo): — *Le Pacifique veritable* (Paris,

1644, 8vo) — condemned by the Sorbonne; etc. See Benoit, *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, 2; De Marolles, *Memoires*; Grotius, *Epistolae*; Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique*; Tallemant, *Historiettes*; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:222. (J.N.P.)

Lammas-day

is the name of a festival observed by Roman Catholics on the 1st of August, in memory of the imprisonment of St. Peter, and otherwise called *St. Peter's chains*. The word is of doubtful meaning: some refer it to a Saxon term signifying contribution. Brande, in his "Antiquities," says, "Some suppose it is called Lammas-day, *quasi Lamb-masse*, because on that day the tenants that held lands of the cathedral church at York were bound by their tenure to bring a live *lamb* into the church at high *mass* on that day." More probably however, is its derivation from "loaf-mass," it having been the custom of the Saxons to offer on this day (August 1) an oblation of loaves made of new wheat. Like many other Church festivals, it seems to have been observed already in pagan times, and, like the 1st of May, was a festive day with the Druids. Vallancey, in his *Collectanea De Rebus Hibernicis*, says the Druids celebrated the 1st of August as the day of the oblation of grain. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*, Genesis Suppl. page 92, Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

Lammermann

SEE LAMORMAIN.

Lammists

a sect of Remonstrant Baptists. *SEE MENNONITES.*

Lamont, David, D.D.,

a Scotch Presbyterian divine, flourished as minister of Kirkpatrick, Durham. He died in 1837. This is all we know of his personal history. His *Sermons* were published at London from 1760-87, in 2 volumes, 8vo (new edit. 1810, 3 volumes, 8vo).

Lamormain, Guillaume Germeau de

a noted Belgian Roman Catholic theologian of the Order of the Jesuits, was born in the duchy of Luxemburg about 1570; entered the Jesuitical

order in 1590, and then became professor of theology and philosophy at the University of Gratz. In 1624 he was appointed confessor of the emperor of Austria, Ferdinand II, and over this thoroughly monkish ruler Lamormain is said to have exercised perfect sway. He and John Weingürtner, another Jesuit confessor, Vehse (see below) tells us, "constantly kept near him, and never let him (Ferdinand) out of their sight;" and it is due to this Jesuitic influence, no doubt, that Ferdinand became such a fanatical adherent of the Church of Rome, and a most cruel persecutor of Protestantism. *SEE AUSTRIA*. Of Lamormain himself, it is said that he was so devoted to the Romish cause that he made upwards of 100,000 converts to the Church of Rome. He died February 22, 1648. He wrote a life of Ferdinand II, which abounds in flattering terms to the emperor, who had been a pliant tool in the hands of the crafty Jesuit. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:245; Paquot, *Memoires pour servir a l'histoire litteraire des Pays-Bas*, 5:98-100; Vehse, *Memoirs of the Court, Aristocracy, and Diplomacy of Austria* (transl. by F. Demmler, Lond. 1856, 2 volumes, sm. 8vo), 1:287 sq., 319. (J.H.W.)

Lamormain, Henri de

a Belgian Jesuit, brother of the preceding, and, like him, a native of Luxemburg, entered the Order of the Jesuits in 1596, but exerted little influence on account of feeble health. He died November 26, 1647. He translated and wrote several works; among them are, *Tractatus amoris divini constans*, libri 12 (from the French of Francisco de Sales, Vienna, 1643, 4to; 2d edit., with life of the author [Sales], Colossians 1657, 8vo): — *De Virtute Paenitentiae*, etc. (Vienna, 1644, 4to). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:245.

Lamothe, Pierre Lambert De,

a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Bucherie, in the diocese of Lisieux, January 18, 1624. After being for some time connected with the chancellery of the Parliament at Rouen, he entered the Church. His talents caused him to be distinguished among a number of priests who had formed in 1652 the plan of Christianizing China and neighboring countries. In 1660 he was consecrated bishop of Berythe. He embarked at Marseilles for China November 27, 1660, and, passing through Malta, Antioch, Aleppo, Bassora, Chalzeran, Shiraz, Ispahan, Lara, Surate, Masulipatam, Tenasserim, Yalinga, Pram, and Pikfri, arrived at Jutlica, the capital of

Siam, April 22, 1662. Here he found some 1500 Christians of different nations and two churches, the one administered by the Dominicans, the other by the Jesuits. He was at first well received, but had subsequently to submit to many annoyances from the archbishop of Goa, who claimed the primacy of the whole East Indies, and Lamothe finally sailed for Canton in July 1663, with two other missionaries. A severe tempest obliged them, however, to return to Siam. Here they were exposed to all sorts of ill treatment at the hands of the Portuguese, and owed their safety only to the aid of the Cochin Chinese. Lamothe sent to the pope and to Paris for more missionaries and other assistance. Alexander VII, in consequence, extended the jurisdiction of apostolic vicars over the kingdom of Siam, Japan, and other neighboring countries, which action freed Lamothe from the control of the archbishop of Goa. He was now joined by Pallu du Pare, bishop of Heliopolis, who reached Siam January 27, 1664, with other missionaries. The two apostolic vicars held a synod, and Lamothe received permission from the king to establish a Church at Siam, which he intended should become the center of communication between the extreme Eastern missions. He also established a seminary for the education of native priests and instructors, a college, and a hospital. Lamothe died June 15, 1679. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:250 sq.

Lamourette, Adrien,

abbe, a noted French ecclesiastic, was born in Picardy in 1742. During the Revolution in France he became an auxiliary of Mirabeau in 1789, and wrote the address on the civil constitution of the clergy which that orator pronounced. In 1791 he was chosen, under the new Church regime enacted by the Assembly in opposition to the Roman see, bishop of Rhone-et-Loire, and deputed to the National Assembly. Having resisted the extreme measures of the dominant party, he was guillotined January 10, 1794. He published *Pensees sur la philosophie et incredulite* (1786, 8vo): — *Pensees sur la philosophie de la foi* (1789, 8vo): — *Les Delices de la Religion* (1789, 12mo): — *Considerations sur l'esprit et les devoirs de la vie religieuse* (1795, 12mo); etc. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Lamp

Picture for Lamp 1

(properly *δύπη* *lappid'*, a fame, ^{<0157>}Genesis 15:17; ^{<0208>}Exodus 20:18, ^{<8411>}Job 41:11; ^{<3415>}Nahum 2:5, ^{<7106>}Daniel 10:6, ^{<2311>}Isaiah 62:1; ^{<3013>}Ezekiel 1:13; *lamp-torch*, ^{<0076>}Judges 7:16,20, 15:4,5, ^{<8126>}Job 12:5; ^{<3115>}Zechariah 12:6; in some of which passages it is rendered "lightning," "brand," "torch," etc.: Gr. *λαμπάς* a torch — "light" or lantern, ^{<4018>}Acts 20:8; ^{<6015>}Revelation 4:5; "torch," ^{<6318>}John 18:3; ^{<6810>}Revelation 8:10, *oil-lamp*, ^{<121>}Matthew 25:1-8; also *ρῆνε* *neyr*, or *ρῆναί* *ail*, a light, in various senses, especially for domestic purposes, the Gr. *λύχνος*) is a term of frequent occurrence in a literal sense in the Scriptures, such a utensil being often really meant where the A.V. gives the rendering "candle" (q.v.). The primary sense of light (^{<0157>}Genesis 15:17) also gives rise to frequent metaphorical usages, indicating life, welfare, guidance, as, e.g. ^{<1217>}2 Samuel 21:17; ^{<3315>}Psalms 119:105; ^{<1023>}Proverbs 6:23; 13:9. **SEE LIGHT.** The following are the cases in which the use of lamps is referred to in the Bible. In their illustration we freely avail ourselves of the materials brought to light from the ancient remains.

1. That part of the golden candlestick belonging to the tabernacle which bore the light; also of each of the ten candlesticks placed by Solomon in the Temple before the Holy of Holies (^{<0257>}Exodus 25:37; ^{<1074>}1 Kings 7:49; ^{<401>}2 Chronicles 4:20, 13:11, ^{<3012>}Zechariah 4:2). The lamps were lighted every evening, and cleansed every morning (^{<0217>}Exodus 30:7,8; *Reland, Ant. Hebr.* 1:5,9, and 7:8). It is somewhat remarkable, that while the golden candlestick, or rather candelabrum, is so minutely described, not a word is said of the shape of the lamps (^{<0257>}Exodus 25:37). This was probably because the socket in which it was to be inserted necessarily gave it a somewhat cylindrical form adapted to the purpose; for it is hardly to be presumed that the insecure cup-form usually represented in engravings would have been adopted. This shape is aptly illustrated by an instance occurring on the Egyptian monuments. Wilkinson gives (*Ancient Egyptians*, 5:376) what he takes to be the representation of a lamp made of glass, with a hand holding separately an erect wick, as if the bearer were about to place it in the vase previous to its being lighted. The lines, he thinks, may represent the twisted nature of the cotton wick, as they do the watering of the glass vase.

Almost the only other fact we can gather in this connection is, that vegetable oils were burnt in them, and especially, if not exclusively, olive-oil. This, of the finest quality, was the oil used in the seven lamps of the tabernacle (⁽¹⁷⁷¹⁾Exodus 27:20). Although the lamp-oils of the Hebrews were exclusively vegetable, it is probable that animal fat was used, as it is at present by the Western Asiatics, by being placed in a kind of lamp, and burnt by means of a wick inserted in it. *SEE OIL*. Cotton wicks are now used throughout Asia, but the Hebrews, like the Egyptians, probably employed the outer and coarser fibre of flax (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 19:1), and perhaps linen yarn, if the rabbins are correct in alleging that the linen dresses of the priests were unraveled when old, to furnish wicks for the sacred lamps.

As to the material, the burners were in this instance doubtless of gold, although metal is scarcely the best substance for a lamp. The golden candlestick may also suggest that lamps in ordinary use were placed on stands, and, where more than one was required, on stands with two or more branches. The modern Orientals, who are satisfied with very little light in their rooms, use stands of brass or wood, on which to raise the lamps to a sufficient height above the floor on which they sit. Such stands are shaped not unlike a tall candlestick, spreading out at the top. Sometimes the lamps are placed on brackets against the wall, made for the purpose, and often upon stools. Doubtless similar contrivances were employed by the Hebrews. The Romans are known to have employed them. *SEE CANDLESTICK*

Picture for Lamp 2.

2. A torch or flambeau, such as was carried by the soldiers of Gideon (⁽¹⁷⁷⁶⁾Judges 7:16, 20; comp. 15:4). From the fact that these were at first enclosed in pitchers, from which, at the end of the march, they were taken out and borne in the hand, we may with certainty infer that they were not ordinary lamps, open at top, from which the oil could easily be spilled. *SEE TORCH*.

Picture for Lamp 3

3. It seems that the Hebrews, like the ancient Greeks and Romans, as well as the modern Orientals, were accustomed to burn lamps overnight in their chambers; and this practice may appear to give point to the expression of "outer darkness," which repeatedly occurs in the New Testament.

(^{<4082>}Matthew 8:12, 22:13); the force is greater, however, when the contrast implied in the term "outer" is viewed with reference to the effect produced by sudden expulsion into the darkness of night from a chamber highly illuminated for an entertainment. This custom of burning lamps at night, with the effect produced by their going out or being extinguished, supplies various figures to the sacred writers (^{<40217>}2 Samuel 21:17, ^{<4039>}Proverbs 13:9, 20:20). On the other hand, the keeping up of a lamp's light is used as a symbol of enduring and unbroken succession (^{<411136>}1 Kings 11:36, 15:4, ^{<40217>}Psalms 132:17). (See Wemyss's *Symbols. Dict.* s.v.)

Picture for Lamp 4

The usual form of these domestic utensils may probably be inferred from the prevailing shape of antique specimens from neighboring nations that have come down to us. In the British Museum there are various forms of ancient Egyptian lamps, which were employed for lighting the interior of apartments, some of terracotta and others of bronze, with various ornaments in bas-relief.

Picture for Lamp 5

Picture for Lamp 6

4. It appears from ^{<40511>}Matthew 25:1, that the Jews used lamps and torches in their marriage ceremonies, or rather when the bridegroom came to conduct home the bride by night. This is still the custom in those parts of the East where, on account of the heat of the day, the bridal procession takes place in the night-time. The connection of lamps and torches with marriage ceremonies often appears also in the classical poets (Homer, *Iliad*, 6:492 Eurip. *Phoeniss.* 346; *Medea*, 1027; Virgil, *Eclog.* 8:29), and, indeed, Hymen, the god of marriage, was figured as bearing a torch. The same connection, it may be observed, is still preserved in Western Asia, even where it is no longer usual to bring home the bride by night. During two, or three, or more nights preceding the wedding, the street or quarter in which the bridegroom lives is illuminated with chandeliers and lanterns, or with lanterns and small lamps suspended from cords drawn across from the bridegroom's and several other houses on each side to the houses opposite; and several small silk flags, each of two colors, generally red and green, are attached to other cords (Lane, *Mod. AEgypt.* 1:201; Mrs. Poole, *Englishman in Egypt*, 3:131). A modern lantern much used on these occasions, with lamps hung about it and suspended from it, is represented

in the preceding cut. The lamps used separately on such occasions are represented in the following cut. Figs. 1, 3, and 5 show very distinctly the conical receptacle of wood which serves to protect the flame from the wind. Lamps of this kind are sometimes hung over doors. The shape in figure 3 is also that of a much-used indoor lamp, called *kandil* (Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, chapter 5, page 151). It is a small vessel of glass, having a small tube at the bottom, in which is stuck a wick formed of cotton twisted round a piece of straw; some water is poured in first, and then the oil. Lamps very nearly of this shape appear on the Egyptian monuments, and they seem, also, to be of glass (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, 3:101; 5:376). If the Egyptians had lamps of glass, there is no reason why the Jews also might not have had them, especially as this material is more proper for lamps intended to be hung up, and therefore to cast their light down from above.

Picture for Lamp 7

The Jews used lamps in other festivals besides those of marriage. The Roman satirist (Persius, *Sat.* 5:179) expressly describes them as making illuminations at their festivals by lamps hung up and arranged in an orderly manner; and the scriptural intimations, so far as they go, agree with this description. If this custom had not been so general in the ancient and modern East, it might have been supposed that the Jews adopted it from the Egyptians, who, according to Herodotus (2:62), had a "Feast of Lamps," which was celebrated at Sais, and, indeed, throughout the country at a certain season of the year. The description which the historian gives of the lamps employed on this occasion strictly applies to those in modern use already described, and the concurrence of both these sources of illustration strengthens the probably analogy of Jewish usage. He speaks of them as "small vases filled with salt and olive-oil, in which the wick floated, and burnt during the whole night." It does not, indeed, appear of what materials these vases were made, but we may reasonably suppose them to have been of glass. The later Jews had even something like this feast among themselves. A "Feast of Lamps" was held every year on the twenty-fifth of the month Kisleu. *SEE DEDICATION*. It was founded by Judas Maccabaeus, in celebration of the restoration of the Temple worship (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:7, 7), and has ever since been observed by the lighting up of lamps or candles on that day in all the countries of their dispersion (Maimonides, *Rosh. Hashanah*, fol. 8). Other Orientals have at this day a

similar feast, of which the "east of Lanterns" among the Chinese is perhaps the best known (Davis, *Chinese*, page 138). *SEE LANTERN.*

Picture for Lamp 8

Picture for Lamp 9

Lamp,

a strange ceremony of the Maronite Church. A wafer of some size, having seven pieces of cotton stuck into it, is put into a flask or basin of oil; a religious service is then read, the cotton is set fire to, and the sick person for whose recovery the rite is intended is anointed with the oil, and prayer is repeated over him.

Lamps

(their use in the Christian Church). Among the Jews *lamps* were freely used in the synagogue for various purposes. In fact, all the ancient nations had them in their temples; but how soon they were made use of by Christians, and what significance they had in symbolism, remains a matter of dispute between the Romish and Protestant churches. The Protestants generally hold that there is no evidence that lamps were used in the early Church for any other purpose than to light up the dark places where they were obliged to congregate for worship, while Romanists claim that they were used as symbols. (Compare, on the Roman Catholic view, Martigny, *Dict. Des Antiquites Chretiennes*, page 151, s.v. Cierges; see also the art. *LIGHTS SEE LIGHTS*.) Several of the fathers, among them Chrysostom, condemn in strong terms the custom of setting up lamps on days of festival as the relic of some pagan rite. In the days of Jerome, it is true, lights were freely used in churches, but Romish theologians forget to tell that the propriety of the custom was much questioned even then. In graves of the Catacombs "lamps were often placed," says Walcott (*Sacred Archaeology*, s.v.), "as a symbol of the eternal light which the departed, it is hoped, enjoy as memorials of their shining lights before men, and their future glory" (Matthew 13:43). But it is evident that even this custom was early disapproved of, for the Council of Elibaris forbade the faithful, on pain of excommunication, lighting wax candles in the daytime in cemeteries or other burial-places of the martyrs (compare Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* page 367). In our day it is the custom in the Roman Catholic churches to keep a lamp

(eternal light) constantly burning before or by the side of the tabernacle. (J.H.W.)

Lampadary

is the name of an officer in the Eastern Church whose duty it is to carry before the patriarchs in all processions a lighted candelabrum, called *λαμπαδοῦχον*, as a badge of distinction among bishops. It is the business of the lampadary also to see that the lamps of the church are lighted, and to carry a taper on days of great processions.

Lampe, Friedrich Adolf,

an eminent German Protestant theologian, was born at Detmold (Lippel-Detmold) February 19, 1683. He entered the University of Franeker, and later that of Utrecht, to study theology. He was successively pastor at Wees, Duisburg, and Bremen. In 1720 he became professor of theology at Utrecht, and in 1727 removed to the University of Bremen in the same capacity. He died December 8, 1729. Lampe is one of the most prominent German theologians of the Reformed Church, who introduced into the (German Church the Coccejanian doctrines, and measurably also the principles of Labadism. Lampe's principal works are, *Commentarius analytico-exegeticus Evangelii secundum Johannem* (Amsterd. 1724-25, 3 volumes, 4to); this work Orme commends as "both extensive and valuable." Walch ranks it among the best expositions of the apostle's Gospel: — *De Cymbalis veterum Libri tres* (Utrecht, 1703, 12mo): — *Exercitationum sacrarium Dodecas, quibus Pssalnuts xlv perpetuo commentario explanatur* (Bremen, 1715, 4to): — *Geheimniss des Gnadenbundes* (Bremen, 1723, 12mo; transl. into Dutch, Amst. 1727, 8vo); this work is nothing more nor less than his system of theology: — *Delineatio Theologiae activas* (Utrecht, 1727, 4to): — *Rudimenta Theologiae elencticae* (Bremen, 1729, 8vo). Lampe published also a large number of sermons and devotional treatises in German, which were linearly all translated into Dutch; he rearranged and edited an edition of the *Historia Ecclesiae Reformatae in Hungaria et Transylvania*, attributed to Paul of Debrezim (Utrecht, 1728, 4to). Together with Hase, he published the first three volumes of the *Bibliotheca Bremensis*, for which he wrote a number of theological articles. Other treatises which he published in various papers were collected and published by D. Gerdes, together with his discourses and programmes (Amsterd. 1737, 2 volumes, 4to). See

Schumacher, *Memoria Lampii*, in *Miscellanea Duisburgensia*, volume 2; *Acta Eruditorum*, ann. 1722; Klifker, *Bibl. Eruditor. Praecocium*; Burmann, *Trajectum eruditum*, Jocher, *Algem. Gel. Lexikon*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:284; Gobel (Maximilian), *Gesch. d. Christlichen Lebens*, volume 2 (see Index).

Lampetians

is the name of one of the heretical sects which, on pretense of promoting sanctity by an ascetic life, made the Christian Sabbath a fast-day.

There was also another sect of this name in the 17th century, the followers of Lampetius, a Syrian monk, who pretended that, as a man is born free, a Christian, in order to please God, ought to do nothing by necessity; and that, therefore, it is unlawful to make vows, even those of obedience. To this doctrine he added the views of the Arians, Carpocratians, and other sects. The Lampetians formed a branch of the MESSALIANS *SEE MESSALIANS* (q.v.).

Lampillas, Francis Xavier,

a Spanish Jesuit, was born in Catalonia in 1731. After the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain in 1767 he went to Genoa, where he died in 1810. His principal work is a defense of Spanish literature against Bettinelli and Tiraboschi, *Saggio storico-apologetico della Letteratura Spagnuola*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:285.

Lamplugh, Thomas, D.D.,

an English prelate of note in the days of king James II, was born in Yorkshire in 1615. But little is known of his early personal history. He was dean of Rochester in 1676, when he was promoted to the episcopate as bishop of Exeter. In this position he became one of the most conspicuous divines of the day, securing, in particular, the favor of the king by his partisanship, especially in 1688. In this year, just before the exit of king James from the English throne, Lamplugh called on the king, was graciously received, praised for his loyalty, and awarded with the archbishopric of York, which had been vacant for more than two years and a half. William III. whom Lamplugh, strangely enough, recognized as the rightful sovereign of England, after the flight of James, confirmed the appointment, hence some writers' statement that William of Orange appointed Lamplugh to the archbishopric. The archbishop died in 1691.

See Debary, *History of the Church of England*, page 167; Macaulay, *History of England*, 2:382. (J.H.W.)

Lampronti, Isaac,

a Jewish Rabbi of some note as an author, flourished in Ferrara in the first half of the 18th century. He died about 1756. He commenced the preparation of a large encyclopaedia of Rabbinism, of which he himself completed twelve volumes, bringing the work, excellent in its character, down to the letter *Mem*. It was published at Venice between 1750 and 1813. See Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 3:230.

Lamson, Alvan, D.D.,

a Unitarian minister, was born in 1792 at Weston, Mass.; was educated first at Phillips Academy, Andover, and then at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1814. He was immediately appointed tutor in Bowdoin College, but left in 1816, and entered the Divinity School at Cambridge. In 1818 he became pastor of the First Church in Dedham, Massachusetts, where he officiated for over forty years. He died July 18, 1864. He wrote much for the *Christian Examiner*, and in 1857 published a volume of sermons (Bost. 12mo). The *Christian Register* says of him: "Dr. Lamson has succeeded in uniting the acutest moral wisdom with the most unpretending and childlike modes of exhibiting it. His style is clear as crystal, sometimes almost quaint in its simplicity, and not without touches of poetic feeling as well as fancy, though a calm, shrewd judgment characterizes all his opinions." — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors* volume 2 *American Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1864, page 612.

Lamy

(or LAMI), Bernard, an eminent priest of the French Oratory, was born at Mans in June, 1640; studied under the Oratorians, joined their order in 1658, and completed his studies at Paris and at Saumur. He next taught belles-lettres at Vendome and Juilly, and philosophy at Saumur and at Angers. In 1676 he was deprived of his professorship for his zealous advocacy of the Cartesian philosophy. His enemies, the Thomists, even obtained a *lettre de cachet* against him under the accusation that he opposed the principle of royal authority. He was banished to Grenoble, where cardinal Le Camus, who had established a seminary for the education of ecclesiastics, and who held Lamy in high estimation,

appointed him professor of divinity. In 1686, his sentence having been revoked in its most essential charges, he was recalled to Paris, and remained for a while in the Seminary of St. Magloire, but, having violated the rules of the establishment by publishing without the knowledge of the superior a work (*Lettre au P. Fourre, de l'Oratoire*), which, besides, was considered to contain objectionable teachings (viz. as that Christ did not celebrate the Jewish Passover with his disciples [a view adopted by some of the soundest scholars]; that John the Baptist was imprisoned twice, by the Sanhedrim and by Herod; and that the three *Mar's* mentioned in the Gospels are identical), he was again exiled, this time to Rouen. He died in the latter city January 29, 1715. Lamy was a very prolific writer, and his works are generally distinguished for clearness of thought and expression. The most important are, *Apparatus Biblicus ad intelligenda Sacra Biblia* (originally [Grenoble, 1687] no more than tables of the chief facts of Scripture, with rules for its study, and compiled simply for his pupils; he subsequently enlarged and published it at Lyons, 1696, sm. 8vo, and it was in its day considered the best "introduction" to the Bible extant; an English edition was prepared by R. Bundy, Lond. 1723, 4to): — *Entretiens sur les Sciences* (1684), a work which was highly esteemed by J.J. Rousseau: — *Introduction a l'Ecriture Sainte, ou l'on traite de tout ce qui concerne les Juifs*, etc. (Lyons, 1709, 4to): — *Harmonia, sive concordia quatuor Evangelistarum*, editio novissima (Paris, 1701, 12mo): — *Commentarius in harmoniam, sive concordiam quatuor Evangelistarum* (Paris, 1699, 4to): — *Dissertutio de Levitis cantoribus* (Ugol. 32, 571): — *De tabernaculo foederis, de sancta civitate Jerusalem, et de templo ejus* (Paris, 1720, fol.). To this last-named work Lamy is said to have devoted the last thirty years of his life. It was published (after his death) under the editorship of pere Desmoulins. See Ellies Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs eccls.* volume 19, 4to ed.; *Journal de tout ce qui s'est passé en l'Universite d'Angers*, 1679, 4to; F. Bouillier, *Hist. du Cartesianisme*, volume 2; B. Haureau, *Hist. Litter. du Maine*, 2:117-165, Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6:515; Kitto, *Biblical Cyclopaedia*, 2:779, 780. (J.H.W.)

Lamy, Dom. Francois

a French Roman Catholic priest, was born at Montereau, in the diocese of Chartres, in 1636. He entered the congregation of St. Maur, of the Order of St. Benoist, in 1685, and was in relation with some of the most important men of the time, Fenelon among others. He died in 1711. Lamy wrote largely in defense of Christianity, and against Spinoza; the most

important of his works are, *Traite de la verite evidente de la religion Chretienne* (1694, 12mo): — *De la connaissance de soimeine* (Paris, 1694-98, 6 volumes, 8vo, augmented, Paris, 1700), the ablest and most celebrated work of Franqois Lamy (comp. the art. MALEBRANCHE *SEE MALEBRANCHE*): — *Le Nouvel Atheisme renverse, ou refutation du systime de Spinosa*, etc. (Anon., Paris, 1696, 12mo): — *Sentiments de pieté sur la profession religieuse* (Paris, 1697, 12mo), which gave rise to much controversy — *Lecons de la Sagesse et de l'engagement au service de Dieu* (Par. 1703, 12mo): — *L'incredule amene a la religion par la raison* (Paris, 1710, 12mo): — *Traite de la connaissance et de lamour de Dieu* (Paris, 1712, 12mo); this work, published after his death, is very scarce. Some of his letters are contained in the *Correspondance de Fenelon* (Paris, 1827-29, 11 volumes, 8vo). See *Le Cerf, Biblioth. des Auteurs de la Congreg. de St. Maur*; *Niceron, Memoires*, vol. 10; *Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:298 sq.

Lancaster, Joseph

an English Quaker, was born in London, November 25, 1775, and died about October 4, 1838. He was the promulgator of the mutual system of education first introduced by Dr. Bell at Madras, but afterwards known both in England and America as the *Lancasterian System*, and gave an impulse, by his writings and lectures, to the cause of popular education in many countries. He first opened a school for poor children in St. George's Field, and soon rendered his method very popular. For the characteristics of his system, see *Watts, Bibl. Brit.*, and his works (London, 1854); *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 6:24; *North Amer. Rev.* 18:184; *Living Age*, April 1845; *Allibone, Dict. of British and Amer. Authors*, 2:1052; *Thomas, Biog. Dict.* page 1365.

Lancaster, Lydia

a female Quaker minister, daughter of Thomas Rawlinson, was born at Graithwaite, Lancashire, England, in 1684. In the course of her ministry she visited several times the greater part of England, Ireland, and Scotland, building up her society with great zeal and efficacy. In 1718 she came to the United States, and was here especially instrumental in the extension of the Quaker cause. She retained her zeal and activity to extreme old age, laboring almost to the close of her days, May 30, 1761. See *Janney, Hist. of Friends*, 3:296.

Lancaster, Nathaniel

D.D., a minister of the Church of England, was born in England in 1698. During a portion of his ministry he was rector of Stamford Rivers, but he is better known as a literary man than as a pastor. He died in 1775. His published works are, *Sermons* (1746): — *Essay on Delicacy* (1748, 8vo): — *The Old Serpent, or Methodism Triumphant — a Poem* (1770, 4to). — Allibone, *Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1052.

Lance

(*ˈdyk*, *kidon'*, so called from its *destructive* use, ^{<2400>}Jeremiah 1:42; elsewhere usually "spear"), a *javelin* or smaller kind of missile weapon, in distinction from the long-handled spear (*ˈtynj* } *chanith'*), and the simple dart (*j l iv*, *she'lach*). *SEE ARMOR*.

Lance, The Holy (1),

is the name of a knife very much in the form of a lance, used in the Greek Church to imitate the spear by which Christ was pierced. With this "holy lance" the priest, at communion, cuts the bread, while reading the corresponding passages of the N.T. Scriptures. See Martigny, *Diet. des Antiquites*, page 353.

Lance, The Holy (2),

was given by king Rudolph of Burgundy to king Henry I of Germany, as a present, through the influence of Luitprand, bishop of Cremona. It came to be considered as one of the chief insignia of the empire, and a powerful talisman. The earlier tradition represents the lance as having been chiefly made of the nails with which Christ was crucified; later accounts assume that it was the identical lance with which the Roman soldier pierced the Savior's side. Under the emperor Charles IV this lance was brought to Prague, and in 1354 pope Innocent VI, at the emperor's request, instituted a special festival, *De lancea*, which was celebrated in Germany and Bohemia on the first octave after Easter. Another holy lance was discovered by the empress Helena, and kept first in the portico of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and afterwards at Antioch, where it was found in 1093 by a French priest, Peter Bartholomew; its appearance cheered the discouraged Crusaders, who gained a brilliant victory over the Saracens. It was subsequently brought to Constantinople, then to Venice,

and afterwards came into the possession of St. Louis, king of France. It was, however, afterwards taken back again to Constantinople, and it is said that the iron of it was brought to Rome as a present to pope Innocent VIII, and is preserved at the Vatican. The genuineness of both lances has, however, been doubted even in the Roman Catholic Church, and their authenticity was never officially proclaimed. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 8:197. (J.N.P.)

Lanceae Et Clavôrum Festum

SEE LANCE, THE HOLY (2).

Lancellot(t)i

(LANCELOTUS), Giovanni Paoli (1), a noted Italian writer on canon law, was born in Perugia in 1511, was professor of canon law in the university of his native place, and died there in 1591. He is particularly known as the author of *Institutiones juris canonici*, which are generally published with the *Corpus juris canonici*; yet it was not adopted in the "editio Romana," and therefore Richter omitted it in his edition. Lancellotti appears to have for a long time contemplated writing an elementary text-book for the study of canon law, after the model of Justinian's Institutes, *SEE CORPIS JURIS CIVILIS*, for we find already in 1555 pope Paul IV encouraging him in his plans. Two years after Lancellotti presented his work to the papal censure, and it was examined by a committee composed of Fabianus Atorombonus, Julius Oradinus, and Antonius Massa, all officers of the court Della Rota. They approved strongly of it, and their recommendation was printed in several editions of the *Commentarii Institutionum* subsequently added by Lancellotti himself to his *liber 1*. The book was afterwards published, and immediately adopted as a text-book in the University of Cologne. On the other hand, the pope steadily refused his approval, and some other censors raised objections against it on the ground that it contained principles opposed to the then recent decisions of the Council of Trent. The author, however, was disinclined to alter the obnoxious passages, and resolved to continue to publish the work as a private enterprise, which he did towards the close of the Council of Trent, in August, 1563, at Perugia, dedicating it to Pius IV. In the following years it was repeatedly reprinted and commended, Petrus Matthiis even appended it to his edition of the *Corpus juris canonici* (Frankf. ad M. 1591). Soon after it was included in the edition of the *Corpus juris canon.* published at Lyons, and continued to

be printed in that manner, it having finally obtained the approval of pope Paul V (1605-21) by the intercession of cardinal Scipio Cobellutius and others. Still the *Institutiones* were never considered as an official work. Their value consists chiefly in the insight it affords into what was considered as law before the Council of Trent, and the common practice of that time. Subsequent editions carefully indicate the differences between it and the new laws. (See Caspar Ziegler, *Notae ex ipsis antiquitatum ecclesiasticarum fontibus deductae*, Wittemb. 1699, 4to; reproduced in Thomasius's edition, Halae, 1716,1717, 4to; also that of Doujat, Venetiis, 1750, 2 volumes, 8vo). A French translation, with a comparison of the Romish and Gallican practice, was published by Durand de Maillane (Lyons, 1710,10 volumes, 12mo). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:187.

Lancellotti

(or LANCELOTTI), Giovanni Paoli (2), an Italian author and priest, was born at Perugia in 1575, and died in Paris in 1640. He is noted as the author of a successful work entitled *To-day* ("L'Hoggiidi"), intended to prove that the world was not morally or physically worse than it had been in ancient times. He wrote also other learned works.

Lancelot, Dom. Claude,

a noted French theologian and writer of the Romish Church, was born at Paris in 1615. In 1640 he was appointed presiding officer of the noted school of Port Royal, and, after its discontinuance in 1660, he became instructor of prince Conti; then lived in the convent St. Cyran until its destruction in 1679. He died at Quimperie April 15, 1695. His works are mainly on the grammar of the classical and Roman languages. He also published historical annotations on the Bible of Vitre, and left in MS. form memoirs of the life of Duverger de Hauranne, of the St. Cyran convent. See Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal*; Vigneul Marville, *Milanges*, 1:132; Nicéron, *Mem. pour servir a l'histoire des Hommes II.* 35; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 29:322 sq.

Lancet

Picture for Lancet

(*j mī* *pro'mach*, from its *piercing*, ^{<1188>}1 Kings 18:28, elsewhere usually "spear"), the iron *point* or head of a lance. *SEE ARMOR.* The incisive

implements of the most ancient Hebrews, as of other peoples, were of stone (^{<0125>}Exodus 4:25; ^{<0126>}Joshua 5:2; compare Abicht, *De cultis saxeis*, Lipsiae, 1712; and generally Creuzer, *Comment. Herod.* 1:22. The *testa samia* with which the priests of Cybele emasculated themselves [Pliny, 35:461, and the stone knives of the Egyptian embalmers [Herod. 2:86], are parallel cases). The Hebrews used no knives at table (although one term for knife, **tl kaniis** so named from *eating*), since the meat was brought on ready cut into pieces, and the bread was so thin as to be easily broken with the fingers. **SEE EATING**. The same is the case at present in the East, even in princely feasts. **SEE MEAL**. Knives were regularly employed by mechanics (q.v.), and in slaughtering animals (^{<0216>}Genesis 22:6, 10; comp. ^{<0752>}Judges 19:29; see Philo, *Opp.* 2:570), and for preparing food (Josephus, *War*, 1:33, 7; *Ant.* 17:71, etc.). The sacrificial knife, in particular, was called **āl j ni** (^{<1500>}Ezra 1:9), and a room in the (second) Temple was appropriated to such cutlery (**twpyl j m tyb**, Mishna, *Middoth*, 6:7). A penknife was called **r [i ti]** (Jer. 26:23; ^{<0121>}Ezekiel 5:1), originally in Aramaean **rPəni** which in the Talmud (*Chelim*, 13:1) likewise denotes a razor. The pruning-knife was **hrməni** (^{<2104>}Isaiah 2:4; 18:5, etc.). **SEE KNIFE**.

Lancet Style

SEE ENGLISH STYLE.

Lancet-Window

Picture for Lancet-Window

is an architectural term for a narrow window with acutely-pointed arch head. This form was much used in England and Scotland during the early pointed period of Gothic architecture. Several lancet-windows are frequently grouped together, so as to produce a pleasing effect. In Scotland, the lancet-window was, like many other features of Scotch Gothic, retained to a much later period than in England. — Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

Land

(represented by several Heb. and Gr. words: properly /**ra**,, *e'rets*, usually rendered "earth," Gr. **γη**; and **hmda**}, *adamnah*', usually the "ground;")

sometimes ἡδὲ; *sadeh'*, elsewhere a "field," Gr. ἀγρός; also χώρα, a tract of land; etc.). This word in the Old Testament often denotes emphatically the country of the Israelites, at other times some particular country or district, as the land of Canaan, the land of Egypt, the land of Ashur, the land of Moab. In several places of our Authorized Version the phrase "all the earth" is used, when the more restricted phrase "the land," or "all the land," would be more proper. *SEE AGRICULTURE; SEE FARM; SEE LANDED ESTATE.*

Landau, Jecheskel,

a German Rabbi of note, was born about 1720. He flourished first as Rabbi of Jampol, Podolia, and later as chief Rabbi of Prague. He died in 1793. While yet a young man Landau gave promise of great ability as a polemic, and he displayed this quality to great advantage in the Sabbatarian controversy which raged between Eibeschtitz, *SEE JONATHAN EIBESCHÜTZ*, and Emden. See Grütz, *Gesch. der Juden*, volume 10, chapter 11, especially pages 409, 415, 438 Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2:216 sq.

Landed Estate

It has been the custom to regard the Hebrews as a pastoral people until they were settled in Palestine. In a great degree they doubtless were so, and when they entered agricultural Egypt, the land of Goshen was assigned to them expressly because that locality was suited to their pastoral habits (^{<0470>}Genesis 47:4-6). These habits were substantially maintained; but it is certain that they became acquainted with the Egyptian processes of culture, and it is more than probable that they raised for themselves such products of the soil as they required for their own use. We may, indeed, collect that the portion of their territory which lay in the immediate vicinity of the Nile was placed by them under culture (^{<05110>}Deuteronomy 11:10), while the interior, with the free pastures of the desert beyond their immediate territory, sufficed abundantly for their cattle (^{<1372>}1 Chronicles 7:21). This partial attention to agriculture was in some degree a preparation for the condition of cultivators, into which they were destined eventually to pass. While the Israelites remained in a state of subjection in Egypt, the maintenance of their condition as shepherds was highly instrumental in keeping them distinct and separate from the Egyptians, who were agriculturists, and had a strong dislike to pastoral habits (^{<0463>}Genesis 46:34). But when they became an independent and sovereign people, their

separation from other nations was to be promoted by inducing them to devote their chief attention to the culture of the soil. A large number of the institutions given to them had this object of separation in view. Among these, those relating to agriculture-forming the agrarian law of the Hebrew people were of the first importance. They might not alone have been sufficient to secure the end in view, but no others could have been effectual without them; for, without such attention to agriculture as would render them a self-subsisting people, a greater degree of intercourse with the neighboring and idolatrous nations must have been maintained than was consistent with the primary object of the Mosaic institutions. The commonest observation suffices to show how much less than others agricultural communities are open to external influences, and how much less disposed to cultivate intercourse with strangers. *SEE HUSBANDRY.*

It was, doubtless, in subservience to this object, and to facilitate the change, that the Israelites were put in possession of a country already in a high state of cultivation (^(4R61)Deuteronomy 6:11), and it was in order to retain them in this condition, to give them a vital interest in it, and to make it a source of happiness to them, that a very peculiar agrarian law was given to them. In stating this law, and in declaring it to have been in the highest degree wise and salutary, regard must be had to its peculiar object with reference to the segregation of the Hebrew people; for there are points in which this and other Mosaic laws were unsuited to general use, some by the very circumstances which adapted them so admirably to their special object. When the Israelites were numbered just before their entrance into the land of Canaan, and were found (exclusive of the Levites) to exceed 600,000 men, the Lord said to Moses, "Unto these the land shall be divided for an inheritance, according to the number of names. To many thou shalt give the more inheritance, and to the few thou shalt give the less inheritance; to everyone shall his inheritance be given according to those that were numbered of him. Notwithstanding the land shall be divided by lot: according to the names of the tribes of their fathers shall they inherit" (^(4R73)Numbers 26:33-54). This equal distribution of the soil was the basis of the agrarian law. By it provision was made for the support of 600,000 yeomen, with (according to different calculations) from sixteen to twenty-five acres of land to each. This land they held independent of all temporal superiors, by direct tenure from Jehovah their sovereign, by whose power they were to acquire the territory, and under whose protection they were to enjoy and retain it. "The land shall not be sold forever, for the land is

mine, saith the Lord: ye are strangers and sojourners with me" (^(~~RE23~~)Leviticus 25:23). Thus the basis of the constitution was an equal agrarian law. But this law was guarded by other provisions equally wise and salutary. The accumulation of debt was prevented, first, by prohibiting every Hebrew from accepting interest from any of his fellow-citizens (^(~~RE25~~)Leviticus 25:35, 36); next, by establishing a regular discharge of debts every seventh year; and, finally, by ordering that no lands could be alienated forever, but must, on each year of Jubilee, or every seventh Sabbatic year, revert to the families which originally possessed them. Thus, without absolutely depriving individuals of all temporary dominion over their landed property, it re-established, every fiftieth year, that original and equal distribution of it which was the foundation of the national polity; and as the period of this reversion was fixed and regular, all parties had due notice of the terms on which they negotiated, so that there was no ground for public commotion or private complaint. *SEE JUBILEE.*

This law, by which landed property was released in the year of Jubilee from all existing obligations, did not extend to houses in towns, which, if not redeemed within one year after being sold, were alienated forever (^(~~RE29~~)Leviticus 15:29, 30). This must have given to property in the country a decided advantage over property in cities, and must have greatly contributed to the essential object of all these regulations, by affording an inducement to every Hebrew to reside on and cultivate his land. Further, the original distribution of the land was to the several tribes according to their families, so that each tribe was, so to speak, settled in the same county, and each family in the same barony or hundred. Nor was the estate of any family in one tribe permitted to pass into another, even by the marriage of an heiress (Numbers 27); so that not only was the original balance of property preserved, but the closest and dearest connections of affinity attached to each other the inhabitants of every vicinage. *SEE INHERITANCE.*

It often happens that laws in appearance similar have in view entirely different objects. In Europe the entailment of estates in the direct line is designed to encourage the formation of large properties. In Israel the effect was entirely different, as the entail extended to all the small estates into which the land was originally divided, so that they could not legally be united to form a large property, and then entailed upon the descendants of him by whom the property was formed. This division of the land in small estates among the people, who were to retain them in perpetuity, was

eminently suited to the leading objects of the Hebrew institutions. It is allowed on all hands that such a condition of landed property is in the highest degree favorable to high cultivation and to increase of population, while it is less favorable to pasturage. The first two were objects which the law had in view, and it did not intend to afford undue encouragement to the pastoral life, while the large pastures of the adjacent deserts and of the commons secured the country against such a scarcity of cattle as the division of the land into small heritages has already produced in France.

For this land a kind of quit-rent was payable to the sovereign Proprietor, in the form of a tenth or tithe of the produce, which was assigned to the priesthood. *SEE TITHES*. The condition of military service was also attached to the land, as it appears that every freeholder (⁽⁻⁰⁸¹⁵⁾Deuteronomy 20:5) was obliged to attend at the general muster of the national army, and to serve in it, at his own expense (often more than repaid by the plunder), as long as the occasion required. In this direction, therefore, the agrarian law operated in securing a body of 600,000 men, inured to labor and industry, always assumed to be ready, as they were bound, to come forward at their country's call. This great body of national yeomanry, every one of whom had an important stake in the national independence, was officered by its own hereditary chiefs, heads of tribes and families (comp. Exodus 18 and ⁽⁻⁰⁸¹⁴⁾Numbers 31:14), and must have presented an insuperable obstacle to treacherous ambition and political intrigue, and to every attempt to overthrow the Hebrew commonwealth and establish despotic power. Nor were these institutions less wisely adapted to secure the state against foreign violence, and at the same time prevent offensive wars and remote conquests. For while this vast body of hardy yeomanry were always ready to defend their country, when assailed by foreign foes, yet, as they were constantly employed in agriculture, attached to domestic life, and enjoyed at home the society of the numerous relatives who peopled their neighborhood, war must have been in a high degree alien to their tastes and habits. Religion also took part in preventing them from being captivated by the splendor of military glory. On returning from battle, even if victorious, in order to bring them back to more peaceful feelings after the rage of war, the law required them to consider themselves as polluted by the slaughter, and unworthy of appearing in the camp of Jehovah until they had employed an entire day in the rites of purification (⁽⁻⁰⁸¹³⁾Numbers 19:13-16; 31:19). Besides, the force was entirely infantry; the law forbidding even the kings to multiply horses in their train

(¹⁵⁷⁶Deuteronomy 17:16); and this, with the ordinance requiring the attendance of all the males three times every year at Jerusalem, proved the intention of the legislator to confine the natives within the limits of the Promised Land, and rendered long and distant wars and conquests impossible without the virtual renunciation of that religion which was incorporated with their whole civil polity, and which was, in fact, the charter by which they held their property and enjoyed all their rights (Graves, *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, lect. 4; Lowman, *Civil Gov. of the Heb.* chapters 3, 4, Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, 1:240 sq.).

Landelin And Landoald

two saints of the Roman Catholic Church, are said to have flourished as preachers of the Gospel in Belgium in the 7th century. We have no trustworthy information as to their lives and proceedings. Among the aids which St. Amandus procured from Rome in 651 to help him in his missionary labors is mentioned the presbyter Landoald, probably an Anglo-Saxon. According to the history of Landoald, written in the 10th century by abbot Heriger von Lobbes, Landoald was especially supported in his missions by king Childeric II, who furnished him with all the necessary means. He is also said to have had Lambert of Maestricht for a pupil, and to have been nine years bishop as successor of St. Amandus. This latter assertion, however, is contradicted by the fact that Remaclus was the successor of Amandus; and it appears also a matter of doubt whether Lambert of Maestricht was indeed a pupil of Landoald.

Concerning Landelin, the Bollandists give, under date of June 15, an old biography, according to which he had been a pupil of Andebart, bishop of Cambay and Arras, had fled from his tutor, and supported himself for a while by highway robbery. The sudden death of one of his band, and a dream, in which he saw his former companion carried to hell by the devil, caused his conversion, and he subjected himself to strict penance in a convent, and made a pilgrimage to Rome. Subsequently consecrated deacon and presbyter, he made two more journeys to Rome, the last time accompanied by his pupils Adelenus and Domitianus. He is said to have founded the two convents of Lobbes and Crepin. According to the same account, Landelin died in 686, continuing his penances to the last. — Dorle, *Landelin, Apostel d. Deutschen* (Augsb. 1838); Wetzler und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:335; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:187. (J.N.P.)

Land-mark

([I WbG] *gebul'*, or [hI WbG] *gebulah'*, usually rendered "border" or "coast"), a *boundary-line* as indicated by a stake, stone, or other monument (^{<694>}Deuteronomy 19:14; 27:17; ^{<128>}Proverbs 22:28; 23:10; ^{<842>}Job 24:2). It was the manifest intention of Jehovah, in bringing the Hebrews into Canaan, to make them a nation of agriculturists. For this purpose the land was divided by lot and measurement among the tribes, families, and individuals of the nation. Thus every citizen had allotted to him a piece of ground, which he was to cultivate and leave to his descendants. The importance of preserving accurately the boundaries of individual or family possessions is very obvious, and, to prevent mistakes and litigation, the fields were marked off by stones set up on the limits, which could not be removed withr out incurring the wrath of heaven. The custom had doubtless prevailed long before (^{<842>}Job 24:2), it was thus confirmed by express statute (^{<694>}Deuteronomy 19:14 27:17), and it appears to have been strictly perpetuated in later times (^{<128>}Proverbs 22:28; 23:10). Similar precautions were in use among the Romans, who had images or posts, called *Herma* or *termini*, set up on the line between different owners, which were under the patronage of a deity especially designated for that care (see Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* s.v. Terminus). Landmarks were used in Greece even before the age of Homer (*Iliad*, 21:405); and they are still used in Persia, and in various parts of the East. Even to this day fields in the East have no fences or hedges, but a ridge, a stone, or a post occasionally marks the boundary; consequently, it is not very difficult to encroach on the property of another (see Hackett, *Illustra. of Script.* page 167). **SEE HEDGE.**

Lando Or Landon

a Roman pontiff, was a native of Sabina, but the date of his birth is not known. Indeed, but little is accessible as to his personal history until he came to the pontifical chair in 913. He held the pontificate only about six months, for he died about April 27, 914. See Bower, *History of the Popes*, 5:89 sq.

Landoald

SEE LANDELIN.

Landon, Whittington, D.D.,

a clergyman of the Church of England, was for some time provost of Worcester College, Oxford. In 1813 he was appointed dean of Exeter, and in 1821 prebendary of Salisbury. He died in 1839. Some of his sermons were published in London (1812, 8vo, and in 1835, 8vo). — Allibone, *Dictionary of English and American Authors*, 2:1053.

Landsborough, David, D.D.,

a Scotch Presbyterian minister, was born at Dalvy, Galloway, Scotland, in 1782. He was pastor of the parish of Stevenson from 1811 to 1843, and of a Free-Church congregation at Saltcoats from 1843 until his death in 1854. Mr. Landsborough was very eminent as a naturalist, and wrote several treatises on botany and zoology. He also contributed frequently to Dr. Harvey's *Psychologia Britannica*, and published papers in the *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*. — Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, 2:1056.

Landsperger, Johann,

a Carthusian monk, who obtained distinction by his voluminous ascetic writings, was born in Landsperg, Bavaria, in the latter part of the 15th century; studied in Cologne, was made prior of his order near Julich, and died about 1534. On account of his marked and severe piety, he was called *the Just*. Among his works, which were published in many editions at Cologne, are, *Sermones capitulares in praecipuis anni festivitatis*: — *Vita Servatoris N.I.X.*: — *Paraphrases in dominicales Epistolas et Evangelia*: — *Alloquia Jesu Christi ad fidelem adniam*: — *Enchiridion vitae spiritualis ad perfectionem*: — *Pharetra divini amoris*. Landsperger was the first to publish the *Revelations of the Holy Gertrude*. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:342.

Landulph

SEE PATARIANS.

Lane

(*ῥόμη*, so rendered in ^{<210>}Luke 14:21; elsewhere "street"), a narrow passage or *alley* in a city, in distinction from a principal thoroughfare (*πλατεῖα*). *SEE STREET.*

Lane, George

a Methodist minister of considerable note, was born in the State of New York April 13, 1784. He was admitted to the Philadelphia Conference in 1805, and located in 1810; was readmitted in 1819, and again located in 1825; but was readmitted once more in 1834. In 1836 he was elected assistant agent of the Methodist Book-Concern at New York. In this capacity first, and later in that of principal agent, he served until 1852, when he retired from all active duties in the Church. He died May 6, 1859. Under his prudent management, the publishing house, then at 200 Mulberry Street, assumed almost gigantic proportions, his industrious and economical business habits having gained him the confidence both of the Church and of the general public. For about twelve years he was also treasurer of the Missionary Society of the M.E. Church. By his energy and business tact this society was relieved of a debt of about sixty thousand dollars, which had long crippled its powers of usefulness. Such was his earnestness in the missionary cause that he was frequently entitled the "father of the Missionary Society." "As a preacher, Mr. Lane was thoroughly orthodox, systematic, and earnest, and often overwhelmingly eloquent; his language unstudied, but chaste, correct, simple, and forcible." — Peck. *Early Methodism*, page 492 sq.; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 7.

Lane, John

an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Virginia about 1789. His early life was spent in Georgia, and he was some time a student of Franklin College. In 1814 he entered the South Carolina Conference; in 1815 was sent to the "Natchez Circuit," and was thrown much in contact with the Creek and Cherokee Indians, where his heroism and success were alike conspicuous; in 1816 he assisted in organizing the Mississippi Conference, then a vast and almost trackless region, now constituting four Conferences and part of a fifth. In 1820 he was delegate to the General Conference at Baltimore, and presiding elder on the Mississippi District. During this year his father-in-law, Reverend Newit Vick, died, and Mr. Lane was obliged to locate, to care for his large estate and numerous family. He remained located for eleven years, during which he successfully founded the city of Vicksburg on his father-in-law's estate, and so saved it, and educated the orphan children. He was also an extensive merchant, probate judge of the county, and director of the

Railroad Bank, and one of the most competent and influential business men of the state, while at the same time he preached continually, and filled Vicksburg station one year. In 1831 he re-entered the Conference, and spent most of his subsequent career in the presiding eldership. For many years he was president of the Board of Trustees of Centenary College, and was still longer president of the Conference Missionary Society. He died in 1855. He was a man of large capacities and indomitable vigor. His piety was genial and earnest, and his great delight was in preaching the Word of Life. He will long be remembered as one of the founders of Methodism in the South-west. — *Summer Biog. Sketches*, page 229, Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 7. (G.L.T.)

Laney, Benjamin, D.D.,

a prelate of the Church of England, was bishop of Peterborough from 1650 to 1663; was then transferred to Lincoln, where he remained until 1667, when he was transferred to the bishopric of Ely. He died about 1675. Some of his sermons were published in 1662 and 1675. He was considered a very learned divine, and of great acumen. — Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 2:1056.

Lanfranc

the most noted foreign churchman who rose to distinction in the English Church of the Middle Ages, was born of a senatorial family in Pavia, Italy, about 1005; studied law in Bologna, but not without attention to other subjects; returned to Pavia, where he taught jurisprudence, and also the liberal arts, with great success. He soon gave his attention exclusively to the latter, the *liberales discipline*, and especially to dialectics, and, leaving his own country, he traveled over a large part of France, until, induced perhaps by the fame of William, duke of Normandy, he settled in Avranches with some of his old pupils. He there won great distinction as a teacher, but in 1042, having determined upon a more private and contemplative life, he betook himself to Rouen, where, in fulfillment of such a purpose, according to his biographer Crispinus, he proposed to reside. On his way thither he was fallen upon by robbers, bound to a tree, and there, stricken in conscience for what he deemed a too selfish fear, and for his unfitness to find consoling communion with God in the hour of peril, he made a vow, should he escape with his life, to enter a monastery. Delivered from the hands of the robbers by some passing travelers, he entered the cloister of Bec, of the Benedictine Order. After three years of

quiet, he began again, at the instance of Herluin, the abbot of Bec, to give instruction, and Bec became the resort of students from every class, both clergy and laity, and from many lands. Made prior of the monastery in 1046, he established a more extensive and systematic course of study, sacred as well as secular, unusual attention being given to grammar and dialectics. In respect to the former, Lanfranc's influence contributed greatly to revive the general study of Latin, and in dialectics he is a forerunner of the schoolmen. Exegesis, and patristic, but especially speculative theology, were pursued. Anselm was among his pupils at Bec, and also the future pope Alexander II. During this period, about 1049, occurred Lanfranc's first dispute with his former friend Berengar, then archdeacon at Angers, on the subject of the Lord's Supper. The latter, while defending the opinions of Scotus Erigena, sought in a letter to persuade Lanfranc; but the letter, falling into the hands of others, gave rise to such charges of heretical fellowship against Lanfranc that he was provoked, in defending himself at Rome and Vercelli in 1050, to a violent attack upon Berengar. The learning which he displayed in this controversy greatly increased Lanfranc's fame for scholarship, and he was now invited to the position of abbot in various cloisters, and was treated with special favor by William of Normandy. It is related that, on occasion of some false charges, the duke fell out with him, and banished him from his dominions. A lame horse was given him for the journey, and, seated on it, he happened to meet the duke, who could not help noticing the laughable hobbling of the animal, when Lanfranc took occasion to say to him, "You must give me a better horse if you wish me out of the country, for with this one I shall never get over the border," The jest won the duke's attention, and an explanation followed, which established Lanfranc in a position of permanent favor. He was employed by William in 1060 to secure from the pope Nicholas II liberty to marry a near relative, a princess of Flanders. This allowance was obtained on the condition that William should found two cloisters, one for monks and another for nuns. Over the monastery of St. Stephen, at Caen, which was thereupon established, Lanfranc was installed in 1063 as abbot, Anselm succeeding him in that capacity at Bee. The dispute with Berengar meanwhile continued. The latter, though constrained at Rome in 1059, through fear, to recognize the doctrine of Paschasius Radbertus, nevertheless afterwards sought to spread his former sentiments, and was bitterly opposed by Lanfranc in his work, *De corpore et sanguine Dom. Jesu Christi, adv. Berengar Turonensem*, published between the years 1064 and 1069. In this work the doctrine of transubstantiation is clearly

contained. Berengar issued a reply, *De sacra caena adv. Lanfrancum* (an edition of which was published by Vischer in Berlin in 1834). The ability with which this controversy was conducted on both sides has been confessed. Severe personal charges are mingled with argument, and, whatever fault may have been established against Berengar, his opponent was not without blame nor without prejudice in dealing with patristic authorities. While at Caen, Lanfranc steadfastly refused the archbishopric of Rouen, but, upon the advice of his old abbot Herluin, he accepted in 1070, with much reluctance, the archbishopric of Canterbury, which was urged upon him by William of Normandy, at this time on the throne of England. His task in the archbishopric was by no means light, inasmuch as he was obliged not only to control and amend the rudeness and ignorance of his own clergy, but to defend also the authority of his primacy against the other prelates, especially Thomas of York and Odo of Bayeux and Kent. The self-will of the king also gave him much trouble and he was frequently tempted to retrace his steps to the cloister, but was urged by pope Alexander II to continue his public labors. The violent disposition of William Rufus, who ascended the throne in 1087, was a further annoyance. Notwithstanding all these difficulties, he labored perseveringly in the erection of churches and cloisters, in multiplying correct copies of the fathers and of the holy Scriptures, in the extension of learning and improvement of manners in clergy and people, and in care for the sick and the poor. "Under his spiritual rule," says a noted Church historian, "the Church of England received as strong an infusion of the Norman element as was forced upon the political system of England by the iron hand of the Conqueror." His active and prudent influence was also often employed in state affairs.

Lanfranc's relation, while archbishop of Canterbury, to the papal chair forms an important feature of his life. He was on a friendly footing with Alexander II, his former pupil, and went to receive at his hands the pallium of his office, though he had at first desired, in accordance with the king's wishes, that it should be sent to him to England. Gregory VII, greatly displeased with William's independent conduct, and his inclination to restrain the bishops from visiting Rome, sharply complained to Lanfranc that he had also lost his former spirit of obedience to papal authority. Lanfranc protested his continued affection for the Church, and declared that he had sought to win the king to conformity in certain particulars (as specially in the matter of Peter's pence), but said little concerning his

general relation to the king, or that of the latter to the pope. He seems to have known that a certain degree of consideration, more than he liked definitely to express, must be allowed to the royal wishes. The pope's command to Lanfranc to appear in Rome within four months under threat of suspension he openly and without answer disobeyed. A letter of Lanfranc to an unknown correspondent (*Ep.* 59), who sought to gain his adhesion to the rival pope, Clement II, places him in a neutral position as between the two popes, and as awaiting, with the government of England, further light on the subject. Something of Lanfranc's coldness towards Gregory may perhaps be explained by the fact that he saw in this pope (as is apparent in a letter cited by Gieseler) a protector of his enemy Berengar. Lanfranc died May 28, 1089, two years after the death of William the Conqueror.

Besides his work against Berengar may be mentioned his *Decreta pro ordine Sancti Benedicti*: — *Epistolarum Liber*, containing 60 letters, 44 written by him and 16 addressed to him: — *De celandia confessione*, a fragment of an address in defense of his primatical authority; and *Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles*. His biography of William the Conqueror has been lost. The first complete edition of Lanfranc's writings was published by D'Achery, a Benedictine (Paris, 1648, fol.); the earliest edition is entitled *B. Laenfranci Opera* (Paris, 1568, fol.); the latest edition is by Giles (Ox. 1844-45, 2 volumes, 8vo).

See Milo Crispinus, *Vita B. Lanfranci*; Cadmer, *Vita Anselmi*; *Chronicon Biccense*; Malmesbury, *Gesta Anglorum*, book 3; *Acta Sanctorum*, Maii, tom. 6; Mohler, *Gesamelte Schriften*, volume 1; Hasse, *Anselm*, volume 1; Sudendorf, *Berengarius Turonensis* (Hamburg and Gotha, 1850); Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 2:10-2; Churton, *Early English Church*, pages 266, 291 sq., 302; Palmer, *Ch. Hist.* page 106 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 3:438-440; Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, volume 2 (1861); Hill, *Monasticism in England*, page 337 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

Lang, Georg Heinrich

a distinguished German theologian, was born November 28, 1740, at Oettingen. He received a scientific education in his native town, and pursued theology at the University of Jena. In 1765 he assumed a pastorate at Bühl, and in 1770 accepted a call to Hohen-und-Nieder-Altheim. From 1774 to 1779 he filled the position of superintendent and pastor at

Trochtelsingen, and in the latter year returned to his late pastorate. In 1789 he became court preacher and ecclesiastical counselor to the reigning princess at Ratisbon. He died March 15, 1806. Lang exerted no little influence in the progress and culture of religious learning. His Dictionary of the N.T. (*Worterbuch des neuen Testaments*), which appeared in 1778, placed him in the front rank of writers on the theory and history of the Christian religion. His intense zeal for the practical in later life directed his literary activity to the popular treatment of religious truth; hence appeared *Katechetisches Magazin*; *Neues Magazin*; *Ascetische Bibliothek*, and numerous sermons and liturgical writings. In his homiletical writings he developed many new and happy ideas, peculiarly adapted to the exigencies of the times. Many estimable traits of character both adorned his private life and enhanced his merits as a teacher of religious truth. For a list of his works, see Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, 2:229.

Lang, Joseph

a German Jesuit, was born in 1746 at Brünn, in Bohemia, and was educated at his native city. The Jesuits then sent him to Olmütz to pursue philosophy, and finally to the University of Prague, where he completed a course of theology. He was ordained in 1773. In 1780 he accepted a call to a Catholic Church in Leipzig, and in 1783 was chosen court preacher at Dresden. In 1802 he received the office of superintendent of the Catholic infirmary at the latter place. He died December 28, 1806. Lang acquired the reputation of a popular and eloquent pulpit orator. Besides frequent contributions to journals, he published several sermons. See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, 2:233.

Lang, Lorenz Johann Jakob

a German theologian, born in Selb, in the principality of Baireuth, on May 10, 1731, was the son of a stocking-maker, and being destined by his father to follow the same trade, he contended in his desire for study, which he early manifested, with many difficulties. By the assistance of his pastor, however, he acquired a thorough knowledge of the Latin and Greek, and entered in 1743 the lyceum at Culmbach. Indefatigable in his industry, he became thoroughly versed in philosophy and theology, as is evinced in the disputations *De praestantia philosophiae Wolfianae*, and *De pontifice coelesti Novi Testamenti*, after the defense of which he entered the University of Erlangen in 1751. After quitting Erlangen, he went to

Baireuth in 1756 as tutor. A few months later he became subrector in Baireuth. In 1758 he was appointed professor of the Oriental languages and of the fine arts at the Gymnasium of Baireuth. In 1767 he was appointed court librarian, and in 1789 the first professor and inspector of the alumni, and in 1795 the first counsellor. He died September 18, 1801. Lang wrote extensively, but most of his writings are in the form of dissertations. A complete list is given by Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 1, s.v

Lang (Of Wellenburg), Matthdus,

a noted German prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, an acknowledged natural brother of the emperor Maximilian I, was born in Augsburg in 1469, and educated at the University of Ingolstadt. He was secretary first to Frederick III and later to Maximilian I. At the same time he held positions in the Church. He was successively priest at Augsburg and Constance until 1505, when he was appointed bishop of Gurk. Inclined towards the schismatics of the Council of Pisa, and feared on account of his influence over the emperor, who was following the lead of Lang, the youthful bishop received the cardinal's hat from pope Julius II in 1511. Of course the conferred honor made the trusted adviser of Maximilian an obedient servant of the pontiff. Lang rested not until peace was restored between emperor and pope, so long at variance. *SEE LATERAN, COUNCIL OF, 1513; SEE PISA, COUNCIL OF; SEE JULIUS II.* In 1514 he was made coadjutor of the archbishop of Salzburg, and in 1519 sole incumbent of that archiepiscopal see. In 1518 he attended the diet at Augsburg, and was active both for the election of Charles V as king of Rome, and the submission of Luther. First inclined to liberal action towards those who clamored for reform, threatening to quit the Church unless their wishes were heeded, he changed front suddenly after he had gained over Johann Staupitz (q.v.); crushed the revolutionary movements of the Salzburger in 1523; in the year following joined the Romish *League* (q.v.) ; and in 1525, assisted by Bavaria, suppressed the peasant insurrections. At the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 he openly declared himself a bitter opponent of Luther. He died in March 1540. A narrative of cardinal Lang's travels in Austria, Hungary, and the Tyrol was published by his chaplain Bartholinus, under the title *Odeporicon de Matthaeei cardinalis* (Vienna, 1511, 4to). This work is now very rare (comp. Gotz, *Dresdener Bibliothek*, 3:37). Vehse (*Memoirs of the Court, Aristocracy and Diplomacy of Austria* [transl. by Demmler, Lond. 1856, 2 volumes, sm. 8vo], 1:31) thus

comments on his character: "Lang was an exceedingly eloquent and adroit man, yet he was just as famous for his elasticity of conscience as for cleverness. He surpassed in splendor all the cardinals and archbishops of his time, and in this respect certainly did not belie his Caesarean descent." See also Hansitz, *Germanian Sacra*, volume 2; Dücker, *Chronik V. Salzburg*; Braun, *Gesch. d. B. B. V. Augsburg*, volume 3; Veith, *Bibliotheca Augustana*, Alphabet 5, pages 25-116; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:348. **SEE MAXIMILIAN.** (J.H.W.)

Langbaine, Gerard, D.D.,

an English divine and philologist, was born at Bartonkirke, in Westmoreland, about 1608. He studied at Blencow, Cumberland, then became successively a servitor, scholar, and fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and held the places of keeper of archives to the university and provost of his college for a good many years before his death, which happened in 1658. He was a studious and timid man, who contrived to steer through the political storms of his time without giving serious offense to any party. He edited Longinus, and published several works of his own, chiefly on Church questions. The most important of them are, *Episcopal Inheritance*, etc. (Oxford, 1641, 4to): — *A Review of the Covenant* (Oxford, 1644; Lond. 1661, 4to): — *Quaestiones pro more solemnibus in Vesperis propositae ann.* 1651 (Oxf. 1658, 4to). He also worked on Usher's *Chronologia Sacra*, transl. from the French into English an account of the Council of Trent (Oxford, 1638, fol.), and is considered the author of *A View of the New Directory, and a Vindication of the ancient Liturgy of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1645, 4to). He left also some unprinted collections, including several catalogues of MSS., which have often been referred to by Warton and others. See Wood, *A thence Oxon.* vol. 2; Chauffepie, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique; English Cyclopaedia*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog.* ¹⁷⁹⁸Genesis 29:384. (J.N.P.)

Langdon, Samuel, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born in 1722 in Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1740, and was ordained colleague pastor in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, February 4, 1747. In 1774 he was elected president of Harvard College, which position he resigned August 30, 1780, and was ordained, January 18, 1781, pastor at Hampton Falls. He died in the last-named place November 29, 1797. Langdon published *An impartial*

Examination of Mr. Robert Sandeman's Letters on Theron and Aspasio (1765): — *A Summary of Christian Faith and Practice, drawn up principally in Scripture language* (1768): — *Dudleian Lecture in Harvard College* (1775): — *Observations on the Revelations of Jesus Christ to St. John* (1791,8vo): — *Corrections of some grand Mistakes committed by Reverend John Cozens Ogden* (1792): — *Remarks on the leading Sentiments of Reverend Dr. Hopkins's System of Doctrines in a Letter to a Friend* (1794); and several occasional sermons. He also published, in company with Colossians J. Blanchard, a map of New Hampshire (1761). — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:455.

Lange, Joachim

a noted German Lutheran theologian, one of the heads of the so-called Pietistic school, was born at Gardelegen, in Saxony, October 26, 1670. He entered the University of Leipzig in 1689 to study theology. Here he became intimate with H. A. Franke, and, besides other subjects, applied himself especially to the study of the Eastern languages. In 1690 he accompanied Franke to Erfurt, and in 1691 to Halle. In 1696 he was made corector of Koslin, rector of the Gymnasium of Friedrichswerder, at Berlin, in 1697, and finally professor of theology at Halle, May 7, 1744. His controversies against the philosopher Christian Wolff, in whose banishment from Halle he was greatly instrumental, and against all philosophical systems, whether atheistical, Jewish, or Mohammedan, prove him to have been fond of controversy, more learned than profound, and greatly wanting in method. The part he played in the Pietistic controversies was not very brilliant. It is not certain, but appears probable, that he was the author of the *Orthodoxia vapulans* (1701) against the theologians of Wittenberg (see G. Walch, *Lehrstreitt. innerhalb d. evang. luth. Kirche*, 1:844 sq.). His *Antibarbarus orthodoxiae* (1709-11), written in answer to Schelwig's *Synopsis Controversiarum sub pietatis praetextu motarum*, is a good specimen of his system, which generally attached itself to particular points of a subject instead of the whole. G. Walch (see above) gives an extensive list of his other works on this topic. His controversy with Christian Wolff, the distinguished pupil of Leibnitz, is the most important. The school of the latter had produced the Bible of Wertheim, which Lange attacked in his *Der philos. Religionsspotter im ersten Theile d. Werthheinishen Bibelwerkes verkappt* (1735; 2d edit. 1736). In that work he advanced his favorite theory, which he further developed in his later writings against Wolff and others, that their philosophical system was purely mechanical.

This was followed by his *Darstellung d. Grundsätze d. Wolffischen Philosophie* (Lpz. 1736, 4to), and the 150 *Fragen aus der neuen mechanischen Philosophie* (Halle, 1734). He had already given some inklings of his views of this system in his *Causa Dei adversus Atheismum et Pseudophilosophiam, praesertim Stoicam, Spinoz. ad Wolfianam* (2d ed. Halle, 1727, 8vo) (see H. Wuttke, *Christian Wolff's eigene Lebensbeschreibung*, Lpz. 1841, Preface). Some of Lange's exegetical works are yet in use; such are *Covem. hist. herm. de vita et epistolis Patuli* (Halle, 1718, 4to): — *Mosaïches Licht u. Recht* (Halle, 1732, fol.), a sort of commentary on all the books of the O.T. Also commentaries on various other books of Scripture, published at different times, and collectively under title *Biblia parenthesis* (Leipzig, 1743, 2 volumes, fol.). Also *Exegesis epp. Petri* (Halle, 1712): — *Joannis* (1713, 4to). Among his historical works we notice *Gestalt d. Kreuzreichs Christi in seiner Unschuld.* (Halle, 1713, 8vo): — *Erläuterung d. neuesten Historie d. evang. Kirche 5:1689 bis 1719* (Halle, 1719, 8vo). Among his doctrinal works the most important is his (*Economia salutis evangelicae* (2d edition, Halle, 1730, 8vo; German translation 1738, often reprinted), against predestination; which met with great success. Finally he published also a Latin Grammar, which was for a long time very popular, and went through a great many editions; and an *Autobiographie*, to which is appended a list of his works (Halle and Lpz. 1744). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:194; Diring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, 2:251 sq.; Rotermund, *Gelehrten Lexikon*, s.v.; Dorner, *Doctrine and Person of Christ*, II, 2:369, 376. (J.H.W.)

Lange, Johann Michael

a German Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Etzelwangen, near Sulzbach, March 9, 1664. He became successively pastor of Hohenstrauss, Halle, Altdorf, and Prenzlau, where he died January 10, 1731. He wrote fifty-six different works (see the list in Rotermund, *Lex.* 3:1227), of which the principal are *Aphorismi Theologici* (Altdorf, 1687): — *De Fabulis Mohamedicis* (Altdorf, 1697, 4to): — *Exercitatio Philologica de differentia linguae Graecorum veteris et novae seu barbaro-Graecae* (2d edit. Altd. 1702): — *Decas I disputat. theolog. exegeticarum cum positivo polemicarum numero sacro* (Altd. 1703, 4to): — *De Alcorani prima inter Europaeos editione Arabica per Paganinum Brixiensem, sed jussu Pontif. Rome. abolita* (Altdorf 1703): — *De Alcorano Arabico et variis speciminibus atque novissimis successibus*

doctorum quorundam virorum in edendo Alcorano Arabico (Altdorf, 1704) — *De Alcorazni versionibus variis, tam oriental. quam occidental, impressis et ἀνεκδόσεις* (Altdorf, 1705): — *Octo Dissertationes de Versione N.T. barbaro-Graeca* (Altd. 1705): — *Institutiones Pastorales* (Nuremb. 1707): — *Philologia barbaro-Graeca*, etc. (Nuremb. 1707-8, 2 parts, 4to). See Zeltner, *Vitae Theolog.* (Altd.), pages 468-488; Will, *Lexicon*, 2:394-405, Rotermund (*Suppl. z. Jocher*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:391. (J.N.P.)

Langeais, Raoul De,

a French prelate, was born in the beginning of the 11th century. He was brother of Fulchredus, abbot of Charroux. Raoul became successively dean of the Church of Tours and bishop of that diocese in 1072. His election, however, caused great disturbances. His enemies having accused him of incest before Alexander II, the latter deposed and excommunicated him. Raoul immediately set out for Rome, justified himself, and was restored to his bishopric. When Gregory VII succeeded Alexander II the accusation was taken up again, but with like result. Still the whole Church of France was at the time in a state of complete anarchy, and the bishop of Tours was treated with the utmost disrespect by his clergy, and especially by the monks, in spite of the evident favor of the pope. In 1078 he was accused of simony before the Council of Poitiers, and unable, it is said, to clear himself otherwise, he broke up the council by main force (compare Labbe, *Concil.* 10:366; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, page 497). Still Gregory VII merely appointed a committee to inquire into the case. How this committee decided is not known, but all trouble was at an end in 1079, for we then find Gregory writing to Raoul inviting him to recognize Gebuin, archbishop of Lyons, whom he had appointed primate of Gaul, and about the same time Raoul was invited to the Council of Badaux by the legate Amat, who calls him "religionis ecclesiastics caput honorabilius." Shortly afterwards he excommunicated Foulques Rechin, count of Anjou, and Gebuin approved his proceedings; but king Philip, angered at Langeais for siding with Gregory VII on the question of investiture, took the part of the count. Langeais was driven from his see, and excommunicated by the canons of St. Martin; the pope, in return, excommunicated the count of Anjou and all his partisans, while Hughes and Amat, legates of the council of Poitiers, excommunicated the canons of St. Martin. It is difficult to form a correct judgment of these events. It is likely, however, that all the trouble resulted from the fact that Langeais had entered zealously into the plans of

reformation of Gregory VII, and therefore, while praised by this pope and his adherents, became necessarily, as a leader of his party in France, an object of hatred to the opposite faction. Documents show that he was governing his diocese again in 1084 and 1086. The exact time of his death is not ascertained, but he must have died previous to the year 1093. See J. Maan, *Sacr. et Metr. eccl. Turon.*; *Gallia Christ.* volume 14, col. 63; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* ~~<OZB>~~ *Genesis* 29:394 sq.

Langeland (Langland Or Longland), John,

a distinguished prelate of the Church of England, was born at Henley, England, in 1473, and was fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and principal of Magdalen Hall in 1507. In 1520 he became bishop of Lincoln, and confessor to Henry VIII, whom he counseled to divorce queen Catharine. He died in 1547. He published a number of sermons and theological treatises from 1517 to 1540. — Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1057; Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary*, page 1452.

Langham Simon Of,

an English prelate, was born about 1310, probably at Langham, in Rutlandshire. In 1335 he entered the convent of St. Peter, Westminster, of which he became abbot in 1349, and showed great zeal in the reformation of monastic abuses. As a reward for his talents Edward III appointed him lord treasurer in 1360, and chancellor in 1364. In the mean time (1361) he had been appointed bishop of Ely. In 1366 he was transferred to the see of Canterbury. The principal act of his administration was the deposing of the celebrated Wycliffe (whom his predecessor had appointed head of Canterbury Hall, Oxford) on the plea that a secular priest was not suitable for the position. This injustice perhaps first suggested to Wycliffe an inquiry into papal abuses. His proceedings on that occasion gave great offense to Edward III, and when the pope, as a reward, created Langham cardinal of St. Sixtus, the king seized on his temporalities, as, by the law, the see of Canterbury had become vacant by the promotion. Langham now went to join the pope, who loaded him with favors. He continued to take a part in the political affairs of England, vainly trying to reconcile that country to France. During the last years of his life Gregory XI entrusted him with the care of the papal affairs at Avignon, where he died July 22, 1376. His body was taken back to England, and buried at Westminster. See Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*; Moser, *Life of Simmon of Langham*, in the

European Magazine, 1797; Th. Tanner, *Biblioth. Britannica*; Baluze, *Vitae Pap. Aven.* volume 1; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:409 Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index in volume 8); Neander, *Church Hist.* 5:136.

Langhorne, John

a minister of the Church of England, was born in Westmoreland, England, in 1735; obtained a curacy in London in 1764; in 1767 he was appointed to the living of Blagden, Somersetshire, in 1777 became prebendary of Wells, and died in 1779. Langhorne published several works both in prose and poetry; also a volume of his *Sermons, preached before the honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn* (3d ed. Lend. 1773, 2 volumes, small 8vo). "His sermons are short, florid, and superficial." His most famous work was his translation of *Plutarch's Lives*, on which his brother assisted. See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:1765; Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, 2:1057.

Langhorne, William

M.A., an English divine, was born in 1721. He was presented to the rectory of Hakinge, and received the perpetual curacy of Folkestone in 1754. He died in 1772. He assisted his brother, John Langhorne, D.D., in the translation of a popular version of *Plutarch's Lives*, and wrote himself *Sermons on practical Subjects, and the most useful Points of Divinity* (2d edition, Lond. 1778, 2 volumes, 12mo): — Job, a poem; and a paraphrase in verse of a part of *Isaiah*. See Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* (Phila. 1871, 8vo), page 1368.

Lanigan, John, D.D.,

an eminent Irish Roman Catholic priest, was born at Cashel, Ireland, in 1758, and received his scientific and theological education at the Irish College in Rome, where he also took his orders. Soon after he was appointed to the chair of Hebrew, divinity, and the Scriptures in the University of Pavia. In 1796 he was elected to a similar position at Maynooth, Ireland, but declined it, and accepted an appointment in Dublin Castle, in connection with which he assumed in 1799 the duties of editor, librarian, and translator for the Dublin Society. In 1821, becoming insane, he was placed in an asylum at Finglas, near Dublin, where he died, July 7, 1828. Among his works are the following important ones: *Institutionum Biblicarum pars prima* (Paviae, 1794, 8vo): — *Protestant's Apology for*

the Roman Catholic Church (1809, 8vo): — *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland to the 13th Century* (Dublin, 1822, 4 volumes, 8vo; 1829, 4 volumes, 8vo), a work much valued for its extensive learning, deep research, and critical acumen. See *New Amer. Cyclop.* 10:304; *Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors*, 2:1058.

Langle, Jean Maximilian Be,

a French Protestant writer, was born at Evreux in 1590, and was made pastor at Rouen in 1615. He died there in 1674. Besides a dissertation in defense of Charles I of England, he wrote *Les joyes inenarrables et glorieuses de l'ame fidele, representees en quinze Sermons sur le huitieme chap. de l'Epitre de Saint Paul aux Romains* (Saumur, 1669, 8vo); and *Sermons sur divers textes de l'écriture*. — *Hoefler, Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:414.

Langres, Synod Of.

From the acts of the Concilium Tullense of June 859, it appears that another (*Concilium Lingonense*) had a short time before been held at Langres by the bishops of Charles the Young, king of Provence, nephew of Charles the Bald, and son of Lothair I, to whom Langres belonged as part of Burgundy. We find sixteen *canones* adopted at Langres still extant. These were read again in the Synod of Toul (Savonnières), and incorporated in the acts of that synod's session held in the early part of June, 859. The *canones* refer partly to political and canonical points, partly to dogmas. The assembled clergy availed themselves of the opportunity afforded them by the synod to obtain from the princes Charles the Bald, Lothair II, and Charles the Young the convocation of yearly provincial synods, and two yearly general synods (canon 7). An attempt was also made to take the election of bishops out of the hands of the laity, wherever these still retained this right, and to leave it exclusively with the clergy, under the plea that the metropolitan and bishops of the diocese were alone able to judge of the qualifications of candidates (canon 8). Great opposition was also manifested against the independence of convents from the episcopacy, the interest of discipline requiring that such institutions should be visited by the bishops (canon 9). They only maintained the right of the convents to appoint their superiors themselves (canons 9 and 12). Much was also done in regard to the building of churches, the administration of Church property, etc. (canon 13); the establishing of

schools (canon 10), and the restoration of *hospitalit, peregrinorum videlicet, et aliorum pro remedio animarum receptacula* (canon 14). The intervention of the temporal power was invoked against *raptores, adulteri vel rapaces*, which latter were to be also punished by the Church with the full severity of her discipline. But the most important of the decrees adopted by this synod are those which refer to the dogma of predestination. It is in this Synod of Langres that the bishops of Provence appear to have prepared the whole matter, so as to have it ready to be submitted to the Synod of Toul for the three Carolinian kingdoms (Neustria, Lorraine, and Provence). King Charles was himself present, with a view to prevent the proceedings becoming a basis for the decrees of the future Synod of Toul. In the kingdom of Charles the Bald the semi-Pelagian views of Hincmar on that dogma were most generally held, whilst in the ancient provinces of Lothair I the Augustinian views were still officially retained. As the coming Synod of Toul was intended to settle all disputes between the two kingdoms in regard to political and religious questions, the preparatory Synod of Langres had either to recall the Augustinian resolutions of the Synod of Valence, or to alter them in such a manner that they might no longer give offense. They could not agree to do the former, and the six *canones* of Valence were endorsed; but the expressions against the Synod of Kiersy, which offended Hincmar and his followers (*capitula quatuor quae a concilio fratrum nostrorum minus prospere suscepta sunt propter inutilitatem vel etiam noxietatem et errorem contrarium veritati [a pio auditu fidelium penitus explodimus]*) were omitted from the fourth canon. That this was but a half-way and inefficient measure had already been sufficiently established by Hincmar himself in his work on predestination, cap. 30, if the canons of Valence were retained, it should be done openly, and they should be courageously defended, and then the protestation against the four principles of Kiersy could not be considered omitted; but if these were omitted, then it would be consistent to drop the resolutions of the Council of Valence (comp. Hincmari *Opp.* ed. Sirm. 1:231). Its inefficiency was subsequently made evident in the proceedings of the *Concilium Tullense apud Saponarias*. See Mansi. 15:537; Hardouin, 5:481; Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* 4th edit. 2:1,137; Gfrörer, *K.G.* 3:2, 881, Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:196. (J.N.P.)

Langton, Stephen,

one of the greatest prelates of the early English Church, celebrated alike in ecclesiastical and secular history, was born in the earlier half of the 12th

century, according to one account in Lincolnshire, according to another in Devonshire, and was educated at the University of Paris, where he was the fellow-student and associate of Innocent III. Immediately after the completion of his studies he was appointed teacher in the university, and, by successive advances, finally rose to the office of its chancellor. On his visit to Rome about the year 1206, pope Innocent III honored him with the purple by the title of *Cardinal of St. Chrysogonus*; and when, by the rejection for the archbishopric of Canterbury of the claims both of Reginald, the subprior of Christchurch, whom his brother monks, without consultation of the king, had in the first instance appointed to succeed the last archbishop, Hubert, and of John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, whom they had afterwards substituted in deference to the commands of king John, another choice had to be made, Innocent III favored his old school-associate rather than the appointment of John de Gray, and Langton was consequently elected by the English monks who were then at Rome, and was consecrated by Innocent at Viterbo June 27, 1207. John's determined resistance to this nomination gave rise to the contest between him and the pontiff which had such important results. *SEE INNOCENT III; SEE JOHN*, king of England. The consequence, in so far as Langton was concerned, was, that he was kept out of his see for about six years; till at last, after the negotiation concluded by the legate Pandulf, John and the cardinal met at Winchester in July 1213, and the latter was fully acknowledged as archbishop. In the close union, however, that now followed between John and Innocent, Langton, finding his own interests and those of the clergy in general, in so far as they were opposed to those of the king, disregarded by the pope, joined the cause of the English barons, among whom the eminence of his station and the ascendancy of his talents soon gave him a high influence, and 2; whose councils he at once took a prominent part. At the meeting of the heads of the revolters and the king at Runnymede he was present, and it was through his efforts that the charter of Henry I was renewed. Among the subscribing witnesses to the *Magna Charta* his name stands first; and from henceforth we find him devoted to the cause of the national liberties, which he had just joined, without swerving throughout the rest of the contest, a course by which he greatly offended the pope. Indeed, so sincerely devoted to the interests of his native country was Stephen Langton that he hesitated not to act not only in direct opposition to the wishes of his friend the Roman pontiff, but he even refused to comply with his demand to publish the document containing the announcement of excommunication of the barons who had

rebelled against the king, a punishment which Innocent sought to inflict in order to please John, whose warm partisan he had become after 1213. Langton did not waver even when threatened with expulsion from the archiepiscopal see; he was suspended in 1215, but was restored in the year following (in February), and was in his place in 1218 on the accession of Henry III. From this time forward Langton busied himself chiefly with the affairs of the Church, instituted many reforms, caused the translation of Becket's relics into a magnificent shrine of gold, set with precious stones, and introduced into England the mendicant orders. He attended the Lateran Council convened at Rome in 1215. He died July 9, 1228.

Langton is generally considered one of the most illustrious men of the age in which he lived. Both as an ecclesiastic and a writer he has exerted great influence. Unfortunately, however, his writings, which displayed great learning and ability, are hardly accessible. They have hitherto found no editor, nor has any one, as far as we are aware, ever taken the trouble to ascertain how much the commentaries of Langton differ from the works of that class by mediaeval Church writers. A few of his theological tracts have been printed, and lists of all the productions known as his are given by Cave and by Tanner. The principal are, *De Benedictionibus*: — *De Maledictionibus*: — *Summa Theologiae*: — *Summa de diversis*: — *Repetitiones lectionum*: — *Documenta Clericorum*: — *De sacerdotibus Deum nescientibus*: — *De vera Paenitentia*: — *De Similitudinibus*: — *Adam ubi es*; and more particularly his *Commentary* (on a large portion of the O. Test.). Dean Hook (in his *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, volume 2 [1861], chapter 12) gives references to libraries where some of Langton's writings are still preserved; and we may add that the library of Canterbury Cathedral contains his *Morals* on Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Tobit, Esther, Ezra, Maccabees, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the lesser prophets (comp. Todd [H. J.], *Catalogue* [Lond. 1802], page 111 sq.). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Me. Levi*; Tanner, *Biblioth. Britannico-Hibern.*; Oudin, *Comment. de Script. Eccles.* volume 2; Cave, *Script. eccles. Hist. Litterat.* volume 2; Ciaconis, *Vitae Pontific. et Cardin.* volume 2; Godwin, *De Praesulibus Angliae Commentarius*; *English Cyclop.*; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, 6:538 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity* 5:25 sq.; Inett, *Hist. of English Church*, volume 3 (see Index); Churton, *Early Engl. Ch.* page 355; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* (see Index in volume 8); Hume, *Hist. of England*, volume 1, chapter 11; and the authorities already

cited in the articles *SEE INNOCENT III*, and *SEE JOHN*, king of England. (J.H.W.)

Language

([^]/vl ;[Chald. [^]V] [⌘] tongue; ^hpc). An indication of the manner in which man may have been led to the formation of a vocabulary is thought to be given in ^{<0029>}Genesis 2:19. But it is evident from the whole scriptural account of creation that speech was coeval with the formation of our first parents. At a later date the origin of the various languages on the earth (see Van den Honert, *De lingua primaeva*, L.B. 1738) is apparently given in connection with the building of the tower of Babel (comp. Romer, *De linguar. in extruenda turri Babyl. ortu, Viteb.* 1782) and the dispersion of men (Genesis 11); but it is probable that the diversities of human speech have rather resulted from than caused the gradual divergence of mankind from a common center (Diod. Siculus, 1:8; comp. Jerusalem, *Fortges. Betracht.* Brschw. 1773, page 263 sq.; Eichhorn, *Diversitatis linguar. ex tradit. Semit. origines*, Gotting. 1788; Abbt, *Vermisch. Schrift.* 6:96 sq.). *SEE TONGUES, CONFUSION OF*. The later Jews inferred from Genesis 10 that there were generally on earth seventy (nations and) languages (compare Wagenseil, *Sota*, page 699; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* page 754, 1031, 1089: see a list in the Jerusalem Talmud, *Megill.* fol. 71, chapter 2). Individual tongues are only mentioned incidentally in the Bible, as follows: the *Canaan fish* ([^][^hK]trpc] ^{<2398>}Isaiah 19:18), the *Chaldean* (^μΥΔᾶκι [^]ωσλ] ^{<2004>}Daniel 1:4), the *Aramean* (^tymæa} familiar to the Assyrians [^{<2835>}2 Kings 18:26], the *Magians* [^{<2704>}Daniel 2:4], and the *Persian officials* [^{<1507>}Ezra 4:7]), the *Jewish* (^{ty}δᾶy] i.e., Hebrew; ^{<2835>}2 Kings 18:26; ^{<6324>}Nehemiah 13:24; compare ^{<789>}Esther 8:9; Josephus, *Apion*, 2:2), the *Ashdodite* (^{ty}δᾶvᾶi] ^{<6324>}Nehemiah 13:24); in the N.T. the *Hebrew*, i.e., *Syro-Chaldee* (^Ἑβραΐς, ^Ἑβρα στί, ^{<4217>}Acts 22:2, etc.), the *Greek* (^ἡ Ἑλληνικη, ^Ἑλληνιστί, ^{<6300>}John 19:20; ^{<4237>}Acts 21:37; ^{<6011>}Revelation 9:11), the *Latin* (^Ῥωμα στί, ^{<6300>}John 19:20; ^{<4238>}Luke 23:8), and the *Lyconian* (^Λυκαονιστί, ^{<4441>}Acts 14:11). It is remarkable that, in all the intercourse of the Hebrews with foreign nations, mention is very rarely made of an interpreter (^{<0423>}Genesis 42:23); but the passages in ^{<2835>}2 Kings 18:26; ^{<2391>}Isaiah 36:11, prove that the common Jews of the interior at least did not understand the Aramaean dialect. That the Jews of later times, especially the bigoted citizens of Palestine, despised heathen languages, is notorious (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:11, 2); that they made use of the Greek,

however, is evident from the Talmud (*Sota*, 9:14; comp. *Jadaim*, 4:6, where Homer is mentioned), to say nothing of the N.T. — Winer, 2:498. **SEE HELLENIST.** The question as to the common language of Palestine in the time of our Lord and his apostles has been keenly discussed by learned writers with very opposite conclusions. On the one hand, Du Pin (*Dissert.* 2), Mill (*N.T.* page 8), Michaelis (*Introd.* 3), Marsh (*ibid.* notes), Weber (*Untersuch. ub. d. Ev. der Hebraer*, Tüb. 1806), Kuinol (*Comment.* 1:18), Olshausen (*Echtheit der Evang.* Königsberg, 1823, page 21 sq.), and especially De Rossi (*Della lingua propria di Cristo*, Parma, 1772), and Pfannkuche (in Eichhorn's *Allgem. Bibliothek*, 8:365 sq.) contend for the exclusive prevalence of the Aramaean or Syro-Chaldee at the time and in the region in question. On the other hand, Cappell (*Observatt. in N.T.* page 110), Basnage (*Annul.* ad an. 64), Masch (*Von der Grundsprache Matthcei*), Lardner (Supplement to *Credibility*, etc., 1 c. 5), Waleus (*Commentarius*, page 1), and more particularly Vossius (*De Oraculis Sibyll.* Oxon. 1860. page 88 sq.), and Diodati (*De Christo Graece loquente*, Neap. 1767, London, 1843), insist that the Greek *alone* was then and there spoken. Between these extremes Simon (*Hist. Crit. du N.T.* Rotterd. 1689, c. 6, page 56), Fabricy (*Titres primitifs de la Revelation*, Rome, 1773, 1:116), Ernesti (*Neuste theol. Bibliothek*, 1 [1771], 269 sq.), Hug (*Einleit. in d. N.T.* Tub. 1826, 2:30 sq.), Binterim (*De ling. originali N.T. non Latina*, Dusseld. 1820, page 146 sq.), Wiseman (*Horae Syriaae*, Rom. 1828, 1:69 sq.), and the mass of later writers, as Credner (*Einleit. in d. N. Test.* Halle, 1836), Bleek (*id.* Berl. 1862), and (though with more reserve) Roberts (*Language of Palestine*, London, 1859) hold the more reasonable view that *both* languages were concurrently used, the Aramean probably as the vernacular at home and among natives, and the Greek in promiscuous and public circles. For additional literature on this question, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, 4:760; *Biblical Repository*, 1831, page 317 sq., 530 sq.; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, page 18. On the Greek of the N.T., **SEE NEW TESTAMENT.** On the tongues cognate with the Hebrew, **SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.**

Languet de Gergy, Jean Joseph,

a distinguished French prelate, noted for his opposition to the Jansenists, was born at Dijon August 25, 1677. A compatriot and friend of Bossuet. he was influenced to dedicate himself early to the service of the Church. After having filled various minor positions, he became bishop of Soissons

in 1715; later (in 1730) he was promoted to the archbishopric of Sens, where, by his zeal and ultramontane opinions, he brought upon himself several controversies with the Jansenists, and by his extreme course made himself very unpopular. In 1721 the French Academy honored him with membership. He died May 3, 1753. Languet wrote very extensively. A complete list of his works is given by Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:441. The most important of his writings are *Memoire pour l'evêque de Soissons contre les religieuses du Vall de Grace et les benedictines de Saint-Corneille de Compiègne* (Paris, 1726, fol.): — *Opera omnia pro defensione Constitutionis Unigenitus et adversus ab ea atepelantes successive edita; in Latinam linguam conversa a variis doctoribus et ab auctore recognita. et emendata* (Sens, 1752, 2 volumes, folio). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog Generale*, 29:441 sq.

Laniado

(or LANADO), Abraham BEN-ISAAC, an Italian rabbi and commentator, flourished in the latter half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th century. He wrote a work on the mysteries of the Mosaic law, entitled **µhrba ḡm**, *The Shield of Abraham*, which consists of seventeen treatises and discourses on circumcision, marriage, almsgiving, confession of sins, repentance, and mourning for the dead. It was printed in Venice in 1603, and is very highly esteemed by the Jews: — A commentary on the Song of Songs, entitled **āskh twdqn**, *Studs of Silver*, which was edited by Moses Laniado, with the Hebrew text, the Commentary of Rashi, the Chaldee Paraphrase, with a Spanish translation by the editor, printed in Hebrew characters (Venice, 1619). He also wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, and a commentary on Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, which have not as yet been published.

Laniado, Samuel Ben-Abraham,

another Italian rabbi of note, flourished at Aleppo about 1580. He wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled **yl k hdmj**, *Delightful Vessel*, which was first published in Venice in 1594-1595. He explains the Pentateuch according to the Sabbatic Lessons, **SEE HAPIITARAH**, in the Midrashic manner: — A commentary on Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, entitled **rqy yl k**, *Precious Vessel*, which was first published in Venice in 1603, and excerpts of it are printed in Frankfurter's *Rabbinic*

Bible (q.v.). It consists chiefly of extracts from the expositions of Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, etc.: — A commentary on Isaiah, called **z p y l k**, *A Vessel of Pure Gold* (Venice, 1657). It is a very lengthy commentary, and, like the former, is chiefly made up from the expositions of Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, etc. See First, *Biblioft. Hebraica*, 2:222; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 2433; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s.v.

Lanka

the ancient name of the capital of Ceylon, is celebrated in Hindu mythology as the chief city of the giant Rhvana (q.v.), who, by carrying off Sita, the wife of Rama, caused the conquest of Ceylon by the latter personage, who is considered as an incarnation of the god Vishnu.

Lanneau, Bazile E.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Charleston, South Carolina, March 22, 1830, and was educated at Charleston College, where he graduated in 1848. He completed a course of theology at Columbia Seminary, South Carolina, in 1851, and was immediately appointed tutor of Hebrew in the same institution. In 1854 he was ordained and made pastor of a Church at Lake City, Florida; from 1856 to 1858 he was editor of the *Southern Presbyterian*, at Charleston, and then returned to Lake City. In October, 1859, he was elected to the chair of ancient languages in Oakland College, Miss., which position he held until his death, July 12, 1860. Lanneau's linguistic acquirements were very extensive. "He was not only a scholar, but an accurate and well-read divine. His style as a writer was chaste and clear." — Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, page 95.

Lanneau, John Francis

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Charleston, South Carolina, August 14, 1809; was educated at Yale College, class of 1829, and studied theology at the theological seminaries of Princeton, New Jersey, and Columbia, South Carolina. He was ordained in 1833, and labored three years for the cause of foreign missions; then went as a missionary to Jerusalem. In 1846 he returned to America, and was called to Marietta, Ga. In 1855 he became pastor at Salem, Virginia, and in 1861 returned to Marietta, where he died, October 7, 1867. Mr. Lanneau is represented as

an able minister, and always eminently influential and acceptable both as a preacher and a citizen. — Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, page 340.

Lannis, Jacob W.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Baltimore County, Maryland, July 8, 1826; received a collegiate education at Muskingum College, Ohio, and at Jefferson College, Pennsylvania, where he graduated in 1852. He studied theology at Alleghany City Theological Seminary, and afterwards with Dr. Edwards, of Fort Wayne, Indiana. In 1856 he was ordained and installed as pastor of a Church at Waveland, Ind. In 1858 he removed to Nashville, Tennessee, and died there August 9, 1859. Mr. Lannis was very successful in his brief ministry. — Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, page 95.

Lansing, Nicholas,

a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born at Albany in 1748. He studied theology under Dr. Westerlo, of that city, and was licensed to preach by a general meeting of ministers and elders in 1780. Among the Dutch clergymen of the last two generations, this venerable man held a reputation for piety and individuality of character that reminds us of Rowland Hill, James Patterson, of Philadelphia, and a few others of similar mould. Many curious and interesting stories are told of his unique and godly life, and of his holy ministry. He was, while young, captain of a small sailing vessel that ran between Albany and New York, and was converted to Christ while in this calling. Immediately he consecrated himself to the ministry, although his health was so feeble that his physician said he would not live to enter the pulpit. But God spared him to serve in his sanctuary fifty-five years. He preached regularly until the second Sabbath before his death, at the great age of eighty-seven. "He spent much time day and night in his study, fasting much and being much in prayer. He usually spent much of the night, and sometimes the whole night, in praying. His clothing always gave way first upon the knees." His preaching, which was in the Dutch language, was remarkable for its scriptural character, spirituality, and utter fearlessness. Striking anecdotes are told, and many of his peculiar expressions are yet current, illustrative of these features of his ministry. On one occasion, in a meeting of classis, when called upon a second time by the president to make a brief statement of the condition of his Church, the old man rose suddenly and said, "Mr. President, Tappan! Tappan! all Tappan is dead, and I'm dead too." He sat down and said no more until he

was asked to pray, and then poured out his soul in such strains of "power with God" that all who heard him felt that whatever might be the state of his people, he, at least, was not "dead" yet. He observed family worship three times daily during a part of his life. A great revival of religion followed one of his most bold and characteristic sermons in a neighboring place, where people were given up to worldliness and sin. During his last service he sat in the pulpit, as his feebleness obliged him to do frequently in his later years. Like Baxter, he could have said

*"I preached as if I ne'er should preach again,
And as a dying man to dying men."*

Referring to the strain of his ministry among them, he said to his people, 'I have never preached to you 'Do and live,' but 'Live and do.' "That week he was seized with his last illness, during which he was constantly engaged in prayer, and in speaking for Christ to those who were with him. His last end was peace. Mr. Lansing was settled first in the united churches of what are now Greenbush, Linlithgo, and Taghkanic, near Albany, during 1781-4, and afterwards at Tappan and Clarkstown, in Rockland County, N.Y., 1784-1830, and Tappan alone 1830-35. His home and church in the latter place were near the spot on which major Andre was hung in the Revolutionary War. See Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church*, page 134 sq. (W.J.R.T.)

Lantern

Picture for Lantern 1

Picture for Lantern 2

(φανάξ, so called for its *shining*) occurs only in ~~EBIB~~ John 18:3, where the party of men which went out of Jerusalem to apprehend Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane is described as being provided "with lanterns and torches:" it there probably denotes any kind of covered light, in distinction from a simple taper or common house-light, as well as from a flambeau (comp. Athenseus, 15:58; Philosen. *Gloss.*). Lanterns were much employed by the Romans in military operations; two of bronze have been found among the ruins of Herculaneum and Pompeii. They are cylindrical, with translucent horn sides, the lamp within being furnished with an extinguisher (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* page 568). In the article LAMP *SEE LAMP* it has been shown that the Jewish lantern, or, if we may so call it, lamp-frame,

was similar to that now in use among the Orientals. As the streets of Eastern towns are not lighted at night, and never Egyptian monuments offer any trace of the use of a lantern. In this case it seems to be borne by the night-watch, or civic guard, and is shaped like those in common use among ourselves (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 2:72). A similar lantern is at this day used in Persia, and perhaps does not materially differ from those mentioned in Scripture. More common at present in Western Asia is a large folding lantern of waxed cloth strained over rings of wire, with a top and bottom of tinned copper. It is usually about two feet long by nine inches in diameter, and is carried by servants before their masters, who often pay visits to their friends at or after supper-time. In many Eastern towns the municipal law forbids any one to be in the streets after nightfall without a lantern.

Picture for Lantern 3

Picture for Lantern 4

Lantern

Picture for Lantern

in Italian or modern architecture, a small structure on the top of a dome, or in other similar situations, for the purpose of admitting light, promoting ventilation, or for ornament. In Gothic architecture the term is sometimes applied to *louvres* on the roofs of halls, etc., but it usually signifies a tower which has the whole height, or a considerable portion of the interior, open to view from the ground, and is lighted by an upper tier of windows: lantern-towers of this kind are common over the center of cross churches. The same name is also given to the light open erections often placed on the tops of towers; these sometimes have spires rising from them, but in such cases they are less perforated with windows. *Lanternes des Morts* occur only in the church-yards on the Continent, they were simply pillars, with a place for a light on the top similar to small light-houses, and it is not improbable that something of the kind was adopted in the early Roman cemeteries, and so has given origin to some of the Irish round towers, which may well have been used, at least in some instances, for this purpose.

Lanterns, Feast of

is a Chinese festival, observed in the evening of the 15th day of January by every Chinese of respectability, who illuminates, with a great number of wax candles, a large lantern, displaying more or less splendor, according to the circumstances of the owner. Some of them are valued at several thousand dollars, on account of the decorations bestowed on them, and are from twenty to thirty feet in diameter. The Chinese ascribe the rise of this festival to a sad accident which happened in the family of a certain mandarin, whose daughter, as she was walking one evening on the bank of a river, fell in and was drowned. Her father, in order to find her, embarked on board a vessel, carrying with him a great number of lanterns. The whole night was spent in search of her, but to no purpose. However, this ceremony is annually kept up in memory of the mandarin's daughter. In some respects this festival resembles that observed by the ancients in honor of Ceres, when her votaries ran up and down the streets with lighted torches in their hands, in imitation of the hurry and confusion of the goddess when in quest of her daughter Proserpine. Others ascribe the rise of this Chinese festival to an extravagant project of one of their emperors, who shut himself up with his concubines in a magnificent palace, which he illuminated with a great number of splendid lanterns. The Chinese, scandalized at his behavior, demolished his palace, and hung the lanterns all over the city. But, however uncertain its origin, it seems pretty definitely established that the lantern-festival was observed as early as A.D. 700 (comp. Williams, *Middle Kingdom*, 2:82).

One peculiar custom of this feast is the grant of greater license to married women, who on other evenings, by Chinese custom, are obliged to confine themselves to their homes. The goddess called *Mother* (q.v.) is worshipped by them at this time, particularly by married but childless women, "expecting or desiring, as a consequence of such devotional acts to 'Mother,' to have male offspring." See Broughton, *Bibliotheca Hist. Sacra*, 2:4; Doolittle, *Social Life of the Chinese* (New York, 1867, 2 volumes, 12mo), 2:34 sq. (J.H.W.)

Lantfredus Or Lamfridus

a disciple of bishop Ethelnoth of Winchester, flourished in the latter part of the 10th century. He is known only by his life of St. Swithun, which is very interesting, as it affords fine facilities for studying the manners and history

of his time. "His style is very inflated, and it is rendered obscure by the adoption of numerous words formed from the Greek language." The editions of Lantfredus are those of Henry Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, 1 (Lond. 1691, folio), 322: — *Lantfredi epistola proemissa Historiae de Miraculis Swithini, Acta Sanctorum Julii*, 1 (Antwerp, 1719, fol.), 328337: — *Swithuni Vita et Miracula, per Lamfridum Monuchue Winton*. See Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* 2:1767.

Laödicaea

[strictly LAÖDICIA] (**Λαοδίκεια**, *justice of the people*), the name of several cities in Syria and Asia Minor, but one of which, usually called *Laodicea ad Lycuum* (from its proximity to the river Lycus), is named in Scripture. It lay on the confines of Phrygia and Lydia, about forty miles east of Ephesus, and is that one of the "seven churches in Asia" to which John was commissioned to deliver the awful warning contained in ⁴¹⁸⁴Revelation 3:14-19. The fulfillment of this warning is to be sought in the history of the Christian Church which existed in that city, and not in the stone and mortar of the city itself; for it is not the city, but "the Church of the Laodiceans," which is denounced. It is true, however, that the eventual fate of that Church must have been involved in that of the city. (See an account of the synod at Laodicea, in Phrygia, A.D. 350-389, in Von Drey's *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1824, page 3 sq.)

Laodicea was the capital of Greater Phrygia (Strabo, 12, page 576; Pliny, 5:29; or Phrygia Pacatiana, according to the subscription of 1 Timothy), and a very considerable city (Strabo, page 578) at the time it was named in the New Testament; but the violence of earthquakes, to which this district has always been liable, demolished, some ages after, a great part of the city, destroyed many of the inhabitants, and eventually obliged the remainder to abandon the spot altogether. The town was originally called *Diospolis*, and afterwards *Rhoas* (Pliny, 5:29); but Laodicea, the building of which is ascribed to Antiochus Theos, in honor of his wife Laodice, was probably founded on the old site. It was not far west from Colossae, and only six miles to the west of Hierapolis (*Itin. Ant.* page 337; *Tab. Peut.*; Strabo, 13, page 629). At first Laodicea was not a place of much importance, but it soon acquired a high degree of prosperity. It suffered greatly during the Mithridatic war (Appian, *Bell. Mith.* 20; Strabo, 12, page 578), but quickly recovered under the dominion of Rome; and towards the end of the republic and under the first emperors, Laodicea

became one of the most important and flourishing commercial cities of Asia Minor, in which large money transactions and an extensive trade in wood were carried on (Cicero, *ad Fam.* 2:17; 3:5; Strabo, 12, page 577; compare Vitruv. 8:3). The place often suffered from earthquakes, especially from the great shock in the reign of Tiberius, in which it was completely destroyed; but the inhabitants restored it from their own means (Tacit. *Ans.* 14:27). The wealth of the citizens created among them a taste for the arts of the Greeks, as is manifest from the ruins; and that it did not remain behind-hand in science and literature is attested by the names of the sceptics Antiochus and Theiodas, the successors of Enesidemus (Diog. Laert. 9:11, § 106; 12, § 116), as well as by the existence of a great medical school (Strabo, 12, p. 580). During the Roman period Laodicea was the chief city of a Roman conventus (Cicero, *ad Fam.* 3:7; 9:25; 13:54, 67; 15:4; *ad Att.* 5:15,16, 20, 21; 6:1, 2, 3, 7; *in Verr.* 1:30). Many of its inhabitants were Jews, and it was probably owing to this circumstance that at a very early period it became one of the chief seats of Christianity [we have good reason for believing that when, in writing from Rome to the Christians of Colossae, Paul sent a greeting to those of Laodicea, he had not personally visited either place. But the preaching of the Gospel at Ephesus (~~Acts~~ Acts 18:19-19:41) must inevitably have resulted in the formation of churches in the neighboring cities, especially where Jews were settled. *SEE LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO THE*, and the see of a bishop (Coloss. 2:1; 4:15 sq.; ~~Revelation~~ Revelation 1:11; 3:14 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:10, 20; Hierocl. page 665). The Byzantine writers often mention it, especially in the time of the Comneni; and it was fortified by the emperor Manuel (Nicet. *Chon. Ann.* Pages 9, 81). During the invasion of the Turks and Mongols the city was much exposed to ravages, and fell into decay; but the existing remains still attest its former greatness (see Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geog.* s.v. Laodiceia). Smith, in his *Journey to the Seven Churches* (1671), was the first to describe the site of Laodicea. He was followed by Chandler, Cockerell, and Pococke; and the locality has, within the present century, been visited by Mr. Hartley, Mr. Arundell, Colossians Leake, and Mr. Hamilton.

Picture for Laodicea

Laodicea is now a deserted place, called by the Turks *Eski-hissar* ("Old Castle"), a Turkish word equivalent to *Paleo-kastro*, which the Greeks so frequently apply to ancient sites. From its ruins, Laodicea seems to have been situated upon six or seven hills, taking up a large extent of ground.

To the north and north-east runs the river Lycus, about a mile and a half distant; but nearer it is watered by two small streams, the Asopus and Caprus, the one to the west, and the other to the southeast, both passing into the Lycus, which last flows into the Maeander (Smith, page 85). Laodicea preserves great remains of its importance as the residence of the Roman governors of Asia under the emperors, namely, a stadium, in uncommon preservation, three theaters, one of which is 450 feet in diameter, and the ruins of several other buildings (*Antiq. of Ionia*, part 2, page 32; Chandler's *Asia Minor*, 100:67). Colossians Leake says, "There are few ancient sites more likely than Laodicea to preserve many curious remains of antiquity beneath the surface of the soil; its opulence, and the earthquakes to which it was subject, rendering it probable that valuable works of art were often there buried beneath the ruins of the public and private edifices (Cicero, *Epist. ad Amic.* 2:17; 3:5; 5:20; Tacitus, *Annal.* 14:27). A similar remark, though in a lesser degree, perhaps, will apply to the other cities of the vale of the Masander, as well as to some of those situated to the north of Mount Tmolus; for Strabo (pages 579, 628, 630) informs us that Philadelphia, Sardis, and Magnesia of Sipylus, were, not less than Laodicea and the cities of the Maeander as far as Apameia at the sources of that river, subject to the same dreadful calamity (*Geography of Asia Minor*, page 253)." "Nothing," says Mr. Hamilton (*Researches in Asia Minor*, 1:515), "can exceed the desolation and melancholy appearance of the site of Laodicea; no picturesque features in the nature of the ground on which it stands relieve the dull uniformity of its undulating and barren hills; and, with few exceptions, its gray and widely-scattered ruins possess no architectural merit to attract the attention of the traveler. Yet it is impossible to view them without interest when we consider what Laodicea once was, and how it is connected with the early history of Christianity." See also Fellows, *Journal written in Asia Minor*, page 251 sq.; Arundell, *Seven Churches*, page 85 sq.; Schubert, *Reisen*, 1:282; S. Stosch, *Syntagma dissert. 7 de sept. urbibus Asice in Iapoc.* p. 165 sq.; also in Van Hoven, *Otiurnn literar.* 3, p. 52; Mannert, VI, 3:129 sq.; Schultess, in the *N. theol. Annal.* 1818, 2:177 sq. **SEE ASIA, SEVEN CHURCHES OF.**

Laodicea, Council, Of

(*Conciliumt Laodicenseum*), an important council held at Laodicea, in Phvrgia, in the 4th century. The year in which this council convened is disputed. Baronius and Binius assign the year 314; Pagi. 363; Hardouin places it as late as 372, and others even in 399. Hefele thinks that it must

have had its session between 343 (the Council of Antioch) and 381, rather in the second than in the first half of the 4th century. Beveridge adduces some probable reasons for supposing it to have been held in 365. Thirty-two bishops were present, from different provinces of Asia, and sixty canons were published, which were accepted by the other churches.

- 1.** Permits the administration of communion to persons who have married a second time, after their remaining a while in retreat, fasting and praying.
- 2.** Directs holy communion to be given to those who have completed their penance.
- 3.** Forbids to raise neophytes to the sacerdotal order.
- 4.** Forbids usury among the clergy.
- 5.** Ordination not to be administered in the presence of those who are in the rank of hearers.
- 6.** No heretics to enter within the church.
- 7.** Any Novatians, Photinians, or Quartodecimani who are to be received into the Church must first abjure every heresy, be instructed in the true faith, and anointed with the holy chrism.
- 8.** All Cataphrygians or Montanists to be instructed and baptized before being received into the Church.
- 9.** Excommunicates the faithful who go to the places of worship or burial-grounds of heretics.
- 10.** Forbids the faithful to give their children in marriage to heretics.
- 11.** Forbids the ordination of priestesses (πρεσβύτιδες) (see below).
- 12.** Bishops to be appointed by the metropolitan and his provincials.
- 13.** Priests not to be elected by the people.
- 14.** Consecrated elements not to be sent into other parishes at Easter by way of eulogize.
- 15.** Only those chanters named in the Church roll shall ascend the pulpit and chant.

- 16.** The Gospels to be read, as well as the other books of Scripture, on Saturday.
- 17.** A lesson shall be read between each psalm.
- 18.** The same prayer to be repeated at nones as at vespers.
- 19.** After the bishop's sermon the prayers for the catechumens shall be said separately, then those for the penitents, and, lastly, those of the faithful; after which the kiss of peace shall be given, and after the priests have given it to the bishop, the lay persons present shall give it to each other; and that ended, the administration of the holy eucharist shall proceed. None except the priests shall be permitted to approach the altar in order to communicate.
- 20.** A deacon not to sit in the presence of a priest without permission of the latter. The same conduct is enjoined on subdeacons and all inferior clergy towards the deacon.
- 21, 22.** The subdeacon not to undertake any of the functions of the deacon, nor touch the sacred vessels, nor wear a stole.
- 23.** Forbids the same to chanters and readers.
- 24.** No one of the clergy, or of the order of ascetics, to enter a tavern.
- 25.** Forbids the subdeacon to give the consecrated bread and to bless the cup.
- 26.** Prohibits persons not appointed thereto by a bishop from meddling with exorcisms.
- 27.** Forbids the carrying away of any portion of the agapae.
- 28.** Forbids the celebration of the agapae, or love-feasts, in churches.
- 29.** Forbids Christians observing the Jewish Sabbath.
- 30.** Forbids Christian men, especially the clergy, from bathing with women.
- 31.** Forbids giving daughters in marriage to heretics.
- 32.** Forbids receiving the eulogiae of heretics.
- 33.** Forbids all Catholics praying with heretics and schismatics.

- 34.** Anathematizes those who go after the false martyrs of heretics.
- 35.** Forbids Christian persons leaving their church in order to attend private conventicles in which angels were invoked, and anathematizes those who are guilty of this idolatry.
- 36.** Forbids the clergy dealing in magic, and directs that all who wear phylacteries be cast out of the Church.
- 37.** Forbids fasting with Jews or heretics.
- 38.** Forbids receiving unleavened bread from Jews.
- 39.** Forbids feasting with heathen persons.
- 40.** Orders all bishops to attend the synods to which they are summoned, unless prevented by illness.
- 41, 42.** Forbids clergymen leaving the diocese to travel abroad without the bishop's permission and the canonical letters.
- 43.** Forbids the porter of the church leaving the gate for a moment, even in order to pray.
- 44.** Forbids women entering into the altar.
- 45.** Forbids receiving those who do not present themselves for the Easter baptism before the second week in Lent.
- 46.** Orders that all catechumens to be baptized shall know the Creed by heart, and shall repeat it before the bishop or priest on the fifth day of the week.
- 47.** Those who have been baptized in sickness, if they recover, must learn the Creed.
- 48.** Orders that those who have been baptized shall be anointed with the holy chrism, and partake of the kingdom of God.
- 49.** Forbids celebrating the holy eucharist during Lent on any days but Saturdays and Sundays.
- 50.** Forbids eating anything on the Thursday in the last week of Lent, or during the whole of Lent anything except dry food.

- 51.** Forbids celebrating the festivals of the martyrs during Lent; orders remembrance of them on Saturdays and Sundays.
- 52.** Forbids celebrating marriages and birthday feasts during Lent.
- 53.** Enjoins proper behavior at marriage festivals, and forbids all dancing.
- 54.** Forbids the clergy attending the shows and dances given at weddings.
- 55.** None of the clergy or laity to club together for drinking-parties.
- 56.** Forbids the priests taking their seats in the sanctuary before the bishop enters, except he be ill or absent.
- 57.** Directs that bishops shall not be placed in small towns or villages, but simply visitors, who shall act under the direction of the bishop in the city.
- 58.** Forbids both bishops and priests celebrating the holy eucharist in private houses.
- 59.** Forbids singing uninspired hymns, etc., in church, and reading the uncanonical books.
- 60.** Declares which are the canonical books of Scripture. In this list the Apocrypha and the book of Revelation are omitted. *SEE CANON OF SCRIPTURE*. Of particular interest among the decisions of this council is canon 11, forbidding the employment of women as preachers. Hefele holds that the canon has hardly been properly translated, and that the desire of the council was simply to forbid *superior diaconesses* in the Church. But for a detailed discussion we must refer to Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 1:731 sq. The difficulty as to the meaning arises from the fact that the canons were written in Greek, and the question hinges on the *meaning* intended for **πρεσβύτερες** and **προκαθήμεναι**.

Laodice'an

(**Λαοδικεύς**), an inhabitant of the city of Laodicea, in Phrygia (^{<50416>}Colossians 4:16; ^{<6114>}Revelation 3:14), from which passages it appears that a Christian Church was established there by the apostles. See below.

Laodiceans, Epistle To The.

"In the conclusion of the Epistle to the Colossians (^{<50416>}Colossians 4:16), the apostle, after sending to the Colossians the salutations of himself and

others who were with him, enjoins the Colossians to send this epistle to the Laodiceans, and that they likewise should read *the one from Laodicea* (τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικεαίης). It is disputed whether by these concluding words Paul intends an epistle from him to the Laodiceans or one from the Laodiceans to him. The use of the preposition to favors the latter conclusion, and this has been strongly urged by Theodoret; Chrysostom, Jerome, Philastrius, (Ecumenius, Calvin, Beza, Storr, and a multitude of other interpreters. Winer, however, clearly shows that the preposition here may be under the law of attraction, and that the full force of the passage may be thus given: that written *to* the Laodiceans, and to be brought *from* Laodicea to you (*Grammatik d. Neutestamentl. Sprachidioms*, page 434, Lpz. 1830). It must be allowed that such an interpretation of the apostle's words is in itself more probable than the other; for, supposing him to refer to a letter from the Laodiceans to him, the questions arise, How were the Colossians to procure this unless he himself sent it to them? And of what use would such a document be to them? To this latter question it has been replied that probably the letter from the Laodiceans contained some statements which influenced the apostle in writing to the Colossians, and which required to be known before his letter in reply could be perfectly understood. But this is said without the slightest shadow of reason from the epistle before us; and it is opposed by the fact that the Laodicean epistle was to be used by the Colossians *after* they had read that to themselves (ὅταν ἀναγνῶσθῃ, κ. τ. λ.). It seems, upon the whole, most likely that the apostle in this passage refers to an epistle sent by him to the Church in Laodicea some time before that to the Church at Colossae." The suggestion of Grotius (after Marcion) that it is identical with the canonical Epistle to the Ephesians has substantially been adopted by Mill and Wetstein, and many modern critics: see, especially, Holzhausen, *Der Brief an die Ephesen* (Hannover, 1834); Baur, *Paulus* (2d ed. Lpz. 1866-7), 2:47 sq.; Rabiger, *De Christologia Paulina* (Breslau, 1852), page 48; Bleek, *Einleitung in das N.T.* (2d ed. Berlin, 1866), page 454 sq.; Hausrath, *Der Apostel Paulus* (Heidelb. 1865), page 2; Volkmar, *Commentar zur Offenb. Joh.* (Zurich, 1862), page 66; Kiene, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1869, page 323 sq.; Klostermann, in the *Jahrb. fur deutsche Theol.* 1870, page 160 sq.; Hitzig, *Zur Kritik Paulinischen Briefe* (Lpz. 1870), page 27. The only supposition that seems to meet all the circumstances of the case is that the Epistle to the Ephesians, although not exactly encyclical, was designed (as indeed its character evinces) for general circulation; and that Paul, after having dispatched this, addressed a special epistle to the Colossians on occasion of

writing to Philemon, and recommends the perusal of that to the Ephesians, which would by that time reach them by way of Laodicea. This explains the doubtful reading *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*, and the absence of personal salutation in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and at the same time the allusion to a letter from Laodicea; while it obviates the objectionable hypothesis of the loss of an inspired epistle, to which particular attention had thus been called, and which was therefore the more likely to have been preserved. *SEE EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO*. Wieseler's theory (*Apost. Zeitalter*, page 450) is that the Epistle to Philemon is meant; and the tradition in the *Apostolical Constitutions* that he was bishop of this see is adduced in confirmation. But this is utterly at variance with the evidently personal nature of the epistle. *SEE PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO*. Others think that the apostle refers to an epistle now lost, as Jerome and Theodoret seem to mention such a letter, and it was also referred to at the second general Council of Nicaea. But these allusions are too vague to warrant such a conclusion. The apocryphal epistle, now extant, and claiming to be that referred to by Paul, entitled *Epistola ad Laodicenses*, is admitted on all hands to be a late and clumsy forgery. It exists only in Latin MSS., from which a Greek version was made by Hutten (in Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N.T.* 1:873 sq.). It is evidently a cento from the Galatians and Ephesians. A full account of it may be found in Jones (*On the Canon*, 2:31-49). The Latin text is given by Auger (*ut inf.*), and all English version by Eadie (*Comment. on Colos.*). We may remark in this connection that the subscription at the end of the First Epistle to Timothy (*ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας, ἣτις ἐστὶ μητρόπολις Φρυγίας τῆς Πακατιανῆς*) is of no authority; but it is worth mentioning, as showing the importance of Laodicea. On the general subject of the Laodicean epistle, see Michaelis, *Introd.* 4:124; Hug, *Introd.* 2:436; Steiger, *Colosserbr.* ad loc.; Heinrichs, ad loc.; Raphel. ad loc.; and especially Credner, *Geschichte d. N. 7. Kanon* (ed. Volkmar, Berlin, 1860), p. 300, 313; Auger, *Ueb. d. Laodicenerbrief* (Lpz. 1843); Sartori *Ueb. d. Laodicenerbrief* (Lübeck, 1853); Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 2:395 sq.; Huth, *Ep. ex Laodicea in Encyclica and Ephesios odservata* (Erlangen, 1751); and other monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, page 85. *SEE PAUL*.

Laos

the name of the mountain tribes in Farther India who inhabit the country between China, Assam, Burmah, Siam, and Tonquin, and are dependent upon Siam. Like the Shaus of Burmah, they belong to the race of the Thai,

which extends through the Ahom as far as Assam. The Laos and their descendants, scattered through the northern provinces of Siam and their own country, are estimated at two to three millions. The Laos are divided into two subdivisions. The western tribes tattoo themselves like the Burmese and the Shans, and are on that account called *Lao-punydam*, or black-bellied Laos; the eastern tribes, which do not tattoo themselves, are called *Lao-pung-khao*, or white-bellied Laos. The western Laos form the principalities of Labong (founded in 574 after Christ), Lamphun, Lagong, Myang Preh, Myang Nan, Chiengrai, and Chiengmai or Zimmay. The last-named was formerly an independent kingdom, which frequently carried on wars with Pegu. Of the principalities of the eastern or white Laos, Viengkhan has been almost wholly (1828), and Myang Phuen for the greater part, destroyed by the Siamese; Myang Lomb pays a tribute to Siam, and Myang Luang Phrabang, which was formerly governed by three kings, is dependent not only upon Siam, but upon Cochin China. As the Laos have no maritime coast, they have for a long time remained unknown to the Europeans. Chiengmai was for the first time visited by the London merchant, Ralph Fitch, who arrived there in 1586 from Pegu. After the occupation of Maulmain in 1826 by Great Britain, new expeditions were sent out, and the meeting with Chinese caravans suggested the first idea of an overland road to Yunnan. The first European who visited the eastern Laos was Wusthof, an agent of a Dutch establishment in Cambodia, who in 1641, amid the greatest difficulties, sailed up the Mekhong. The Laos possess several alphabets which are derived from the Cambodian form of the Pali. The name of *Free Laos* is usually given to the mountain tribes of the Radeh. Between the language of the Laos and that of the Siamese there is only a dialectic difference, which has chiefly been caused by the fact that the savage mountaineers neglect or misapply the rules of accentuation. On the other hand, the Laos surpass the Siamese in musical taste. The religion of the Laos is Buddhism, which, however, they do not hold so strictly as the Siamese. The first Christian mission among the Laos was commenced in 1867 at Chiengmai (on the river Quee Ping, 500 miles north of Bangkok), by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The first missionary, Mr. M'Gillivray, was welcomed on his arrival at Chiengmai both by the people and by the princes, who had provided a native house for him until he was able to build one more suitable to his wants and tastes. In 1869 the missionaries were even presented by the king with a beautiful lot, but subsequently a spirit of opposition and persecution manifested itself.

According to the report of the Board of Foreign Missions of May, 1871, no congregation had yet been organized. (A.J.S.)

Lao-tzu

(formerly written LAO-TSE), one of the most remarkable men of the Chinese Empire, the author of the *Tao-to-king*, and founder of the religious sect known as Taoists (or Tauists), was born in the kingdom of Tsu B.C. 604. His family name was *Le*, or Plum; in his youth he himself was called *Urh*, or Ear, a name given him on account of the size of his ears. When he came to be known as a philosopher he was honorably called *Pe-yang* and was surnamed *Lao-tzu* (old boy), or *Lao-kun-tzu* (old prince). Tradition asserts that his father was a poor peasant, who remained a bachelor until he was seventy years old, and then married a woman of forty. Lao-tzu was probably a great student in early life, and when yet a youth was promoted to an office connected with the treasury or the museum under the Chow dynasty. While in the service at the court of Chow he visited the western parts of China, and there probably became acquainted with the rites and religion of Fuh, or Buddha. The duration of Lao-tzu's service at the court is entirely uncertain. When the Chow dynasty was hastening to its fall, and the whole country torn up into petty states warring with each other, and anarchy every where prevailing, Lao-tzu retired into obscurity. For this course he has been often and severely censured; but when we consider that the corruption of the government was too great for him to overcome, it does not appear that he was to blame for retiring with pure hands from his connection with it. There is no trustworthy account of the time or manner of his death, but some writers have assigned the date of B.C. 523 to this event. Szu Ma-chien, in relating his retirement from the government, simply says, "He then went away, and no one knows his end." His life seems to have been that of a contemplative philosopher—far more occupied with thoughts of the invisible and the mysterious than with sublunary things. He became so celebrated as a philosopher that Confucius went to see him, and left him deeply impressed with his extraordinary character, and evidently regarded Lao-tzu as something wonderful—divine; yet, while all agree that Confucius was almost carried away by his admiration of Lao-tzu, the latter has been accused of jealousy and spite against Confucius. His writings, however, give no color to the charge; nor is it likely that Confucius himself would have always spoken of Lao-tzu in such high terms of esteem and admiration, and even quoted the opinions of his rival as sufficient answers to the queries of his disciples, had he not

received kind treatment and attentions at the hands of Lao-tzu, the advocate of a doctrine that "man is to be rendered immortal through the contemplation of God, the repression of the passions, and the perfect tranquillity of the soul," the author of "a moral code inculcating all the great principles found in other religions: charity, benevolence, virtue, and the free-will, moral agency, and responsibility of man."

Lao-tzu has at different periods enjoyed the patronage of the Chinese government, there being, indeed, a constant struggle for ascendancy between his supporters and those of Confucius during several centuries at the beginning of our era. Emperors have paid homage to him in his temple, and one of them wrote a commentary on his book. When we turn aside from definite history and give our attention to legends, there is no end to the mysteries thrown around his birth and being. His followers have transferred him from the ranks of ordinary mortals into an incarnation of deity, and have clothed his philosophic treatise with the authority of a sacred book, being probably moved to this course by a desire to make their founder equal to Sakyamuni, *SEE GAUTAMA*, and to give enhanced importance to his works. He is represented as an eternal and self-existing being, incarnated at various times upon the earth. One account represents him as having been conceived by the influence of a meteor, and after being carried in the womb for seventy-two (another author says eighty-one) years, at last delivering himself by bursting a passage under his mother's left arm. From having gray hairs at birth, and looking generally like an old man, he was called Lao-tzu — i.e., *the old boy*. He is reported to have had the gift of speech at birth. It is also said that, as soon as he was born, he mounted nine paces in the air, each step producing a lotus-flower, and, while poised there, pointed with his left hand to heaven and with his right hand to earth, saying, "Heaven above — earth beneath — only Tao is honorable." The eighty-one chapters of the *Tao-to-kin*, are said to have been obtained from him by Yin-hsi, the keeper of the Han-ku Pass, through which he was leaving the country on his retirement from office.

The *Tao-to-king* seems to have received its present name about B.C. 160. Before that, it was known as the teachings of Hwang and Lao — i.e., the emperor Hwang (B.C. 2600) and Lao-tzu; also as the Book of Lao-tzu. There is much uncertainty and confusion in regard to the text. Some editors, having in view the tradition that Lao-tzu wrote a book of 5000 characters, have cut down those in excess of that number without much regard for the sense of the author. Others have added characters to explain

the meaning, thus incorporating their commentary into the text. The occasional suppression of a negative particle, by some editors, gives an exactly opposite meaning to a sentence from that of other editions. To ascertain the true text is in many instances impossible. The style is exceedingly terse and concise, without any pretension to grace or elegance. The work is full of short sentences, often enigmatical or paradoxical, and without apparent connection. Quite probably the book is composed of notes for philosophical discourses, which were expanded and explained by Laotzu while orally instructing his disciples. As contributing to the obscurity of the style, we must consider that the topics discussed are exceedingly abstruse, and that Lao-tzu labored under the disadvantage of writing in the infancy of literary language in China, and was compelled to use a very imperfect medium for communicating his thoughts.

There has been much discussion and much difference of opinion as to what Lao-tzu really intended by *Tao*. The word means a path, a road; the way or means of doing a thing; a course; reason, doctrine, principle, etc. Lao-tzu sometimes uses it in its ordinary senses, but it is evident that in general he uses it in a transcendental sense, which can only be ascertained by a careful study of his writings. *Tao* is something which existed before heaven and earth, and even before deity. It has no name, and never had one. It can not be apprehended by the bodily senses; it is profound and mysterious; it is calm, void, solitary, and unchanging; yet, in operation, it revolves through the universe, acting everywhere, but acting mysteriously, spontaneously, and without effort. It contains matter, and has an inherent power of production; and although itself formless, yet comprehends all possible forms. It is the ultimate cause of the universe, and is the model or rule for all creatures, but chiefly for man. It represents also that ideal state of perfection in which all things acted harmoniously and spontaneously, good and evil being then unknown, and the return to which constitutes the *summum bonum* of existence. French and English writers generally have translated *Tao* by "Reason," some adding "or Logos." There are some striking similarities between *Tao* and *Logos*; and in all the translations of the Scriptures into Chinese the *Logos* of John is rendered by *Tao*. Julien, decidedly dissenting from the common translation of *Tao*, adopts "Voie" or "Way" — giving just cause for his dissent in the fact that Lao-tzu represents *Tao* as devoid of thought, judgment, and intelligence. Julien's "Way," however, is also objected to, as implying a way-maker antecedent to it, while *Tao* was before all other existences. The "Nature" of modern

speculators probably answers more nearly than anything else to *Tao*, although it will by no means answer all the conditions of the use of *Tao* by Lao-tzu.

Doctrines. —

(1.) The teachings of Lao-tzu on speculative physics may be summarized as follows: All existing creatures and things have sprung from an eternal, all-producing, self-sustaining unity called *Tao*, which, although regarded as a potential existence, is also distinctly denominated non-existence, Lao-tzu considering it equivalent to the primeval Nothing or Chaos. Mr. Watters (see below) thus combines these apparently contradictory views: "Though void, shapeless, and immaterial, it yet contains the potentiality of all substance and shape, and from itself produces the universe, diffusing itself over all space. It is said to have generated the world, and is frequently spoken of as its mother 'the dark primeval mother, teeming with dreamy beings.' All things that exist submit to it as their chief, but it *shows* no lordship over them. All the operations of Nature (*Tao*) occur without any show of effort or violence — spontaneously and unerringly. Though there is nothing done in the universe which Nature does not do, though all things depend upon it for their origin and subsistence, yet in no case is Nature *visibly* acting. It is in its own deep self a unit—the smallest possible quantity, yet it prevails over the wide expanse of the universe, operating unspent but unseen." Lao-tzu's account of the origin of the universe is, "Tao begot 1, 1 begot 2, 2 begot 3, and 3 begot the material universe," which has been explained by commentators that *Tao* generated the Passive Element in the composition of things, this produced the Active Element, and this the harmonious agreement of the two elements, which brought about the production of all things. The next thing to *Tao* is heaven — i.e., the material heaven above us. This is pure and clear, and if it should lose its purity would be in danger of destruction. The earth is at rest, the heavens always revolving over it, producing the various seasons, vivifying, nourishing, killing all things. Then come the "myriad things" — all animate and inanimate existences, that spring from *Tao* which, although in itself impalpable, bodies itself forth in these objects, and thus becomes subject to human observation. This manifestation of *Tao* in each object constitutes its *Te*. *Te* is generally translated "Virtue," but this rendering is inadequate. It seems frequently to refer to the *specific* nature of the object spoken of, which is derived from Universal Nature (*Tao*). Following the popular ideas of his country, Lao-tzu speaks of five colors, five sounds, and five tastes,

and regards all things as arranged in a system of dualism — e.g. a wooden vessel, in the case of which solidity gives the object, and hollowness the utility. In representing pure existence as identical with non-existence, he anticipated Hegel, of our own century, who says, "Sein und Nichts ist dasselbe" — Being and Non-being are the same. He agrees with those modern philosophers who maintain that God made all things out of himself, but differs from them in never introducing personality into his conception, and consequently excluding will and design from the primordial existence.

(2.) In politics he assigns the original choice of a sovereign to the people, and holds that he whom the people elect is the elect of heaven. He conceives of the sovereign as rather the model and instructor than the judge and ruler of the people. He compares the ruling of a kingdom to the cooking of a small fish, which is easily spoiled by too much cooking. The first duty of the ruler is to rectify himself. This done, it will be easy for him to regulate his kingdom. He speaks in strong terms against military oppression, and has a poor opinion of fire-arms. He opposes capital punishment and excessive taxation. He thinks the people should be kept ignorant — the ruler should empty their minds and fill their stomachs; weaken their wills and strengthen their bones. The intercourse of different states with each other should be regulated by courtesy and forbearance.

(3.) In ethics, Lao-tzu held that in the beginning virtue and vice were unknown terms. Man, without effort, constantly lived according to *Tao*. In the next stage, man — though in the main virtuous — was occasionally sliding into vice, and was unable to retain the stability of unconscious goodness. Then came a period of filial piety and integrity; and, finally, the days of craft, and cunning, and insincerity. He makes no express statement as to the moral condition of human beings at birth, but it may be inferred from some expressions that he regards the spirit as coming pure and perfect from the great Mother, but susceptible of bad influences, which lead it astray. With him, *Tao* is the standard of virtue, the guide and model of the universe. To meet the desire of men for something more tangible, he refers to heaven, earth, and the sages of olden times, but nowhere to a personal god, and there is no clear evidence of his belief in such a being. The virtues which distinguish the perfect man are freedom from ostentation, humility, continence, moderation, gravity, and kindness. Much and fine talking are to be avoided. He assigns a low place to learning, which, he says, adds to the evil of existence; and, if we were to put away learning, we would be exempt from anxiety. There is one passage that seems to refer to a future

life, but it is very obscure; and the only future Lao-tzu appears to anticipate is absorption into *Tao*. Most, minds will see little difference between absorption into non-existence and annihilation. At chapter 16 of his *Tao-to-king*, where he refers to this subject, he says, "When things have luxuriated for a while, each returns home to its origin. Going home to the origin is called stillness. It is said to be a reversion to destiny. This reversion to destiny is called eternity. He who knows (this) eternity is called bright. He who does not know this eternity wildly works his own misery. He who knows eternity is magnanimous. Being magnanimous, he is catholic. Being catholic, he is a king. Being a king, he is heaven. Being heaven, he is Tau. Being Tau, he is enduring. Though his body perish, he is in no danger." And again, at chapter 28 "He who knows the light, and at the same time keeps the shade, will be the whole world's model. Being the whole world's model, eternal virtue will not miss him, and he will return home to the absolute." The attainment, then, of this state of absolute vacuity he looks upon as the chief good, and warns such as have attained to it to keep themselves perfectly still, and to avoid ambition. And, in alluding to the fact that emptiness or non-existence is superior to existence, he says that the former may be said to correspond to use, the latter to gain. "Tau is empty." "The space between heaven and earth may be compared to a bellows; though empty, it never collapses, and the more it is exercised the more it brings forth." To enforce this theory he draws an illustration from common life and says, "Thirty spokes unite in one nave, and by that part which is non-existent (i.e., the hole in the center of it) it is useful for a carriage-wheel. Earth is moulded into vessels, and by their hollowness they are useful as vessels. Doors and windows are cut out in order to make a house, and by its hollowness it is useful as a house."

Since the 2d century A.D. the Taoists have greatly spread in China, Japan, Cochin-China, Tonquin, and among the Indo-Chinese nations. In our day they are especially popular with the common people, and in some parts of China their influence rivals that of the Buddhists. They have, however, greatly corrupted the teachings of their founder; the worship of original Taoism has been degraded into the lowest idolatry, while its priests are jugglers and necromancers, among whom scarcely a trace of the pure spirit of Lao-tzu can be found. See J.P.A. Remusat, *Memoire sur la Vie et les Opinions de Lao-tseu* (1829); John Chalmers, *The Speculations on Metaphysics, Polity, and Morality of the old Philosopher Lao-tseu*, with an Introduction (Lond. 1869, 8vo); the valuable articles of T. Watters in

the *Chinese Recorder*, volume 1 (1868); Pauthier, *La Chine* (Paris, 1837, 2 volumes, 8vo), pages 110-120; Stanislas Julien, *Le Livre des Recompenses* (Paris, 1848, 8vo); Neumann, *Lehrsaal des Mittelreichs* (Munich, 1856, 8vo); Legge, *Life and Teachings of Confucius* (Lond. 1867, 8vo), chapter 5; Loomis, *Confucius and the Chinese Classics*, page 278 sq.; *Pall Mall Gazette* (London), September 3, 1869, page 11 sq. See also articles on Lao-tzu in Chambers, *Cyclop.*; Thomas, *Biogr. Dict.*; and Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lex.* (S.L.B.)

Lap

(**dgB**, 2. Kings 4:39, a *garment*, as elsewhere; **qyj e**^{<163>} Proverbs 16:33, the *bosom*, as elsewhere; **xj o**^{<163>} Nehemiah 5:13, the *armful*, as in ^{<242>}Isaiah 49:22), the fold of the raiment in which Orientals are accustomed to carry articles in lieu of pockets. Instead of the *fibula* or clasp that was used by the Romans, the Arabs join together with thread, or with a wooden bodkin, the two top corners of their upper garment; and, after having placed them first over one of their shoulders, they then fold the rest of it about their bodies. The outer fold serves them frequently instead of an apron, in which they carry herbs, loaves, corn, and other articles, and may illustrate several allusions made to it in Scripture: thus one of the sons of the prophets went out into the field to gather herbs, and found a wild vine, and gathered thereof wild gourds his lap full (^{<163>}2 Kings 4:39). The Psalmist offers up his prayers that Jehovah would "render unto his neighbors sevenfold into their bosom their reproach" (^{<192>}Psalm 19:12). The same allusion occurs in our Lord's direction, "Give, and it shall be given unto you, good measure, pressed down and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom" (^{<163>}Luke 6:38). **SEE BOSOM; SEE DRESS.**

Lapide

SEE STEEN.

Lapithae

(**Λαπίθαι**), in mythical geography, a people of Thessaly, chiefly known to us from their fabled contests with the Centaurs. The battle between the Centaurs and the Lapithae has been minutely described by Hesiod and Ovid. — Brande and Cox. 2:317.

Laphria

(**Λαφριά**), a surname of Artemis or Diana among the Calydonians, from which the worship of the goddess was introduced at Naupactus and Patrae, in Achaia. At the latter place it was not established till the time of Augustus, but it became the occasion of a great annual festival (Pausanias, 4:31, § 6; 7:18, § 6, etc.; Schol. *ad Eurip. Orest.* 1087). The name Laphria was traced back to a hero, Laphrius, son of Castalius, who was said to have instituted her worship at Calydon. Laphria was also a surname of Athene or Minerva (Lycophron, 356). — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, volume 2, s.v.

Lapides Judaici

(*Jewish Stones*). In the chalky beds which surround in some parts the summit of Mount Carmel are found numerous hollow stones, lined in the inside with a variety of sparry matter, which, from some distant resemblance, are supposed by the natives to be petrified olives, melons, peaches, and other fruit. These are considered not only as curiosities, but as antidotes against several diseases. Those which bear some resemblance to the olive have been designated *Lapides Judaici*, otherwise "Elijah's Melons," and are superstitiously regarded as an infallible remedy for stone and gravel when dissolved in the juice of lemons. Those supposed petrified fruits are, however, as Dr. Shaw states, only so many different-sized flint-stones, beautified within by sparry and stalagmitical knobs, which are fancifully taken for seeds and kernels. *SEE CARMEL*.

Lap'idoth

(Hebrew *Lappidoth'*, **ת/דַּבְּתַי** *torches*; Sept. **λαφιδώθ**), the husband of Deborah the prophetess (⁴⁰⁰⁶Judges 4:4). He may have resided with her at the time of her public services as female judge (verse 5), or more probably he was deceased. and she is named as his widow. B.C. ante 1409. From the fact that the name is in the form of a fem. plur., some have taken it to mean her place of residence (**tvæ** *woman of*, being understood before it), but without probability (Bertheau, ad loc.). By others the term *lappidoth* has been understood to denote merely her character (q.d. "woman of splendors," i.e., noble, brilliant), or even her occupation merely (q.d. *lamp-trimmer*); but all these are equally nugatory suppositions. *SEE DEBORAH*.

La Pilonniere, Francois De,

an eminent French writer, was born in the second half of the 17th century. After remaining for some time a member of the Order of the Jesuits, he was converted to Protestantism, and on this account was obliged to flee the country. He took refuge first in Holland, then in England, where he was welcomed by bishop Hoadly. The precise time of his death is not ascertained. He wrote *L'Atheisme decouvert par le P. Hardouin, Jsuite, dans les ecrits de tons les Peres de l'Eglise et des philosophes modernes* (1715, 8vo; and in St. Hyacinthe, *Memoires Litteraires*, 1716): — *L'Abus des Confessions de Foi* (1716, 8vo): — *An Answer to the R.D. Snape's Accusation, containing an account of his behavior and suffering amongst the Jesuits* (Lond. 1717, 8vo; transl. into Latin in 1718): it is a sort of autobiography: — *Defense des Principes de la Tolerance* (London, 1718, 8vo): — *Further Account of himself* (Lond. 1729, 8vo). He translated also into French Pope's *Essay on Criticism* (1717); Plato's *Republic* (1725, 8vo); Burnet's *Histoire des dernieres Revolutions d'Angleterre* (La Haye, 1725, 2 volumes, 4to; London, 3 volumes, 12mo; latest edit. La Haye, 1735); and some works of bishop Bauger and of Steele. See Adelung, *Suppl. z. Jocher*; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:527. (J.N.P.)

Lapis

(*the stone*), a surname of Jupiter at Rome, as is evident from the expression "Jovem Lapidem" (Cicero, *ad Fam.* 7:12; Gellius, 1:21; Polybius, 3:26). It was formerly believed that Jupiter Lapis was a stone statue of the god, or originally a rude stone serving as a symbol, around which people assembled for the purpose of worshipping Jupiter. But it is now generally acknowledged that the pebble or flint-stone was regarded as a symbol of lightning, and that therefore, in some representations of Jupiter, he held a stone in his hand instead of the thunderbolt (Arnobius, *adv. Gent.* 4:25). Such a stone ("lapis Capitolinus," August. *De Civ. Dei.* 2:29) was even set up as a symbolic representation of the god himself (Serv. *ad AEn.* 8:641). When a treaty was to be concluded, the sacred symbols of Jupiter were taken from his temple, viz. his scepter, the pebble and grass from the district of the temple, for the purpose of swearing by them ("per Jovem Lapidem jurare," Livy, 1:24; 30:43). A pebble or flint-stone was also used by the Romans in killing the animal when an oath was to be accompanied by a sacrifice, and this custom was probably a remnant of very early times,

when metal instruments were not yet used for such purposes. — Smith, *Dict. Greek and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Laplace

(PLACEUS), Josue de, a distinguished French Protestant theologian, was born in Brittany about the year 1605. After completing his studies in the University of Saumur, he taught philosophy for a while, and in 1625 was appointed pastor of the Church at Nantes. He left this situation in 1633, to become professor of theology in the University of Saumur. Here, with L. Cappel and Moses Amyraut, he gave a new impulse to theological studies. Laplace, attacking the Calvinistic dogma of the imputation of original sin to all the descendants of Adam, endeavored to show its incompatibility with the divine mercy and justice. According to him, original sin is only indirectly imputed to man, and he has to answer only for his own individual sins. The orthodox party in the Calvinistic Church strongly opposed this doctrine, and, on the motion of Garissoles, the national Synod of Charenton (in 1644) formally condemned it, without, however, naming the author. The schools of Sedan, Geneva, and Holland denounced it also as impious and heretical. On the other hand, it obtained the approbation of all moderate people. A large number of provincial synods thought the national synod had been too hasty in condemning a doctrine before taking time to thoroughly investigate and discuss it; they refused to submit to the verdict until another national synod should decide. Laplace, for fear of increasing the difficulties, patiently submitted to the repeated attacks of Desmarets, Rivet, and other orthodox theologians. He only answered them after waiting vainly for ten years for the convocation of the synod which was to decide. He died at Saumur August 17, 1665. His works are, *Discours en forme de dialogue entre un pere et son fils*, etc. (Quevilly, 1629, 8vo); often reprinted, also under title *Entretiens d'un pere et de son fils sur le changement de religion* (Saumur, 1682, 12mo; transl. into German, Basle, 1665, 8vo): — *Examen des Raisons pour et conire le sacrifice de la Messe* (Saumur, 1639, 8vo): — *Suite de l'Examen*, etc. (Saumur, 1643, 8vo): — *De locis Zachariae* 11:13; 12:10; *Malachia* 3:1 (Saumur, 1650, 4to): — *Exposition et Paraphrase du Cantique des Cantiques* (Saumur, 1656, 8vo): — *Explication typique de l'histoire de Joseph* (transl. from the Latin of Laplace by Rosel, Saumur, 1658, 8vo): — *De argumentis quibus efficitur Christum prius fuisse quam in utero beatae Virginis secundum carnem conciperetur* (Saumur, 1649, 4to): — *De Testimoniis et Argumentis ex Veteri Testamento petitis, quibus probatur Dominum*

nostrum Jesum-Christum esse Deum, praeditum essentia divina (Saumur, 1651, 4to): — *Catechesis pro conversione Judeorum* (Saumur, 4to): — *Theses Theologicae de statu hominis lapsi ante gratiam* (Saumur, 1640, 4to): this is the work whose doctrines were condemned by the Synod of Charenton in 1644: — *De Imputatione primi peccati Adami* (Saumur, 1655, 4to): a defense of his opinions: — *Opuscula nonnulla* (Saumur, 1656, 8vo): — *Syntagma Thesium theologiarum* (Saumur, 1660, 3 parts 4to; 4th part, 1664). A complete collection of Laplace's works was published under the style *Opera Omnia* (Franeker, 1699, and Aubincit, 1702, 2 volumes, 4to). See Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History*, 3:404; Aymon, *Synodes des Eglises Reformees de France*, 2:680; Weismann, *Historia Ecces. saec. 17*, page 919; Haag, *La France Protestante*; T. Colani, *Revue de Theologie*, October 1855; Bartholmess, *Discours sur la vie et le caractre de J. de La Place*, in the *Bulletin de la Societe de l'histoire du Protestantisme Francais* (1853); Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, 8:97; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:529; Herzog, *Real-Encyccklop.* 11:755 sq. (J.N.P.)

Laplace, Pierre Simon de

a noted French philosopher, one of the greatest astronomers and mathematicians of any age or country, born at Beaumont-enAuge (Calvados), in France, March 23, 1749, of humble parentage, and appointed professor of mathematics in the military school at Paris in 1768, and membre-adjoint of the Academy of Sciences in 1773, first made a reputation for himself by his *Exposition du Systemne du Monde*, which he published in 1796, and which was simply an outline for popular use of his greater treatise, *La Mecanique celeste*, of which the first two volumes were sent forth in 1798, the third in 1802, the fourth in 1805, and the fifth in 1825, and still later (1827) a posthumous supplement (for a full synopsis of the contents of this great work on mathematical astronomy, see *Penny Cyclop.* 13:326 sq.), a book which will doubtless preserve his memory to the latest posterity. He also wrote *Theorie Analytique sur les Probabilites* (1812) and *Essai Philosophique sur les Probabilites* (1814). He died May 5, 1827. His last words were, "Ce que nous connaissons est peu de chose; ce que nous ignorans, est immense." "The author of the *Mecanique Celeste*, to use a common synonyme for Laplace, must be an object of the admiration of posterity as long as any record of the 18th century exists. For many years he was the head, though not the hand of European astronomy; and most of the labors of observation were made in directions pointed out

by him, or for the furtherance of his discoveries in the consequences of the law of gravitation. It is sometimes stated by English writers that Laplace was an atheist. We have attentively examined every passage which has been brought in proof of this assertion, and we can find nothing which makes either for or against such a supposition.... An attempt to explain how the solar system might possibly have arisen from the cooling of a mass of fluid or vapor is called atheistical because it attempts to ascend one step in the chain of causes; the *Principia* of Newton was designated by the same term, and for a similar reason. What Laplace's opinions were we do not know and it is not fair that a writer who, at a time of perfect license on such matters, has studiously avoided entering on the subject, should be stated as of one opinion or the other upon the authority of a few passages of which it can only be said (as it could equally be said of most mathematical works) that they might have been written by a person of any religious or political sentiments whatever" (*Penny Cyclop.* 13:325-328). See Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary*, page 1372; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:531 sq.

La Placette, Jean,

a distinguished French Protestant theologian and moralist, was born at Pontac, in Bearn, January 19, 1639, and studied theology at the Protestant Academy of Montauban. Appointed pastor of Orthez in 1660, he removed in the same capacity to Nai in 1664, and remained there until the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, refusing several pressing invitations from the important congregation of Charenton. At the revocation he obtained leave to go to Holland, from whence he afterwards went to Prussia. In 1686 he finally accepted the office of pastor to the French Church at Copenhagen, which he held until 1711. He then resigned and retired to Utrecht, where he died April 25, 1718. His principal works are, *Traite des Bonnes (uvres en general* (Amst. 1709, 12mo): — *Traite de la Restitution*, etc. (Amst. 1696, 12mo): — *La mort des justes, ou la maniere de bien mourir* (La Haye, 1729, 12mo): — *Traite de l'Aumone* (Amsterd. 1699, 12mo): — *Divers traites sur les matieres de Conscience* (Amst. 1697, 12mo): — *The Death of the Righteous*, etc., translated by Thomas Fenton, M.A. (Lond. 1725, 2 volumes, 12mo): — *Traite de la foi divine* (Roter. 1716, 3 volumes, 12mo): — *La communion devote, ou la maniere de participer saintement et utilement a l'Eucharistie* (Amsterd. 6th edit. 1706, 12mo): — *La morale Chretienne abregee*, etc. (Amst. 2d ed. 1701, 12mo): — *Essais de morale* (Amst. 1716, 4 volumes, 12mo): —

Nouveau essais de morale (La Haye, 1715 2 volumes, 12mo): — *The incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome* (Gibson's *Preservative*, 16:176); etc. See *Vie de La Placette*, by Carrier de Sto Philippe, in *Avis sur la maniere de precher*; Niceron, *Memoires*, volume 2; *Europe Savante*, volume 18; *Nouvelles Litteraires*, July 1718, Haag, *La France Protestante*; Quernerard, *La France Litteraire*; Sayons, *Hist. de la litter. Frannaise a l'etranger*, 2:211-220; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:549; Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 2:1767. (J.N.P.)

Lapland

(native *Sameanda*), a territory in the northernmost part of Europe, is bounded on the north by the Arctic Ocean, on the south by Finland and the Swedish province of Norrland, on the east by the White Sea, and on the west by Norway. The winter is very long and severe; the summer lasts only nine weeks, but is, in consequence of the very long days, almost as hot as in Italy, and, owing to the innumerable mosquitoes, most oppressive for both man and beast. Only in the southern part of Swedish Lapland is the soil capable of cultivation; the corn is sown towards the close of May, and reaped in the middle of August, but is frequently spoiled by night-frosts. The territory is but very thinly settled, and only a part of it is now occupied by the people to which it owes its name, the southern and better portions having been gradually encroached upon by Norwegians, Swedes, and Finlanders, till the Laplanders proper have in a great measure been cooped up within the Arctic Circle. The territory is politically divided into three parts:

- 1.** Norwegian Lapland or Finnmark, containing 27,315.70 square miles and 13,668 inhabitants, all Laplanders, or, as they are here called, Finnar.
- 2.** Swedish Lapland, containing 49,035.17 square miles, with a population of 27,443 inhabitants, of whom only 5685 are Laplanders, and all the remainder Swedish colonists, whose number has steadily increased since 1760, when the first two Swedish families settled in the country.
- 3.** Russian Lapland, which partly belongs to Finland and partly to the government of Archangel, and embraces Eastern Lapland, with the peninsula of Kola, also called the Lapland peninsula. The number of Laplanders in Russian Lapland had in 1852 been reduced to 2290. The native inhabitants, Laplanders or Laps, call themselves Sami or Samelads, and consider Lapland and Laplanders as terms of abuse. They are either

Fjell Lappar-Finner, mountain Laplanders, who lead a nomadic life, and pasture large reindeer herds; or SkogsLappar, forest Laplanders, chiefly occupied with hunting and fishing, leaving their herds of reindeer in charge of the preceding class; or Soe-Finner, sea or shore Laplanders. who, too poor to possess such herds, have been obliged to fix their residence upon the coast, and subsist chiefly by fishing; or Sockne Lappar, parish Lappars, who hire themselves out as servants, chiefly for tending the reindeer. They are good-natured, honest, superstitious, and patriotic, and, with the exception of an inclination to drunkenness, they show neither great vices nor great virtues. The origin of the Laplanders is not yet fully cleared up, as their physical characteristics point partly to the Mongolian and partly to the Caucasian race. The prevailing opinion, however, is, that they are only a variety of Tchude or Finns. The Christianization of the Laplanders did not begin until, in 1275, a part of their territory was annexed to Sweden. For several centuries, however, no results were obtained except the introduction of Christian baptism and Christian marriage. The Norwegian part of Lapland belonged to the archbishopric of Nidaros (Drontheim); the Swedish to the archbishopric of Upsala. Gustavus I, of Sweden, in the first half of the 16th century, established the first Lappish school in the town of Pikea. Charles IX and Christina made great efforts for bringing them over to the Lutheran Church, while in Norwegian Finnark king Christian IV, of Denmark (about 1600), extirpated the remnants of paganism by force. The Christianization of this part of Lapland was completed by the zeal of bishop Eric Bredahl, of Drontheim (1643 to 1672), and his successors. At the beginning of the 18th century, Isaac Olsen, a poor man, during fourteen years, labored among the Laplanders for their Christianization, and king Frederick IV, of Denmark, in 1715 and 1717, for the same purpose, established theological seminaries in Copenhagen and Drontheim. In 1730 king Christian VI issued an order that every Laplander, before the nineteenth year of his age, must receive confirmation, from which time the parents began to bestow greater care upon the education of their children. The government appointed traveling teachers, and also several resident clergymen, who at first found their progress greatly delayed by the difficulty of mastering the Lappish language. The kings of Sweden since Frederick I (1748) worked with great zeal, but little success, for the entire conversion of the Laplanders. In the treaty of Friedrichshaven Sweden had to cede its Lappish territory to Russia, but in 1814, in the treaty of Kiel, it received another portion from Norway. The most zealous missionary who has labored among the Laplanders was pastor Stockfleth (born in 1787),

who joined them in their nomadic life, and preached to them in their own language, which it cost him great efforts to learn. At present divine service is held in the Lappish, Swedish, and Finnish languages. During the summer months the Laplanders, who during this time are moving with their reindeer further into the mountains, are visited by clergymen of Southern Lapland. The Laplanders show great docility for the reception of the Christian doctrine, but their Christianity is still mixed up with many superstitious views and pagan customs. The Roman Catholic Church established in 1855 the Prefecture Apostolic of the North Pole, which embraces Lapland, the Faroe Islands, Greenland, and the northernmost part of America. The apostolic prefect resides at Tromsø, the capital of Finnmark; another Laplandish station has been established at Altengard. See Wiggers. *Kirchl. Statistik*, 2:421 sq.; Neher, *Kirchl. Statistik*, 2:406 sq. (A.J.S.)

Lapping

(**qqi** ; to *lick* up like a dog, ^{<1219>}1 Kings 21:19, etc.) of water by "putting their hand to their mouth." spoken of as a test in reference to Gideon's men (^{<0075>}Judges 7:5, 6), is still in the East supposed to distinguish those who evince an alacrity and readiness which fits them in a peculiar manner for any active service in which they are to be engaged. **SEE GIDEON**. Among the Arabs, lapping with their hands is a common and very expeditious way of taking in liquids. "The dog drinks by shaping the end of his long, thin tongue into the form of a spoon, which it rapidly introduces and withdraws from the water, throwing each time a spoonfill of the fluid into his mouth. The tongue of man is not adapted to this use; and it is physically impossible for a man, therefore, to lap literally as a dog laps. The true explanation, probably, is that these men, instead of kneeling down to take a long draught, or successive draughts from the water, employed their hand as the dog employs his tongue — that is, forming it into a hollow spoon, and dipping water with it from the stream. Practice gives a peculiar tact in this mode of drinking; and the interchange of the hand between the water and the mouth is so rapidly managed as to be comparable to that of the dog's tongue in similar circumstances. Besides, the water is not usually sucked out of the hand into the mouth, but by a peculiar knack is jerked into the mouth before the hand is brought close to it, so that the hand is approaching with a fresh supply almost before the preceding has been swallowed: this is another resemblance to the action of a dog's tongue. On coming to water, a person who wishes to drink cannot stop the whole

party to wait for him when traveling in caravans, and therefore, if on foot, any delay would oblige him to unusual exertion in order to overtake his party. He therefore drinks in the manner described, and has satisfied his thirst in much less time than one who, having more leisure, or being disposed to more deliberate enjoyment, looks out for a place where he may kneel or lie down to bring his mouth in contact with the water, and imbibe long and slow draughts of it" (Kitto, *Pictorial Bible*, ad loc.).

Lapse

is a term used in English ecclesiastical law to denote the failure to exercise the right of presenting or collating a vacant ecclesiastical benefice within the lawful period. On such occasions, if the bishop be the patron, the right devolves or lapses to the archbishop, and if the archbishop omits to take advantage thereof, to the king. So also if any person, other than the bishop, be patron, on his neglecting to present, the right lapses in the first place to the bishop, on the bishop's neglect to the archbishop, and from him to the king. The patron, the bishop, and the archbishop are severally and successively allowed the full period of six calendar months, exclusive of the day on which the benefice becomes void; and if the bishop be himself the patron, he must collate to the benefice within the period of the first six months after the vacancy, as he is not entitled to six months in his character of patron, and six months more in his character of bishop. When the patron's six months have expired, his right of presentation is not absolutely destroyed by the lapse which then takes place, but the bishop acquires merely a kind of concurrent right with him; for, although the bishop may collate immediately after the lapse, yet, so long as he suffers the benefice to continue vacant, he cannot refuse to institute a person presented by the patron; and, in like manner, when the bishop's six months have expired, the patron may present at any time before the archbishop has filled up the vacancy. By these means provision is made against the improper duration of vacancies in the Church; for when the benefice has continued vacant for six months, the patronage for that turn becomes an object of competition between the original patron and the bishop or archbishop, as the case may be, the nominee of that party which presents first being entitled to the benefice. But when the right to present has passed the bishop and the archbishop, and through their neglect has actually lapsed to the crown, a different rule prevails, arising from an old maxim of English law, that the king's rights shall never be barred or destroyed by delay on his part. *Nullum tempus occurrit regi*. When, therefore, the lapse to the king has actually

occurred, the right of presentation for that turn is absolutely vested in him; and if the patron presents while the benefice continues vacant, the king may present at any time afterwards before another vacancy occurs, and may turn out the patron's nominee. But if the patron's nominee is instituted and inducted, and dies incumbent, or if, after his induction, he is deprived by sentence of the ecclesiastical courts, or resigns *bona fide*, and not with intent to defeat the king's right to present, before the king has exercised that right, it is then held that his right is destroyed; for he was only entitled to the presentation for one turn, and his having permitted the patron to present for that turn will not entitle him to any other. When the vacancy is occasioned by the death of the incumbent, or by his cession, which is his own voluntary act, being the acceptance of a second benefice incompatible with the one which he already holds, the patron is bound to take notice of the vacancy, without its being notified to him by the bishop, and his six months are calculated from the time at which the vacancy actually occurs. But when the incumbent is deprived by sentence of the ecclesiastical courts, and when he resigns, such resignation being necessarily made into the hands of the bishop, it is held that, as neither his deprivation nor resignation can be complete without the concurrence of the bishop, the bishop ought to notify the vacancy to the patron, and that the patron's six months are to be calculated from the time at which such notice is given. And in like manner, if the patron presents in due time, and the bishop refuses to institute the person so presented on the ground of his insufficiency, the bishop ought, if the patron be a layman, to give notice of his refusal, and until he does so no lapse can take place; but if the patron be a spiritual person. it appears from the old lawbooks that no notice is necessary, because the spiritual person is presumed to be a competent judge of the morals and abilities of the person whom he has selected for the appointment. If, on account of some such neglect or omission on the part of the bishop, the benefice does not lapse to him, it cannot lapse to the archbishop or to the king; for it is a rule that a lapse cannot take place *per saltum*, that is, by leaping over or leaving out the intermediate steps. This rule protects the patron's right from being ever injured by the improper refusal of the bishop to institute his nominee; for the bishop can take no advantage of that which is occasioned by his own wrongful act, neither can the archbishop or the king, for the reason alleged above. This right of lapse appears to have been first established about the time of the reign of Henry II, and to be coeval with the practice of institution. Previously to that period the incumbent's title was complete, upon his appointment by the

patron, without his being instituted by the bishop. But the Church of Rome, always anxious to render the clergy independent of the laity, strongly opposed this custom (*pravam consuetudinem*, as Pope Alexander III in a letter to Thomas a Becket, designates it), and insisted that the right of appointing to ecclesiastical benefices belonged exclusively to the bishops. This introduced the ceremony of *institution* (q.v.). It is, however, contended by some that institution is as ancient as the establishment of Christianity in England; but Blackstone (2:33) maintains that it was introduced at the time stated above. After that period the bishop alone had the power of conferring the legal title to the vacant church, which he did by institution: but he was still bound to institute the person presented to him for that purpose by the patron, provided the patron presented some one. But how long was the bishop to wait to see whether it was the patron's intention to exercise his right of presentation? The law declared that he should wait a reasonable time; and with a due regard to the interest of the patron and the convenience of the public, it has settled that time to be six months. *SEE JUS DEVOLUTUM.*

Lapsed

SEE LAPSI.

Lapsi

in the more extended meaning of the word, "*the fallen*," especially those who were excluded from communion with the Church on account of having committed one of the *peccata mortalia*. In a more restricted sense, it was used to denote such as had "fallen away," i.e., committed the *peccatum mortale* of denying their faith. It was natural that these should be first designated by the expression of "lapsi," as heretics were very numerous in the early ages of the Church, and the question of their reintegration into the Church was one of considerable importance. As, after the close of the persecutions, there were no longer any "lapsi" in that sense of the word, it came to be applied as synonymous with *paenitentes* or *haeretici*, though only occasionally. Compare Henschel, *Glossarium*, s.v.

The "lapsi" were especially numerous when persecution assumed the regular and systematic form it obtained in Roman law under Nerva and Trajan. Persistence in the profession of Christianity was alone considered a crime against the state. Yet Trajan granted full forgiveness to the Christians who consented to offer up incense before his statues and those

of the gods. During the Decian persecution the form of abjuration became even more simple. Those who shrank from offering up sacrifices were *supposed* to have done so by the authorities. Indeed, in many instances certificates were given by magistrates that the law had actually been complied with. Such mild measures made it easy for many to recant. Cyprian informs us that large numbers eagerly recanted in Carthage even before the persecution broke out; and Tertullian (*De fuga in persec.* 100:13) relates with righteous indignation that whole congregations, with the clergy at their head, would at times resort to dishonorable bribes in order to avert persecution. But, after the end of the persecution, many tried to unite again with the Church. The question now arose whether the Church could again receive them as members, and on what conditions; and also, who had the power to decide that question? In the first ages such penitents were, upon their confessions, readmitted by imposition of hands. Confessors had the privilege of issuing letters of peace (*libelli pacis*) to the lapsed, which facilitated their early reception to communion. But such penitents were ineligible for holy orders, and, if already ordained, they were deposed, not being allowed to resume their clerical functions, but suffered only to remain in lay communion. By degrees these admissions were made still easier, and therefore became a matter of serious consideration by the Council of Ancyra (q.v.), and resulted in the revival of the old Montanist controversy as to the purity and holiness of the Church, besides provoking another as to the extent of episcopal powers. On the controversies and schisms which were thus provoked in the African Church, see the articles *SEE CYPRIAN*; *SEE DECIUS*; *SEE FELICISSIMUS*; *SEE MARTYRS AND CONFESSORS*; *SEE NOVATIAN*; *SEE NOVATUS*. (Compare also Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* volume 1, § 114 and 115.) Epiphanius asserts that Meletius revived the struggle against the laxity of Church discipline; yet this assertion is not fully substantiated; the question of authority was already the foremost in these discussions. *SEE MELETIUS*. This was still more the case in the controversy with the Donatists (q.v.).

The only other points to be noticed are some decisions of the councils which gradually elaborated each of the principles finally established. Thus seven *canones* (1-8) of the Synod of Ancyra determine the penance to be performed by the *lapsi*. It distinguished between those who cheerfully partook of the repast which followed the sacrifices offered to idols, those who partook of it reluctantly and with tears, and those who ate none of it.

These latter were punished with two years of penance, the others more severely. Priests who had sacrificed to idols lost their ecclesiastical character. The Synod of Nicaea was still more lenient. Those against whom it was most severe were persons who had recanted without being threatened in their lives or fortunes; yet even those, while declared to be "unworthy of the pity of the Church," were also readmitted. Naturally, as persecution decreased, the Church became less stringent, as it had no longer to fear desertions. Even before that the practice of the Eastern Church had become very lenient. See Tertullian, *De pudicitia*; *De puenitentia*; Cyprian, *De lapsis*; *epistolae*; *ep. canonicae Dionysii Alexandrini*, c. 262; Mansi, *Acta Concil.* (Ancyra. 1-8; Nicaen. 10-13; II Carthag. 3; III Carthag. 27; Agath. 15); Jacobi Sirmondi *Historia paenitentiae publ.* (1650); Joh. Morini *Comm. histor. de disciplina in administratione sacr. poenit.* 13 *primis saeculis* (1651); Klee, *Die Beichte, eine hist. krit. Untersuchung* (1828); Krause, *Diss. de lapsis primae ecclesiae*; Riddle, *Christian Antiq.* page 624 sq.; Siegel, *Christlich-Kirchliche Alterthumer*, 1:290 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 4:215, 282 sq.; 5:59, 313, 382; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:200; Blunt, *Dict. Hist. and Doct. Theology*, page 395. **SEE APOSTASY.** (J.H.W.)

Lapwing

Picture for Lapwing 1

in our version, is used for **тпѣкѣ** (*dukiphath'*, perhaps from **ĒWD**, the Arabic for *cock*, and **απὸ κεφαλῆς**, i.e., topknot), a word which, occurring as the name of an unclean bird only in ^{<6119>}Leviticus 11:19 and ^{<6148>}Deuteronomy 14:18, affords no internal or collateral evidence to establish the propriety of the translation. It has been surmised to mean "double-crest," which is sufficiently correct when applied to the *hoopoe*, but less so when applied to the lapwing (Targum, *Gallus montanus*), or the cock of the woods, *Tetrao urogallus*, for which bird Bochart produces a more direct etymology; and he might have appealed to the fact that the *Attagan* visits Syria in winter, exclusive of at least two species of *Pterocles*, or sand-grouse, which probably remain all the year. But these names were anciently, as well as in modern times, so often confounded that the Greek writers even used the term Gallinacea to denote the hoopoe; for Hesychius explains **ἔπρωψ** in AEschylus by the Greek appellations of "moor-cock" and "mountain-cock" (see Bochart, s.v. *Dukiphath*); and in modern languages similar mistakes respecting this bird are abundant.

Æschylus speaks of the hoopoe by name, and expressly calls it the *bird of the rocks* (*Fragm.* 291, quoted by Aristotle, *H.A.* 9:49). Xelian (N.A. 3:26) says that these birds build their nests in *lofty rocks*. Aristotle's words are to the same effect, for he writes, "Now some animals are found in the mountains, as the *hoopoe*, for instance" (*H.A.* 1:1). When the two lawsuit-wearied citizens of Athens, Euelpides and Pisthetserus, in the comedy of the *Birds* of Aristophanes (20, 54), are on their search for the home of Epops, king of birds, their *ornithological* conductors lead them through a wild, desert tract *terminated by mountains and rocks*, in which is situated the royal aviary of Epops. The Septuagint and Vulgate agree with the Arabian interpreters in translating the Hebrew term by ἔποψ and *upupa*; and, as the Syrian name is *kikuphah*, and the Egyptian *kukuphah*, both apparently of the same origin as *dukiphath*, the propriety of substituting hoopoe for lapwing in our version appears sufficiently established. The word *hoopoe* is evidently onomatopoeitic, being derived from the voice of the bird, which resembles the words "hoop, hoop," softly but rapidly uttered. "It utters at times a sound closely resembling the word *hoop*, *hoop*, *hoop*, but breathed out so softly, but rapidly, as to remind the hearer of the note of the dove" (Yarrell, *Brit. Birds*, 2:176). The Germans call the bird *Ein Hloup*, the French, *La Iluppe*, which is particularly appropriate, as it refers both to the crest and note of the bird. In Sweden it is known by the name of *Har-Fogel*, the army-bird, because, from its ominous cry, frequently heard in the wilds of the forest, while the bird itself moves off as any one approaches, the common people have supposed that seasons of scarcity and war are impending (Lloyd's *Scand. Advent.* 2:321).

The hoopoe is not uncommon in Palestine at this day (Forskäl, *Descr. Anim.* pref. Page 7, Russel, *Aleppo.* 2:81; Host, *Nachr. v. Marokko*, page 297; compare Jerome, *ad* ~~308B~~ *Zechariah* 5:9; Bechstein, *Naturgesch.* 2:547), and was from remote ages a bird of mystery. Many and strange are the stories which are told of the hoopoe in ancient Oriental fable, and some of these stories are by no means to its credit. It seems to have been always regarded, both by Arabians and Greeks, with a superstitious reverence — a circumstance which it owes, no doubt, partly to its crest (Aristoph. *Birds*, 94; compare Ovid, *Met.* 6:672), which certainly gives it a most imposing appearance, partly to the length of its beak, and partly, also, to its habits. "If any one anointed himself with its blood, and then fell asleep, he would see daemons suffocating him" — "if its liver were eaten with rue, the eater's wits would be sharpened, and pleasing memories be excited" — are

superstitions held respecting this bird. One more fable narrated of the hoopoe is given, because its origin can be traced to a peculiar habit of the bird. The Arabs say that the hoopoe is a betrayer of secrets; that it is able, moreover, to point out hidden wells and fountains under ground. Now the hoopoe, on settling upon the ground, has a strange and portentous-looking habit of bending the head downwards till the point of the beak touches the ground, raising and depressing its crest at the same time. Hence, with much probability, arose the Arabic fable. These stories, absurd as they are, are here mentioned because it was perhaps in a great measure owing, not only to the uncleanly habits of the bird, but also to the superstitious feeling with which the hoopoe was regarded by the Egyptians and heathen generally, that it was forbidden as food to the Israelites, whose affections Jehovah wished to wean from the land of their bondage, to which, as we know, they fondly clung. The summit of the augural rod is said to have been carved in the form of a hoopoe's head; and one of the kind is still used by Indian gosseins, and even Armenian bishops, attention being no doubt drawn to the bird by its peculiarly arranged bars upon a delicate vinous fawn color, and further embellished with a beautiful fan-shaped crest of the same color. The hoopoe is a bird of the slender-billed tribe, allied to the creepers (*Certhiadae*), about as large as a pigeon, but rather more slender. The general hue is a delicate reddish buff, but the back, wings, and tail are beautifully marked with broad alternate bands of black and white: the feathers of the crest, which can be raised or dropped at pleasure, are terminated by a white space tipped with black. In Egypt these birds are numerous (Sonnini, *Travels*, 1:204), forming probably two species, the one permanently resident about human habitations, the other migratory, and the same that visits Europe, The latter wades in the mud when the Nile has subsided, and seeks for worms and insects; and the former is known to rear its young so much immersed in the shards and fragments of beetles, etc., as to cause a disagreeable smell about its nest, which is always in holes or in hollow trees. Though an unclean bird in the Hebrew law, the common migratory hoopoe is eaten in Egypt, and sometimes also in Italy; but the stationary species is considered inedible. See Macgillivray's *British Birds*, 3:43; Yarrell, *Brit. B.* 2:178, 2d ed.; Lloyd's *Scandinavian Adventures*, 2:321. The chief grounds for all the filthy habits which have been ascribed to this muchmaligned bird are to be found in the fact that it resorts to dunghills, etc., in search of the worms and insects which it finds there. A writer in *Ibis*, 1:49, says, "We found the hoopoe a very good bird to eat." Tristram says of the hoopoe (*Ibis*, 1:27): "The Arabs have a superstitious

reverence for this bird, which they believe to possess marvellous medicinal qualities, and call it 'the Doctor.' Its head is an indispensable ingredient in all charms, and in the practice of witchcraft." See Bochart, *Hieroz.* 3:107 sq.; Rosenmuller, *Alterth.* IV, 2:326; Oedmann, *Samml.* 5:66 sq.; Sommer, *Bibl. Abhandl.* 1:254 sq.; *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. Upupidae: Wood, *Bible Animals*, page 392.

Picture for Lapwing 2

Dr. Thomson, however, dissents from the common view above that the Hebrew *dukiphath* is the ordinary hed-hood or hoopoe, on the ground that the latter "is a small bird, *good to eat*, comparatively rare, and therefore not likely to have been mentioned at all by Moses, and still less to have been classed with the unclean." He proposes the English *pewit*, called by the natives *now* and *bu-teet*. "The bird appears in Palestine only in the depth of winter. It then disperses over the mountains, and remains until early spring, when it entirely disappears. It roosts on the ground wherever night overtakes it. It utters a loud scream when about to fly, which sounds like the last of the above names. It is regarded as an unclean bird by the Arabs. The upper part of the body and wings are of a dull slate-color, the under parts of both are white. It has a topknot on the hinder part of the head pointing backward like a horn, and when running about on the ground it closely resembles a young hare" (*Land and Book*, 1:104).

Lardner, Dionysius

LL.D., a distinguished English writer on physical science, was born in Dublin April 3, 1793, and was appointed professor of natural philosophy and astronomy in University College, London, in 1828. In 1830 he projected a sort of Encyclopaedia, consisting of original treatises on history, science, economics, etc., by the most eminent authors, and 134 volumes were accordingly published, under the general name of *Lardner's Cyclopaedia*, between 1830 and 1844. Some of these volumes were from his own pen. A second issue of this work was begun in 1853. He has published various scientific works, the most important of which are his "hand-books" of various branches of natural philosophy (1854-56). He is also the author of the *Museum of Science and Art*, an excellent popular exposition of the physical sciences, with their applications. He died in Paris April 29, 1859.

Lardner, Nathaniel

D.D., a very noted English theologian and minister of the Presbyterian Church, of Arian tendency, was born in Hawkshurst, in Kent, in 1684. In early life he was a pupil of Dr. Joshua Oldfield, a minister of eminence in that denomination, but, like many of the Dissenters of his time, he preferred to go abroad to prosecute his studies. He spent more than three years at the University of Utrecht, where he studied under Graevius and Burmann, and was then some time at the University of Leyden. He returned to England in 1703, and continued to prosecute his theological studies with a view to the ministry, which he entered at the age of twenty-five. He began preaching at Stoke-Newington in 1709, but, owing to his want of power to modulate his voice, soon became private chaplain and tutor in the family of lady Treby. In 1724 he was appointed lecturer at the Old Jewry, where he delivered in outline his work, *The Credibility of the Gospel History* (London, 1727-43, 5 volumes, 8vo), generally acknowledged as constituting the most unanswerable defense of Christianity to our own day. "The work is unequalled for the extent and accuracy of its investigations. Recent researches supplement it, but it is not likely that they will ever supersede it" (W.J. Cox in Kitto). Sir James Mackintosh, in his remarks on Paley (in the *View of the Progress of Ethical Philosophy*), rather discredits its general usefulness as an apologetical work, because it "soon wearies out the greater part of readers," though there are many eminent English critics who think otherwise (compare Allibone, *Dict. of Engl. and Am. Authors*, 2:1060). But even sir J. Mackintosh concedes that with the scholar it has power: "The few who are more patient have almost always been gradually won over to feel pleasure in a display of knowledge, probity, charity, and meekness unmatched by an avowed advocate in a case deeply interesting his warmest feelings" (compare also Leland, *Deistical Writers*). In 1729 he was unexpectedly called to the Church in Crutched Friars, which position he accepted and held for about twenty-two years. He died at his native place in 1768, having devoted his long life to the prosecution of theological inquiry, to the exclusion of almost any other subject. As a supplement to *The Credibility*, Lardner wrote *History of the Apostles and Evangelists, writers of the N. Test.* (1756-57, again 1760, 3 volumes, 8vo; also in volume 2 of bishop Watson's *Collection of Tracts*). Dr. Lardner likewise wrote many other treatises, in which his store of learning is brought to bear on questions important in Christian theology. The most remarkable of these, his minor

publications, are his *Letter on the Logos* (1759), in which it distinctly appears that he was of the Unitarian or Socinian school; and *History of the Heretics of the first two Centuries after Christ* (published after his decease [1780, 4to], with additions by John Hogg). The best edition of Lardner's works is that by Dr. Andrew Kippis (Lond. 1788, 11 volumes, 8vo); but it is no mean proof of the estimation in which they are held, that, large as the collection is, they were reprinted entire as late as 1838 (Lond. 10 volumes, 8vo, a very handsome edition). His writings, now more than a century old, are still regarded as "a bulwark on the side of truth," so much so that not only ministers and students of theology of our day call ill afford to be without them, but every intelligent layman who seeks to do his duty in the Church, of which he is a part, should possess and study them. "In the applause of Dr. Lardner," says T.H. Home (*Bibl. Bib.* page 368), "all parties of Christians are united, regarding him as the champion of their common and holy faith. Seeker, Porteus, Watson, Tomline, Jortin, Hav, and Paley, of the Anglican Church; Doddridge, Kippis, and Priestley, among the Dissenters and all foreign Protestant Biblical critics have rendered public homage to his learning, his fairness, and his great merits as a Christian apologist. The candid of the literati of the Romish communion have extolled his labors; and even Morgan and Gibbon, professed unbelievers, have awarded to him the meed of faithfulness and impartiality. By collecting a mass of scattered evidences in favor of the authenticity of the evangelical history, he established a bulwark on the side of truth which infidelity has never presumed to attack." See Dr. Kippis, *Life of Lardner*, in volume 1 of the works of the latter; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, 2:1060; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, page 468; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, 2, part 3, App. page 407.

Larès

in connection with the MANÈS and the PENÀTÈS, were tutelary spirits, genii, or deities of the ancient Romans. The derivation of the names is not perhaps quite certain, but the first is generally considered the plural of *lar*, an Etruscan word signifying "lord" or "hero;" the second is supposed to mean "the good or benevolent ones;" and the third is connected with *penus*, "the innermost part of a house or sanctuary." The Lares, Manes, and Penates do not appear to have been regarded as essentially different beings, for the names are frequently used either interchangeably or in such a conjunction as almost implies identity. Yet some have thought that a distinction is discernible, and have looked upon the Lares as earthly, the

Manes as infernal, and the Penates as heavenly protectors — a notion which has probably originated in the fact that Manes is a general name for the souls of the departed, those who inhabit the lower world; while among the Penates are included such great deities as Jupiter, Juno, Vesta, etc. Hence we may perhaps infer that the Manes were just the Lares viewed as departed spirits, and that the Penates embraced not only the Lares, but all spirits, whether daemons or deities, who exercised a "special providence" over families, cities, etc. Of the former, Manes, we know almost nothing distinctively. An annual festival was held in their honor on the 19th of February, called *Feralia* or *Parentalia*, of the latter, Penates, we are in nearly equal ignorance, but of the Lares we have a somewhat detailed account. They were, like the Penates, divided into two classes — *Lares domestici* and *Lares publici*. The former were the souls of virtuous ancestors set free from the realm of shades by the Acherontic rites, and exalted to the rank of protectors of their descendants. They were, in short, household gods, and their worship was really a worship of ancestors. The first of the Lares in point of honor was the *Lar familiaris*, the founder of the house, the family Lar, who accompanied it in all its changes of residence. The *Lares publici* had a wider sphere of influence, and received particular names from the places over which they ruled. Thus we read of *Lares compitales* (the Lares of cross-roads), *Lares vicorum* (the Lares of streets), the *Lares rurales* (the rural Lares), *Lares viales* (the Lares of the highways), *Lares permarini* (the Lares of the sea), and the *Lares cubiculi* (the Lares of the bedchamber). The images of these guardian spirits or deities were placed (at least in large houses) in small shrines or compartments called *cediculae* or *lararia*. They were worshipped every day: whenever a Roman family sat down to meals, a portion of the food was presented to them; but particular honors were paid to them on the calends, nones, and ides of the month; and at festive gatherings the lararia were thrown open. and the images of the household gods were adorned with garlands. See Smith's *Dictionary of Classical Biography and Mythology*, s.v.

Lamed, Sylvester

an American Presbyterian minister, born in Pittsfield, Massachussets, August 31, 1796, was educated at Lenox Academy and Middlebury College, studied theology in Princeton Seminary, and was ordained in July, 1817. His earliest efforts at preaching showed rare gifts of eloquence, and his first sermons, delivered in New York city, attracted large crowds, and

melted whole audiences to tears. President Davis, of Middlebury College, remarked of him that in his composition and eloquence he was not surpassed by any youth whom he had ever known; and John Quincy Adams declared that he had never heard his equal in the pulpit. To his wonderful gift of oratory Larned added the strength of a dignified and commanding presence, a voice full of melody and pathos, thorough and sympathetic appreciation of his theme, and an unyielding devotion to his calling. He had the unusual power of winning his audience with the utterance of almost his first sentence. His very look was eloquent. Larned was solicited to take the first stations, with the largest salaries; but, desiring to give his energies to build up the Church where it was weak, he went to New Orleans, and soon organized a church, the First Presbyterian, over which he became pastor. He labored there with the greatest success, creating deep impressions upon the popular mind until his death, August 20, 1820. Seldom, if ever, has the death of one so young caused such widespread sorrow. His *Life and Sermons* were published by Reverend R.R. Gurley (New York, 1844, 12mo). — Alibone, *Dict of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1060; Waterbury, *Sketches of Eloquent Preachers*, page 33 sq.; *New Englander*, 5:70 sq.

Larned, William Augustus

a noted American Congregational theologian and professor, was born in Thompson County, Conn., June 23, 1806. His ancestors had lived in that county for four generations, the first of the family having come over in John Winthrop's colony in 1630. Provided with suitable opportunities for obtaining an education by his father, a lawyer of considerable ability and renown, young Larned was graduated at Yale College with honor when about twenty years of age. Although religiously trained he was somewhat skeptical in his youth, but, under the preaching of Dr. Fitch while in college, he was powerfully impressed, and in the great revival that occurred soon after his graduation he resolved to be a follower of Christ. After teaching five years, first at Salisbury, North Carolina, and then for three years as tutor in Yale College, he entered upon his theological studies, and was ordained in 1834 pastor of the Second Congregational Church, Millbury, Massachusetts, but was compelled to relinquish this charge—in the following year on account of impaired health. From 1835 to 1839 he was associated, at their request, with Reverend N. S. Beman, D.D., and Reverend Mr. Kirk, in instructing theological students in Troy, N.Y. Soon after finishing his labors in Troy he was appointed professor of rhetoric and English literature in Yale College, a position which he filled

with honor and usefulness till his death, February 3, 1862. Professor Larned's literary labors were mostly confined to the *New Englander*, of which he was editor for two years, and to which he contributed twenty-seven different articles on a variety of topics. As the pastor of a church, as the successor of Dr. Goodrich in the professor's chair, and as a literary man, he acquitted himself with fidelity and success. He was a man simple and unpretending in his tastes and habits, of great purity of character, and of strong faith in Christ as his Savior. See *New Englander*, 1862, April, art. ix; Appleton, *New Am. Cyclop.* volume 10, s.v.; *Congreg. Quart.* 1863; Dr. Theodore Woolsey, *Funeral Discourse commemorative of Reverend W.A. Larned* (New Haven, 1862, 8vo). (H.A.B.)

Laroche, Alain De,

also called ALANUS DE RUPE, a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born in Brittany about the year 1428. While yet quite young he joined the Dominicans, studied philosophy and theology at Paris, and was sent to the Netherlands in 1459. After lecturing for a while in the convents of Lille and Douai, he became professor of theology at Gand in 1468, and at Rostock in 1470. He died at Zwoll September 8, 1475. Full of zeal, but very deficient in knowledge, Laroche labored ceaselessly to propagate the use of the rosary; he was the first to preach on this practice, introducing in his sermons marvelous stories which he mostly invented himself. His works were published more than a century after his death, under the title *Beatus Alanus de Rupe redivivus, de Psalterio, seu Rosario Christi et Mariae, tractatus, in partes distributus* (Friburg, 1619, 4to; Colossians 1624; Naples, 1630). See Trithemius, *De Script. Eccles.* 100:850; Choquet, *Script. Belg. Ord. Praedicat.* pages 202-218; Echard, *Script. Ord. Praedicat.*; Paquot, *Memoires*, etc., 3:144-150; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:622. **SEE ROSARY.** (J.N.P.)

Larochefoucauld, Francois, Duc De,

a noted French philosophical writer, the descendant of an old French family of great celebrity, was born in 1613. He early enjoyed the favor and confidence of the court, but involved himself in intrigues against cardinal Richeleu, and in the tumults of the Fronde, and was obliged to retire into private life. Ever attached to literary pursuits, he cultivated the society of the most eminent literary persons of his time, Boileau, Racine, and Moliere, and composed his famous *Memoires* (Cologne, 1662; Amsterdam, 1723,

etc.), in which he gives a simple but masterly historic account of the political events of his time. In 1665 he published *Reflexions ou Sentences et Maximes Morales*, a work containing 360 detached thoughts, of which, perhaps, the most widely celebrated is his definition of hypocrisy, as "the homage which vice renders to virtue." The book is regarded as a model of French prose, and exhibits much acuteness of observation, and a clear perception of the prevalent corruption and hypocrisy of his time.

Larochefoucauld died March 17, 1680. His (*Euvres Completes* were edited by Depping (Par. 1818), and his writings have been commented on by a host of critics of the most different schools, as Voltaire, Vinet, Sainte-Beuve, and Victor Cousin. See Suard, *Notice sur La Rochefoucauld*; Sainte-Beuve, *Estudes sur La Rochefoucauld*, in his *Portraits des Femmes*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:634 sq.

Laromiguiere, Pierre,

a distinguished French metaphysician, was born at Livignac-le-Hault, Aveyron, November 3, 1756. He studied at the College of Villefranche, and became successively professor of philosophy at Carcassonne, Tarbes and La Fleche, and Toulouse. In 1790 he went to Paris, where he soon became professor of the normal school. In 1812 he confined himself to his office of librarian of the university, still retaining, however, the title of professor of the faculty of philosophy. He died at Paris August 12, 1837. With the exception of a few miscellaneous pieces, his chief reputation as a philosopher rests on his *Lemons de Philosophie* (3d ed. Paris, 1826, 3 volumes, 12mo). He had been educated a zealous pupil of Condillac, but there were, as Cousin expresses it, two men in Laromiguiere, the ancient and the modern; the disciple and the adversary of Condillac.

Laromiguiere's Philosophy. —

(1.) Classification of the Faculties. — "These powers and capacities he separates into two great classes—those of the *understanding* and those of the *will*. The faculties of the understanding he reduces to these three: 1. Attention; 2. Comparison; 3. Reasoning. Of these three, attention is the fundamental principle from which the other two proceed; and of these two, again, the phenomena usually denoted by the words memory, judgment, imagination, etc., are simply modifications. Since, however, these three generic powers, in their last analysis, are all included in the first, the whole of the phenomena of the understanding may be said to spring from the one great fundamental faculty of *attention*. If we now turn to the *will*, we find,

according to M. Laromiguiere, a complete parallel existing between its phenomena and those we have just been considering. The foundation of all voluntary action in man is *desire*; and in the same manner as we have already seen the two latter faculties of the understanding spring from the first, so now we see springing from desire, as the basis, the two corresponding phenomena of *preference* and *liberty*. These three powers, then, being established, all the subordinate powers of the will are without difficulty reducible to them, so that, at length, we have the complete man viewed in two different aspects — in the one as an intellectual, in the other as a voluntary being, the chief facts of his intellectual exactly corresponding to those of his voluntary existence. Lastly, to bring the whole system to a state of complete unity, our author shows that desire itself is, strictly speaking, a peculiar form of attention; that the fundamental principle, therefore, of our intellectual and voluntary life is the same; that the power of attention, broadly viewed (being, in fact, but another expression for the natural activity of the human mind), is the point from which the whole originally proceeds. Now the contrast between this psychology and that of Condillac is sufficiently striking, the one being indeed, in a measure, directly opposite to the other. The one lays at the foundation of our whole intellectual and active life a faculty purely *passive* in its nature, and regards all phenomena as simply transformations of it; the other assumes a primitive power, the very essence of which is *activity*, and makes all our other powers more or less share in this essence."

(2.) *Origin of our Ideas.* — "Here, in order to swerve as little as possible in appearance from the philosophy of Condillac, he makes the whole *material* of our knowledge come from our *sensibility*. Condillac had derived all our ideas from sensation in its ordinary and contracted sense; Locke had derived them from sensation and reflection, thus taking in the active as well as the passive element to account for the phenomena of the case; M. Laromiguiere, however, explains his meaning of the word *sensibility* in such a manner as to make the foundation still broader than that of Locke himself. *Sensibility*, he shows, is of four kinds: 1. That produced by the action of external things upon the mind — this is sensation in the ordinary sense of the word; 2. that produced by the action of our faculties upon each other this is equivalent to Locke's reflection; 3. that which is produced by the recurrence and comparison of several ideas together, giving us the perception of *relations*; and, 4. that which is produced by the contemplation of human actions, as right or wrong, which

is the moral faculty. In this theory it appears at once evident that there is a secret revolt from the doctrines of sensationalism. The activity of the human mind was again vindicated, the majesty of reason restored, and, what was still more important, the moral faculty was again raised from its ruins to sway its scepter over human actions and purposes. M. Laromiguiere, the ideologist, will always be viewed as the day-star of French eclecticism" (Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy*, page 631 sq.).

Laromiguiere's works were published, in the 7th edition, as *OEuvres de Laromiguiere*, at Paris, in 1862. See Cousin, *Fragments philosophiques* (1838), 2:468; Damiron, *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Philosophie en France au dix^{me} siecle* (1828); Daunou, *Notice sur la Vie et les Ecrits de Laromigniere* (1839); Valette, *Laromiguière et l'Eclectisme* (1842); Saphary, *L'Ecole eclectique et l'Ecole Francaise* (1844); Perrard, *Logique classique d'apres les principes de Laromiguiere* (1844); C. Mallet, *Mem. sur Laromiguiere*, in the *Compte rendu de l'Academie des Sciences morales et politiques* (1847), volume 3; Tissot, *Appreciations des Lemons de Philosophie de Laromiguiere* (1855); Mignet, *Notice historique sur la Vie et les Ecrits de IM. Laromiguiere* (1856); Taine, *Les Philosophes Francais du dix^{me} siecle* (1857); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:669.

Laros, John Jacob,

a minister of the German Reformed Church, of Huguenot descent, was born in Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, in February 1755. He was three years a soldier in the Revolutionary War, and fought in the battle of Trenton. Afterwards he went to North Carolina, where he taught school. He studied theology privately, and was licensed to preach in 1795. He preached seven years in North Carolina, when he removed to Ohio, and there continued the good work. He was not ordained, however, till 1820. He died November 17, 1844, having accomplished an important work in Ohio as a pioneer of the German Reformed Church. Mr. Laros wrote much. He left behind in MS. treatises on *The Decrees of God and Reprobation*, and *The Evidences of saving Faith*. These are in Germanably conceived, well conducted, and written in a beautiful style. He left also a number of poems of considerable merit. Without much learning, he was decidedly a genius, but, what is better, he left behind him the record of a long, laborious, and useful life.

Larroque, Daniel

a French theologian and writer, was born at Vitre near 1660. He studied theology, and was about to enter the ministry, when the revocation of the Edict of Nantes drove him to London. After preaching in the capital of England for several months, he went to Copenhagen as minister to Huguenot refugees. In 1690 he returned to France, and became a Roman Catholic; but he failed to meet with success among the Romanists, and he devoted himself mainly to study, and kept in close retirement from the world. He died at Paris September 5, 1731. A list of his writings, which are not of particular interest, is given in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:697-699.

Larroque, Matthieu de

a distinguished French Protestant theologian, was born at Lairac, near Agen, in 1619. He studied theology at Montauban, and in 1643 became pastor of the Church at Poujoh. The next year he went in the same capacity to Vitre, where he remained twenty-six years. In 1669 he was proposed as minister to the Church of Charenton, but the government opposed his nomination; similar reasons prevented his accepting a call as pastor and professor to Saumur. He shortly after went to Rouen, where he died, Jan. 31, 1684. Larroque was a man of eminent natural talents, extensive learning, and great activity. He wrote a large number of works, mostly polemical, the principal of which are, *Histoire de l'Eucharistie* (Amst. 1669, 4to; 2d ed. 1671, 8vo); a very scholarly work, by far his best, and of itself enough to make his name immortal: — *Dissertatio duplex de Photino haeretico et de Liberio pontifice Romano* (Geneva, 1670, 8vo): *Observationes in Ignatianas Personii vindicias et in annotationes Beveregii in (Canones Apostolorum* (Rouen, 1674, 8vo): a defense of Daille's work on the epistles of Ignatius against Pearson and Beveridge; *Riponse au livre de M. l'evêque de Meaux, De la Communion sous les deux especes* (Rotterdam, 1683, 12mo): — *Nouveau Traiti de la Regale* (Rotterdam, 1685, 12mo), in defense of the king's right to appoint ministers to the vacant churches in France: — *Adversariorum sacrorum Libri iii* (Leyden, 1688, 8vo), being part of an ecclesiastical history which he left incomplete. See *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, March, 1684, art. 5; Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique*; Nicéron, *Memoires*, volume 21; *Histoire des Ouvrages des Savants*, April, 1688; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:697. (J.N.P.)

Larue, Charles De,

a French Jesuit and celebrated preacher, was born at Paris in 1643; joined the order in 1659, became soon after professor of rhetoric, and at once attracted the attention of Louis XIV by his talents as a preacher and poet. He was for a while sent as a missionary among the Protestants of the Cevennes, but soon returned to Paris, where he was appointed professor of rhetoric in the college Louis-le-Grand. He was also chosen confessor of the dauphiness, and of the duke of Berri. He died at Paris May 27, 1725. Larue wrote *Idyllia* (Rouen, 1669, 12mo), reprinted under the title *Carminum Libri 4* (6th ed. Paris, 1754), which contains, among a number of profane pieces, a Greek ode in honor of the immaculate conception (1670): — *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera, interpretatione et notis, ad usum Delphini* (Paris, 1675, 4to, often reprinted): — *Sermons* (in Migne, *Collection des Orateurs Sacres*): these are celebrated as models of pathos, as well as for vehemence of style and grace of diction: — *Panegyriques des Saints*, etc. (Paris, 1740, 2 volumes, 12mo); and a number of theatrical pieces, etc. See *Mercure de France*, June, 1725; Baillet, *Jugements des Savants*; *Journal des Savants*, 1695, 1706, 1712, 1738, and 1740; *Dict. des Predicateurs*; Le Long, *Bibl. Historique*; Moreri, *Dictionnaire Hist.* 9; *Bibl. des ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jesus*, pages 658-665; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:700.

Lasae'a

(**Λασαία**, derivation unknown), a place mentioned only in ~~Acts~~ Acts 27:8, as a city lying near the Fair Havens, in the island of Crete. Other MSS. have *Alassa* **Αλασσα**), and some (with the Vulgate) *Thalassa* (**Θάλασσα**), which latter Beza adopted (see Kuinöl, *Comment.* ad loc.), and Cramer mentions coins of a Cretan town by this latter name (*Ancient Greece*, 3:374); but neither of these readings is to be preferred. It is likely that during the stay at the adjoining port the passengers on Paul's ship visited Lassea (Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epist. of St. Paul*, 2:320, n.). It is probably the same as the *Lisia* of the Peutinger Tables, sixteen miles east of Gortyna (see Hock, *Kreta*, 1:412, 439). In the month of January 1856, a yachting party made inquiries at Fair Havens, and were told that the name Lasaea was still given to some ruins in the neighborhood. It lies about the middle of the southern coast of Crete, some five miles east of Fair Havens, and close to Cape Leonda. Mr. Brown thus describes the ruins: "Inside the cape, to the eastward, the beach is lined

with masses of masonry. These were formed of small stones cemented together with mortar so firmly that even where the sea had undermined them huge fragments lay on the sand. This sea-wall extended a quarter of a mile along the beach from one rocky face to another, and was evidently intended for the defense of the city. Above we found the ruins of two temples. The steps which led up to one remain, though in a shattered state. Many shafts, and a few capitals of Grecian pillars, all of marble, lie scattered about, and a gully worn by a torrent lays bare the substructions down to the rock. To the east a conical rocky hill is girdled by a wall, and on a platform between this hill and the sea the pillars of another edifice lie level with the ground" (Smith's *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, Append. 1, page 260, 3d edit., where a plan is given). Captain Spratt, R.N., had previously observed some remains which probably represent the harbor of Lasaea (see pages 80, 82, 245). It ought to be noticed that in the *Descrizione dell' Isola di Candia*, a Venetian MS. of the 16th century, as published by Mr. E. Falkener in the *Museum of Classical Antiquities*, Sept. 1852 (page 287), a place called *Lapsea*, with a "temple in ruins," and "other vestiges near the harbor," is mentioned as being close to Fair Havens.

La Salle, Jean Baptist De,

a French priest, founder of the Order of *Brethren of the Christian Schools*, was born at Rheims April 30, 1651. In 1670 he went to Paris to complete his education at the Seminary of St. Sulpice. He was made canon of Rheims, and was ordained priest in 1671. Struck with the ignorance of the poorer classes with regard to religion, he resolved to establish a congregation whose chief object should be to teach and elevate them. In 1679 he began teaching in two parishes of Rheims, but was subjected to many annoyances from the secular teachers, and even censured by some of the clergy. He nevertheless continued his labors, gave all his means to the poor, and finally succeeded. A house which he had bought at Rouen, SaintYon, became the head-quarters of his order, and when he died, April 7, 1719, the Brethren of the Christian Schools were established at Paris, Rouen, Rheims, and other principal cities of France. Its institution was approved by Benedict XIII in 1725. The Brethren of the Christian Schools take the three vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, but they are not perpetual. La Salle did not wish any priest to be ever received among them. Their dress consists of a black robe resembling a cassock, with a small collar or white bands, black stockings, and coarse shoes, a black cloak of

the same material as the dress, with wide hanging sleeves, and a broad-brimmed black felt hat, looped up on three sides. Their order became widely disseminated, and they are now scattered nearly through the whole world. In 1854 they counted over 7000 members, employed in France, Algeria, the United States, Italy, etc. Pope Gregory XVI placed La Salle among the blessed, and he was canonized by Pius IX. La Salle wrote a number of books for the education of children, many of which are still in use; among them we notice *Les Devoirs du Chretien envers Dieu, et les moyens de pouvoir bien s'en acquitter*: — *Les Regles de la Bienseance et de la civiltite Chretienne*: — *Instructions et Prieres pour la Sainte Messe*: — *Conduite des Ecoles Chretiennes*: — *Les douze Vertus d'un bon Maitre*. He is also considered the author of *Meditations sur les Evangiles de tous les Dimanches et sur les principales Fetes de l'Annee*, of which a new edition was published in 1858 (Versailles, 8vo). See abbe Carron, *Vie de J.-Bapt. de La Salle*; Garreau, *Vie de J.-Bapt. de La Salle*; *L'Ami de l'Enfance, ou Vie de J.-B. de La Salle*; *Le veritable Ani de l'Enfance, ou Abrege de la Vie et des Vertus du venerable Serviteur de Dieu J.B. de la Salle*; abbe Tresvaux, *Vie des Saints*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 29:724. (J.N.P.)

Las Casas

SEE CASAS.

La'sha

(Heb. *Le'sha*, [vl], *fissure*, in pause [vl]; Sept. *Λασά*, Vulg. *Lesā*), a place mentioned last in defiling the border of the Canaanites (⁰¹⁰⁰⁹Genesis 10:19), and apparently situated east of the Dead Sea. According to Jerome (*Quaest. in Gen.*), Jonathan (where *yhdl q* is doubtless an erroneous transcription for *yhrl q*), and the Jerus. Targum, it was the spot afterwards known as *Callirrhoe*, famous for its warm springs, just beyond Jordan (Josephus, *Ant.* 7:6, 5; *War.* 1:33, 5; compare Ptolemy, 5:16, 9), on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, where Machaerus lay (Pliny, 5:15). These springs were visited by Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, page 467 sq.); they lie north of the Arnon (Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* II, 1:218). Schwarz says that ruins as well as the hot springs are still found at the mouth of *wady Zurka* (*Palestine*, page 228). Bochart (*Geogr. Sacr.* 4:37) less correctly identifies the name with the Arabic *Lusa* (Reland, *Paltest.* page 871). Lieut. Lynch visited the outlet of these springs through the *wady Zurka*,

which he describes as a rapid stream twelve feet wide and tell inches deep, with a temperature of 94°, having a slight sulphurous taste. The bed is a chasm 122 feet wide, worn through perpendicular cliffs, and fringed with canes, tamarisks, and the castor-bean (*Narrative of the U.S. Expedition to the Jordan*, page 370). Irby and Mangles found several warm sulphur springs discharging themselves into the stream at various points, being, no doubt, those visited by Herod in his last sickness. *SEE CALLIRHOE*. The place is apparently also the ZARETH-SHAHAR *SEE ZARETH-SHAHAR* (q.v.) of ^{<1639>}Joshua 13:19.

Lash'aron

[many *Lasha'ron*] (Heb. *Lashsharon'*, ^{<1639>}לַשְׁשָׁרוֹן; signif. unknown; Sept. *Λεσσαρόν*, but almost all copies omit; Vulg. *Sarmon*, but in the Benedictine text *Lassaron*), one of the Canaanitish towns whose kings were killed by Joshua (^{<1639>}Joshua 12:18). "Some difference of opinion has been expressed as to whether the first syllable is an integral part of the name or the Hebrew preposition with the art. implied (see Keil, *Josua*, ad loc.). But there seems to be no warrant for supposing the existence of a particle before this one name, which certainly does not exist before either of the other thirty names in the list. Such, at least, is the conclusion of Bochart (*Hieroz.* 1, chapter 31), Reland (*Palaest.* 871), and others, a conclusion supported by the reading of the Targum, and the Arabic Version, and also by Jerome, if the Benedictine text can be relied on. The opposite conclusion of the Vulgate, given above, is adopted by Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, page 642, b), but not on very clear grounds, his chief argument being apparently that, as the name of a town, Sharon would not require the article affixed, which, as that of a district, it always bears. The name has vanished from both the Vat. and Alex. MSS. of the Sept., unless a trace exists in the *Ὀφεκτησαρόκ* of the Vat." (Smith). Masius supposes Lasharon to be the place mentioned in ^{<1639>}Acts 9:35, where the reading of some MSS. is *Ἀσσάρωνα* instead of *Σάρωνα*; but there is no evidence to support such a view. From the fact that in Joshua it is named between Aphek and Madon, a writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary* argues for a position at the modern *Saruneh*, south-east of Tiberias (Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* 3, Appendix, page 131); but the reasoning is wholly inconclusive, and the location utterly out of the question. Lasharon was possibly the same place with the LASHA of ^{<1639>}Genesis 10:19.

Lashers

SEE *KHLYSTIE*.

Lasitius, John,

a noted Polish Protestant ecclesiastical writer, often mistaken, formerly, for the celebrated John a Lasco, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was born of a noble family about 1534, and, as was the custom of his day, was early sent abroad to pursue a course of studies at the high-schools of Basle, Berne, Geneva, and Strasburg. After quitting the university he taught for a short time in a private family of one of the most celebrated noble families of Poland, John Krotowsky, an ardent follower of the Moravian Brethren. Of a restless nature, and greatly addicted to study, he soon took up his wandering-staff again, and roamed nearly over all Europe, bringing up, most generally, at some place noted for its university. First we meet him in Paris, next in Basle, next in Geneva, and next in Heidelberg, etc., until, in 1567, he brings up again in Paris, and holds a disputation on the Trinity with the Romish theologian Genebrard (*Chronolog.* lib. 4, a.a. 1582, page 786). After 1575 Lasitius seems to have settled in his native country, but frequently, even after this date, he went abroad, not for his own gratification, however, but in the interests of the State and the Church. He early became an admirer of the Moravians, and is by many (e.g. Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* 2:4. page 460) supposed to have joined their communion; but, however uncertain his membership, certain it is that Lasitius greatly favored the Moravians, and that he was engaged on a history of them. He was one of the most energetic and indefatigable workers among the Poles for the union of all his Protestant brethren into one common bond, and in 1570 finally saw his efforts crowned with success at the Synod of Sendomir. SEE *POLAND*. He died July 12, 1599. His history of the Moravians Lasitius enlarged after the union of the Protestants, but it was never published entire. In 1649 Amos Comenius published an outline of the larger one under the title *Johannis Lasitii, nobilis Poloni, historiae de origine et rebus gestis Fratrum Bohemicorum liber octavus, qui est de moribus et institutis eorum. Ob praesentem rerum statum seorsim editus. Adduntur tamen reliquorum vii librorum argumenta et particularia quaedam excerpta* (1649, 8vo; Amst. 1660, 8vo). For criticisms of this work, see Gindely, *Gesch. d. böhmischen Brüdern*, 2:90; Wagenmann, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, 19:776. His other works are, *Clades Dantiscanorum* (Frkf; 1578, 8vo): — *Historia de*

ingressu Polonorum in Walachiam anno 1572 (Frankf. 1578, 8vo): — *De Russorum et Moscovitarum et Tartarorum religione*, etc. (Speier, 1582, 8vo): — *De Diis Samogitarum ceterorumque Sarmatarum et falsorum Christianorum, item de religione Armeniorum et de initio regiminis Stephani Bathorii opuscula* (Basle, 1615, 4to): — *Pro Volano et puriore religione defensoribusque ejus adversus Antonium Possevinum S.J. scriptum apologeticum* (Wilna, 1584, 4to). See Lukaszewicz, *Gesch. d. reform. Kirchen in Litthauen*, 2:182 sq.; Gindely, *Geschichte d. bonnmischen Bruder*, 2:90; and by the same author, *Quellen zur Geschichte d. bonnmisch. Bruder*, in *Fontes rerum Austriacarum* (Vienna, 1859), page 379; Dieckhoff, *Gesch. d. Waldenser im Mittelalter*, pages 172, 357; Regenvolscius (Wengerski), *Hist. eccl. Slavon.* 3:452; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s.v.; Jicher, *Gelehrten Lex.* 2:2283; and especially the excellent article by Wagenmann in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:770-777. (J.H.W.)

Lasius, Christophorus

a Protestant theologian, prominent as a preacher of the synergistic school, and opponent of Flacius, was born at Strasburg about the beginning of the 16th century. He was in high favor with Melancthon in 1531, and by the latter recommended to Bucer. The part he took in the synergistic Melancthonian controversy, and his activity against the Flacian, rendered his life comparatively a wandering one. In 1537 he became rector of Gorlitz, and in 1543 pastor at Greussen. On account of his Melancthonian proclivities he was deposed in 1545; was then made pastor of Spandau, and when driven away from that place became superintendent of Lauingen, which he was also obliged to leave. After remaining for a time in Augsburg he was appointed superintendent of Cottbus, but was here likewise subject to many annoyances, and finally died at Senftenberg in 1572. His works are especially bitter against the doctrine of the passivity of man in repentance, and do not in the least compliment the Lutherans of his day and generation. The principal are, *Fundament wahrer Bekehrung wider d. flacianische Klotzbusse* (Frankf. ad O. 1568): — *Gildenes Kleinod* (Niiremb. 1556): — *Grundfeste d. reinen evangelischen Wahrheit* (Wittemb. 1568). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:203; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:353.

Lasius, Hermann Jacob

a German theologian, was born November 15, 1751, at Greifswald, Prussia. He entered the university of his native place in 1733, and studied

theology, philosophy, mathematics, and philology. In 1738 he went to Jena, and in 1740 to Halle, with the intention of lecturing at the universities; at the latter he obtained the degree of M.A. Failing health soon obliged him to leave for his native city, and he reopened his lectures there. In 1745 he became subrector, and in 1749 rector of the public school. In 1764 he accepted a call to Rostock as professor of Greek literature at the university, where he continued laboring until 1793. He died August 4, 1803. Lasius spent a great deal of his time in the study of theology. The few books he wrote are valuable, and generally esteemed. The most noted of his dissertations are *De individuo finito* (Jenas, 1739, 4to): — *De bonarum malarumque actionum effectibus naturalibus post hanc vitam* (Halee, 1740, 4to): — *Diss. qua justa divina imputatio actionum nostrarum liberarum vindicatur* (Gryphisw. 1741, 4to): — *De legibus et poenis conventionalibus, in genere* (Halae, 1740, 4to). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Lasius, Lorenz Otto

a German theologian, born December 31, 1675, at Rüden, in Brunswick, was early distinguished for his knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. He attended the universities of Heidelberg and Halle, and became successively in 1702 subrector in Salzwedel; in 1705, deacon; and in 1709, pastor at Ziebelle, near Muskau; then assessor of the Consistory; in 1717, doctor of theology; and died September 20, 1750. Among his numerous books are *Die Prüfung seiner selbst* (Lauban, 1710, 8vo, and often): — *Versuch die hebraische, griechische, lateinische, französische und italienische Sprüche ohne Grammatik zu erlernen* (Budissin, 1717, 8vo, and often): — *Palingenesia mortalium, oder Betrachtungen der Wiedergeburt* (Crossen, 1736, 8vo). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Laskary, Andreas,

a learned and pious Roman Catholic prelate, was bishop of Posen from 1414-1426. He was a member of the Council of Constance, and often preached to the assembled clergy. On his return home he sought cloister life, but was restrained by the pope, and subsequently by his active influence secured such marked prosperity for an episcopal village in Masowine that it was called after his name, Laskarzewo. Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* s.v.

Lasko

(Polish *Laski*, Latin *Lascus*), John à (1), a very celebrated Roman Catholic prelate of the Church of Poland, was born in the early part of the year 1466. He was at first provost at Skalbimierz, then at Posen, and was afterwards chosen by Andreas Roza, of Borvszewice, archbishop of Gnesen, as his coadjutor. During the reigns of Casimir IV, John Albrecht, and Alexander, he resided at court as archchancellor, and on the death of the archbishop of Gnesen (in 1510) Lasko succeeded him in that eminent position. In 1513 he was sent to the fifth general council of Lateran, together with Stanislaus Ostrorog, and in the presence of pope Leo X implored the Christian princes there present to assist Poland and Hungary against the attacks of the Turks and Tartars. In this council Lasko obtained for himself and all succeeding archbishops of Gnesen the title of *legatus natus sedis apostolicae*. He died May 19, 1531. He wrote *Relatio de erroribus Moschorum, facta in concilio Lateranensi a Joanne Lasko*. His activity as archbishop is manifest in the number of provincial synods over which he presided: 1. at Gnesen, in 1506; 2. at Petrikau, in 1510; 3. same, 1511; 4. Lenczyc, 1523; 5. same, 1527; 6. Petrikau, 1530. He was a decided opponent of the Reformation and its propagation in Poland as is evinced by his canons and decretals (*comp. Constitutiones synodorum metropolitanae ecclesiae Gnesnensis*, Cracov. 1630). He wrote also *Sanctiones ecclesiasticae tam ex pontificum decretis quam in constitutionibus synodorum provinciae inprimis autem statuta in diversis provincialibus synodis a se sancita* (Cracov. 1525,4to). Lasko gained great reputation by his collection of the laws of the country, made by order of king Alexander of Poland, under the title *Commune Poloniae regni privilegium constitutionum et indultuum* (Cracov. 1506). See Damalewicz, *Vitae arehiepscoporum (Gnesnensium)*, page 278; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:203; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v. (J.H.W.)

Lasko, John a

(2), one of the most distinguished of the Polish reformers, was born at Warsaw in the early part of 1499, of one of the noblest families of Poland, which, during the 16th century especially, furnished many men illustrious in the Church, in the council, and the camp. We know little of John a Lasko's early education, but it was probably conducted under the supervision of his uncle (see the preceding article), who would naturally intend him for the priesthood. While he was yet a youth, the German Reformation

commenced, and evidently attracted a large share of his attention. The archbishop, however, was its strenuous opponent, and young Lasko, at the University of Cracow, where Luther's writings were publicly bought and sold, may have contented himself with accepting the current religious sentiments of his countrymen, which by no means accorded with the highest standards of Roman Catholic orthodoxy. At the age of twenty-five he set forth on his travels. It was his purpose to visit the courts and universities of other lands. Passing by Wittenberg, with its Luther and Melancthon, he directed his course to Louvain, where he seems to have been repelled by the ignorance and bigotry of the priesthood, and thence passed to Zurich, where he met and conferred with Zwingle, and was by him influenced to take a decided stand for the reformatory movement. From Zurich he went to Paris, where he was honorably received, and entered into a correspondence with the sister of the king, the famous Margaret of Navarre, already favorably disposed to the cause of reform. Thence he directed his course to Basle, attracted thither by the fame of Erasmus, who extended to him a cordial welcome, and did not disdain to accept his hospitable gifts. The veteran scholar admired and praised his young friend, and Lasko seems to have reciprocated his confidence and affection. Both occupied the same dwelling, and for some months the expense of the household was met from Lasko's purse. Perhaps the fact that at this very juncture the break between Luther and Erasmus took place may not have been without its effect in repelling Lasko from too close association with the German reformer. In October 1525, Lasko was recalled to Poland, doubtless with a view to be engaged in state employ, or as an ambassador to France or Spain. However this may be, he probably passed through Italy previous to his return, and there formed some acquaintanceships, not without influence in later years. Not long after his return he fell in with the writings of Melancthon, with whom he subsequently corresponded, and we may reasonably conclude that by his counsel, or with his sanction, Polish youth were sent abroad to complete their studies at Wittenberg. A marked change by this time is manifest in his views and feelings. Erasmus, in his correspondence, was not slow to note this. It was due partly, no doubt, to a better knowledge of the German reformers, and partly, also, to the ripening of his own Christian experience. We hear him declaring that he owed everything to the mercy of God. No foresight of his own, no world-wisdom, could have saved him from ruin. There was more of Luther than of Erasmus in such soul-humbling confessions. The death of his uncle, the archbishop (1531), who was

resolutely opposed to the cause of reform, removed a certain measure of restraint which had checked young Lasko's freedom of action, if not speculation. No outward manifestation of any radical change of sentiment had hitherto been apparent. He was successively nominated canon of Gnesen, custos of Plock, and dean of Gnesen and Lencicz. In accepting these dignities he still cherished the hope inspired by Erasmus that reform might take place within the Church itself, and to this end he was induced, in a cautious manner, to present the Polish monarch with suggestions as to the necessity of measures directed to that object (Krasinski's *Ref. in Poland*, 1:248). In 1536 he received the royal nomination of bishop of Cujavia, and the most inviting prospects of ecclesiastical promotion opened before him. But already his hope that the Church of Rome would reform herself had died out. He opened his heart to the king, and freely confessed the views and convictions which forbade his acceptance of the proffered promotion. With the royal permission, and provided with commendatory letters, he chose temporarily to withdraw from his native land. He directed his course to the Netherlands. At Antwerp he was sought out and his acquaintance cultivated by the most respectable citizens. The royal letters alone would have opened all doors to him. But his final decision to withdraw entirely from the Roman Catholic Church was hastened in or before 1540. In that year he married a woman of humble rank, without dowry, whom he met at Louvain (Krasinski says Mayence), and thus made his breach with Rome irreparable. Instead of returning to his native land, he sought a retired residence at Emden, in Friesland. Count Enno, who was anxious to secure a reformation of the Church in his principality, proposed to Lasko the charge of the matter as superintendent. His death suspended the negotiation, but his sister Anna, who succeeded him, renewed the proposal. After much hesitation, Lasko was induced in 1543 to accept the charge, and in the following year was nominated superintendent of all the churches of Friesland. He had already declined the invitation to return to Poland, where he was assured that his marriage should not stand in the way of the bestowment of a bishopric. He longed, indeed, to return, but only that he might labor as an evangelist, unencumbered with any connection with Rome. He accepted his present post — as he did others to which he was subsequently called — with the express proviso that if duty and the prospect of useful service called him back to his native land he might be free to go. He made it also a condition of his acceptance that no obligation should be imposed upon him in his office inconsistent with the word and will of God. In neighboring lands his proceedings were jealously watched.

The duke of East Courland, who had married a daughter of Maximilian, as well as the duke of Brabant, felt that his influence and innovations threatened their states. Lasko pushed on the cause of reform by assailing the monasteries and the pictures in the churches. A formidable opposition was provoked, but he manfully defended himself, and was sustained by the countess. Opposition gradually yielded, and Romish rites and ceremonies disappeared from all the churches. An improved order of Church organization and discipline was introduced and established, substantially Presbyterian. He employed the eldership to enforce discipline. He sought to promote pastoral culture and improvement, as well as confessional unity of doctrine. Preaching himself, he habitually insisted on the sole and supreme authority of the Word of God. In correspondence with Melancthon, Bucer, Bullinger, Pellican, and Hardenberg, he drew up a confession of faith, which yet proved unsatisfactory to the Lutherans, leaning as it did to the views of the Swiss and Anglican reformers, although by no means in full correspondence with those of Calvin.

Lasko's reputation as the founder of the Protestant Church in Friesland now spread rapidly, and he was repeatedly consulted by foreign rulers and divines on questions of Church polity and order. The duke of Prussia invited him to accept the superintendence of the churches of his dominions, but the project was defeated by the condition on which Lasko insisted that the Church should be independent of the state, and that Lutheran rites, kindred to those of the Roman Catholic Church, should be abolished (Krasinski. 1:253). During his residence at Emden Lasko was forced to engage in controversy. Persecuted elsewhere, religious enthusiasts found shelter in the Netherlands, and intruded within his sphere. Menno Simon and David George were his principal antagonists. He sought to convince them by argument, but failed. His constant difficulties and the pressing burden of his duties induced him to listen to an invitation that reached him from England. Archbishop Cranmer, to whom Lasko had been recommended by some of his brother reformers, Peter Martyr and William Turner, pressed him to come and assist in the task of completing the reformation of the Church. Early in September 1548, parting from the countess, who reluctantly consented to his withdrawal, Lasko set out for England. Three days before he left the celebrated interim of the emperor was published, threatening to arrest and put back the cause of Church reform in all his states. Lasko wrote back to his friends in Emden to abide firm, assuring them that it was better to fall into the hands of God than into

those of men. His first visit to England was designedly temporary. For six months he resided with Cranmer at Lambeth. The views of the two men were coincident in doctrine, and apparently not greatly divergent in matters of order and discipline. The impression which he made in England was favorable, and in a sermon preached before the king Latimer extolled him with high praise. Returning to Emden, Lasko encouraged his fellow-religionists in their opposition to the interim, and incurred the hostility of those — and among them of the chancellor Ter West — who were disposed to favor a compromise with the emperor. There was some danger that Lasko himself would be sacrificed to their policy. Leaving Emden, therefore, he resided for a time at Bremen and Hamburg, and at length directed his course back to England, in May 1550, to which he had been reinvited. Here, under the protection of a Protestant monarch (Henry VI), refugees from persecution on the Continent were collected in considerable numbers. The foreign Protestant congregation in London was composed of French, Germans, and Italians. Of this, in all about 3000 members, Lasko, by the king's nomination (July 24, 1550), was made superintendent. He seems, however, to have had supervisory charge over all the other foreign churches of the city, while their schools were subject to his inspection. The wisdom of his measures is attested by a letter of Melancthon, who speaks (September 1551) of the purity of doctrine of his churches. He differed with Cranmer on some points, as in reference to sacramental doctrine and the use of priestly habits, but his scruples were respected, and his intervention secured the foreign churches from molestation. In London he introduced the same system of Church order which he had established at Emden. He brought out an edition of his Catechism for the instruction of the people, and to this the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism are said to have been manifestly indebted. The English liturgy he discarded. His views on the sacraments may be inferred from his republication in England of the work of Bullinger, to which he furnished an introduction. This was followed, however, by his *Brevis et delucidæ de Sacramentis Ecclesia Christi Tractatio* (Lond. 1552, 8vo), in which he approximated to the views of Zwingle and Calvin. On the doctrines peculiar to Calvin Lasko was not disposed to stand. He uses language that would seem to indicate an acceptance of the belief in a general atonement. While insisting on the insufficiency and inability of human effort without the grace of God, he emphasizes the freeness and rich provisions of the Gospel of Christ. It was during his residence in England that Lasko's wife died, and his second marriage took place. The death of the young king suddenly wrought an

entire change in the prospects of the exiles, and on the accession of queen Mary they prepared to return to the Continent. On the 17th of September, 1553, the first band of them, more than 170 in number, embarked for Denmark, where they had been assured of a welcome reception from a Protestant monarch. But a bigoted Lutheranism repelled them from the Danish shores. Lasko hastened back to Emden, while his fellow-pilgrims, called by Westphal, a Lutheran divine, "martyrs of the devil," and repulsed at Hamburg, Lubeck, and Rostock, finally found a hospitable reception at Dantzic. At Emden Lasko found his position uncomfortable. His vicinity to Brabant gave occasion for those who feared his influence to intrigue against him. Gustavus Vasa invited him and his friends to Sweden, assuring him of entire religious liberty. But he longed to return to his native land. His views concerning the sacrament, however, were represented to the king as objectionable, and it seemed essential that he should first seek to harmonize them with the Augsburg Confession. His opponents in controversy, Westphal especially, had spoken of him in reproachful terms. He determined to consult with Melancthon, and in April, 1555, he left Emden, and for many months, passing from city to city in Germany, and conferring with leading theologians, he awaited the long-desired opportunity of returning, with the hope of useful service, to his native land. We find him at Frankfort almost at the very time when the English exiles had transferred their altercations with reference to the habits to that city, and involved there to some extent in the Lutheran controversy. He was complained of as a dissenter from the Augsburg Confession, but in reply he asserted that he accepted its very language in regard to Christ's presence in the sacrament. At Stuttgard (May 22, 1556) he entered with Brentz upon a disputation on the sacramentarian controversy, and there renewed his assertion and vindicated his views. With Melancthon he succeeded better. Although he could not effect a union of the Lutherans and the Reformed, as he was exhorted to do by the king of Poland, with a view to its happy effect in his own states, he yet secured the confidence and friendly offices of Melancthon. The latter entrusted him with a letter to the king of Poland, to which a modification of the Augsburg Confession, such as it was hoped all Protestants might unite in, was added. Lasko now prepared for his return to Poland, where the king, Sigismund Augustus, was disposed to welcome him. He first, however, published a new account of the foreign churches which he had superintended in London, dedicating it to the king, the senate, and the states of Poland, urging at the same time the reasons for reformation, and setting forth the grounds of his own action in rejecting the

doctrines of the Church of Rome. Such a vindication of himself was called for. The news of his return excited the apprehensions, if not the consternation of his enemies. In December 1556, after an absence of twenty years, he planted his feet on his native soil. His approach had been preceded by alarms addressed especially to the ears of the king. He was called a dangerous person, an outlawed heretic, who returned to his country only to excite troubles and commotions. He was said to be preparing measures of rebellion, and means to destroy the churches. The king was not alarmed. He received the reformer in a friendly manner, and was gratified with Melancthon's letters. Cautious in his policy, however, he was anxious, before taking bold and decisive measures of reform, to secure Protestant union. Lasko was entrusted with the superintendence of all the Reformed churches in Little Poland. Laboring for the desired union, his efforts were counteracted by men who preferred to conceal their real (Socinian) sentiments, and by the grave difficulties which he had to encounter. At successive annual synods he exerted himself to secure a harmony of the Protestant confessions—a result effected after his death in the celebrated Consensus Sandomiriensis. In the translation of the Bible of Brzesc he took an active part, and is said to have published many books, most of which are now irrecoverably lost. In the midst of his efforts, and under the burden of his pressing duties, he closed his life, January 8, 1560. During the last four years of his life the record of his labors is scanty indeed, but his vigor, activity, and practical ability left a deep and abiding impress on the development of the Polish Reformation.

Literature. — The sources of information in regard to Lasko are at present quite ample. His *Life (Leben d. Johann v. Lasko)*, by Peter Bartels (Elberfeld, 1860) has been concisely and carefully compiled, and gives a satisfactory account of his doctrinal position, as well as some notice of his books, together with an extended list of authorities. Krasinski's *Hist. Sketch of the Reformation in Poland* (Lond. 1838, 2 volumes, 8vo) presents an extended view of his life in connection with the Reformation in his native country. In some respects, however, the most valuable work on the subject of this article is *Johannis a Lasco Opera, tam edita quame inedita, recensuit vitam auctoris enarravit A. Kuypper* (Amsterd. 1866, 2 volumes, 8vo). In over 1300 closely printed pages we have nearly, if not quite all the remains of Lasko that can now be identified, including portions of his correspondence, extending from 1526 to 1559. See also Bertram (J.F.), *Gründlicher Bericht von Johann Alasco* (1733, 3 volumes, 4to);

GCbel. *Gesch. des christlichen Lebens in der rhein-westph. Kirche* (Coblenz, 1849), 1:318-351; Neal, *History of the Puritans*, 1:53 sq.; Hassencamp, *Hessische Kirchengesch.* (Marburg, 1832), 1, § 47; Fischer, *Versuch einer Gesch. der Ref. in Polen* (1856); Schrnnkh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* 2:688 sq.; Middleton, *Reformers*, 2 (see Index); *Jahrb. deutscher Theologie*, 1860, 2:536; 1868, 3:536; and the excellent article by Göbel, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:204 sq. (E.H.G.)

Last Day

SEE JUDGMENT DAY.

Las'thenes

(*Λασθένης*; comp. *Λά-μαχος*), an officer who stood high in the favor of Demetrius II Nicator. He is described as "cousin" (*συγγενής*, 1 Macc. 11:31) and "father" (1 Macc. 11:32; Josephus, *Ant.* 13:3, 9) of the king. Both words may be taken as titles of high nobility (compare Grimm on 1 Macc. 10:89; Diod. 17:59; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v. *ba*; § 4). It appears from Josephus (*Ant.* 13:4, 3) that he was a Cretan, to whom Demetrius was indebted for a large body of mercenaries (compare 1 Macc. 10:67), when he asserted his claim to the Syrian throne against Alexander Balas, B.C. 148 or 147. It appears that Lasthenes himself accompanied the young prince; and when Demetrius was established on the throne, he appointed Lasthenes his chief minister, with unlimited power. His arbitrary government, added to his persuading Demetrius to disband the regular troops and only employ Cretans, is supposed to have alienated the subjects from the king, and caused great dissatisfaction to the soldiers. This conduct led to the downfall of Demetrius, for it enabled Tryphon to set up Antiochus, the young son of Alexander Balas (Diodotus, *Relig.* lib. 33:4, ed. Didot, 2:522). What became of Lasthenes is not known. *SEE DEMETRIUS.*

He must not be identified with the *Cnidian* instructor of the sons of Demetrius I Soter (Justin, 35:2; comp. Livy, *Epit.* 52). There is a later Lasthenes, also a Cretan, who took a prominent part against the Romans in B.C. 70-68 (Smith, *Dict. of Biogr.* s.v. Lastheles, No. 3).

Last Time

SEE ESCHATOLOGY.

Latchet

($\ddot{E}/rc]$ *serok'*, so called from *lacing* and binding together; Gr. ἰμός, a *thong*, as it is rendered in ^{<422>}Acts 22:25), the cord or strap which fastens an Oriental shoe upon the foot (^{<2327>}Isaiah 5:27; ^{<4007>}Mark 1:7; ^{<416>}Luke 3:16; ^{<402>}John 1:27); proverbial for anything of little value (^{<01423>}Genesis 14:23). **SEE SANDAL.** "Gesenius (*Thesaur.* s.v. fWj) compares the Lat. *hilum* = *filum*, and quotes two Arabic proverbs from the Hamasa and the Kamuls, in which a corresponding word is similarly employed. In the poetical figure in ^{<2327>}Isaiah 5:27, the 'latchet' occupies the same position with regard to the shoes as the girdle to the long flowing Oriental dress, and was as essential to the comfort and expedition of the traveler. Another semi-proverbial expression in ^{<416>}Luke 3:16 points to the same easily-removed article of clothing" (Smith). "In ^{<4011>}Matthew 3:11 the same sentiment is expressed rather differently, 'Whose shoes I am not worthy to bear;' in both cases the allusion is to slaves, who were employed to loosen and carry their master's shoes, the habits of Orientals requiring this article of dress to be taken off before entering an apartment (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, part 1, chap. 9). This saying of the Baptist, as reported by Matthew, is repeated by Paul in his address to the Jews at Antioch, in Pisidia (^{<4425>}Acts 13:25). Chrysostom, on ^{<4027>}John 1:27, remarks, $\text{Tò γὰρ ὑπόδημα λῦσαι τῆς ἐσχάτης διακονίας ἐστι}$ " (Kitto). **SEE SHOE.**

Lateran, Church Of St. John,

the first in dignity of the Roman churches, and situated in the southern extremity of the city, derives its name from its occupying a portion of the site of the splendid palace of Plantius Lateranus, which having been escheated (A.D. 66) in consequence of Lateranus being implicated in the conspiracy of the Pisos (Tacitus), became imperial property, and was assigned for Christian uses by the emperor Constantine. The palace, once destroyed by fire, and rebuilt by Sixtus V, was the habitual residence of the popes until after the return from Avignon, when they removed to the Vatican. It was once made a hospital for orphans, and is now occupied partly by officials of the chapter, partly for public purposes. The present pope, Pitis IX, has converted a portion of it into a museum of Christian archaeology. Its ancient magnificence is celebrated by Juvenal. In the time of Constantine the palace was the abode of his second wife, the empress Fausta. It has been the conjecture of some that Fausta was a Christian, and that the Basilica, or Hall of Justice, connected with her palace, was granted

by Constantine as a place of Christian assembly. The fact seems, however, well established that Constantine subsequently bestowed the palace upon pope Sylvester, and it has ever since (several times rebuilt, and modified in its final completion, dating from the pontificate of Clement XII) continued a papal patrimony. The emperor is said to have founded at the same time the adjacent church, which was originally dedicated to the Savior, but after it was rebuilt by Lucius II in the middle of the 12th century, was dedicated to St. John, because of the baptistery which Constantine built near by it. It bears the additional name *Basilica Constantiniana*. The church has thus been naturally regarded as the parish or cathedral church of the popes, and is distinguished as such above any other in Rome. St. Peter's and Sta. Maria Maggiore are not to be compared with it in importance. Each of the three has a *porta santo*. In reference to the Lateran, however, Gregory XI, in his bull June 23, 1372, uses the following language, which has been substantially repeated by many popes: "Sacrosanctam Lateranensem ecclesiam, praecipuam sedem nostram, inter omnes alias Urbis et orbis ecclesias ac basilicas, etiam super ecclesiam seu basilicam principis Apostolorum de Urbe, supremum locum tenere." The ceremony of taking possession of the Lateran Basilica is one of the first observed on the election of a new pope, whose coronation takes place in it. The chapter of the Lateran has precedence of that of St. Peter's. On the throne of the Lateran is written the inscription, "Haec est Papalis Sedes et Pontificalis." An inscription on each side of the entrance styles it mother and mistress of churches, *Omnium urbis et orbis Ecclesiarum Mater et Caput*. In accordance with its dignity, therefore, all the oecumenical councils assembled in the city of Rome have been held in this church. the late council (1870), held at St. Peter's, being the only exception. **SEE LATERAN COUNCILS**. In the piazza of St. John Lateran stands the celebrated relic called the "Scala Santa," or "Holy Staircase," reputed to be the stairs of Pilate's house at Jerusalem, made holy by the feet of Christ as he passed to judgment. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:212; Stanley, *Hist. East. Ch.* page 304; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, volume 6, s.v.

Lateran Councils

a general name for the ecclesiastical councils that have been convened in the Lateran Church at Rome, but especially five great councils held there, and regarded by the Roman Catholics as oecumenical, viz. those of the years 1123, 1139, 1179, 1215, and 1512-17. We have room to notice the

most important only of all these councils, and that with reference to their principal enactments and historical connections.

I. The council of 649, under Martin I, condemned the Monothelitic doctrine, or that of *one will* in the person of Christ. This view was developed as a continuation of the Monophysite controversy. The Council of Chalcedon, in 451, had affirmed the existence of *two natures* in Christ in *one person*, against the Antiochians, the Nestorians, and Eutychians. This determination of the council did not obtain final supremacy in the Greek and Latin churches till after the time of Justinian, and the conflict with it was continued under various forms. From the Council of Chalcedon till that of Frankfort, in 793, the Church councils especially sought to maintain the *twofoldness* of the nature of Christ asserted at Chalcedon, with less regard to the *unity*, which was at the same time established. An early source for the rise of Monothelitism appeared in the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, which, originating probably in the 4th century, obtained for many centuries thereafter great credit in the Church. A Neo-Platonic mysticism in these writings seeks to mediate between the prevalent Church doctrine and Monophysitism (or the doctrine of one nature in Christ). The Areopagite is not an outspoken Monophysite, and yet, with him, the human in Christ is only a form of the divine, and there is in all the acts of Christ but one *mode of operation*, the theandric energy (**μία θεανδρική ἐνέργεια**). This expression became a favorite one with all the Monophysite opponents of the Chalcedonian decisions.

The Monothelitic controversy proper extends from 623 to 680, at which latter date the Synod of Constantinople gave the most precise definition of *two wills* in the two natures of Christ. The earlier stage of the controversy, extending to the year 638, concerns rather the question of one or two energies or *modes of working* in the acts of Christ. The emperor Heraclius, on occasion of his reconquering the Eastern provinces from the Persians in the year 622, and there coming in contact with certain Monophysite bishops, conceived the idea of reconciling them to the Church by authorizing the expression in reference to the acts of Christ which was used by Dionysius — the **μία θεανδρική ἐνέργεια**. Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, being consulted, admitted the propriety of the expression as one sanctioned by the fathers, and recommended it to Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, who, being soon made bishop of Alexandria, set up a compromise for the Monophysites with the Council of Chalcedon on nine points. Sophronius, a monk of Alexandria, seriously objected to the course taken

by Sergius. and, on being made bishop of Jerusalem, became so strong an opponent that Sergius called to his aid the influence of Honorius, bishop of Rome, who expressed himself in favor of the view rather of one will than of one operation, but advised that controversy be avoided. It is unquestionably the fact that the expressed views of Honorius, though a pope, were subsequently condemned in council. By occasion of the more decided opposition of Sophronius, the emperor Heraclius, under advice of Sergius, issued his edict, the *Ecthesis*, in the year 638, in which he forbade the use of either expression, "one mode of working" or "two modes of working," in a controversial way, but especially prohibited the latter, since it is evident that Christ can have but *one will*, the human being subordinate to the divine. This was distinct Monothelitism. A powerful opponent of this view was the monk Maximus, whose writings had a controlling influence with the Lateran Council. He asserts that for the work of redemption a completeness in the two natures of Christ is necessary; there must be a complete human will. The Logos, indeed, works all through the human working and willing. There is a theandric energy in his own sense. It is rather as a τρόπος ἀντιδόσεως, or what was subsequently called the *communicatio idiomatum*. Maximus worked with great zeal against Monothelitism in Rome and Africa, sending out thence tracts on the subject into the East. Sophronius still carried on the controversy, as also, with him, Stephen, bishop of Doria, his pupil. After the death of Honorius in 638, the bishops of Rome were decidedly opposed to Monothelitism, and Martin I, who had zealously contended against the view while representative of the Roman Church at Constantinople, became, when made pope in 649, the chief pillar of the contrary opinion. Advocates of the view enunciated in the *Ecthesis* of Heraclius were Theodore, bishop of Phasan, and Pyrrhus of Constantinople. In 648 the emperor Constans II, under the influence of the patriarch Paul, issued his Tespe (τύπος πίστεως), which, though not so decidedly Monothelitic as the *Ecthesis*, condemns, under threat of the severest penalties, any further controversy upon this subject. Without consulting the emperor, Martin I now convoked this first Lateran Council, in which he presided over about 104 bishops from Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Africa. The pope sought to obtain generally recognition for the council, and it was finally everywhere received with the five oecumenical councils. Five sessions were held; the writings of the prominent Monothelites were examined and condemned; pope Martin explained the proper meaning of Dionysius's term "theandric operation," stating that it was designed to signify *two* operations of one person; the

Ecthesis of Heraclius and *Type of Constans* were condemned; and the judgment of the council pronounced in twenty canons, which anathematize all who do not confess in our Lord Jesus Christ two wills and two operations.

II. The councils of 1105, 1112, and 1116, under Pascal II, concern the contest about *investitures* between the pope and the emperor, which was brought to a close in the Council of 1123, called and presided over by Calixtus II. This body consisted of 300 bishops and 600 abbots, all of the Latin Church. The investiture (q.v.) contest, which began as early as 1054, when, by mutual decrees of excommunication, the breach between the Eastern and Western churches was made final, arose from the claim made by the German emperors to an inheritance of rights exercised by the Greek emperors concerning the appointment of candidates to ecclesiastical offices, and their investiture with the right to hold Church property as subjects of the empire. Under the new German empire, from Otho the Great to Henry IV, 936-1056, the popes themselves were confirmed in their seat by the emperor. Henry III obtained from the Council of Sutry, which was held near Rome, in the midst of his own army, in 1046, the power of nominating the popes, without intervention of clergy or people. The influence of Hildebrand was now felt an influence which he had begun to exert from the time of Leo IX, in 1048, and which secured from Nicolas II, 1060, a decree transferring the election of popes to a conclave of cardinals. Hildebrand, as Gregory VII, maintained a celebrated contest with Henry IV, to whom, in 1075, he forbade all power of investiture, excommunicating the emperor the next year, and causing him to do penance at Canossa. With his victorious campaign in Italy, 1080-83, Henry drove the pope into exile at Salerno, where he soon after died. His immediate successors, however, were such as he had designated for the post, and were the inheritors of his doctrines and plans for the supremacy of the Church. Urban II sent forth an encyclical declaring his adhesion to the principles of Gregory — the *Dictastus Gregorii*; and Pascal II (1099-1118), who had been one of Gregory's cardinals, showed more zeal than firmness in the same course. In the Lateran Council under the pope, 1105, an oath of obedience to the pope was taken by the clergy, and a promise rendered to affirm whatever he and the Church in council should affirm. The count De Meulan and his confederates were excommunicated for having encouraged the king of England in his conduct concerning investitures. Henry V, who, in the rebellion against his father, was

encouraged by Pascal, would nevertheless yield nothing on becoming emperor, 1105, in the matter of investitures, his example being followed in this respect by England and France. Henry marched into Italy and imprisoned the pope in 1111, forcing from him the concession of rendering back to the emperor the fiefs of the bishops on condition that there should be no imperial interference with the elections. For his weakness in this and in other points the pope was bitterly reproached, and the council of 1112 revoked all these concessions and excommunicated the emperor.


Notwithstanding the rebellion of his German subjects, Henry collected an army and invaded Italy anew in 1116. The council convoked the same year thereupon renewed the revocation of the concessions Pascal had formerly made, and anathematized the emperor. At last, the German people, weary of the conflict between State and Church, brought about a peaceful compromise in the concordat at the imperial Diet of Worms, 1122. The principles of this concordat were adopted by the council of 1123. The terms of the compact are as follows: "The emperor surrenders to God, to St. Peter and Paul, and to the Catholic Church, all right of investiture by king and staff. He grants that elections and ordinations in all churches shall take place freely in accordance with ecclesiastical laws. The pope agrees that the election of German prelates shall be had in the presence of the emperor, provided it is without violence or simony. In case any election is disputed, the emperor shall render assistance to the legal party, with the advice of the archbishop and the bishops. The person elected is invested with the imperial fief by the royal scepter pledged for the execution of everything required by law. Whoever is consecrated shall also receive in like manner his investiture from other parts of the empire within six months" (Hase, *Church History*, page 200; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 3:181 sq.). The pope here made considerable concessions in form, but actually, through his influence, obtained all power at the elections. The council of 1123 also renewed the grant of indulgences promulgated by Urban II in promotion of the first crusade in 1095, and decreed the celibacy of the clergy. Twenty-two canons of discipline were established.

III. The council of 1139, under Innocent II, condemned the anti-pope Anacletus II, with his adherents, and deposed all who had received office under him. On the same day with the installation of Innocent II, in 1130, Peter of Leon, a cardinal, and grandson of a rich Jewish banker, had been proclaimed pope, as Anacletus II, by a majority of the cardinals. Innocent took refuge in France, where he was supported by the king. His cause was

warmly espoused by Bernard of Clairvaux, through whose influence chiefly Innocent recovered his position in Italy, and marched into Rome triumphantly with Lothaire II in 1136. Anacletus died in 1138, and a successor was chosen by his party only with the purpose of making peace. Roger of Sicily had supported Anacletus, and was on this account condemned in the council of 1139, though the origin of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies belongs to the same year, Roger having taken Innocent prisoner, and having compelled the pope to bestow upon him the investiture of this kingdom. At this council Arnold of Brescia was also condemned. This was a young clergyman of the city of Brescia, a disciple of Abelard, who, inspired by the free philosophical spirit of his master, devoted himself to the promotion of practical reform in Church and State. A marked spirit of political independence was manifesting itself about this time in Lombardy, as an inheritance from the old Roman municipalities established there. The popes, from the days of Leo IX, had themselves inspired movements of ecclesiastical reform. Pascal II had admitted that the secular power of the bishops interfered with their spiritual duties. Bernard, though a zealous opponent of Arnold, yet writes as follows in his *Contemplations on the Papacy*: "Who can mention the place where one of the apostles ever held a trial, decided disputes about boundaries, or portioned out lands?" "I read that the apostles stood before judgment seats, not sat on them." Arnold preached with great zeal against the political power and wealth of the clergy. The Church ought rather to rejoice, he said, in an apostolic poverty. He was driven successively from Italy, France, and Switzerland, but in 1139 was recalled to Rome by the populace, who sought to revive the sovereignty of the state, established a senate, limited the pope to the exercise of spiritual power and the possession of voluntary offerings, and invited the German emperor to make Rome his capital. Arnold and his "politicians" at Rome thus gave pope Innocent and his immediate successors — Lucius II, Eugenius III, and Adrian IV — more trouble than any political movements elsewhere. This condemnation at the council did not effectually diminish his power. When, however, Adrian, in 1154, put the city of Rome under ban, and prohibited all public worship, Arnold was abandoned by the senate, sacrificed by Frederick I, and hung at Rome in 1155, his body being burned and thrown into the Tiber. Among the canons of the council, the twenty-third condemns the heresy of the Manichaeans, as the followers of Peter de Bruis were called. This heresy was attributed to the early Waldensians in France and elsewhere, arising partly from their ascetic mode of life. About

1000 prelates were present at this council; thirty canons of discipline were published, and among them reaffirmations of former canons against simony, marriage, and concubinage in the clergy.

IV. The council of 1179, under Alexander III, numbering 280, mostly Latin bishops, was called to correct certain abuses which had arisen during the long schism just brought to a close by the peace of Venice, 1177. Until near the end of the 12th century the popes were hard pressed by the Hohenstauffen emperors. It is the contest of Ghibelline and Guelph. Frederick I had taken umbrage at the use of the term "beneficium" in a letter addressed to him by Adrian IV about the rudeness of German knights to pilgrims visiting Rome, as if the pope meant to imply that the imperial authority had been conferred by him. The emperor marched into Italy, and other letters were interchanged between him and the pope, when, upon the death of Adrian in 1159, the two parties—the hierarchic and the moderate among the cardinals chose two opposing popes, viz. Alexander III and Victor IV. The emperor's council, called at Pavia in 1160, recognized the latter. Pascal III and Calixtus III followed at the imperial dictation, with but little influence. Alexander, from his refuge in France, enjoyed great popularity. He had on his side the Lombard league. The cause of Frederick was defended by the lawyers of Bologna, who ascribed to him unlimited power, to the prejudice of the people. Defeated at Legnano in 1176, the emperor subscribed, at the dictation of Alexander, the peace of Venice, the provisions of which were based on the Concordat of Worms. The first and most important of the twenty-seven canons established by this council, which were mostly disciplinary, provides that henceforth "the election of the popes shall be confined to the college of cardinals, and *two thirds* of the votes shall be required to make a lawful election, instead of a majority only, as heretofore." It was by this council also that the "errors and impieties" of the Waldenses and Albigenses were declared heretical. At the unimportant council of 1167, pope Alexander excommunicated Frederick I.

V. The council of 1215, under Innocent III, was the most important of all the Lateran Councils. It is usually styled the Fourth Lateran. It continued in session from November 11 to November 30, having present 71 archbishops, 412 bishops, 800 abbots, the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and the legates of other patriarchs and crowned heads. The pope opened the assembly with a sermon upon St.  Luke 22:15, relating

to the recovery of the Holy Land and the reformation of the Church. The remarkable power of Innocent III is displayed in his influence over this council, which was submissive to all his wishes, and received the seventy canons proposed by him. The papal prerogatives attained their greatest height in Innocent, whose pontificate extended from 1198 to 1216. The bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII, directed against Philip the Fair in 1302, marks the limit from which the power of the popes evidently declined. Innocent III — a man of great personal power, of marked ability as a writer and orator, bold, crafty, and ever watchful of affairs — had his eye on all that transpired through his legates. The chief objects which his pontificate sought were "the strengthening of the States of the Church, separation of the Two Sicilies from all dependence on the German empire, the liberation of Italy from all foreign control, the exercise of guardianship over the confederacy of its states, the liberation of the Oriental Church, the extermination of heretics, and the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline" (Hase, *Church Hist.* page 207). Hitherto England, Germany, and France had constituted a balance of power against the pope, but under Innocent the two former, as well as Italy, submitted to the claims of the pseudo-Isidorean decretals. France was early laid under interdict (1200) on account of Philip Augustus's repudiation of Ingeburge and the French bishops' approval of the act, while John of England was deprived of his realm, to receive it back (in 1213) only as a fief of Rome. Deciding at first for Otho IV, the Guelph, against the Hohenstauffen Philip, in Germany, Innocent subsequently secured from the council the recognition of Frederick II, vainly seeking in this his German policy to free Italy entirely from the power of the emperor. The famous seventy constitutions of Innocent, if not discussed *conciliariter* by the bishops, or passed with every form of enactment, were nevertheless regarded as the canons of the council, so recognized by the Council of Trent and by Church authorities of the intervening age, and they have constituted a fundamental law for many well-known practices of the Romish Church. The *first* of these canons asserts the Catholic faith in the unity of God against all Manichæan sects. It also, for the first time, makes the doctrine of transubstantiation, in the use of this express term, an article of faith. "The body and blood of Jesus Christ in the sacrament of the altar are truly contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread being, by the divine omnipotence, *transubstantiated* into his body, and the wine into his blood." The *second* canon condemns the treatise of Joachim, the prophet of Calabria, which he wrote against Peter Lombard on the subject of the Trinity. The *third* canon

is of great importance, furnishing the basis for the crusade against the Albigenses, and for all severities of a like character on the part of the Romish Church. It "anathematizes all heretics who hold anything in opposition to the preceding exposition of faith, and enjoins that, after condemnation, they shall be delivered over to the secular arm; also excommunicates all who receive, protect, or maintain heretics, and threatens with deposition all bishops who do not use their utmost endeavors to clear their dioceses of them" (Landon, *Manual of Councils*, page 295). The fourth canon invites the Greeks to unite with and submit themselves to the Romish Church. The fifth canon regulates the order of precedence of the patriarchs: 1. Rome; 2. Constantinople; 3. Alexandria; 4. Antioch; 5. Jerusalem; and permits these several patriarchs to give the pall to the archbishops of their dependencies, exacting from themselves a profession of faith, and of obedience to the Roman see, when they receive the pall from the pope. The *sixth to the twentieth*, inclusive, are of minor importance (see Landon, *Manual of Councils*, page 296). The *twenty-first* canon enjoins "all the faithful of both sexes, having arrived at years of discretion, to confess all their sins at least once a year to their proper priest, and to communicate at Easter." This is the first canon known which orders sacramental confession generally, and may have been occasioned by the teachings of the Waldenses, that neither confession nor satisfaction was necessary in order to obtain remission of sin. From the words with which it commences, it is known as the canon "Omnis utriusque sexus," and was solemnly reaffirmed by the Council of Trent. The canons (given completely by Landon, *Man. of Councils*, page 293 sq.) in general constitute a body of full and severe disciplinary enactments. This council reaffirmed and extended the Truce of God on plenary indulgence which had been previously proclaimed in behalf of the Eastern Crusades, and fixed the time, June 1, and place, Sicily, as a rendezvous for another crusade.

This council also confirmed Simon de Montfort in possession of lands which the Crusaders had obtained by papal confiscation from the Waldenses, and decreed the entire extirpation of the heresy. The Waldenses or Albigenses in the south of France were the followers of Peter Waldo, a wealthy citizen of Lyons, who, from religious principle, adopted a life of poverty. His followers were also called Leonistae and "Poor men of Lyons." They were allied in their sentiments to the Vaudois of the Piedmontese valleys, with whom they became united for mutual defense. They protested against these points in the doctrine of the Romish Church:

1. Transubstantiation.
2. The sacraments of confirmation, confession, and marriage.
3. The invocation of saints.
4. The worship of images.
5. The temporal power of the clergy.

A crusade had been instituted against them by the papal power in 1178. Innocent sought to win them over and make monks of them by establishing in 1201 the order of "Poor Catholics." Unsuccessful in this, he confiscated their lands to the feudal lords, and established an inquisition among them under the direction of Dominic, which was formally sanctioned by the present council. The warfare against them, incited and directed by the monks of Citeaux, was allowed by Philip Augustus. Count Raymond of Toulouse espoused the cause of his persecuted vassals. The papal legate, Peter of Castelnau, sent to convert the Waldenses, was murdered by Raymond, whose dominions were thereupon assaulted in 1209 by a fiercer crusade of so-called "Christian Pilgrims," led on by Simon de Montfort and Arnold, the abbot of Citeaux. The count of Toulouse submitted, but a bloody warfare was prosecuted against Raymond Roger, viscount of Beziers and Albi, and subsequently 200 towns and castles within the boundaries of the two counts were granted to the successful Simon de Montfort. A rebellion, however, against his power deprived him of all; but Raymond of Toulouse, who appeared at the council of 1215, obtained no favor, and his territory was declared to be alienated from him forever.

VI. The council of 1512-1517, under Julius II and Leo X, was convened for the reformation of abuses, for the condemnation of the Council of Pisa, and attained its most important result in the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction. France, under Louis XII, had obtained great military successes in Italy by the League of Cambray, formed in 1509 against Venice. In the interests of France, and by the friendship of some of the cardinals, Louis XII summoned a Church council at Pisa, Nov. 1511, which in 1512 was moved to Milan, but was entirely fruitless of results, being dissolved by the presence of the pope's army. Julius II, though at first jealous of Venice, had nevertheless, aroused by the successes of the French general, formed the Holy Alliance with Venice, Spain, England, and Switzerland, and now, at the head of his army, drove the French beyond the Alps, and himself summoned a council at the Lateran May 10, 1512. This council extended over twelve sessions, until March 1517. The bishop of Guerck had actively promoted the summoning of the council, and attended as representative of

the German emperor. All the acts of the Council of Pisa were at once annulled. Julius having died in February 1513, Leo X presided over the sixth session. At the eighth session, in December 1513, Louis XII, through his ambassador, declared his adhesion to this Council of the Lateran. At the eleventh session, in December 1516, the bull was read which, in place of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), wherein France accepted the decisions of the Basle council in so far as they were consistent with the liberties of the Gallican Church, substituted the Concordat agreed upon this year, 1516, between Leo X and Francis I. Through hope of increasing his power in Italy, Francis largely sacrificed the liberties of the Church. Several of the articles of the Pragmatic were retained, but most of them were altered or abolished. The first article was entirely contrary to the Pragmatic, which had re-established the right of election, while the Concordat declares that the chapters of the cathedrals in France shall no longer proceed to elect the bishop in case of vacancy, but that the king shall name a proper person, whom the pope shall nominate to the vacant see. The Concordat, on account especially of this provision, met with great opposition in the Parliament, universities, and the Church at Paris. It was a great advance of the papacy against the liberties of France (compare Janus, *Pope and Council*, § 28 and 29). Neither this council nor the other four, viz. those of 1123, 1139, 1179, and 1215, styled oecumenical by the Romish Church, can be properly regarded as such.

Some writers mention as the sixth Lateran the council convened by pope Benedict XIII on the bull *Unigenitus*, *SEE JANSENIUS*, and for the purpose of general reform in the Church (compare Klemm, *Cone. a Bened. XIII*, in *Lat. habiti praembreve examenz* (1729); Walch, *De concil. Lat. a Bened. XIII* (Lips. 1726). For a detailed account of the council at the Lateran opened Dec. 8, 1869, *SEE OECUMENICAL COUNCIL*, and the article INFALLIBILITY *SEE INFALLIBILITY* in volume 4, See Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 287-303; Mansi, *Concil.* 6:75; 10:741, 767, 806, 891, 999, 1503; 11:117; 14:1-346; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* 1:368; 2:131, 184, 195, 388; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 3:297, 298 sq., 434; 4:146, 175 sq., 236; 5:211 sq.; Cunningham, *Hist. Theol.* 1:417 sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1:351; 2:206.

Latey, Gilbert,

an English Quaker, was born in England in 1627. He was one of the most active and efficient members of his society in London. His labors were

directed especially to the relief of the more unfortunate of his Church. He died September 15, 1705. See Janney, *Hist. of Friends*, 3:105.

Lathrop, Joseph, D.D.,

an eminent Congregational minister, was born October 20, 1731 (O.S.), at Norwich, Connecticut; graduated at Yale College in 1754; entered the ministry January 1756; was ordained pastor in West Springfield, Massachussets, August 25, and labored there until his death, December 31, 1820. In 1793 he was elected professor of divinity in Yale College, but declined the position. He published *A Letter to the Reverend the associated Pastors in the County of New Haven concerning the Ordination of the Reverend John Hubbard in Meriden* (1770); *Miscellaneous Collection of original Pieces, political, moral, and entertaining* (1786); and a number of occasional *Sermons* (Hartford, 1793, 8vo; 1803, 8vo; Worcester, 1807, 8vo). Doctor Lathrop was a popular preacher, and his sermons have long been highly commented upon both in this country and in Europe. — Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 1:528.

Latimer, Hugh

one of the most distinguished prelates of the Church of England, undoubtedly one of the ablest, if not the ablest ecclesiastic among the English reformers of the 16th century, called by Froude (*Hist. of England*, 1:264 comp. 2:101) the John Knox of England, the bearer of a name that "now shines over two hemispheres, and will blaze more and more till the last day," was born at Thurcaston, in Leicestershire, about 1490. His father, a farmer of good practical judgment, early discovering in Hugh talents that would fit him for a literary position of note, afforded him all the advantages of his time at school, and at fourteen Hugh was transferred to Cambridge, where he was soon known as a sober, hard-working student. At nineteen he was elected fellow of Clare Hall, took his degree at twenty, and at once entered on the study of theology, having decided to devote himself to the services of the Church. A sincere and devout believer in the doctrines and rites of the Church of Rome, we need not wonder at finding him, at this period of his life, loud and frequent in his denunciation of the would-be reformers, seldom losing an opportunity of inveighing against them. "He even held them," says Middleton (*Memoirs of the Reformers*, 3:103), "in such horror that he thought they were the supporters of that Antichrist whose appearance was to precede the coming of the Son of

Man, and conjectured that the day of judgment was at hand." Nor were the events of his day likely to cool his mistaken zeal. Luther, who was making havoc in the ranks of the papacy, had just been assailed by "the defender of the faith" (king Henry VIII); and as a most fit subject for his dissertation for the divinity degree, Latimer could find no better work than "fleshing his maiden sword" in an attack upon Melancthon — surely no small task for a man not much beyond his teens. But even at this early age Hugh Latimer proved himself quite a formidable polemic, and, what is even more noteworthy, a man not afraid to speak his mind — a trait which distinguishes our subject in all the acts of his life. Immediately after his attack on Melancthon he came under the eye and tongue of Bilney, the famous advocate of the Reformed doctrines in the English Church, and he was led to examine more critically the doctrines and discipline of his Church. The result was, naturally enough, conversion to the cause which Bilney so ably advocated. Latimer was at this time about thirty years of age, and as he was not a man accustomed to do things by halves, he became a zealous advocate for reform, and preached manfully and boldly against the false doctrines and various abuses of Romanism which had crept into and polluted the Church of England. Naturally gifted with great oratorical powers, and inspired by the fitness of the subject with which he was dealing, he soon made himself famous as a preacher at Cambridge. "None, except the stiff-necked and uncircumcised, ever went away from his preaching, it was said, without being affected with high detestation of sin, and moved to all godliness and virtue" (*Jewel of Joy* [Parker Society edition], page 224 sq.). Such preaching, however, greatly as it was needed by the times in which Latimer lived, could not meet the approval of the servile ecclesiastics. It was too much tinged by theological statements that "had originally sprouted in England, and, after being translated to Germany, had been brought back with improved fiber;" and Latimer soon found himself surrounded by a formidable opposition, daily growing in strength. His "heretical preaching," as it was then called, caused a remonstrance made to the diocesan bishop of Ely by a gray friar named Venetus, but really due to most of the divines of Cambridge, requesting episcopal interference. Dr. West, then the incumbent of the bishopric of Ely, naturally a mild and moderate man, inclined to favor Latimer at first, and only mildly rebuked him. Here the matter might have ended, and it is more than likely that "he would not have been the Latimer of the Reformation, and the Church of England would not, perhaps, have been here today" (Froude, 2:101), had not this bishop, while on a visit to

Cambridge (1525), unexpectedly attended one of Latimer's preaching services, and had not his prelatical dignity been sorely touched on the occasion. Latimer was right in the midst of his sermon when the bishop entered; immediately he abandoned his subject, and, as soon as the bishop had been seated, according to Strype, addressed the audience as follows: "It is of congruence meet that a new auditory being more honorable, requireth a new theme, being a new argument to entreat of. Therefore it behoveth me now to deviate from mine intended purpose, and somewhat to entreat of the honorable estate of a bishop. Therefore let this be the theme, '*Christus existens pontifex futurorum bonorum*, etc.'" This text, says a contemporary, he so fruitfully handled, expounding every word, and setting forth the office of Christ so sincerely as the true and perfect pattern unto all other bishops that should succeed him in his Church, that the bishop then present might well think of himself that neither he nor any of his fellows were of that race, but rather of the fellowship of Caiaphas and Annas. It cannot appear strange to any one that "the wise and politic man," as the bishop of Ely was generally called, thereafter also went over to the enemy, and forbade Latimer's preaching within the diocese over which he presided. Latimer, however, overcame this obstacle by gaining the use of a pulpit in a monastery of Austin friars, exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, and the prior of which, Dr. Barnes, decidedly favored the reformed doctrines. This daring attitude of the young preacher so provoked Dr. West and the Cambridge clique that the bishop made complaint to cardinal Wolsey. "No eye saw more quickly than the cardinal's the difference between a true man and an impostor," and when he had heard from the lips of Latimer himself the substance of the sermons that had given cause to the complaint, the cardinal, instead of punishing Latimer, replied to the accusations by granting the offender a license to preach in any church in England. "If the bishop of Ely cannot abide such doctrine as you have here repeated," he said, "you shall preach it to his beard, let him say what he will" (Latimer, *Remains*, page 27 sq., as quoted by Froude, 2:102). From this time forward the career of Latimer seems clearly marked out. Hitherto he had been quite orthodox in points of theoretic belief. "His mind," says Froude, "was practical rather than speculative, and he was slow in arriving at conclusions which had no immediate bearing upon action." Now he broke loose altogether from the position of the Cambridge authorities, and probably became defiant of them. But Wolsey (t 1530) fell from grace, and there was reason to fear that Latimer would now, at last, also fall a prey to the malice of his formidable adversaries, greatly increased in numbers by

his success in gaining followers, who were drawn towards him by his eloquence, his moral conduct, and his kindness of disposition, as well as by the merits of his cause. Unexpectedly, however, and quite to the chagrin of the Cambridge men, he found a fresh protector in the king himself. He had preached before Henry in the Lent of 1530, having been introduced to his royal master by the king's physician, Dr. Butts; and he won the favor of Henry by his honest, straightforward logic and his enthusiasm. In this new position he performed his duty as faithfully as he had in preaching at Cambridge, and he dared to speak the truth in a place where the truth is generally forgotten. A special opportunity to speak in defense of the Protestant cause was afforded him by the persecutions to which the truest men in Henry's dominions were subjected at this time on account of their religious faith; and, though he did not succeed in staying the hand of persecution by this address of almost unexampled grandeur, it yet remains "to speak forever for the courage of Latimer, and to speak something, too, for a prince that could respect the nobleness of the poor yeoman's son, who dared in such a cause to write to him as a man to a man. To have written at all in such a strain was as brave a step as was ever deliberately ventured. Like most brave acts, it did not go unrewarded; for Henry remained ever after, however widely divided from him in opinion, yet his unshaken friend" (Froude, 2:104). Perhaps it may not be out of place here to say that Henry VIII himself; however nobly he may have acted towards Latimer and the Reformers after 1530, was perhaps, in the main, incited to his friendly deeds towards Latimer by the position the latter had taken in 1527. Froude and most of the English historians forget, in their great endeavor to cleanse Henry VIII from all sin, that, however greatly the Church of England has been benefited by his work, his object was not reform in the Church, but the establishment of a second papacy and his own enthronement as pope, and that he was only led to take this step when he found so many pliant tools to carry out his project of separation from his first wife, Catharine of Aragon. Of the commission appointed by the University of Cambridge to investigate the king's rights in this matter, Latimer had been a member, and had taken decided ground in favor of the king. This of itself was sufficient to secure the good offices of his royal master. Latimer's record of course, both before and after this event, clearly proves that he was not a pliant tool in the hands of the king, but actually believed Henry VIII justified in his separation from Catharine.

Most prominent and influential at this time among the king's favorites, or the Anne Boleyn party, as they are sometimes termed, as the advocates of her cause and the justness of king Henry's marriage with her, was lord Thomas Cromwell (q.v.; comp. also Froude, *History of England*, 2:109 sq.). By Cromwell's exertions, Latimer, in 1531, was presented with the benefice of West Kingston, in Wiltshire. where he preached the reformed doctrines with such plainness and emphasis as to bring upon him a public accusation and citation before the bishop of London, who had only been watching for an opportunity to punish him as a heretic. The citation was issued and served January 10, 1532. Articles were drawn up, mainly extracts from his sermons, in which he was charged with speaking lightly of the worship of the saints, and with affirming that there was no material fire of a purgatorial description, and that, for his own part, he would rather be in purgatory than in the Lollard's tower! He set out for London in the depth of winter, and under a severe fit of the stone, determined to defend the justness of his course. He was submitted by the different bishops to the closest cross-questionings, in the hope that he would commit himself. "They felt," says Froude (2:107), "that he was the most dangerous person to them in the kingdom, and they labored with unusual patience to insure his conviction." Latimer, however, baffled his episcopal inquisitors with their own weapons, and when they dared to excommunicate and to imprison him, he dared to appeal to the king in the face of their formidable opposition, and was permitted to escape with a simple submission to the archbishop, instead of an obligation to subscribe to a certain list of articles. These latter were as follows: "That there is a purgatory to purge the souls of the dead after this life; that the souls in purgatory are holpen with the masses, prayers, and alms of the living: that the saints do pray as mediators now for us in heaven; that they are to be honored; that it is profitable for Christians to call upon the saints that they may pray for us unto God; that pilgrimages and oblations done to the sepulchers and relics of saints are meritorious; that they which have vowed perpetual chastity may not marry, nor break their vow, without the dispensation of the pope; that the keys of binding and loosing delivered to Peter do still remain with the bishops of Rome, his successors, although they live wickedly, and are by no means, nor at any time, committed to laymen; that men may merit at God's hand by fasting, prayer, and other works of piety; that they which are forbidden of the bishop to preach, as suspected persons, ought to cease until they have purged themselves; that the fast which is used in Lent, and other fasts prescribed by the canons, are to be observed; that God, in every one of the

seven sacraments, giveth grace to a man rightly receiving the same, that consecrations, sanctifyings, and blessings, by custom received into the Church, are profitable; that it is laudable and profitable that the venerable images of the crucifix and other saints should be had in the Church as a remembrance, and to the honor and worship of Jesus Christ and his saints; that it is laudable and profitable to deck and clothe those images, and to set up burning lights before them to the honor of said saints." Historians disagree as to the attitude of Latimer towards the bishops, who demanded that he should sign at least two of the articles, viz. the one respecting the observance of Lent, and that concerning the crucifix and the lawfulness of images in churches. Fox doubts that Latimer signed any; Gilpin, in his memoir of Latimer, denies it outright; Hook (*Eccles. Biogr.* 6:562) says that the fact of his signing "is put beyond all question by the minutes of the Convocation, where it is recorded that in the month of March 1532, Latimer appeared, and, kneeling down, craved forgiveness, acknowledging that he had erred in preaching against the aforesaid two articles." Froude, however, holds that Latimer signed "all except two — one apparently on the power of the pope; the other I am unable to conjecture." (Comp. Burnet, *Hist. of the Ref.* 3:116; Latimer's *Remains*, page 466.)

Rescued from these perils by lord Cromwell, he was by the latter now introduced to Anne Boleyn, and by her appointed chaplain; and in 1535 he was honored with the bishopric of Worcester. In this new appointment, which marks an important epoch in the ecclesiastical history of the (lay, Latimer was remarkably zealous in the discharge of his office; he was active, determined, and vigilant. "In writing, frequent; in ordaining, strict; in preaching, indefatigable; in reproving, severe; in exhorting, persuasive." In 1536, finally, he was brought from the somewhat secluded position he had hitherto occupied to a more public exhibition by a summons to Parliament and Convocation, at the opening of which he preached two very powerful sermons, boldly urging the necessity of reform. Ever since 1534 estrangement between the pope and the king had been quite decided. Cranmer's decree of 1533, approving the marriage with Anne Boleyn, had been declared first null and void by the pope, and Henry had been threatened with excommunication; but, as he had ignored the papal threat, a bull to this effect was published in 1534-5. These proceedings on the part of Rome left no other course open to Henry than either to repent, or to establish himself as the supreme head of the English Church. The Convocation of Canterbury, in 1531, had pronounced officially in favor of

constitutional reforms, and an act of Parliament in 1533 repudiated papal supremacy by withdrawing first the payment of the bishops' annates or first-fruits, and next by an "act for the restraint of appeals," which forbade appeals to Rome on any pretext, and asserted the civil and ecclesiastical authorities in England competent to decide without any consultation of the papal power, followed by another act conferring on the English monarch the right of episcopal appointment, as well as another forbidding applications to the Roman see for faculties, dispensations, etc. It was therefore no great task to prevail upon the convocations of Canterbury and York, in 1534, to declare formally against the claim of the Roman see to exercise any jurisdiction in England; and, when once the step had been taken by the convocations, both the universities, as well as the whole of the bishops, and an overwhelming majority of the clergy, cheerfully followed in the same wake, "all apparently feeling that there was no sound theological reason for the maintenance of so burdensome and unconstitutional a tyranny" (Blunt [John Henry], *Key to Ch. History* [modern], page 23). With all these initiatory measures secured, Henry had no reason any longer to hesitate on the decided step of seizing the supreme power over the English Church, which, in 1531, the convocations of Canterbury and York had consented to recognize only with the definite limitation "as far as the law of Christ will allow," and he began the work by an order, in 1534, to omit the pope's name from the service-books, quickly followed by two successive acts, passed by a servile Parliament, confirming the supremacy, and giving to the king unlimited power to repress all heresies, and to punish as high treason the denial of his right to the title of supreme head of the Church. In order further to secure him in the position which he had assumed, the Convocation of 1536, in which Latimer, as we have seen above, figured quite prominently, was urged to settle the questions of doctrine and devotion, which were agitating the English Church, and, as the result of their deliberations, sent forth the following ten articles, the original predecessors of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. *SEE ARTICLES.*

I. Enjoined belief in the Holy Bible, the three creeds, and the teaching of the first four general councils.

II. Set forth the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

III. Defined penance as consisting of repentance, confession, absolution, and amendment of life.

IV. Declared fully the doctrine of the real presence, without asserting that of transubstantiation.

V. Explained justification as attainable by repentance faith, and charity, through the merits and mission of our blessed Lord.

VI. Declared that images might be profitably used as aids to devotion, but not worshipped nor unduly honored.

VII. Set forth the honor due to saints as God's faithful people who pray for us.

VIII. Showed that, with certain limitations, the prayers of the saints might be asked for.

IX. Spoke of minor rites and ceremonies of the Church such as the use of holy water, ashes on Ash-Wednesday palms (on Palm-Sunday, etc., and declared that they might be fitly used to excite devotional feelings, but not as if they could obtain remission of sins.

X. Distinguished prayers for the dead from the Romish doctrine of purgatory, repudiating the latter.

In the following year these doctrinal articles were succeeded by the *Institution of a Christian Man* (q.v.), a plain and authoritative exposition of Church doctrine, composed by a commission of forty-six divines, appointed by the king, and including all the bishops as well as some other dignitaries of the Church. In this commission all shades of opinion had been represented, Cranmer and Latimer, as well as Gardiner and Bonner, being of the number; but it was evident throughout that the Reformers were in the majority; and when, to all outward appearances, the reform movement seemed destined to prove a success in England, it suddenly received, from a quarter where it was last looked for, a blow that stunned it almost completely. The separation between the king of England and the pope of Rome having become complete, the Lutherans grew anxious to effect a union with the English Reformers, and to this end three German divines, with Burckhardt at their head, had come to England in 1538, to discuss and amicably settle all minor religious differences of opinion.

Unfortunately, however, they not only failed to bring about an agreement on sacramental doctrine, but the discussion even induced the king to cling more tenaciously than ever to the belief of the Romish Church, especially

on transubstantiation; and in 1539 the king actually caused the passage of "a the 10 Articles, or the Six Articles," or "whip with six strings," as the Protestants termed it, by which the denial of transubstantiation was made punishable with death, and other mediaeval dogmas were enforced by fine and imprisonment (comp. Froude, *Hist. of England*, 3, ch. 16). From these *six articles* (q.v.) the reformers, of course, totally dissented; many of them preferred to hold their peace, and kept their places. Latimer, however, was not one of these; accustomed to speak his mind, he at once manifested his dissent to this enactment by his resignation of the bishopric. Some historians will have it that he was induced to resign by lord Cromwell; the latter, "either himself deceived or desiring to smooth the storm, told Latimer that the king advised his resignation" (Froude, 3:370, foot note). The *state papers* (1:849), however, state "that his majesty afterwards denied this, and pitied Latimer's condition;" and when we consider that Latimer had found a tried friend in Cromwell, we can hardly conclude that either he or the king had anything to do with the resignation, which was an act only to be expected of Latimer, ever independent and bold to speak the truth. Froude (on the authority of Hall) will have it even that Latimer, together with Shaxton (q.v.), were imprisoned immediately after their resignation, but if this be true he can have been confined only a brief period, as by a summary declaration of pardon the bishop's dungeon doors were thrown open and the prisoners were dismissed a very short time after their imprisonment.

Latimer thereafter sought retirement in the country, where he would have continued to reside had not an accident befallen him, the effects of which he thought the skill of London surgeons would alleviate. He arrived in London when the power of Cromwell was nearly at an end, and the mastery in the hands of Gardiner, who no sooner discovered him in his privacy than he procured accusations to be made against him for his objections to the Six Articles, and he was committed to the Tower. Different causes being alleged against him, he remained a prisoner for the remaining six years of king Henry VIII's reign, his enemies evidently designing mainly to prevent his influence for the cause of the Reformers in the capital of the nation. Upon the accession of Edward VI Parliament offered to restore him to his see, but Latimer was firm in his refusal to receive it: his great age, he said, made him desirous of freedom from any and all responsibility. He preached, however, frequently, and gave himself up to all manner of benevolent works. He was a decided opponent of "the

bloody Bonner;" occasionally his advice was sought for by the king, and he was continually active as the strenuous reprover of the vices of the age; but the reign was short, and with it expired Latimer's prosperity. In July 1553, king Edward died; in September, Mary had begun to take vengeance on the Reformers, and, among others, Latimer was committed to the Tower. Though he was at least eighty years old, no consideration was shown for his great age, and he was sent to Oxford, March 8, 1554, together with Cranmer and Ridley, to dispute on the corporal presence. He had never been accounted very learned: he had not used Latin much, he told them, these twenty years, and was not able to dispute; but he would declare his faith, and then they might do as they pleased. He declared that he thought the presence of Christ in the sacrament to be only spiritual; "he enlarged much against the sacrifice of the mass, and lamented that they had changed the communion into a private mass; that they had taken the cup away from the people; and, instead of service in a known tongue, were bringing the nation to a worship that they did not understand" (Burnet, *Reformation*, volume 2). He was laughed at, and told to answer their arguments; he reminded them that he was old, and that his memory had failed; the laughter, however, continued, and there was great disorder, perpetual shoutings, tauntings, and reproaches. When he was asked whether he would abjure his principles, he only answered, "I thank God most heartily that he hath prolonged my life to this end, that I may in this case glorify God with this kind of death." He was found guilty of heresy and sentenced to death, but the Romanists, to make sure that no claims for the irregularity of the trial should be charged upon them, set aside the sentence which had been passed at the first trial, and, by direction of cardinal Pole, another commission, consisting of Brookes, bishop of Gloucester; Holyman, bishop of Bristol; and White, bishop of Lincoln, was convened on the 7th of September, under the altar of St. Mary's Church at Oxford, and the three "arch heretics" given a second hearing and condemned. Latimer was the last introduced. He was now eighty years old, "dressed in an old threadbare gown of Bristol frieze, a handkerchief on his head with a night-cap over it, and over that again another cap, with two broad flaps buttoned under the chin. A leather belt was round his waist, to which a Testament was attached; his spectacles, without a case, hung from his neck. So stood the greatest man, perhaps, then living in the world, a prisoner on his trial, waiting to be condemned to death by men professing to be ministers of God . . . Latimer's trial was the counterpart of Ridley's (see Froude, 6:356 sq.); the charge was the same (on the sacrament), and the result was the

same, except that the stronger intellect vexed itself less with nice distinctions. Bread was bread, said Latimer, and wine was wine; there was a change in the sacrament, it was true, but the change was not in the nature, but the dignity" (Froude, 6:359 sq.). Every effort was made to induce a recantation, but Latimer, like Ridley, remained firm, and sentence was pronounced upon them as heretics obstinate and incurable, and on the 16th of October 1555, both Latimer and Ridley were led to the stake and burnt, outside the north wall of the town, a short stone's throw from the southward corner of Baliol College, and about the same distance from Brocardo prison, where Cranmer still lingered. The last words of Latimer were addressed to his companion, and are characteristic of our subject: "Be of good comfort, master Ridley, and play the man: we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out." Gunpowder had been fastened about his body to hasten his death; it took fire with the first flame, and he died immediately.

Latimer's character, which has been treated most beautifully by the late Reverend E. Thomson, D.D., LL.D., in his *Sketches, Biographical and Incidentals* (Cinc. 1856), page 42 sq., seems to us to present a combination of many noble and disinterested qualities. "He was brave, honest, devoted, and energetic, homely and popular, yet free from all violence; a martyr and hero, yet a plain, simple-hearted, and unpretending man; an earnest, hopeful, and happy man, fearless, open-hearted, hating nothing but baseness, and fearing none but God — not throwing away his life, yet not counting it dear when the great crisis came — calmly yielding it up as the crown of his long sacrifice and struggle. There may be other reformers that more engage our admiration, there is no one that more excites our love" (Tulloch, *Leaders of the Ref.* pages 322-324). Latimer's sermons, characterized by humor and cheerfulness, manly sense and direct evangelical fervor, were first printed collectively in 1549, 8vo, and in 1570, 4to; one of the best editions, with notes and a memoir, was prepared by John Watkins, LL.D. (Lond. 1824, 2 volumes, 8vo). A complete edition of his *Works* (the only complete one) was edited for the Parker Society by the Reverend G.E. Corrie (Cambr. 1844-5, 4 volumes, 8vo). See Gilpin, *Life of Latimer* (1755, 8vo); Fox, *Book of Martyrs*; Middleton, *Mem. of the Reformers*, 3:101 sq.; Tulloch, *Leaders of the Reformation*, page 245 sq.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 6:551 sq.; Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation* (see Index); Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index); Froude, *Hist. of Engl.* volume 1-

6 (see Index in volume 12); *Engl. Cyclop. s.v.*; *Blackwood's Mac.* 69:131 sq.; *Lond. Retr. Rev.* 1822, 6:272 sq. (J.H.W.)

Latimer, William

an English humanist of the 15th century, became in 1489 a fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. He studied theology in that university, and afterwards Greek at Padua, and subsequently became teacher to Reginald Pole. He was a friend of Erasmus, and even assisted him in preparing his second edition of the N.T. He died about 1545. Erasmus and Leland both speak of Latimer in high terms as a writer and scholar. Unfortunately, however, he never published any of his writings, and there remain in MS. form only a few of his letters to Erasmus. See Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe* (Lond. 1854), 1:232, 271.

Latin

(ῥωμα κός, *Boman*, ⁴²³⁸ Luke 23:38; ῥωμα στί, *in Roman*, ⁴³²⁰ John 19:20), the vernacular language of the Romans, although most of them in the time of Christ likewise spoke Greek. See the monographs on the subject cited by Volbeding, *Index*, page 135. **SEE LATINISMS.**

Latin, Use Of, In The Administration Of The Sacraments.

The words of St. Augustine against heathen Rome in *De civitate Dei.* 19:7, "Opera data est, ut imperiosa civitas non solum jugum sed etiam linguam suam domitis gentibus imponeret," may be justly applied to modern Christian Rome. By imposing its language on all nations acknowledging its sovereignty it has obtained also the mastery over their spiritual life. Benedict XIV, indeed, nobly declared, "Ut omnes catholici sint, non ut omnes Latini fiant, necessarium est." But this principle of true, ancient catholicity resulted only in some useless concessions on unimportant points, for Roman Catholicism early found that it cannot afford to dispense with the use of Latin and adopt the vulgar tongues; that it would thereby endanger the consolidation of the Church's power — yea, its very existence. That the Latin language was originally used in the public worship of the Romish adherents, in countries where Latin was the popular language, cannot be a matter of surprise or condemnation, nor that the clergy should have continued to use it in Christianizing the nations who became subjects to Rome, even after its use had become obsolete in Rome itself. Of course there is every reason to believe that in the earliest stages

the ecclesiastical language of the Greek-speaking Roman Church was Greek, and continued such till the transfer of the empire to Byzantium (Forbes, *Explan. XXXIX Art. 2:430*), and that, indeed, all the early churches followed the practice of the apostles, to whom the use of a foreign language was repugnant (compare ~~444~~ 1 Corinthians 14:19; *ibid.* 16), and made use of their own vernacular, as in the introduction of the Gospel to India, Parthia, and other regions. But the use of the Latin tongue by the Romish Church was in its early period admissible, when we consider that it was only the Church that had it in its power, at a time when the influence of the infant modern languages was derogatory to the Latin, to maintain the ancient language in comparative purity, and to preserve to us its most noble monuments. Indeed, as Hill (*English Monasticism*, page 325) has well said, "had it not been adopted by the Church, then, for some centuries, while the new tongues were gradually developing themselves and settling into a form, the world would have been dark indeed; not a book, not a page, not a syllable would have reached us of the thought, the life, or the events of that period. From the 4th to the 7th century there would have been an impenetrable gap in the annals of humanity — the voice of history would have been hushed into a dead silence, and the light of the past, which beacons the future, would have been extinguished in the darkness of a universal chaos." Not so justifiable, however, was the conduct of the Romish Church after the moderate development of the modern languages; and we see an inclination, even in the papal chair, to revolutionize ecclesiastical usage in this respect in the latter half of the 9th century, when the Slaves became converts to Christianity under the labors of St. Methodius, and introduced the vernacular, with the consent and approval of pope John VIII (comp. Methodius, *Epist.* 247, to Sfantopulcher, count of Moravia). Gregory VIII, on the other hand, quickly undid the liberal work of John VIII, and was loud in his denunciations of the use of any but the Latin language in Christian religious worship. Nevertheless, there have been many exceptions during the Middle Ages. The Bohemian Church early manifested a desire to use the vernacular; and, although Gregory VII had stringently insisted on the use of the Latin, they succeeded at the Council of Basle (1431) in the passage of an act tolerating the vernacular in the churches of Bohemia.

The Reformation of the 16th century first awoke a general desire for the use of the vernacular, France and Germany were particularly determined to secure this privilege. The Council of Trent, which was approached on this

subject, however, only so far regarded the demands of Catharine de Medicis and the emperor Ferdinand on this point as to reaffirm the existing rules in the mildest possible terms, so as not to offend them (Sessio 22, cap. 8: "Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut [missa] vulgari lingua passim celebraretur"). It only anathematizes those who claim that mass is to be exclusively celebrated in the vernacular: "Si quis dixerit, lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere, anathema sit" (I.c. canon 9). Yet, in order to appear to make some concession to the requirements of the times, the synod decided (I.c. cap. 8), "Ne oves Christi esuriant, neve parvuli panem petant, et non sit qui frangat eis, mandat S. synodus pastoribus et singulis curam animarum gerentibus, ut frequenter inter missarum celebrationem vel per se vel per alios ex iis, quae in missa leguntur, aliquid exponant, atque inter cetera sanctissimi hujus sacrificii mysterium aliquod declarent, diebus proesertim dominicis et festis," by which they acknowledged, perhaps more than they intended to do, the necessity of making an allowance for the desire of having the Scriptures explained in the vernacular. The reasons given by the Council of Trent for its determination to continue the use of Latin as the language of the Church (given by Goschl in his *Geschichtliche Darstellung d. Conc. v. Trident.* 1840, part 2, page 135) are as follows:

- 1.** That, in consequence of the changes to which modern languages are liable, the terms of worship might be altered, and also the ideas connected with them, thus giving rise to heresies.
- 2.** If mass were to be said in the vernacular, then the greater number of the priests would be unable to say mass in other than their native countries, as they would be obliged to say mass in a different language in every country.
- 3.** The holy mysteries, of which mass is the most important, should not be presented to the masses in their own language, as, from their inability to understand their mysterious import, occasion might thus arise for modern heretics to profane these mysteries in the vernacular. All the other reasons which have at various times been advanced in defense of the custom by Roman Catholic writers are but variations on the above (comp. Forbes, *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, 2:434; Adolphus, *Compendium Theologicum*, page 420).

Bellarmino (in his *Works*, 3:119) attempts to complete and comment on these grounds.

1. He says "the Latin Church has always administered the sacraments in Latin, although this language had long since ceased to be the common language of the people." This is admitting that circumstances are changed, but asserting, at the same time, that it is to be retained simply from habit. Bellarmine then attempts to prove its reasonableness. He says: "There is no pressing motive why the sacraments should be administered in the vernacular, while there are many objections to it; for there is no necessity that those who receive the sacraments should understand the words which accompany them; for the words are addressed either to the elements, as in the eucharist, the blessing of holy water, oil, etc., and these understand no language; or else they are addressed to God, and he understands them all; or, again, they are addressed to persons who are to be consecrated or absolved, not instructed or edified, as in the sacraments of baptism and absolution; hence it is at best a matter of indifference to the person concerned whether he understood the words or not; it is further proved that persons deprived of reason can nevertheless receive baptism and the sacrament of *reconciliatio*, which is seen in the baptism of new-born infants and the *reconciliatio* of sick persons when in an unconscious state." Yet Bellarmine himself, perceiving the difficulties of the position he had assumed, adds: "There are, moreover, hardly such grossly ignorant persons in the Latin Church as not to know in general, by the words which accompany it, which of the sacraments is being administered to them." Granting this, we cannot understand, then, in what manner the use of Latin is to prevent the profanation of the sacraments as set forth by the Council of Trent. Among the objections to the use of modern languages, we find that "the free intercourse between the different churches, which they need as members of one body, is rendered by it much more difficult. Moreover, Christians leaving their native country would thus be obliged to deprive themselves from attending the divina officia." This is taking for granted that all Christians understand Latin; for, unless they do, it would become a matter of indifference to them whether they heard mass in that or another foreign language.

"2. The sacraments should always be attended by a certain majesty and inspiring solemnity, which can be better preserved by not using their usual language. If it is granted that in public worship we should use special buildings, special costumes, special forms, etc., there cannot be any objection against the propriety of using also a different language; not that Latin is in itself a more sacred language than another, but because it is

better calculated to produce a feeling of reverence than the common tongue.

3. It is right that the sacramental words should always be presented to all the people in the same manner and under the same form, to avoid the danger of changes and alterations. This is the more easily accomplished by making all priests use the same language." Yet this does not always avoid the danger, for there have been instances of priests administering baptism "in nomine patris, filii et spiritus sancti."

4. "By administering the sacraments in the vernacular a wide door would be opened to ignorance, for the priests would at last consider themselves fully qualified if they knew how to read. Latin would be totally forgotten, and they would be unable to read the fathers and even the Scriptures." Here we see another instance of the arrogance of the hierarchy, surpassing that of heathen Rome, which, if it compelled subjected nations to adopt its language, did not, at least, prevent them from understanding it. Christian Rome seems, indeed, to be imbued with the idea that mankind praise and value most what they do not understand.

Towards the close of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th, efforts were again made, especially in Germany, to have mass said in the vernacular (see Marheinecke, *System d. Katholicismus*, 3:397), but in vain. The increase of ultramontanism rendered all efforts unavailing. Hirscher, in his *Missae genuinam notionem eruere, etc., tentavit Hirscher* (Tubing. 1821), thus clearly expressed the general aspiration (page 69): "Vituperamus igitur hunc exterae in cultu nostro linguae usum pro viribus nostris, atque si unquam eucharistiae celebrationi vitam redire velimus, eliminandum esse atque proscribendum statuimus. Et sane, si liturgia Latina inter nos Germanos non existeret, nemo profecto populum aliquem universum lingua uti vel duci velle, qua Deum adoret, sibi penitus ignota admitteret possibilitatem. Incomprehensibile revera istud omnibus debet videri, qui cuncta ad sanae rationis normam solent metiri, et nihil nisi quod sedificat ad cultum admittere." Here Hirscher quotes the words of St. Paul, ~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 14:1-20, and continues: "Apostolus hoc loco ne de ordinario quidem linguae exterae in ecclesia usu sed de extraordinario aliquo loquitur, quem argumentis ex visceribus rei petitis impulgnat. Quanto magis igitur principiis suis inhaerens ordinarium ab ipsis mysteriorum ministris et universi cultus ducibus debuit corrumpere?" He then goes on to prove that the use of Latin in the mass is in contradiction with

the object of this part of worship, which requires "sacerdotem inter et populum actionem, celebrantis et populi communionem" (pages 70-71). These views, however, he afterwards withdrew, on being admonished by superior authorities. Romanism cannot admit any real communion between the priest and the people in the sacrifice of the mass, and Hirscher had in this respect gone further than his Church would allow him. It is remarkable that all such efforts were always connected with more extended theological views, namely, with the rejection of the atoning character of mass.

As the principles of the Reformation unfolded, so did the necessity of administering the sacraments in the vernacular. Yet Latin was not at once set aside, and there are yet extant a number of Lutheran liturgies of the second half of the 16th century in which that language is extensively used.

In the English Church, one of the first acts of the Reformers was in behalf of the use of the vernacular in religious service, and the twenty-fourth of the Thirty-nine Articles treats "of speaking in the congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth." The article reads thus: "It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people."

See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:208; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch.* 2:619 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchenesch.* 20:153 sq.; 21:418 sq. (J.H.V.)

Latinisms

This word, which properly signifies *idioms* or *phraseology peculiar to the Latin tongue*, is extended by Biblical critics so as to include also the *Latin words* occurring in the Greel Testament. It is but reasonable to expect the existence of Latinisms in the language of every country subdued by the Romans. *SEE ROME*. The introduction of their civil and military officers, of settlers, and merchants, would naturally be followed by an infusion of Roman terms, etc., into the language of their new subjects. There would be many new things made known to some of them for which they could find no corresponding word in their own tongues. The circumstance that the proceedings in courts of law were, in every part of the Roman empire, conducted in the Latin language, would necessarily cause the introduction of many Roman words into the department of law, as might be amply illustrated from the present state of the juridical language in every country

once subject to the Romans, and even in our own. Valerius Maximus (2:2, 2), indeed, records the tenacity of the ancient Romans for their language in their intercourse with the Greeks and their strenuous endeavors to propagate it through all their dominions. "The Latinisms in the New Testament are of four kinds.

1. Latin Words in Greek Characters. — The following are instances (see Tregelles in Horne's *Introd.* 4:15): **Ἀσσάριον**, "farthing," from the Latin *assarius* (^{<4009>}Matthew 10:29). This word is used likewise by Plutarch, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Athenaeus, as may be seen in Wetstein, ad loc. **SEE ASSARIUM.** **Κῆνσος**, *census* (^{<4075>}Matthew 17:25); **κεντυρίον**, *centurio* (^{<4159>}Mark 15:39), etc.; **λεγεών**, *legio*, "legion" (^{<4083>}Matthew 26:53). Polybius (B.C. 150) has also adopted the Roman military terms (6:17) 1616. **Σπεκουλάτωρ**, *speculator*, "a spy," from *specular*, to look about," or, as Wahl and Schleusner think, from *spiculum*, the weapon carried by the speculator. The word describes the emperor's life-guards, who, among other duties, punished the condemned; hence "an executioner" (^{<4107>}Mark 6:27), margin, "one of his guard" (comp. Tacitus, *Hist.* 1:25; Josephus, *War*, 1:33, 7; Seneca, *De Irâ*, 1:16). **Μάκελλον**, from *macellum*, "a market-place for flesh" (^{<4605>}1 Corinthians 10:25). As Corinth was now a Roman colony, it is only consistent to find that the inhabitants had adopted this name for their public market, and that Paul, writing to them, should employ it. **Μίλιον**, "a mile" (^{<4154>}Matthew 5:41). This word is also used by Polybius (34:11, 8) and Strabo (5:332).

2. Latin Senses of Greek Words: as **καρπός** (^{<5158>}Romans 15:28), "fruit," where it seems to be used in the sense of *emolumentum*, "gain upon money lent," etc.; *Tratvoe*, "praise," in the juridical sense of *elogium*, a testimonial either of honor or reproach (^{<4045>}1 Corinthians 4:5).

3. Those forms of speech which are properly called Latinisms: as **βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι** "willing to content the people" (^{<4155>}Mark 15:15), which corresponds to the phrase *satisfacere alicui*; **λαβεῖν τὸ ἱκανὸν παρά**, "to take security of," *satis accipere ab* (^{<4109>}Acts 17:9); **δὸς ἐργασίαν**, "give diligence," *da operam* (^{<4028>}Luke 12:58) — the phrase *remittere ad aliuom judicem* is retained in Luke 23, **σὺ ὕψει**, "see thou to that," *tu videris* (^{<4074>}Matthew 27:4) (Aricler, *Hermeneut. Biblica*, Vienna, 1813, page 99; Michaelis, *Introd. to the New Test.* by Marsh, Camb. 1793, volume 1, part 1, page 163 sq.).

4. *Latin Terminations* in Greek, Gentile, and patronymic nouns: e.g. **Ἡρωδιανός** (^{<41216>}Matthew 22:16) and **Χριστιανός** (^{<41126>}Acts 11:26, etc.) (Winer, *New Test. (Gram. ed. Andlover, 1869, page 95)*).

The importance of the Latinisms in the Greek Testament consists in this, that, as we have partly shown (and the proof might be much extended), they are to be found in the best Greek writers of the *same era*. Their occurrence, therefore, in the New Testament adds one thread more to that complication of probabilities with which the Christian history is attended. Had the Greek Testament been free from them, the objection, though recondite, would have been strong. At the same time, the subject is intricate, and admits of much discussion. Dr. Marsh disputes some of the instances adduced by Michaelis (*at sup.* page 431 sq.). Dresigius even contends that there are no Latinisms in the New Testament (*De Latinismis*, Lips. 1726; and see his *Vinidiciae Dissertationis de Latinismis*). Even Aricler allows that some instances adduced by him may have a purely Greek origin. Truth, as usual, lies in the middle, and there are, no doubt, many irrefragable instances of Latinisms, which will amply repay the attention of the student. See Georgii *Hierocrit. de Latinismis Novi Test.* (Wittemberg, 1733); Kypke, *Observat. Sacr.* 2:219 (Wratisl. 1755); Pritii *Introductio in Lect. Nov. Test.* page 207 sq. (Leipz. 1722); Wetterburg, *De vocibus Latinis in N.T. obviis* (Lund. 1792); Fougberg, *De Latinismis in N.T.* (Upsal. 1798); Kapp, *De N.T. Latinismis* (Lipsite, 1726); Wernsdorf, *De Christo Latine loquente*, page 19; Jahn, *Archiv.* II, 4; Olearius, *De Stylo Nov. Test.* page 368 sq.; Inchofer, *Sacrae Latinfatis Historia* (Prag. 1742). **SEE NEW TESTAMENT.**

Latin Versions Of The Holy Scriptures.

— The extensive use of the Latin as a learned language, and the great influence which the translations in it have had upon all subsequent versions, render them highly important. The various recensions or editions, however, need to be carefully distinguished and critically examined in order to show their real value and bearing.

I. Ante-Hieronymian Versions. — The early and extensive diffusion of Christianity among the Latin-speaking people renders it probable that means would be used to supply the Christians who used that language with versions of the Scriptures in their own tongue, especially those resident in countries where the Greek language was less generally known. That from

an early period such means were used cannot be doubted; but the information which has reached us is so scanty, that we are not in circumstances to arrive at certainty on many points of interest connected with the subject. It is even matter of debate whether there were several translations, or one translation variously corrupted or emended.

1. The first writer by whom reference is supposed to be made to a Latin version is Tertullian, in the words "Sciamus plane non sic esse in Graeco authentico, quomodo in usum exiit per duarum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem eversionem," etc. (*De Monogamia*, 100:11). It is possible that Tertullian has in view here a version in use among the African Christians; but it is by no means certain that such is his meaning, for he may refer merely to the manner in which the passage in question had come to be usually cited, without intending to intimate that it was so written in any formal version. The probability that such is really his meaning is greatly heightened when we compare his language here with similar expressions in other parts of his writings. Thus, speaking of the Logos, he says, "Hanc Graeci Λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam *sermonem* appellamus. Ideoque in usu est nostrorum per simplicitatem interpretationis, Sermonem, dicere, in primordio apud Deum esse" (*Adv. Prax.* c. 5), where he seems to have in view simply the colloquial usage of his Christian compatriots (comp. also *Adv. Marc.* c. 4 and c. 9). The testimony of Augustine is more precise. He says (*De Doct. Christ.* 2:11): "Qui Scripturas in Hebraea lingua in Graecam verterunt numerari possunt, Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuiquam primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Graecus et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguas Latine videbatur, ausus est interpretari." A few sentences before he speaks of the "Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas;" and he proceeds to give instances how one of these versions elucidates another, and to speak of the defects attaching to all of them. This testimony not only clearly establishes the fact of the existence of Latin versions in the beginning of the 4th century, but goes to prove that these were numerous; for that Augustine has in view a number of interpreters, and not merely a variety of recensions, is evident from his statement in this same connection, "In ipsis interpretationibus Itala caeteris praeferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae;" and from his speaking elsewhere (*Cont. Faustuem*, 2:2) of "codices aliarum regionum." On the other hand, the testimony of Hilary is in favor of only one Latin version: "Latina translatio dum virtutem dicti ignorat magnam intulit obscuritatem, non discernens ambigui sermonis proprietatem" (*in*

Psalm 158). On the same side is the declaration of Jerome: "Si Latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda respondebunt Quibus? tot sunt enim exemplaria pene quot codices." That by "exemplaria" here Jerome refers to what would now be called *editions* or *recensions*, is evident from the nature of his statement, for it cannot be supposed that he intends to say that almost every codex presented a distinct translation; and this is rendered still more so by what follows: "Si autem veritas est quærenda de pluribus, cur non ad Graecam originem revertentes ea quæ vel a vitiosis interpretibus male reddita, vel a præsumptoribus imperitis emendata perversius, vel a librariis dormitantibus addita sunt aut mutata corrigamus" (*Prief. in Evang. Ad. Danmas.*). Elsewhere (*Praef. in Josuam*) he says also: "Apud Latinos tot exemplaria quot codices et unusquisque pro suo arbitrio vel addidit vel subtraxit quod ei visum est;" where there can be no doubt as to his meaning. Jerome frequently uses the expression *communis* or *vulgata editio*, but by this he intends the Sept., or the old Latin translation of the Sept. In reference to the Latin N.T. he uses the expressions *Latinus interpres*, *Latini codices*, or simply *in Latino*.

The statement of Augustine, that of these interpretations the *Itala* was preferred, has been supposed to indicate decidedly the existence of several national Latin versions known to him. For this title can only indicate a translation prepared in Italy, or used by the Italian churches, and presupposes the existence of other versions, which might be known as the *Africana*, the *Hispanica*, etc. On the other hand, however, if there was a version known by this name, it seems strange that it should never be mentioned again by Augustine or by any one else; and further, it is remarkable, that to designate an Italian version he should use the word "*Itala*" and not "*Italica*." This has led to the suspicion that this word is an error, and different conjectural emendations have been proposed. Bentley suggested that for *itala nam* there should be read *illa quæ*, a singularly infelicitous emendation, as Hug has shown (*Introd. E.T.* page 267). As Augustine elsewhere speaks of "codicibus ecclesiasticis interpretationis usitatae" (*De consensu Evang.* 2:66), it has been suggested by Potter that for *Itala* should be read *usitata*, the received reading having probably arisen from the omission, in the first instance, of the recurrent syllabus between *interpretationibus* and *usitata* (thus INTERPRETATIONIBUSITATA), and then the change of the unmeaning *itata* into *itala*. Of this emendation many have approved, and if it be adopted, the testimony of Augustine in this passage, as for a plurality of Latin

versions, will be greatly enfeebled, for by the *versio usitata* he would doubtless intend the version in common use as opposed to the unauthorized interpretation of private individuals. As tending to confirm this view of his meaning, it has been observed that it is extremely improbable that if there was an acknowledged *versio Africana*, the Christians in Africa would be found preferring to that a version made for the use of the Italians. A new suggestion relating to this passage has been offered by Reuss (*Gesch. d. Schr. d. N.T.* page 436), "Is it not possible," he asks, "that Aulugustine may refer, in this passage (written about the year 397), to a work of Jerome, viz., his version of Origen's Hexapla, which Augustine, in one of his letters (*Ep.* 28, tom. 2, page 61) to Jerome prefers to his making a new translation from the original? At any rate," he adds, "it is remarkable that Isidore of Spain (*Etymnol.* 6:5) characterizes the translation of Jerome (the last) as *verborumn tenaciorem et perspicuitate sententiae clariorem*. May one venture to suggest that he has taken this phrase from Augustine, regarding him as using it of Jerome." To this, however, it may be replied, that whilst it is not improbable that Isidore took the passage from Augustine, he may have done so without regarding Augustine's words as referring to any work of Jerome. That they do so refer seems to us very improbable.

An effort has been made to obtain a decision for this question from a collation of the extant remains of the ancient Latin texts, but without success. Eichhorn (*Esinleit. ins. N.T.* 4:337 sq.) has compared several passages found in the writings of the early Latin fathers with certain extant codices of the early Latin text, and, from the resemblance which these bear to each other, he argues that they have all been taken from one common translation. In this conclusion many scholars have concurred both before and since the time of Eichhorn (Wetstein, Hody, Semler, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf), but others have, on the other side, pointed to serious differences of rendering, which, in their judgment, indicate the existence of distinct translations (Michaelis, Hug, De Wette, Bleek, etc.).

As the evidence stands, it seems impossible either to hold to the existence of only one accredited Latin version before the time of Jerome, the corruption of which from various causes, is sufficient to account for all the discrepancies to be found in the extant remains, or to maintain with certainty that there were several independent versions, the work of persons in different parts of the Latin Church. There is, however, a third supposition which may be advanced: There may at an early period, and

probably in Africa, have been made a translation of the Bible from the Greek into Latin, and this may have formed the groundwork of other translations, intended to be amended versions of the original. In this case a certain fundamental similarity would mark all these translations along with considerable variety; but this variety would be traceable, not to undesigned corruption, but to purposed attempts, more or less skillfully directed, to produce a more adequate version. This supposition meets all the facts of the case, and so far has high probability in its favor. Proceeding upon it, we may further suppose that these different revised or amended translations might have their origin in different parts of the western world; and in this case the meaning of Augustine's statement in the passage (*Conf. Faustunz*, 2:2) where he speaks of "codices aliarum regionum" becomes manifest. In this case, also, if the reading *Italoa* be retained (and most critics incline to retain it) in the famous passage above cited, it will indicate the revision prepared in Italy and used by the Italian churches, of which it is natural to suppose that it would be both more exact and more polished than the others, and with which Augustine would become familiar during his residence in Rome and Milan. *SEE ITALIC VERSION.*

II. Of this ancient Latin version in its various amended forms, all of which it has become customary to include under the general designation *Itala*, we have remains partly in the citations of the Latin fathers, partly in the Graeco-Latin codices, and partly in special MSS. A copious collection from the first of these sources (which yet admits of being augmented) has been supplied by Sabatier, *Bibliorum SS. Latinae Vers. antiquae seu Vetus Itacla, etc., quaecunque reperiri potuerunt* (Remis, 1743, 3 volumes fol., ed. 2, 1749). For the Apocalypse we depend entirely on this source, namely, the quotations made by Primasius. The Graeco-Latin codices are the *Cantabrigdian* or *Codex Beza*, the *Laudian*, the *Claromontane*, and the *Boernerian*. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS.* Of the known special codices containing portions of the N.T., the following have been printed or collated:

1. *Cod. Vercellensis*, written apparently by Eusebius the Martyr in the 4th century: it embraces the four Gospels, though with frequent *lacunae*. It is mentioned by Montfalcon in his *Diarium Italicum*, page 445; and it has been edited by Bianchinus (Bianchini), in *Evangeliarium quadruplex Latince vers. antiq. seu Vet. Italice*, etc. (Romans 1749, 4 volumes, fol.); previously, and still more carefully, by J.A. Irici, *SS. Evangeliorum Cod. S. Eusebii manu exaratus, ex autoegrapho ad unguem exhibitus*, etc.

(Meclil. 1748, 2 parts, 4to). In this codex the Gospels are arranged in the order Matthew, John, Luke [Lucanus], Mark. As a specimen of the style of this codex, and the imperfect state in which some parts of it are, we give the following passage (~~John~~ John 4:48-52) from the edition of Irici:

AIT ERGO AD ILLV	ET IBAT JAM
HIS NISI SIG	IPSO DESCEN
NA ET PRODIG	DENTE SERVI
--VIDERITIS	OCCVRER
NON---	ILLI ET NVNT
TIS DICIT ILLI	VERVNT EI
REG – S DME	CENTES QVO
L ----- E	NIAM FILIVIS
-----	TVVS VIVIT
-----	INTER – GA
-----	BAT H
AIT HIS- ADE	---
FILIVS TVVS	MELIVS HABVIT
VIVIT ET CRE	ET DIXERVNT
DIDIT HOMO	HERI HORA SEP
VERBO QVOD	TIMA – LIQVID
DIXIT ILLI IHS	ILLVM FEBRIS

2. *Cod. Veronensis*, a MS. of the 4th or 5th century, in the library at Verona, containing the Gospels, but with many lacunae; printed by Bianchini.

3. *Cod. Brixionus*, of about the 6th century, at Brixen, in the Tyrol, containing the Gospels, with the exception of some parts of Mark; printed by Bianchini.

4. *Cod. Corbeijensis*, a very ancient MS., from which Matianay edited Matthew's Gospel, the Epistle of James, etc. (Par. 1695). The gospel appears also in Bianchini's work, and in the appendix to Calmet's commentary on the Apocalypse. There is another MS. of the old Latin text at Corbey, from which various readings have been collected on Matthew, Mark, and Luke by Bianchini, and on the four Gospels (partially) by Sabatier.

- 5.** *Cod. Colbertinus*, of the 11th century, in the Parisian library; edited entire by Sabatier.
- 6.** *Cod. Palatinus*, of the 5th century, in the library at Vienna, containing about the whole of Luke and John, and the greater part of Matthew and Mark; edited by Tischendorf (Leipz. 1847, 4to).
- 7.** *Cod. Bobbiensis*, of the 5th century, now at Turin, formerly in the monastery of Bobbio, containing portions of Matthew and Mark; fragments of ~~Acts~~ Acts 23:27, 28; and of the Epistle of James, 1:1-5; 3:13-18; 4:1, 2; 5:19, 20; ~~1 Peter~~ 1 Peter 1:1-12; edited by Fleck, in *Anecdota Sacra* (Lips. 1537), and more fully by Tischendorf, in the *Wiener Jahrbucher*, 1847.
- 8.** *Cod. Clarmontanus*, of the 4th or 5th century, now in the Vatican library, containing the four Gospels, Matthew in an ante-hieronymian version (wanting 1:1-3, 15; 14:33-18:12), the other three according to the Vulgate; collated by Sabatier, edited by Mai, *Scriptorr. Vett. Nova Collectio a Vatican. codd. edita*, 3:257 sq.
- 9.** Fragments of Mark and Luke, contained in a MS. of about the 5th century, belonging to the imperial library at Vienna, have been printed by Alter, in Paulus, *Repertor. für Bibl. und Morgen und Litter.* 3:115-170, and in Paulus, *Memorabilien*, 7:58-96.
- 10.** A MS. of the 7th century, now at Breslau, containing the synoptic Gospels, with *lacunae* and part of John's Gospel; described by Dr. D. Schulz, *De Cod. 4 Evangg. Biblioth. Rhedigerianae* (Bresl. 1814).
- 11.** A fragment of Luke (17-21) from a palimpsest of the 6th century, in Ceriani, *Monumenta Sac. et Prof. praesertim Bibl. Amabrosianae* (Mil. 1861), I, 1:1-8.
- 12.** Cardinal Mai has given, in his *Spicilegium Romanum*, 9:61-86, various readings from a very ancient codex of the *Speculum Aulyustini*, and he has since edited the *Speculum* entire in his *PP. Nov. Bibl.*; comp. Tregelles, page 239.
- 13, 14, 15.** In the monastery of St. Gall are three codices, the first of the 4th or 5th century, containing fragments of Matthew; the second a Gallic MS. of the 7th century, containing ~~Mark~~ Mark 16:14-20; the third an Irish MS. of the 7th or 8th century, containing ~~John~~ John 11:14-44.

16. *Cod. Monacensis*, of the 6th century, containing the four Gospels, with *lacunae*; transcribed by Tischendorf.

17. A fragment containing ^{<013>}Matthew 13:13-25, on purple vellum, of the 5th century, in the library at Dublin, printed in the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 3:374, by Dr. Todd.

18. *Cod. Guelferbytanus*, of the 6th century, containing some fragments of ^{<5115>}Romans 11:15, published by Knittel (q.v.) in 1762, and more correctly by Tischendorf, *Anecd. Sac. et Prof.* page 153.

19. Fragments of the Pauline epistles discovered by Schmeller at Munich, and transcribed by Tischendorf, who has described them in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christ. Wissenschaft* for 1857, No. 8.

Besides these, there are several MSS. known to exist chiefly in the British libraries. Some of these are noticed in Bentley's *Critica Sacra*, edited by Ellis, 1862, and in Westwood's *Palcesographia Sacra Pictoria*. See also Betham, *Antiquarian Researches*; Petrie, *On the Ecclesiastical Antiq. of Ireland*; O'Connor, *Rerum Hibern. Scripto res*.

These codices palmographers and critics profess to be able to allot to different recensions or revisions. Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 17 they pronounce to be African; 3, 6, 12, 16, Italian; and 14, 15, Irish; though Tischendorf expresses doubt as to the African character of No. 9, and the Italian of No. 6.

Of the O.T. only a few fragments have been discovered in special codices. These have been printed by Sabatier (*lib. cit.*), by Vercellone (*Variae Lectiones Vulg. Lat. Bibliorum*, 2 volumes, Romans 1860-62), by Munter (*Miscell. Hafn.* 1821), by Mone (*Libri Paslimpsesti*, Carlsruhe, 1855), by Ranke (*Fragmenta Hosea Amt. Mich.* Vien. 1856, 1858), by Fritzsche (*Liber Judicuen*, Turici. 1867), and anonymously (*Biblioth. Ashburnham*, Loud. 1868). The MSS. of the Vulgate preserve the old Latin version of those books of the Apocrypha which were not retranslated by Jerome, and the Psalter. Our principal source of information, however, is in the citations made by the Latin fathers from the version in their hands.

From these various sources we possess, in the old Latin version of the O.T., the Psalter, Esther, and some of the apocryphal books entire, the rest only in fragments; whilst of the N.T. we possess nearly the whole.

a. The value of these remains in regard to the criticism of the sacred text is very considerable. They afford important aid in determining the condition of the Greek text in the early centuries. This, which Bentley was the first to perceive, or at least to announce, has been fully recognized by Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf, though they have not all followed it out with equal discretion (see Tischendorf's strictures, *Proleg. in ed. Sept. et N.T.* page 103, 242).

The general character of the Itala is close, literal adherence to the original, so as often to transgress the genius of the Latin language; its phraseology being marked by solecisms and improprieties which may be due to its having been originally produced either in a region remote from the center of classical culture, or among the more illiterate of the community. Thus **Σωτήρ** is rendered by *salutaris*, **διαφόρειν** by *supesponere* (e.g. "quanto ergo superponit homo ab ove," ^{<4012>}Matthew 12:12), **προελπίζειν** by *prcesperare*, **κοσμοκράτορες** by *zmunditenentes*, etc.; and we have such constructions as "stellam quam viderant in orientem" (^{<4019>}Matthew 2:9); "ut ego veniens adorem ei" (^{<4018>}Matthew 2:8); "qui autem audientes" (^{<4019>}Matthew 2:9); "pressuris quibus sustiletis" (^{<5004>}2 Thessalonians 1:4); "habitavit in Capharnaum maritimam" (^{<4013>}Matthew 4:13); "terra Naphthalim viam maris" (^{<4015>}Matthew 4:15); "verbum audit et continuo cum gaudio accipit eum" (^{<4031>}Matthew 13:20); "dominantur eorum, principantur eorum" (^{<4025>}Matthew 20:25), etc. It must be borne in mind, however, that the current text was exposed to innumerable corruptions, and that we can hardly, from the specimens that have come down to us, form any very accurate judgment of the state in which it was at first. One can hardly suppose that by *any* Latin-speaking people, the following version, which is that presented by the Colbertine MS. of ^{<5018>}Colossians 2:18, 19, could have been accepted as idiomatic, or even intelligible: "emo vos convincat volens in humilitate et religione angelorum, quae vidit ambulans, sine causa inflatus sensu carnis sute, et non tenens caput Christum, ex quo omne corpus connexum et conductione subministratum et provectum crescit in incrementum Dei." If this be (to borrow the remark of Eichhorn, from whose *Einleitunlg ins N.T.* 4:354, we have taken these specimens) "verborum tenax," where is the "perspicuitas sententi.e" of which Augustine speaks?

II. Hieronymians or Vulgate Version. SEE VULGATE. III. Laster Latin Versiolns. — Both before and since the invention of printing attempts have been made to present, through the medium of Latin, a more correct version

of the original text than that found in the ancient Latin versions. Of these we have space only for a bare catalogue. (See notices of the authors under their names in this work.)

1. Adam Eston, a monk of Norwich, and cardinal (died 1397), seems to have been the first who thought of a new version; he translated the O.T., with the exception of the Psalter, from the Hebrew; his work is lost (Hody, page 440; Le Long-Masch 2:3, page 432).

2. Giannozzo Manetti, who died in 1459, began a translation of the Bible, of which he finished only the Psalms and the N.T.; this is lost (Tiraboschi, *Storia della Lett. Ital.* 6:2, page 109 sq.).

3. Erasmus translated the N. Test., and published the translation along with the Greek text (Basil. 1516, fol.).

4. Th. Beza issued his translation of the N.T. in 1556; it appeared along with the Vulgate version. Four other editions followed during the author's lifetime, and these present the Greek text as well as the Vulgate and Beza's own translation; many other editions have since followed. Beza aimed at presenting a just rendering of the original, without departing more than necessary from the, Vulgate. His renderings are sometimes affected by his theological views.

5. Sanctes Pagninus, a learned Dominican from Lucca, produced a translation of the whole Bible (Lugdun. 1528, 4to, and Colon. 1541, fol.). Later editions of this work, with considerable alterations, appeared: one, edited by the famous Mich. Servetus, under the name of Villanovanus (Lugd. 1542); another, revised and edited by R. Stephen (Paris, 1557, 2 volumes, folio; with a new title, 1577). This latter has been often reprinted. The version of Arias Montanus, printed in the Antwerp, Paris, and London polyglots, is a revision of this version.

6. Cardinal Cajetan employed two Hebrew scholars, a Jew and a Christian, to supply him with a literal version of the Old Test. This they accomplished, and the work appeared in parts (Lugd. 1639, 5 volumes, folio). The N.T., translated on the same principle of strict literality, appeared earlier (Ven. 1530, 1531, 2 volumes, folio).

7. Sebastian Münster added to his edition of the Hebrew Scriptures a Latin translation (Basle, 1534-35, and 1546, 2 volumes, folio). This translation is

faithful without being slavishly literal, and is executed in clear and correct Latin. Portions of it have been published separately.

8. The Zurich version, begun by Leo Judae, and completed by Bibliander and others (1543, folio, and in 4to and 8vo in 1544). This version is much esteemed for its ease and fluency; it is correct, but somewhat paraphrastic. It has frequently been reprinted, there is one edition by R. Stephen (Paris, 1545).

9. Sebastian Castellio produced, in what he intended to be purely classical Latin, a translation of the O. and N.T. (Basil. 1551, again 1573, and at Leipzic, 1738).

10. The version of Junius and Tremellius appeared at Frankfort in parts between 1575 and 1579, and in a collected form in 1579, 2 volumes, folio. Tremellius took the principal part in this work, his son-in-law Junius rather assisting him than sharing the work with him. Tremellius translated the N. Test. from the Syriac, and this, along with Beza's translation, appeared in an edition of Tremellius's Bible, published at London in 1585. The translation of Piscator is only an amended edition of that of Tremellius.

11. Thomas Malvenda, a Spanish Dominican, engaged in a "nova ex Hebraeos translatio," which he did not live to finish. What he accomplished was published along with his commentaries (Lugdun. 1650, 5 volumes, folio); but the extreme barbarism of his style has caused his labors to pass into oblivion.

12. Cocceius has given a new translation of most of the Biblical books in his commentaries, *Opera Omnia* (tom. 1-6, Amsterdam, 1701).

13. Sebastian Schmid executed a translation of the O. and N. Test., which appeared after his death (Argentor. 1696, 4to); it has been repeatedly reprinted, and is esteemed for its scholarly exactness, though in some cases its adherence to the original is over close.

14. The version of Jean le Clerc (Clericus) is found along with his commentaries; it appeared in portions from 1693 to 1731.

15. Charles Fr. Houbigant issued a translation of the O.T. and the Apocrypha along with his edition of the Hebrew text (Paris, 1753, 4 volumes, folio).

16. A new translation of the O.T. was undertaken by J.A. Dathe; it appeared between 1773 and 1789. At one time much admired, this version has of late ceased perhaps to receive the attention to which it is entitled.

17-19. Versions of the Gospels by Ch. Wilh. Thalemann (Berl. 1781); of the Epistles by Godf. Sigismund Jaspis (Lipsise, 1793-97. 2 volumes); and of the whole N.T. by H. Godf. Reichard (Lips, 1799), belong to the school of Castellio.

20. H.A. Schott and F. Winzer commenced a translation of the Bible, of which only the first volume has appeared, containing the Pentateuch (Alton. et Lipsit, 1816). Schott has also issued a translation of the N.T., appended to his edition of the Greek text (Lips. 1805). This has passed into four editions, of which the last (1839) was superintended by Baumgarten-Crusius.

21. Rosenmuller (in his *Scholia in V.T.* Lips. 1788 sq.). Translations of the N.T. have also been issued by F.A. Ad. Naebe (Lips. 1831) and Ad. Goeschen (Lips. 1832).

See Carpzov, *Crit. Sacr.* page 707 sq.; Fritzsche, art. *Vulgata*, in Herzog's *Encyk.; Bible of every Land*, page 210, etc.

IV. Literature. — Simon, *Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. Test.* (1690); Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina Vulgata*, Libri 4 (Oxford, 1705, folio); Martianav, *Hieronymni Opp.* (Paris, 1693); Bianchinus, *Vindiciae Canonis SS. Vulg. Lat. ed.* (Rome, 1740); Riegler, *Krit. Gesch. der Vulgata* (Sulzb. 1820); L. van Elss, *Pragmatisch-Krit. Gesch. der Vulgata* (Tib. 1824); Wiseman, *Two Letters on* ^{<A>}1 John 5:7, reprinted in his *Essays*, volume 1; Diestel, *Gesch. d. Alten Test.* (Jena, 1869); Rorsch, in the *Zeitschrift für d. hist. Theol.* 1867, 1869, 1870. See also the *Introductions* of Eichhorn, Michaelis, Hug, De Wette, Havernick, Bleek, etc.; Davidson, *Biblical Criticism*; Reuss, *Gesch. der Heil. Schr. N.T.* sec. 448-457; Darling, *Cyclopaedia*, page 80. **SEE VERSIONS.**

Latitudinarians

a name given to those divines who in the 17th century professed indifference to what they considered the small matters in dispute between Puritans and High-Churchmen, and, looking at theology from a philosophical point of view, laid more stress on classical philosophy than

on Christian theology. They attempted to compromise the differences between Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents. Their views were a result of the changes then going on in the religious world, and of the influence of philosophy. The doctrinal Puritans had already taken a position midway between the school of Laud and the fanatical Puritans. Abbot, Carlton, Hall, and others were the chief leaders of that party. They attached no importance to externals, and prized practical piety far above all matters of form; and, though themselves attached to the Protestant Episcopal Church, they allowed others to differ from them as to the best form of ecclesiastical government. In their theology they adhered to the milder Calvinism of the Thirty-nine Articles; but, being the most moderate, they were soon overwhelmed by the other parties. As liberal, but differing from them in doctrine, we find among the Eaton scholars Hales, who, although an opponent of Laud's High-Churchism, was in dogmatics an Arminian; and Chillingworth, who desired to reduce Christianity to a few essential practical principles. In the midst of the struggle, and the rapid changes of religious views and systems, the moral conception of Christianity was daily gaining ground; on the other hand, theology was unable to withstand the influence of philosophy. The regeneration which the latter had experienced at the hands of Bacon and Des Cartes obliged theology to review its foundations in the light of philosophy and science as well as of history (compare Professor Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, in the *Encyclop. Metropol.* 2:656; Stewart, *Essay on Metaphysical Philosophy*, pages 58, 61, notes, and 246, note O). Thus Platonic philosophy and theology were introduced into Cambridge by Cudworth (q.v.) and Henry More (q.v.). Men of these views (among others, also, John Smith, Worthington, bishop Wilkins, and Theophilus Gale), and especially the more moderate among them, were looked down upon with contempt by the more ambitious ones in power, and, as they would not follow the selfish tendencies of the times, were called *Latitude-men*. In the days of the Commonwealth they were reproached with Arminianism and prelatism. But when the High-Church party came again into power with the Restoration, and its old adversaries tried to atone for their former attacks by all means in their power, the moderate party was accused of want of loyalty and of opposition to the Church. Whoever refused to submit to the High-Church, or did not take sides with the strict Puritans against it, were called *Latitudinarian*. "That name," said a contemporary, "is the man of straw who, in order to have something to fight against, has been set up for want of a real adversary — a very

convenient name wherewith to defame any one who we may wish to injure." As the name came thus to be applied to a number of persons who had no connection whatever with the party which it designated at first, and even to such as were totally indifferent in matters of religion, the appellation soon came to be regarded as equivalent to Socinian, Deist, and Atheist. As regards the original Latitudinarians, they retained the liturgy, rites, and organization of the English Episcopal Church. They considered a general liturgy as a necessary guard against the often fanatical prayers of the Puritans, and they considered the English liturgy as the best, on account of its solemn earnestness and its character of primitive simplicity. The form of public worship they looked upon as a happy medium between that of the Romish Church and that of the conventicles. Ceremonies they deemed useful for the purpose of edification, and episcopacy they cherished as the most correct and evangelical form of Church government, differing both from what they regarded as the tyrannical authority of Scotch Presbyterianism *and* from the anarchy of the Independents. In point of doctrine they also retained the confession of the English Church, which they considered as according thoroughly with the Scriptures. The commentaries of the primitive Church were the guides by which they wished reason to be governed, and reason they recognized as the source of our knowledge of revealed and natural religion, which agree on all points. The fundamental principles of true religion are freedom of the will, the universality of the redemption by the death of Christ, the sufficiency of divine grace; and these find entrance into the human heart *sometimes* by the testimony of Scripture, *sometimes* by the unvarying testimony of the primitive Church, and again by reason only. In theology, the oldest views are always found to be the most reasonable. Nothing that is false in philosophy is true in theology; but what God has united, let no man put asunder. Natural sciences have made immense progress, and philosophy and theology cannot remain behind. True science cannot be put down any more than the light of the sun or the motion of the ocean. It is the best weapon against atheism and superstition (comp. Smith [John], *Discourses* [ed. 1821], 2, page 19). Thus the Latitudinarians took at once for their basis science and toleration. They taught respect for the Church by their submission to it, defended it by their learning and activity, and hoped to win over the Dissenters by their moderation, and the Presbyterians by their accommodating spirit, thus preventing them from anarchy. This is the character given to the Latitudinarians by one of their contemporaries in a work entitled *A brief account of the New Sect of Latitudinarians* (1662). It

is remarkable how many ideas of the school of Laud this party still retained, in spite of its philosophical views. Its broad platform admitted men of the most different tendencies. While Cudworth, Whichcote, Worthington, and Wilkins inclined to philosophical views, Burnet, Tillotson, Whiston, and Spencer adhered more to the Church doctrines. Bury, in *The Naked Gospel* (1690), declared all Christian doctrines, except those of repentance and faith, non-essential. For this he was attacked by Jurieu in his *La Religion du Latitudinaire*, and vainly attempted to defend the orthodoxy of his views in his *Latitudinarius orthodoxus* (1697). The attempts made by the Latitudinarians in 1689-1699 to reconcile the Episcopalians and Presbyterians failed utterly. Latitudinarianism was subsequently identified still more with indifferentism, and seldom appeared in theological works. It is only in quite modern times, and especially under the influence of human theology, that this tendency has been brought to light again in the *Broad-Church* party, which forms a sort of medium between the High and *Low Church*. By their opponents the Broad-Churchmen are, however, designated as Latitudinarians or Indifferents. They consider the differences among Christians as unimportant when compared with their essential unity. The watchword of the party is love and toleration. For doctrines, they hold to those of incarnation and atonement, conversion by grace and justification. They coincide with the Low Church in considering Scripture as the only rule of faith, but taking exceptions here and there to miracles, and with the High-Church in believing that man shall be judged according to his works. In opposition to the doctrine of the invisible Church of the evangelical Church, they lay great stress on the doctrine of a visible Church. They take what is good anywhere, as well in the Romish as in the evangelical churches. They aim at nothing less than the accomplishment of a religious and moral reformation, and seek to occupy in our day the place held at the beginning of this century by the evangelical party. This end they strive to attain partly by their science and partly by their practice, and thus distinguish among themselves between the theorists and anti-theorists. They derive great power from the high scientific attainments of many of their members, and try to advance the education of the masses. The founders of this school were S.T. Coleridge and Thomas Arnold, and its most eminent followers Hare, Whately, Maurice, Kingsley, Stanley, Alford, Conybeare, and Howson. About one seventh of the English clergy and a number of bishops belong to it. See Conybeare, *Church Parties*; Schaff, *Zust. u. Partheien d. engl. Staats-Kirche in Deutsch. Zeitschrift*. 1856,

No. 17; Edward Churton, *The Latitudinarians from 1671-1787* (Lond. 1861. 8vo); *Amer. Presb. Rev.* 1861, April, art. 6; *Westminster Rev.* 1854, January; *Bib. Sacra*, 1863, page 865; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*; Gass, *Dogmengescicuh.* 3 (see Index); Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of England* (since the Restoration), 2:262 sq., 341 sq., 359 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:215; Blunt, *Dict. Doctr. and Hist. Theol.* page 395 sq., and his *Key to the Knowledge of Ch. Hist.* (Mod.) page 97 sq. On the present Broad Church of England, see Miss Cobbe. *Broken Lights* (London ed. page 63), and Hurst's *History of Rationalism*, Eng. edition (greatly enlarged), pages 423-438.

Latomius, Jacobus

(*Jaques Masson*), a celebrated Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Cambron, in Hainault, about the middle of the 15th century, and was educated at the University of Paris. In 1500 he became a resident of Louvain, where he was made a professor of theology. He died in 1544. A zealous disciple of scholasticism. he ardently opposed the Reformation both by his pen and his tongue, and was engaged in an able controversy with Luther, who addressed to him *Rationis Latomiance confutatio* while a resident of the Wartburg (comp. Kostlin, *Luther's Theologie*, 2:55, 366). The Roman Catholics, of course, greatly loved Latomius, and he is spoken of as "vir multae eruditionis, pietatis, modestiae, trium linguarum peritissimus, haereticae pravitatis inquisitor." A collection of his works was made by his nephew, Jacobus Latomius, his successor at Louvain (died in 1596), and was published at Louvain in 1550, in folio, containing,

1. *Articulorum doctrine Lutheri per theologos Lovanienses damnatorum ratio* (1519 and 1521): —
2. *Responsio nad libellum a Luthero emissum pro usdem articulis* (1521): —
3. *De primatu Pontificis adersus artinu Lutherun* (1526; also reprinted in Rocaberti *Biblioth. max. pontificia*, Romans 1689, tom. 13): —
4. *De variis quaestionum generibus quibus certat ecclesia intus et foris*: —
5. *De ecclesia et hunanae legis obligatione*: —
6. *De confessione secreta* (1525): —

7. *Ad helleborum J. (Ecolampadii responsio: —*
8. *Libellus de fide et operibus, de votis atque institutis monasticis: —*
9. *De trium linguarum et studii theologici ratione dialogi ii (1519, 4to): —*
10. *Apologia pro dialogis: —*
11. *Adversus librum Erasmi de sarcienda ecclesiae concordia: —*
12. *Confutationum adversus Guil. Tindalumn libri iii: —*
13. *De Alatrimonio: —*
14. *De quibusdam articulis in ecclesia controversis: —*
15. *Disputatio quodlibetica tribus quaestionibus absoluta:*
 - (1.) *In libellune de ecclesia, Philippians Melancthoni inscriptum;*
 - (2.) *Contra orationem factiosorum in Comitii Ratisbonensibus habitam (1544, 8vo). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19:777.*

Latrîa

(λατρειά), the name given in the Roman Catholic Church to the adoration due to God alone on account of his supremacy, as distinguished from *hyperdulia* (q.v.), worship paid to the Virgin, and *dulis* (q.v.), the worship paid to saints.

Latroncinium

SEE EPHESUS, ROBBER COUNCIL OF.

Latta, James

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland in 1732; emigrated to America at an early age, and graduated at the College of Philadelphia in 1757. He became college tutor at his alma mater, and pursued the study of divinity. He was licensed in 1758, and ordained as an evangelist in 1759. Two years after he accepted a call from the congregation of Deep Run, in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, which he resigned in 1770 for the charge of Chestnut Level, in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. Here he established a school of long-continued celebrity. During the war he accompanied the

American army on their campaign as a soldier, and served as chaplain for a time. He vindicated the introduction of the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts, and labored faithfully in his ministry till near the close of life. He died January 29, 1801. Latta published a pamphlet showing that the principal subjects of psalmody should be taken from the Gospel, 8vo. — Sprague, *Annals*, 3:199; Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1865.

Latta, Samuel A

a minister of the M.E. Church South, born April 8, 1804, in Muskingum County, Ohio, early evinced an aptitude for the Christian ministry, and, having practiced medicine from 1824 to 1829, entered the ministry by joining the Ohio Conference, and was appointed to the difficult mission at St. Clair, Michigan. In 1830 he was stationed at Cincinnati, and in 1831 was traveling agent for the American Colonization Society. In 1832 and 1833 he occupied the Union Circuit; in 1834, Lebanon station; in 1835 and 1836, Hamilton and Rossville stations. In 1837 he was agent for Augusta College, Ohio, in behalf of which institution he was very successful. In 1838 and 1839 he preached at Dayton, Ohio. From 1840 till his death, June 28, 1852, he maintained a superannuated relation. Dr. Latta was both an excellent preacher and a good physician, but he earned his highest distinction as a writer. For some years he was editor of the *Methodist Recorder*. He had a mind of uncommon strength, quite versatile, and he had improved it by extensive research and study. "He would sometimes reason with great power, and his descriptions of men and things were often exceedingly striking and beautiful." The work which gained him his greatest fame was *The Chain of Sacred Wonders*, published in 1851 and 1852, 2 volumes, 8vo. — Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 7:755.

Latter-Day Saints

SEE MORMONS.

Lattice

Picture for Lattice 1

stands in the Auth.Vers. for the following Hebrew words in certain passages: 1. **חַנְיָא** (*eshnah'*, so called from *darkening* a room), a latticed opening through which the cool breeze passes, and which at the same time screens the inmates, especially females, from exterior sight (^{<0052>}Judges

5:28; "casement," ^{<2006>}Proverbs 7:6). *SEE WINDOW*. $\mu\gamma\kappa\alpha\eta$ (*charakkim'*, prop. *nets*; Sept. ($\delta\iota\kappa\tau\omega\alpha$), the net-work or lattices of a window (^{<2119>}Song of Solomon 2:9). 3. $hkb\epsilon\zeta$ (*sebakah'*, an *interweaving*), the latticed balustrade before a window or balcony (^{<2002>}2 Kings 1:2; elsewhere a *net* or "snare," ^{<1818>}Job 18:8; "net-work," etc., around the capitals of columns).

Picture for Lattice 2

"The lattice window is much used in warm Eastern countries. It frequently projects from the wall of the building, and is formed of reticulated work, often highly ornamental, portions of which are hinged, so that they may be opened or shut at pleasure. The object of the contrivance is to keep the apartments cool by intercepting the direct rays of the sun, while, at the same time, the air is permitted to circulate freely through the trellis openings. Through the lattice the mother of Sisera and the mystical bridegroom are represented as looking. Through this Ahaziah fell and injured himself; for there is no reason to adopt an old idea that he fell through a grating in the floor. The words in these three texts, however, are different each time in the original, though it is now impossible to determine whether they were entirely interchangeable, or whether there were certain differences of construction indicated by each of them." *SEE HORSE*.

Latzembock, Henry De,

a native of Bohemia, lived in the latter part of the 14th and first part of the 15th centuries. He was a friend of the reformer John Huss, whom, in connection with two other friends, he was appointed to conduct in safety to the Council of Constance. He stood very high in the favor of the emperor Sigismund, and appealed to him in behalf of the reformer. After the condemnation and burning of Huss he was himself suspected of heresy, was summoned before the council, and required to abjure the doctrines of his friend and approve of his condemnation. With this requisition he complied, being more intent on his own safety and advancement at court than anxious for reform. After this period little information concerning him is attainable. — Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, 1:352-354, 386; 2:28, 260.

Laud, William

the celebrated archbishop under James I and Charles I, was born at Reading, the principal town of Berkshire, October 7, 1573, of humble but

respectable parentage. In 1589 he entered St. John's College, Oxford, graduated with distinction in 1594, and proceeded A.M. in 1598, when he was appointed reader in grammar. In January 1600, he was ordained deacon, and priest in 1601. The Calvinistic and Puritan tendency was strong in Oxford at that time; but Laud's immediate instructors and friends had been on the other side; his natural instincts inclined him to High-Church views and high ritualistic observances; he saw, too, that the court was on that side, and that a powerful reaction against the Calvinistic ascendancy was already in progress. Abbot (afterwards primate) and Prideaux had succeeded Drs. Holland and Reynolds as theological professors in the university; but Laud, being appointed in 1602 to read the Maye divinity lecture in St. John's College, did not hesitate to attack Abbot's doctrine in regard to the visibility of the Church. The latter had traced the visible Church down, in the Middle Ages, through the Berengarians, the Albigenses or Waldensians, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites, to Luther and the Reformation; Laud traced it boldly and exclusively through the Church of Rome. They did not see that *exclusiveness* was the error of both parties. In 1603 James succeeded to the throne of England, and, greatly to the disappointment and disgust of the Puritans, but to the unbounded satisfaction of Laud and his friends, he openly took sides with the highest hierarchical party in the English Church, early adopting as his pet motto, "No bishop, no king." Then followed the "Millenary petition" and the famous conference at Hampton Court, which resulted in the king's proclamation of "uniformity in discipline and worship." This year Laud was chosen proctor for the University of Oxford, and in the same year he was appointed chaplain to the earl of Devonshire. In 1604 he took his degree of B.D., and in the thesis which he presented on the occasion he maintained the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation, and of diocesan bishops to the existence of a true Church. In the following year Laud committed one of the most unfortunate, though oft-repent-ed faults of his life, in solemnizing the marriage of his patron, the earl of Devonshire, with lady Rich, who, as he and all the world knew, had been divorced from her former husband, lord Rich, on account of adultery already committed with the same earl of Devonshire himself, of whom Laud was meanwhile the chaplain. The consequence of this affair was that the earl was utterly disgraced at court, and soon after died, while Laud, sharing in the public odium, was severely censured by the highest dignitaries both in Church and state.

In 1606 Laud preached a sermon before the university for which he was vehemently attacked by the vicechancellor as a papist; and though he contrived to escape formal censure from the authorities, he acknowledged afterwards to Heylin that such was the repute in which he was generally held at the university that "it was reckoned a heresy to speak to him, and a suspicion of heresy to salute him as he walked the street." Still, Laud was not without powerful friends, who sympathized with him and his opinions, and especially active among them was Dr. Neile, then bishop of Rochester. In 1607 he was preferred to the vicarage of Stamford, received the advowsson of North Kilworth, and took his degree of D.D. In 1608 he was appointed chaplain of bishop Neile, exchanged North Kilworth for West Tilbury, and preached his first sermon before king James at Theobald's. The next year he was presented to the living of Cuckstone, whereupon he resigned his fellowship in St. John's and resided on his benefice. The climate of Cuckstone not agreeing with his health, he soon exchanged this benefice for that of Norton. In the mean time Neile, having been translated to the see of Lichfield, recommended Laud so powerfully to the king that he obtained for him a prebend's stall in the Cathedral of Westminster, the deanery of which Neile, as bishop of Rochester, had held *in commendam*. In 1611, after a violently contested canvass, Laud was elected president of St. John's College, owing his success chiefly to the strenuous efforts of bishop Neile and of Dr. Buckeridge. At the same time he became one of king James's chaplains, while, to his great chagrin, Abbot, upon the death of archbishop Bancroft, was raised to the primacy. Abbot is charged by Laud's friends as having been the inveterate enemy of the latter, and the great retarder of his ecclesiastical promotion. Of the "enmity," it may be said once for all that there seems to be no evidence beyond the constant repetition of the charge. The simple truth of the case seems to be that Laud became the "inveterate enemy" of Abbot because the latter, when he had the power, refused to promote him, and conscientiously discouraged the advancement of a man in whom he had no confidence. Bishop Neile now bestowed upon Laud the prebendary of Bugden, and in 1615 the archdeaconry of Huntingdon. In 1616 James himself bestowed upon him the deanery of Gloucester, and he thus obtained the prospect of reaching the higher prizes he had in view. A second time he got into hot water by a sermon preached before the university. For this he was taken to task by Dr. Robert Abbot, then vice-chancellor, and brother of the archbishop. Abbot now, like bishop Hall before, charged him with trying to keep on both sides at once. In his deanery of Gloucester he proceeded to "reform and set in

order" according to his own ecclesiastical notions, ordering the communion-table to the east end of the choir, to stand as the "altar" formerly stood, and enjoining a becoming reverence, i.e., due bowings and genuflections, upon the clergy and officers on entering the church or chancel, and proceeding withal in a most high-handed manner. Returning to court, Laud procured directions for the "better government" of the university, which contained the first official disapprobation of the tenets of the Calvinists, and which, being evidently leveled against the Puritans, are conceded by one of Laud's most ardent eulogists (Lawson) to have been "not altogether justifiable." inasmuch as they deprived the university of its independence, and subjected it completely to the control of the king. " But," he adds, with characteristic fallacy and one-sidedness, "the state of the times rendered such instructions necessary; and the consternation of the Puritan faction, when they were made known at Oxford, is a proof of the wisdom of the monarch and his advisers in thus placing a timely restraint on the progress of sectarian partisanship and enthusiasm." James had already (1610-12) re-established episcopacy in Scotland, and with a special view to effect a more perfect uniformity in the two churches, he set out in 1617 to visit his northern kingdom for the first time since his accession to the English throne, and ordered Laud to accompany him. The king's favorite object was to substitute in the Scottish Church the Episcopal liturgy instead of the Presbyterian form of worship; and, though the Presbyterians prayed that they might be preserved from the same, Laud and some of the royal chaplains encouraged James to persist in regarding the mass of the nation as a set of "factious enthusiasts," and to obstinately adhere to his purpose of imposing upon these people his own form of religion in the name of "the Church." James and Laud, with a little knot of archbishops and bishops who had been consecrated to their office, not in Scotland, but at Westminster, were "the Church," and the Scottish nation was "the faction" — a mistake big with sad and fearful consequences. James now propounded the famous *Five Articles*, which he subjected first to the assembly called together at St. Andrew's, and later to the assembly at Perth, where, through the indefatigable exertions of the bishops, and the shrewd and cunning management of the king, the Five Articles were confirmed. These articles were rigidly enforced, but without the desired effect. The Scottish "rabble" were too "factious" to submit to a religion manufactured for them and forcibly imposed upon them by others. It was left for James's successor to continue his father's design, but with still worse success; and it was reserved for Laud to take a more dominant part

in the business, and from a higher position, at a subsequent period. On his return through Lincolnshire he was inducted into the rectory of Ibstock, which he had taken in exchange for Norton; and, arriving at Oxford, he learned with pleasure that his exertions had effectually restrained the "Puritan enthusiasm" at Gloucester.

In 1620 Laud was at length raised to the episcopate, being made bishop of St. David's, in spite of the strenuous opposition of archbishop Abbot, as his friends assert, and through the earnest solicitations of the duke of Buckingham and of the lord-keeper Williams, then bishop of Lincoln, as is commonly alleged. Before his consecration as bishop, Laud, much to his credit, resigned the presidency of St. John's College, because, though such things were often winked at, he could not hold it without a violation of the statute. In his primary visitation of his diocese, he set things "in order" according to his peculiar views of what constituted the essentials of "the Church's" religion. He also built a chapel for himself, which he proceeded to fit up to his own taste as a model, and consecrated it with sundry extraordinary ceremonies.

In 1622 Laud's dispute with the Jesuit Fisher took place, which was, perhaps, the most creditable performance of his life, evincing extensive learning and no mean ability. Yet, dealing with the controversy from the high Anglican point of view, it fails to cover the whole Protestant position, and is now almost forgotten, being a document of much less breadth and historical interest than some still older defenses of the English Church, as, for example, Jewell's *Apology*.

About this time Laud became chaplain to the duke of Buckingham, and between them there grew up an intimate and lasting friendship. While Buckingham was absent with prince Charles in Spain, Laud was in correspondence with him, and seems to have been charged with the care of his interests at court during his absence; for, observing or suspecting some movements of the lord-keeper Williams towards undermining the duke in the royal favor, he immediately informed his patron in Spain of the apprehended danger, who accordingly hastened home to protect himself. Hence arose a determined hostility of the duke towards Williams, and Williams accused Laud of ingratitude, while Laud, on the other hand, charged him with duplicity and selfishness. Evidently the duke's patronage was judged of more value than the bishop's, and the breach ripened into a rooted enmity between the two churchmen. Laud chose to consider himself

insulted by Abbot and Williams because his name was not inserted in the High Commission. He complained to Buckingham, who forthwith procured his nomination. In 1624 James died, and Laud lamented him with demonstrations of the utmost sorrow. On the first day of March, the year after the death of James, Laud received his appointment to preach before Charles at Westminster at the opening of the first Parliament; and the king, upon the advice of bishops Laud and Andrews, prohibited, in the Convocation which met at the same time with Parliament, the discussion of the five predestinarian articles of the Synod of Dort, "on account of the number of Calvinists admitted under 'Abbot's auspices into the Lower House." On the Sunday after the marriage of Charles and Henrietta Maria, Laud again preached before the king and the House of Lords. The king had summoned this Parliament to procure supplies for the prosecution of his wars; but they chose to look after the righting of their own grievances before attending to the king's wants, and proceeded to cite and condemn a certain Mr. Montague for preaching what they judged heretical and unconstitutional doctrine. Laud immediately flew to Montague's protection, and, at his remonstrance, the king revoked the proceedings of Parliament, and prorogued them to Oxford. Parliament was no more pliant at Oxford than it had been at Westminster, and in a pet Charles suddenly dissolved it.

Meanwhile Laud was continually rising in the king's esteem and confidence, while Williams was removed from his office of lord-keeper and banished the court. Laud was indefatigable in his labors in preaching and purging the Church, refusing to ordain any whom he found to be unqualified for the sacred office, according to his view of the proper qualifications. He was appointed by the king to supply the place of the now disgraced Williams, the dean of Westminster, at the ceremony of the coronation. He here had official charge of the regalia, and is accused of having placed a crucifix upon the "altar," and tampered with the coronation oath; but of this accusation not much was ever made. By the king's appointment Laud again preached the sermon at the opening of Parliament, which assembled immediately after the coronation. This Parliament likewise proceeded at once to appoint a committee on religion. They also impeached the duke of Buckingham, and refused to do any other business until his case was disposed of. The king, finding them resolved on the ruin of his minister — and it is to be observed it was the House of Lords and not the House of Commons before which he was to be tried — to save his

favorite, was compelled to dissolve his second Parliament. Unquestionably Laud was deeply and anxiously interested in the cause of his patron, and he is charged, on some show of evidence, with having written the speech of Buckingham in his own defense, and the speech of the king in Buckingham's behalf.

In 1626 Laud was translated to the see of Bath and Wells — a richer bishopric than that of St. David's. Both of Charles's Parliaments had refused to vote the subsidies to supply his pecuniary wants, and he resolved to collect the money without parliamentary authority. With this view he resorted to the expedient of "tuning the pulpits," and Laud was his instrument for this purpose. He was instructed to prepare letters to be issued to the two archbishops and their suffragans, through them to the inferior clergy, and by them to the people, persuading them to pay cheerfully the taxations necessarily imposed on them. "The instructions," as Laud informs us, "were partly political and partly ecclesiastical," and were to be published in every parish in the kingdom. Laud engaged in the duty with his wonted alacrity, and almost immediately upon receiving the royal commands he had the instructions prepared. His apologists admit that it is a difficult matter to justify these instructions, "because they afford a dangerous precedent, which, were it followed, would be attended with the worst consequences;" it was no less than undertaking to tax the people without the consent of their representatives. By Laud's prompt and efficient management of this affair he was still further advanced in the king's good opinion, and was rewarded with the appointment of dean of the chapel royal, and the promise of the primacy in the event of Abbot's decease. In enforcing Laud's "instructions," doctors Sibthorpe and Manwaring preached sermons in which they maintained the extreme doctrines of passive obedience, and which, after Laud's revision, were published. Abbot, too, had refused to license Sibthorpe's sermon, for which factious procedure a commission of sequestration was issued against him, and the administration of his metropolitan functions was put into the hands of Laud, in conjunction with four other bishops. In the same year Laud was made a privy counselor, and, by the redistribution of sundry bishoprics and bishoprics, arrangements were initiated to make a vacancy in the see of London, that Laud might at once be translated to that rich and powerful bishopric. Meanwhile Charles had been compelled by his necessities to call a third Parliament, although it was well understood that Laud as well as Buckingham would be thereby endangered. But, to propitiate the popular

feeling, several commissions were made, and, among other things, Abbot was restored to his functions, and received at court. Again Laud preached the opening sermon, and the king concluded his speech by exhorting Parliament to follow the good advice which Laud had given them. But the Commons determined to proceed to business in their own way. They first drew up and passed the famous Petition of Right. They then presented a remonstrance of grievances against the duke of Buckingham, not omitting to mention Laud in their indictment. They cited Dr. Manwaring to their bar, ordered him to be severely punished, and his sermons to be burnt. The king prorogued Parliament, ignored the complaints against Buckingham and Laud, remitted Manwaring's fine, and, successively giving him various livings, at length promoted him to the deanery of Worcester, and then to the bishopric of St. David's, made Sibthorpe prebendary of Peterborough, and translated Laud to the see of London, July 15, 1629. On the death of Buckingham, which took place before the next meeting of Parliament, the king was pleased to assure Laud that he intended to entrust him with his confidence in Buckingham's room. At the examination of Felton, the assassin of Buckingham, before the privy council, the man admitted the deed, but denied the privity of any other parties. Laud, in his eagerness to improve this presumed opportunity for reaching and crushing his enemies, threatened him with the rack if he would not disclose his accomplices. But, upon the judges being asked whether Felton could be lawfully put to the rack, they returned for answer that by the laws of England he could not. It was in this interval, too, that Laud, "in order to put a stop to the disturbances which arose from the preaching of the abstruse and mystical doctrines of predestination," as his friends aver, "procured a royal declaration to be prefixed to the Articles," prohibiting such preaching. Sir Thomas Wentworth, afterwards earl of Strafford, was gained over from the popular party to the king's side by largesses of royal favor, and he and Laud immediately commenced a friendship which ever after remained inviolate.

When at length Parliament again assembled, the Commons opened with a remonstrance upon the alleged infractions of the Petition of Right, and then turned their attention to their religious grievances. Excited to great exasperation by the king's declaration which Laud had procured, they passed a solemn vote against it, claiming, protesting, and vowing that the current and general exposition of the articles, "which had been established by act of Parliament," had ever been the same as their own. In the debate,

Sir John Eliot denounced some of the bishops as neither "orthodox nor sound in religion. Witness," said he, "the two bishops, Laud and Neile, who were complained of at the last meeting of Parliament. I apprehend much fear that, should we be in their power, we may be in danger to have our religion overthrown. Some of them are masters of ceremonies, and they labor to introduce new ceremonies into the Church." The House resumed the cases of Montague, Manwaring, and Sibthorpe, to all of whom the king had granted pardons and preferments. Laud and Neile were the grand objects of attack, being accused of having procured these pardons. "In Laud and Neile," declared Sir John Eliot, "is centred all the danger we fear," and he proposed to petition the king to leave those bishops to "the justice of the House." Oliver Cromwell, too, distinguished himself in this discussion; the preferment of Manwaring especially "excited his wrath." "If these be the steps to Church preferment," cried the future Protector, "what may *we* expect?" At length the king, exasperated, endeavored to adjourn the House by royal command. This led to a scene of great excitement and confusion, and finally the third Parliament of Charles's reign was abruptly dissolved. Parliaments were now to be abolished, and Laud was prime minister. He must be held to all the responsibility attaching to such a position at such a time. He presided especially over the affairs of England, the duke of Hamilton over those of Scotland, and Wentworth over those of Ireland. In his ecclesiastical administration, Laud's friends commonly claim for him the character of toleration and liberality, in the face of the fact that, having advised with Harsnet, archbishop of York, he drew up certain articles which, under the royal authority, were immediately dispatched to archbishop Abbot, requiring him and his suffragans (in brief) to suppress the preaching of the Puritans, to note all absentees from the prescribed public prayers, and to render an account in the premises on the 2d of January every year.

Early in 1630 Laud was chosen chancellor of the University of Oxford. In the same year he also enjoyed the honor of officiating at the baptism of the infant prince, afterwards Charles II, although this distinction belonged by usage to the archbishop of Canterbury. Laud was now in the full tide of prosperity, and nothing could stand in his way. Did the Puritans undertake to buy up the impropriations of Church livings, that they might have the disposal of them for their lecturers, Laud had them punished for their impertinence, and their purchases confiscated to the king. Did they presume to preach or publish their peculiar tenets at Oxford or in Ireland,

Laud had them expelled or silenced. Were any bishoprics or deaneries vacant, Laud saw that they were filled with the right sort of churchmen. He enlarged St. John's College with a new quadrangle. He repaired St. Paul's Cathedral. He took cognizance of the chapels and chaplains of English congregations abroad, and of the congregations or churches of foreigners in England, and reduced them all to conformity, or placed the members of the latter under the strictest surveillance, taking away the children, and burdening the parents with all the disadvantages of alienage. He urged the Scottish bishops, if they made any change in their liturgy, to adopt that of the Church of England without any variation; and the new liturgy which was drawn up by those bishops was submitted to his final revision. On the king's visit to Scotland, Laud attended him, was made a member of the Scotch Privy Council, and preached before the king, in the chapel royal in Holyrood House, on "the utility of conformity."

At length, on the 4th of August, 1633, archbishop Abbot died; on the 6th Laud was promoted by the king to the primacy, and on the 19th of September was formally translated to this, the long-desired goal of his ambition. At the same time he was offered a cardinal's hat by certain emissaries of the pope, which, without betraying either astonishment, or indignation, or disturbance of any kind, he respectfully declined "till Rome should be otherwise than it then was;" and before his enthronement he was elected chancellor of the University of Dublin.

In his metropolitan chair his first act was to issue more stringent rules for candidates for ordination, so as more effectually to shut out Puritan preachers and lecturers. The next was to revive and extend the king's declaration concerning lawful sports on Sundays. The archbishop now proceeded upon his metropolitan visitations, and he made thorough work of it; for all Puritanism he was a perfect "root and branch" man. But one great business and burden with him was to see that the communion-tables were placed altar-wise, railed in, and approached always with the prescribed bows and obeisances, it being assumed that thus, and thus only, could true devotion and godly reverence be preserved in the Church. His old patron, bishop Williams, he suspended for contumacy. He busied himself earnestly in improving the revenues of the poor clergy of London and the poorer clergy of Ireland. He procured a new charter and statutes for the University of Dublin, and the adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles, instead of those of Lambeth, by the Irish Church. Indeed, through his intimacy with Wentworth, the lord deputy, and his chancellorship of the

Dublin University, he seems, as prime minister and archbishop of Canterbury, to have had much more control of the affairs of the Irish Church than her own primate, Usher, or any or all of her bishops and archbishops. Civil appointments, also, were accumulated upon Laud. He was not only prime minister, privy counselor in England and in Scotland, member of the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission, but he was also appointed a member of the committee of trade, and a commissioner of the Treasury, and placed on the foreign committee. He procured the new Caroline Charter for Oxford, and continued his munificent gifts. He took especial care of the restoration of the cathedrals and of the Cathedral service, with all the old accustomed appointments and ceremonies.

Laud, like Wolsey when in favor with Henry VIII, had reached the highest pinnacle of his greatness. All honor, power, and splendor seemed to converge towards him. All around was buoyant with success and glowing with promise. It was Laud here, it was Laud there, it was Laud everywhere. He had three kingdoms well in hand. Church and State lay submissive at his feet. But the scene was soon to change. He was disporting himself upon the bosom of a volcano, whose vent-holes he was hoping to keep stopped up with his puny engineering. The quakings and rumblings of the approaching eruption were already increasing. In the year 1637, "some factious and refractory men had determined to establish their enthusiasm on the shores of America, amid the forests of New England." These disorderly emigrations without a royal license it was thought expedient to restrain, "because of the many idle and obstinate humors whose only or principal end was to live without the reach of authority." Eight ships in the Thames were stopped by an order of Council, and no clergyman was allowed to leave the country without the approbation of the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London. Among those intended emigrants Oliver Cromwell is said to have been thus stopped. The symptoms of dissatisfaction and uneasiness were drawing towards a crisis, and some prosecutions of this same year accelerated the national calamities. The first case was the trial of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton in the Star Chamber. Prynne was a graduate of Oxford, and a barrister of Lincoln's Inn; Bastwick left Cambridge before taking his degree, and, having traveled nine years on the Continent, took the degree of M.D. at Padua; Burton was A.M. and B.D. at Oxford, and had been clerk of the closet to the Prince of Wales, and rector of St. Matthew's, Friday Street, London. Prynne, for his *Histrio-Mastyx*, had already been condemned to

pay a fine of £5000, to be expelled from Oxford and from Lincoln's Inn, to stand in the pillory at Westminster and at Cheapside, and at each place to have an ear cut off, to have his book burnt before his face, and to remain a prisoner for life. In the execution of the sentence it is said that Prynne had nearly been suffocated with the smoke of his book. From prison, however, the irrepressible Prynne, as soon as he could procure writing materials, continued audaciously, and with amazing industry, to send forth his pamphlets against his persecutors; and now the doctor Bastwick and the rector Burton had joined the lawyer in the fray. These pamphlets were no doubt intemperate and extravagant, coarse and violent in their language; they were naturally branded as scurrilous and seditious by the other side. But it is to be remembered their authors were persecuted fanatics; and it is a better excuse for them to say that the controversial language of the age was coarse, than it is for their enemies to say that the punishments of the age were barbarous. The use of epithets is largely a matter of taste and fashion; but humanity itself, wherever it exists, is shocked at the sight of torture, and cruelty, and blood. All three of the accused were condemned; Prynne to pay a fine of £5000, to lose the remainder of his ears in the pillory, to be branded on both cheeks with the initials of slanderous libeler, and to be immured for life in Caernarvon Castle. Bastwick and Burton were to pay the same fine, were to lose their ears in the pillory, and to be imprisoned for life in separate castles. On this occasion, Laud, who was a member of the court, made a long speech. As he had everything under his own control, he had no temptation to use violent language. He assumed an air of studied coolness and dignity. Having descanted upon the merits of his own immaculate administration in Church and State, and set forth in strong colors the dangerous and abominable character of factious and seditious libeling, he added, "But because the business hath some reflection upon myself, *I shall forbear to censure them*, and leave them to God's mercy and the king's justice." That is to say, having fully given his views, he would not cast his formal vote in the case, but, knowing full well what the decision, yea, the "unanimous" decision of the judges would be, he concludes his speech thus. "I give all your lordships hearty thanks for your noble patience, and your just and honorable sentence upon these men, and your unanimous dislike of them and defense of the Church." Who can doubt that Prynne was right in afterwards declaring that Laud was "the cause and contriver of the sentence before it was given, and that he approved and thanked the lords for it when it was given?" The three victims underwent their "punishment" (as Laud's friends delight to call it)

with the most astonishing heroism. Such "punishment" of such men, however ignominious or degrading it was meant to be, could never elevate the dignity or strengthen the position of the party that inflicted it. The sufferers were no doubt supported by the sympathies of an immense mass of the people, as well as by their own courage or obstinacy, their religious principle or fanaticism. No wonder that libels against the archbishop were multiplied and intensified, and that his victims were honored with abundant and galling demonstrations of popular favor. It was found necessary, in order to remove them out of the reach of their friends, to transfer them from the prisons to which they had been condemned to other castles in the Channel Islands.

Having now seen the leaders of the "malignant faction" visited with condign "punishment" and put out of the way, Laud had the pleasure of having his early patron, bishop Williams — against whom he seems to have nursed a rancorous grudge, as though fearing that one day he might be a dangerous rival — arraigned before him in the Star Chamber, at first on the old charge of revealing the king's secrets, and afterwards in that of suborning a witness; and, having again delivered himself of a long and dignified speech, magnifying the enormity of the crime of subornation of perjury, especially in a clergyman and a bishop, and at the same time protesting his personal friendliness, he graciously and humbly leaves the accused to the tender mercies of a court thus "tuned," who sentenced him to pay a fine of £10,000, to be imprisoned during the king's pleasure, and to be suspended from all his offices, preferments, and functions.

Upon Laud's recommendation, a decree was passed by the Star Chamber in 1637 for restraining the freedom of the press. The provisions of the edict were sufficiently severe. It limited the number of master printers under penalty of whipping; it forbade the printing of books without a license from the archbishop or the bishop of London, or their chaplains, or from the chancellors or vice-chancellors of the universities. It prohibited the sale of imported books without a similar license; it authorized the Company of Stationers to seize on all such books as they found to be schismatical or offensive, and to lay them before the ecclesiastical authorities; it enacted that no one in England should cause to be printed any books in English beyond the seas, or to import them into the country; and finally it provided that offenses against the decree should be punished by the court of Star Chamber or High Commission. Such was the law enacted — not by the English Parliament, but by the Star Chamber — to protect, not the English

Protestant Church, but the Laudian ecclesiastical system against the "Puritan faction."

The "Short Parliament" of 1640 had been dissolved after a session of three weeks; but as the Convocation continued to sit a set of new canons was drawn up under the influence and presidency of Laud, which contained the famous *election* oath; and the first of which proclaimed that monarchy was of divine right, that the royal authority was independent, not only of the bishop of Rome, but of every other earthly power, and that it cannot be assailed on any pretense without resistance to the ordinance of God. Not only this canon, but the whole body of them, were of the most arbitrary character, especially enjoining, under severe penalties, the ceremonies to which the archbishop was notoriously attached; and all this at a time most unwisely chosen, when the whole condition of the empire was imminently critical; so that, as Clarendon remarks, "the season in which that synod continued to sit was in so ill a conjuncture of time that nothing could have been transacted there of a popular and prevailing influence."

The archbishop prime minister had so completely established uniformity in England that he now had leisure to turn his particular attention to the reformation of Puritan abuses in the outlying islands of Jersey and Guernsey. He claims to have brought Chillingworth back from the Church of Rome. If he did, he certainly did not make that irrefragable defender of the religion of Protestants a disciple of his own system. He urged bishop Hall to write his treatise on Episcopacy; but Hall's claims were not put high enough to satisfy Laud, who was particularly offended because the pope was plainly called Antichrist. The plot now thickens. The Scottish troubles growing out of the attempted imposition of the new canons and liturgy upon the Scottish people, beginning with the "profane imprecation" of the dame Janet Geddes, in St. Giles's, at the first reading of the detested service: "Out, out, thou false thief; dost thou say mass at my lug?" had now swollen into an irresistible storm of violence and rebellion. The uproar of the "old woman" in a church, and the brickbats of the mob around it, had turned into a national conspiracy. Through all the business Laud had adroitly managed to incur no mesponsibility without the participation or authority of the king or the Scottish bishops; nevertheless, it is evident he was mixed up with it all, not only as accessory, but as prime minister. He corresponded constantly with the Scottish bishops as well as with the civil authorities in Scotland. To him they made their reports and their excuses, and his advice and direction were required and sought on all occasions.

The invasion of England by the army of the Covenanters at length compelled Charles once more to summon the English Legislature. The Long Parliament met. Then the bubble burst; then the flaunting splendors of a luxurious and insolent court were exchanged for humiliation and deepening gloom; then the vast machinery of ecclesiastical despotism, pushed to its utmost tension of pride and tyranny, suddenly gave way with a crash, and the accumulated usurpations of royal prerogative hastened to their final and irreversible doom. The odious courts of the Star Chamber and High Commission were abolished, and all judges were henceforth made independent of the crown; no taxes, of whatever description, were to be levied without authority of Parliament, and Parliaments were by law to be triennial. The earl of Strafford, lord deputy of Ireland, Laud's most intimate friend, the king's ablest political adviser, and the most skillful commander of the royal forces against the Scotch, was impeached for high treason. Laud's own impeachment soon followed, and he was forthwith committed to the Towser, where he was kept imprisoned three years (1641-5); his jurisdiction and all his offices and emoluments were sequestered by the House of Peers. Lambeth Palace was made a state prison, and Leighton, now almost a maniac, was put in charge of it; Prynne was made his warden in the Tower. The bishops were unseated from the House of Lords; episcopacy and the liturgy were abolished by act of Parliament; and Laud — having seen the complete triumph of the miserable "fanatical faction" over which he had wielded the rod of power and of punishment so long, the utter destruction and abolition of the hierarchy and the ceremonies to whose aggrandizement and magnificence he had devoted his life, and the annihilation of all his fond dreams of personal grandeur, and glory, and lordly munificence — was at length condemned by an ordinance of Parliament, and suffered decapitation on Tower Hill, meeting his doom with perfect composure and quiet dignity, on the 10th of January, 1645.

Thus fell the famous archbishop Laud, perhaps the best praised and most blamed man that ever lived. As to the formal legality of his sentence, it may be admitted that it cannot be constitutionally or technically justified. As to the specific charges against him, it may be granted that they could not, except constructively, amount to treason even if proved, and that few of any weight were proved with such evidence as would be satisfactory under the strict rules of an impartial court of justice. But it must be remembered that Laud was tried before a revolutionary tribunal; that, in such

circumstances, moral, not legal evidence swayed his judges; and that the general, known truth of the case, not the detailed proof of specific articles, determined the conclusion.

It may be conceded that the arbitrary and tyrannical acts of the administration of Charles and of Laud, whether in Church or State, did not go beyond the precedents which had been set from Henry VIII downwards; but it must be remembered that the spirit of the times had changed, and it was the bounden duty of wise men in high places to know it, and act accordingly. A people educated under Romish domination and superstition might submit to the imposition of taxes or of creeds by the sovereign and established authority, which a people educated under even an imperfect influx of Protestant light, and of its attendant maxims of personal liberty and freedom of thought, could no longer brook. Moreover, a tyrannical despotism once constitutionally established can never be abolished or got rid of unless the governors either yield to the popular demands or are illegally put down by revolutionary force and violence.

It may be conceded that Laud was honest and conscientious in defending the extreme doctrines of the divine right, of the royal prerogative, and of passive obedience, and in his endeavors to suppress the "Puritan faction" in Church and State; but, in a historical estimate of his career and character, this proves nothing. The constitution of successive Parliaments shows that this "faction" was an increasing majority of the nation; they, too, were conscientious; Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton were conscientious — fanatically, not by policy, conscientious; the parliamentary leaders, those noble defenders of English liberty, were conscientious; most despots, tyrants, and conservatives, as well as rebels, revolutionists, and reformers, are conscientious. Their conduct and character must be judged of by rules independent of their well informed or ill informed private consciences. There may be fault on both sides: one extreme begets another. So it was then; so it was afterwards.

It may be conceded that the charge of popery against Laud — a charge from which he suffered more severely than from any other, and which more than any other was the cause of his ruin — was not literally true. What was substantially true was thus put into the false and extravagant formula of the demagogue — it was a caricature. Laud was a loyal son of the Church of England, "as by law established," so long as the laws were in accordance with his notions, or as he had the interpretation and execution of them in

his own hands. It was not Roman popery, but Anglican or Laudean popery which he would establish. No doubt he was more of a Papist than of a Protestant in the true sense of that word. His sympathies were more with Rome than with Augsburg or Geneva; and the people, who are instinctively sagacious in questions of this kind, did not fail to perceive it, and they expressed their judgment, as is their wont, in the most summary and positive terms.

As to ecclesiastical ceremonies, Laud's devotion to them and to their enforcement is certainly not among the marks of his greatness of mind. The opposition to them may have been as unreasonable as their imposition; yet the fact was they were generally unpopular and odious, and Laud, in his position, was bound to have the discretion to accommodate himself to that fact. It boots nothing to say that they were not illegal; it is enough that they were both unpopular and unnecessary. It boots nothing to talk of the irreverence and slovenliness of the Puritan worship; that is mostly exaggeration; but, at all events, decency and reverence could have been preserved without the precision and multiplied formalities of the Laudean ceremonial.

It may be conceded that Laud was a munificent patron of learning and of the universities, with whose dignities he was invested; but it might not be altogether amiss to inquire whence came all the funds of which he made all this lordly distribution; and perhaps we shall find that, in this matter, Laud deserves only this honor above many other men, that he honestly paid over at least a portion of the money to those to whom, after all, it rightfully belonged. He never stinted the splendor or sumptuousness of his own establishment, or the appointments of his personal retinue. Of his wealth and grandeur he enjoyed what he could. But let it remain to his credit that his vanity — if it were nothing better — took the form of magnificent public benefactions.

As to intellectual abilities, Laud's must have been considerable, or he could never have been the historical personage he was. In the personal habits of his private life he was irreproachable. As a clergyman he was indefatigable and punctilious in the discharge of his duties. He was always narrow and bigoted in his views, but he lived in narrow and bigoted times. How far his high political positions were compatible with his ecclesiastical character may well be doubted, and his example can never be repeated again in England. How far the corrupting influence of political place, and of the

association of political persons and of political life, may have contributed to develop and exaggerate his worst faults — which, after all, were chiefly those of administration — it is impossible to say. It must be remembered that he was a courtier long before he was even a bishop, and continued a courtier till he became primate of all England, and thereafter till he was "translated" from the court to the Tower of London. If lawn sleeves could pass unsullied through the scenes of such a life, a naturally ambitious churchman could hardly grow in grace in such an atmosphere. Laud's devotional compositions, in the form of private prayers, are often admirable, and are thought to give a very favorable insight into his interior religious life. Let us hope that the prayers were sincere and acceptable.

Laud's character may be considered with reference to the rightness of his general purpose, or to the wisdom of his aiming at its accomplishment, or to the manner in which he endeavored to effect it. As to the right or wrong of his general purpose, his theory and aim, whether in Church or State, but particularly in the Church, it always has been, and perhaps always will be, a matter of dispute. It is useless to discuss it. Any judgment of his character based upon the assumption of this question is no better than a *petitio principii*. As to the wisdom or folly of undertaking to accomplish that purpose in those times and under those circumstances, it is more and more generally admitted that he made a mistake in the attempt. His friends regard it as a venial error, his enemies reckon the blunder a crime. As to the means he employed, and, in general, his whole manner and bearing in seeking his end, there is a very general verdict against him. He had great personal faults. Prominent among them were an overweening ambition, self-sufficiency, and insolence. An aristocratic estimate of the structure of society, and a sovereign contempt for the people and the popular will — very natural, but the more inexcusable in a man of his origin and profession — an utter destitution of the grand idea of *humanity*, underlie all the mistakes and all the misfortunes of his life.

We conclude our sketch with the following candid admissions from Le Bas, one of Laud's most earnest apologists and admirers. "That the administration of Laud was in some respects injurious to the Church can hardly be denied; but then it is most important to keep in mind that the injury was inflicted not so much by the measures which he adopted as by the manner in which he enforced them. There has seldom, perhaps, lived a man who contrived that his good should be so virulently evil spoken of. From all that we learn of him, his manner appears to have been singularly

ungracious and unpopular, and his temper offensively irascible and hot. If we are to trust the representations of him left us either by friend or foe, he must have been one of the most disagreeable persons in the three kingdoms except to those who were intimately acquainted with his worth. There was nothing affable or engaging in his general behavior. His very integrity was often made odious by wearing an aspect of austerity and haughtiness. It would almost seem as if prudence had been struck out of his catalogue of the cardinal virtues. He was unable, as Warburton remarks, to comprehend one important truth, with which Richelieu was so familiar, when he said that if he had not spent as much time in civilities as in business he had undone his master. The consequence of this ignorance, or of this disdain, of the ways of the world was unspeakably hurtful to the cause which at all times was nearest his heart. In the minds of many who were ignorant of the essential excellence of the man, the interests of the Establishment were, by his demeanor, associated with almost everything that is harsh and repulsive. For a considerable portion of his life he was regarded not only as the leader, but the representative of the ecclesiastical body; and the impression which he communicated to the public was too often that of unfeeling arrogance and lofty impatience of control. Whether the Church could have been saved by any combination, in the person of its ruler, of those rare endowments which secure at once both reverence and attachment, no human sagacity can at this day be competent to pronounce; but it certainly is not altogether surprising that this unhappy defect should, even in the minds of judicious and impartial men, have connected his administration with the ruin of the Establishment. In such unquiet times, more especially, a man like Laud would not only be dreaded as a firm and conscientious disciplinarian, but as the rigorous and overbearing priest; and the Church would be sure to suffer most grievously for the unpopularity of her governor."

In England, the parties with which Laud's life was implicated have not yet passed away, so that it is almost impossible even now to get an impartial estimate of the man from his own countrymen; but it can hardly be doubted that the ultimate verdict of history will be his final condemnation. The English monarchy has gloriously survived the political principles which he defended; his ecclesiastical principles will ultimately be found equally unnecessary, nay, hostile, to the true strength and glory of the English Church. (D.K.G.)

Laud's writings are few. Wharton published his *Diary* in 1694, and Parker his *Works* (Oxford, 1847-60), containing, among other things, his letters and miscellaneous papers, many of them then published for the first time, and, like his *Diary*, invaluable as contributions to the personal history of this noted archbishop and his associates. See Hume, *Hist. of Engl.* Chapter 52; Hallam, *Constit. Hist. of Engl.* (Lond. 1854), 2:38, 167; Macaulay, *Essays* (1854), 1:159 sq., 424 sq.; Short, *Ch. Hist.* (Lond. 1840), page 486 sq., 553 sq.; Tulloch, *English Puritanism*, page 45 sq.; Fletcher, *History of Independency*, volumes 2, 3, 4; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* (see Index); Prynne, Heyin, Le Bas, Lawson, and Baines, on the *Life of Laud; Westm. Rev.* 17:478 sq.; 1870, page 294; *London Month. Rev.* 118:317 sq.; *Lond. Retrop. Rev.* 7 (1827), 49 sq.; *Blackw. Mag.* 25:619 sq.; 27:179; 29:523; 1, 806; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* 10:101 sq.; *North. Amer. Review*, 1864, 606 sq.

Lauda Sion Salvatorem

is the beginning of the renowned sequence of Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274) for Corpus-Christi day. It consists of twelve double verses, which are as follows:

Picture for Lauda Sion Salvatorem

Lauda Sion, although full of the doctrine of transubstantiation, as was to be expected from its author, yet contains no allusion to the priestly power "*deum conficere*, which is the chief characteristic of Corpus-Christi day, but ends with an inward prayer for adoption and participation in the eternal feast of grace. A German translation was made of it by the monk John of Salzburg (1366-1396), beginning with the words *Lob, O Syon, deinen Schöpfer*. We know of no English translation. See Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, Z; Daniel, *Thesaur. Hygmnologicus*, 2:97 sq. (Lips. 1855, 5 volumes, 8vo)

Laudiani Manuscript

Picture for Laudiani Manuscript

(CODEX LAUDIANUS, so called because presented by archbishop Laud in 1636 to the University of Oxford, now in the Bodleian Library, where it is numbered 35), usually designated as E of the Acts, is a very valuable MS. of the Acts, with the Greek and Latin in uncial letters in parallel columns, the Latin words (which are neither Jerome's nor the Vulgate, but

a closely literal version) always exactly opposite the Greek. It is defective at ~~Acts~~ Acts 26:29-27:26. It is in size nine inches by seven and a half, and consists of 226 leaves of 23-26 lines. The vellum is rather poor, and the ink faint. There are no stops, and few breathings. It was probably written in the West during the sixth century. Readings were taken from it by Fell (1675) and Mill (1707). Hearne published the text in full: *Acta Apostolorum Graeco-Latinae*, literis majusculis (Oxon. 1715, 8vo); now very scarce. See Davidson, *Bib. Crit.* 2:293; Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* 4:187 sq.; Scrivener, *Introd.* page 128. **SEE MANUSCRIPTS.**

Laudemium

a name given to the sum which heirs, on obtaining their inheritance, are to pay to certain parties. It was to be paid for the recognition and establishment (*laudatio*) of the claim, and even, occasionally, on coming into possession other than an inheritance, as, for instance, by gift, etc. It subsequently became obligatory only in cases of sale, of inheritance from collateral relations, or sometimes from descendants, etc. The Roman law states the amount to be paid in the case of a copyhold to be one fiftieth of the principal ("quinguesima pars pretii vel astimationis loci, qui transfertur," cap. 3, *Cod. Just. de jure emphyteutico*, 4:66). It subsequently increased to one thirtieth, one twentieth, and even one tenth. This, however, is named the *laudemium majus*, and distinguished from the *laudemium minus*. See J.C.H. Schroter, *V. d. Lehensware*, etc. (Berlin, 1789); Christ, *Analecta de sportula clientelari vulyo de taxafeudali* (Lips. 1757). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 8:230.

Lauds

Hymns of praise (from Latin *laus*, praise). In some of the ancient councils the hallelujah appointed to be sung after the Gospel is termed *Laudes*. Also the name of the service which, before the Reformation, followed after the Nocturn, celebrated between 12 and 3 A.M., or in the 3d watch. Du Cange assigns them this place, but cites a passage from which it would appear that they rather belong to *matins* in the following watch. The Lauds, Du Cange tells us, consisted, in the monastic or pre-reformatory service, of the last three psalms. Durand, however, names five. See Procter, *Common Prayer*, page 186 sq. — Eden, *Theolog. Dict.* s.v.; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v. **SEE BREVIARY; SEE CANONICAL HOURS; SEE LITURGY; SEE MATINS.**

Lauffer, Jacob

a Swiss Protestant minister and historian, was born at Zoffingen July 25, 1688, and studied theology at Halle and Utrecht. In 1718 he became professor of history and eloquence at Berne. He died February 26, 1734. His works are not of special interest to theological students, excepting, perhaps, *De Hostium Spoliis Deo sacratis et sacrandis* (1717).

Laughter

(**qj** **ⲁ** γέλως), an action usually expressing joy (^{<0205}Genesis 21:6; Psalm 126. 2; ^{<0004}Ecclesiastes 3:4; ^{<0021}Luke 6:21); sometimes mockery (^{<0183}Genesis 18:13; ^{<0022}Ecclesiastes 2:2; ^{<0049}James 4:9); and occasionally conscious security (^{<0022}Job 5:22). When used concerning God (as in ^{<0004}Psalm 2:4; 59:8; ^{<0026}Proverbs 1:26) it signifies that he despises or pays no regard to the person or subject. *SEE ISAAC.*

Laughton, George, D.D.

an English minister, lived in the latter half of the 18th century. Among his works of importance are his *History of Ancient Egypt* (Lond. 1774, 8vo): — *Reply to Chap. X V of Gibbon's Decline and Fall* (1780-86). His *Sermons* were published from 1773-90. — Allibone, *Hist. of British and American Authors*, 2:1064.

Laugier, Marc Antoine

a French Jesuit, was born at Manos July 25, 1713. He was a priest at Paris until 1757, when he was appointed to the abbey of Ribeauts. He died April 7, 1769. For a list of his works on various subjects, see Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 29:894.

Launay, Pierre De,

lord of La Motte and Vaufeelan, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Blois in 1573. After holding a high position in the war department, he resigned in 1613, retaining only the title of secretary and counsellor to the king, and devoted himself exclusively to study. He acquired the mastery over Greek, learned Hebrew from a Jewish teacher, and was for forty years a member of the Consistory of Charenton. He took part in several provincial synods, and was secretary of the two national synods of Charenton in 1623 and of Alenlon in 1637. He died at Paris June 27, 1661.

His works are, *Paraphrase et Exposition du Prophete Daniel* (Sedan, 1624) — *Paraphrase et claire Exposition du Livre de Salomon vulgairement appele l'Ecclésiaste* (Saint-Maurice, 1624, 8vo): — *Paraphrase et Exposition des Proverbes de Salomon et du premier Chapitre du Cantique des Cantiques* (Charenton, 1650, 2 volumes, 8vo; 2d ed. 1655, 12mo): — *Paraphrase et Exposition de l'Epistre de Saint Paul aux Romains* (Saumur, 1647, 8vo): — *Paraphrase sur les Epistres de Saint Paul* (Charenton 1650, 2 volumes 4to): — *Paraphrase et Exposition de l'Apocalypse* (Geneva, 1651, 4to); published under the name of Jonas le Buy de la Prie. In this work he advances opinions on the Millennium which were strongly opposed by Amyraut: — *Examen de la Replique de M. Amyraut* (Charenton, 1658, 8vo): — *Traite de la Sainte Cene du Seigneur, avec l'Explication de quelques Passages difficiles du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament* (Saumur, 1659, 12mo): — *Remarques sur le Texte de la Bible, ou Explication des Mots, des Phrases, et des Figures difficiles de la sainte Ecriture* (Geneva, 1667, 4to), a posthumous and highly esteemed work. See Haag, *La France Protestante*. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:907.

Launoi, Jean De,

a noted French Roman Catholic historian and canonist, was born at Val-de-Sis, near Valogne, December 21, 1603. He studied at Constance and Paris, where he was received *magister* in June 1634. In the same year he entered the Church. He was highly esteemed among the learned men of his time. On a journey to Rome he became the intimate friend of Luc Holstenius and Leo Allatius. His whole life was devoted to the study of theology at the Sorbonne in Paris; he never sought any promotion, but preferred to serve his Church by his pen, which he wielded with great power and ability. He died at Paris March 10, 1678. Moreri says of him: "The great number of his works, and the manner in which they are written, give ample evidence of his extensive reading and ready ability. But his style is neither ornate nor polished; he uses awkward, obsolete expressions; handles his subjects very peculiarly; and, if he overcomes his adversaries, he also tires his readers by the profusion of his quotations. He could not endure fables nor superstitions, and defended with great firmness the rights of the Church and of the king, which were endangered by the ultramontanes." In a noble spirit of independence, he preferred expulsion from the Sorbonne rather than to endorse the condemnation of Arnauld by that body, although he differed from that theologian in his views on grace. He even went so far as

to write against the *Formulaire* of the assembly of the clergy of 1656. He particularly distinguished himself by his acumen in discovering the spuriousness of most of the acts of the saints, as also of a number of ecclesiastical privileges. Dom Bonaventure, of Argonne, writes of him: "He is dangerous alike to heaven and to earth; he has overthrown more saints in paradise than were canonized by any ten popes. He looked with suspicion on the whole martyrologia, and examined the claims of the saints one after another, as they do in France about the nobility." His writings are mainly of a historico-critical nature, and in tendency apologetical in behalf of Gallicanism. The most important of them are, *Syllabus rationum quibus caussa Durandi de modo conjunctionis concursuum Dei et creaturae, defenditur* (Par. 1636, 8vo): — *De mente concilii Tridentini circa satisfactionem in sacramento paenitentiae* (1644), in which he maintains that the Council of Trent and the practice of the Church do not prove that satisfaction must precede absolution: — *De frequenti Confessionis et Eucharistic usu* (1653): — *De commentitio Lazari, Magdalene, Marthe ac Maximini in provinciam Appulsu* (1660, 8vo): — *De auctoritate negantis argummenti* (Paris, 1650 and 1662, 8vo), wherein he affirms he had himself seen at Sienna, in 1634, the statue of the popess Joanna placed between those of Leo IV and Benedict III. It produced quite a controversy, and abbot Thiers wrote against it *Defensio adversus Joh. de Launoi in qua defensione Launoi fraudes calumniae, plagia, inposturae*, etc. (Paris, 1664): — *De recta Nicaeni canonis VI, et prout a Rufino explicatur, Intelligentia*: — *De veteri Ciborum Delectu in jejuniis Christianorum*: — *Judicium de Auctore libri De Imitatione Christi* (Paris, 1649, 1650, 1652, 1663, 8vo). Launoi advocates the claim of Gersen. **SEE KEMPIS, THOMAS A**: — *De Cura Ecclesiae pro Miseris et pauperibus* (Paris, 1663, 8vo): — *Epistolae* (Par. 1664-1673, 8 volumes, 8vo; Cambridge, 1689, 1 volume, folio): — *De vero Auctore fidei professionis qua Pelagio Hieronymo, Augustino tribui solet*, in which he attempts to prove that Pelagius is the only author of the profession of faith attributed to Jerome and Augustine: — *Explicata Ecclesiae Traditio circa canonem "Omnis utriusque sexus"* (Par. 1672, 8vo), a highly-esteemed work: — *Regia in Matrimonium Potestas, vel de jure saecularium principum Christianorum in sciendis impedimentis matrimonium dirimentibus* (Par. 1674, 4to). This work was condemned at Rome, December 10, 1688, yet its principles were approved by a number of the most distinguished theologians and jurists: — *Venerandae Romanae Ecclesiae circa simoniam Traditio* (Paris, 1675, 8vo): — *De Sabbatinae bullae Privilegio et de Scapularis*

Carmelitarum Soliditate: — In Privilegia ordinis Praemonstratenensis: — In Chartam immunitatis quam beatus Germanus, episcopus Parisiensis, suburbano monasterio dedisse fertur: — In privilegium quod Gregorius lusus monasterio Sancti-Medardi Suessionensis dedisse dicitur. In these works the author examines a number of rights and privileges which he considers as unfounded or unjust: — A treatise on the conception of the Virgin, in which he asserts that if an attempt were made to define "the point of the conception of the Virgin by the Scriptures and tradition, it would be shown that she was conceived in sin." The complete works of Launoï were published by abbot Granet (Geneva, 1731, 10 volumes, fol.). See Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, volume 18:34-62; *Journal des Savants*, anno 1664, 1665, 1667, 1668, 1675, 1688, 1698, 1701, 1704, 1705, 1726, 1731; *Bibl. sacree*; Moreri, *Grand Diction. Historique*; Guy-Patin, *Epist.*; Bayle, *Dict. Critique*, and *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*; Nicéron, *Memoires*, volume 32; Colomies, *Recueil de Particularites*, page 329; Reiser, *Elogium Joannis Launoii* (Lond. 1685); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:912 sq., Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 8:230 sq.

Laura

(*collection of anchorites' cells*), a name given by Church historians to collections of cells, the habitations of hermits or monastics of the early days of the Church, but incorrectly used as a synonyme of *monasterium*, from which it greatly differs, inasmuch as the inmates of the latter were coenobites, and held intercourse with each other, while those of the former lived apart, in seclusion. The holy tenants of a laura passed in solitude and silence five days in a week; their food was bread, water, and dates; on Saturday and Sunday they received the sacrament, and messed together on broth and a small allowance of wine. Bingham states that when many of the cells of anchorites were placed together in the same wilderness, at some distance from one another, they were all called by one common name, laura, which, as Evagrius informs us (1:21), differed from a coenobium in this, that a laura was many cells divided from each other, where every monk provided for himself; but a cenobium was but one habitation, where the monks lived in society, and had everything in common. Epiphanius (*Hoeres.* 69, 1) says *Laura*, or *Labra*, was the name of a street or district where a church stood in Alexandria; and it is probable that from this the name was taken to signify a multitude of cells in the wilderness, united, as it were, in a certain district, yet so divided as to make up many separate

habitations. The most celebrated lauras were established in the East, especially in Palestine, as the laura of St. Euthymus, St. Saba, the laura of the towers, etc. *SEE MONACHISM; SEE MONASTERY.*

Laureate

(from the Latin verb *laureatus*, *crowned with the prize*) was used of a successful theological candidate, in ancient times, at the Scotch universities.

Laurence Richard, D.C.L.,

a distinguished English prelate, was born at Bath in 1760; matriculated in the University of Oxford July 14, 1778, as an exhibitor of Corpus Christi College; took the degree of B.A. April 10, 1782; that of M.A. July 9, 1785, and those of B. and D.C.L. June 27, 1794. Upon the appointment in 1796 of his brother, Dr. French Laurence, to the regius professorship of civil law, he was made deputy professor at Oxford. In 1804 he preached the Bampton Lectures, and the reputation thence acquired secured for him from the archbishop of Canterbury the rectory of Mersham, Kent. In 1814 he was appointed to the chair of regius professor of Hebrew, and to the canonry of Christ Church, Oxford, and in 1822 was elevated to the archiepiscopal see of Cashel. He died in Dublin December 28, 1838. His most important works are his translations of certain apocryphal books of the O.T. from the Ethiopic, accompanied by critical investigations: *Ascensio Isaiae Vatis, opusculum pseudepigraphum, multis abhinc saeculis, ut videtur, ut id depeditum, nunc autem apud Aethiopas compertum et cum versione Latina Anglicanaque public jurisfactum* (Oxon. 1819, 8vo): — *Primi Ezrae Libri, qui apud Vulgatum appellatur quartus versio Aethiopica, nunc primo in medium prolata et Latine Angliceque reddita* (Oxon. 1820, 8vo). The translation is followed by general remarks upon the different versions of this book, its apocryphal character, the creed of its author, and the probable period of its composition, *SEE ESDRAS*: — *The Book of Enoch the Prophet*, an apocryphal production, supposed to have been lost for ages, but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia, now first published from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library (Oxford, 1821, 8vo; 3d ed. 1838), *SEE ENOCH, BOOK OF*: — also, *Remarks on the systematical Classification of MSS. adopted by Griesbach in his Edition of the Greek Testameent* (Oxf 1814, 8vo): — *Dissertation on the Logos of St. John*

(Oxf. 1808, 8vo): — *Critical Relections upon some important Misrepresentations contained in the Unitarian Version of the N.T.* (Oxford, 1811, 8vo): — *The Book of Job in the Words of the A.T.*, arranged and printed in conformity with the Masoretic text (Dublin, 1828, 8vo): — *On the Existence of the Soul after Death* (London, 1834, 8vo). This work, written in opposition to Priestley, Law, and their respective followers, discusses the usage of the terms *κοιμᾶσθαι* and *Sheol*, and enters into the critical examination of various scriptural narratives: — *An Attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical* (seven sermons preached as Bampton Lectures, Oxford, 1838, 8vo); and several sermons on the doctrine of *Atonement* (Oxford. 1810, 8vo), *Baptismal Regeneration* (1815, 8vo), and on *Baptism* (1838, 8vo). See Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclopl.* volume 2, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Am. Auth.* volume 2, s.v.; *Lond. Gentl. Mag.* 1839, part 1, page 205 sq.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliograph.* volume 2, s.v.

Laurentius

and pope, lived about 460-520. He was archdeacon of a Chlurch in Rome, and was opposed to Symmachus who in 498 was elected successor of Anastasius II in the papal chair. This schism created much disturbance in the city, Festus and Probinus, two of the most influential senators, siding with Laurentius. Both parties finally agreed to submit their difficulty to the decision of Theodoric, king of the Goths, though an Arian. He decided in favor of Symmachus, and Laurentins, having withdrawn his claim, was made bishop of Nocera. But as he subsequently created new disturbances, and was, whether justly or unjustly is not known accused of Eutvchianism, he was deposed by the Synodus Palmaris (501), and died an exile. See Anastasius, *Vita Pontif.*; Baronius, *Annales*; Plotina, *Vita Pontif.: Roman.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 19:927. (J.N.P.)

Laurentius

a noted prelate of the early English Church (Anglo-Saxon period), flourished in the first half of the 7th century (A.D. 605) as successor of St. Augustine — suggested for the archbishopric by Augustine himself. Under the reign of Eadbald, the successor of Ethelbert, when England was in danger of a return to heathenish practices by Eadbald's marriage of his own mother-in-law, Laurentius shrewdly managed affairs for the benefit of

Christianity; he induced the king to renounce his incestuous marriage, and to embrace the Christian faith. See Churton, *Hist. Early in Engl. Church*, page 41 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* book 2. cent. 7, part 1, chapter 1, § 2, and note (5).

Laurentius

ST., according to tradition, was a disciple of pope Sixtus II (257-258), who received him among the seven Roman deacons, and afterwards made him archdeacon. When the pope, during the persecution of the Christians by Valerian, was led out to suffer martyrdom, Laurentius wished to accompany him, and to share his fate; but Sixtus prevented him, prophesying to him at the same time that he would be called upon to endure even greater sufferings for the cause of Christianity, and that he would follow him within three days. The omen was fulfilled; the Roman governor had heard of treasures belonging to the Christian Church, and wished to obtain possession of them. He desired Laurentius to reveal them to him. Laurentius seemed to comply, and was allowed to depart. Soon the courageous young disciple of Christ returned, accompanied by a crowd of paupers, cripples, and sick, whom he presented to the governor, saying, "These are our treasures." This was regarded as an insult, and in punishment he was condemned to be slowly roasted alive in an iron chair. Laurentius underwent this martyrdom with resignation and cheerfulness. He is said to have been buried in the Via Tiburtina. The pope Leo I said of him that he was as great an honor to Rome as Stephen to Jerusalem, and Augustine that the crown of Laurentius can as little be hidden as the city of Rome itself. Under Constantine a church was erected over the place where his remains were supposed to be (*Sti. Laurentii extra muros*); another church dedicated to him is *St. Laurentii in Damaso*. He is commemorated on the 10th of August. The earliest accounts of his martyrdom are to be found in Ambros. *De offic. ministr.* 1:41; 2:28. The most glowing account of him is Prudentius's *Hymn. in Laeur.* (Prudentius, *Peristeph.*) — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:232; Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:365.

Laurentius Valla

a distinguished humanist, was born at Rome in 1415. He was still young when the reaction against scholasticism set in, and took an active part in the conflict. He attacked the authenticity of Constantine the Great's deed of donation in his *De ilso credita et et eentita Constantini donatione*

Declamatio, as also all the other unproved assertions of the theologians. Thus he questioned the origin of the so-called Apostles' Creed, pointed out the faults contained in the old Latin versions of the Bible, and applied philological exegesis to the New Testament. It is no wonder that by such a course he gained many enemies, especially among the clergy, who denounced him as an infidel. He was compelled to leave Rome, and retired to the court of Alphonse, king of Naples, who, though fifty years of age, now commenced to study Latin under Valla's tuition. Here, however, he commenced anew his arguments on the Trinity, free will, the vows of continence, and other delicate questions, and was therefore accused of heresy by the ecclesiastical authorities. King Alphonse succeeded in saving his life, but could not prevent his being whipped publicly around the convent of St. Jacob. Valla then returned to Rome, where he found a protector in pope Nicholas V, who gave him permission to teach, and granted him a salary. Here again he entered into a most violent controversy with Poggi. He died at Rome in 1457. His works, in which he attacks scholastic theology more with the weapons of common sense than of philosophy, are especially directed against Aristotle and Boetius, whom he considers as the founders of the scholastic dialect. He looked upon the evidences of Christianity as a result of sane human reason, which, in its development, has become participant in the divine revelation. But he was far from attempting to inquire further into these revelations by analyzing their mysteries. He says that there are many things we cannot know, and that we must respect the mystery with which it has pleased God to surround them. His tendency is eminently practical; according to him there is no virtue without faith, and all without it is but sinfulness. Where hope no longer points to higher and eternal happiness, nothing can remain but the false honesty of the stoic, or the material sense of the epicure. Without hope of a future life there can be no virtue, only misery; the peace and inner satisfaction of which philosophers boast are but falsehoods. True virtue is undeniably above worldly desires—it is the chief requisite of happiness; but it must be Christian virtue, not that of the philosophers. Among his works are to be noticed *Elegantiae Latini sermonis* (Venice, 1471, 6 volumes, fol.; Par. 1575, 4to): — *De libero arbitrio*: — *De voluptate ac de vero bono libri iii*: — *Fabulae et facetiae*; and especially the above *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione declamatio*. His collected works were published at Basle in 1540, folio, and at Venice in 1592. See H. Ritter, *Geschichte d. Christl. Philosophie*, 5:243-261; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:232, 233; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:366.

Lauria, Francis Laurent Brancate De,

an Italian theologian, was born, at Lauria, in the kingdom of Naples, in 1611. He joined the Franciscans, was made cardinal by Innocent XI in 1687, and died at Rome Nov. 30, 1693. He wrote commentaries on the four books of Scot's sentences (8 volumes, folio): — *Devota laudis ad sanctissimam Trinitatem Oratio* (Rome, 1695, 12mo): — *De Predestinatione et Reprobatione* (Rome, 1688, 4to; Rouen, 1715). In this last work he defended Augustine's doctrine on grace against the Molinists and Jansenists. See Perennes, *Biographie Chretienne et Anti-Chretienne*; Joannes a Sancto-Antonio, *Biblioth. Franciscana*. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 29:939. (J.N.P.)

Laurie, Jamies, D.D.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born February 11, 1778, in Edinburgh, Scotland, where he also received his education. He was licensed in 1800, and continued to preach in his native country for two years, after which he came to America, having been previously ordained. In 1803 he was installed pastor of the Associate Reformed Congregation, and was instrumental in the establishment of the first place of Protestant worship in Washington, D.C. He was employed also during his ministry as a clerk in the register's office of the Treasury. He died April 18, 1853. He published *A Sermon*. — Sprague, *Annals*, 4:314.

Lavacrum

SEE FONT; SEE LAVATORY.

Laval, Francois De Montmorency,

a noted prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Laval, France, March 23, 1622, and early decided for the priesthood. He was ordained priest at Paris September 23, 1645; became archdeacon of Evreux in 1653, and bishop of Petrea and vicar apostolic of New France in 1658. In the year following he went to Quebec and assumed the government of that see; while there, founded the Seminary of Quebec in 1663, and in 1666 consecrated the parochial church of Quebec. He returned to France in 1674. In 1688, however, he returned again, and retired to the seminary he had founded, and to this school made over all his private possessions. He died at Quebec May 6, 1708. Laval is said to have exercised as powerful an

influence over the civil as he did over the ecclesiastical affairs of the colony. See Drake, *Dictionary of American Biography*, s.v.

Lavalette, Anthony De,

a French Jesuit, who became the indirect cause of the suppression of his order in France in 1764, was born near Valbres October 21, 1707. He entered the society at Toulouse October 10, 1725; was for a time professor at Puy and Rodez, and was ordained priest in 1740. In 1741 he went to Martinique, where he had at first the care of a parish; then became administrator of the mission, and was entrusted with all its temporal concerns. Appointed general of the Jesuits' mission in South America in 1754, he indulged in wild commercial speculations for the purpose of canceling the debts of the mission, but they all failed; he became bankrupt, and had to leave the country. He retired to England, was disowned by the society, and died some time after 1762. The society was sued by his creditors, but declined any responsibility for his engagements contracted without the consent or knowledge of his superiors; the question was referred to Parliament, which decided against the Jesuits. The sums claimed amounted to five million francs. On the 8th of May, 1761, the Jesuits were condemned to pay the whole amount and costs; and on August 6, 1761, their institution itself was attacked as illegal, and as contrary to the interest of the country. This finally led to the suppression of the order in France by an edict of November 1764. See Senac de Meilhan, *De la Destruction des Jesuites en France*, in the *Melanges d'Histoire et de Litterature*, published by Crawford, and in the appendix to the *Mineoires de Mme. du Hausset*; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:296 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:973.

Lavater, Johann Kaspar

a noted Swiss theologian and preacher, one of the most interesting men of the last century, was born at Zurich November 15, 1741. His father, Henry Lavater, was doctor of medicine and member of the government of Zurich. His mother, whose maiden name was Regula Escher, was a woman of marked character and extraordinary gifts. His childhood was not marked by any great signs of promise as a student, but he had a decided tendency to religion, and a great predilection for singing hymns and reading the Bible. It was while at school in Zurich that he conceived the idea of becoming a minister of the Gospel. In 1755 Lavater entered the college in his native

city. In 1759 he began his theological studies, and in 1762 was ordained a minister. In consequence of complications in the political affairs of his country, he traveled in company with the celebrated painter Fuseli, and successively visited the universities of Leipsic and Berlin. He also visited Barth, in Pomerania, for the theological advice of the celebrated provost Spalding. In 1764 he returned to his native place, and occupied himself with the duties of the ministerial office and Biblical studies. He also wrote some poetry, inspired by the poetical productions of Bodmer and Kilopstock. In 1766 he married Miss Anna Schinz, the daughter of a highly respectable merchant. As the result of his study of Bodmer and Klopstock, he published in 1767 his *Schweitzerlieder*, containing his finest poems, which was followed by his *Aussichten in die Ewigkeit* (1768-73, 3 volumes), the first of a series of works in which he maintained the perpetuity of miracles, the irresistibility of prayer, and the necessity for every person to conceive of God as manifested in Christ crucified in order to be really alive to himself. The last doctrine was called his Christomania. In 1769 Lavater was made deacon of the Orphan-house Church at Zurich, where the extraordinary effect of his sermons, his blameless life, and benevolent disposition made him the idol of his congregation, while his printed sermons sent forth his fame to distant parts. It was reserved, however, for his *Physiognomische Fragmente zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntniss und Menschenliebe* (Leipsic, 1775-78) to extend his celebrity generally. This work, which has often been reprinted and translated (best by Dr. H. Hunter, London, 1789-98, 5 volumes, royal 4to), was the first elaborate attempt to reduce physiognomy to a science. Having in early life been acquainted with a large number of eminent men, he had observed corresponding points of resemblance in their minds as well as their features, and from a disposition to generalize he was led to adopt a fixed system, and wrote this work in the hope that it might promote greatly the welfare of mankind, an effort in which he moderately succeeded. He illustrated it with numerous engravings and vignettes, and it is superior in respect of paper and typography to any book previously issued from the German press. Lavater had remarkable powers of observation and skill in detecting character. He differed from all who had preceded him in this science. In order to form an opinion of the character from the face, he required to see the face at rest — in sleep or in an unconscious state. "The greater part of the physiognomists," he says, "speak only of the passions, or rather of the exterior signs of the passions, and the expression of them in the muscles. But these exterior signs are only transient circumstances,

which are easily discoverable. It has therefore always been my object to consider the general and fundamental character of the man, from which, according to the state of his exterior circumstances and relations, all his passions arise as from a root." Lavater's "Fragmente" gave rise to considerable discussion, and occasioned general excitement. He was visited at Zurich by throngs of eminent and curious persons, whose character he usually judged with great sagacity; at a glance he recognized Necker, Mirabeau, and Mercier. In 1775 he was elevated to the pastorate of the Orphan-house; in 1778 was elected second pastor of St. Peter's Church in Ziirich, and in 1786 he was called to fill the position of chief pastor, made vacant by the death of his associate. When the French Revolution broke out Lavater was a zealous partisan of it, but the execution of Louis XVI made him turn in disgust from the Republican party, and in 1798, when the French took possession of Switzerland. he protested against their ravages in a publication addressed to the Directory, entitled "Words of a free Swiss to a great Nation," which, on account of its high-toned courage, gained the applause of all Europe. This work was addressed, under his own name, to Reubel, a member of the French government at that time, but was printed without his cooperation, and more than a hundred thousand copies circulated. At the same time he gave a thrilling discourse from his pulpit from the words, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God," etc. (~~6130~~ Romans 13:1-4). This, as may be supposed, produced an indescribable excitement. The Swiss Directory at first resolved upon his banishment. Difficulties were in the way of carrying out this rigid measure, and the decree was changed to suspension from his office. This, too, was prevented by his friends, and finally he received only a gentle expression of disapproval. A few months later, however, while away from home for his health, he was seized and carried prisoner to Basle, on the charge of conspiracy against the French, but was released, after a confinement of several weeks, for want of evidence. On his return to Zurich he renewed his pastoral labors, and opposed with all his energies the oppressive measures of the French Directory. On the 26th of September, 1799, after the French had taken possession of Zurich, as Lavater was standing near his own house and trying to pacify some disorderly soldiers with money, he received a gun-shot from one of them, which, though it healed for a time, finally proved fatal. The last year of his life was one of great bodily suffering, occasioned by his wound, which he bore with Christian patience, praying for the man who had cwounded him. He desired that the culprit should not be arrested. "I would, with all my

severe pain, have much more sorrow if I knew that any punishment were done to him, for he certainly knew not what he did." He at the same time inscribed some beautiful poetical lines to him. During the intervals of suffering his mental activity continued unabated. He was never idle. When traveling or taking daily exercise, and even at his meals, he always had a pencil and paper, that he might write down any new thought that might suggest itself. He wrote, during this period of his life, several small works or poems. Among them were "Zurich at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century;" "Swan Song, or Last Thoughts of a Departing One on Jesus of Nazareth and Memorial Leaves." The latter he desired to be given after his death, as little legacies, to his friends. Lavater's relation to his flock was always of the most intimate character, as is evinced by his request, not long before his death, to be afforded one more opportunity to speak to his beloved congregation, and partake with them of the holy sacrament. He was carried to his much-loved Church, where he met a large assembly of devoted and sorrowing people. One who was present on the occasion wrote: "His face was filled with earnestness and love, by which, though death could be read in every one of his features, he seemed to be reflecting the very glory of heaven." When he was no longer able to sit up and hold his pen, he dictated to an amanuensis. On the last evening of the old year, while lying in bed, and his friends were obliged to stand very near to understand him, he dictated some lines (German hexameters) to be read the following day to his congregation. He died the 2d of January, 1801.

Lavater was one of the most remarkable men of his time. He had an original mind, and was a true philosopher. He wrote with acceptance on a great variety of subjects, and on none more effectively than on questions of theology. Among those who knew him best, he was distinguished more by his moral traits than by his intellectual gifts; by his purity of heart, his deep humility, his fervent piety, his Christian charity and zeal for mankind. A more thoroughly good man and devoted Christian the annals of literature do not exhibit. Goethe at one time said of him, "He is the best, greatest, wisest, sincerest of all mortal and immortal men that I know." He always firmly clung to his peculiar religious views, "which were a mixture of new interpretations with ancient orthodoxy, and mystical even to superstition. One leading article of his faith was a belief in the sensible manifestation of supernatural powers. His disposition to give credence to the miraculous led him to believe the strange pretensions of many individuals, such as the power to exorcise devils, to perform cures by animal magnetism, etc. Some

even suspected him of Roman Catholicism. Thus, while his mystical tendency rendered him an object of ridicule to the party called the enlightened (*Aufgeklärte*), the favor he showed to many new institutions offended the religionists of the old school" (*Enyl. Cyclop.* s.v.). Yet withal, many of the religious world, even of those not immediately belonging to his congregation, regarded Lavater with great veneration, and those who were entertained by a correspondence with him found his letters the great source of their spiritual consolation. His biography by his son-in-law Gessner (*Lebensbeschreibung Lavaters*), by far the most complete, appeared in 1802 (3 volumes, 8vo), and an excellent selection from his works by Orelli (Zurich, 1841-44, 8 volumes, 8vo). See Appleton's *New American Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Hedge, *Prose Writers of Germany* (Philadel. 1848), pages 187-189; *Anna Lavater, or Picture of Swiss Pastoral Life in the Last Century* (Cincinnati. 1870); Hagenbach, *History of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries* (New York, 1869); Bodemann, *Lavater* (1856); Nitzsch, *Lavater u. Gellert* (1857); *Ueber Lavater's, Herder's, und Schleiermacher's Kirchengeschichtliche Bedeutung*, in the *Allgem. Kirchenzeit.* 1856, No. 91 sq.; and the excellent article by Schenkel, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 8:233 sq.

Lavater, Louis

a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Kybourg March 1, 1527. He went to Strasburg in 1545, and there became intimately acquainted with the theologians Bucer and Sturm. He afterwards removed to Paris, and studied theology with Turnebus, Ramus, and Lambin. After visiting Italy he returned to Zurich, where he became archdeacon and canon in 1550, and finally head pastor in 1585. He died July 15, 1586. His principal works are, *De Ritibus et Institutis ecclesiae Tigurinae* (Zurich, 1559, 8vo): — *Historia de origine et progressu Controversiae Sacramentariae de Coenam Domini* (Zurich, 1563 and 1572, 8vo): — *De Spectris, Lemuribus et magnis atque insolitis fragoribus et praesagitionibus quae obitum hominum, clades, mutationesque imperiorum praecedunt* (Zu. 1570, 12mo; translated into most European languages): — *Ven Leben u. Tod Heinrich Bullingers* (Zurich, 1576); and a number of exegetical and devotional works. See Adam, *Vitae Theolog. German.*; Verhegden, *Elogia*; Hottinger, *Bibl. Tigurina*. — Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:994.

Lavatory

Picture for Lavatory

(Lat. *lavatorium*), a cistern or trough to wash in. There was usually a lavatory in the cloisters of monastic establishments, at which the inmates washed their hands and faces, also the surplices and other vestments; some are still extant. This name is also given to the *piscina* (q.v.). In the south of Germany the lavatory is an important feature resembling a baptistry; it is a separate chamber, square or octagonal, standing on one side of the cloister-court, with a reservoir of water or a fountain in the middle, and watertroughs around the sides for washing at.-Parker, *Glossary*, s.v.

Laver

(רִיבְיָאן and זֶרְבַבְיָאן *ziyōr'*, prop. a *basin* for boiling in, and so signifying a "pan" for cooking, ^{<1024>}1 Samuel 2:14; or a *fire-pan*, "hearth," ^{<3176>}Zechariah 12:6; also a *pulpit* or "scaffold" of similar form for a rostrum, ^{<463>}2 Chronicles 6:13; elsewhere spoken of the sacred wash-bowl of the tabernacle and Temple, ^{<208>}Exodus 30:18, 28; 31:9, 35:16; 38:8; 39:39; 40:7, 11, 30; ^{<881>}Leviticus 8:11; ^{<1267>}2 Kings 16:17; plur. fem. ^{<1070>}1 Kings 7:30, 38, 40, 43. plural masc. ^{<406>}2 Chronicles 4:6, 14; Sept. λουτήρ, Vulg. *labrum*), a basin to contain the water used by the priests in their ablutions during their sacred ministrations. This was of two sorts in different periods.

1. The original one was fabricated at the divine command (^{<208>}Exodus 30:18) of brass (*copper*, **tvj n]**, see Bihr, *Symbolik*, 1:484, 485; Michaelis, *Soc. Gutt. comment.* 4; Umbreit, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1843, page 157), out of the metal mirrors which the women brought from Egypt (^{<288>}Exodus 38:8). The notion held by some Jewish writers, and reproduced by Franzius, Baihr (*Symb.* 1:484), and others, founded on the omission of the word "women," that the brazen vessel, being polished, served as a mirror to the Levites, is untenable. (See the parallel passage, ^{<1022>}1 Samuel 2:22, where **μυναεγυναικων**, is inserted; Gesenius on the prep. **B**, page 172; Keil, *Bibl. Arch.* Part 1, 100:1, § 19; Glassius, *Philippians Sacr.* 1:580, ed. Dathe; Lightfoot, *Descr. Templ.* c. 37, 1; Jennings, *Jew. Antig.* page 302; Knobel, *Kurtzsg. Exeg. Handb.* Exodus 38; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 3:15; 2:156, ed. Mangey.) Its size and shape are not given, but it is thought to have been circular. It contained water wherewith the

priests were to wash their hands and their feet whenever they entered the tabernacle, or came near to the altar to minister (^{<0412>}Exodus 40:32). It stood in the court between the altar and the door of the tabernacle, and, according to Jewish tradition, a little to the south (^{<0319>}Exodus 30:19, 21; Reland, *Ant. Hebr.* Part 1, ch. 4:9; Clemens, *De Labro AEneo*, 3:9; ap. Ugolini *Thes.* 19). It rested on a basis (^{<0400>}Κεκεν, Sept. βάσις), i.e., a foot, though by some explained to be a cover (Clemens, *ibid.* 100:3:5), of copper or brass, which was likewise made from the same mirrors of the women who assembled at the door of the tabernacle court (^{<0238>}Exodus 38:8). This "foot" seems, from the distinct mention constantly made of it, to have been something more than a mere stand or support. Probably it formed a lower basin to catch the water which flowed, through taps or otherwise, from the laver. The priests could not have washed in the laver itself, as all the water would have been thereby defiled, and so would have had to be renewed for each ablution. The Orientals, in their washings, make use of a vessel with a long spout, and wash at the stream which issues from thence, the waste water being received in a basin which is placed underneath. *SEE ABLUTION.* It has therefore been suggested that they held their hands and feet under streams that flowed from the laver, and that the "foot" caught the water that fell. As no mention is made of a vessel whereat to wash the parts of the victims offered in sacrifice, it is presumed that the laver served this purpose also. The Jewish commentators state (perhaps referring, however, to the later vessels in the Temple) that any kind of water might be used for the laver, but that, the water must be changed every day. They also mention that ablution before entering the tabernacle was in no case dispensed with. A man might be perfectly clean, might be quite free from any ceremonial impurity, and might even have washed his hands and feet before he left home, but still he could by no means enter the tabernacle without previous ablution at the laver. "In the account of the offering by the woman suspected of adultery there is mention made of 'holy water' mixed with dust from the floor of the tabernacle, which the woman was to drink according to certain rites (^{<0457>}Numbers 5:17). Most probably this was water taken from the laver. Perhaps the same should be said of the 'water of purifying' (^{<0087>}Numbers 8:7), which was sprinkled on the Levites on occasion of their consecration to the service of the Lord in the tabernacle." Like the other vessels belonging to the tabernacle, the laver was, together with its "foot," consecrated with oil (^{<0380>}Leviticus 8:10, 11). No mention is found in the Ieebrew text of the mode of transporting it, but in ^{<0044>}Numbers 4:14 a

passage is added in the Sept., agreeing with the Samaritan Pent. and the Samaritan version, which prescribes the method of packing it, viz. in a purple cloth, protected by a skin covering. *SEE TABERNACLE.*

2. In the Temple of Solomon, when the number of both priests and victims had greatly increased, *ten* lavers were used for the sacrifices, and the molten sea for the personal ablutions of the priests (^{<4006>}2 Chronicles 4:6). These lavers are more minutely described than that of the tabernacle. These likewise were of copper ("brass"), raised on bases (**τ/ηκω**], from **ἰσῆ**, to "stand upright," Gesenius, *Thesaur.* pages 665, 670, Sept. Graecizes **μexωνόθ**, Vulg. *bases*) (^{<1072>}1 Kings 7:27, 39), five on the north and south sides respectively of the court of the priests. They were used for washing the animals to be offered in burntofferings (^{<4006>}2 Chronicles 4:6). Josephus (*A nf.* 8:3, 6) gives no distinct account of their form. Ahaz mutilated the laver, and removed it from its base (^{<267>}2 Kings 16:17). Whether Hezekiah restored the parts cut off is not stated, but in the account of the articles taken by the Chaldaeans from the Temple only the bases are mentioned (^{<2516>}2 Kings 25:16; ^{<2517>}Jeremiah 52:17; Josephus omits even these, *Ant.* 10:8, 5).

"The dimensions of the bases, with the lavers, as given in the Hebrew text, are four cubits in length and breadth, and three in height. The Sept. gives 4 by 4, and 6 in height. Josephus, who appears to have followed a various reading of the Sept., makes them five in length, four in width, and six in height (^{<1072>}1 Kings 7:28; Thenius, *ad loc.*; Josephus, *Ant.* 8:3, 3). There were to each four wheels of one and a half cubit in diameter, with spokes, etc., all cast in one piece. The principal parts requiring explanation may be thus enumerated:

(a) 'Borders' (**τῶν ἰσῆ** Sept. **συγκλείσματα**, Vulgate *sculptur*, probably panels. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* page 938) supposes these to have been ornaments like square shields, with engraved work.

(b) 'Ledges' (**μυβλ ἰν] ἐξεχόμενα**, juncture, from **βλ ἰν**; 'to cut in notches,' Gesenius, page 1411), joints in corners of bases or fillets covering joints.

(c) 'Additions' (**τῶν ἰσῆ**, from **ἰσῆ**; 'to twine,' Gesenius, page 746; **χῶραι**, *lora*, whence Thenius suggests **λῶροι** or **λῶρα** as the true reading), probably festoons; Lightfoot translates 'margines oblique descendentes.'

- (d) 'Plates' (μῆρας] πρόεχοντα, *axes*, Gesenius, page 972; Lightfoot, *massae aerae tetragonae*), probably axles, cast in the same piece as the wheels.
- (e) 'Undersettors' (τῶν τῆ] ὀμῖαι *haeruli, eul*, Gesen. page 724), either the naves of the wheels, or a sort of handles for moving the whole machine; Lightfoot renders 'columnae fulciantes lavacrum.'
- (f) 'Naves' (μῆρας] , *modioli*).
- (g) 'Spokes' (μῆρας] , *radii*; the two words combined in the Sept. ἡ πραγματεία, Gesen. page 536; Schleusner, *Lex. V.T. πραγμ*).
- (h) 'Felloes' (μῆρας] νῶτοι, *canthi*, Gesen. page 256).
- (i) 'Chapiter' (τῶν τῆ] κεφαλῖς, *summites*, Gesen. page 725), perhaps the rim of the circular opening ('mouth,' ^{<1075>} 1 Kings 7:31) in the convex top.
- (k) A 'round compass' (βύβρα] γῶ; Gesenius, pages 935, 989; στρόγγυλον κύκλω; *rotunditas*), perhaps the convex roof of the base. To these parts Josephus adds chains, which may probably be the festoons above mentioned (*Ant.* 8:3, 6).

Picture for Laver 1

"Thenius, with whom Keil in the main agrees, both of them differing from Ewald, in a minute examination of the whole passage, but not without some transposition, chiefly of the greater part of verse 31 to verse 35, deduces a construction of the bases and lavers, which seems fairly to reconcile the very great difficulties of the subject. Following chiefly his description, we may suppose the base to have been a quadrangular hollow frame, connected at its corners by pilasters (ledges), and moved by four wheels or high castors, one at each corner, with handles (plates) for drawing the machine. 'The sides of this frame were divided into three vertical panels or compartments (borders), ornamented with bass-reliefs of lions, oxen, and cherubim. The top of the base was convex, with a circular opening of one and a half cubit diameter. The top itself was covered with engraved cherubim, lions, and palm-trees or branches. The height of the convex top from the upper plane of the base was one and a half cubit, and the space between this top and the lower surface of the laver one and a half cubit more. The laver rested on supports (undersettors) rising from the four

corners of the base. Each laver contained 40 'baths' (Gr. *χόαξ*), or about 300 gallons. Its dimensions, therefore, to be in proportion to seven feet (four cubits, verse 38) in diameter, must have been about thirty inches in depth. The great height of the whole machine was doubtless in order to bring it near the height of the altar (~~400~~ 2 Chronicles 4:1; Arias Montanus, *De Templi Fabricsa*, in *Crit. Sac.* 8:626, Lightfoot, *Descr. Templi.* 100. 37:3, volume 1, page 646; Thenius, in *Kurzg. Exeg. Handb.* on 1 Kings 7, and Append. page 41; Ewald, *Geschichte*, 3:313; Keil, *Handb. der Bibl. Arch.* § 24, pages 128, 129)." Mr. Paine, in his work on *Solomon's Temple* (plate 12, fig. 5), gives the following conjectural view of one of these lavers, which is more compact, less likely to be overturned, and more closely analogous to the form of the great or molten sea (q.v.). Yet in neither of these figures does the "base," with its chest-like form and inconvenient height, seem at all adapted to the above purpose of catching the waste water, or of aiding in any way the ablutions, unless the laver itself were furnished with a spout, and the box below formed a tank with openings on the top for receiving the stream after it had served its cleansing purpose. The portable form was doubtless for convenience of replenishing and emptying.

Picture for Laver 2

3. In the second Temple there appears to have been only one laver of brass (Mishna, *Middoth*, 3:6), with twelve instead of two stop-cocks, and a machine for raising water and filling it (Mishna, *Tamidl*, 3:8; compare 1:4, *Zoma*, 3:10). Of its size or shape we have no information, but it was probably like those of Solomon's Temple. Josephus, in his description of Herod's Temple (*War*, 5:5), scarcely alludes to this laver. See H.G. Clemens, *De labro aeneo* (Utr. 1725; also in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 19); Lamy, *De tabernac. faed.* 3:6, 7, page 460 sq., and table 16; Vilalpandus, *On Lazek.* 2, page 492; L'Empereur in Surenhusius's *Mischna*, 5:360; Schaacht, *Animadv. ad Iken. antiq.* page 297 sq.; Zullig, *Cherubim - wagen*, page 50 sq.; Gruneisen, in the *Stuttgart. Kunstbl.* 1834, No. 5 sq.; A. Clants, *Scription. biblic.* (Groningen, 1733), page 65; Scacchi, *Myroth. sacr. elaeochrism.* page 41; and the various commentators on the passages of Scripture, especially Rosenmüller, and Hengstenberg's *Pentat.* 2:133.

SEE TEMPLE.

Laverty, William W.,

an American Presbyterian minister, was born in Union County, Pennsylvania, June 15, 1828; was educated at Washington College, Pennsylvania (class of 1849), and studied theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. In the fall of 1853 he was ordained and installed pastor of Big Spring and New Cumberland churches, Ohio. In connection with his ministerial duties he also filled the position of principal of Hagerstown Academy. In 1857 he accepted the pastorate of the Wellsville and East Liverpool churches, Ohio, and in the spring of 1864 he was elected principal of Mongolia Academy, at Morgantown, West Virginia, where he died October 28, 1865. Mr. Laverty was especially adapted to the training and instruction of youth, and he always devoted himself with untiring assiduity to whatever he undertook. — Wilson, *Presb. Historical Almanac*, 1866, page 167.

Lavialle, Piere Joseph,

a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Mauriac, France, in 1820, and received both a collegiate and theological education in the universities of his native city. In 1843 he came to the United States, and was ordained priest the following year. After a year's service in New York City he was made professor of theology in St. Mary's College, Lebanon, Ky., and in 1855 was appointed president of the same institution. In 1859 he declined the proffered bishopric of Savannah, but in 1865 accepted that of Louisville. He died May 11, 1867. Bishop Lavialle was a man of great zeal and energy. He founded several educational and benevolent institutions in his diocese. His character was such as to win him the esteem not only of his own people, but of the citizens generally. — *American Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1867, page 428.

Lavington, George,

an English prelate, noted for his antagonism to Wesley and Whitefield, was born in Wiltshire in 1683; became canon of St. Paul's, London in 1732, and in 1747 was promoted to the bishopric of Exeter. Shortly after his elevation to the episcopal dignity, Lavington, who had from the first looked unfavorably upon the Methodistic movement, found an opportunity to exert his episcopal jurisdiction upon one of the ministers of his diocese, the Reverend Mr. Thompson, "the tolerant and zealous rector of St. Gennis," who had dared to exert himself in behalf of a more genuine and

active religious spirit among the people of his own parish, and the, community in its neighborhood. In this instance the bishop failed utterly of cutting short the evangelizing efforts of an earnest and zealous servant of God, and he gave vent to his feelings by a public attack on the originators of the whole movement — Wesley and Whitefield — in a pamphlet entitled *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists compared* (London, 1749, 3 parts, 8vo), in which he "exaggerated their real faults, and imputed to them many that were monstrous fictions." he attack was at once taken up by both the persons assailed in the pamphlet, and from the position assumed by Wesley in his answer many of the English Church divines have plucked an arrow in defense of their own Church in Wesley's day. Southey was the first to censure Wesley for the use of intemperate language in his reply to Lavington, but there is really no reason for any one, however anxious to shield Mr. Wesley, to defend his harsh treatment of the bishop, when we consider that the provocation was great indeed. Mr. Tyerman, Wesley's latest biographer (London, 1871, 3 volumes. 8vo; N. York, Harper and Brothers, 3 volumes 8vo, 1872), certainly goes too far when he attempts to clear Wesley's skirts by saying that Lavington "deserved all he got," and that he was "a buffooning bishop" and "a cowardly calumniator" (2:94, 153). But there is no justice in the attempts of modern English writers to praise bishop Lavington at the expense of Mr. Wesley. The bishop made a most undignified assault on men who were engaged in a work approved and owned of God, and, as his later conduct towards lady Huntingdon and Wesley himself proves, retreated from the position he had taken, "apologizing to her ladyship [Huntingdon] and the Messrs. Whitefield and Wesley for the harsh and unjust censures which he was led to pass on them," and even requested them to "accept his unfeigned regret at having unjustly wounded their feelings, and exposed them to the odium of the world" (*Ladey Hutisongdon's Life and Times*, chapter 7). How in the face of this position, however hypocritical on the part of Lavington, any English writers can afford to defend bishop Lavington's position, as has been done lately in the *North British Review* (January 1871), seems to us still more strange when we take into consideration the attitude of Wesley on his last meeting with bishop Lavington: "I was well pleased to partake of the Lord's Supper with my old opponent, bishop Lavington. Oh, may we sit down together in the kingdom of our Father!" recorded by Wesley himself in his journal of 1762. Bishop Lavington, indeed, seems to have been fond of polemical extravagances. for a few years after his attack on Methodism he wrotes *The Moravians compared and detected* (1755, 8vo). Besides

these two attacks upon fellow Christians, he published some *occasional Sermons*. He died in 1762. See, besides the references already made, Polwhele, *History of Devonshire*, 1:313; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, 1:247, 306; *Meth. Quart. Review*, 1871, page 306 sq. (J.H.W.)

Lavipedium

SEE FOOT-WASHING.

Law

is usually defined as *a rule of action*; it is more properly a precept or command coming from a superior authority, which an inferior is bound to obey. Such laws emanate from the king or legislative body of a nation. Such enactments of "the powers that be" are recognized in Scripture as resting upon the ultimate authority of the divine Lawgiver (~~Exodus~~ Romans 13:1). We propose in this article to discuss only the various distinctions or applications of the term, in an ethical sense, reserving for a separate place the consideration of the Mosaic law, in its various aspects, ceremonial, moral, and civil.

I. Classification of Laws as to their interior Nature. —

1. "*Penal Laws*" are such as have some penalty to enforce them. All the laws of God are and cannot but be penal, because every breach of his law is sin, and meritorious of punishment.
2. "*Directing Laws*" are prescriptions or maxims without any punishment annexed to them.
3. "*Positive Laws*" are precepts which are not founded upon any reasons known to those to whom they are given. Thus, in the state of innocence, God gave the law of the Sabbath; of abstinence from the fruit of the tree of knowledge, etc. In childhood most of the parental commands are necessarily of this nature, owing to the incapacity of the child to understand the grounds of their inculcation.

II. Certain Special Uses of the Term. —

1. "*Law of Honor*" is a system of rules constructed by people of fashion, and calculated to facilitate their intercourse with one another, and for no other purpose. Consequently nothing is adverted to by the law of honor but what tends to incommode this intercourse. Hence this law only prescribes

and regulates the duties betwixt equals, omitting such as relate to the Supreme Being, as well as those which we owe to our inferiors, and in most instances is favorable to the licentious indulgence of the natural passions. Thus it allows of fornication, adultery, drunkenness, prodigality, duelling, and of revenge in the extreme, and lays no stress upon the virtues opposite to these.

2. "*Laws of Nations*" are those rules which, by a tacit consent, are agreed upon among all communities, at least among those who are reckoned the polite and humanized part of mankind.

3. "*Laws of Natures.*" — "The word law is sometimes also employed in order to express not only the moral connection between free agents of an inferior, and others of a superior power, but also in order to express the *nexus causalis*, the connection between cause and effect in inanimate nature. However, the expression *law of nature*, *lex naturae*, is improper and figurative. The term law implies, in its strict sense, *spontaneity*, or the power of deciding between right and wrong, and of choosing between good and evil, as well on the part of the lawgiver as on the part of those who have to regulate their conduct according to his dictates" (Kitto, s.v.). Moreover, the powers of nature, which these laws are conceived as representing, are nothing in reality but the power of God exerted in these directions. Hence these laws may at any time be suspended by God when the higher interests of his spiritual kingdom require. Viewed in this light, miracles not only become possible, but even probable for the furtherance of the divine economy of salvation. (See Bushell, *Nature and the Supernatural*.) **SEE MIRACLE.**

III. *Forms of the Divine Law.* — The manner in which God governs rational creatures is by a law, as the rule of their obedience to him, and this is what we call God's moral government of the world. At their very creation he placed all intelligences under such a system. Thus he gave a law to *angels*, which some of them have kept, and have been confirmed in a state of obedience to it; but which others broke, and thereby plunged themselves into destruction and misery. In like manner he also gave a law to Adam, which was in the form of a covenant, and in which Adam stood as a covenant head to all his posterity (Romans 5). But our first parents soon violated that law, and fell from a state of innocence to a state of sin and misery (²⁰¹⁷Hosea 6:7). **SEE FALL.**

1. The "*Law of Nature*" is the will of God relating to human actions, grounded in the moral difference of things, and, because discoverable by natural light, obligatory upon all mankind (^{<4010>}Romans 1:20; 2:14, 15). This law is coeval with the human race, binding all over the globe, and at all times; yet, through the corruption of reason, it is insufficient to lead us to happiness, and utterly unable to acquaint us how sin is to be forgiven, without the assistance of revelation. This law is that generally designated by the term *conscience*, which is in strictness a capacity of being affected by the moral relations of actions; in other words, merely a *sense of right and wrong*. It is the judgment which intellectually determines the moral quality of an act, and this always by a comparison with some assumed standard. With those who have a revelation, this, of course, is the test; with others, education, tradition, or caprice. Hence the importance of a trained conscience, not only for the purpose of cultivating its susceptibility to a high degree of sensitiveness and authority, but also in order to correct the judgment and furnish it a just basis of decision. A perverted or misled conscience is scarcely less disastrous than a hard or blind one. History is full of the miseries and mischiefs occasioned by a misguided moral sense.

2. "*Ceremonial Law*" is that which prescribes the rites of worship under the Old Testament. These rites were typical of Christ, and were obligatory only till Christ had finished his work, and began to erect his Gospel Church (^{<3009>}Hebrews 7:9, 11; 10:1; ^{<4016>}Ephesians 2:16; ^{<5014>}Colossians 2:14; ^{<4810>}Galatians 5:2, 3).

3. "*Judaicia Law*" was that which directed the policy of the Jewish nation, under the peculiar dominion of God as their supreme magistrate, and never, except in things relating to moral equity, was binding on any but the Hebrew nation.

4. "*Moral Law*" is that declaration of God's will which directs and binds all men, in every age and place, to their whole duty to him. It was most solemnly proclaimed by God himself at Sinai, to confirm the original law of nature, and correct men's mistakes concerning the demands of it. It is denominated perfect (^{<3907>}Psalm 19:7), perpetual (^{<4017>}Matthew 5:17, 18), holy (^{<4512>}Romans 7:12), good (^{<4512>}Romans 7:12), spiritual (^{<4514>}Romans 7:14), exceeding broad (^{<3906>}Psalm 119:96). Some deny that it is a rule of conduct to believers under the Gospel dispensation; but it is easy to see the futility of such an idea; for, as a transcript of the mind of God, it must be the criterion of moral good and evil. It is also given for that very purpose,

that we may see our duty, and abstain from everything derogatory to the divine glory. It affords us grand ideas of the holiness and purity of God; without attention to it, we can have no knowledge of sin. Christ himself came, not to destroy, but to fulfill it; and though we cannot do as he did, yet we are commanded to follow his example. Love to God is the end of the moral law as well as the end of the Gospel. By the law, also, we are led to see the nature of holiness and our own depravity, and learn to be humbled under a sense of our imperfection. We are not under it, however, as a covenant of works (^{<RB13>}Galatians 3:13), or as a source of terror (^{<RB13>}Romans 8:1), although we must abide by it, together with the whole perceptive word of God, as the rule of our conduct (^{<RB13>}Romans 3:31; 7).
SEE LAW OF MOSES.

IV. *Scriptural Uses of the Law.* — The word "law" (*hr/T, torah', νόμος*) is properly used, in Scripture as elsewhere, to express a definite commandment laid down by any recognized authority. The commandment may be general or (as in ^{<RB13>}Leviticus 6:9, 14, etc., "the law of the burnt-offering," etc.) particular in its bearing, the authority either human or divine. It is extended to prescriptions respecting sanitary or purificatory arrangements ("the law of her that has been in childbed," or of those that have had the leprosy, ^{<RB13>}Leviticus 14:2), or even to an architectural design ("the law of the house," ^{<RB13>}Ezekiel 43:12): so in ^{<RB13>}Romans 6:2, "the law of the husband" is his authority over his wife. But when the word is used with the article, and without any words of limitation, it refers to the expressed will of God, and, in nine cases out of ten, to the Mosaic law, or to the Pentateuch, of which it forms the chief portion.

The Hebrew word (derived from the root *hry; yarah'*, "to point out," and so "to direct and lead") lays more stress on its moral authority, as teaching the truth, and guiding in the right way; the Greek *νόμος* (from *νέμω*, "to assign or appoint,") on its constraining power, as imposed and enforced by a recognized authority. But in either case it is a commandment proceeding from without, and distinguished from the free action of its subjects, although not necessarily opposed thereto.

The sense of the word, however, extends its scope, and assumes a more abstract character in the writings of the apostle Paul *Νόμος*, when used by him with the article, still refers in general to the law of Moses; but when used without the article, so as to embrace any manifestation of "law," it includes all powers which act on the will of man by compulsion, or by the

pressure of external motives, whether their commands be or be not expressed in definite forms. This is seen in the constant opposition of ἔργα νόμου ("works done under the constraint of law") to faith, or "works of faith," that is, works done freely by the internal influence of faith. A still more remarkable use of the word is found in ^{<8173>}Romans 7:23, where the power of evil over the will, arising from the corruption of man, is spoken of as a "law of sin," that is, an unnatural tyranny proceeding from an evil power without. The same apostle even uses the term "law" to denote the Christian dispensation in contrast with that of Moses (^{<5025>}James 1:25; 2:12; 4:11; comp. ^{<5104>}Romans 10:4; ^{<3072>}Hebrews 7:12 10:1); also for the laws or precepts established by the Gospel (^{<5138>}Romans 13:8, 10; ^{<8112>}Galatians 6:2; 5:23).

The occasional use of the word "law" (as in ^{<8177>}Romans 3:27, "law of faith;" in 7:23, "law of my mind" [τοῦ νόου]; in 8:2, "law of the spirit of life;" and in ^{<5025>}James 1:25; 2:12, "a perfect law, the law of liberty") to denote an *internal* principle of action does not really militate against the general rule. For in each case it will be seen that such principle is spoken of in contrast with some formal law, and the word "law" is consequently applied to it "improperly," in order to mark this opposition, the qualifying words which follow guarding against any danger of misapprehension of its real character.

It should also be noticed that the title "the law" is occasionally used loosely to refer to the whole of the Old Testament (as in ^{<5104>}John 10:34, referring to ^{<3816>}Psalms 82:6; in ^{<5155>}John 15:25, referring to ^{<3819>}Psalms 35:19; and in ^{<5142>}1 Corinthians 14:21, referring to ^{<2381>}Isaiah 28:11, 12). This usage is probably due, not only to desire of brevity and to the natural prominence of the Pentateuch, but also to the predominance in the older covenant (when considered separately from the new, for which it was the preparation) of an external and legal character. — Smith, s.v.

It should be noted, however, that νόμος very often stands, even when without the article, for the Mosaic law, the term in that sense being so well known as not to be liable to be misunderstood. *SEE ARTICLE, GREEK.*

Law Of Moses

(*hvm hr/T*) signifies the whole body of Mosaic legislation (I Kings 2:3; ^{<1225>}2 Kings 23:25; ^{<5180>}Ezra 3:2), *the law given by Moses*, which, in reference to its divine origin, is called *h20why]trwō*, *the law of Jehovah*

(¹⁹¹⁸Psalm 19:8; 37:31; ²¹²⁴Isaiah 5:24; 30:9). In the latter sense it is called, by way of eminence, **hrwōhi** THE *law* (¹⁸⁰⁵Deuteronomy 1:5; 4:8, 44; 17:18, 19. 27:3, 8). When not so much the substance of legislation, but rather the external written code in which it is contained is meant, the following terms are employed: "Book of the Law of Moses" (¹²⁴⁶2 Kings 14:6; ²¹⁸⁸Isaiah 8:31; 23:6) "Book of the La of the lord," or "Book of the Law of God" (¹⁸²⁵Joshua 24:26). "Judgments," "statutes," "testimonies," etc., are the various precepts contained in the law. In the present article (which has been carefully compiled from the most recent codifications, compared with the sacred text, and which strenuously maintains the perpetual obligation of the ten commandments), we propose to give a brief analysis of its substance, to point out its main principles, and to explain the position which it occupies in the progress of divine revelation. For the history of its delivery, *SEE MOSES*; *SEE EXODE*; for its authenticity, *SEE PENTATEUCH*; for its particular ordinances, see each in its alphabetical place.

The law is especially embodied in the last four books of the Pentateuch. In Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers there is perceptible some arrangement of the various precepts, although they are not brought into a system. In Deuteronomy the law or legislation contained in the three preceding books is repeated with slight modifications. See each of these books.

'The Jews assert that, besides the *written law*, **hrwt btkbç**, **νόμος ἔγγραφος**, which may be translated into other languages, and which is contained in the Pentateuch, there was communicated to Moses on Mount Sinai an *oral law*, **hp l [bç hrwt**, **νόμος ἄγραφος**, which was subsequently written down, together with many rabbinical observations, and is contained in the twelve folio volumes which now constitute the Talmud, and which the Jews assert cannot be, or at least ought not to be, translated. *SEE TALMUD*).

The Rabbins divide the whole Mosaic law into 613 precepts, of which 248 are affirmative and 365 negative. The number of the affirmative precepts corresponds to the 248 members of which, according to rabbinical anatomy, the whole human body consists. The number of the negative precepts corresponds to the 365 days of the solar year or, according to the rabbinical work *Brandspiegel* (which has been published in Jewish German at Cracow and in other places), the negative precepts agree in number with the 365 veins which, they say, are found in the human body. Hence their

logic concludes that if on each day each member of the human body keeps one affirmative precept and abstains from one thing forbidden, the whole law, and not the Decalogue alone, is kept. The whole law is sometimes called by Jewish writers *Theraiog*, which word is formed from the Hebrew letters that are employed to express the number 613, viz. $400 = \mathbf{t} + 200 = \mathbf{r} + 10 = \mathbf{y} + 3 = \mathbf{g}$ Hence $613 = \mathbf{gyr} \mathbf{t}$ *theriog*. Women are subject to the negative precepts or prohibitions only, and not to the affirmative precepts or injunctions. This exception arises partly from their nature, and partly from their being subject to the authority of husbands. According to some rabbinical statements women are subject to 100 precepts only, of which 64 are negative and 36 affirmative. The number 613 corresponds also to the number of letters in the Decalogue. Others are inclined to find that there are 620 precepts according to the numerical value of the word \mathbf{rmk} = crown, viz., $400 = \mathbf{t} + 200 = \mathbf{r} + 20 \mathbf{k}$; and others, again, observe that the numerical value of the letters \mathbf{hrwt} , law, amounts only to 611. The first in order of these laws is found in ^{<0017>}Genesis 1:27, $\mathbf{wbrw} \mathbf{wrp}$, *be fruitful and multiply*. The transgressor of this law is, according to Rabbi Eliezer, as wicked as a murderer. He who is still unmarried at twenty years of age is a transgressor; and the law is binding upon every man, according to Schamai, until he has two sons; or, according to Hillel, one son and one daughter (compare *Juris Hebraeorum leges*, ductu Rabbi Levi Barzelonitae, auctore J. Henrico Hottinger). **SEE CABALA.**

I. *The Law with reference to the Past History of the People.* —

1. Here it is all-important, for the proper understalling of the law, to remember its *entire dependence on the Abrahamic Covenant*, and its adaptation thereto (see ^{<0017>}Galatians 3:17-24). That covenant had a twofold character. It contained the "spiritual promise" of the Messiah, which was given to the Jews as representatives of the whole human race, and as guardians of a treasure in which "all families of the earth should be blessed." This would prepare the Jewish nation to be the center of the unity of all mankind. But it contained also the temporal promises subsidiary to the former, and requisite in order to preserve intact the nation, through which the race of man should be educated and prepared for the coming of the Redeemer. These promises were special, given distinctively to the Jews as a nation, and calculated to separate them from other nations of the earth. It follows that there should be in the law a corresponding duality of nature. There would be much in it peculiar to the Jews, local, special, and

transitory; but the fundamental principles on which it was based must be universal, because expressing the will of an unchanging God, and springing from relations to him inherent in human nature, and therefore perpetual and universal in their application.

2. The nature of this *relation of the law to the promise* is clearly pointed out. The belief in God as the Redeemer of man, and the hope of his manifestation as such in the person of the Messiah, involved the belief that the spiritual power must be superior to all carnal obstructions, and that there was in man a spiritual element which could rule his life by communion with a Spirit from above. But it involved also the idea of an antagonistic power of evil, from which man was to be redeemed, existing in each individual, and existing also in the world at large. The promise was the witness of the one truth, the law was the declaration of the other. It was "added because of transgressions." In the individual it stood between his better and his worse self; in the world, between the Jewish nation as the witness of the spiritual promise, and the heathendom which groaned under the power of the flesh. It was intended, by the gift of guidance and the pressure of motives, to strengthen the weakness of good, while it curbed directly the power of evil. It followed inevitably that, in the individual, it assumed somewhat of a coercive, and, as between Israel and the world, somewhat of an antagonistic and isolating character; and hence that, viewed without reference to the promise (as was the case with the later Jews), it might actually become a hinderance to the true revelation of God, and to the mission for which the nation had been made a "chosen people."

3. Nor is it less essential to note the *period of the history* at which it was given. It marked and determined the transition of Israel from the condition of a tribe to that of a nation, and its definite assumption of a distinct position and office in the history of the world. It is on no unreal metaphor that we base the well-known analogy between the stages of individual life and those of national or universal existence. In Israel the patriarchal time was that of childhood, ruled chiefly through the affections and the power of natural relationship, with rules few, simple, and unsystematic. The national period was that of youth, in which this indirect teaching and influence gives place to definite assertions of right and responsibility, and to a system of distinct commandments, needed to control its vigorous and impulsive action. The fifty days of their wandering alone with God in the silence of the wilderness represent that awakening to the difficulty, the

responsibility, and the nobleness of life, which marks the "putting away of childish things." The law is the sign and the seal of such an awakening.

4. Yet, though new in its general conception, it was probably *not wholly new in its materials*. Neither in his physical nor his spiritual providence does God proceed *per saltum*. There must necessarily have been, before the law, commandments and revelations of a fragmentary character, under which Israel had hitherto grown up. Indications of such are easily found, both of a ceremonial and moral nature, as, for example, in the penalties against murder, adultery, and fornication (⁽¹⁰⁰⁰⁶⁾Genesis 9:6; 38:24), in the existence of the Levirate law (⁽¹⁰⁰⁰⁸⁾Genesis 38:8), in the distinction of clean and unclean animals (⁽¹⁰⁰⁰⁹⁾Genesis 8:20), and probably in the observance of the Sabbath (⁽¹⁰⁰²³⁾Exodus 16:23, 27-29). But, even without such indications, our knowledge of the existence of Israel as a distinct community in Egypt would necessitate the conclusion that it must have been guided by some laws of its own, growing out of the old patriarchal customs, which would be preserved with Oriental tenacity, and gradually becoming methodized by the progress of circumstances. Nor would it be possible for the Israelites to be in contact with an elaborate system of ritual and law, such as that which existed in Egypt, without being influenced by its general principles, and, in less degree, by its minute details. As they approached nearer to the condition of a nation they would be more and more likely to modify their patriarchal customs by the adoption from Egypt of laws which were fitted for national existence. This being so, it is hardly conceivable that the Mosaic legislation should have embodied none of these earlier materials. It is clear, even to human wisdom, that the only constitution which can be efficient and permanent is one which has grown up slowly, and so been assimilated to the character of a people. It is the peculiar mark of legislative genius to mold by fundamental principles, and animate by a higher inspiration, materials previously existing in a cruder state. The necessity for this lies in the nature, not of the legislator, but of the subjects, and the argument, therefore, is but strengthened by the acknowledgment in the case of Moses of a divine and special inspiration. So far, therefore, as they were consistent with the objects of the Jewish law, the customs of Palestine and the laws of Egypt would doubtless be traceable in the Mosaic system.

5. In close connection with this, and almost in consequence of this reference to antiquity, we find an *accommodation of the law* to the temper and circumstances of the Israelites, to which our Lord refers in the case of

divorce (^{<6107>}Matthew 19:7, 8) as necessarily interfering with its absolute perfection. In many cases it rather should be said to guide and modify existing usages than actually to sanction them; and (the ignorance of their existence may lead to a conception of its ordinances not only erroneous, but actually the reverse of the truth. Thus the punishment of filial disobedience appears severe (^{<6218>}Deuteronomy 21:18-21); yet when we refer to the extent of parental authority in a patriarchal system, or (as at Rome) in the earlier periods of national existence, it appears more like a limitation of absolute parental authority by an appeal to the judgment of the community. The Levirate law, again, appears (see *Mich. Alos. Recht*, book 3, chapter 6, art. 98) to have existed in a far more general form in the early Asiatic peoples, and to have been rather limited than favored by Moses. The law of the avenger of blood is a similar instance of merciful limitation and distinction in the exercise of an immemorial usage, probably not without its value and meaning, and certainly too deep-seated to admit of any but gradual extinction. Nor is it less noticeable that the degree of prominence given to each part of the Mosaic system has a similar reference to the period at which the nation had arrived. The ceremonial portion is marked out distinctly and with elaboration; the moral and criminal law is clearly and sternly decisive; even the civil law, so far as it relates to individuals, is systematic, because all these were called for by the past growth of the nation, and needed in order to settle and develop its resources. But the political and constitutional law is comparatively imperfect; a few leading principles are laid down, to be developed hereafter; and the law is directed rather to sanction the various powers of the state than to define and balance their operations. Thus the existing authorities of a patriarchal nature in each tribe and family are recognized, while side by side with them is established the priestly and Levitical power which was to supersede them entirely in sacerdotal, and partly also in judicial functions. The supreme civil power of a "judge," or (eventually) a king, is recognized distinctly, although only in general terms, indicating a sovereign and summary jurisdiction (^{<6174>}Deuteronomy 17:14-20); and the prophetic office, in its political as well as its moral aspect, is spoken of still more vaguely as future (^{<6185>}Deuteronomy 18:15-22). These powers, being recognized, are left, within due limits, to work out the political system of Israel, and to ascertain by experience their proper spheres of exercise. On a careful understanding of this adaptation of the law to the national growth and character of the Jews (and of a somewhat similar adaptation to their climate and physical circumstances) depends the correct appreciation of its

nature, and the power of distinguishing in it what is local and temporary from that which is universal.

6. In close connection with this subject we observe also *the gradual process by which the law was revealed* to the Israelites. In Exodus 20-23, in direct connection with the revelation from Mount Sinai, that which may be called the rough outline of the Mosaic law is given by God, solemnly recorded by Moses, and accepted by the people. In Exodus 25-31 there is a similar outline of the Mosaic ceremonial. On the basis of these it may be conceived that the fabric of the Mosaic system gradually grew up under the requirements of the time. In certain cases, indeed (as e.g., in ~~Exodus~~ Leviticus 10:1, 2, compared with 8-11; ~~Exodus~~ Leviticus 24:11-16; ~~Exodus~~ Numbers 9:6-12, 15:32-41; 27:1-11, compared with 36:1-12), we actually see how general rules, civil, criminal, and ceremonial, originated in special circumstances; and the unconnected nature of the records of laws in the earlier books suggests the idea that this method of legislation extended to many other cases.

The first revelation of the law in anything like a perfect form is found in the book of Deuteronomy, at a period when the people, educated to freedom and national responsibility, were prepared to receive it, and carry it with them to the land which was now prepared for them. It is distinguished by its systematic character and its reference to first principles; for probably even by Moses himself, certainly by the people, the law had not before this been recognized in all its essential characteristics; and to it we naturally refer in attempting to analyze its various parts. *SEE DEUTERONOMY.* Yet even then the revelation was not final; it was the duty of the prophets to amend and explain it in special points (as in the well-known example in Ezekiel 18), and to bring out more clearly its great principles, as distinguished from the external rules in which they were embodied; for in this way, as in others, they prepared the way of Him who "came to fulfill" (*πληρῶσαι*) the law of old time.

II. *Analysis of its Contents.* — It is customary to divide the law into the Moral, the Ceremonial, and the Political. But this division, although valuable if considered as a distinction merely subjective (as enabling us, that is, to conceive the objects of law, dealing as it does with man in his social, political, and religious capacity), is wholly imaginary if regarded as an objective separation of various classes of laws. Any single ordinance might have at once a moral, a ceremonial, and a political bearing; and, in

fact, although in particular cases one or other of these aspects predominated, yet the whole principle of the Mosaic institutions is to obliterate any such supposed separation of laws, and refer all to first principles, depending on the will of God and the nature of man. In giving an analysis of the substance of the law, it will probably be better to treat it, as any other system of laws is usually treated, by dividing it into

- (1) Civil;
- (2) Criminal;
- (3) Judicial and Constitutional;
- (4) Ecclesiastical and Ceremonial.

(I.) LAWS CIVIL.

1. OF PERSONS.

(A) *Father and Son.*

The power of a Father to be held sacred; cursing, or smiting (^{<0215>}Exodus 21:15, 17; ^{<0210>}Leviticus 20:9), or stubborn and willful disobedience to be considered capital crimes. But uncontrolled power of life and death was apparently refused to the father, and vested only in the congregation (^{<0218>}Deuteronomy 21:18-21).

Right of the first-born to a double portion of the inheritance not to be set aside by partiality (^{<0215>}Deuteronomy 21:15-17). For an example of the authority of the first-born, see ^{<0219>}1 Samuel 20:29 ("My brother, he hath commanded me to be there").

Inheritance by Daughters to be allowed in default of sons, provided (^{<0216>}Numbers 27:6-8; comp. 36) that heiresses married in their own tribe.

Daughters unmarried to be entirely dependent on their father (^{<0213>}Numbers 30:3-5).

(B) *Husband and Wife.*

The power of a Husband to be so great that a wife could never be *sui juris*, or enter independently into any engagement, even before God (^{<0216>}Numbers 30:6-15). A widow or divorced wife became independent, and did not again fall under her father's power (verse 9).

Divorce (for uncleanness) allowed, but to be formal and irrevocable (^{<1634>}Deuteronomy 24:1-4).

Marriage within certain degrees forbidden (Leviticus 18, etc.).

A Slave Wife, whether bought or captive, not to be actual property, nor to be sold; if ill treated, to be *ipso facto* free (^{<1210>}Exodus 21:7-9; ^{<16210>}Deuteronomy 21:10-14).

Slander against a wife's virginity to be punished by fine, and by deprivation of power of divorce; on the other hand, ante-conubial uncleanness in her to be punished by death (^{<16213>}Deuteronomy 22:13-21).

The raising up of seed (Levirate law) a formal right to be claimed by the widow, under pain of infamy, with a view to preservation of families (^{<1635>}Deuteronomy 25:5-10).

(C) *Master and Slave.*

Power of Master so far limited that death under actual chastisement was punishable (^{<1213>}Exodus 21:20); and maiming was to give liberty *ipso facto* (verses 26, 27).

The Hebrew Slave to be freed at the sabbatical year, and provided with necessaries (his wife and children to go with him only if they came to his master with him), unless by his own formal act he consented to be a perpetual slave (^{<1210>}Exodus 21:1-6; ^{<16512>}Deuteronomy 15:12-18). In any case (it would seem) to be freed at the jubilee (^{<16510>}Leviticus 25:10), with his children. If sold to a resident alien, to be always redeemable, at a price proportional to the distance of the jubilee (^{<16507>}Leviticus 25:47-54).

Foreign Slaves to be held and inherited as property forever (^{<1656>}Leviticus 25:45, 46); and fugitive slaves from foreign nations not to be given up (^{<16235>}Deuteronomy 23:15). *SEE SLAVE.*

(D) *Foreigners.*

They seem never to have been *sui juris*, or able to protect themselves, and accordingly protection and kindness towards them are enjoined as a sacred duty (^{<1222>}Exodus 22:21; ^{<16833>}Leviticus 19:33, 34).

2. LAW OF THINGS.

(A) *Laws of Land (and Property).*

(1) *All Land to be the property of God alone*, and its holders to be deemed His tenants (^{<1823>}Leviticus 25:23).

(2) *All sold Land* therefore to *return to its original owners* at the jubilee, and the price of sale to be calculated accordingly; land redemption on equitable terms to be allowed at all times (25:25-27).

A House sold to be redeemable within a year; and, if not redeemed, to pass away altogether (25:29, 30).

But the Houses of the Levites, or those in unwalled villages, to be redeemable at all times, in the same way as land; and the Levitical suburbs to be inalienable (25:31-34).

(3) *Land or Houses sanctified*, or tithes, or unclean firstlings, to be capable of being redeemed at six-fifths value (calculated according to the distance from the jubilee year by the priest); if devoted by the owner and unredeemed, to be hallowed at the jubilee forever, and given to the priests; if only by a possessor, to return to the owner at the jubilee (^{<1874>}Leviticus 27:14-34).

(4) *Inheritance:*

(1) *Sons.*

(2) *Daughters.*

(3) *Brothers.*

(4) *Uncles on the Father's side.*

(5) *Next Kinsmen*, generally.

(B) *Laws of Debt.*

(1) *All Debts* (to an Israelite) to be released at the seventh (sabbatical) year; a blessing promised to obedience, and a curse on refusal to lend (^{<1851>}Deuteronomy 15:1-11).

(2) *Interest* (from Israelites) not to be taken (^{<1925>}Exodus 22:25-27; ^{<1829>}Deuteronomy 23:19, 20).

(3) *Pledges* not to be insolently or ruinously exacted (^{<1846>}Deuteronomy 24:6, 10-13, 17, 18).

(C) *Taxation.*

(1) Census-money, a poll-tax (of a half shekel), to be paid for *the service of the tabernacle* (^{<0302>}Exodus 30:12-16).

All spoil in war to be halved; of the combatant's half, one tive hundredth, of the people's, one fiftieth, to be paid for a "heave-offering" to Jehovah.

(2) Tithes:

(a) Tithes of all produce to be given for maintenance of the Levites (^{<0480>}Numbers 18:20-24).

(Of this, one tenth to be paid as a heave-offering [for maintenance of the priests] [^{<0484>}Numbers 18:24 32].)

(b) Second Tithe to be bestowed in religious feasting and charity, either at the Holy Place, or every third year at home (?) (^{<0542>}Deuteronomy 14:22-28).

(c) First-fruits of corn, wine, and oil (at least one sixtieth, generally one fortieth, for the priests) to be offered at Jerusalem, with a solemn declaration of dependence on God, the King of Israel (^{<0610>}Deuteronomy 26:1-15; ^{<0482>}Numbers 18:12, 13).

Firstlings of clean beasts; the redemption-money (5 shekels) of man, and (shekel, or 1 shekel) of unclean beasts, to be given to the priests after sacrifice (^{<0485>}Numbers 18:15-18).

(3) Poor-Laws:

(a) Gleanings (in field or vineyard) to be a legal right of the poor (^{<0600>}Leviticus 19:9, 10; ^{<0640>}Deuteronomy 24:19-22).

(b) Slight Trespass (eating on the spot) to be allowed as legal (^{<0620>}Deuteronomy 23:24, 25).

(c) Second Tithe (see 2, b) to be given in charity.

(d) Wages to be paid day by day (^{<0645>}Deuteronomy 24:15).

(4) Maintenance of Priests (^{<0488>}Numbers 18:8-32).

(a) Tenth of Levites' Tithe. (See 2, a.)

(b) The heave and wave offerings (breast and right shoulder of all peace-offerings).

(c) *The meat and sin offerings*, to be eaten solemnly, and only in the holy place.

(d) *First-fruits* and redemption money. (See 2, c.)

(e) *Price of all devoted things*, unless specially given for a sacred service. A man's service, or that of his household, to be redeemed at 50 shekels for man, 30 for woman, 20 for boy, and 10 for girl.

(II.) LAWS CRIMINAL.

1. OFFENCES AGAINST GOD (of the nature of treason).

1st Command. Acknowledgment of false gods (^{<0220>}Exodus 22:20), as e.g. Moloch (^{<0310>}Leviticus 20:1-5), and generally all *idolatry* (Deuteronomy 13; 17:2-5).

2d Command. *Witchcraft and false prophecy* (^{<0228>}Exodus 22:18; ^{<0310>}Deuteronomy 18:9-22; ^{<0331>}Leviticus 19:31).

3d Command. *Blasphemy* (^{<0345>}Leviticus 24:15, 16).

4th Command. *Sabbath-breaking* (^{<0450>}Numbers 15:32-36). *Punishment in all cases, death by stoning*. Idolatrous cities to be utterly destroyed.

2. OFFENCES AGAINST MAN.

5th Command. *Disobedience to or cursing or smitings of parents* (^{<0215>}Exodus 21:15, 17; ^{<0310>}Leviticus 20:9; ^{<0318>}Deuteronomy 21:18-21), to be punished by death by stoning, publicly adjudged and inflicted: so also of disobedience to the priests (as judges) or Supreme Judge. Comp. ^{<0210>}1 Kings 21:10-14 (Naboth); ^{<0421>}2 Chronicles 24:21 (Zechariah).

6th Command.

(1) *Murder*, to be punished by death without sanctuary or reprieve, or satisfaction (^{<0212>}Exodus 21:12, 14; ^{<0311>}Deuteronomy 19:11-13). Death of a slave, actually under the rod, to be punished (^{<0210>}Exodus 21:20, 21).

(2) *Death by negligence*, to be punished by death (^{<0218>}Exodus 21:28-30).

(3) *Accidental Homicide*; the avenger of blood to be escaped by flight to the cities of refuge till the death of the high-priest (^{<0439>}Numbers 35:9-28; ^{<0441>}Deuteronomy 4:41-43; 19:4-10).

(4) *Uncertain Murder*, to be expiated by formal disavowal and sacrifice by the elders of the nearest city (^{<0201>}Deuteronomy 21:1-9).

(5) *Assault* to be punished by *lex talionis*, or danmages (^{<0218>}Exodus 21:18, 19, 22-25; ^{<0349>}Leviticus 24:19, 20).

7th Command.

(1) *Adultery* to be punished by death of both offenders: the rape of a married or betrothed woman, by death of the offender (^{<0213>}Deuteronomy 22:13-27).

(2) *Rape or Seduction* of an unbetrothed virgin, to be compensated by marriage, with dowry (50 shekels), and without power of divorce; or, if she be refused, by payment of full dowry (^{<0216>}Exodus 22:16, 17; ^{<0228>}Deuteronomy 22:28, 29).

(3) *Unlawful Marriages* (incestuous, etc.) to be punished, some by death, some by childlessness (Leviticus 20).

8th Command.

(1) *Theft* to be punished by fourfold or double restitution; a nocturnal robber might be slain as an outlaw (^{<0221>}Exodus 22:1-4).

(2) *Trespass and injury* of things lent to be compensated (^{<0215>}Exodus 22:5-15).

(3) *Perversion of Justice* (by bribes, threats, etc.), and especially oppression of strangers, strictly forbidden (^{<0219>}Exodus 23:9, etc.).

(4) *Kidnapping* to be punished by death (^{<0347>}Deuteronomy 24:7).

9th Command. *False Witness*; to be punished by *lex talionis* (^{<0211>}Exodus 23:1-3; ^{<0316>}Deuteronomy 19:16-21).

Slander of a wife's chastity, by fine and loss of power of divorce (^{<0228>}Deuteronomy 22:18, 19).

A fuller consideration of the tables of the Ten Commandments is given elsewhere. *SEE THE COMMANDMENTS.*

(III.) LAWS JUDICIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL.

1. JURISDICTION.

(a) *Local Judges* (generally Levites, as more skilled in the law) appointed, for ordinary matters, probably by the people, with approbation of the supreme authority (as of Moses in the wilderness) (^{<01825>}Exodus 18:25; ^{<0115>}Deuteronomy 1:15-18), through all the land (^{<01618>}Deuteronomy 16:18).

(b) *Appeal to the Priests* (at the holy place), or to *the judge*; their sentence final, and to be accepted under pain of death. See ^{<01718>}Deuteronomy 17:8-13 (comp. appeal to Moses, ^{<01826>}Exodus 18:26).

(c) *Two witnesses* (at least) required in capital matters (^{<01530>}Numbers 35:30; ^{<01716>}Deuteronomy 17:6, 7).

(d) *Punishment* (except by special command) to be personal, and not to extend to the family (^{<01416>}Deuteronomy 24:16).

Stripes allowed and limited (^{<01511>}Deuteronomy 25:1-3), so as to avoid outrage on the human frame.

All this would be to a great extent set aside

1st. By the summary jurisdiction of the king. See ^{<0221>}1 Samuel 22:11-19 (Saul); ^{<0121>}2 Samuel 22:1-5; 4:4-11; ^{<01316>}1 Kings 3:16-28; which extended even to the deposition of the high-priest (^{<02217>}1 Samuel 22:17, 18; ^{<01226>}1 Kings 2:26, 27).

The practical difficulty of its being carried out is seen in ^{<01512>}2 Samuel 15:2-6, and would lead, of course, to a certain delegation of his power.

2d. By the appointment of the Seventy (^{<01124>}Numbers 11:24-30) with a solemn religious sanction. In later times there was a local Sanhedrim of 23 in each city, and two such in Jerusalem, as well as the Great Sanhedrim, consisting of 70 members, besides the president, who was to be the high-priest if duly qualified, and controlling even the king and high-priest. The members were priests, scribes (Levites), and elders (of other tribes). A court of exactly this nature is noticed, as appointed to supreme power by Jehoshaphat. (See ^{<01498>}2 Chronicles 19:8-11.)

2. ROYAL POWER.

The King's Power limited by the law, as written and formally accepted by the king, and directly forbidden to be despotic (^{<6774>}Deuteronomy 17:14-20; comp. ^{<9125>}1 Samuel 10:25). Yet he had power of taxation (to one tenth), and of compulsory service (^{<9180>}1 Samuel 8:10-18); also the declaration of war (1 Samuel 11), etc. There are distinct traces of a "mutual contract" (^{<1083>}2 Samuel 5:3 (David); a "league" (Joash), ^{<1117>}2 Kings 11:17); the remonstrance with Rehoboam being clearly not extraordinary (^{<1111>}1 Kings 12:1-6).

The Princes of the Congregation. The heads of the tribes (see ^{<6915>}Joshua 9:15) seem to have had authority under Joshua to act for the people (comp. ^{<1376>}1 Chronicles 27:16-22); and in the later times "the princes of Judah" seem to have had power to control both the king and the priests (see ^{<2930>}Jeremiah 26:10-24; 38:4, 5, etc.).

3. ROYAL REVENUE.

(1) *Tenth of produce.*

(2) *Domain land* (^{<1376>}1 Chronicles 27:26-29). Note confiscation of criminal's land (^{<1215>}1 Kings 21:15).

(3) *Bond service* (^{<1057>}1 Kings 5:17, 18), chiefly on foreigners (^{<1020>}1 Kings 9:20-22; ^{<1426>}2 Chronicles 2:16, 17).

(4) *Flocks and herds* (^{<1379>}1 Chronicles 27:29-31).

(5) *Tributes* (gifts) from foreign kings.

(6) *Commerce*; especially in Solomon's time (^{<1102>}1 Kings 10:22, 29, etc.).

(IV.) ECCLESIASTICAL AND CEREMONIAL LAW.

1. LAW OF SACRIFICE (considered as the sign and the appointed means of the union with God, on which the holiness of the people depended).

(A) *Ordinary Sacrifices.*

(a) *The whole Burnt-Offering* (Leviticus 1) of the herd or the flock; to be offered continually (^{<9238>}Exodus 29:38-42); and the fire on the altar never to be extinguished (^{<9038>}Leviticus 6:8-13).

(b) *The Meat-Offering* (Leviticus 2; 6:14-23) of flour, oil, and frankincense, unleavened, and seasoned with salt.

(c) *The Peace-Offering* (^{<R87>}Leviticus 3:7:11-21) of the herd or the flock; either a thank-offering, or a vow, or free-will offering.

(d) *The Sin-Offering, or Trespass-Offering* (Leviticus 4, 5, 6).

[1] For sins committed in ignorance (Leviticus 4).

[2] For vows unwittingly made and broken, or uncleanness unwittingly contracted (Leviticus 5).

[3] For sins wittingly committed (^{<R88>}Leviticus 6:1-7).

(B) *Extraordinary Sacrifices.*

(a) *At the Consecration of Priests* (Leviticus 8, 9).

(b) *At the Purification of Women* (Leviticus 12).

(c) *At the Cleansing of Lepers* (Leviticus 13, 14).

(d) *On the Great Day of Atonement* (Leviticus 16).

(e) *On the great Festivals* (Leviticus 23).

2. LAW OF HOLINESS (arising from the union with God through sacrifice).

(A) *Holiness of Persons.*

(a) *Holiness of the whole people* as "children of God" (^{<D95>}Exodus 19:5, 6; Leviticus 11-15, 17, 18; ^{<S40>}Deuteronomy 14:1-21) shown in

[1] The Dedication of the first-born (^{<D30>}Exodus 13:2, 12,13; 22:29, 30, etc.); and the offering of all firstlings and first-fruits (Deuteronomy 26, etc.).

[2] Distinction of clean and unclean food (Leviticus 11; Deuteronomy 14).

[3] Provision for purification (Leviticus 12, 13, 14, 15; ^{<S20>}Deuteronomy 23:1-14).

[4] Laws against disfigurement (^{<R27>}Leviticus 19:27; ^{<S40>}Deuteronomy 14:1; compare ^{<S23>}Deuteronomy 25:3, against excessive scourging).

[5] Laws against unnatural marriages and lusts (Leviticus 18, 20).

(b) *Holiness of the Priests (and Levites).*

[1] Their consecration (Leviticus 8, 9; Exodus 29).

[2] Their special qualifications and restrictions (^{<R212>}Leviticus 21:22:1-9).

[3] Their rights (^{<S181>}Deuteronomy 18:1-6; Numbers 18) and authority (^{<S183>}Deuteronomy 18:8-13).

(B) Holiness of Places and Things.

(a) *The Tabernacle* with the ark, the veil, the altars, the laver, the priestly robes, etc. (Exodus 25-28, 30).

(b) *The Holy Place* chosen for the permanent erection of the tabernacle (Deuteronomy 12; 14:22-29), where only all sacrifices were to be offered, and all tithes, first fruits, vows, etc., to be given or eaten.

(C) Holiness of Times.

(a) *The Sabbath* (^{<D110>}Exodus 20:9, 11; 23:12, etc.).

(b) *The Sabbatical Year* (^{<D230>}Exodus 23:10, 11; ^{<R211>}Leviticus 25:1-7, etc.).

(c) *The Year of Jubilee* (^{<R218>}Leviticus 25:8, 16, etc.).

(d) *The Passover* (^{<D113>}Exodus 12:3, 27; ^{<R214>}Leviticus 23:4-14).

(e) *The Feast of Weeks* (Pentecost) (^{<R215>}Leviticus 23:15, etc.).

(f) *The Feast of Tabernacles* (^{<R213>}Leviticus 23:33-43).

(g) *The Feast of Trumpets* (^{<R223>}Leviticus 23:23-25).

(h) *The Day of Atonement* (^{<R216>}Leviticus 23:26-32, etc.).

On this part of the subject, *SEE FESTIVAL; SEE KING; SEE PRIEST; SEE TABERNACLE; SEE SACRIFICE*, etc.

III. Distinctive Characteristic of the Mosaic Law. —

1. The leading principle of the whole is its THEOCRATIC CHARACTER, its reference (that is) of all action and thoughts of men *directly and immediately* to the will of God. All law, indeed, must ultimately make this reference. If it bases itself on the sacredness of human authority, it must finally trace that authority to God's appointment; if on the rights of the individual and the need of protecting them, it must consider these rights as inherent and sacred, because implanted by the hand of the Creator. But it is characteristic of the Mosaic law, as also of all Biblical history and prophecy, that it passes over all the intermediate steps, and refers at once to God's commandment as the foundation of all human duty. The key to it

is found in the ever-recurring formula, "Ye shall observe all these statutes; I am Jehovah."

It follows from this that it is to be regarded not merely as a law, that is, a rule of conduct, based on known truth and acknowledged authority, but also as a *revelation of God's nature* and his dispensations. In this view of it, more particularly, lies its connection with the rest of the Old Testament. As a law, it is definite and (generally speaking) final; as a revelation, it is the beginning of the great system of prophecy, and indeed bears within itself the marks of gradual development, from the first simple declaration ("I am the Lord thy God") in Exodus to the full and solemn declaration of his nature and will in Deuteronomy. With this peculiar character of revelation stamped upon it, it naturally ascends from rule to principle, and regards all goodness in man as the shadow of the divine attributes, "Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy" (^{<880>}Leviticus 19:2, etc. comp. ^{<4158>}Matthew 5:48). But this theocratic character of the law depends necessarily on the *belief in God* as not only the creator and sustainer of the world, but as, by special covenant, *the head of the Jewish nation*. It is not indeed doubted that he is the king of all the earth, and that all earthly authority is derived from him; but here again, in the case of the Israelites, the intermediate steps are all but ignored, and the people are at once brought face to face with him as their ruler. It is to be especially noticed that God's claim (so to speak) on their allegiance is based, not on his power or wisdom, but on his especial mercy in being their savior from Egyptian bondage. Because they were made free by him, therefore they became his servants (comp. ^{<819>}Romans 6:19-22); and the declaration which stands at the opening of the law is, "I am the Lord thy God, *which brought thee out of the land of Egypt.*" (Compare also the reason given for the observance of the Sabbath in ^{<815>}Deuteronomy 5:15; and the historical prefaces of the delivery of the second law [Deuteronomy 4]; of the renewal of the covenant by Joshua [^{<820>}Joshua 24:1-13]; and of the rebuke of Samuel at the establishment of the kingdom [^{<926>}1 Samuel 12:6-15].)

This immediate reference to God as their king is clearly seen as the groundwork of their entire polity. The foundation of the whole law of land, and of its remarkable provisions against alienation, lies in the declaration, "The land is mine, and ye are strangers and sojourners with me" (^{<823>}Leviticus 25:23). As in ancient Rome all land belonged properly to the state, and under the feudal system in mediaeval Europe to the king, so in the Jewish law the true ownership lay in Jehovah alone. The very system of

tithes embodied only a peculiar form of tribute to their king, such as they were familiar with in Egypt (see ^{<0473>}Genesis 47:23-26); and the offering of the first-fruits, with the remarkable declaration by which it was accompanied (see ^{<0305>}Deuteronomy 26:5-10), is a direct acknowledgment of God's immediate sovereignty. As the land, so also the persons of the Israelites are declared to be the absolute property of the Lord by the dedication and ransom of the first-born (^{<0112>}Exodus 13:23, etc.), by the payment of the half shekel at the numbering of the people " as a ransom for their souls to the Lord" (^{<0201>}Exodus 30:11-16), and by the limitation of power over Hebrew slaves as contrasted with the absolute mastership permitted over the heathen and the sojourner (^{<0259>}Leviticus 25:39-46). From this theocratic nature of the law follow important deductions with regard to

- (a) the view which it takes of political society;
- (b) the extent of the scope of the law;
- (c) the penalties by which it is enforced; and
- (d) the character which it seeks to impress on the people.

(1.) *The basis of human society* is ordinarily sought, by law or philosophy, either in the rights of the individual, and the partial delegation of them to political authorities; or in the mutual needs of men, and the relations which spring from them; or in the actual existence of power of man over man, whether arising from natural relationship, or from benefits conferred, or from physical or intellectual ascendancy. The maintenance of society is supposed to depend on a "social compact" between governors and subjects; a compact, true as an abstract idea, but untrue if supposed to have been a historical reality. The Mosaic law seeks the basis of its polity, first, in the absolute sovereignty of God; next, in the relationship of each individual to God, and through God to his countrymen. It is clear that such a doctrine, while it contradicts none of the common theories, yet lies beneath them all, and shows why each of them, being only a secondary deduction from an ultimate truth, cannot be in itself sufficient; and, if it claim to be the whole truth, will become an absurdity. It is the doctrine which is insisted upon and developed in the whole series of prophecy, and which is brought to its perfection only when applied to that universal and spiritual kingdom for which the Mosaic system was a preparation.

(2.) The law, as proceeding directly from God, and referring directly to him, is necessarily *absolute in its supremacy* and *unlimited in its scope*.

It is supreme over the governors, as being only the delegates of the Lord, and therefore it is incompatible with any despotic authority in them. This is seen in its limitation of the power of the master over the slave, in the restrictions laid on the priesthood, and the ordination of the "manner of the kingdom" (^{<1574>}Deuteronomy 17:14-20; comp. ^{<9025>}1 Samuel 10:25). By its establishment of the hereditary priesthood side by side with the authority of the heads of tribes ("the princes"), and the subsequent sovereignty of the king, it provides a balance of powers, all of which are regarded as subordinate. The absolute sovereignty of Jehovah was asserted in the earlier times in the dictatorship of the judge, but much more clearly under the kingdom by the spiritual commission of the prophet. By his rebukes of priests, princes, and kings for abuse of their power, he was not only defending religion and morality, but also maintaining the divinely-appointed constitution of Israel.

On the other hand, it is supreme over the governed, recognizing no inherent rights in the individual as prevailing against, or limiting the law. It is therefore unlimited in its scope. There is in it no recognition, such as is familiar to us, that there is one class of actions directly subject to the coercive power of law, while other classes of actions and the whole realm of thought are to be indirectly guided by moral and spiritual influence. Nor is there any distinction of the temporal authority which wields the former power from the spiritual authority to which belongs the other. In fact, these distinctions would have been incompatible with the character and objects of the law. They depend partly on the want of foresight and power in the lawgiver; they could have no place in a system traced directly to God: they depend also partly on the freedom which belongs to the manhood of our race; they could not, therefore, be appropriate to the more imperfect period of its youth.

Thus the law regulated the whole life of an Israelite. His house, his dress, and his food, his domestic arrangements and the distribution of his property, all were determined. In the laws of the release of debts and the prohibition of usury, the dictates of self-interest and the natural course of commercial transactions are sternly checked. His actions were rewarded and punished with great minuteness and strictness, and that according to the standard, not of their consequences, but of their intrinsic morality, so that, for example, fornication and adultery were as severely visited as theft or murder. His religious worship was defined and enforced in an elaborate and unceasing ceremonial. In all things it is clear that, if men submitted to it

merely as a law, imposed under penalties by an irresistible authority, and did not regard it as a means to the knowledge and love of God, and a preparation for his redemption, it would well deserve from Israelites the description given of it by St. Peter (~~<4450>~~ Acts 15:10) as "a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear."

(3.) *The penalties and rewards* by which the law is enforced are such as depend on the direct theocracy. With regard to individual actions, it may be noticed that, as generally some penalties are inflicted by the subordinate, and some only by the supreme authority, so among the Israelites some penalties came from the hand of man, some directly from the providence of God. So much is this the case, that it often seems doubtful whether the threat that a "soul shall be cut off from Israel" refers to outlawry and excommunication, or to such miraculous punishments as those of Nadab and Abihu, or Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. In dealing with the nation at large, Moses, regularly and as a matter of course, refers for punishments and rewards to the providence of God. This is seen not only in the great blessing and curse which enforces the law as a whole, but also in special instances, as, for example, in the promise of unusual fertility to compensate for the sabbatical year, and of safety of the country from attack when left undefended at the three great festivals. Whether these were to come from natural causes, i.e., laws of his providence, which we can understand and foresee, or from causes supernatural, i.e., incomprehensible and inscrutable to us, is not in any case laid down, nor indeed does it affect this principle of the law.

(4.) The bearing of this principle on the inquiry as to the *revelation of a future life, in the Pentateuch*, is easily seen. So far as the law deals with the nation as a whole, it is obvious that its penalties and rewards could only refer to this life, in which alone the nation exists. So far as it relates to such individual acts as are generally cognizable by human law, and capable of temporal punishments, no one would expect that its divine origin should necessitate any reference to the world to come. But the sphere of moral and religious action and thought to which it extends is beyond the cognizance of human laws and the scope of their ordinary penalties, and is therefore left by them to the retribution of God's inscrutable justice, which, being but imperfectly seen here, is contemplated especially as exercised in a future state. Hence arises the expectation of a direct revelation of this future state in the Mosaic law. Such a revelation is certainly not given. Warburton (in his *Divine Legation of Moses*) even builds on its non-

existence an argument for the supernatural power and commission of the lawgiver, who could promise and threaten retribution from the providence of God in this life, and submit his predictions to the test of actual experience. The truth seems to be that, in a law which appeals directly to God himself for its authority and its sanction, there cannot be that broad line of demarcation between this life and the next which is drawn for those whose power is limited by the grave. Our Lord has taught us (^{<1223>}Matthew 22:31, 32) that in the very revelation of God, as the "God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob," the promise of immortality and future retribution was implicitly contained. We may apply this declaration even more strongly to a law in which God was revealed as entering into covenant with Israel, and in them drawing mankind directly under his immediate government. His blessings and curses, by the very fact that they came from him, would be felt to be unlimited by time, and the plain and immediate fulfillment which they found in this life would be accepted as an earnest of a deeper, though more mysterious completion in the world to come. But the time for the clear revelation of this truth had not yet come, and therefore, while the future life and its retribution is implied, yet the rewards and penalties of the present life are those which are plainly held out and practically dwelt upon.

(5.) But perhaps the most important consequence of the theocratic nature of the law was the *peculiar character of goodness* which it sought to *impress on the people*. Goodness in its relation to man takes the forms of righteousness and love; in its independence of all relation, the form of purity; and in its relation to God, that of piety. Laws which contemplate men chiefly in their mutual relations endeavor to enforce or protect in them the first two qualities; the Mosaic law, beginning with piety as its first object, enforces most emphatically the purity essential to those who, by their union with God, have recovered the hope of intrinsic goodness, while it views righteousness and love rather as deductions from these than as independent objects. Not that it neglects these qualities; on the contrary, it is full of precepts which show a high conception and tender care of our relative duties to man (see, for example, ^{<1227>}Exodus 21:7-1.1, 28-36; 23:1-9; ^{<1221>}Deuteronomy 22:1-4; 24:10-22, etc.); but these can hardly be called its distinguishing features. It is most instructive to refer to the religious preface of the law in Deuteronomy 6-11 (especially to ^{<1224>}Deuteronomy 6:4-13), where all is based on the first great commandment, and to observe the subordinate and dependent character of "the second that is like unto it" — "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; *I am the Lord*" (^{<1228>}Leviticus

19:18). On the contrary, the care for the purity of the people stands out remarkably, not only in the enforcement of ceremonial "cleanness," and the multitude of precautions or remedies against any breach of it, but also in the severity of the laws against self-pollution, a severity which distinguishes the Mosaic code before all others, ancient and modern. In punishing these sins. as committed against a man's own self, without reference to their effect on others, and in recognizing purity as having a substantive value and glory, it sets up a standard of individual morality such as. even in Greece and Rome, philosophy reserved for its most esoteric teaching.

Now in all this it is to be noticed that the appeal is not to any dignity of human nature, but to the obligations of communion with a holy God. The subordination, therefore. of this idea also to the religious idea is enforced; and as long as the due supremacy of the latter was preserved, all other duties would find their places in proper harmony. But the usurpation of that supremacy in practice by the idea of personal and national sanctity was that which gave its peculiar color to the Jewish character. In that character there was intense religious devotion and self-sacrifice; there was a high standard of personal holiness, and connected with these an ardent feeling of nationality, based on a great idea, and, therefore, finding its vent in their proverbial spirit of proselytism. But there was also a spirit of contempt for all unbelievers, and a forgetfulness of the existence of any duties towards them, which gave even to their religion an antagonistic spirit, and degraded it in after .times to a ground of national self-glorification. It is to be traced to a natural, though not justifiable perversion of the law by those who made it their all, and both in its strength and its weaknesses it has reappeared remarkably among those Christians who have dwelt on the Old Testament to the neglect of the New.

(6.) It is evident that this characteristic of the Israelites would tend to preserve *the seclusion* which, under God's providence, was intended for them, and would in its turn be fostered by it. We may notice, in connection with this part of the subject, many subordinate provisions tending to the same direction. Such are the establishment of an agricultural basis of society and property, and the provision against its accumulation in a few hands; the discouragement of commerce by the strict laws as to usury, and of foreign conquest by the laws against the maintenance of horses and chariots, as well as the direct prohibition of intermarriage with idolaters, and the indirect prevention of all familiar intercourse with them by the laws as to meats — all these things tended to impress on the Israelitish polity a

character of permanence, stability, and comparative isolation. Like the nature and position of the country to which it was in great measure adapted, it was intended to preserve in purity the testimony borne by Israel for God in the darkness of heathenism, until the time should come for the gathering in of all nations to enjoy the blessing promised to Abraham.

2. The second great and obvious design of the Mosaic statutes was to found, in pursuance of the theocratic idea, a complete system of national CULTUS, and, in order to the perpetuity of this, to establish a permanent sacred caste or HIERARCHY. We here use the word *hierarchy* without meaning to express that the Mosaic legislation was like some later hierarchies falsely so called, in which it was attempted to carry into effect selfish and wicked plans by passing them off as being of divine appointment. In the Mosaic hierarchy the aim is manifest, viz. to make that which is really holy (τὸ ἱερόν) prevail, while in the false hierarchies of later times the profanest selfishness has been rendered practicable by giving to its manifestations an appearance of holiness calculated to deceive the multitude. In the Mosaic legislation the priests certainly exercise a considerable authority as external ministers of holiness, but we find nothing to be compared with the sale of indulgences in the Romish Church. There occur, certainly, instances of gross misdemeanor on the part of the priests, as, for instance, in the case of the sons of Eli; but proceedings originating in the covetousness of the priests were never authorized or sanctioned by the law.

In the Mosaic legislation almost the whole amount of taxation was paid in the form of tithe, which was employed in maintaining the priests and Levites as the hierarchical office-bearers of government, in supporting the poor, and in providing those things which were used in sacrifices and sacrificial feasts.

The taxation by tithe, exclusive of almost all other taxes, is certainly the most lenient and most considerate which has ever anywhere been adopted or proposed. It precludes the possibility of attempting to extort from the people contributions beyond their power, and it renders the taxation of each individual proportionate to his possessions; and even this exceedingly mild taxation was apparently left to the conscience of each person. This we infer from there never occurring in the Bible the slightest vestige either of persons having been sued or goods distrained for tithes, and only an indication of curses resting upon the neglect of paying them. Tithes were

the law of the land, and nevertheless they were not recovered by law during the period of the tabernacle and of the first Temple. It is only during the period of the second Temple, when a general demoralization had taken place, that tithes were farmed and sold, and levied by violent proceedings, in which refractory persons were slain for resisting the levy. But no recommendation or example of such proceeding occurs in the Bible. This seems to indicate that the propriety of paying these lenient and beneficial taxes was generally felt, so much so that there were few, or perhaps no defaulters, and that it was considered inexpedient on the part of the recipients to harass the needy.

Besides the tithes there was a small poll-tax, amounting to half a shekel for each adult male. This tax was paid for the maintenance of the sanctuary. In addition to this, the first-fruits and the first-born of men and cattle augmented the revenue. The first-born of men and of unclean beasts were to be redeemed by money. To this may be added some fines paid in the shape of sin-offerings, and also the vows and free-will offerings.

3. In addition to these great moral and liturgical ends of the Mosaic institutes, we must not fail to notice their **REPUBLICAN ECONOMY**. The whole territory of the state was to be so distributed that each family should have a freehold, which was intended to remain permanently the inheritance of that family, and which, even if sold, was to return at stated periods to its original owners. Since the whole population consisted of families of freeholders, there was, strictly speaking, neither citizens, nor a profane or lay nobility, nor lords temporal. We do not overlook the fact that there were persons called heads, elders, princes, dukes, or leaders among the Israelites; that is, persons who by their intelligence, character, wealth, and other circumstances were leading men among them, and from whom even the seventy judges were chosen who assisted Moses in administering justice to the nation. But we have no proof that there was a nobility enjoying prerogatives similar to those which are connected with birth in several countries of Europe, sometimes in spite of mental and moral disqualifications. We do not find that, according to the Mosaic constitution, there were hereditary peers temporal. Even the inhabitants of towns were freeholders, and their exercise of trades seems to have been combined with, or subordinate to, agricultural pursuits. The only nobility was that of the tribe of Levi, and all the lords were lords spiritual, the descendants of Aaron. The priests and Levites were ministers of public worship, that is, ministers of Jehovah the King, and as such, ministers of

state, by whose instrumentality the legislative as well as the judicial power was exercised. The poor were mercifully considered, but beggars are never mentioned. Hence it appears that as, on the one hand, there was no lay nobility, so, on the other, there was no mendicity.

Owing to the rebellious spirit of the Israelites, the salutary injunctions of their law were so frequently transgressed that it could not procure for them that degree of prosperity which it was calculated to produce among a nation of faithful observers; but it is evident that the Mosaic legislation, if truly observed, was more fitted to promote universal happiness and tranquillity than any other constitution, either ancient or modern.

4. We close this part of our discussion by a few miscellaneous observations on minor peculiarities of the Mosaic code.

It has been deemed a defect that there were no laws against infanticide; but it may well be observed, as a proof of national prosperity, that there are no historical traces of this crime; and it would certainly have been preposterous to give laws against a crime which did not occur, especially as the general law against murder, "Thou shalt not kill," was applicable to this species also. The words of Josephus (*Contra Apionem*, 2:24) can only mean that the crime was against the spirit of the Mosaic law. An express verbal prohibition of this kind is not extant.

There occur also no laws and regulations about wills and testamentary dispositions, although there are sufficient historical facts to prove that the next of kin was considered the lawful heir, that primogeniture was deemed of the highest importance, and that, if there were no male descendants, females inherited the freehold property. We learn from the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews (³⁰¹⁶Hebrews 9:16, 17) that the Jews disposed of property by wills; but it seems that in the time of Moses, and for some period after him, all Israelites died intestate. However, the word (*διαθήκη*, as used in Matthew-, Mark, Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and repeatedly in the Hebrews, implies rather a disposition, arrangement, agreement between parties, than a will in the legal acceptance of the term.
SEE TESTAMENT.

There are no laws concerning guardians, and none against luxurious living. The inefficiency of sumptuary laws is now generally recognized, although renowned legislators in ancient times and in the Middle Ages displayed on this subject their wisdom, falsely so called.

Neither are there any laws against suicide. Hence we infer that suicide was rare, as we may well suppose in a nation of small freeholders, and that the inefficiency of such laws was understood.

The Mosaic legislation recognizes the human dignity of women and of slaves, and particularly enjoins not to slander the deaf nor mislead the blind.

Moses expressly enjoined not to reap the corners of fields, in consideration of the poor, of persons of broken fortunes, and even of the beasts of the field.

The laws of Moses against crimes are severe, but not cruel. The agony of the death of criminals was never artificially protracted, as in some instances was usual in various countries of Europe even in the present century; nor was torture employed in order to compel criminals to confess their crimes, as was usual in ancient times, and till a comparatively recent period. Forty was the maximum number of stripes to be inflicted. This maximum was adopted for the reason expressly stated that the appearance of the person punished should not become horrible, or, as J.D. Michaelis renders it, *burnt*, which expresses the appearance of a person unmercifully beaten. Punishments were inflicted in order specially to express the sacred indignation of the divine Lawgiver against willful transgression of his commandments. and not for any purposes of human vengeance, or for the sake of frightening other criminals. In some instances the people at large were appealed to in order to inflict summary punishment by stoning the criminal to death. This was, in fact, the most usual mode of execution. Other modes of execution also, such as burning, were always public, and conducted with the cooperation of the people. Like every human proceeding, this was liable to abuse, but not to so much abuse as our present mode of conducting lawsuits, which, on account of their costliness, often afford but little protection to persons in narrow circumstances. In lawsuits very much was left to the discretion of the judges, his position greatly resembling that of a permanent jury, who had not merely to decide whether a person was guilty, but who frequently had also to award the amount of punishment to be inflicted.

In the Old Testament we do not hear of a learned profession of the law. Lawyers (*νομικοί*) are mentioned only after the decline of the Mosaic institutions had considerably progressed. As, however, certain laws concerning contagion and purification were administered by the priests,

these might be called lawyers. They, nevertheless, did not derive their maintenance from the administration of these laws, but were supported by glebe-lands, tithes, and portions of the sacrificial (offerings. It is, indeed, very remarkable that, in a nation so entirely governed by law, there were no lawyers forming a distinct profession, and that the **νομικοί** of a later age were not so much remarkable for enforcing the spirit of the law as rather for ingeniously evading its injunctions, by leading the attention of the people from its spirit to a most minute literal fulfillment of its letter. *SEE LAWYER.*

IV. In considering *the relation of the law to the future*, it is important to be guided by the general principle laid down in ^{<3179>}Hebrews 7:19, "The law made nothing perfect" (**οὐδὲν ἔτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος**). This principle will be applied in different degrees to its bearing

- (a) on the afterhistory of the Jewish commonwealth before the coming of Christ;
- (b) on the coming of our Lord himself; and
- (c) on the dispensation of the Gospel.

1. To that after-history the law was, to a great extent, the key; for in ceremonial and criminal law it was complete and final; while, even in civil and constitutional law, it laid down clearly the general principles to be afterwards more fully developed. It was, indeed, often neglected, and even forgotten. Its fundamental assertion of the theocracy was violated by the constant lapses into idolatry, and its provisions for the good of man overwhelmed by the natural course of human selfishness (^{<2842>}Jeremiah 34:12-17); till at last, in the reign of Josiah, its very existence was unknown, and its discovery was to the king and the people as a second publication: yet it still formed the standard from which they knowingly departed, and to which they constantly returned, and to it, therefore, all which was peculiar in their national and individual character was due. Its direct influence was probably greatest in the periods before the establishment of the kingdom and after the Babylonian captivity. The last act of Joshua was to bind the Israelites to it as the charter of their occupation of the conquered land (^{<1928>}Joshua 24:24-27); and, in the semi-anarchical period of the Judges, the law and the tabernacle were the only centers of anything like national unity. The establishment of the kingdom was due to an impatience of this position, and a desire for a visible and

personal center of authority, much the same in nature as that which plunged them so often into idolatry. The people were warned (^{<09126>}1 Samuel 12:6-25) that it involved great danger of their forgetting and rejecting the main principle of the law — that "Jehovah their God was their king." The truth of the prediction was soon shown. Even under Solomon, as soon as the monarchy became one of great splendor and power, it assumed a heathenish and polytheistic character, breaking the law both by its dishonor towards God and its forbidden tyranny over man. Indeed, if the law was looked upon as a collection of abstract rules, and not as a means of knowledge of a personal god, it was inevitable that it should be overborne by the presence of a visible and personal authority.

Therefore it was that from the time of the establishment of the kingdom the prophetic office began. Its object was to enforce and to perfect the law by bearing testimony to the great truths on which it was built, viz. the truth of God's government over all kings, priests, and people alike, and the consequent certainty of a righteous retribution. It is plain that at the same time this testimony went far beyond the law as a definite code of institutions. It dwelt rather on its great principles, which were to transcend the special forms in which they were embodied. It frequently contrasted (as in Isaiah 1, etc.) the external observance of form with the spiritual homage of the heart. It tended therefore, at least indirectly, to the time when, according to the well-known contrast drawn by Jeremiah, the law written on the tables of stone should give place to a new covenant, depending on a law written on the heart, and therefore coercive no longer (^{<28131>}Jeremiah 31:31-34). In this it did but carry out the prediction of the law itself (^{<15810>}Deuteronomy 18:9 -22), and prepare the way for "the Prophet" who was to come. Still the law remained as the distinctive standard of the people. In the kingdom of Israel, after the separation, the deliberate rejection of its leading principles by Jeroboam and his successors was the beginning of a gradual declension into idolatry and heathenism. But in the kingdom of Judah, the very division of the monarchy and consequent diminution of its splendor, and the need of a principle to assert against the superior material power of Israel, brought out the law once more in increased honor and influence. In the days of Jehoshaphat we find, for the first time, that it was taken by the Levites in their circuits through the land, and the people were taught by it (^{<44709>}2 Chronicles 17:9). We find it especially spoken of in the oath taken by the king "at his pillar" in the

Temple, and made the standard of reference in the reformation of Hezekiah and Josiah (^{<42114>}2 Kings 11:14; 23:3; 2 Chronicles 30: 34:14-31).

Far more was this the case after the captivity. The revival of the existence of Israel was hallowed by the new and solemn publication of the law by Ezra, and the institution of the synagogue, through which it became deeply and familiarly known. *SEE EZRA*. The loss of the independent monarchy, and the cessation of prophecy, both combined to throw the Jews back upon the law alone as their only distinctive pledge of nationality and sure guide to truth. The more they mingled with the other subject-nations under the Persian and Grecian empires, the more eagerly they clung to it as their distinction and safeguard; and opening the knowledge of it to the heathen by the translation of the Septuagint, they based on it their proverbial eagerness to proselytize. This love for the law, rather than any abstract patriotism, was the strength of the Maccabean struggle against the Syrians (note here the question as to the lawfulness of war on the Sabbath in this war [1 Macc. 2:23-41]), and the success of that struggle, enthroning a Levitical power, deepened the feeling from which it sprang. It so entered into the heart of the people that open idolatry became impossible. The certainty and authority of the law's commandments amidst the perplexities of paganism, and the spirituality of its doctrine as contrasted with sensual and carnal idolatries, were the favorite boast of the Jew, and the secret of his influence among the heathen. The law thus became the molding influence of the Jewish character; and, instead of being looked upon as subsidiary to the promise, and a means to its fulfillment, it was exalted to supreme importance as at once a means and a pledge of national and individual sanctity.

This feeling laid hold of and satisfied the mass of the people, harmonizing as it did with their ever-increasing spirit of an almost fanatic nationality, until the destruction of the city. The Pharisees, truly representing the chief strength of the people, systematized this feeling; they gave it fresh food, and assumed a predominant leadership over it by the floating mass of tradition which they gradually accumulated around the law as a nucleus. The popular use of the word "lawless" (*ἄνομος*) as a term of contempt (^{<4123>}Acts 2:23; ^{<41921>}1 Corinthians 9:21) for the heathen, and even for the uneducated mass of their followers (^{<41749>}John 7:49), marked and stereotyped their principle.

Against this idolatry of the law (which, when imported into the Christian Church, is described and vehemently denounced by St. Paul) there were two reactions. The first was that of the *Sadducees*; one which had its basis, according to common tradition, in the idea of a higher love and service of God, independent of the law and its sanctions, but which degenerated into a speculative infidelity and an anti-national system of politics, and which probably had but little hold of the people. The other, that of the *Essenes*, was an attempt to burst the bonds of the formal law, and assert its ideas in all fullness, freedom, and purity. In its practical form it assumed the character of high and ascetic devotion to God; its speculative guise is seen in the school of Philo, as a tendency not merely to treat the commands and history of the law on a symbolical principle, but actually to allegorize them into mere abstractions. In neither form could it be permanent, because it had no sufficient relation to the needs and realities of human nature, or to the personal subject of all the Jewish promises; but it was still a declaration of the insufficiency of the law in itself, and a preparation for its absorption into a higher principle of unity. Such was the history of the law before the coming of Christ. It was full of effect and blessing when used as a means; it became hollow and insufficient when made an end.

2. The relation of the law to the advent of Christ is also laid down clearly by St. Paul. The law was the *παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν*, the servant (that is) whose task it was to guide the child to the true teacher (^{<4834>}Galatians 3:24); and Christ was "the end" or object "of the law" (^{<5104>}Romans 10:4). As being subsidiary to the promise, it had accomplished its purpose when the promise was fulfilled. In its national aspect it had existed to guard the faith in the theocracy. The chief hinderance to that faith had been the difficulty of realizing the invisible presence of God, and of conceiving a communion with the infinite Godhead which should not crush or absorb the finite creature (compare ^{<4824>}Deuteronomy 5:24-27; ^{<4172>}Numbers 17:12, 13; ^{<4832>}Job 9:32-35; 13:21, 22; ^{<2381>}Isaiah 45:11, 64:1, etc.). From that had come in earlier times open idolatry, and a half-idolatrous longing for and trust in the kingdom. In after times the substitution of the law for the promise. The difficulty was now to pass away forever, in the incarnation of the Godhead in one truly and visibly man. The guardianship of the law was no longer needed, for the visible and personal presence of the Messiah required no farther testimony. Moreover, in the law itself there had always been a tendency of the fundamental idea to burst the formal bonds which confined it. In looking to God as especially their king, the Israelites were

inheriting a privilege, belonging originally to all mankind, and destined to revert to them. Yet that element of the law which was local and national, now most prized of all by the Jews, tended to limit this gift to them, and place them in a position antagonistic to the rest of the world. It needed, therefore, to pass away before all men could be brought into a kingdom where there was to be "neither Jew nor Gentile, barbarian, Scythian, bond, or free."

In its individual, or what is usually called its "moral" aspect, the law bore equally the stamp of transitoriness and insufficiency. It had, as we have seen, declared the authority of truth and goodness over man's will, and taken for granted in man the existence of a spirit which could recognize that authority; but it had done no more. Its presence had therefore detected the existence and the sinfulness of sin, as alien alike to God's will and man's true nature; but it had also brought out with more vehemence and desperate antagonism the power of sin dwelling in man as fallen (^{REF}Romans 7:7-25). It only showed, therefore, the need of a Savior from sin, and of an indwelling power which should enable the spirit of man to conquer the "law" of evil. Hence it bore testimony to its own insufficiency, and led men to Christ. Already the prophets, speaking by a living and indwelling spirit, ever fresh and powerful, had been passing beyond the dead letter of the law, and indirectly convicting it of insufficiency. But there was need of "the Prophet" who should not only have the fullness of the Spirit dwelling in himself, but should have the power to give it to others, and so open the new dispensation already foretold. When he had come, and by the gift of the Spirit implanted in man a free internal power of action tending to God, the restraints of the law, needful to train the childhood of the world, became unnecessary and even injurious to the free development of its manhood.

The relation of the law to Christ, in its sacrificial and ceremonial aspect, will be more fully considered elsewhere. *SEE SACRIFICE*. It is here only necessary to remark on the evidently typical character of the whole system of sacrifices, upon which alone their virtue depended; and on the imperfect embodiment, in any body of mere men, of the great truth which was represented in the priesthood. By the former declaring the need of atonement, by the latter the possibility of mediation, and yet in itself doing nothing adequately to realize either, the law again led men to him who was at once the only mediator and the true sacrifice.

Thus the law had trained and guided man to the acceptance of the Messiah in his threefold character of king, prophet, and priest; and then, its work being done, it became, in the minds of those who trusted in it, not only an encumbrance, but a snare. To resist its claim to allegiance was therefore a matter of life and death in the days of St. Paul, and, in a less degree, in after ages of the Church.

3. It remains to consider how far it has any obligation or existence under the dispensation of the Gospel. As a means of justification or salvation, it ought never to have been regarded, even before Christ: it needs no proof to show that still less can this be so since he has come. But yet the question remains whether it is binding on Christians, even when they do not depend on it for salvation.

It seems clear enough, that its formal coercive authority as a whole ended with the close of the Jewish dispensation. We may indeed distinguish its various elements; yet he who offended "in one point against it was guilty of all" (^{<B10>}James 2:10). It referred throughout to the Jewish covenant, and in many points to the constitution, the customs, and even the local circumstances of the people. That covenant was preparatory to the Christian, in which it is now absorbed; those customs and observances have passed away. It follows, by the very nature of the case, that the former obligation to the law as such must have ceased with the basis on which it is grounded. This conclusion is stamped most unequivocally with the authority of St. Paul through the whole argument of the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians. That we are "not under law" (^{<B14>}Romans 6:14, 15; ^{<B15>}Galatians 5:18); "that we are dead to law" (^{<B16>}Romans 7:4-6; ^{<B17>}Galatians 2:19), "redeemed from under law" (^{<B18>}Galatians 4:5), etc., is not only stated without any limitation or exception, but in many places is made the prominent feature of the contrast between the earlier and later covenants. It is impossible, therefore, to avoid the conclusion that the formal code, promulgated by Moses, and sealed with the prediction of the blessing and the curse, cannot, *as a law*, be binding on the Christian.

But what, then, becomes of the declaration of our Lord, that he came "not to destroy the law, but to perfect it," and that "not one jot or one tittle of it shall pass away?" what of the fact, consequent upon it, that the law has been revered in all Christian churches, and had an important influence on much Christian legislation? The explanation of the apparent contradiction lies in several considerations.

(1.) The *positive* obligation of the law, as such, has passed away; but every revelation of God's will, and of the righteousness and love which are its elements, imposes a *moral* obligation, by the very fact of its being known, even on those to whom it is not primarily addressed. So far as the law of Moses is such a revelation of the will of God to mankind at large, occupying a certain place in the education of the world as a whole, so far its declarations remain for our guidance, though their coercion and their penalties may be no longer needed. It is in their general principle, of course, that they remain, not in their outward form; and our Lord has taught us, in the Sermon on the Mount, that these principles should be accepted by us in a more extended and spiritual development than they could receive in the time of Moses.

To apply this principle practically there is need of study and discretion, in order to distinguish what is local and temporary from what is universal, and what is mere external form from what is the essence of an ordinance. The moral law undoubtedly must be most permanent in its influence, because it is based on the nature of man generally, although at the same time it is modified by the greater prominence of love in the Christian system. Yet the political law, in the main principles which it lays down as to the sacredness and responsibility of all authorities, and the rights which belong to each individual, and which neither slavery nor even guilt can quite eradicate, has its permanent value. Even the ceremonial law, by its enforcement of the purity and perfection needed in any service offered, and in its disregard of mere costliness on such service, and limitation of it strictly to the prescribed will of God, is still in many respects our best guide. In special cases (as, for example, that of the sabbatic law and the prohibition of marriage within the degrees) the question of its authority must depend on the further inquiry whether the basis of such laws is one common to all human nature, or one peculiar to the Jewish people. This inquiry may occasionally be difficult, especially in the distinction of the essence from the form but by it alone can the original question be thoroughly and satisfactorily answered.

(2.) A plain distinction of this kind seems to lie on the face of the subject, as to the main question at issue. The ceremonial or ritual department of the Mosaic laws, which stood in meats, and drinks, and carnal ordinances (~~scrip~~ Hebrews 9:10); which were of a typical character, and a mere shadow of good things to come, was abolished by the introduction of the Gospel for then they ceased to have any pertinence, the reality having come of

which they were the figures. But the kernel of the law, properly speaking, the moral law, which is a transcript of the divine mind, is eternal and unchangeable in its obligations and sanctions. It *was fulfilled* rather than abrogated by the Gospel. It was confirmed by Christ, and explained in its infinite comprehension and spirituality by him and his apostles throughout the New Testament (^{<4157>}Matthew 5:17, 18; ^{<203>}Luke 10:26-28; ^{<515>}Romans 5:15-8:39). Hence, when, in ^{<514>}Romans 6:14; 7:1-6; ^{<809>}Galatians 2:19; 5:18, the moral law is spoken of as not being the mere rule of life for persons who rely on the grace of God, and who are authorized to expect a salvation not to be purchased by their works, it is so depreciated simply because in that aspect it is regarded as a law according to which rewards and punishments should be adjudged in so rigid and inexorable a manner as to exclude all grace, and all reliance on grace (^{<542>}Romans 4:12-14; ^{<808>}Galatians 2:31; 3:10-12). In short, it is abrogated as a justifying ground of salvation by good works, because none can keep it perfectly to that end. Yet it is not abolished as an external criterion of virtue and piety, and as the final test before the assembled universe. *SEE ANTINOMIANS.*

(3.) Another very important fact in this discussion is that all the moral precepts of the Decalogue have been *re-enacted* by our Lord and his apostles, not only in principle, but in explicit terms (^{<1109>}Mark 10:19; ^{<513>}Romans 13:9). It is true Jesus sums up the spirit of the whole ten commandments in the two of love to God and man (^{<425>}Matthew 22:37-40), and St. Paul (^{<530>}Romans 13:10), as well as St. John (^{<331>}1 John 3:11), substantially do the same. But this is not done with a view to derogate from the precise form of the Mosaic commands, much less to abolish them; but rather with a view to re-enforce them by educing their permanent and universal principle of obligation. Christianity has therefore in all ages justly recognized the paramount and unvarying force of the moral law as promulgated on Mount Sinai.

The only exception to the above remark of the direct renewal of all these commandments by Christ and his apostles is that relating to the Sabbath, which is never quoted among the rest, but is noticeably omitted, and has even been held to be intentionally discarded, by precept, inference, and example, by them. The exception, however, is only apparent, and is due to the peculiar nature of this observance. It really rests upon an earlier than the Mosaic institute, for it dates from the creation, and was therefore appropriately introduced at, Sinai by the allusion, "Remember the Sabbath day." Moreover, the Jews of our Lord's day were in no need of being

reminded of this institution; they were slavishly and superstitiously observant of it. Finally, as the day of its observance was changed by the very first Christians, there would have been an obvious impropriety in their referring to the institution itself *under that name*. That the obligation to occupy in religious rest one day in seven was scrupulously recognized by them the historical fact of the "Lord's day" abundantly attests. *SEE SABBATH.*

(4.) Indeed, the same remark as to primeval origin and validity applies to the whole Decalogue, although this cannot be so clearly proved in a historical argument as with regard to the Sabbath. Yet it has been shown above (§ 1, No. 4) that these moral enactments at least were nothing new; indeed, as all must at once admit, they lie at the very foundation of civil law and social organization; and it could easily be shown that the Hebrews had substantially recognized their force for ages. They were therefore, in fact, but republished on Sinai, under new sanctions, and do not require for their authority the support of any special dispensation.

The argument of the apostle Paul, especially in the epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, invariably is an appeal from the legal bondage of Judaism — not merely, be it observed, the intolerable ceremonial yoke (~~4150~~ Acts 15:10), but still more emphatically the law of "good works," including, of course, especially the moral code (see ~~4121~~ Romans 2:21, 22; 7:7) — to the ante-Mosaic dispensation, the *faith* which Abraham had when yet a Gentile (~~4140~~ Romans 4:10; ~~4117~~ Galatians 3:17, 18), and the primitive priesthood of Jesus (Hebrews 7). Yet this law of faith, so far from ignoring the moral law, is its only effectual support (comp. ~~4112~~ John 6:29); and thus the solution of this question becomes likewise the reconciliation of the doctrine of St. Paul with that of St. James. *SEE JAMES, EPISTLE OF.*

V. Literature. — J.D. Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht* (Frkft. 1770-75), translated by Alexander Smith under the title *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses* (London, 1814); J.H. Hottinger, *Juris Hebraeorum leges* 261, *ad Judaeorum eentem explicatae* (Tiguri. 1655); Selden, *De Jure naturali et gentinum juxta Hebraeorum Disciplinam* (Argentorati. 1665); Reimarus, *De legibus Mosaicis ante Mosem* (Hamb. 1741); D. Hornsyli *De principiis Legume Mosaicarum* (Hafnie, 1792); Staudlin, *Commentationes II de Legum Mosaicarum* (Gottingoe, 1796); Purmann, *De fontibus et aeconomia Legum Mosaicarum* (Francofurti. 1789); T.G. Erdmann, *Leges*

Mosis praestantiores esse legibus Lyncurgi et Solonis (Viteberge, 1788); Pastoret, *Histoire de la Legislation* (Par. 1817), volumes 3 et 4; J. Salvador, *Histoire des Institutions de Mose et du Peale hebreu* (Paris, 1828, 3 volumes); Manson, *De legislatura Mosaica quantum ad hygienem pertinet* (Haag, 1835); Welker, *Die Letzen Grunde von Recht*, page 279 sq.; Staudlin, *Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu*, 1:111 sq.; Holberg, (*Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu*, 2:331 sq.; De Wette, *Sittenlehre*, 2:21 sq. Luther's views are given by C.H.F. Bialloblotzky, *De Legis Mosaice Abrogatione* (Gottingae, 1824). For other, chiefly older, works on the subject in general, see Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, s.v. Gesetz; Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. Moses; Volbeding, *Index Programmatum*, page 37; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* column 237 sq. Among later discussions we may name Duncan, *Character and Design of the Law of Moses* (Edinburgh, 1851); an art. in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, 1:43 sq.; Saalschutz, *D. mos. Recht m. Berücksicht. des spat. Jud.* (Berl. 1846); Piccard, *De legislationis Mosaicae indole morali* (Utr. 1841); Kubel, *Das alttestam. Gesetz und seine Urkunde* (Stuttg. 1867). **SEE MOSES.**

Law, Edmund

D.D., a noted English prelate, was born in 1703, near Cartmel, in Lancashire, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; was elected fellow upon graduation, and in 1737 was, by the university, presented with the rectory of Gravstock, in Cumberland. To this living was added in 1743 the archdeaconry of Carlisle. These positions he held until 1756, when he returned to Cambridge as master of St. Peter's College. Later he was appointed librarian of the university and professor of casuistry. was made archdeacon of Stafford, was presented with a prebend in the church of Lincoln, and in 1767 with one of the rich prebends in the church of Durham, and in 1768, finally, was honored with the bishopric of Carlisle. He died in 1787. While yet a student at Cambridge, Law published two works which show at once the peculiar turn of his own mind, and secured him a place among the best and wisest instructors of their species. The first of these was his translation of archbishop King's *Essay on the Origin of Evil*, with copious notes, in which many of the difficult questions in metaphysical science are considered; the second was his *Inquiry into the Ideas of Space and Time*. In 1743, while a resident of Salkeld, on the pleasant banks of the Eden, a part of the living of Carlisle, which Law was then holding, he began his third work, *Considerations on the Theory of Religion*, etc. (Camb. 1745, 1749, 1755, 1765, 8vo; London, 1774, 8vo,

7th ed., Carlisle, 1784, 8vo; new edit. by bishop George H. Law, of Chester, with Life of bishop Edmund Law by Williams Paley, D.D., Lond. 1820, 8vo), and shortly after, *Reflections on the Life and Character of Christ* (Camb. 1749, 8vo; often reprinted with the *Considerations*), "a work of singular beauty, not to be read by any person without edification and improvement." In 1777 he published an edition of the works of Locke, with a life of the author. Of this English philosopher bishop Law was ever an ardent follower and able interpreter. Indeed, "the peculiar character of Dr. Law's mind appears to have been acquired in a great measure by a devoted study of the writings of that philosopher. From him he seems to have derived that value which he set on freedom of inquiry, in relation to theology as well as to every other subject. He took a prominent part of the great controversy respecting subscription, and acted accordingly himself. The most striking proof of this is afforded in the later edition of his *Considerations*, which contains many important alterations. From Locke also he seems to have derived his notions of the proper mode of studying the sacred Scriptures in order to come at their true sense. He was, in short, an eminent master in that school of rational and liberal divines which flourished in England in the last century, and is adorned by the names of Jortin, Blackburne, Powell, Tyrwhitt, Watson, Paley, and many others." See *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1065.

Law, George Henry

D.D., an English divine, second son of Edmund Law, D.D., was born in 1761. He became bishop of Chester in 1812, and of Bath and Wells in 1824. He died in 1845. Bishop Law published a number of his *Sermons*, for a list of which, and a biographical notice of the author, see the *London Gent. Mag.* 1845, part 2, page 529. — Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.

Law, Isaac

a minister of the United Presbyterian Church, was born September 5, 1815, at Salem, N. York, was educated at Union College (class of 1838), and became shortly after a student of theology at Canonsburg, Pa, and was licensed March 26, 1840. In 1842 he was ordained missionary by the East Salem Presbytery, and labored in this capacity until 1847, when he was ordained pastor at Cambridge. He died January 28, 1861. Law "proved

himself 'a workman that needeth not to be ashamed.' . . . As a minister, in the discharge of every public and private duty of religion he was exact, fixed, old regular." — Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, page 22.

Law, Joseph

a Methodist minister, was born in Washington County, N.Y., October 10, 1798; was converted in 1815, and admitted into the New York Conference in 1830, after eight years' service as a local preacher. Although he had not enjoyed the advantages of early education, he soon, by unwearied perseverance, fitted himself for usefulness in the ministry, and quickly gained distinction among his ministerial brethren and among the people, and he was honored with some of the best appointments in the Conference. He was for many years confined in his labors to the cities of New York and Brooklyn, and New Haven (First and Second Church) and Hartford. In the city of Brooklyn he was instrumental in the building of five large churches. He was superannuated in 1861, and died June 11, 1863. On his dying bed he frequently requested the sorrowing friends around him to sing; and a little before his spirit departed, as they were singing one of his favorite hymns — "On Jordan's stormy banks I stand," etc. — his eye kindled with rapture, and he gave the whispered assurance, "All is well." — Smith, *Sacred Memories*, page 243.

Law, Samuel Warren

a Methodist minister, the son of the Reverend Joseph Law (q.v.), was born at Marlborough, Ulster County, N.Y., November, 1821, was converted in his fourteenth year, and in 1841 entered the itinerancy. He had many excellences, and was an able and successful minister. His death, which occurred April 28, 1857, was such as his life had promised — calm, confiding, and peaceful. — Smith, *Sac. Memories*, page 230.

Law, William

an eminent English nonjuring divine and able religious writer of the mystic school of the last century, was born at Kingscliffe, Northamptonshire, in 1686, and educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of M.A. in 1712, and became fellow in 1713. Shortly after this he began to preach, but was obliged to quit the ministry, and also to give up his fellowship, on the accession of George I in 1714, because of his refusal to take the required oath. He now became tutor to his relative and friend,

Edward Gibbon, father of the historian, who speaks of his piety and talents with unusual warmth. Later, two of his friends, Miss Hester Gibbon, sister of his pupil, and Mrs. Hutcheson, widow of a London barrister, having resolved to retire from the world, and devote themselves to works of charity and a religious life, selected Law for their almoner and instructor. He accepted the position, and the three parties settled in a house at Kingscliffe, where Law died, April 9, 1761. Law's writings are tinged with what is commonly called mysticism, as he became an ardent follower of the noted mystic, Jacob Bohme. His principal work, and, indeed, one of the best books of the kind, is his *Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (1729), a treatise that first awakened the religious sensibilities of Dr. Samuel Johnson, who speaks of it in high terms, and from which the brothers Wesley also derived much advantage. Next to the *Serious Call*, his most important works are his answer to Mandeville's *able of the Bees* (published in 1724, republished. with an introduction by the Reverend F.D. Maurice, in 1844), his letters to the bishop of Bangor, *The Way to Knowledge*, and *The Spirit of Love*. A collective edition of his works was published at London in 9 volumes, 8vo in 1762. It has fallen to the lot of but few English writers to elicit such general comment and commendation as has been the fortune of William Law. The rationalistic Gibbon, the liberal Macaulay, the pious John Wesley, and the morose Sam. Johnson, all were of one mind in their praise of William Law. See Richard Tighe, *Life and Writings Of William Law* (1813, 8vo); *Lond. Gent. Mag.* volume 70; *Theol. Eclectic*, Jan. 1868; *Contemporary Review*, October 1867; *Christiaen Examiner*, 1869, page 157; Chambers, *Cyclopo.* 5; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, 2:1065 sq.

Lawn Sleeves

SEE ROCHETTE.

Lawrence, Abbott

an eminent American merchant and philanthropist, was born at Groton, Massachussetts, December 16, 1792; was elected to Congress in 1839, and in 1843 was appointed commissioner to settle the northeast boundary question with Great Britain; United States minister to England in 1849; and died August 18, 1855. Among his numerous and munificent donations was that of \$100,000 to Harvard University, to flunk the scientific school called

by his name. He also bequeathed the sum of \$50,000 towards erecting model lodging-houses. — Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* page 14.

Lawrence, Amos

a distinguished American philanthropist, was born at Groton Massachusetts, April 22, 1786. He spent a great part of his immense fortune in various charities and donations to public institutions. He died December 31, 1852. His *Life and Correspondence* was published by his son in 1855. — Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* page 1384.

Lawrence, Sir Henry Montgomery

brother of sir Thomas Lawrence, the "Savior of India," is noted for his philanthropy and Christian bearing as a soldier in the British army in India. He was born in Ceylon in 1806, and after entering the army quickly rose to distinction. In the campaigns of the Sutlej he served with distinction, and about 1850 was appointed president of the board of government in the Punjab, and in 1857, when the Indian mutiny broke out, chief commissioner of Lucknow, and virtually governor of Oude. While in command of the handful of heroic men who defended the women and children in the residency of Lucknow, sir Henry was wounded by the explosion of a shell, and died July 4, 1857. He was the founder of the *Lawrence Asylum* for the reception of the children of European soldiers in India. A monument to his memory has been placed in St. Paul's Cathedral. See J.W. Kaye, *Lives of Indian Officers* (London, 1867); *Fraser's Magazine*, December 1857; *North British Review*, May 1860; Butler, *Land of the Veda*, page 319 sq.

Lawrence, St

SEE LAURENTIUS, ST.

Lawrence, St., Regular Canons of

a religious order, said to have been founded by St. Benedict in the 6th century. Its seat was in Dauphine. It was reformed in the 11th century, under the patronage of Odo, count of Savoy. The bishop of Turin in 1065 conferred many gifts upon it, and several popes enriched it with benefactions.

Lawrenson, Laurence

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in 1779, entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1810, and died April 4, 1829. He possessed a strong and generous mind, and deep piety. He was an excellent presiding elder, and preached with distinguished success the word of life. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 2:38.

Lawyer

(**νομικός**, *relating to the law*, as in ^{<500>}Titus 3:9), "in its general sense, denotes one skilled in the law, as in ^{<503>}Titus 3:13. When, therefore, one is called a lawyer, this is understood with reference to the laws of the land in which he lived, or to which he belonged. Hence among the Jews a lawyer was one versed in the laws of Moses, which he taught in the schools and synagogues (^{<100>}Matthew 28:35; ^{<205>}Luke 10:25). The same person who is called 'a lawyer' in these texts is in the parallel passage (^{<112>}Mark 12:28) called 'a scribe' (**γραμματεύς**), whence it has been inferred that the functions of the lawyers and the scribes were identical. The individual may have been *both* a lawyer* and a scribe, but it does not thence follow that all lawyers were scribes. Some suppose, however, that the 'scribes' were the public expounders of the law, while the 'lawyers' were the private expounders and teachers of it. But this is a mere conjecture, and nothing more is really known than that the 'lawyers' were expounders of the law, whether publicly or privately, or both" (Kitto). Hence the term is equivalent to "teacher of the law" (**νομοδιδάσκαλος**, ^{<45>}Acts 5:34). "By the use of the word **νομικός** (in ^{<500>}Titus 3:9) as a simple adjective, it seems more probable that the title 'scribe' was a legal and official designation, but that the name **νομικός** was properly a mere epithet signifying one 'learned in the law' (somewhat like the **οἱ ἐκ νόμου** in ^{<504>}Romans 4:14), and only used as a title in common parlance (comp. the use of it in ^{<503>}Titus 3:13, 'Zenas the lawyer'). This would account for the comparative unfrequency of the word, and the fact that it is always used in connection with 'Pharisees,' never, as the word 'scribe' so often is, in connection with 'chief priests' and 'elders' " (Smith). See Lilienthal, *De νομικοῖς* 'juris utriusque apud Ifebrceos (Hal. 1740). Comp. **SEE SCRIBE**.

Lawyers

In the Roman and Spanish churches, pleaders before the courts were not eligible to the clerical office. The rule, however, was not universal, for the Council of Sardica enacted that a lawyer might be ordained a bishop if he passed through the inferior grades of reader, deacon, and presbyter. On the other hand, clergymen were not allowed to act as lawyers, or to plead either their own cause or even an ecclesiastical one. Bribery and extortion were forbidden to lawyers under severe penalties.

Lay, Benjamin

an eccentric philanthropist, was born at Colchester, in England, in 1681, and settled in Barbadoes in 1710, but became obnoxious to the people by his abolition principles, came to the United States, and settled at Abington, Pennsylvania. He was one of the earliest and most zealous opponents of slavery in the United States, and the coadjutor of Franklin and Benezet. He was originally a member of the Society of Friends, but so decidedly opposed was he to the practice of slaveholding then prevalent among them (e.g. he resolutely refused to partake of any food or wear any clothing which was wholly or in part produced by the labor of slaves) that he was obliged to leave the society in 1717. Before his death (in 1760), however, he had the pleasure of seeing his society take a decided stand against this abominable institution. His opposition to slavery was noticeable on every public occasion where he had any opportunity to manifest his disapprobation. He always expressed himself in strong terms, and sometimes resorted to methods for enforcing his arguments that evinced great eccentricity. Says Janney (3:246): "He came into the yearly meeting with a bladder filled with blood in one hand and a sword in the other. He ran the sword through the bladder, and sprinkled the blood on several Friends, declaring that so the sword would be sheathed in the bowels of the nation if they did not leave off oppressing the negroes." In 1737 he wrote a treatise entitled *All Slave-keepers that keep the Innocent in Bondage Apostates*, which was published by Franklin. See Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, 3:245. (J.H.W.)

Lay Abbots Or Abbacomites

Prior to the period of Charlemagne the court appointed its favorites to the office of abbot: rich abbacies were given to the higher secular clergy *in commendam*, i.e., simply to enjoy its revenues, or else to counts and

military chiefs in reward for their services. These lay abbots occupied the monasteries with their families, or with their friends and retainers, sometimes for months, converting them into banqueting halls. or using them for hunting expeditions or for military exercises. The wealthiest abbacies the kings either retained for themselves or bestowed on their sons and daughters, their wives and mistresses. Charlemagne corrected this abuse: he insisted on strict discipline, and made it a rule that schools should be planted in connection with the various monasteries, and that literary labors should be prosecuted within their walls. *SEE ABBOT.*

Layard, Charles Peter, D.D.,

an English theologian, grandfather of Austin Henry Layard, the celebrated traveler, and himself a descendant of an ancient French family, was born about 1748. He was educated at Westminster School and St. John's College, Cambridge; was then appointed minister of Oxendon Chapel, and librarian to Tenison's Library, Westminster; and in 1800 was promoted to the deanery of Bristol, and to the royal chaplaincy. He died April 11, 1803. Besides an essay on Charity and Duelling (1774 and 1776), he published several of his *Sermons*. Layard was one of the most popular preachers of his day. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1071; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:39.

Lay Baptism

SEE BAPTISM, LAY.

Lay Brothers

a name for a class of Romish illiterate persons who in convents devote themselves to the service of the monks. They wear a different habit from the monks, but never enter the choir, nor are present at the chapters. The only vow they make is of obedience and constancy. They were first employed in the 11th century. In the nunneries there are also *lay sisters*, or *sisters converse*, who hold a similar relation in the service of the nuns. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

Lay Chancellors

This office is found in the Church at an early period. Bishops were often appealed to in civil causes, especially when both parties agreed to refer any dispute to them; and in this case their sentence was valid, but its execution

was left to the civil power. When civil causes began to multiply, the bishops were compelled to devolve some part of this service on others, in whose fidelity and integrity they could confide. Some bishops selected laymen for this purpose, and this, according to Bingham, probably originated the office of lay chancellor.

Lay Elders

SEE ELDER.

Laying on of Hands

SEE HANDS, IMPOSITION OF.

Layish

SEE LION.

Laymann, Paul

a German Jesuit, was born at Innsbruck in 1576, and died of the plague at Constance November 13, 1635. He was distinguished in life for a remarkable knowledge of canonical law, so that he became an oracle in these matters. His *Moraltheologie*, published first at Munich (1625, 4to), passed through many editions (one of the best at Mayence, 1723). His work, *Justa defensio Sanctissimi Romani Pontificis, etc., in causa Monasteriorum et bonorum ecclesiastic. vacantium*, etc. (Diling. 1631), was replied to by the Benedictine Roman Hay, in *Aster inextinctus*, and led to an answer by Laymann, entitled *Censura Astrolog. ecclesiasticae, et Astri inextincti*. After his death appeared his *Jus canonicum* (Diling. 1643) and *Repertorium* (Diling. 1644). See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:383.

Laynez

SEE LAINEZ.

Lay Preaching

In order to form just views of this subject, it is well to consider that primary design of Christianity which contemplates world-wide diffusion. For the accomplishment of that design, preaching is the grand and divinely appointed agency. But the true idea of preaching, as instituted by the Lord

Jesus Christ, is not narrow and exclusive. It is comprehensive and manifold. It demands adaptation to all men and all circumstances. Preaching warns, proclaims, invites, teaches. Although made the special work of certain representative disciples, it is, in fact, enjoined upon the Church as a whole, and upon its members in particular, "as of the ability which God giveth" (^{<4040>}1 Peter 4:10, 11). There is no Christian so humble as to be beneath the application of the following and many kindred precepts: "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (^{<4056>}Matthew 5:16); "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples" (^{<4058>}John 15:8) "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God" (^{<4278>}Luke 12:8). These declarations of the Savior have a special significance when viewed in comparison with various other passages which indicate that an important element of preaching consists in bearing witness of things seen, heard, and experienced in reference to Christ and his kingdom (see ^{<4248>}Luke 24:48; ^{<4402>}Acts 1:21, 2; 2:32; 4:20; 22:15).

When considered in the plain light of Christian history and obligation, the subject of lay preaching becomes relieved from both the difficulties and the technicalities with which it has sometimes been invested by a pretentious ecclesiasticism. None of our Lord's disciples were priests, and yet, from the moment of their call to his discipleship, he proceeded to instruct them in the matter and duty of preaching. At an early period of their instruction they were sent out to preach experimentally (see ^{<4005>}Matthew 10:5-42; ^{<4301>}Luke 9:1-6). Not only were the twelve thus sent forth to preach, but "other seventy also." The number seventy was symbolic both of multiplicity and completeness, and the act of sending out seventy (lay) disciples, "two by two, before his face, into every city and place whither he himself would come," was in itself significant of our Lord's purpose to employ all his true disciples in spreading the truth and establishing his kingdom upon the earth.

In imitation of its divine Lord, the Apostolic Church employed not only the apostles, but its lay members in preaching the Word. "At that time (after the death of Stephen) there was a great persecution against the Church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles." "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the Word" (^{<4408>}Acts 8:1, 4). The same fact is illustrated by the course of Paul, of whom,

immediately after his conversion, and long prior to his ordination, it is recorded, "and straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues" (~~400~~ Acts 9:20). In this act the regenerated persecutor showed that Christian obligations precede ministerial, and that whosoever is born of God not only hath the witness in himself, but is prompted by the Holy Spirit to utter his testimony in the ears and to the hearts of his fellow-men.

The allusions to the modes and accompaniments of worship in ~~516~~ Romans 12:6-8, and 1 Corinthians 14, as well as in several less detailed passages, clearly imply that the apostles were accustomed to encourage the exercise of all species of gifts in the Church, but especially those of exhortation and prophecy. From these scriptural examples, it is just to infer that lay preaching, in the various forms of teaching, evangelizing, and prophesying, had from the first a double object: 1, to do good to all men; and, 2, to develop and prove the gifts of those who from time to time were called from the ranks of the laity to the more public ministry of the Word. Such, doubtless, continued to be the practice of the Church during the early centuries, and it was only by degrees that it became modified under the hierarchical spirit which became developed at a later period. Interesting proof of this is found in connection with the history of Origen of Alexandria. He, as a layman of known learning and skill in exposition, having gone to Caesarea, was invited by the bishops there to preach. True, his preaching on that occasion was made the ground of a charge from Demetrius of Alexandria against the bishops who invited him. But the form which the charge took is in favor of the general right of laymen to exercise their teaching functions in the Church. His alleged offense was not that he, being a layman, taught, but that he taught when bishops were present. The accused bishops, Alexander of Jerusalem and Theoctistos of Caesarea, defended themselves, not with a plea of ignorance or of exceptional circumstances, but by an appeal to the common law of the Church. They knew the custom, even in the form of which Demetrius complained, to prevail at Iconin and other churches of Asia. They believed it to prevail elsewhere, and thought it proper to be recognized at Alexandria also (see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6:19).

In the fourth Council of Carthage we find, with the name of Augustine among the subscriptions to its laws, the rule, "Laicus praesentibus clericis, nisi ipsis jubentibus, docere non audeat" (can. 98). From this we may infer that in the absence of the clergy a layman might teach, and also in their presence at their request. It is noted by Socrates (*Hist. Eccles.* 5:22) as an

exceptional custom of the Alexandrian Church that the office of reader might be filled by even an unbaptized catechumen. The commentary of the pseudo-Ambrose on Ephesians 4th recognizes that at the commencement "omnibus concessum est et evangelizare, et baptizare, et scripturas in ecclesia explanare." In the so-called Apostolic Constitutions, representing the practice of the Church in the 3d and 4th centuries, we find the law that "if any man, though a layman, is skillful in expounding doctrines, and of venerable manners, he may be allowed to teach" (8:32). Similar indications are also found in the Shepherd of Hermas. *SEE LAITY.*

But it is unnecessary to dwell upon the lingering evidences of a custom that was destined to be crushed out by increasing perversions of the original spirit of the Gospel. When ritual ceremonies came to supersede not only the practice, but the very idea of evangelization, it is not surprising that preaching itself became a ceremony, and at length a rare and infrequent ceremony. Not merely laymen, but even presbyters of the Church, were inhibited from preaching, except by special permission of bishops; while many of the bishops, who had arrogated to themselves the exclusive right of preaching, either through ignorance or indolence practically abandoned the custom. "There was a time when the bishops of Rome were not known to preach for five hundred years together! — insomuch that, when Plus Quintus made a sermon, it was looked upon as a prodigy, and, indeed, was a greater rarity than the *Saeculares Ludi* were in old Rome" (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 2, chapter 3, § 4). This general abandonment of the great and peculiar work of the Christian ministry had its counterpart of error in monasticism, which, by an equal perversion, sent myriads of the best men in the Church during successive centuries to waste their lives and religious zeal in fruitless penances in desert places and gloomy cloisters. Had the lives and talents which were thus thrown away in monastic idleness been wisely employed in various forms of evangelization, whether lay or clerical, who can tell how much better the world would have been today! In fact, nearly all the real progress made by Christianity during several of the medieval centuries was by exceptional missionary effort among various aboriginal nations of Europe. The general abandonment of preaching above alluded to formed a pretext for the establishment, in the 13th or 14th centuries, of several preaching orders of monks, specially the Franciscans and Dominicans. These monks, in an ecclesiastical point of view, were laymen, and by profession they were also mendicants. Nevertheless, they acquired great influence and great wealth for their several orders. But such

results did not relieve the evangelical barrenness of the period, nor render less necessary the great Reformation of the 16th century. In the Reformed churches there was a general breaking away from the trammels of ecclesiasticism, together with an energy of purpose which did not scruple to employ any agencies at its command for the dissemination of truth. Still, under the influence of long-prevailing custom, that great element of Christian power to be derived from the personal activity of devoted laymen was to a large degree suffered to lie dormant, and in some cases actually repressed. The first formal and greatly effective organization of lay preaching as a system, and as a recognized branch of Church effort, took place under John Wesley at an early period of that great religious movement known as the revival of the 18th century. See *Stevens, History of Methodism*, 1:173,174.

Not only was great good accomplished by the Wesleyan lay preachers in England, but by persons of this class Methodism was introduced into America. *SEE EMBURY, PHILIP; SEE STRAWBRIDGE, ROBERT; SEE WEBB, CAPT.* In all parts of the world, wherever Methodism has extended its activities, organized lay preaching has been a leading feature of its evangelical movements. *SEE EXHORTERS; SEE LOCAL PREACHERS; SEE READERS.* During the current century other evangelical churches have adopted analogous measures in various forms, and employed lay evangelists under such names as Bible-readers, prayer-leaders, colporteurs, etc. In some churches in which official sanction has not been given to lay preaching — e.g. the national churches of England and Scotland, many earnest Christian laymen, including some noblemen, have gone forth independently, under their personal convictions of duty, preaching wherever they could assemble congregations.

The vast Sunday-school enterprises of modern times are themselves at once a grand result and agency of lay teaching in perfect harmony with the design of the Christian ministry, and powerfully auxiliary to its most effective administration by regularly ordained ministers of the Word. The Christian Associations of the present day are chiefly composed of laymen, and the whole weight of their influence is given to encourage the evangelization of the neglected classes of society by all available agencies, such as lay preaching and its various auxiliary forms of Christian work. By these numerous and multiplying means of Christian teaching and influence the modern Church is approximating the intense activity of the apostolic Church, and at the same time adapting itself to the moral necessities and

special conditions of the present age. In this manner the primary design of Christianity is answered, and great good is accomplished among classes of people that would scarcely be reached by the regular clergy of any of the churches. Nor are the just prerogatives of ordained preachers in any degree prejudiced by the cooperative action of pious and judicious laymen. On the other hand, all ministers of a truly apostolic type cannot fail to see that their own success is greatly promoted by their imitation of the apostle to the Gentiles in enlisting and encouraging as extensively as possible all worthy helpers in Christ. *SEE YOUNG MENS CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS.* (D.P.K.)

Lay Representation

The participation of the laity, by their representatives, in the government of the Church, is one of the fruits of the Protestant Reformation. The ground of their claim to be represented in ecclesiastical government is found, however, in the nature of the Christian priesthood, and the constitution of the Church itself. Christ having satisfied, by his offering of himself, that sense of need which leads men to seek for mediators, there remains to the Christian community the offering of themselves, as a priestly body, in sacrifice and service to their Redeemer. Towards God, all are spiritually equal, and the Church, therefore, as originally constituted, was without an external priestly caste. "As all believers," says Neander, in his *Planting and Training of the Church*, "were conscious of an equal relation to Christ as their Redeemer, and of a common participation of communion with God through him, so on this consciousness an equal relation of believers to one another was grounded, which utterly precluded any relation like that found in other forms of religion subsisting between a priestly caste and a people of whom they were mediators and spiritual guides. The apostles themselves were very far from placing themselves in a relation to believers which bore any relation to a mediating priesthood; in this respect they always placed themselves on a footing of equality."

Yet apostolic churches were by no means without a distinct method of government. Following the example of the synagogue, elders very soon appear in the Christian community; and, the choosing of deacons by the people, with the approval of the apostles, is one of the earliest facts recorded in the New Testament history of the organizing Church. The *charisms*, or gifts of the Spirit, included that of government (1 Corinthians 12); yet this gift was used, not as of exclusive right, but in cooperation

with other gifts for the common welfare. The gift of the Spirit was a designation to the Christian community of the persons fitted for the exercise of this function. The Gentile churches adopted substantially the form of government in use among their Jewish fellow-Christians; "but their government," says Neander, "by no means excluded the participation of the whole Church in the management of their common concerns, as may be inferred from what we have already remarked respecting the nature of the Christian communion, and is also evident from many individual examples in the apostolic Church. The whole Church at Jerusalem took part in the deliberation respecting the relation of the Jewish and Gentile Christians to each other, and the epistle drawn up after these deliberations was likewise in the name of the whole Church. The epistles of the apostle Paul, which treat of various controverted ecclesiastical matters, are addressed to whole churches, and he assumes that the decision belonged to the whole body. Had it been otherwise, he would have addressed his instructions and advice principally, at least, to the overseers of the Church."

In the post-apostolic age, with the growth of the sacerdotal system, the laity gradually disappeared from participation in the government of the Church. As religion became more external, the minister became more a mediating priest, until finally the churches were represented in the provincial and other councils solely by their bishops. *SEE LAY*. The hardening process went on till the fabric of mediaeval Christianity was complete. The laity were held in a state of pupilage, their capability of self-guidance in matters of faith and practice was denied, and the powers of the Church were wholly absorbed by the hierarchy. This continued till the spell of mediaevalism was broken by Luther.

The doctrine of justification by faith alone abolished human mediation between man and God. Luther fully recognized the New-Testament idea of the priesthood of all believers, and proclaimed it with all the force of his eloquence. His language on this subject is very explicit: "Every Christian man is a priest, and every Christian woman a priestess, whether they be young or old, master or servant, mistress or maid-servant, scholar or illiterate. All Christians are, properly speaking, members of the ecclesiastical order, and there is no difference between them except that they hold different offices" (see citations in Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2:24). By the inculcation of this fundamental principle the laity recovered their position in the Church of Christ, and lay representation again became possible. "The restoration," says Litton, in his work on the Church, "in

theory at least, of the laity to their proper place in the Church, was an immediate consequence of the Reformation. By reasserting the two great scriptural doctrines of the universal priesthood of Christians, and of the indwelling of the Spirit, not in a priestly caste, but in the whole body of the faithful, Luther and his contemporaries shook the whole fabric of sacerdotal usurpation to its base, and recovered for the Christian laity the rights of which they had been deprived. The lay members of the body of Christ emerged from the spiritual imbecility which they had been taught to regard as their natural state, and became free, not from the yoke of Christ, but from that of the priest."

The right of the laity to representation has ever since remained one of the points of difference between Protestantism and Romanism. The Council of Trent reaffirmed the mediaeval doctrine in the strongest terms. In its decree on the sacrament of "order" it says, "And if anyone affirm that all Christians indiscriminately are priests of the New Testament, or that they are mutually endowed with an equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which is as an army set in array; as if, contrary to the doctrine of the blessed Paul, all were apostles, all prophets, all evangelists; all pastors, all doctors." In the development of Protestantism the lay power was unfortunately absorbed by the state. The State-Church system has hindered the free growth of the Christian community; but wherever Protestantism has had the opportunity of freely unfolding its principles, lay representation has been recognized as just and fitting.

The form of lay representation varies in the Protestant churches. Among the Presbyterians the laity are represented by ruling elders, who are chosen for life. A presbytery usually consists of all the ministers, and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district; a synod is a similarly constituted body from a larger district, embracing several presbyteries; and a general assembly consists of an equal delegation of ministers and elders from each presbytery, in a certain fixed proportion. In the General Assembly of the State Church of Scotland, the crown is also represented by a lord high commissioner. The Lutheran Church adheres to the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, as taught by Luther: "The ultimate source of power is in the congregation, and synods possess such powers as the congregations delegate to them." In the United States most of the synods are connected with a more general body (the General Synod, the General Council, or the Southern General Synod). Among the Friends, or

Quakers, the legislative power is exercised by a yearly meeting, which embraces the whole society within a certain district. In this the proceedings of the quarterly and monthly meetings are reviewed. There are also "district meetings" for the supervision and care of the ministry, which are composed of ministers and elders. The Congregationalists hold the entire independence of each Christian congregation, and its right to manage its own affairs without interference from other churches. In each church all the brethren have equal rights. Councils may be called by letters addressed to neighboring churches, and, when assembled, are composed of a pastor and a delegate from each church invited. They have, however, no authoritative power. In the United States all the congregational bodies (Baptists, Orthodox Congregationalists, Unitarians, and Universalists) hold general conventions, in which the laity are always represented.

In the Established Church of England the lay power has been jealously retained and guarded by the crown and Parliament, but the Disestablished Church of Ireland has reorganized with lay representation. In the councils of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States the laity have an important place. In each diocese there is held annually a convention composed of the bishop, the clergy, and a lay delegate from each church. This is the governing body of the diocese. The legislative authority of the entire Church resides in a general convention, which meets once in three years, and is composed of the bishops and four clerical and four lay delegates from each diocese, elected by the diocesan convention. The bishops form one house, and the clerical and lay delegates another. The concurrence of both houses is necessary for the passage of any law, and, if asked for, the concurrence of the three orders becomes necessary.

Direct representation of the laity is not established among the Wesleyan Methodists of England. There are, however, preparatory committees appointed by the conference, and composed of ministers and laymen, who revise the connectional business in advance of the annual assembling of the conference. These committees shape the measures adopted subsequently by the conference, their recommendations being usually concurred in. Direct lay representation has been proposed by the Rev. William Arthur and Mr. Percival Bunting, and no doubt the proposal will hereafter be much discussed. The Irish Wesleyans are making steady progress towards lay delegation. The minor Wesleyan bodies in England (the Primitive Methodists, New Connection Methodists, etc.) have adopted lay representation. Lay representation first went into effect in the Methodist

Episcopal Church South in 1869. It also exists in the Methodist Protestant, the Methodist, the African Methodist, and the African Meth. Episcopal Zion churches.

The history of lay representation in the Methodist Episcopal Church has been quite eventful. Originally and for many years the Church was governed by the traveling ministers, through annual conferences and a delegated general conference. Early in this century symptoms of a desire for a change in the form of government appeared. About 1822 the *Wesleyan Repository*, a paper advocating reform (as it was then called), was established in Philadelphia. This was followed by a convention of "reformers" in Baltimore in 1824, who established as their periodical organ in that city *The Mutual Rights*. The objects of attack were the episcopacy and the clerical government of the Church. In 1827 Dr. Thomas E. Bond issued an appeal to Methodists against lay delegation which exerted a great influence in determining the maintenance of the existing system. At the General Conference of 1828 the subject was discussed in the celebrated "Report on Petitions and Memorials," which denied the claims of the petitioners. This report was unanimously adopted. By this time Church proceedings had been instituted against some of the "reform party" in Baltimore, which resulted in expulsion. Others withdrew, and in 1830 the Constitution of the "Methodist Protestant Church" was formed. The controversy was accompanied and followed with great bitterness on both sides. Looked at from this distance of time, it is apparent that both parties numbered among their leaders good and strong men, who unfortunately stood upon extreme and irreconcilable propositions. The "reformers" claimed the admission of the laity to the General Conference on the ground of the right of the people to share in ecclesiastical legislation; this claim was denied by the conservative side chiefly on the ground that the General Conference possessed "no strictly legislative powers."

The discussion rested, after the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church, for more than twenty years. Shortly before the General Conference of 1852, a convention of laymen was held in Philadelphia to take measures for bringing the subject before the Church once more. This convention, however, disclaimed all connection with the principles of the reformers of 1828, and asked for lay representation on the grounds of expediency solely. Dr. Thomas E. Bond, the great antagonist of the "radicals," met the members of the convention in the most friendly spirit, and conceded to them that lay delegation put on the ground of expediency

was an open question. While still denying the claim of right, he went so far as to suggest a plan of lay cooperation in the annual conferences. The petition of the convention to the General Conference was denied. In the General Conference of 1856 an appeal for lay delegation was presented again, but received very little attention. By 1860 such progress had been made that the General Conference, assembled in that year, referred the measure to a popular and ministerial vote, to be taken in 1861 and 1862. Both votes were adverse to lay representation, but the vote, though adverse, developed the fact of a growing favor for this important measure. The *Methodist*, which was established in 1860, devoted itself to the advocacy of it; other papers, especially the *Zion's Herald* and the *North-Western Advocate*, urged it upon the Church. A largely-attended convention of laymen was held in New York in the spring of 1863. At this meeting it was resolved to hold another convention, concurrently with the session of the General Conference at Philadelphia, in 1864. The convention was so held, and presented through a deputation of its delegates a memorial to the General Conference though without immediate result. A third convention was held, concurrently with the session of the General Conference at Chicago, in 1868. At this conference a popular and ministerial vote was ordered for a second time. The vote of the lay members, which was large, showed a majority of two to one for lay delegation, and the necessary three fourths of the ministry were secured. At the session of General Conference which assembled in Brooklyn May 1, 1872, the measure was fully inaugurated, and the lay delegates already elected were admitted to equal powers. The plan thus adopted provides for two lay delegates for every Annual Conference, — with separate votes of the lay and clerical members on any question in case one third of either order demand it.

References. — Neander, *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, book 1, chapter 2, and book 3, chapter 5; Hagenbach, *History of Christian Doctrines*, 2:277-283; Litton, *History of the Church*, book 3, chapter 2; Waterworth, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, page 172 sq.; *Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.* (publ. by Presb. Board, Philadelphia); *Life of Bishop Emory*, chapters 10, 11; *Economy of Methodism Illustrated and Defended*, by Dr. T.E. Bond, Introduction and Appendix; Perrine (Prof. W.H.), *The "Wesleyan Axiom" expounded: a Plea for a Lay Delegation thoroughly Scriptural, Wesleyan,*

and *Democratic* (N.Y. 1872), attacking the plan adopted by the General Conference of 1868. *SEE LAITY.* (G.R.C.)

Layritz, Johann Georg

a German theologian, was born July 15, 1641, at Hof, in Bavaria. In 1667 he entered the university at Jena; in 1677 he was graduated M.A., and became in 1673 professor of Church and profane history at the gymnasium of Baireuth; in 1675, librarian and instructor of the margraves Erdmann, Philipp, and Georg Albrecht; in 1685, deacon of the court Church; in 1688, superintendent at Neustadt. In 1697 he accepted the call of the duke Wilhelm Ernst of Weimar, and he then became superintendent in general, counselor of the consistory, first preacher of the Petri-Paul Church, and director of the gymnasium. He died April 4, 1716. He left numerous productions, e.g. *Diss. de simpliciter et composito* (Jenae, 1668, 4to): — *Auszug der Kirchengeschichte des Neuen Testaments.* (Baireuth und Niremb. 1678, 12mo): — *Synopsis historiae ecclesiasticae Novi Testam.* (ibid. 1678, 12mo): — *Der romische Papst-Thron, d. i. gründliche und ausführliche Beschreibung des papstlichen Ehrund Macht-und Wachsthums* (ibid, 1685, 4to).

Layritz, Paul Eugen

a noted German theologian and Moravian bishop, was born November 13, 1707, at Wunsiedel, in Bavaria; was educated at the university of Leipsic, where, besides theology, he studied philosophy and mathematics. In 1731 he became subrector, and in 1735 rector of the town-school at Neustadt. Through an early acquaintance with the count Zinzendorf, however, he was in 1749 entrusted with the directorship of the Moravian seminary and grammar-school at Marienborn, and henceforth with different commissions on the affairs of the denomination; in 1749 he was sent by them to England; in 1763 to St. Petersburg, to procure permission for the Moravians to settle in the Russian empire; in 1773 to Labrador, to inquire into the progress of their missions there. In 1775, at the Synod of Barby, he was appointed a bishop, and entrusted with the supervision of the Moravian communities throughout Silesia. In 1782 he undertook also the supervision of the communities in upper Lusatia, especially that of Herrnhut. He died August 3, 1788. Besides his practical activity, of great importance to his denomination, and his extended knowledge of the Oriental languages, and of the modern also, his productions as an author

received a hearty welcome by his contemporaries, and are by no means useless to us, a few of which are here mentioned: *Erste Anfangsgründe der Vernunftlehre* (Züllichau, 1743, 8vo; 2d ed., *ibid.*, 1748, 8vo; 3d ed., *ibid.*, 1755, 8vo; 4th ed., *ibid.*, 1764, 8vo; translated into Latin, with the title *Elementa Logicae*, Stuttgart, 1766, 8vo): — *Betrachtungen über eine vollständige und christliche Erziehung der Kinder* (Barby, 1776, 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theolog. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Lazae Or Lazi

(Λαζαί), the name of a large nation inhabiting Colchis, between the rivers Bathys and Phasis. Under the Romans the name *Lazica* was applied to the whole of Colchis. In 520 the prince of the Lazae, Tyathus (Zathus or Tzathus), went to Constantinople to ask the aid of the emperor Justin against the Persians. He was baptized there, with the emperor himself as his sponsor, married a Grecian Christian lady of high rank, and requested the emperor to crown him king, in order that, if he should receive the crown at the hands of the king of Persia, as was formerly the custom, he should not be obliged to take a part in the heathen ceremonies and sacrifices which would follow. Justin recognized him as an independent sovereign, and crowned him himself. Soon after this the whole of the Lazae appear to have become zealous Christians. Procopius calls them "the most zealous of all Christians," and this seems to be to some extent corroborated by the fact that Chosroes, king of Persia, endeavored to remove them into the interior of his empire, as they and their neighbors the Iberians, who were also Christians, opposed an invincible barrier to the extension of Persia. One of their princes, Gubazes, having been assassinated by a Roman general, they entertained for a moment the idea of attaching themselves to Persia, but relinquished it for fear of thereby being in danger of losing their faith: "qui enim varia senserint, versari simul nil possunt, et sane nec timore intercedente nec beneficio duce fides in his stabilis manet, ni forte eadem et rectius senserint" (Agath. 3:12). From the statement in Procopius (*Bell. Goth.* 4:2), that the bishops of the Lazae sent priests to neighboring independent Christian nations, it appears that the Lazae were zealous in propagating their faith. Among the converts they made to Christianity are the Abasians, to whom Justinian I sent priests. See Theophan. *Chronogr.* anno 512; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:250; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:386; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.

Lazarists, Or Priests Of The Mission

Picture for Lazarists

a society of missionary priests in the Roman Catholic Church. It was founded in 1624 by St. Vincent of Paul, who, while living as tutor and chaplain in the house of count Gondi, general of the royal galleys, was induced by the general confession of sick men to give a mission for the people of the dominions of the count, The results of the mission so well pleased the count that he offered a sum of money to any religious congregation which would be willing to give a mission in his dominions. Vincent in vain offered this sum to the members of his own order, the Oratorians, and to the Jesuits. Both were so overwhelmed with business that they could not accept the offer. This refusal, and the wish of the family of count Gondi, as well as of the brother of the count, the archbishop of Paris, induced Vincent in 1624 to establish the society of the missionary priests, who were chiefly to devote themselves to the religious care of the country people and the lower classes. The new institution soon received the royal sanction, and pope Urban VIII made it a special religious society under the name of the Priests of the Mission. In 1632 they received the college of St. Lazarus in Paris, whence their usual name Lazarists is derived. Their more spacious establishment and the increase of their income now enabled the congregation to extend their sphere of action. In addition to the revival of religion among the masses of the people, the chief objects of the Priests of the Mission were the reformation of the clergy by means of conferences, and the establishment of seminaries in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent. Even during the lifetime of St. Vincent nearly all the dioceses of France had been visited by his disciples; and, besides, also Italy, Corsica, Poland, Ireland, Scotland, Algeria, Tunis, and Madagascar received the missionaries, who, on the coast of Africa, vied with the Order of Mercy in the redemption of slaves. To Poland they were called by the queen, Maria Louisa, wife of king John Casimir II. They established a missionary institution, under the direction of Lambert, while the plague and famine were raging, in particular in Warsaw. Lambert and his successor, Ozenne, fell victims to the epidemic, but the mission became very prosperous. The first successors of Vincent as superiors general were Rene Almeras (1672), Edmund Jolly (1697), and Nicolas Pierron; at the time of the first revolution abbé Cayla de la Garde was the head of the congregation. At this time the congregation had reached its zenith; and as

in France no less than forty-nine theological seminaries were conducted by it, it exercised a great influence on the theological views of the French clergy. During the Revolution, the Lazarists, in common with all the other religious denominations, perished; but they were restored as early as 1804, and even received from the public exchequer a support of 15,000 francs. At Paris a hospital belonging to the public domain was given to them for the establishment of a central institution and a novitiate; they also received several houses in the departments beyond the Alps, and the right to accept legacies. But when Napoleon had fallen out with the pope he again abolished the Lazarists by a decree of 1809, suppressed all their houses, cancelled the dotation, and confiscated the property which had been given to them or acquired by them. They were legally restored in 1816: and, though they could not recover their original house, St. Lazare, they acquired another house in the Rue Sevres, whither they also transferred their seminary. They now resumed their former labors, but remained for some time without a regular superior general. After the death of Cayla de la Garde two vicars general had been appointed, but in 1829 the pope appointed a new superior general (Pierre Dewailly), as the convocation of a chapter general presented insurmountable obstacles. The pope, in making this appointment, expressly recognised the fact that the office of superior general had always been filled by a Frenchman. According to the Roman Almanac for 1870, the office of superior general was at that time filled by father Etienne. In 1862 (according to P. Karl vom heil. Aloys, *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Kirche*, Ratisbon, 1862) the Lazarists had 18 houses in France, 27 in Italy, 4 in the British Isles, 6 in Germany, 3 in the Pyrenean peninsula, 10 in Poland (with 143 members). In Asia they had establishments in Asiatic Turkey, in Persia, in Manilla, and in five provinces of China; in Africa, at Alexandria, in Egypt, at Algiers and Mustapha, in Algeria, and at Adowa, in Abyssinia. In America they had 17 establishments. In all, there were in 1862 about 100 establishments, with 2000 members. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:383; Fehr, *Gesch. der Monchsorden*, 2:254. (A. J. S.)