# L

## LAubespine, Gabriel de[[@Headword:LAubespine, Gabriel de]]

             SEE AUBESPINE.

## LAubespine, Sebastien de[[@Headword:LAubespine, Sebastien de]]

             a French prelate and diplomatist, was born in Beauce in 1518. His high ability won for him from Francis I the gift of many ecclesiastical benefices, especially that of the abbey of Basse Fontaine, in the diocese of Troyes. Being sent to Switzerland, he there combated the influence of the emperor, in 1543. At the Diet of Worms, he prepared the work of the honorary ambassador, the count of Grignan, a man more distinguished by his ancestry than by his own merit (1545). Henry II afterwards sent him to negotiate with the people of Strasburg in 1548, and to modify the treaty of alliance with the Helvetian cantons. On his return to France he was charged with an embassy to Flanders, but he soon resumed his former functions in Switzerland, and still negotiated with ability and honor. Then he was appointed ambassador to Philip II of Spain. From 1558 he held the bishopric of Limoges, in which city he already held the rich abbey of St. Martial. After rendering various services to the king, and being driven from the court, he withdrew to Limoges, and devoted all his attention to works of piety connected with the episcopacy. Here he died in 1582, and was interred in his cathedral. For mention of his works see Hoefer, Nouv, Biog. Generale, s.v.

## LBEspine (Lat. Spina, or Spinacen-s), Jean De[[@Headword:LBEspine (Lat. Spina, or Spinacen-s), Jean De]]

             a French theologian, was born about 1506. At first a monk, he renounced Romanism in 1561, and joined the Reformed Church. After the Poissy Colloquy, he was for some time preacher at Fontenay-le-Comte, and afterwards at La Rochelle. In 1564 he published his Discours du Vray Sacrifice et du Vray Sacrificateur. In 1568 he was pastor at St. Quentin, in 1572 at Paris, in 1576 at Saumur, in 1578 at Angers, and died in 1594 at Saumur. Besides his Discours, he published, Traite de l'Apostasie (1583): — Dialogue de la Cene (eod.), etc. See Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Critique, s.v. "Spina;" Vincent, Recherches sur les Commencemens et Premiers Progres de la Reformation en la Ville de La Rochelle (Rotterdam, 1693); Lichtenberger. Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## LHopital[[@Headword:LHopital]]

             SEE HOPITAL.

## La Brune, Francois De[[@Headword:La Brune, Francois De]]

             SEE LA BRUSE, JEAN DE.

## La Brune, Jean De[[@Headword: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).-Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 28:423.

## La Bruyere, Stephen De[[@Headword:La Bruyere, Stephen De]]

             a French prelate, was elected bishop of Nantes some time before 1213, and was involved in a contest with Peter Mauclerc, duke of Brittany, on the privileges of the clergy, which resulted in the bishop's forcible expulsion from his diocese in 1219. He withdrew to Rome, but after some months returned to his functions, and died at Nantes, February 8, 1227. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Chaise Or La Chaize Daix, Francois De[[@Headword:La Chaise Or La Chaize Daix, 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 sapientic Propositiones propugnatce Lugduni in collegqio Soc. Jesu (Lyons, 1662, fol.): — Reponse a quelques dificultes proposees a un theologien, etc. (Lyons, 1666, 4to); etc. See Saint Simon, Memoires; Madame de Maintenon, Correspondance; Voltaire, Siecle de Louis XlV; Benoist, 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); Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 28:483. See Louis XIV.

## La Chapelle, Armand Boisbeleau De[[@Headword:La Chapelle, Armand Boisbeleau 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'ne 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 ungentilhomme Lutherien (Amst. 1736, 2 vols. 12mo); it is also known under the title Lettres sur l'ouvrage de controverse du P. Schafimacher: Memoires de Pologne, etc. (Lond. 1739,12mo): — Description des ceremonies observes 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 Litterare; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale. 28:507. (J. N. P.)

## La Chartres, Pierre de[[@Headword:La Chartres, Pierre de]]

             SEE PETER OF CHARTRES.

## La Chartres, Renoud de[[@Headword:La Chartres, Renoud de]]

             SEE CHARTRES, RENOUD DE.

## La Ferronnays, Jules Basile Ferron De[[@Headword:La Ferronnays, Jules Basile Ferron De]]

             a French prelate, was born at the castle of St. Mards-les-Ancenis, January 2, 1735. After he had finished his studies, he entered into orders, and followed cardinal Bernis to Rome, to the conclave which elected Clement XIV, in 1769. On December 24 of the same year he was nominated bishop of St. Brieuc, and was transferred to the bishopric of Bayonne in 1774, and to the episcopal see of Lisieux, where he remained until 1790. He refused to take the oath to the civil constitution of the clergy, and left France in 1791. He was pursued by the French soldiers, and retired to Bavaria, where he died, May 15, 1799. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Lane, Noel De[[@Headword:La Lane, Noel De]]

             one of the most famous French theologians of the 17th century, was born of a noble family at Paris, and died in 1673. In 1653 he was sent to Rome to defend the cause of Jansenius, and his famous speech., which he delivered before pope Innocent X, is contained in the twenty-second chapter of the sixth volume of the Journal de Saint-Amour. He was a doctor of the Sorbonne, abbot of Notre Dame de Valcroissant, and wrote, De Initio Piae Voluntatis: — La Grace Victorieuse: — Examen de la Conduite des Religieuses de Port-Royal, etc. (1664): — Lettre sur le Livre de iM. Chamillard, etc.: — Defense de la Foi des Religieuses de Port- Royal (1667, 2 parts). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## La Luzerne, Caesar Guillaume De[[@Headword: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 Assemblee 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 Oraisonfuinebre de  Charles Emmanuel III, roi de Sardaigne (1773, 4to and 12mo), and the Oraisonfitnebre 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 AI. de La Luzerne (Lyonls 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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:38. (J. N. P.)

## La Marche, Jean Francois[[@Headword:La Marche, Jean Francois]]

             a French prelate, was born in the diocese of Quimper in 1729, of a noble family from Brittany. After the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle le left the army to embrace the ecclesiastical calling. He was first canon and grand-vicar of Treguier, then abbot of St. Aubin des Bois, and in 1772 was elected bishop of St. Pol de Leon. At the commencement of the Revolution La Marche refused to obey the civil constitution, and, January 8, 1791, fled to London, where he was befriended by Burke and other Englishmen, who charged him with the distribution of means of relief to the French emigrants. This position he held until his death, November 25, 1806. He wrote, Mandements, also a Lettre Pastorale and an Ordonnance, the last in  London, August 20, 1791, to warn his diocesans against schism. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Marck, Evrard de[[@Headword: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 Carsdinaux, volume 3, chapter 5 and 6; Auber, Histoire des Cardinaux. 3:331, Louis Doni d'Attichy, Flores Cardinalium, volume 3; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:52. (J.N.P.)

## La Marck, Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet[[@Headword: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 Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:55-62). (J.H.W.)

## La Pilonniere, Francois De[[@Headword: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 decouvertpar le P. Hardou.in, 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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:527. (J.N.P.)

## La Placette, Jean[[@Headword: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 sma niere 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; Qunerard, La France Litteraire; Sayons, Hist. de la litter. Frannaise a l'etranger, 2:211-220; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:549; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, 2:1767. (J.N.P.)

## La Poype (de Vert-ieu), Jean Claude De[[@Headword:La Poype (de Vert-ieu), Jean Claude De]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1655, of an ancient family of Poitou. He became vicar to M. de St. Georges, archbishop of Lyons, and in 1702 was called to the episcopal see of Beziers. This he refused, and the same year became bishop of Poictiers. In 1716 he was one of the prelates who signed the article demanding of the pope an explanation of the bull Unigenitus. He died February 3, 1732, near Poictiers. He was in part author of an estimable work entitled, Compendiosae Institutiones Theologicae (Poictiers, 1708). The questions are here treated with great precision and method. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Roche (Aymon) Charles Antoine de[[@Headword:La Roche (Aymon) Charles Antoine de]]

             a French prelate, was born at the chateau of Mainsat, February 17, 1697. He was at first canon of St. Peter's at Macon, and vicar-general of Limoges, before being consecrated bishop of Sarepta, August 5, 1725. He occupied successively the sees of Tarbes, 1729, Toulouse, 1740, Narbonne, 1752, before being appointed grand almoner, July 13, 1760, and archbishop of Rheims, December 5, 1762. He was created cardinal in 1771, invested the following year with the abbey of St. Germain-des-Pres, and consecrated Louis XVI on Trinity Sunday, June 11, 1775, having previously baptized him, given to him his first communion, and confirmed his union with Marie Antoinette of Austria. He presided over all the assemblies of the clergy of France from 1760 to 1775, having assisted at all the preceding assemblies from 1735. He was at the time of his death dean of the French episcopacy, having as his coadjutor Alexander Angelique, of Talleyr and Perigord, afterwards archbishop of Paris. He was distinguished for his modest piety and extreme benevolence. He died at Paris, October 27, 1777. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Roche (Aymon), Ralph de[[@Headword:La Roche (Aymon), Ralph de]]

             a French prelate, was born about 1160. He was a Cistercian monk, was at first abbot of Igny, in the diocese of Rheims, and in 1224 was deemed  worthy to succeed St. Bernard at Clairvaux. Having occupied this see for eight years, he was called to govern the Church of Agen, from which Gregory IX transferred him, in 1235, to the metropolitan see of Lyons. Here he died March 5, 1236. His memory is celebrated March 5, and he is called the Happy Ralph de la Roche. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Rochefoucauld (Bayers), Francois Joseph de[[@Headword:La Rochefoucauld (Bayers), Francois Joseph de]]

             a French prelate, was born at Angouleme in 1735. He was bishop of Beauvais in 1772, and by this title peer of France, and was sent by the clergy of the bailiwick of Clermont, in Beauvais, to the States-General, which became the constituent assembly. He there defended the privileges of the clergy. Chabot having denounced him before the legislative assembly as taking part in an anti-revolutionary meeting, he fled with his brother the bishop of Saintes, to the house of their sister, the abbess of Soissons, and then started for Paris. They were arrested at Carmes, and assassinated at Paris, September 2, 1792. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Rochefoucauld (Bayers), Pierre Louis de[[@Headword:La Rochefoucauld (Bayers), Pierre Louis de]]

             a French prelate, brother of Francois Joseph, was born in 1744 in the diocese of Perigueux. In 1770 he was made commendatory prior of Nanteuil by the cardinal La Rochefoucauld, and general agent of the clergy in 1775, which office he held until 1780. In 1782 he was called to the bishopric of Saintes. Being sent to the States-General by the jurisdiction of the seneschal of Saintes, he voted at the national assembly with the minority. Having taken flight with his brother, the bishop of Beauvais, he perished with him at Paris, in the prison of Carmes, September 2, 1792. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Rochefoucauld, Dominique de[[@Headword:La Rochefoucauld, Dominique de]]

             count of St. Elpis, a French prelate, was born in 1713 at St. Elpis, in the diocese of Mende. He was a descendant of a poor and ignorant branch of the house of La Rochefoucauld, which the bishop of Mendes, of Choiseul, discovered in one of his pastoral visits. Frederic Jerome de la Rochefoucauld, archbishop of Bourges, made known this discovery, and took upon himself the direction of the studies of young Dominique.' He placed him at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and having made him grand- vicar, gave him the archbishopric of Alby in 1747. Being a member of the assemblies of the clergy in 1750 and 1755, he zealously defended the rights of the Gallican Church, and was invested with the abbey of Cluny in 1757. Two years later he was transferred to the see of Rouen. and in 1778 made cardinal. Elected deputy of the clergy of the bailiwick of Rouen to the States-General in 1789, he came out strongly against the principles of the revolution. He was one of the signers of the protest of September 12, 1791, against the innovations made by the national assembly in the matter of religion. In the preceding April he had published a pastoral instruction, which the tribunal of Rouen had torn and burned, as being contrary to the laws of the constituent assembly. After August 10, 1792, the cardinal La Rochefoucauld retired to Germany, and died at Munster, September 2, 1800. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Rochefoucauld, Francois de[[@Headword:La Rochefoucauld, Francois de]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris, December 8, 1558, being the son. of Charles I, of La Rochefoucauld, count of Randan, and of Fulvie Pic de la Mirandole, lady of honor to the queen. He was destined by his uncles for the priesthood, and completed his studies at the College of Clermont in a very brilliant manner. At the age of fifteen he was invested by the cardinal of Guise with the rich abbey of Tournus, and scarcely had he reached his twenty-seventh year when Henry III appointed him bishop of Clermont. Being a partisan of the Holy League, he sought to excite Auvergne in  revolt against the king; but the inhabitants of Clermont revolted against their bishop, and he was obliged to take refuge at his chateau in Mozun. In 1589 the bishop of Clermont called an assembly of the states of his province at Billom. La Rochefmocauld addressed them in a vehement discourse, in which he accused the king of being in harmony with the Protestants. This led the Assembly to embrace the side of the sacred union. His father, who governed in the League, was killed in 1590, and Henry IV abjured some years later. The bishop of Clermont yielded, and composed a work upon the spiritual authority of the popes, remaining silent upon the temporal power. Some time after Martha Brossier excited the wonder of the credulous world. Frangois de la Rochefoucauld and his brother, Alexander, travelled from city to city, interrogating the evil spirits concerning the real presence of Jesus Christ in the eucharist. They were at length obliged to desist from this ridiculous business. Francois de la Rochefoucauld yielded, and in 1607 was made cardinal and bishop of Senlis. In 1618 he became grand almoner of France, and in 1619 of the abbey of St. Genevieve. In 1622 he was made president of the Council of the States, and charged with the reformation of the abbeys of France. This reform occupied the rest of his life. He died at the abbey of St. Genevieve, February 14, 1645, and an elegant tomb was erected for him. Full of zeal for literature, La Rochefoucauld enriched various libraries with Greek and Latin MSS. He wrote, Statuts Synodaux pour l'Eglise de Clermont (1599): — Statuts Synodaux pour l'Egilise de Senlis (Paris, 1621): — De l'Autorite de l'Eglise en ce gui Concerne la Foi et la Religion (ibid. 1603, 1604). His Life was written by La Mariniere (Paris, 1647). See Hoefer, Naouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Rochefoucauld, Frederic Jerome de Roye de[[@Headword:La Rochefoucauld, Frederic Jerome de Roye de]]

             a French prelate, was born July 16, 1701. He was son of Fransois de la Rochefoucauld, of Rove, count of Rouncy. He embraced the ecclesiastical calling, and in 1729 was called to the archbishopric of Boutges. Elected coadjutor of the abbey of Cluny in 1738, he became titular abbot in 1747, by the death of the cardinal of Auvergne. The same year he was made cardinal, and the following year was sent to Rome as ambassador. In 1755 the king appointed him to the abbey of St. Vandrille, and charged him at the same time with the schedule of benefices. He presided over the assemblies of the clergy in 1750 and 1755. In 1756 Louis XV made him grand almoner. He died April 29, 1757. He was a prelate of mild and conciliatory character. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Rocheposay, Henri Louis Chasteignier de[[@Headword:La Rocheposay, Henri Louis Chasteignier de]]

             a French prelate, son of Louis Chasteignier, was born September 6, 1577, at Tivoli, Italy. Having been educated by the celebrated Scaliger, he received at Rome the four minor orders in 1596, and the priesthood at Paris at the hand of Henry de Gondi, who was then cardinal of Retz. Coadjutor of Geoffroi de St. Blin, bishop of Poictiers, he succeeded him in 1611, and bore witness three years later to his fidelity to the king byopposing the entrance of the prince of Conde and his troops. The conduct of this prelate appears little in conformity with the canons, and gave rise, on the part of the celebrated Jean du Vergier de Hauranne, abbot of St. Cyran, to a defence, ingenious as well as paradoxical: Apologie pour Messire Henri Chasteignier de la Rocheposay, etc. (1615). La Rocheposay assisted at the assembly which was held at Rouen in 1627, under the presidency of Gaston of France, then at the synod of Bordeaux,  and at the general assembly of the clergy in 1628. He occupied himself zealously in trying to purge Poitou of the doctrines of Calvin. He died July 30,1651, leaving several works, as Recueil des Axiomes de Philosophie et de Thiologie: — Remarques Frangaises sur St. Jattkieu (Poictiers, 1619): Exercitationes in Marcumn, Lucam, Joannem et Acta Apostolorum, etc. (ibid. 1626): — In Genesina (1628): — In Librun Job (eod.): — In Exodum et in Libros Numearorum, Josue et Judicum (1629): — In Prophetas Majores et Minores (1630): — Dissertationes Ethico-Politicc — See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## La Salle, Jean Baptist De[[@Headword: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 civilite 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. die 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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 29:724. (J.N.P.)

## La Saussaye, Daniel Chantepie De[[@Headword:La Saussaye, Daniel Chantepie De]]

             a Walloon preacher and Dutch publicist, was born at La Have, December 10, 1818. He studied at Leyden, was preacher at the Walloon Church in Leeuwarde (1842-48), and at Leyden (1848-62). Here he edited a periodical entitled Ernst en Vrede (1853-58), in which he defended the ethical principle and supernatural in Christianity against the so-called "modern theology," inaugurated by J.H. Scholten. In 1862 he accepted a call to Rotterdam, where he edited another journal. In 1872 he was called to the chair of dogmatics and Biblical theology, which was formerly occupied by P. Hofstede de Groot, and died shortly afterwards, February 13, 1874, doctor of theology, a distinction conferred on him by the Bonn University in 1858. He published, L'Existence Permanente du People Juif Expliquee par son Avenir (Leyden, 1849): — Temoignages contre l'Esprit  du Siecle (Amsterdam and Leyden, 1852): — Reflexions sur l'Essence et les Besoins de l'Eglise (Leyden, 1855): — Appreciation de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Reformee, de J.H. Scholten (Utrecht, 1859): — Etudes Bibligues (1859-61): — La Crise Religieuse en Hollande (Leyden, 1860): — Sermons (Leyden and Rotterdam, 1860-66, 5 volumes): — Leven en Rigting, i.e., Life and Tendency (Rotterdam, 1865): — Le Surnaturel dans l'Histoire (Groningen, 1874). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laadah[[@Headword:Laadah]]

             (Heb. Ladah', לִעְדָּה, 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 (1Ch 4:21). B.C. cir. 1873.

## Laadan[[@Headword:Laadan]]

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

1. (In 1Ch 23:7-9, Sept. Λεαδάν v. r. Ε᾿δάν, Vulg. Leedan; in 1Ch 26:21, Λεδάν v. r. Λαδάν, Λααδάν, Ledan.) The first named of the two sons of Gershom, the son of Levi; elsewhere called LIBNI (1Ch 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.

## Laan, Peter[[@Headword:Laan, Peter]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born December 24, 1696. He studied at Utrecht and Leyden, and acted as preacher at different places from 1722 to 1739. In the latter year he was called as professor of theology and university preacher to Franeker, and died April 4, 1743. He published, Disp. ad Inscript. Psalsmi 31; — Ad Job 5:23 : — De Tolerantia Civili ad Socinianos non Extendenda, Gesnuinis Mennonitis Minimze Iniqua. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laanah[[@Headword:Laanah]]

             SEE WORMWOOOD.

## Labadie, Jean De[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Labadists]]

             SEE LABADIE.

## Labagh, Peter, D.D.[[@Headword: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.)

## Laban[[@Headword:Laban]]

             (Hebrew Laban', לָבָן, white, as frequently; comp. Simonis, Onon. V. T. p. 100; Septuag. Λάβαν, but Λοβόν in Deu 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 (Gen 28:5), and kinsman of Abraham (Gen 24:15; Gen 24:29), being a grandson (בֵּן, not simply "son," as usual; see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 216) of Nahor (Gen 29:5). During the lifetime of his father, and by his own consent, his sister Rebekah was married to Isaac in Palestine (Gen 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; 1Sa 19:13; Hos 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 נַחִשְׁתַּי, in 30:27; A. V., 'I have learnt by experience,' but properly ' I have divined' or 'learnt by an augury' (comp. 14, 15; 1Ki 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 (Num 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.; ltauarra 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.).

## Labana[[@Headword:Labana]]

             (Λαβανά), one of the chief Temple-servants whose " sons" returned from the captivity (1Es 5:28); evidently the LEBANA SEE LEBANA (q.v.) of the Hebrew list (Neh 7:48).

## Labaree, Benjamin, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Labaree, Benjamin, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Congregational minister and distinguished educator, was born in Charlestown, N.H., June 3, 1801. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1828, and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1831; was ordained at Bradford, Massachusetts, September 26 of the same year, and for a time was a home missionary in Tennessee. From 1832 to 1837 he was professor of ancient languages, and president of Jackson College; for the next three years secretary of the Central American Educational Society. He was called to the presidency of Middlebury College, Vermont, in 1840, and remained in office twenty-six years. From 1867 to 1869 he resided in Hyde Park, Mass., preaching for a part of this time at South Weymouth. His residence thereafter was in West Roxbury (1870-75), Charlestown, N.H., and Walpole from 1880 till his death, Nov. 15,1883. See Boston Advertiser, November 21, 1883; Trien., Catalogue of Andover Theol. Sem. 1870, page 94; N.Y. Observer, November 22, 1883; Cong. Year-book, 1884, page 27. (J.C.S.)

## Labarum[[@Headword:Labarum]]

             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, λαίφη, 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 τιμυώτερον. 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 Constantin. 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 ecclesicsticuem. 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[[@Headword: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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 28:333.

## Labbe, Martin[[@Headword:Labbe, Martin]]

             a French prelate and missionary, was born at Le Luc, near Caen. He entered the Society of Jesus, and requested to be sent to the foreign missions. He went to Cochin China in 1678, and returned in 1697. Innocent XII made him bishop of Tilopolis. After a short sojourn in Europe the abbot returned to Cochin China, where he lived fifteen years, in the midst of fatigues and perils. He died in 1723, leaving a letter to pope  Clement XI, on the worship of the Chinese; also a memoir on the persecutions. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Labbe, Phillippe[[@Headword: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 editionemr exacta, quce 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 prcecipuefulcientibus, 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 deplusieurs mots Francois, contre les abus de la secte des Hellenistes du Port-Royal (Paris, 1661, 12mo):-Bibliotheca bibliothecarum (3d edit. Roth. 1678, 8vo): — De Byzantince 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[[@Headword:Labben]]

             SEE MUTH-LABBEN.

## Laberenz, Gottfried[[@Headword:Laberenz, Gottfried]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Fulda, May 6,1802. He received holy orders in 1825, and was appointed at the same time professor of Oriental languages and of Old Test. exegesis. In 1829 he was cathedral dean, in 1836 doctor of theology, and died March 13, 1875, at his native place. He wrote, De Vera Jonce Interpretatione (Fulda, 1836): — Katholische Homiletik (Ratisbon, 1844): — Grammatik. der Hebr. Sprache (Paderborn, 1867). (B.P.)

## Labis[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Labor]]

             (properly עָבִד, abad', to work, Gr. ἐργάζομαι; also עָמִל, amal', to toil, Gr. κοπιάω; and other terms). From Genesis ii, 15 (where the same word עָבִדis 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. Ecc 5:12). In Gen 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 Gen 35:16). But labor is by no means exclusively an evil, nor is its prosecution a dishonor (comp. Psalm 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 (Exo 20:9; Deu 5:13); and the Bible entertains so high a respect for the diligent and skilful laborer, that we are told in Pro 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" (Pro 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 (2Ki 24:14-16; Jer 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 Bathrc, 110, a). SEE HANDICRAFT.

The Hebrews, like other primitive nations, appear to have been herdsmen before they were agriculturists (Gen 4:2; Gen 4:12; Gen 4:17; Gen 4:22); and the practice of keeping flocks and herds continued in high esteem and constant observance as a regular employment and a social condition (Jdg 1:16; Jdg 4:11; Amo 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 (Gen 26:12; Gen 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 (Jdg 6:11; 1Sa 11:5; 1Ki 19:19). No small care was bestowed on the culture of the vine, which grew  luxuriously on the hills of Palestine (Isa 5:2; Isa 5:5; Mat 21:33; Num 13:24). The vintage was a season of jubilee (Jdg 9:27; Jer 25:30; Isa 16:10). The hills of Palestine were also adorned with wellcultured olive-gardens, which produced fruit useful for food, for anointing, and for medicine (Isa 17:6; Isa 24:13; Deu 24:20; Eze 27:17; 1Ki 4:25; Hos 14:6-7). Attention was also given to the culture of the fig-tree (2Ki 21:7; 1Ch 27:28), as well as of the date-palm (Lev 23:40; Jdg 1:16; Jdg 4:5; Jdg 20:33; Deu 34:3), and also of balsam (Gen 43:11; Eze 27:17; Eze 37:25; Jer 8:22). SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Laborantes[[@Headword:Laborantes]]

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

## Laborde, Vivien[[@Headword: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.

## Labouchere, Pierre Antoine[[@Headword:Labouchere, Pierre Antoine]]

             a noted French Protestant painter, was born at Nantes, November 26, 1807, and studied in Germany and in England. He had been placed at first in a commercial house at Antwerp, and made, in 1827, a journey to the United States, as secretary of M. Bates, and in 1832 went to China as supercargo of a vessel of Nantes, which belonged to his elder brother. Painting, however, seems to have been his predominating passion, and a visit to Antwerp decided his vocation, and he accordingly became a pupil of Paul Delaroche. He died at Paris in 1873. Labouchere chiefly painted historical subjects, especially those of the Reformation in Germany. He left a set of subjects drawn from the life of Luther, which have been engraved, and are accompanied with a text by Merle d'Aubigne. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale. s.v.

## Labouderie, Jean[[@Headword: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 addressees 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 Hoefer, Noun. Biog. Generale, 28:395.

## Laboureur, Le Jean[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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. La-rence, 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 wit h 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, Cyclopcedia of Missions; Grundeman, Missionsatlas ; Romer, Geschichte der Labrador-Mission (Gnadau, 1871). (A. J. S.)

## Labrousse, Clotilde Suzan Courcelles De[[@Headword: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 concermant 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.-Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 28:418.

## Labyrinth[[@Headword:Labyrinth]]

             At St. Bertin's, in St. Omer, there was one of those curious floors, representing the Temple of Jerusalem, with stations for pilgrims, and actually visited and traversed by them as a compromise for not going to the  Holy Land in fulfilment of a vow. The labyrinth at Sens was destroyed in 1768; those of Arras and Amiens shared the same fate in 1825. There is a round labyrinth in the centre of the nave of Chartres, inlaid with lead; another, of encaustic tiles, in the chapter-house of Bayeux; and a third, of octagonal shape, in the nave of St. Quentin.

## Lacarry, Giles[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lace]]

             (פָּתַיל, peathil', from being twisted), the blue cord with which the high- priest's breastplate was attached to the ephod (Exo 28:28; Exo 28:37; Exo 39:21; Exo 39:31; rendered "riband" Num 15:38); spoken of gold ' wire" (Exo 39:3), the chain for attaching a cover to its vessel (" bound," Num 19:15); a strong "thread" of tow (Jdg 16:9), or measuring-" lisne" of flax (Eze 40:3); also of the string by which the signet-ring was suspended in the bosom (" bracelet," Gen 38:18); finally (κλῶσμα, a spun thread, like pathil above, for which it stands in Num 15:36), a cord (Sir 6:30).

## Lacedaemonian[[@Headword:Lacedaemonian]]

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

## Lacey, William B., D.D.[[@Headword: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 ministration 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 Amn. Ch. Rev. 1867, p. 647.

## Lachasse), Jean De[[@Headword:Lachasse), Jean De]]

             a French savant of the 16th century, was a native of Monistrol (Velay), and one of the main propagators of the Reformation in France. He organized in 1556 a Church at Meaux, but was compelled to leave it, and continued his work at Montpellier; afterwards he took refuge in Geneva and at Metz in 1576. He is the author of Histoire oabe inoab des Grands et A Merveilleux Jugements et Punitions de Dieu (Geneva, 1595):-Histoire des Albigeois, etc. (ibid. eod.). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses,  s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. fit. i, 733; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (B. P.)

## Lachish[[@Headword:Lachish]]

             (Heb. Lakish', לָכַרשׁ, 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 Λαχής; in Mic. Λαχείς; Josephus Λαχίς, Ant. 8:10, 1; also Λάχεισα, Ant. 9:9, 3), a Caananitish royal city (Jos 12:11) in the southern part of Palestine, whose king Japhia joined the Amoritish confederacy against Joshua (Jos 10:3; Jos 10:5); but he was taken (Jos 15:25), and his city destroyed by the victorious Israelites, in spite of the re-enforcement of the king of Gezer (Jos 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 (Jos 15:39). It is mentioned in connection with Adoraim and Azekah as having been rebuilt, or rather fortified, by Rehoboam against the  Philistines (2Ch 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, 2Ki 14:19; 2Ch 25:27), having for a time braved the assaults of the Assyrian army under Sennacherib on his way to Egypt (2Ki 18:14; 2Ki 18:17; 2Ki 19:8; 2Ch 32:9; Isa 36:2; Isa 37:8); but was at length taken by Nebuchadnezzar, at the downfall of the kingdom of Judah (Jer 34:7). It was reoccupied after the exile (Neh 11:30). The affright occasioned by these sudden attacks was predicted by the prophet Micah (Mic 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," 2Ch 32:1; " departed from Lachish," 2Ki 19:8; and especially Jer 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 (lHerodotus, i, 481, note 6). At all events, it would seem that, after the submrission of Hezekiah, Sennacherib in some way reduced Lachish, and marched in force against the Egyptians (Joseph. Ant. 10:1, 1; comp. Isa 20:1-4). Rawlinson maintains (Heroudotus, 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" (2Ch 32:9), and here " the great king" himself remained, while his officers only were dispatched to Jerusalem (2Ch 32:9; 2Ki 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.

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 Jos 10:31-36) to Eglon (Raumer, Beitrage 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 Hesy, where ancient remains have been found (Pal. Explor. Quarterly Statement, 1890, p. 159 sq.).

## Lachish (2)[[@Headword:Lachish (2)]]

             On the identification of this place, Lieut. Conder remarks (Tent Work, 2:168):

"We visited Um Lags, the site proposed by Dr. Robinson, and could not but conclude that no ancient or important city ever stood there, nor has the name any radical similarity to that of Lachish. [This is surely a mistake, for the initial L is at least the same, and no more can be said in favor of his own proposal.] Much nearer, indeed, would be the title el-Hesy, applying to a large ancient site with springs, near the foot of the hills, about in the proper position for Lachish. The modern site means a water-pit, and, if it is a corruption of Lachish, it would afford a second instance of changse which is well known to have taken place in the case of Michmash- the k being changed to a guttural h. The distance from Beit Jibrin to Tell el-Hesy is not much greater than that given in the Onomasticon for Lachish, while the proximity of Eglon ('Ajlan), and the position south of Belt Jibrin, on a principal road, near the hills, and by one of the only springs in the plain, all seem to be points strongly confirming this view."

Tell el-Hesy is laid down on the Ordnance Map ten and a half miles south- west of Beit Jibrin, and is described in the accompanying Memoirs (3:290) as "a truncated cone, with a broad, flat top, and traces of ruins round its- base. There are several springs in the neighborhood, but the water is bad." This site was known in the Middle Ages as Alkassi (Boheddin, Vita Salad. page 228). But Tristram (Bible Places, page 36) and Trelawmney  Saunders (Map of the O.T.) still adhere to UmLakhis, which lies three miles north-west of Tell el-Hesy, and twelve and a half miles west by south from Belt Jibrin. Its remains are thus described by Gudrin (Judaea, 2:299):

"These ruins cover a space of about a kilometre and a half in circumference. They are situated partly on a hillock, and partly in the midst of fields, either cultivated or bristling with thistles and brambles. A multitude of excavations show that stones, the fragments of ancient buildings, have been taken from the place. There remains, however, a good quantity of materials scattered on the ground. In one of these holes I found a Corinthial capital of grayish white marble, waiting for some one to carry it off. Fifteen ancient silos continue to serve the Arabs of the neighborhood."

## Lachmann, Karl[[@Headword: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 citv 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 ta 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.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogq. Generale, 28:532; Pierer, Universal Lexikon, 9:954. SEE CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

## Lachrymatory[[@Headword:Lachrymatory]]

             a small glass or earthen vessel, formerly supposed to have been used among the ancient heathens to receive the tears of surviving relatives or friends, wept for the dead, but now shown to have been merely pots of ointment or perfume, which, with their contents, were buried with the urns and ashes of the deceased. SEE TEARS.

## Lacombe, Dominique[[@Headword: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.

## Lacombe, Pere[[@Headword: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.)

## Lacordaire, Jean Baptiste Henri[[@Headword: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'incdiference, 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. Hers 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 retractation of course drew upon him not only estrangement from his master, whose intellectual philosophy he had never really adopted, and whose retractation 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, lhe 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, a.nd 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 i' 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 Doniniquce, 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 desfreres 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, Corrnespondence inedite et bioracphie (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 (De Chevrieres), Jean Baptiste de[[@Headword:Lacroix (De Chevrieres), Jean Baptiste de]]

             a French prelate, belonged at first to the order of the Knights of Malta, was afterwards abbot of Gimont, in the diocese of Auch, and embarked in 1683 for Canada, to preach to the Indians. He was consecrated bishop of Quebec while on a visit to Paris in 1688. He returned soon afterwards to Canada, where he built a hospital, in which he died, December 26, 1727. He left Etat Present de l'glise et de la Colonie dans la Nouvelle-France (Paris, 1688). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lacroix, Claudius[[@Headword: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.

## Lacroix, John Power, Ph.D., D.D[[@Headword:Lacroix, John Power, Ph.D., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Haverhill, Ohio, February 13, 1833. In his boyhood, while at farm work, he displayed an insatiable thirst for book knowledge. He graduated at the Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, in 1857; soon after went to New Orleans, where he spent two years in teaching; and then, having cleared himself of college debt, returned north, and in the fall of 1859 entered the Ohio Conference. His fields of  labor were Tarlton Circuit, Spencer Chapel, Ironton, and Piketon. He spent sixteen months of close application in the universities of Germany in 1865 and 1866, and in the fall of the latter year was elected to the chair of modern languages and history in the Ohio Wesleyan University, which office he held till his death, September 22, 1879. His translations of De Pressensd's Religion and the Reign of Terror; or, The Church During the French Revolution, Naivelle's Problem of Evil, Wultke's Christian Ethics, together with his own Life of Rudolph Stier, will perpetuate his name in scholarly circles. Dr. Lacroix also contributed many able articles to this cyclopedia, as well as writing a valuable Manual on Ethics for the Chautauqua Literary Circle, and, in connection with a fellow-professor, an Introductory Book of Latin. He was the special friend of young men, and hundreds of students who came under his influence at the university, now scattered all over the land and in other nations, bear cheerful testimony to his great personal worth. As a thinker and writer he was bold, independent, and progressive, fervent in his attachment to truth, ardent in his devotion to the Church, broad in charity, and incapable of bigotry or prejudice. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1879, page 47.

## Lacroze, Mathurin Veyssiere De[[@Headword:Lacroze, Mathurin Veyssiere 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[[@Headword: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 lie 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, Colossians 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 vet 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, ill 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 ill 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 penme 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 anl argumentum ad honminem,, 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 witth 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 manl; 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 wilfuhiess 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 Ie 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 Perseculions, 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 Il1. 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, le 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 Lacltantius (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.

## Lacticinia[[@Headword:Lacticinia]]

             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 jejunio quadragesimali interdicunter universaliter etiam ova et lacticinia, 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, Sacrsed 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[[@Headword: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.

## Lacunus[[@Headword:Lacunus]]

             (rather LACCUNUS, Λακκοῦνος, Vulg. Caleus), one "of the sons of Addi," who had married a foreign wife after the exile (1Es 9:31); doubtless the CHELAL SEE CHELAL (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezr 10:30).

## Lacy, John[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lad]]

             (נִעִר, na'ar, often rendered "young man," etc.; N.T. παιδάριον, a little child, the last occurring only Joh 6:9, and " child" in Mat 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 (Gen 24:14; Gen 24:16; Gen 24:28; Gen 24:55; Gen 34:3; Gen 34:12; Deu 22:15 sq.), for which the fem. noun (נִעֲרָה, naarah') is usually employed, properly denotes a boy, being prob. a primitive word. It is spoken of an infant just born (Exodus ii, 6; Jdg 13:5; Jdg 13:7; 1Sa 4:21), of a boy not yet full grown (Gen 21:16 sq.; Gen 22:12; Isa 7:16; Isa 8:4), and of a youth nearly twenty years old (Gen 34:19; Gen 41:12; 1Ki 3:7; 2Sa 18:5; 2Sa 18:29). SEE CHILD, etc.

## Lada (or Lado)[[@Headword:Lada (or Lado)]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was the goddess of beauty and love, worshipped in Kiev. Lel (love), Did (return love), and Polol (marriage) were her sons. There are still traces of an idol worship in the yearly celebrated festival of Lada and Did, which falls on the Thursday before Whitsuntide.

## Ladan[[@Headword:Ladan]]

             (Γαδάν v. r. Λαλάν, and even Α᾿σάν, Vulg. Dalarus), one of the Temple servants whose descendants had lost their pedigree after the exile (1Es 5:37); evidently the DELAIAH SEE DELAIAH (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezr 2:60).

## Ladd, Francis Dudley[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Ladder]]

             (סֻלָּם, sullatm', a staircase, perh. from סָלִל, to raise up; Sept. κλῖμαξ; the Arab. sullamnun has the same signification) occurs only once, in the account of Jacob's vision in his dream at Bethel (Gen 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 0. 17-.) Scalingladders for war (κλίμακες) are mentioned in the Apocrypha (1Ma 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[[@Headword:Ladder Of Tyrus, The]]

             (ἡ κλῖμαξ Τύρου; Vulg. a terminis Tyri, possibly reading κλίμα), one of the extremities (the northern) of the district over which Simon Maccabneus was made captain (στρατηγός) by Antiochus VI (or Theos) very shortly after his coming to the throne; the other being "the borders of Egypt" (1Ma 11:59). The Ladder of Tyre (צור סולמא של, see Reland, Palest. p. 343), or of the Tyrians (ἡ κλῖμαξ τῶν Τυρίων), 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  Tyriorum, " 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 Pheenicia" (comp. p. 266).

## Ladislas[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 bv 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 poesession.

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, lie advanced in triumph to Romn . Ladislaus was now confronted by all Italian pope and a French army under Louis. 'The sentence of excommunication wlas pronounced against him, but, reckless of spiritual terrors, he marshalled his forces and prepared for the conflict. 'he 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 fur 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 gonfalionere 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 Rimili, 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 ol allies, -Ie exculpated himself to Louis, sand again denounced the king of Naples. The latter responded by hostile demonstrations. The council which the pope had meanwhile convoked at Rome was considered bv 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 Perusia, 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 le devotes over 200 pages of his second volume almost exclusively to Ladislaus. (E.H. G.)

## Ladvocat, Billiard Nicolas[[@Headword:Ladvocat, Billiard Nicolas]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris in 1620. He entered the ministry, was received in the Sorbonne, December 24, 1652, and became canon of Notre Dame and vicar-general of the coadjutor of Paris, Albert de Conti, cardinal of Retz, whom he assisted for several years in his political intrigues, in the administration of his diocese, and whom he accompanied to Rome in 1675. In 1677 he obtained the episcopal see of Boulogne-sur-Mier. He governed his diocese wisely, where he also founded a seminary and some establishments of instruction and of charity. He died April 14, 1681, leaving Vindicice Partheniae (Paris, 1679), which maintains that the Virgin Mary was taken up into heaven bodily. He also composed the first rules which were observed in the Hotel Dieu de Paris. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ladvocat, Jean Baptist[[@Headword: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 laquellle il examine si les Textes originaux de l'Ecriture sont corrumpus 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: גְּבֶרֶת (gebe'reth, fern. of a גְּביר, a nighty man), applied to Babylon as the mistress of nations (Isa 47:5; Isa 47:7; elsewhere a "mistress," as opposed to a maid-servant, Gen 16:4; Gen 16:8-9; 2Ki 5:3; Pro 30:23; Psa 123:2, Isa 24:2); שָׂרָה(saruta', fem. of שִׂר, noble; the same as the name given to Sarai), a noble female (Jdg 5:29; Est 1:18; elsewhere a " princess," spec. the king's wives of noble birth, 1Ki 11:13, different from concubines, comp. Son 6:8; "queen," Isa 49:23; " princess" among provinces, Lam 1:1); κυρία (fem. of κύριος, lord or master), mnistress, occurs only as an epithet of a Christian female (2Jn 1:1; 2Jn 1:5), either as an honorable title of regard, or as a fem. proper name CYRI SEE CYRI .  (q.v.).

## Lady Chapel[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lady Day]]

             SEE ANNUNCIATION, FEAST OF.

## Lady Fast[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lady Psalter]]

             SEE ROSARY.

## Lael[[@Headword:Lael]]

             (Heb. Ladl', לָאֵל, fo r or of God, i.e. created by him; otherwise to God, i.e. devoted to him; occurs also in 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 (Num 3:24). B.C. ante 1657.

## Laelius, Laurentius[[@Headword:Laelius, Laurentius]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born in Franconia, April 15, 1572. He studied at Jena and Wittenberg, was in 1599 deacon, and attended the colloquy at Ratisbon in 1601; in 1602 he was rector at Heilbronn, in 1605 first preacher at Onolzbach, and died July 26, 1634. He wrote, Criterium Fidei: Index Haeresium Conitroversiarum et Schismatum, etc.: Exegesis Articuli de Persona et Officio Christi Bellarnino Opposita.. See Freher, Theatrum Eruditorum; Witte, Diarium Biogaphicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laetare Sunday[[@Headword: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 Isa 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.

## Laetus, Georg[[@Headword:Laetus, Georg]]

             a preacher at Lublin, Poland, who died March 27, 1649, is the author of, Peregrinatio Pauli Romana: — Comment. Pract. in Pauli Conversionem: — De Ratione Concionnandi ad Methoduns Anglicanam Conformata. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:569; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laevinus, Torrentinus[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 mediattore (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 Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genrale, 28:686.

## Lafitau, Joseph Francois[[@Headword: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 Americans compar ees aux mroeurs des premiers temps (Paris, 1723, 2 vols. 4to). He wrote also Histoire des decouvertes et des conqutes des Portugais dans le nouveau neolde.

## Lafitau, Pierre Francois[[@Headword:Lafitau, Pierre Francois]]

             a French prelate, was born at Bordeaux in 1685. He studied among the Jesuits, and for some time was very active in the affairs of Jansenism. He was sent to Rome as an ambassador, was consecrated there bishop of Sisteron in 1719, and took possession of his see the following year. He is said to have been immoral early in life, but afterwards a pattern of piety. Lafitau died at Sisteron, April 3, 1764, leaving several works on practical religion, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lafo al-jemin[[@Headword:Lafo al-jemin]]

             (the thief on the right-hand), a festival observed by the Syrian Christians in commemoration of the penitent thief. It occurs on the octave of Easter.

## Laforet, Nicolas Joseph[[@Headword:Laforet, Nicolas Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born in 1823 at Graide, Namur (Belgium). In 1848 he was called as professor to Louvain, and died January 26, 1872. He wrote, Histoire de la Theologie Dogmatique: — Vie et Travaux d'Arnold Tits: — Les Dogmnes Catholiques: — La Papaute et la Civilisation: — Histoire de la Philosophie. (B.P.)

## Laga[[@Headword:Laga]]

             in Norse mythology, was the goddess of the refreshing springs and waters. She lives in Soquabekr, a silver palace, by which the waters of the earth flow. Odin visits her daily to bathe there.

## Lagarto, Pedro[[@Headword:Lagarto, Pedro]]

             a Portuguese prelate and theologian, was born at Setubal about 1524. In 1540 he joined the monks of Arrabida, who lived under the rule of St. Francis; afterwards studied theology at Salamanca, and was elected in 1576 provincial of Arrabida. He died July 28, 1590, leaving Summa Utilis Omnium Notabilium. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lagomarsini, Geronimo[[@Headword:Lagomarsini, Geronimo]]

             a celebrated Italian Humanist, was born Septrrmber 30, 1698, at Porto- Santo-Maria (Spain). In 1708 he went to Italy, and commenced his studies in the College of the Jesuits at Prato, in Tuscany. In 1721, he began to teach rhetoric at the College of Arezzo. Four years afterwards he went to Rome to complete his theological studies, after which he returned to his duties at Arezzo. In 1732 he was appointed to the chair of rhetoric at Florence, and in 1751 to that of Greek in the Collegium Gregorianum at Rome, which position he occupied until his death, May 18, 1773. He left several works on classical literature, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lagrange (dArquien), Henri De[[@Headword:Lagrange (dArquien), Henri De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Calais in 1613, of an ancient family of the 15th century, which had been settled at Berry. He went to Poland about 1674, where he finally devoted himself to the Church, and was consecrated cardinal, in 1695, by Innocent XII. After the death of Sobieski, his son-in- law, the queen retired with her father to Rome, where Lagrange died seven years afterwards, May 24, 1707. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lagrenee, Louis Jean Francois[[@Headword:Lagrenee, Louis Jean Francois]]

             an eminent French painter, was born at Paris, December 30, 1724, and studied under Charles Vanloo. He gained the grand prize of the French Academy for his picture of Joseph Explaining the Dreams, and at the age of twenty visited England, and was employed by Antonio Verrio upon the large picture of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. He was also unanimously chosen by the commissioners to paint the cupola of St. Paul's. He died in Paris, June 17, 1801. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Lagus, Daniel[[@Headword:Lagus, Daniel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1618 at Colberg, Pomerania. He studied at Konigsberg and Wittenberg, was in 1653 doctor of theology, and for some time professor of theology at Greifswalde. He died May 30, 1678, leaving, Comment. Super Epistolas Pauli ad Galatas, Ephesios, Philippenses: — Examen Trium Confessionum Reformatarum, Marchiacae, Lipsiensis et Thoruniensis: — Vindiciae Evangeliorum Dominicalium et Festivalium contra Thom. Stapleton.: — De ἐπινικίῳ Jesu: Decantato ad Psa 16:10-11 : — De Omntipraesentia Humanae Christi Naturae: — De Bonorum Operum Necessitate ad Salutem. See Witte, Diarium Biographicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laha[[@Headword:Laha]]

             a tablet suspended in a Buddhist Wihara (q.v.) in Ceylon, upon which anything might be written which was intended for the information of the priests.

## Lahad[[@Headword:Lahad]]

             (Heb. id. לִהִד, in pause לָהִד, prob. oppressor, otherwise ./aene; Sept. Λάδ v. r. Λαάδ,Vulg. Laad), the second named of the two sons of Jahath, of the familv of Zerah, grandson of Judah (1Ch 4:2). B.C. post 1612.

## Lahai-Roi[[@Headword:Lahai-Roi]]

             SEE BEER-LAHAI-ROI.

## Lahas[[@Headword:Lahas]]

             in Lamaism, are heavenly spirits who, long before the creation of the world, lived in unspeakable felicity, which was of an earthly nature. Above the earth there were twenty worlds inhabited by these beings, the highest four of which were so purified that their inhabitants lived without food. When the world was created many of these Lahas descended to it, and became so earthly they were subjected to its laws. When they ate of the fruits of this earth they became black, and the sun and moon were therefore created to give light to this .otherwise dark world. The human family, as also the sunken animal world, is indebted to the Lahas for their existence.

## Lahmam[[@Headword:Lahmam]]

             (Heb. Lachmas', לִחְמָס, prob. an erroneous reading for Lachmam',

לִחְמָם, their bread, which is read in some MSS., and which the Vulg. and Auth.Vers. follow, Septuag. Λαμάς,Vulg. Lehemam), a city in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Cabbon and Kithlish (Jos 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).

## Lahmam (2)[[@Headword:Lahmam (2)]]

             is doubtless the present Khurbet el-Lahm, located on the Ordnance Map at two and a half miles south of Beit-Jibrin, and described in the accompanying Memoirs (3:283) as "foundations, heaps of, stones, wells, cisterns, and caverns. The masonry seems probably of Byzantine date, but the site to be older."

## Lahmi[[@Headword:Lahmi]]

             (Heb. Lachmi', לִחְמַי, my bread; Septuag. Λεεμεί v. r. Λοομί, Λαχμί, etc.; Vulg. Bethlehemites), a person named (1Ch 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 (2Sa 21:19). SEE ELHANAN. It wouldi 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 CGath, whose spear-handle was like a weaver's beam." SEE JAIR.

## Laiaez[[@Headword:Laiaez]]

             lago, a celebrated Spanish Jesuit, was born at Almancario. near Siguenca, in Castile, in 1512, and was educated at the high-school of Alcsla. 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 suecessor, 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. lie 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. Ins 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. lie 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, Ecclesiastes 1 iist. 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.)

## Laidlie, Archibald, D.D.[[@Headword: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 Cusihing, 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 ill the English tongue in this denomination. His first sermon was delivered April 15, 1764, from 2Co 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. lie 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.)

## Lain, Saint[[@Headword:Lain, Saint]]

             SEE LATUINUS.

## Lainez[[@Headword: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 fir 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):- Cartla 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. 'I1rauois 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 Coinbra (2 vols. fol.); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen 30:41.

## Laing, James[[@Headword: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.

## Laing, John[[@Headword:Laing, John]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first rector of Tannadice, in the shire of Angus, and Linlithgow, and was next preferred to the office of high treasurer in 1465, which office he held until 1468, at which time he was made lord-register, and about the same time enjoyed the rectories of Suthet and Newlands. He was promoted to the episcopal see of Glasgow in 1474; was made lord high chancellor in 1482, and died January 11, 1482-83. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 253.

## Laird, Francis, D.D[[@Headword:Laird, Francis, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, graduated from Dickinson College under Dr. Nisbet, became pastor at Plumb Creek and Pike Run, Pennsylvania, in 1800, at Murrayville in 1831, resigned in 1850, and died April 6, 1851. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Lairesse, Gerard[[@Headword:Lairesse, Gerard]]

             an eminent Flemish painter, was born at Liege in 1640. He studied under Bertholet Flemael, and at the age of sixteen had gained considerable reputation from his efforts. He visited Utrecht, and afterwards removed to Amsterdam, where his reputation rose so high that the Dutch esteem him their greatest historical painter. He died at Amsterdam in 1711. The following are some of his best works: The Fall of our First Parents; Adam  and Eve Driven from Paradise; Joseph and his Brethren; The Child Jesus. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Lais, Giuseppe Maria[[@Headword:Lais, Giuseppe Maria]]

             an Italian prelate, was born March 24, 1775, at Rome, of Bavarian parentage. He was educated at first among the Jesuits, and finished his studies at the University of La Sapienza, where he also took the degree of a doctor in utroque jure, and was ordained priest. A short time after he became vicargeneral to cardinal Galeffi, and commendatory abbot of Subiaco. In 1817 he was appointed bishop of Hippone in partibus, and administrator of the diocese of Anagni. He died at Terentius, July 18, 1836, leaving De Universa Christi Ecclesia. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Laishah[[@Headword:Laishah]]

             (Heb. La'yeshah, לִיְשָׁה, i.e. Laish, with הparagogic, Isa 10:30). SEE LAISM, 2.

## Laity[[@Headword: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 עָם, people. As synonymes of these Scripture terms we may also cite the words " faithful," "saints," and " idiotae" (q.v.). Comp. Riddle, C/hristiua Antiquities, p. 188 sq., 274, 275; Vinet, Pastoiral Theology (N. Y. 1854), p. 345. In the O.-T. Scriptures we find allusions to the laity in Dcute. 18:3, where upon them is laid the obligation to pay a tithe to the priest when offering sacrilice; 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 (Eze 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 2Ki 23:2-3; Neh 8:11; Isa 24:2; Hos 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 Prnimitive Churich [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 inl qualifying themselves to explain, and to enforce on others, tile 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' (1Co 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[[@Headword:Lake]]

             (λίμνη, apool), a term used in the N.T. only of the Lake of Gennesareth (Luk 5:1-2; Luk 8:22-23; Luk 8:33), and of the burning sulphurous pool of Hades (Rev 19:20; Rev 20:10; Rev 20:14-15; Rev 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[[@Headword: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, Cyclopcedia Bibliographica, ii, 1755; Allibone, Dict. Encyl. and Amer. Authors, ii, 1048.

## Lake, John, D.D[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 linguce 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 Sacrce (ibid, 1734, 8vo).-Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, ii, 223.

## Lakin, Benjamin[[@Headword: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.

## Lakshana[[@Headword:Lakshana]]

             a Hindu name for the characteristic beauties or signs of a supreme Buddha. These were divided into three classes:

1. The two hundred and sixteen Mangalya-lakshana, of which there were one hundred and eight on each foot;

2. The thirty-two Mahapurusha-lakshana, or superior beauties;

3. The eight Anawyanjana-lakshana, or inferior beauties.

## Lakshmi[[@Headword: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 boly 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 Hiindus ( 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.

## Lakshmi (2)[[@Headword:Lakshmi (2)]]

             in Hindu mythology, was the goddess of beauty and loveliness, the wife of Vishnu, generated from the foam of the sea, similar to Venus Anadvomene of the Greeks. She is also the goddess of plenty, and as such is called Sri or Shiri. She is also the goddess of felicity, and thus identical with Mangola Dewta. She often serves poets as an ideal of womanly beauty.

## Lakum[[@Headword:Lakum]]

             (Heb. Lakkum', לִקּוּם, according to Gesenius, way-stopper, i.e. fortified place; Sept. Λσκούμ v. r. Δωδάμ and ῎Ακρον, Vulg. Lecum), a place on the northeastern border of Naphtali, mentioned after Jabneel in the direction of the Jordan (Jos 19:33), and therefore probably situated not far south of Lake Merom. ''he Talmud (Megilloth, lxx, 1) speaks of a Lakium (לוקים), 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.

## Lakum (2)[[@Headword:Lakum (2)]]

             This site Trelawney Saunders (Map of the O.T.) confounds with that of Adam, locating it at Damieh; perhaps from misunderstanding the ambiguous language of Tristram (Bible Places, page 278), who thinks that "Lakum may be traced in Kefr Kanua," which is laid down on the  Ordnance Map at two and a quarter miles southwest of Damieh, and eight miles west from the south end of the Sea of Galilee. The accompanying Memoirs (1:391) say of it: "There are ruins in this village, and portions of fine limestone columns, but no capitals. There is also a circular basalt olive- press and cisterns."

## Lalita -Vistaria[[@Headword: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 Buddahists 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 Buddhisine Indien (Par. 1844); and W. Wassiljew, Der Buddhismus, seine Dogmen, Geschichte und Literatur (St. Petersburg, 1860).

## Lallemant, Jacques Philippe[[@Headword: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 qf 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[[@Headword: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.

## Lallouette, Ambrose[[@Headword:Lallouette, Ambrose]]

             a French theologian, was born in 1654 at Paris, and died May 9, 1724. He wrote, Discours sur la Presence Reelle: — Histoire des Traductions Francaises de l'Ecriture Sainte: — Extraifs sur Diferens Points de Morale: — Avis pour Lire Utilement l'Evangile. See Moreri, Dictionnaire; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v (B.P.)

## Lama[[@Headword:Lama]]

             (λαμά, Mat 27:46, which is also read in the best MSS. at Mar 15:34, where the received text has λάμμα; the Heb. has both forms, לָמָה and לָמָּה, lam'mah, for what; the Syriac version has lemono), a term signifying why (as the context explains it, ἱνατί, by which also the Sept. interprets), quoted by our Saviour on1 the cross from Psa 22:1 [2 in the Hebrew].

## Lamaism[[@Headword: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 v.ar, sought refuge in Thilet, where he became king. The Lichhavyis of Vaisili professed belief in " Swasti." Sw.ati 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-stegs-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 vears ago. In B.C. 240, at the close of the third synodl, 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 Nepaulese, 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 Ladal 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 Brormston (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 indigenous element, 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 Lhassa, 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 (Sanscrit, Vinaya), or discipline;

2. Sher-phjin (Sans. Prajnaparamita), or philosophy and metaphyics;

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 Pekin, Lhassa, 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 Pekin, 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 (dhyan), 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 1:4. 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 Legin 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 Bodhisattna," 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 Mlaitreya. 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 Lhassa 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 Pekin. 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 ssPungss (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 Pekin, 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 Gantuum 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-raja, 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 Sungnam 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 Irtish 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 Pekin 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.)

## Lamasery[[@Headword:Lamasery]]

             a collection of small houses built around one or more Buddhist temples in Tartary and Thibet, as a residence for the Lamas. SEE LAMAISM.

## Lamb[[@Headword: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, כֶּבֶשׂ, ke'bes (with its transposed form כֶּשֶׂב, ke'seb, and the feminines בַּבְשָׂה, kibsah', or כִּבְשָׂה' kabs, kabsh', and כַּשְׂבָּה, 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 (Exo 29:38-41), on the Sabbath day (Num 28:9), at the feasts of the new moon  (Num 28:11), of trumpets (Num 29:2), of tabernacles (Num 29:13-40), of Pentecost (Lev 23:18-20), and of the Passover (Exo 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 (Lev 9:3), the coronation of Solomon (1Ch 29:21), the purification of the Temple under Hezekiah (2Ch 29:21), and the great Passover held in the reign of Josiah (2Ch 35:7). They formed part of the sacrifice offered at the purification of women after childbirth (Lev 12:6), and at the cleansing of a leper (Lev 14:10-25). They accompanied the presentation of first-fruits (Lev 23:12). When the Nazarites commenced their period of separation they offered a he-lamb for a trespass-offering (Num 6:12), and at its conclusion a he-lamb was sacrificed as a burnt-offering, and a ewe-lamb as a sin-offering (Num 5:14). A ewe-lamb was also the offering for the sin of ignorance (Lev 4:32). SEE SACRIFICE.

2. The corresponding Chaldee term to the above is אַמִּר, inmmar' (Ezr 6:9; Ezr 6:17; Ezr 7:17). In the Targum it assumes the form אַימְרָא

3. A special term is טָלֶה, taleh' (1Sa 7:9; Isa 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!" (Mar 5:41). The plural of a cognate form occurs ( טְלַיtell') in Isa 40:11.

4. Less exact is כִּר, car, a fat ram, or, more probably, "wether," as the word is generally employed in opposition to ayil, which strictly denotes a "ram" (Deu 32:14, 2Ki 3:4; Isa 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 Isa 16:1, which he regards as an exhortation to the Moabites to renew their tribute. The Tyrians obtained their supply from Arabia and Kedar (Eze 27:21), and the pastures of Bashan were famous as grazing- grounds (Eze 39:18). SEE RAM

5. Still more general is צֹאן, tson, rendered "lamb" in Exo 12:21, properly a collective term denoting a "flock" of small cattle, sheep and  goats, in distinction from herds of the larger animals (Ecc 2:7; Eze 45:15). SEE FLOCK.

6. In opposition to this collective term the word שֶׂה, 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" (Gen 22:7-8; Exo 12:3; Exo 22:1, etc.). — Smith, s.v. SEE KID.

7. In the N.T. we find ἀρνίον (strictly the diminutive of ἀρήν, which latter once occurs, Luk 10:1), a lambkisn, 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 (Exo 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 (Exo 22:30; Exo 33:19; Lev 22:27). SEE PASSOVER.

In the symbolical language of Scripture the lamb is the type of meekness and innocence (Isa 11:6; Isa 65:25; Luk 10:3; Joh 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 (Rev 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 (2)[[@Headword:Lamb (2)]]

             (as a Christian emblem), the symbol of Christ (Gen 4:4; Exo 12:3; Exo 29:38; Isa 16:1; Jeremiah 53:7; Joh 1:36; 1Pe 1:19; Rev 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 (Isa 11:5), bears the banner-cross of the resurrection, or treads upon a serpent (Rev 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[[@Headword:Lamb Of God]]

             (ἀμνὸς Θεοῦ, Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36; so of the Messiah, Test. xii Patr. pages 724, 725, 730), a title of the Redeemer (compare Act 8:32; 1Pe 1:19, where alone the term ἀμνός is elsewhere employed, and with a like reference). This symbolical appellation applied to Jesus Christ, in Joh 1:29; Joh 1:36, 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" (Rev 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 (Num 6:12; Lev 4:32; Lev 5:6; Lev 5:18; Lev 14:12-17). So the prophet understood it: "He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter" (Isa 53:7); and Paul: "For even Christ, our Passover," i.e., our Passover lamb, "is sacrificed for us" (1Co 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 (Joh 1:14; comp.  1Jn 2:28; Act 20:28; Rom 9:5, 1Ti 3:16; Tit 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 (1Co 15:25, Php 2:9-11; 1Jn 3:8; Heb 10:5-17; Rev 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, Andrew[[@Headword:Lamb, Andrew]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Brechin in 1610, and was translated to the see of Galloway in 1619, which he held until his death in 1634. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, pages 167-281.

## Lamb, John[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lamb, Thomas]]

             an English Baptist minister and strict Calvinist, flourished in the second half of the 17th1 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, Tennesee, 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 Of Maestricht[[@Headword: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 Von Hersfeld[[@Headword: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 ducumn Brunsvicensium ac Lyneburgensium 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 Altahenses (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, Bernard[[@Headword:Lambert, Bernard]]

             a French theologian, the last of the Jansenistic school, was born at Salernes, Provence, in 1738. When made professor of theology, Lambert published some theses, which were at once censured by the Roman see, and he had to leave Limoges in consequence. He then went to Grenoble, where he remained some time. The episcopal see of Lyons was then occupied by the famous Montazet, who gathered about himself all opposed to the Jesuits, including Lambert. When Lambert went to Paris, monsieur de Beaumont, an opponent of the Jansenists, was archbishop there, and refused to receive father Lambert into his diocese; but some bishops interfered in his behalf, and he was admitted on condition that he would write only against philosophers and unbelievers. Lambert died at Paris, February 27, 1813. Of his many writings we mention, Apologie de l'Etat Religieux: — Traite sur le Sacrifice de Jesus Christ (1778): — Idee de l'Oeuvre des Secours Selon les Sentiments de ses Veritables Defenseurs (1786): — Traite Dogmatique et Moral de la Justice Chretienne (1788): — La Verite et la Saintete du Christianisme (1796): — Exposition des Predictions et des Promesses Faites a l'Eglise (1806, 2 volumes), a work in which he admits the doctrine of the Millenarians, and the theory of those who regarded the pope as antichrist. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lambert, Chandley[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 iln Evangelium Lucae (Wittemberg, 1523, 8vo; Nuremberg and Strasburg, 1525, 8vo; Frankfort, 1693, 8vo): — In Cantica canticorum Salomonis libellIus, etc. (Strasburg, 1524, 8vo): — De fidelium vocatione in regnum Christi, id est Ecclesiam, etc. (Strasburg, 1525, 8vo): — Farrago omnium fere rerum theologicarum (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 Homsburgensi 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 Lutheranismo, lib. 2, sect. 8; Freher, Theatrum Virorum Doctorum, 1:104; Bayle, Hist. Deuteronomy Dit. 2:708 sq.; J. Tilemann, Vitae Professoruom theologiae  Mapurgensium; Abraham Scultet, Annales AEvangelii, ann. 1526; Le Long, Biblioth. Sacra; J.F. Hekelius, Epistolae Sigular. manip. primus; Nicéron, Memoires, 39:234 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:132; Baum (Johann W.), Lambert v. Avignon nach seinem Leben, etc. (1840); Schrockh, Kirchelgesclichte s. d. Ref. 1:380, 434; 2:219.

## Lambert, George[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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, ins his Neues Organon,  oder Gedanken uber die Erforschung und Beziehung des Wahren (Lpzg. 1764, 2 volumes). Of his other works, we may mention his profound Kosmologische Briefe uber 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 fill list of his writings, Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:150.

## Lambert, Ralph[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lambert, St., de, Charles Francois]]

             marquis, a noted French infidel and poet, a contemporary and colaborer 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.)

## Lamberton, William[[@Headword:Lamberton, William]]

             a Scotch prelate, was chancellor of the Church of Glasgow in 1292, and elected bishop of St. Andrews in June, 1298. Bishop Lamberton strenuously opposed the encroachments made by king Edward I of  England upon the constitution of Scotland, and contributed his hearty endeavors to set and keep king Robert Bruce upon the Scottish throne. He died in 1328. He built a palace for the bishop of St. Andrews, also ten churches belonging to the diocese, and did a great many other good and noble works. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 21.

## Lambeth Articles[[@Headword:Lambeth Articles]]

             SEE ARTICLES, LAMBETH.

## Lambruschini, Louis[[@Headword: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 Besanqon, 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.)

## Lamech[[@Headword:Lamech]]

             (Heb. Le'mek, לֶמֶךְ, taster, otherwise a vigorous youth, in pause La'mek, . לָמֶךְSeptuag. 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 (Gen 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 seventymeven, 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 (Gen 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  fiollowing 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 Psalms 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 Luk 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 ascendency; 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 trom Seth, being the son of Methuselah, and father of several sons, of whom apparently the oldest was Noah (Gen 5:25-31; 1Ch 1:3; Luk 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."

## Lamed, Sylvester[[@Headword: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.

## Lamennais, Felicite Robert[[@Headword:Lamennais, Felicite 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 deplores 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 1'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 consideree 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'eglise (1829).

The July revolution completed, the Church must now be saved by bringing it into harmoiny 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 foundeed 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 wav. 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. Ie had ideal ized the Church, and would now seek a like panacea inl 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 losn 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 vou 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 uip 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 Gouvernment (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 People (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 Madamne 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 portraitures 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 comspletes (Paris, 183637,12 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 A dversaires de Lamennais (in the Revue des Deux Mondes, 1834); Robinet, Etudes sur l'abbe de Lamennais (1835); Madrolle, Histoire secsrte 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 Dogmqwes 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-Encycklop. 8:178-184; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:182 sq.

## Lamennais, Jean Marie Robert de[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lament]]

             (represented by numerous Heb. and several Gr. words, of which the principal are אָבִל, abal', to mourn; אָנָה, anah', to sigh; נָהָה, nahuh', to wail; סָפִד; saphad', to smite the breast in token of violent grief; קוּן, kun, to strike a mournful tune; בָּכָה, 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 קַינָה, 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 (2Sa 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 Amo 8:10 : "I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation" (קַינָה). 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 (2  Chronicles 35:25; compare also Jer 7:29; Jer 9:9; Jer 9:16; Jer 9:19). In 2Sa 3:33-34, is preserved the brief but touching lament of David over Abner (q.v.).

The kinah was of two sorts, historical and prophetical. 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 Eze 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. Eze 19:1; Eze 19:14; Eze 26:17; Eze 27:32; Eze 28:12; Eze 32:2; Eze 32:16. So Amo 5:1.)

The only other passage in which קַינָה, or its cognate verb קוֹנֵן(hkonen), is found, is Eze 2:10 where we read of a "roll of a book, סֵפֶר מְגַלִּת(megillath sepher), being spread out before the prophet; " and there was written therein lamentations, קַינַים(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 מְגַלָּה, 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 (Eze 27:27, etc.). Perhaps the most perfect example is the lament in Eze 28:12-19; but even there we meet with a "Thus saith the Lord" (Eze 28:12). 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 prophetical 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 (2Ch 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" (Jer 4:20), and the reference is evidently not to Josiah. SEE LAMENTATIONS, BOOK OF.

## Lamentations, Book Of[[@Headword: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, אֵיכָה, Eykah', "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 2Sa 1:19-27). The Rabbins remark upon this title, “Three prophets have used the word איכהwith reference to Israel: Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. To what are they to be likened? To three bridesmen (שושבינין= 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?' (Deu 1:2). The second has seen her in her dissipation and dissoluteness, and he said, 'Oh, how has she become a harlot!' (Isa 1:21). And the third has seen her in her utter desolation, and he said, 'Oh, how does she sit solitary!' (Lam 1:1)" (Introduction to Echac Rabathi).

Later Jewish writers usually designate the book by the more descriptive title קַינוֹת, Kinoth', "lamentations" =dirge, a term which they found in Jer 7:29; Jer 9:10; Jer 9:20; 2Ch 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 θρῆνοι  Ι᾿ερεμίου as the equivalent of the latter Hebrew term. The Vulgate gives the Greek word, and explains it (Threni, id est, Lamentationes Jeremiae Prophetae). 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 ע and פ 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 Psalms 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 Psalms 9, 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 concensus 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 (Lam 1:15; Lam 2:13; Jer 14:17).

In both there is the same vehement outpouring of sorrow. The prophet's eyes flow down with tears (Lam 1:16; Lam 2:11; Lam 3:48-49; Jer 9:1; Jer 13:17; Jer 14:17). There is the same haunting feeling of being surrounded with fears and terrors on every side (Lam 2:22; Jer 6:25; Jer 46:5). In both the worst of all the evils is the iniquity of the prophets and the priests (Lam 2:14; Lam 4:13; Jer 5:30-31; Jer 14:13-14). The sufferer appeals for vengeance to the righteous Ju dge (Lam 3:64-66; Jer 11:20). He bids the rival nation that exulted in the fall of Jerusalem prepare for a like desolation (Lam 4:21; Jer 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. Lam 2:11; Lam 2:3, with Jer 15:15 sq.; Jer 17:13 sq.;  Jer 20:7; Lam 3:14 with Jer 20:7 with Jer 17:18; Jeremiah 5 with Jer 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 Jer 13:22-26; Jer 14:7; Jer 16:10 sq.; Jer 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 prophetical 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. Jer 2:14; Jer 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. דִוָּיִ, Lam 1:22, and Jer 8:18; פחד ופחתLam 3:47, and Jer 48:43; שבר הת עמי, Lam 2:11, and Jer 6:14; Jer 8:11; מגור מסיב, Lam 2:22, and Jer 6:25, and  frequently the very frequent use of דַּמְעָה מִיַם הוֹרַיד שֶׁבֶרin both; phrases like "I became a mockery all day long," Lam 3:14, and Jer 20:7, etc.: the use of the 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, 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 clief' 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 2Ch 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 (Lam 2:11-12; Lam 2:20; Lam 4:4; Lam 4:9; 2Ki 25:3). The city was taken by storm (Lam 2:7; Lam 4:12; 2Ch 36:17). The Temple itself was polluted with the massacre of the priests who defended it (Lam 2:20-21; 2Ch 36:17), and then destroyed (Lam 2:6; 2Ch 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 (Lam 4:20; Jer 39:5). The chief of the people were carried into exile (Lam 1:5; Lam 2:9; 2Ki 25:11). The bitterest grief was found in the malignant exultation of the Edomites (Lam 4:21; Psa 137:7). Under the rule of the stranger the Sabbaths and solemn feasts were forgotten (Lam 1:4; Lam 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 Jer 37:5 sq..; chapter 3 to Jer 38:2 sq.; chapter 4 to Jer 39:1 sq., and 2Ki 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 reneved 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 veheemnt 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 peoplethat 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 (Lam 1:2). The heathen have entered into the sanctuary, and mock at her Sabbaths (Lam 1:7; Lam 1:10). 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?" (Lam 1:12). 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" (Lam 1:17). 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" (Lam 1:18). 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 (Lam 1:21).

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 (Lam 2:2). The rampart and the wall lament together (Lam 2:8). The walls of the palace are given up into the hand of the enemy (Lam 2:7). The breach is great, as if made by the inrushing of the sea (Lam 2:13). 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 (Lam 2:19); women eating their own children, and so fulfilling the curse of Deu 28:53 (Lam 2:20); 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 (Lam 2:14). A righteous judgment had fallen on them. The prophets found no vision of Jehovah (Lam 2:9). 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 (Lam 3:1), who has been brought into darkness and not into light (Lam 3:2). 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 (Lam 3:14-15). But that experience was not one which had ended in darkness and despair. Here, as in the prophecies, swe 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 (Lam 3:22-23). He is good to them that wait for him (Lam 3:25). 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 (Lam 3:26-27). 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 (Lam 3:39-42). The closing verses may refer to that special epoch in the prophet's life when his own sufferings had been sharpest (Lam 3:53-56), 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 (Lam 3:57-58). Feeling sure that, at some time or other, there would )e 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 (Lam 3:64-66).

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 (Deu 28:13). 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 (Deu 28:20). The closing words indicate the strength of that feeling against the Edomrites which lasted all through the captivity (Deu 28:21-22). 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 (Deu 28:18). Slaves have ruled over the people of Jehovah (Deu 28:8). Women have been subjected to intolerable outrages (Deu 28:11). The young men have been taken to grind, and the children have fallen under the wood (Deu 28:13). 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 (Deu 28:19), 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" (Deu 28:21). 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 ill 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 (Pro 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 Psalms 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. Pralect. 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. Zec 1:6 with Lam 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, conforting 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, Commenttria (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, קוֹל בּוֹכַים (Ven. 1589, 4to); Sam. de Vidas, פֵּרוּשׁ(Thessalon. 1596, 8vo); Figuero, Commentaria (Lugd. 1596, 8vo); Makshan, יְגוֹן לֵב (Cracow, s.a. [about 1600],4to); Alscheich, דְּבָרַים נְחוּמַים (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 (LugIdun. 1608,  4to); Polan, Commentarius [including Jer.] (Basil. 1608, 8vo); A Costa de Andrada, Commentuarii (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, Conmentarius (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, אֵלוֹן בָּכוֹת (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); Libowitzer צַיּוֹן בְּכַית (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, אֵבֶל צַיּוֹן (Sklon, 1797, 8vo); Lundmark, Dissertatio (Upsal. 1799, 4to); Hasselhuhn, Dissertationes (Upsal. 1804, 4to); Deresir, Erklarung [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, יֶשֶׁר אמְרֵי [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. קַינוֹת. (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, Erklarung (Berl. 1868, 8vo); Henderson, Commentary [includ. Jer.] (London, 1851; Andov. 1868, 8vo). SEE POETRY, HEBREW; SEE COMMENTARY.

## Lamfridus[[@Headword:Lamfridus]]

             SEE LANTFREDUS.

## Lami[[@Headword:Lami]]

             SEE LAMY.

## Lami, Bernard[[@Headword:Lami, Bernard]]

             SEE LAMY.

## Lami, Francois[[@Headword:Lami, Francois]]

             a French Benedictine, was born at Montireau, near Chartres, in 1636, and died at St. Denis, April 4, 1711. After having served in the army, he embraced a monastic life at the age of twenty-three. In spite of his controversies with Bossuet, Malebranche, Arnauld, Nicole, Duguet, and others, he was highly esteemed by all who knew him for his sincerity and piety. He wrote, De la Connaissance de Soi-Meme (Paris, 1694-98, 6 volumes; improved ed. 1700): — Le Nouvel Atheisme Reverse, Contre Spinlosa (1696): — Vrit Evidente de la Religion Chretienne (1694): — Des Sentiments de Piete sur la Profession Religieuse (1697): — Lefons de la Sagesse sur l'Engagenment au Service de Dieu (1703): — L'Incredule Amenze la Religionpar la Raison (1710): — Les Gemissements de l'Ame sous'la Tyrannie du Corps (1700): — Conjectures sur Divers Effets du Tonnerre (1689). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lami, Giovanni[[@Headword: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 recentiorunm  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.

## Lamiletiere, Theophile Brachet De[[@Headword:Lamiletiere, 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 ducem 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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:222. (J.N.P.)

## Lammas-day[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lammermann]]

             SEE LAMORMAIN.

## Lammists[[@Headword:Lammists]]

             a sect of Remonstrant Baptists. SEE MENNONITES.

## Lamont, David, D.D[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:250 sq.

## Lamourette, Adrien[[@Headword: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. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lamp[[@Headword:Lamp]]

             (properly לִפַּיד, lappid', a fame, Gen 15:17; Exo 20:18, Job 41:11; Nah 2:5, Dan 10:6, Isa 62:1; Eze 1:13; lamp-torch, Jdg 7:16; Jdg 7:20; Jdg 15:4-5, Job 12:5; Zec 12:6; in some of which passages it is rendered "lightning," "brand," "torch," etc.: Gr. λαμπάς a torch — "light" or lantern, Act 20:8; Rev 4:5; "torch," Joh 18:3; Rev 8:10, oil-lamap, Mat 25:1-8; also נֵיר, neyr, or נַיר, nil, 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 (Gen 15:17) also gives rise to frequent metaphorical usages, indicating life, welfare, guidance, as, e.g. 2Sa 21:17; Psa 119:105; Pro 6:23; Pro 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 (Exo 25:37; 1Ki 7:49; 2Ch 4:20; 2Ch 13:11, Zec 4:2). The lamps were lighted every evening, and cleansed every morning (Exo 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 (Exo 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 (Exo 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

2. A torch or flambeau, such as was carried by the soldiers of Gideon (Jdg 7:16; Jdg 7:20; comp. 15:4). From the fact that these were at first enclosed in pitchers, from which, at the endl of the march, thev 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.

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.  (Mat 8:12; Mat 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 (2Sa 21:17, Pro 13:9; Pro 20:20). On the other hand, the keeping up of a lamp's light is used as a symbol of enduring and unbroken succession (1Ki 11:36; 1Ki 15:4, Psa 132:17). (See Wemyss's Symsbol. Dict. s.v.)

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.

4. It appears from Mat 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. AEygpt. 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 kandíl (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 stra; some water is poured in first, and then the oil. Lamps very nearly of this shape appear on the Egyptian nomuments, and they seem, aslo, 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 thismaterial is more proper for lamps intended to be hung up, and therfore to cast their light down from above.

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 theEgyptians, who, according to Herdotus (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 reasonable 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.

## Lamp (2)[[@Headword:Lamp (2)]]

             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.

## Lamp, The[[@Headword:Lamp, The]]

             a ceremony practiced by the Maronites (q.v.), by way of anointing for the sick. They make a cake somewhat larger than the consecrated wafer of the Romanists, and put upon it seven pieces of cotton twisted with little pieces of straw, and place all together in a basin with some oil. Having read a portion of one of the gospels and epistles, with some prayers, they set fire to all the cotton. They now anoint with this oil the forehead, breast, and arms of every one present, and particularly of the sick person, saying at each unction, "May the Almighty, by his sacred unction, pardon all thy sins, and strengthen thy limbs as he did those of the poor man who was troubled with the palsy." Then they let the lamp burn till all the oil is exhausted. This rite is administered to the sick, and is not confined to the dying, as in the case of extreme unction in the Roman Catholic Church.

## Lampadary[[@Headword: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.

## Lampadephoria[[@Headword:Lampadephoria]]

             (from λαμπάς, a torch, and φέρω, to bear), ancient Grecian games, celebrated in honor of Prometheus, Athena, and Hephaestus, who taught men the use of fire. The game consisted in carrying an unextinguished torch through certain distances by a successive chain of runners; each taking it up at the point where another left it, and the one who permitted it to go out losing the game.

## Lampadon Hemera[[@Headword:Lampadon Hemera]]

             (from λαμπάς, a torch and ἡμέρα, a day), the name given to the fifth day of the Eleusinian Mysteries (q.v.), because on that day the initiated marched two and two in procession, each with a torch in his hand, into the temple of Ceres at Eleusis.

## Lampe, Friedrich Adolf[[@Headword: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 Ultrecht, 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 Johannent (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 Pssalnusts xlv perpetuo conmmentario explanatur (Bremen, 1715, 4to): — Geheimniss des Gnadenbundes (Bremen, 1723, 12mo; translat. into Dutch, Amst. 1727, 8vo); this work is nothing more nor less than his system of theology: — Delineatio Thelogiae activas (Utrecht, 1727, 4to): — Rudimenta Theologiae elenchticae (Bremen, 1729, 8vo). Lampe published also a large number of sermons and devotional treatises in German, which were lnearly 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).

## Lampeter Brethren[[@Headword:Lampeter Brethren]]

             SEE AGAPEMONE.

## Lampetians[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Leteratura Spagnuola. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:285.

## Lamplugh, Thomas, D.D.[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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.

## Lamps[[@Headword:Lamps]]

             (their use in the Christian Church). Among the Jews lamps were freely used in the synagogue for 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, remians 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, whicle Romanists claim that they were used as sumbols. (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 its 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 "lambs 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" (Mat 13:43). But it is evident that even this custom was early diapproved of, for the Council of Eilbaris 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.)

## Lamps, Christian[[@Headword:Lamps, Christian]]

             Many of these of ancient manufacture have been discovered in the catacombs and elsewhere. They were in general of similar form to those used by the Romans at the time, but often with Christian emblems upon them. SEE FISH.

## Lamps, Festival of[[@Headword:Lamps, Festival of]]

             a feast celebrated annually in Rajastban, in honor of the Hindu goddess, Lakshmi (q.v.). The festival is called Dewali, and every city, village, and encampment exhibits a most brilliant spectacle from the illumination. On this day it is incumbent upon every votary of Lakshmi to try the chance of dice, and from their success in the Dewali the prince, the chief, the merchant, and the artisan foretell the state of their coffers for the ensuing year.

## Lampsacus, Council Of[[@Headword:Lampsacus, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Lampsaceum), held at Lampsaki, on the Hellespont, A.D. 364, as Pagi shows. Orthodox bishops were invited to it; and it is described as a council of Homoiusians by Sozomen (6, 7) if the reading is correct. But those who directed it must have been really Semi-Arians; for they  professed to be partisans of the Homoousian formula, and of the creed published at Antioch, besides siding with Macedonius, by whom the godhead of the Holy Ghost was denied. What made Sozomen think well of them probably was that they were treated with marked favor by Valentinian; while they condemned the extreme party which Valens espoused, and which he ordered them into exile for dissenting from. On this, too, they seem to have despatched a still more orthodox account of themselves to Rome, which dontented Liberius (Socinus, 4:12; comp. Mansi, 3:378).

## Lamson, Alvan, D.D[[@Headword: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, Massachussets, 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.

## Lamson, William, D.D[[@Headword:Lamson, William, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Danvers, Massachusetts, February 22, 1812. He studied at the South Reading (now Wakefield) Academy, graduated from Waterville College (now Colby University) in 1835, and was a tutor there one year. In the autumn of 1837 he was ordained pastor of the Church in Gloucester, Massachusetts, where he remained until 1839, and then went to the Newton Theological Institution and studied two years. He was pastor in Thomaston, Maine, about two years (1841 and 1842), and then returned to Gloucester as pastor until 1848. His next settlement was in Portsmouth, N.H., and his last in Brookline, Massachusetts (1859-75), where he died, November 20, 1882. See Cathcart, Bapt. Encyclop. page 669. (J.C.S.)

## Lamy[[@Headword: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 A uteurs eccls. volume 19, 4to ed.; Journal de tout ce qui s'est passi en 1'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[[@Headword: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 piete 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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:298 sq.

## Lancaster, Joseph[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lance]]

             (כּידוֹן, kidon', so called from its destructive use, Jeremiah 1:42; elsewhere usually "spear"), a javelin or smaller kind of missile weapon, in distinction from the long-handled spear (חֲנית, chanith'), and the simple dart (שֶׁלִח, she'lach). SEE ARMOR.

## Lance (2)[[@Headword:Lance (2)]]

             (λόγχη, cultellus), a liturgical instrument of the Greek Church, in the shape of a small knife formed like a spear, is used in the common Greek rite in the preparatory office of prothesis, to divide the host from the holy loaf previous to consecration. This earlier fraction, the primitive antiquity of which is doubtful, is distinctly symbolical, and has no reference to the subsequent distribution, for which another fraction has always been made. The typical allusion to the circumstances of our Lord's Passion receives greater force and vividness in the Greek Church, from the use of the "holy spear" for the division of the loaf, as commemorative of the piercing of our Lord's body by the Roman soldier. The priest makes four cuts to separate the host from the oblation, and also stabs it more than once, accompanying every cut or stab with appropriate texts of Scripture, e.g. "He was led as a  lamb to the slaughter," "One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side," etc.

The use of the holy spear is not found in the purely Oriental liturgies, e.g. those of the Syrians and Egyptians, a fact which leads Renaudot to question whether the rite is of primitive antiquity, since these churches borrowed their discipline from the Greek Church in the earliest ages. It is entirely unknown in the Western Church,

## Lance, Lucien Charles, D.D[[@Headword:Lance, Lucien Charles, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Bordentown, N.J., September 7, 1832. He graduated from Charleston College, and in 1854 from the General Theological Seminary, N.Y.; became pastor of All- Saints', Waccamaw, N.C.; after the war in Wye and Queenstown, Maryland, rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Kentucky, two years at Kenosha, Wisconsin, from 1872; in 1879 chaplain in Kemper Hall; and died January 12, 1883.

## Lance, The Holy (1)[[@Headword: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)[[@Headword: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-Encyklop. 8:197. (J.N.P.)

## Lanceae Et Clavorum Festum[[@Headword:Lanceae Et Clavorum Festum]]

             SEE LANCE, THE HOLY (2).

## Lancellot(t)i[[@Headword: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 Matthiius even appended it to his edition of the Corpus juris cunonici (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[[@Headword: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'Hoggidi"), 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[[@Headword: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; Niceron, Mem. pour servir a l'histoire des Hommes II. 35; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 29:322 sq.

## Lancet[[@Headword:Lancet]]

             (רֹמִח, ro'mach, from its piercing, 1Ki 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 (Exo 4:25; Jos 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, מִאֲכֶלֶתis 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 (Gen 22:6; Gen 22:10; comp. Jdg 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 מִחֲלָŠ(Ezr 1:9), and a room in the (second) Temple was appropriated to such cutlery (בית מחליפות, Mishna, Middoth, 6:7). A penknife was called תִּעִר(Jer 26:23; Eze 5:1), originally in Aramaean מִסְפֵּר, which in the Talmud (Chelim, 13:1) likewise denotes a razor. The pruning-knife was מִזְמֵרָה(Isa 2:4; Isa 18:5, etc.). SEE KNIFE.

## Lancet Style[[@Headword:Lancet Style]]

             SEE ENGLISH STYLE.

## Lancet-Window[[@Headword: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.

## Lancher, Karl Adolph Ferdinand[[@Headword:Lancher, Karl Adolph Ferdinand]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Schonebeck, near Magdeburg, January 4, 1796. For some time rector of the Lyceum and preacher at Stolberg, in Saxony, he was called as member of consistory and preacher to Neustadt in 1828, and died in 1865, a doctor of philosophy. He published sermons and some ascetical works. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:761 sq. (B.P.)

## Lanckisch, Friedrich Von[[@Headword:Lanckisch, Friedrich Von]]

             a German writer, was born at Leipsic, March 12, 1618. He studied at his native place, was magister of philosophy in 1640, and died October 22, 1669, a bookseller at Leipsic. He published Concordantice Germanico- Hebraico-Graecae (Leipsic, 1677, fol. often reprinted; best edition that of Reinmeccius, 1718). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:175; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Land[[@Headword:Land]]

             (represented by several Heb. and Gr. words: properly אֶרֶוֹ, e'rets, usually rendered "earth," Gr. γῆ; and אֲדָמָה, adamnah', usually the "ground;"  sometimes שָׂדֶה, 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.

## Land Of Canaan[[@Headword:Land Of Canaan]]

             (אֶרֶוֹ כְּנִעִן, according to some, from its being lew; see 2Ch 28:19; Job 40:12, among other passages in which the verb is used), a name denoting the country west of the Jordan and Dead Sea (Gen 13:12; Deu 11:30), and between those waters and the Mediterranean; specially opposed to the “land of Gilead” — that is, the high table-land on the east of the Jordan (Num 32:26; Num 32:32; Num 33:51;Jos 22:32; see also Gen 12:5; Gen 23:2; Gen 23:19; Gen 31:18; Gen 33:18; Gen 35:6; Gen 37:1; Gen 48:4; Gen 48:7; Gen 49:30; Num 13:2; Num 13:17; Num 33:40; Num 33:51; Jos 16:2;Jdg 21:12). True, the district to which the name of “low land” is thus applied contained many very elevated spots: Shechem (Gen 33:18), Hebron (Gen 23:19), Bethel (Gen 35:6), Bethlehem (Gen 48:7), Shiloh (Jos 21:2; Jdg 21:12), which are all stated to be in the “land of Canaan.” But, high as the level of much of the country west of the Jordan undoubtedly is, there are several things which must always have prevented it from leaving a marked impression of general elevation. These are,

(1), that remarkable, wide, maritime plain over which the eye ranges for miles from the central hills, a feature of the country which cannot be overlooked by the most casual observer, and which impresses itself most indelibly on the recollection;

(2), the still deeper and more remarkable and impressive hollow of the Jordan valley, a view into which may be commanded from almost any of the heights of Central Palestine; and,

(3), there is the almost constant presence of the long high line of the mountains east of the Jordan, which, from their distance, have the effect more of an enormous cliff than of a mountain range-looking down on the more broken and isolated hills of Canaan, and furnishing a constant standard of height before which every thing is dwarfed. These considerations are based upon the supposition that the name was derived from the natural features of the country. But this is not countenanced by Scripture. Canaan was the son of Ham. He and his whole family colonized Western Syria, and while the whole region took his name, differentsections of it were called after his sons (Gen 10:15-20). Aram was a son of Shem, and him descendants colonized the country of Aram (Gen 10:21-31). On the other hand, Aram cannot, at least ab, solutely, be termed a “highland region.” It comprised the vast plains along the banks of the Euphrates, and westward to the Orontes and Anti- Libanus. Canaan, on the whole, however, is rather a hilly country, with strips of plain along the coast. In one passage it is distinguished from the low valley of the Jordan (Gen 13:12). In short, the terms Aram and Canaan, if bestowed with any reference to the comparative elevation of the respective countries, have a merely relative significance; the latter lying nearer the sea-boast, while the former — especially that part of it wherethe Hebrew patriarchs originated — is situated toward the interior head- waters of the great river Euphrates. SEE ARAM.

The extent and boundaries of Canaan are given with tolerable exactness in the Bible. On the west the sea was its border from Sidon to Gaza (Gen 10:19). On the south it was bounded by a line running from Gaza to the southern end of the Dead Sea, including the Judaean hills, but excluding the country of the Amalekites (Gen 10:19; Num 13:29). The Jordan was the eastern boundary; no part of Canaan lay beyond that river (Num 33:51; Exo 16:35, with Joshua v. 12;22:11. See Reland, Palest. p. 3 sq.). On the north, Canaan extended as far as Hamath, which was also the utmost boundary of the “land of promise” (Gen 17:8; Num 34:8). The coast from Sidon northward to Arvad, and' the ridge of Lebanon, were inhabited by Canaanites, though they do not appear to have been included in Canaan proper (Gen 10:15-19. See Bochart, Opp. 1:308 sq.; Roland, Palcest. p. 3 sq.). For geographical and other details, SEE PALESTINE.

The word “Canaan,” in a few instances, such as Zep 2:5, and Mat 15:22, was applied to the low maritime plains of Philistia and Phoenicia (comp. Mar 7:26; and see Gesenius on Isa 23:11). In the same manner, by the Greeks, the name Χνᾶ was used for Phoenicia, i.e. the sea-side plain north of the “Tyrian ladder” (see the extract in Reland, Palcest. p. 7, and Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 696), and by the later Pnoenicians, both of Phoenicia proper and of the Punic colonies in Africa (Kenrick, Phanicia, p. 40, 42, 460). The name occurs in this sense on the Egyptian monuments as well as on Phoenician coins (Eckhel, Doctr.Numbers 4:409), and was not even unknown to the Carthaginians (Gesenius, Gesch. d. Hebrews Sprach. p. 16). The Sept. in two cases, in like manner, renders the Hebrew by χώρα τῶν Φοινίκων (Exo 16:35; Jos 5:12; comp. Jos 5:1), as they do “Canaanites” by Φοίνικες.Agaie, in Num 13:29, “The Hittites, and the Jebusites, and the Amorites dwell in the mountains; and the Canaanites dwell by the sea, and by the coast of the Jordan.” In 2Sa 24:7, the Canaanites are distinguished from the Hivites, though the latter were descended from Canaan; and in several passages the Canaanites are mentioned with the Hittites, Amorites, Jebusites, etc., as if they constituted a special portion of the population (Exo 3:8; Deu 7:1; Jos 3:10).The most probable explanation of these limited applications of the name is, that while some of the tribes which inhabited Syria retained for their territories the name of their common ancestor Canaan, others preferred taking, as a distinctive appellation, the name of some subsequent head or chief of the tribe. The very same practice prevails to this day among the great tribes of Arabia. SEE CANAANITE.

## Land-mark[[@Headword:Land-mark]]

             (גְּבוּל, gebul', or גְּבוּלָה, gebulah', usually rendered "border" or "coast"), a boundary-line as indicated by a stake, stone, or other monument (Deu 19:14; Deu 27:17; Pro 22:28; Pro 23:10; 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 (Job 24:2), it was thus confirmed by express statute (Deu 19:14; Deu 27:17), and it appears to have been strictly perpetuated in later times (Pro 22:28; Pro 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.

## Landaff, Council Of[[@Headword:Landaff, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Landavensse). Three such are given in Mansi (9:763 sq.) dated A.D. 560; but, even if genuine, they were simply meetings of the bishop, his three abbots, and his clergy, for excommunicating or absolving great offenders: in the 1st case Meuric, in the 2d Morgan, kings of Glamorgan; in the 3d Gwaednerth, king of Gwent; all of them under Oudoceus, third bishop of Llandaff, and therefore scarcely before the 7th century. "The book, however, in which these records occur is a compilation of the 12th century" (Haddan and Stubbs, Councils and Documents, 1:125, 147).

## Landal, William[[@Headword:Landal, William]]

             a Scotch prelate, was early rector of the Church of Kinkell, and was promoted to the see of St. Andrews in 1341. He was still bishop of St.  Andrews in 1373, and present at the famous act of Parliament, April 4, that year. He died in the abbey of St. Andrews, on St. Thecla's day, October 15, 1385. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 24.

## Landau, Jecheskel[[@Headword: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.Griitz, Gesch. der Juden, volume 10, chapter 11, especially pages 409, 415, 438 Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 2:216 sq.

## Landauer, Moses H[[@Headword:Landauer, Moses H]]

             a Jewish rabbi of Germany, who died February 3, 1841, is the author of, Jehova und Elohim, etc. (Stuttgart, 1836): — Wesen und Form des Pentateuchs (1838): — Uebersicht der Geschichte und Literatur der Kabbala (published in Literaturblatt des Orients, 6:178 sq.). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:219 sq.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:762. (B.P.)

## Landed Estate[[@Headword: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 the:n expressly because that locality was suited to their pastoral habits (Gen 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 (Deu 11:10), while the interior, with the free pastures of the desert beyond their immediate territory, sufficed abundantly for their cattle (1Ch 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 (Gen 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 (Deu 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" (Num 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" (Lev 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 (Lev 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 (Lev 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 (Deu 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 Num 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 (Num 19:13-16; Num 31:19). Besides, the force was entirely infantry; the law forbidding even the kings to multiply horses in their train  (Deu 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; Lowaman, Civil Gov. of the Heb. chapters 3, 4, Michaelis, Mos. Recht, 1:240 sq.).

## Landelin And Landoald[[@Headword: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 Andebert, bishop of Cambray 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); Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:335; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 8:187. (J.N.P.)

## Landerer, Maximilian Albert Von[[@Headword:Landerer, Maximilian Albert Von]]

             a German theologian, one of the most learned and able, though not one of the best known, representatives of the school of theology occupying an intermediate position between the old supranaturalism and modern rationalism, was born at Maulbronn, Wurtemberg, January 14, 1810. He studied at Tubingen, where Dorner (q.v.) was his fellow-student. In 1839 he was deacon at Goppingen, in 1841 professor at Tubingen, and died April 13, 1878. Rejecting the Hegelian principle of absolute knowledge, Landerer emphasized the religious experience in the department of systematic theology. He did not, however, forcibly separate it from the revelation of the Scriptures. The central doctrine in systematic theology he regarded as the perfect union of God and man in Jesus of Nazareth; and he laid special emphasis on the humanity of Christ, insisting, however, upon his supernatural birth and absolute sinlessness. Being not as imposing in presence as Baur or Beck, yet he became one of the most influential of the theologians of his school, and the more intimately the students came in contact with him, the more highly they learned to respect him. Landerer published very little. For the first edition of Herzog he contributed thirteen articles, the most prominent of which was the one on Melanchthon. For the Jahrbucher fur deutsche Theologie he wrote on "The relation of grace to the freedom of the will in' the application of salvation."' After his death some of his former pupils published from his manuscripts, Zur Dogmatik. Zwei akademische Reden, together with Landerer's Gedichtnissrede auf F.C. Baur (ed. by Buder and Weiss, Tubingen, 1879): — Predigten (ed. by P. Lang, Heilbronn, 1880): — Neueste Dogmengeschichte von Semumler bis auf die Gegenwart (published by vaul Zeller, 1881). See Worte der Erinnerung an Dr. M.A. Landerer (Tubingen, 1878); Wagenmann in  Jahrbucher fur deutsche Theologie (1878), part 3; Wurtemabergisches Kirchenund Schulblatt (eod.), No. 26-28; Protestantische Kirchenzeitung (eod.), No. 20; Schmidt, in Plitt-Herzog, Real-Ezncyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Scnences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Landi, Gasparo[[@Headword:Landi, Gasparo]]

             an eminent Italian painter, was born at Piacenza in 1756, and studied the grand productions of Correggio and the Caracci. He gained the grand prize at the Academy of Parma for his fine picture of Tobias and Sarah, after which he was sent to Rome by the marquis of Landi, and studied under Pompeo Batoni. After gaining a number of prizes at the exhibitions, he was chosen professor of the Academy of St. Luke by pope Pius VI. In 1813 he was commissioned bv the French government to execute several works, and was appointed a director of the School of Design established in the convent of Apollinarius. His masterpiece is the picture in the Church of the Dominicans at Piacenza, representing Christ Ascending Mount Calvary. He died at Rome, February 24, 1830. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Landis, Robert Wharton, D.D[[@Headword:Landis, Robert Wharton, D.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian divine, son of Samuel Calvin Landis, a descendant of the old Huguenot family of Calvin, was born at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 8, 1809. He was converted at seventeen, joined the Baptist Church, of which his parents were members, and commenced his theological studies in the same year. He remained but fifteen months at an academy, and three months under a private tutor, before entering upon his pastoral labors. At twenty he united with the Presbyterian Church, was licensed in 1831, and ordained in 1832. He continued his studies while carrying forward his work as pastor, and became possessed of rare literary attainments. In 1835 he was pastor at Providence and Norristown; in 1839 at Allentown; in 1842 at Bethlehem, N.J.; in 1849 at Hillsdale, N.Y.; in 1852 at Greenville; in 1853 at Paterson, N.J.; in 1856 at Iona, Michigan; in 1860 at Somerset, Kentucky; in 1867 at Wilmington, Del. In all these places his preaching was attended with marked effect upon his hearers, and large numbers were converted. In 1868 he became professor in Danville Theological Seminary, where he remained one year. He died at Danville, Kentucky, January 24, 1883. Dr. Landis was the author of several valuable  works, and contributed largely to the religious and literary journals. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Lando Or Landon[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Landoald]]

             SEE LANDELIN.

## Landon, Seymour[[@Headword:Landon, Seymour]]

             a veteran Methodist Episcopal minister, was born May 3, 1798, at Grand Island, in Lake Champlain, N.Y. He was converted in 1815, and in 1818 joined the New York Conference. He served the following charges: Charlotte Circuit, Vermont; Ticonderoga Circuit, N.Y. (twice); St. Albans Circuit, Vermont; Chazy Circuit, N.Y.; Whitehall Circuit; Poultney, Vermont; Sandy Hill and Glens Falls, N.Y.; York Street, Brooklyn (twice); Lansingburgh, N.Y.; New York; Rhinebeck; Newburgh; Sugar Loaf; Hudson; Hempstead, L.I.; Sag Harbor; West Winsted, Connecticut; Grand Street, Brooklyn, L.I.; Greenpoint; Southport, Connecticut; Watertown, N.Y.; Mount Vernon; Astoria, L.I.; Amityville and New Bridge; Springfield; Orient. He was presiding elder of Hartford and Long Island districts. He died at Jamaica, L.I., July 29, 1880. His effective ministry closed at Orient when he was seventy-four years old, after an active ministerial career of fifty-five consecutive years. In 1852 and 1860 he was a delegate to the General Conference, and in 1856 and 1864 he was a reserve delegate. He was a man of excessive diffidence, with a conscientiousness and firmness equally marked. Of majestic figure and handsome face, his amiability of disposition and other personal qualities made him a welcome ornament in every circle of society. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1881, page 80.

## Landon, Whittington, D.D.[[@Headword: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.

## Landri (Lat. Landericus), Saint[[@Headword:Landri (Lat. Landericus), Saint]]

             twenty-eighth bishop of Paris, occupied that see about 650, under Clovis II, between Audebert and Chrodebert. He showed his love for the poor during the famine which desolated Paris in 651, by sacrificing all his own means, and selling even the vessels of the altar to help them. A tradition generally accepted in the diocese of Paris, and admitted by the Bollandists, attributes to St. Landri the founding and endowing of the hospital called Hotel Dieu. The monk Marculfe dedicated to Landri his Formules, which he had probably collected at his instigation. The name of this prelate is found among those of the twenty-four bishops who signed the charter of emancipation which Clovis II accorded, in 653, to the abbey of St. Denis, founded by Dagobert I. The last breviary of Paris places the death of St. Landri in 656, and his festal day on June 3, but he is usually  commemorated June 10. He was interred in the Church of St. Germain l'Auxerrois, then called St. Germain le Rond. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Christ. Antiq. s.v.

## Landriot, Jean Francois Anne Thomas[[@Headword:Landriot, Jean Francois Anne Thomas]]

             a distinguished French prelate, was born at Conches-les-Mines in 1816, and died at Rheims in 1874. He was vicar-general of Autun, in 1856 bishop of La Rochelle, and in 1866 archbishop of Rheims. He published, Discours et Instructions Pastorales (1856-60, 3 volumes): — Conferences, Allocutions, Discours et l'Mandements (1856-64, 3 vols.): — La Femme Forte (1863; 8th ed. 1868): — La Femme Pieuse (1863, 2 volumes; 7th ed. 1874): — La Prieie Chretienne (1862, 2 volumes; 6th ed. 1874): — Le Christ de la Tradition (1865, 2 vols.): — Les Biatitudes Evangeliques (1866). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Landsborough, David, D.D.[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 festivitatibus: — Vita Servatoris N.I.X.: — Paraphrases in dominicales Epistolas et Evangelia: — Alloquia Jesu Christi ad fidelem adnimam: — 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[[@Headword:Landulph]]

             SEE PATARIANS.

## Lane[[@Headword:Lane]]

             (ῥύμη, so rendered in Luk 14:21; elsewhere "street"), a narrow passage or alley in a city, in distinction from a principal thoroughfare (πλατεῖα). SEE STREET.

## Lane, Aaron D[[@Headword:Lane, Aaron D]]

             a veteran Presbyterian minister, was born at Lansingburgh, N.Y., January 29,1797. He studied at the Lenox Academy, Berkshire Co., Massachusetts; graduated from Union College, N.Y., in 1816, and from Princeton Theological Seminary. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Columbia, October 26, 1819; was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Waterloo, Seneca County, N.Y., in 1821, having served as stated supply for nine months. At Waterloo he continued to labor zealously and successfully over fourteen years, until compelled by bronchial affection to cease from preaching. He continued, however, to labor among his former people, loved and appreciated, until his death at Waterloo, November 2, 1880. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 11. (W.P.S.)

## Lane, Edward William[[@Headword:Lane, Edward William]]

             an English Orientalist, was born September 17, 1801, at Hereford. He studied at Cambridge, and spent some years in Egypt (1825-28; 1833-35). He published An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians (Lond. 1836, and often Germ. transl. Leipsic, 1856): — Selections of the Kur'an (Lond. 1843): — Arabian Society in the Middle Ages (1853). In 1842 he went for a third time to Egypt, and after his return, in 1849, began the publication of his main work, Arabic-English Lexicon, of which he published five parts (1863-74), and died August 9,  1876. Lane's nephew, Stanley Lane Poole, continues the work of the deceased. (B.P.)

## Lane, George[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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.[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 celanda 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.

## Lanfranco (or Lanfranchi), Giovanni[[@Headword:Lanfranco (or Lanfranchi), Giovanni]]

             an eminent Italian painter, was born at Parma in 1581, and studied under Agostino Caracci. At the age of sixteen he painted a picture of the Virgin with Saints, which was greatly admired, and placed in the Church of San Agostino, at Piacenza. At the age of twenty he visited Rome, becoming the pupil of Annibale Caracci, who employed him in the Farnese palace, and in the Church of San Jago, where he executed a number of works. His fresco paintings in San Agostino, particularly his Assumption of the Virgin, were greatly admired. Among his other good works were, Moses Striking the Rock; Abraham Offering Isaac; and The Flight into Egypt. He procured the commission to paint the cupola of San Andrea della Valle. It was a wonderful work of art, and represented The Virgin seated in the clouds, surrounded with saints, and contemplating the figure of Christ, which is in the upper part of the picture. In 1646 he was invited to Naples to paint the cupola of the treasury at that place. He was employed by Urban VIII to paint a picture for the Church of St.

Peter, representing that apostle walking on the sea. He died at Rome in 1647. There are a number of excellent plates by him, as follows: The Messengers of Moses Returning from the Land of Canatan; also a series of pictures of subjects from the Passion of Christ, for the chapel of the Crucifix. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Lanfredini, Jacopo[[@Headword:Lanfredini, Jacopo]]

             an Italian prelate, was born at Florence, October 26, 1670. He became civil auditor of cardinal Camerlingue in 1722, and the following year was declared domestic prelate, member of the consistorial congregation, and referendary of both signatures. Benedict XIII ordained him priest, March 16, 1727. Clement XIII, his compatriot, appointed him, in 1730, to a canonship in St. Peter's. After having been successively secretary of the congregation of the council, voter of the signature of grace, datary of the penitentiary, he was, in 1735, made cardinal, and bishop of Osimo and Cingoli, in the bounds of Ancona. He died May 16, 1741. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lanfrey, Pierre[[@Headword:Lanfrey, Pierre]]

             a French historian, was born at Chambery, in Savoy, October 26, 1828. He studied at the College Bourbon in Paris, and published, in 1857, L'Eglise et es Philosophes au XVJIII Siecle. In 1858 he issued Essai sur la Revolution Franpaise. Histoire Politique des Papes followed in 1860, but his main work is Histoire de Napoleon I (1867-75, 5 volumes; Germ. transl. Berlin, 1869-76). He died November 15, 1877. Of his OEuvwres Completes, the first volume was published in 1879. (B.P.)

## Lang (Of Wellenburg), Matthdus[[@Headword: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 Salzburgers 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 Matthaei 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.)

## Lang, Georg Heinrich[[@Headword: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 Testamentes), 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, Heinrich[[@Headword:Lang, Heinrich]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born November 14, 1828, at Frommen, in Wurtemberg. He studied at Schonthal and Tubingen, and was in 1848 appointed pastor at Wartau, in Switzerland. Here he commenced, in 1859, the publication of the Zeitstimmen aus der Reformirten Schweiz, the organ of the liberal reformed Church party. In 1863 he was called to Meilen, and in 1871 he was elected pastor of St. Peter's at Zurich. He died January 13, 1876, leaving, Predigten (St. Gall, 1852): — Versuch einer christlichen Dogmatik (Berlin, 1858; 2d ed. 1868): — Ein Gang durch die christliche Velt (1859): — Stunden der Andacht (Winterthur, 1862-65, 2 volumes): — Religioise Charaktere (1862). See Mayer, Heinrich Lang. Lebensbild einesfreisinigen Theologen ( Basle, 1877); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:763. (B.P.).

## Lang, John[[@Headword:Lang, John]]

             an eminent minister of the Society of Friends, was born at Vassalborough, Maine, in 1790. He felt a special interest in the North American Indians, and about 1840 was appointed one of a deputation sent out by the New England Yearly Meeting to the Indians west of the Mississippi River, with a view of suggesting and maturing plans for their improvement. President Grant appointed him on the Board of Indian Commissioners, a position which he held till his death. "Both as a commissioner and as a private citizen he served the government several times in missions of great delicacy and difficulty, accomplishing the service to the satisfaction of the government, and securing amicable relations with the tribes visited." He is represented as having been "a man of splendid physique and great vigor, both of body and mind, yet gentle and unassuming in manner, genial and sympathetic, most appreciative of others, and forgetful of self ill his efforts  for the good of his fellows." He died at his native place, May 25, 1879. See Friends' Review, 32:681. (J.C.S.)

## Lang, Joseph[[@Headword: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 wvas ordained in 1773. In 1780 he accepted a call to a Catholic Church in Leipzic, 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[[@Headword: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

## Langbaine, Gerard, D.D.[[@Headword: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 solemni in Vesperiis 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; Chaufepie, Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique; English Cyclopaedia; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 29:384. (J.N.P.)

## Langbecker, Emanuel Christian Gottlieb[[@Headword:Langbecker, Emanuel Christian Gottlieb]]

             a German hymn-writer, was born at Berlin, August 31, 1792, and died October 24,1843. He published, Gedichte (Berlin, 1824, 1828, 2 collections): — Das deutsche-evangelische Kirchenlied (1830): — Gesang-Blatter aus demi 16. Jahrhundert (1838): — Leben und Lieder von P. Gerhard (1841). Some of his spiritual songs are found in the hymn- books of Germany. See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:40 sq.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:763. (B.P.)

## Langbein, Bernhard Adolph[[@Headword:Langbein, Bernhard Adolph]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born in 1815 at Wurzen, Saxony. In 1841 he was deacon at Meissen, in 1853 church counsellor at Dresden, in 1866 first court-preacher there, and died July 17, 1873, doctor of theology. Langbein was-one of the most prominent preachers of Germany, and the author of many volumes of sermons and ascetical works. Of the latter we mention, Die Reise aus dem irdischen nach dem himmlischen Vaterhause (3d ed. Leipsic, 1869): — Tagliche Erquickung aus dem Heilsbrunnenu (2d ed. 1866): — Der christliche Glaube nach dem Bekenntniss der lutherischen Kirche (1873). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:763 sq. (B.P.)

## Langdon, Samuel, D.D.[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lange]]

             (On Genesis, Am. cd., page 73 sq.) remarks that “the significance of Paradise is this, that it declares the original ideal state of the earth and the human race, the unity of the particular and the general, the unity of spirit and nature, the unity of spiritual innocence and the physical harmony of nature, the unity of the fall and the disturbance of nature; lastly, the unity of the facts and their symbolical meaning, which both the barely literal and mythical explanations of the record rend asunder. The tree of knowledge of good and evil existed in some one form, but with it all nature is in some measure designated as a test. But the serpent, as the organ of that temptation, is not only the type of temptation and of sin, but, as originally a worm, the type of its brutality, its degradation, and its subjection. The record of the actual fall stands there as an eternal judgment upon the theoretical, the human, view of moral evil, especially upon the errors of Dualisue and Manicheism, Pelagianism and Pantheism. Hence arise the numerous and strong objections which the most diverse systems in old and modern times have raised against this record. The earthly origin of evil out of the abuse of freedom offends dualism, which derives it from an evil deity, from dark matter, or from the supremacy of sense, Although the serpent sustains the doctrine that, prior to the fall of man, sin had existed in  a sphere on the other side, working through demasoniac agency upon this (for the serpent was not created evil, Gen 1:25; generally not even fitted for evil, and can only be regarded, therefore, as the organ of a far different evil power), yet the visible picture of the fall in this sphere is a certain sign that the fall in that sphere could only have risen through the abuse of the freedom of the creature. But if we observe the progress of sin from the first sin of Eve to the fratricide of Cain; if we view the opposition between Cain and Abel, and the intimation of the moral freedom of Cain himself, so the Augustinian view, raising original sin to absolute originals death, receives its illuminatiom and its juist limits. But how every Pelagian view of life falls before this record, as it brings into prominence the causal connection, between the sin of the spirit world and that of man, between the sin of the woman and the man, between the sin of our first parents, and their own sinfulness, and the sinfulnesss of their posterity!

If we take into view the stages of the development of evil in the genesis of the first sin, how limited and vapid appears the modern view, which regards the senses as the prime starting-point of evil! But when Pantheism asserts the necessity of sin, or rather of the fall, as the necessary transition of men from the state of pure innocence to that of conscious freedom, the simple remark that the ingenuousness of Adam ewould have been carried directly on in the proper eay if he had stood the test, just as Christ through his sinlessness has reached the knowledge of the the distinction between good and evil, and has actually shown that sin, notwithstanding its inweaving with human nature, does not belong to its very being, clearly refutes the assertion. But how clear is the explanation of evil, of punishment, and of judgment, as it meets us in this account! that the natural evil does not belong to the moral, but, notwithstanding its inward connection with it, is still, the divine counteracting force against it; that punishment is to redeem and purify; that from the very acme of the judgment breaks forth the promise and salvation. These truths which are far above every high and- Christian view of the world, make it apparent that the first judgment of God, as a type of the world-redeeming judgment of God, has found its completion in the death of Christ upon the cross." "The deceptive promise of the serpent was fulfilled: man's eyes were opened (chapter 3:7), but he saw only his misery and nakedness. He was now brought to know good and evil, hut with the painful consciousness of having trifled with and lost the one, and of being sunk in thee depths of woe by the other. He had become as god; he had boldly cast off as allegiance to the one God, and assumed sovereignty over himself. He had constituted himself a God, no  longer the representative of God; he had become his own master, free as God; but this likeness to God brought notwith it the happiness which pertains to the divine Being, but was fraught with the deepest misery and c- noe" (Kurtz, Bible and Astronomy, page 171).

Muller, after affirming that "there is really nothing in the narrative of the fall: obliging us to consider that event as the primary beginning of sin, in the strict sense of the word," and "'that neither 'the image of God,' wherein man was created, nor God's pronouncing everything 'very good,' prevents our believing that the fall was only the outward manifestation of a perversion of the will preceding the empirical life of man — the outgo of an evil already 'presents its potentia, which might, indeed, by a persevering effort, have been crushed, but which forms the basis of an original moral depravity in human nature. The endeavor of the tempter was to bring out to view, and into action, this hidden evil" (Doctrine of Sin, Edinb. 1868, 2:385). This view of Muller's rests upon his theory of a sin of man in some pre-existent state, which he calls a "self-determination of the transcendental freedom before our individual existence." Rothe, on the other hand (Ethik, 2:180), places the es.sence of sin chiefly in the necessity of matter. " The passage through sin, in his opinion, is a metaphysical necessity. He conceives of our first parents not as anature at their creation, but destined to spiritual development; consequently their material part, in the absence of training, must gain the upper hand; and imperceptibly, and without blame, they found themselves, by their development, in sin. Hence evil lies in the divine world-plan, not merely as something permitted; it lies unavoidably in the creature, on account of his origin in the fact of his coming into existence in contradistinction from God; but as creature-evil has been ordained in the plan of the world, so also has its destruction, as it may come to light. Rothe (page 204) openly declares that the 'effort to separate evil from all connection with the divine causality must ever remain an idle undertaking;' although even he himself, in a measure startled at this result, imagines himself to hold the causation of human sin entirely apart from God. He says: 'The divine production of evil is at the saune time its absolute destruction. Within the sphere of redemption the necessity of sinning is not entirely removed, but is conceived of as constantly vanishing."'

In opposition to Muller and Rothe, as well as to all who presuppose evil as fundamental and its development as necessary, Pastor Rinck wrote an able article, Von dem Ursprung des Bosen, in the Theol. Studien a. Kritiken for 1852 (page 651 sq.; translated by Dr. Nadal in the Methodist Quarterly,  October, 1853), from which we make the following extract. After stating that it matters not, for this discussion, whether the Scripture narrative be literal or figurative, he states its substantial import as follows: "God caused thee tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil to grow up in the midst of the garden, and commanded man, 'Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; for in the day thou atest thereof thou shalt surely die.' This tree of knowledge, as planted by God, is not yet evil, but contains in itself the choice between good and evil — the innate possibility of sinning, which possibility is wound up with the very conception of a free being, whose liberty is not the divine necessity, "but lies outside of it. It is a tree of divine commands and prohibitions — objectively conceived, the object of knowledge; or, subjectively, the possibility of transgressing the command, the object of free choice. Alongside of this stands the tree of life; and both are united to prove that the mere possibility of evil, which is involved in the creation of man, is not yet anything evil or death-bringing.

Only with the realization of the possibility does opposition to the tree of life arise, i.e., the true life is forfeited, and death, curse, and destruction appear in its place. The tree of life which the living God had planted for man, and his expressed will not to eat of the tree of knowledge, presuppose the possibility of not transgressing, because God could neither require anything impossible of man, nor involve him inextricably in the meshes of a scheme which would certainly exclude him from the tree of life. The origin of evil from absolute good must forever remain inconceivable; not so with relative good. If we hold fast to this difference, the objection of Rothe will not hold: 'The religious-moral perfection of the first parents of our race would exclude all psychological possibility of the fall.' But this possibility is explained by the creation of man, who, as it were, stands out of God; not holy and perfect like God, and yet not a mere creature like the beast: he is not under and in the law of necessity, but possesses the likenes of God and freedom. The perfection of a creature is not divine, not absolute. The want of such perfection in a creature casts no shadow upon the Creator. According to the doctrines of Emanation and Pantheism, which mix God and the world, the fall cannot be explained, but only according to the doctrines of God and of the creation. When then, by the creation God set free beings out of himself, then the possible departure from God was given, and the question, Wherefore did not God hinder the evil that he foresaw? is entirely inadmissible. God does not prevent evil, because by so doing, contrary to his own will, he would injure and destroy the province of freedom (the divine image). Thus our Savior did not hinder the murderous  blows of his enemies, while at the same time he did not will or excuse them. In like manner, God was Lord over the parents of our race and over the serpent; but if he by his own will restrained his highest power, and left free play-room to free created beings, and still retains the government, he is not therefore destitute of power, but only consistent, and worthy to be adored.

Man should rather complain of hinmself, but give thanks to God that he has endowed him with such prerogatives, and glorify him with soul and body, which are God's. There was no necessity at all to sin; that complaint can only be established on the ground that, as Rothe teaches, evil inevitably developed itself. Besides, from the beginning of the world God had provided for the human race, whose fall he foresaw, the most perfect means of grace and gifts, in order to make that injury abundantly good, and to lead back the fallen ones to himself and his kingdom. Indeed, as all evil, so also must the sin of our first parents redound to the praise of the merciful God, because by it was conditioned the miss sion of the second Adam as the Redeemer of the world, But the possibility of the fall without blame to the Creator being admitted, another question sarises: Through what incitement did it become a reality? Even to this question the Scriptures give a satisfactory answer: it took place through outward prompting through evil spiritual influence, which was already existing in creation. Upon the basis of a breated but still spiritual existence, the possibility of being moved and poisoned by an influence at enmity with God must be admitted. The inexperience of our first parents, who were not isolated in the new world, corresponded exactly witthe subtlety of Satan in the form of a serpent. The kingdom of Satan, as a spiritual power, and the peccability of the first pair, whose pure self-determination was ensnared and obscured through that power, furnish a satisfactory explanation of the fall. The fall itself was certainly a free self-determination, otherwise no blame could attach to it; but not altogether so: both the decision and the guilt were shared by the devil, as the murderer from the beginning: it was a co-operation of human freedom with the temptation of the evil principle itself. But, according to the Scripture account, the temptation of our first parents was gradual, and the motives to the fall are thus psychologically clear. First of asl, the serpent raised a doubt concerning the divine prohibition and the ruinous consequences of sin: 'Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?' 'Ye shall not surely die.' Then he awakened pride, inducing man to overleap his appointed condition to become like God, and to use his freedom arbitrarily, and according to his own pleasure: 'God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof then your eyes  shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.' After this preparation came the thought that the tree was good for food, pleasant to look upon, and to be desired to make one wise. The sensual desire would now naturally start up, and the woman seduced became the seducer.

The powers of the soul were corrupted before the actual sin took place; the faculty of knowledge by doubt and unbelief toward God, the faculty of desire through unbounded striving and proud excess, as the Grecian fable of Prometheus represents it; and, finally, the faculty of feeling, through sensual longing, which propensity the religion of the Greeks sets forth .by Epimetheus and Pandora. Thus did the possibility of the fall, which rests upon the freedom of the creature, pass over into reality under evil outward influences. The conversation between Eve and the serpent shows how accessible she was the woman, as the weaker part, is first approached and misled, and not till then the man, and even then only through her; as also the apostle Paul expresses it (1Ti 2:14), the woman was first in the transgression. Rothe, indeed (page 221), thinks that the assumption of a satanical temptation does not at all help the difficulty, because that assumption always presupposes a real susceptibility of being tempted, a sinful predisposition, a rminimum of sin. But the possibility of being tempted to sin is not yet sin; with Rothe that predisposition is rather something already existing. It is certainly nmuch more worthy of God to conceive of his creatures as pure and good they first determining themselves to evil, and the enemy active therein. If even the Son of God could be tempted without injury to his sinlessness, much more the first Adam, whose personality and divine resemblance were specifically lower. If, in fine, we compare the scriptural theory, thus under'stood, with the modern philosophical explanations of the fall, the result will be that the former will be found to contain incomparably more truth and wisdom than the latter; although Rothe (page 221) is of the opinion that the Biblical account of the fall can no longer be maintained, and that the fall cannot be explained from the Mosaic stand-point. Only the Bible (and perhaps, agreeing with it, the mythology of antiquity) tells us of a man created in the image of God, in a paradisiacal state of innocence; and, in accordance with this fact, .shows how this state was interrupted and perverted into one of guilt.

Dr. Julius Miller, on the contrary, although Paradise has still a place in his system, places Adam in it as already a sinner. In the same way Rothe presupposes what he ought to show, sines he assumes evil as original and necessary in the development of the world. We cannot see, either according to Miiller or Rothe, whence it could properly come into the  natural world. Rothe, with his presupposition, is obliged to assume one of two things: either he must dualistically establish an evil principle in matter, and deny the pure creation of God, or he must ascribe the origin of sin, not to the perverted will, but to God himself: in both cases he has a Manicheean life-view of sentient beings. Sin with him is not a free act of man, proceeding out of the heart and will; it springs from the overmatching power of material nature sulb-duing his personality with inevitable necessity (page 226). ‘The origin of evil from pure good must forever remain inconceivable' (page 222); thus he establishes an impure material creation. Is anything ex-plained by this means? Whence comes, then, impurity into the material creation before all acts of the will? Is not the question more easily explained by the abuse of freedom than by metaphysics; more easily through the devil and man than by the act of the Creator? The fall, according to the doctrine of the Church, says Rothe (page 220), was a blunder in the work of the earthly creation, as it were, at the beginning. In order to avoid this, either an evil principle must have been co-operative in the creation, or else God himself must have ruined his own work at its commencement. Shall we call this escaping the blun. der made at the beginning? Is it not rather increasing it, and carrying it over into the region of the perfect and the holy? The latter of these two opinions, strictly taken, is that of Rothe, since he assumes matter as created by God, and from matter deduces sin. But the positions, Matter was created by God, and Matter is the opposite of God, and hence the origin of sin, contradict each other."

Literature. — Besides the books already cited in this article, see Hagenbach, History of Doctrines; Neander, History of Dogmas; Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine (all under Anthropology); Hase, Evang. Protest. Dogmatik, Lips. 1860, § 71-73; Fletcher, Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense; Doderlein, Inst. Theol. Christ. § 178; Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, 1:240 sq.; Richers, Schopfungsgeschichte (Leips. 1854, 8vo); Middleton, Essay on the Creation and Fall of Man, Works (1755, 5 volumes), 3:437 sq.; Zeller, Die altests Theodicae (Jena, 1803, 8vo); Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, Intr. 66; Cunningham, Historical Theology, volume 1, chapter 19; Delitzsch, Biblical Psychology (Edinu. 1867), page 147 sq.; Monsell, The Religion of Redemption (Lond. 1867), page 20 sq.; Meth. Quar. Review, October 1867, art. 7.

On the effects of the fall on nature, SEE NATURE.

## Lange, Abraham[[@Headword:Lange, Abraham]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died December 20, 1615. at Weimar, doctor of theology, and general superintendent, wrote Explicatio Catechismi Lutheri: — Explicatio Psalmi lxiv: — Responsum ad iv Quaestiones de Salute: — Responsum Lutheranum ad Anhaltinoruam Calvinianorum Defensionem de Imaginibus Abolendis. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lange, Friedrich Albert[[@Headword:Lange, Friedrich Albert]]

             a German philosophical writer, and son of the famous theologian Johann Peter (q.v.), was born Septmber 28, 1828, at Wald, near Solingen. He studied at Zurich and Bonn, was in 1852 professor at the gymnasium in Cologne, and in 1855 privatdocent of philosophy at Bonn. In 1861 he was appointed professor at the Duisburg gymnasium, was called in 1870 to Zurich, in 1873 to Marburg, and died November 21, 1875. His best work is  Geschichte des Materialismus und Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart (Iserlohn, 1865; 2d ed. 1873-75,2 volumes; Engl. transl. by E.C. Thomas, Boston, 1877 sq., 3 volumes). See Vaihinger, Hartiann, Duhring und Lange (Iserlohn, 1876). (B.P.)

## Lange, Friedrich Conrad[[@Headword:Lange, Friedrich Conrad]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 12, 1738. He studied at Copenhagen, was in 1771 con-rector at Altona, in 1776 court-preacher at Gltickstadt, in 1783 member of consistory, in 1788 doctor of theology, and in the same year provost and first pastor at Altona. He died January 9, 1791, leaving, besides sermons, De Resurrectione Corporum Nostrorum per Spiritum Sanctum (Altona, 1787): — De Jesu Christo, Mortuo quidens quod Corpus, Spiritu vero Vivente (ibid. 1789). See Dorinig, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:89, 141. (B.P.)

## Lange, Joachim[[@Headword: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 Leipzic 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 Controversiarums 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. Werthheinischen 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. Grundsatze 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 Caussa Dei adversus Atheismnum et Pseudophilosophiam, praesertim Stoicam, Spinoz. ad Wolflanan (2d ed. Halle, 1727, 8vo) (see H. Wuttke, Christian Wolff's eigene Lebenseschreibung, 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): — Mosaisches 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 parenthetica (Leipzic, 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): — Erlauterung 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 Christian[[@Headword:Lange, Johann Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born December 25, 1669, at Leipsic. He studied at his native place, and commenced his academical career there in 1694. In 1697 he went to Giessen, was in 1716 member of consistory and superintendent, in the same year doctor of theology, in 1718 general superintendent, and died December 16, 1756. He wrote, Theologia Christiana in Numeris (Leipsic, 1702): — Ordo Salutis sub Ratione Theoloqici Problematis Delineatus (Giessen, 1704; 2d ed. 1744): — Themata Selecta ex Variis Philosophiae Partibus Deprompta (1710): — De Antiquissimno et Novissimo Theologo hoc est, etc. (1716). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lange, Johann George[[@Headword:Lange, Johann George]]

             a German missionary among the Jews, was born in Silesia, November 30, 1804. In 1824 he was admitted to the mission seminary at Berlin. At the end of 1826 he was engaged by the London Jews' Society, and entered their seminary in 1827. In 1829 he was appointed as missionary, and stationed at Amsterdam. Towards the end of that year he was sent to Warsaw. In 1841 he was stationed at Lublin, and after many years of labor there was again placed at Warsaw in 1853. Towards the end of 1854 he was sent to Breslau, where he died, August 14, 1869. Mr. Lange was not ordained, but had from the Evangelical Consistory the regular permission  to preach in any of the Prussian churches, and to give lectures to the Jews. (B.P.)

## Lange, Johann Lobegott Ferdinand[[@Headword:Lange, Johann Lobegott Ferdinand]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born September 26, 1798. He commenced his academical career in 1824, was professor of philosophy in 1828, in 1838 doctor and professor of theology at Jena, and died in 1855. He wrote, Beitrage zur altesten Kirchengeschichte (Leipsic, 1828, 1831, 2 volumes): — Der Glaube an Jesus Christus den Weltheiland (1830): — Die Kindertaufe in der evangelischen Kirche (Jena, 1834): — Anleitung zum Studium der christlichen Theologie (1841): — Tabellen der Kirchen- und Dogmen-Geschichte (2d ed. 1848): — Der Protestantismus in kirchlicher und politischer Hinsicht (1844): — Lehrbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte (2d ed. 1845): — Exercitationes Exaninatorica ad Theologianm Dogmaticam et Historiam Dogmatum Spectans (Leipsic, 1846): Geschichte des Protestantismus (Elberfeld, 1847). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:301, 367,,434, 451, 548; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:767. (B.P.)

## Lange, Johann Michael[[@Headword: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 Prenzlow, 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 disputatt. 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 quorumdam 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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:391. (J.N.P.)

## Lange, Johann Peter, D.D[[@Headword:Lange, Johann Peter, D.D]]

             one of the most prominent German Protestant theologians of the 19th century, was born in Sournborn, near Elberfeld, of Reformed parents, April 10, 1802. He studied at Bonn, was in 1826 pastor of the Reformed Church at Langenberg, and in 1832 at Duisburg. He first attracted public attention by poems and a brilliant series of articles in Hengstenberg's Evangelical Church Gazette, at that time the leading orthodox journal in Germany. When Strauss published his famous Life of Jesus, Lange wrote in reply an able defense of the historical character of the Gospel-accounts of the infancy of our Savior. Soon afterwards, in 1841, he received a call as professor of theology to the University of Zurich, a position to which Strauss had been called before, but which he was prevented from occupying by a rebellion of the people against their infidel government. It was there that Lange prepared his great work on the Life of Jesus (1844- 47, 3 volumes), which is a positive refutation of the infidel work of Strauss, and one of the most original and ingenious among the many biographies of the Son of Man. It has been made known to the English- reading public by a translation published by Clark, in six volumes. In 1854 Lange was called to Bonn, and died July 8, 1884, on the same day on  which professor Dorner (q.v.) died. Lange's works are numerous: Christliche Dogmatik (Heidelberg, 1849-52, 3 volumes): — Das apostolische Zeitalter (1853-54, 2 volumes). But the work by which he is best known and has made himself most useful is his Theological and Homiletical Bible Work (1857-68), well known in this country by the English translation in twenty-four volumes. The success of this voluminous commentary has been marked. Lange conceived the plan, wrote the commentary on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Matthew, Mark, John, Romans, James, and the Apocalypse. The other books were prepared by a number of German and Dutch divines. Besides the works already mentioned, Lange wrote a number of ascetical and poetical works of high character. He was a poetical theologian, and a theological poet, and though having a theological system of his own, was thoroughly evangelical and in essential harmony with the Reformed type, but adapted to the modern currents of thought. Some of his poems have been translated into English. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:764-767; Schaff, Biographical Sketch of Lange, in the introduction to the American edition of the Bible Work; Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:361 sq. (B.P.).

## Lange, Samuel Gottlieb[[@Headword:Lange, Samuel Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born April 5, 1767, at Ohra, near Dantzic. He studied at Jena, and commenced his theological career there in 1795. In 1798 he was called to Rostock as professor, was in 1799 doctor of theology, and died June 15, 1823. He wrote, Versuch einer Apologie der Offenbarung (Jena, 1794): — Die Schriften Johannis ubersetzt und erkldrt (1795): — Diss. Historico-Critica I et II de Justini Martyris Apologia pro Christianis ad Antoninum Pium (eod.): — Ausfurliche Geschichte der Dogmen der christl. Kirche (Leipsic, 1796): — System der theologischen Moral (1803): — Versio Germanica Epistolce Pauli ad Romanos (1820-21). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:238, 367, 592, 897. (B.P)

## Langeac (or Langhac), Jean De[[@Headword:Langeac (or Langhac), Jean De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Langeac, in Auvergne, near the close of the 15th century, of a noble Sicilian family. He early embraced the ecclesiastical calling, and received numerous benefices, being preceptor of the Hotel Dieu of Langeac, rector of Coulange, count of Brionde, dean of the chapter of Langeac, archdeacon of Retz, treasurer of the Church of  Puy, count of Lyons, provost of Brionde, abbot of St. Gildas des Bois, of St. Lo, of Charli, of Eu, of Pibrac, then bishop of Avranches, a see which he resigned in favor of Robert Cenalis, after occupying it six months, and took possession of the bishopric of Limoges, June 22, 1533. He was also prothonotary of the sacred see, counsellor of the grand council, grand- almoner of the king in 1516, master of requests in 1518, ambassador to Portugal, Poland, Hungary, Switzerland, Scotland, Venice, Ferrara, England, and finally to Rome. At Limoges he established an episcopal residence, repaired the cathedral, and elaborately ornamented it. His memory is revered at Limoges, where he is still called "the good bishop." Wherever he was sent he firmly defended the rights of the king. At Rome even, he strongly maintained the liberty of the Gallicah Church, He was a friend and patron of literature. During his embassy at Venice, he had as secretary Stephen Dolet, who dedicated to him three of his books. He died at Paris, May 22,1541. Only a collection of synodal statutes in MS. remain, of his works. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Biog. Universelle, s.v.

## Langeais, Raoul De[[@Headword: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 Badeaux 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. Genesis 29:394 sq.

## Langeland (Langland Or Longland), John[[@Headword: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.

## Langelier, Nicolas[[@Headword:Langelier, Nicolas]]

             a French prelate, raised to the see of St. Brieuc in 1564, was invested by Pius IV, August 5 of the same year, and took the oath of the king, Feb. 3, 1565. His administration was full of trouble. Having, in effect, taken the part of the League, he became one of the active counsellors of the duke of Mercoeur. But the citizens of St. Brieuc and the better part of the diocesan clerks remained faithful to the cause of the king, and struggled with all their might against the encroachments of their bishop. Langelier was nevertheless a distinguished prelate, who well understood canonical questions. He died at Dinan, in September 1595, leaving Notae in Canones, the manuscript of which formed part of the groundwork of St. Gernvain, at the Imperial Library, No. 870. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gesnerale, s.v.

## Langham Simon Of[[@Headword: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 Simnon of Langham, in the  European Magazine, 1797; Th. Tanner, Biblioth. Britannica; Baluze, Vitae Pap. Aven. volume 1; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:409 Collier, Eccles. Hist. (see Index in volume 8); Neander, Church Hist. 5:136.

## Langhans, Friedrich[[@Headword:Langhans, Friedrich]]

             a Swiss rationalistic theologian, was born in 1829. He studied at Berne, where he became a member of the ministerium in 1853. He died April 17, 1880, at Berne, as professor of systematic theology. He was one of the main movers and promoters of the reform movement, and his writings, as Pietismus und Christenthun im Spiegel der dusseren Mission (1849): —  Pietismus und dussere Mission vor dem Richterstuhl ihrer Vertheidiger (1866): — Das Christenthum und seine Mission inm Lichte der Weltgeschichte (Zurich, 1875), are the best proofs of his neology. See Zur Erinnerung an Professor F. Langhans, in the Protestantische Kirchenzeitung, No. 28, 29, for 1880; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Langhorne, John[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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.

## Langle, Jean Maximilian Be[[@Headword: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'ecriture. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:414.

## Langres, Synod Of[[@Headword:Langres, Synod Of]]

             From the acts of the Concilumn 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 (Savonnieres), 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 prospecte 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[[@Headword: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 ascendency 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.], Cataloglue [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[[@Headword:Language]]

             ( לָשׁוֹן[Chald. לַשָּׁן], tongue; שָׂפָה). An indication of the manner in which man may have been led to the formation of a vocabulary is thought to be given in Gen 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 (שְׂפִת כְּנִעִן, Isa 19:18), the Chaldean (כִּשְׂדַּים לְשׁוֹןDan 1:4), the Aramean (אֲרָמַית, familiar to the Assyrians [2Ki 18:26], the Magians [Dan 2:4], and the Persian officials [Ezr 4:7]), the Jewish (יְהיּדַית, i.e., Hebrew; 2Ki 18:26; Neh 13:24; compare Est 8:9; Josephus, Apion, 2:2), the Ashdodite (אִשְׁדּוֹדַית, Neh 13:24); in the N.T. the Hebrew, i.e., Syro-Chaldee ( ῾Εβραϊvς, ῾ΕβραÞστί, Act 22:2, etc.), the Greek (ἡ ῾Ελλησικη, ῾Ελληνιστί, Joh 19:20; Act 21:37; Rev 9:11), the Latin ( ῾ΡωμαÞστί, Joh 19:20; Luk 23:8), and the Lyconian (Λυκαονιστί, Act 14:11). It is remarkable that, in all the intercourse of the Hebrews with foreign nations, mention is very rarely made of an interpreter (Gen 42:23); but the passages in 2Ki 18:26; Isa 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. Konigsberg, 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 Progqrammatum, 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[[@Headword: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'eveque de Soissons contre les religieuses du Vall de Grace et les benedictines de Saint-Corneille de Compiegne (Paris, 1726, fol.): — Opera omnia pro defensione Constitutionis Uniqenitus et adversus ab ea ateppelantes 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.

## Languet, Hubert[[@Headword:Languet, Hubert]]

             one of the most prominent French writers of the 16th century, was born at Viteaux, near Autun, in 1578. He studied theology, canon law, history, and natural sciences in Poictiers, Padua, and Bologna; visited also Spain, and was, by the reading of Melanchthon's Loci Theologici, induced to go to Wittenberg, where he remained from 1549 to 1560, making frequent journeys in Germany and Scandinavia. At what period he definitely embraced the Reformation is not known. In 1560 Languet entered the service of the elector of Saxony, which he left in 1577. The last years of his life he spent in the Netherlands) in intimate connection with William of Orange. Languet died at Antwerp, September 30, 1581. His letters, which are of the greatest interest for the history of his time, were edited by Ludovicus, under the title Arcana Seculi XVI, Huberti Langueti Epistolae (Halle, 1669). But his main work is Vindiciae contra Tyrannos (Edinburgh and Basle, 1579; French transl. by Francois, Paris, 1581; German by Freitzschke, Leipsic, 1846). In an elaborate manner he treats the question whether subjects (for instance, Protestants) have a right to revolt when oppressed for their religion's sake by their princes. See Philibert de La Mare, Vie de Languet (Halle, 1700); Chevreul, Etude sur le Seizieme Siecle, Iubert Languet (2d ed. Paris, 1856); Haag, La France Protestante; ViguLie, Etude sur les Theories Politiques-Liberales au Seizieme Siecle; Hotman, La Franco-Gallia (Paris, 1879); Scholz, Hubert Languet als kursachsischer Berichterstatter und Gesandter in Franklreich (1560-1572; Halle, 1875); Blasel, Hubert Languet (Oppeln, 1872); Plitt-Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laniado[[@Headword:Laniado]]

             (or LANADO), Abraham BEN-ISAAC, an Italian rabbi and comtmentator, 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 אברהם מגן, 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 נקדות הכסŠ, 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[[@Headword:Laniado, Samuel Ben-Abraham]]

             another Italian rabbi of note, flourished at Aleppo about 1580. He wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled חמדה כלי, 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 כלי יקר, 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 כלי פז, 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, Cataloqgus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 2433; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.

## Lanigan, John, D.D[[@Headword:Lanigan, John, D.D]]

             an Irish clergyman, was born at Cashel in 1758, and educated in the Irish college at Rome, where he took orders. He was then appointed to the chair of Hebrew, divinity, and the Scriptures, at Pavia, where he remained until  the university was deserted in consequence of the war in 1796, when he returned to Ireland, and was elected to a similar position in the College of Maynooth. He declined the appointment, however, and was chosen to a position in the record tower of Dublin castle in 1799, and remained there until 1821, when he was seized with insanity, and died in a lunatic asylum at Finglas, near Dublin, July 7, 1828. He published, Institutiones Biblice (1794): — Protestants' Apology for the Roman Catholic Church (1809): — Ecclesiastical History of Ireland to the Thirteenth Century (Dublin, 1822, 4 volumes). See Appletons' Amer. Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Lanigan, John, D.D.[[@Headword: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 A merican Authors, 2:1058.

## Lanini (or Lanino), Bernardino[[@Headword:Lanini (or Lanino), Bernardino]]

             an eminent Italian painter, was born at Vercelli about 1522, and studied under Gaudenzio Ferrari. He was much employed at Milan and Novara, where he painted the personification of The Deity in the dome of the cathedral. also several subjects from the life of the Virgin, and the picture of Our Saviour after the Flagellation, between two Angels, in San Ambrogio, at Novara. He died about 1578. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lanitho[[@Headword:Lanitho]]

             a daemon of the air, worshipped by the inhabitants of the Molucca islands.

## Lanka[[@Headword:Lanka]]

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

## Lanneau, Bazile E[[@Headword: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 ill 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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, Dirck Cornelius, D.D[[@Headword:Lansing, Dirck Cornelius, D.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born of a distinguished family at Lansingburgh, N.Y., March 3, 1785. He graduated from Yale College in 1804. While in college he was converted, and immediately felt impelled to preach the gospel. He studied theology under Reverend Dr. Blatchford of Lansingburgh, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Columbia in 1806. In the autumn of that year he went to an untried field and visited from house to house over a circuit of twenty-five miles, and soon gathered a church where the town of Onondaga now stands, and continued pastor for eight years. Then, on account of failing health, he retired to a farm, preaching as he was able till he became pastor at Stillwater, where he remained two and a half years, and two hundred converts were added to the Church. In 1816 he supplied the Park Street Church in Boston, Mass., and such an interest was awakened in his preaching that in a few weeks more than eighty persons were converted. He next accepted a call from the  First Presbyterian Church in Auburn, N.Y. Here he remained twelve years, and his own enthusiasm kindled a corresponding feeling in the hearts of those who heard his preaching and saw his labors, and more than a thousand souls were converted and added to the Church.

During a part of the time he occupied the chair of sacred rhetoric in the Theological Seminary. In 1829 he took charge of the Second Presbyterian Church in Utica, and in a short time five hundred persons were converted under his ministry. In 1833 he was installed pastor of a Free Church in New York city, then worshipping in Masonic Hall, but was obliged to retire in 1835 on account of ill-health. For the next ten years he labored chiefly as an evangelist in central and western New York, and one year in Illinois. In 1846 he returned to New York city, and took charge of a feeble church in Chrystie Street. In 1848 he assumed the care of the church on Clinton Avenue, Brooklyn, where his labors were crowned with great success, but, his health giving way, he was obliged to leave in 1855. In the spring of 1856 he removed to Walnut Hills, Cincinnati, Ohio, where he supplied the Vine Street Congregational Church. For fourteen weeks he preached twice each Sunday, until the second Sunday in December, when he suddenly failed. This was his last sermon. He died at Walnut Hills, March 19, 1857. Dr. Lansing projected the Auburn Theological Seminary, and by his personal efforts secured an endowment of $100,000. He was a member of the original board of trustees of Hamilton College. He published Sermons on Important Subjects (1825). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:407; Nevin, Presb. Encyclop, s.v.

## Lansing, Nicholas[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lantern]]

             (φανός, so called for its shining) occurs only in Joh 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.

## Lantern (2)[[@Headword:Lantern (2)]]

             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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lantfredus Or Lamfridus]]

             a disciple of bishop Ethelnold 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.

## Lao Kyun[[@Headword:Lao Kyun]]

             in Chinese theology, was the originator of a religious sect. whose followers are called "children of immortality." He came two hundred years after Confucius. His priests were magicians and sorcerers.

## Lao, Andre[[@Headword:Lao, Andre]]

             an Italian Carmelite, and professor of theology at Padua in the 16th century, was one of the most powerful and learned supporters of papacy in his time. After having published a dogmatical treatise of small importance, Disputationes Theologicae ad D. Thomam et de Conscientia, he made himself conspicuous and popular among the clergy by publishing Brevis de Summo Pontifice Tractatus, etc. (2d ed. Rome, 1668). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lao-tzu[[@Headword: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, Lu some writers have assigned the date of B.C. 523 to th it event. Szu Ma-chien, in relating his retirement from the government, simply says, "He then went away, anl 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 ascendency 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, "Seyn 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, lie 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.)

## Laodicaea[[@Headword:Laodicaea]]

             [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 Rev 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 (Act 18:19 to Act 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.; Rev 1:11; Rev 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.

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, Otiumn 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[[@Headword:Laodicea, Council, Of]]

             (Conciliumt Laodicenum), 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 πρεσβύτιδες and προκαθήμεναι.

## Laodicean[[@Headword:Laodicean]]

             (Λαοδικεύς), an inhabitant of the city of Laodicea, in Phrygia (Col 4:16; Rev 3:14), from which passages it appears that a Christian Church was established there by the apostles. See below.

## Laodiceans, Epistle To The[[@Headword:Laodiceans, Epistle To The]]

             "In the conclusion of the Epistle to the Colossians (Col 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 Λαοδικεαίς). 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 ἀναγνωσθῇ, 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 Ε᾿φέσῳ, 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 Φρυγιας 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[[@Headword: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 Shaus, 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 Canmbodia, 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 cifference, 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 Bankok), 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.)

## Laosynactes[[@Headword:Laosynactes]]

             (λαοσυνάκτης), an officer in the Greek Church, whose duty it is to collect together the deacons and the people.

## Lap[[@Headword:Lap]]

             ( בֶּגֶד2. Kings 4:39, a garment, as elsewhere; חֵיק, Pro 16:33, the bosom, as elsewhere; חֹצֶןNeh 5:13, the armful, as in Isa 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 hlerbs, 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 (2Ki 4:39). The Psalmist offers up his prayers that Jehovah would "render unto his neighbors sevenfold into their bosom their reproach" (Psa 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" (Luk 6:38). SEE BOSOM; SEE DRESS.

## Lapacci, Bartolommeo[[@Headword:Lapacci, Bartolommeo]]

             an Italian prelate, was born about 1396 at Florence. He was admitted to the Dominican order, received, in 1427, the diploma of doctor, and was, at the Council of Florence, one of the ten theologians who maintained the articles of union of the Greek with the Latin Church. Pope Eugenius IV recompensed him for this service by appointing him, in 1439, master of the sacred palace in place of Torquemada, who was made cardinal. Being sent to Greece in 1443, in company with F. Condelmerio, he became bishop of Argoli. Two years later he was at Constantinople, where he disputed publicly with Mark of Ephesus. At this time he occupied the see of Caron, and, abandoning it when the Turks became masters of the city, he retired to Florence, where he died, June 21, 1466. He wrote De Sensibilibus Deliciis Paradisi (Venice, 1498): and manuscript treatises upon several points of theology, also some sermons, etc. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Laphria[[@Headword:Laphria]]

             (Λαφραί), 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.

## Lapide[[@Headword:Lapide]]

             SEE STEEN.

## Lapide, Cornelius A [[@Headword:Lapide, Cornelius A ]]

             SEE CORNELIUS A LAPIDE.

## Lapides Judaici[[@Headword: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.

## Lapidoth[[@Headword:Lapidoth]]

             (Hebrew Lappidoth', לִפַּידוֹת, torches; Sept. Λαφιδώθ), the husband of Deborah the prophetess (Jdg 4:4). He may have resided with her at the time of her public services as female judge (Jdg 4:5), 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 (אֵשֶׁת, 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.

## Lapis[[@Headword: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.

## Lapithae[[@Headword: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.

## Laplace[[@Headword: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 Saurnur. 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 ils sur le changement de religion (Saumur, 1682, 12mo; translat. 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 Testiminoniis et Argumentis ex Veteri Testamento petitis, quibuns probatur Dominunt  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 nonulla (Saumur, 1656, 8vo): — Syntagma Thesium theologicarum (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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:529; Herzog, Real-Encycklop. 11:755 sq. (J.N.P.)

## Laplace, Pierre Simon de[[@Headword: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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:531 sq.

## Lapland[[@Headword: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 Tromsoe, 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.)

## Lapland Mythology [[@Headword:Lapland Mythology ]]

             The accounts on this subject are very scant, because the Lapps never had a public divine worship, but conducted their religious services privately in their homes. They had a. conception of a supreme being, which the North American Indians call the Great Spirit, the Laplanders, Jamula. The latter see three forces of nature combined in the supreme god. They have the god Tiermes, thunder, the god Storjunkare, the ruler of earth, protector of the woods, and the goddess Baiwe, the sun. These three were united in Jamula. Besides these supreme deities they have numerous others, who are subordinate, but. not servants of the former; they have their own smaller circles, as, for instance, the spirits of air, the water deities, mountain deities, and the dreaded evil deities of death, who separate the soul from the body, giving the latter to corruption, and bringing the former into distant regions of good hunting and fishing. They made sacrifices of that which they considered most costly, young male and female reindeer. They  offered sacrifices generally in the fall for the whole people. This was the only custom which pointed to a public divine worship. They had no priests nor temples; therefore every father of a household was priest and magician for his family, and taught his own sons. In the autumn, if none of the three gods accepted the offerings, they were sad, because the gods were angry. Although Christianity has entered among them, there are many heathen, who still adhere to their original usages.

## Lapping[[@Headword:Lapping]]

             (לָקִק, to lick up like a dog, 1Ki 21:19, etc.) of water by "putting their hand to their mouth." spoken of as a test in reference to Gideon's men (Jdg 7:5-6), is still in the East supposed to distiuguish 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, Pictoriat Bible, ad loc.).

## Lappish Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Lappish Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Lappish is vernacular to the Laplanders. The earliest religious work in the Lapponese is a manual containing the Psalms, the Proverbs, the book of Ecclesiasticus, the dominical gospels and epistles, published at Stockholm in 1648. This work was not generally understood, on account of the peculiarity of the dialect in which it was written, and accordingly another manual was published in 1669. It is not known at what time the New Test. was translated into Lapponese. The first edition of which there is any account was published in 1755, from which a new edition was printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1811. In the same year the Old Test. was published. Of late efforts have been made to give to the Laplanders of Russia, Sweden, and Norway versions in their respective vernacular, and thus there exist now, besides the Lappish version proper, the New Test. and Psalms in Norwegian-Lapp, the gospel of Matthew in Swedish-Lapp, and the same gospel in Russ-Lapp. See Bible of Every Land, page 322; QUANIAN VERSION. (B.P.).

## Lapse[[@Headword: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 tenpus 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[[@Headword:Lapsed]]

             SEE LAPSI.

## Lapsi[[@Headword: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; epp. canonicae Dionysii Alexandrini, c. 262; Mansi, Acta Concil. (Ancyr. 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[[@Headword:Lapwing]]

             in our version, is used for דּוּכַיפִת(dukiphath', perhaps from דּוּךְ, the Arabic for cock, and כֵּיפָא, head, i.e., topknot), a word which, occurring as the name of an unclean bird only in Lev 11:19 and Deu 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 ἔποψ 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.  AEschylus 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 onomatopoetic, 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 dav (Forskäl, Descr. Anim. pref. Page 7, Russel, Aleppo. 2:81; Host, Nachr. v. Marokko, page 297; compare Jerome, ad Zec 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 Cyclopcedia, s.v. Upupidae: Wood, Bible Animals, page 392.

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).

## Lara, David De[[@Headword:Lara, David De]]

             a Jewish writer of Portuguese descent, who died at Hamburg in 1674, is the author of, כתר כהונה, a Talmudico-Rabbinic lexicon (Hamburg, 1667): — ערדודde Convenientia Vocabulorum Rabbinicorum (Amsterdam, 1638). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:222; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl. page 174 sq.; Perles, David Cohen de Lara's Rabbinisches Lexikon (Breslau, 1868). (B. P.)

## Lararium[[@Headword:Lararium]]

             that part of an ancient Roman house which was appropriated to the Lares (q.v.), and where the morning devotions were offered up.

## Lardner, Dionysius[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Dissenterse 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. Atuthors, 2:1060; English Cyclop. s.v.; Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought, page 468; Dorner, Person of Christ, 2, part 3, App. page 407.

## Larentalia[[@Headword:Larentalia]]

             a festival among the ancient Romans, which was held in honor of Acca Larentia (q.v.). It was also observed in honor of the Lares generally.

## Lares[[@Headword:Lares]]

             in connection with the MANÈS and the PENÂTÈS, 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.

## Larned,William Augustus[[@Headword: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 Lamed 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[[@Headword: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; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:622. SEE ROSARY. (J.N.P.)

## Larochefoucauld, Francois, Duc De[[@Headword: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 Refexions 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 Rochefoeucauld; SainteBeuve, Estudes sur La Rochefoucauld, in his Portraits des Femmes; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:634 sq.

## Laromiguiere, Pierre[[@Headword: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 xixme 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 Frangais du xixme siecle (1857); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:669.

## Laron (or Loron), Jourdain De[[@Headword:Laron (or Loron), Jourdain De]]

             a French prelate, was at first provost of St. Leonard, which position he occupied until the death of Girard, bishop of Limoges. Several competitors claimed the succession to Girard, but Jourdain de Laron obtained it, and the duke of Aquitania conducted him in triumph to his episcopal city. He was the sub-deacon, but in two years was ordained deacon, priest, bishop, by Islon, bishop of Saintes, assistant of the archbishop of Bordeaux and Boson, Arnauld, Isombert. This ordination was not participated in by the archbishop of Bourges, who had Limoges in his province. The archbishopric of Bourges was at that time occupied by Gauslin; son of Hugh Capet, and therefore brother of king Robert; and he, through jealousy, caused the excommunication of Jourdain and his whole diocese. Jourdain, after a time, made a journey to the Holy Land. On his return, in 1028, he consecrated his cathedral. In 1031, at the Council of Bourges, he discoursed against the armed hordes which devastated the country, which discourse was resented by the bishops. He died in 1052. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Laros, John Jacob[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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'veque 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; Niceron, Memoires, volume 21; Histoire des Ouvrages des Savants, April, 1688; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:697. (J.N.P.)

## Larroque, Patrice[[@Headword:Larroque, Patrice]]

             a French spiritualistic philosopher, was born in 1801 at Beaume. He had taught with great success at different colleges, and was successively rector at Cahors, Limoges, and Lyons. The last position he held till 1849, when some differences arose between him and archbishop Bonald. In 1851 he took his dismission, and died at Paris in 1879. He published, Cours de Philosophie: — Examen Critique des Doctrines de la Religion Chretienne (1859), a kind of manifesto of deism: — Renovation Religieuse (1860), a kind of religious programme of the future, destined to unite all on the ruins  of positive religion. See Dumur, in the Revue Chretienne, 1861, page 581 sq.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Larsow, Friedrich[[@Headword:Larsow, Friedrich]]

             a German Orientalist, who died at Berlin, October 3, 1870, is the author of, De Dialectorum Linguae Syriacae Reliquiis (Berlin, 1841): — Des heiligen Athanzasius, Bischof von Alexandria, Festbriefe (Leipsic, 1852): — Die Genesis ubersetzt und schwierige Stellen erliutert (Berlin, 1843). (B.P.)

## Larue, Charles De[[@Headword: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 Comnpagnie de Jesus, pages 658-665; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:700.

## Larue, Charles de[[@Headword:Larue, Charles de]]

             a French Benedictine, was born at Corbie, July 12, 1684, and joined his order at Meaux. Being charged by Montfaucon with the edition of the works of Origen, he only succeeded in publishing the first two volumes. While superintending the print of the third volume, he was seized with a paralytic stroke, and died October 5, 1739, at Paris. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Larue, Vincent de[[@Headword:Larue, Vincent de]]

             a French theologian, nephew of the foregoing, was also born at Corbie. He continLed the work commenced by Sabathier, Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinac-Versionis Antiqua seu Versio Vetus Italica (Rheims, 1743-49, 3 volumes). Larue died at St. Germain-des-Pres, March 29, 1762. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences-Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Las Casas[[@Headword:Las Casas]]

             SEE CASAS.

## Lasaea[[@Headword:Lasaea]]

             (Λασαία, derivation unknown), a place mentioned only in Act 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 Kuinol, 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.

## Lasaulx, Anmalie von[[@Headword:Lasaulx, Anmalie von]]

             a Roman Catholic philanthropist, sister of Ernst (q.v.), was born at Coblentz in 1815. She joined the Sisters of St. Borromeo, and as sister Augustine was made mother superior at Nancy. She was sent, in 1849, to Bonn, apd took charge of the hospital of St. John the Baptist. In the German wars against Schleswig and Austria, and during the Franco- German war of 1870, she proved herself a true Samaritan. Her early education, which she received from pupils of Hermes, whose views were condemned at Rome, her connection with the Catholic professors of the University of Bonn, who refused to subscribe to the decisions of the Vatican council, led her to oppose the papal dogmas. She cared not for the menaces of the Ultramontanes, but followed her calling as before. Her self- denying and faithful attention to her onerous duties finally broke down her  health. While on her bed of sickness, the general mother superior of Nancy demanded of her that she should recant and accept the Vatican decrees, but she would not yield. At last she was obliged to leave the place of her lifelong' activity, and died in 1872. When she was dead, the dress of the order was taken from her corpse. See Reinken, Asalie von Lasaulx (Bonn, 1878); Lecoultre, Courte Notice sur Amlie de Lasaulx (Paris, 1879); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lasaulx, Ernst von[[@Headword:Lasaulx, Ernst von]]

             a German antiquarian, was born at Coblentz, March 16, 1805. He studied at Bonn and Munich, spent some time at Vienna, Rome, Athens, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, was in 1835 professor of philology at Wurzburg, in 1844 professor at Munich, and was deposed in 1847. In 1848 he was a member of the German National Assembly, and went with the Roman Catholic fraction in all religious questions. In 1849 he was reappointed to his professorship, and died May 10, 1861. He published, Der Untergang des Hellenismus durch die christlichen Kaiser (Munich, 1854): — Die Philosophie der schoinen Kiinste (1860): — Ueber die theologische Grundlage aller philosophischlin Systeme (1856): — Wahrheit der Thatsachen gegrundeter Philosophie der Geschichte (eod.): — Des Sokrates Leben, Lehre und Tod (1857): — Die prophetische Kraft der menschlichen Seele in Dichtern und Denkern (1858). The last four books were put on the papal index. See Holland, Erinnerungen an Ernst von Lasaulx (Munich, 1861). (B.P.)

## Lasha[[@Headword:Lasha]]

             (Heb. Le'sha, לֶשִׁע, fissure, in pause לָשִׁע; Sept. Λασά, Vulg. Lesa), a place mentioned last in defilling the border of the Canaanites (Gen 10:19), and apparently situated east of the Dead Sea. According to Jerome (Quaest. in Gen.), Jonathan (where קלדהיis doubtless an erroneous transcription for קלרהי), 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 CALLIRRHOE. The place is apparently also the ZARETH-SHAHAR SEE ZARETH-SHAHAR (q.v.) of Jos 13:19.

## Lasharon[[@Headword:Lasharon]]

             [many Lasha'ron] (Heb. Lashsharon', לִשָּׁרוֹן, signif. unknown; Sept. Λεσαρών, but almost all copies omit; Vulg. Sarmon, but in the Benedictine text Lassaron), one of the Canaanitish towns whose kings were killed by Joshua (Jos 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 Ο᾿φεκτησαρώκ of the Vat." (Smith). Masius supposes Lasharon to be the place mentioned in Act 9:35, where the reading of some MSS. is Α᾿σσάρωνα 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 Gen 10:19.

## Lasharon (2)[[@Headword:Lasharon (2)]]

             Concerning this place Keil remarks (Commentary, Jos 12:18), "Knobel supposes it to be the place called Saruneh, to the west of the lake of Tiberias, and conjectures that the name has been contracted from Lassaron by the aphaeresis of the liquid. This is quite possible, if only we could look for Lasharon so far to the north. Bachiene and Rosenmuller imagine it to be the village of Sharon, in the celebrated plain of that name, between Lydda and Arsof." Nevertheless, Conder (Tent Work, 2:338) and Trelawney Saunders (Map of the O.T.) adopt the above position at- Sarona, which is laid down on the Ordnance Map at six miles west of the south end of the sea of Galilee, and described in the accompanying Memoirs (1:414, quoting from Guerin) thus, "The houses are rudely built on two hillocks, which lie round a valley watered by a spring, which is contained in a sort of square chamber, the roof of which is formed of large slabs, and which is preceded by a large vaulted chamber in very regular cut stones, the whole of ancient appearance." Eusebius and Jerome state (Onomast. s.v. Sarona) that the region between Tabor and the lake of Tiberias was called Sharon in their time.

## Lashers[[@Headword:Lashers]]

             SEE KHLYSTIE.

## Lasitius, John[[@Headword: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 wevnt 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. bohmischen Bridcer, 2:90; Wagenmann, in Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 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 Moscovitarumn et Tartarorum religione, etc. (Speier, 1582, 8vo): — De Diis Samogitarum ceterorumque Sarmatatrum 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. bonmischen Bruder, 2:90; and by the same author, Quellen zur Geschichte d. bonmisch. 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[[@Headword: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 (Francf. 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[[@Headword: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 1.764 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[[@Headword: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, franzosische und italienische Spruche 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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). Lasco 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 arehiepiscoporum (Gnesnensium, page 278; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:203; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Lasko, John a[[@Headword: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 delucidae 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 Sendomiriensis. 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 (Elberfsld, 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. Kuyyper (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); Schrnckh, 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.)

## Lassen, Christian[[@Headword:Lassen, Christian]]

             a famous German Orientalist, was born October 22, 1800, at Bergen, Norway. He studied at Christiana, Heidelberg, and Bonn, spent some years at London and Paris copying and comparing Indian MSS., and published with Burnouf the Essai sur le Pali (Paris, 1826). Having returned to Bonn, he commenced his academical career by publishing Commentatio Geographica atque Historica de Pentapotamia Indica (Bonn, 1827). In 1830 he was made professor, and died May 8, 1876. He published editions of Javadeva's Gitagovinda (1837): — Gymnosophista, sive Indicae Philosophiae Documenta (1832 ): — Anthologia Sanscritica (1838; new  edition by Gildemeister, 1865, 1868): — Institutiones Linguae Pracriticae (1837); but his main work is Indische Alterthumskunde (1844-62, 4 volumes; 2d ed. volume 1, 1866; volume 2, 1873). In his Die altpersischen Keilinschriften (1836) he deciphered for the first time the-cuneiform inscriptions. (B.P.)

## Lassenius, Johann[[@Headword:Lassenius, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Waldau, in Pomerania, April 26, 1636. He studied at different universities, and travelled extensively. On account of his writings against the Jesuits he was imprisoned at Vienna. He was taken to the Turkish frontier for the purpose of being, sold as a slave to the Turks, but he managed to escape. He took his degree as doctor of theology at Greifswalde, was appointed court-preacher at Copenhagen, and died August 29, 1692. He was a very prolific writer, and wrote a great many ascetical works. See Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Jocher, Allgeneines Gelehrten-Lexikon s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:769. (B.P.)

## Last Day[[@Headword:Last Day]]

             SEE JUDGMENT DAY.

## Last Time[[@Headword:Last Time]]

             SEE ESCHATOLOGY.

## Lasthenes[[@Headword:Lasthenes]]

             (Λασθένης; comp. Λά-μαχος), an officer who stood high in the favor of Demetrius II Nicator. He is described as "cousin" (συγγενής, 1Ma 11:31) and "father" (1Ma 11:32; Josephus, Ant. 13:3, 9) of the king. Both words may be taken as titles of high nobility (compare Grimm on 1Ma 10:89; Diod. 17:59; Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v. אָב, § 4). It appears from Josephus (Ant. 13:4, 3) that he was a Cretan, to whom Demetrils was indebted for a large body of mercenaries (compare 1Ma 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).

## Latchet[[@Headword:Latchet]]

             (שְׂרוֹךְ, serok', so called from lacing and binding together; Gr. ἱμάς, a thong, as it is rendered in Act 22:25), the cord or strap which fastens an Oriental shoe upon the foot (Isa 5:27; Mar 1:7; Luk 3:16; Joh 1:27); proverbial for anything of little value (Gen 14:23). SEE SANDAL. "Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v. חוּט) 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 Isa 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 Luk 3:16 points to the same easily- removed article of clothing" (Smith). "In Mat 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 (Act 13:25). Chrysostom, on Joh 1:27, remarks, Τὸ γὰρ ὑπόδημα λῦσαι τῆς ἐσχάτης διακονίας ἐστι”(Kitto). SEE SHOE.

## Lateran Councils[[@Headword: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 θεανδρικὴ 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 θεανδρικὴ 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. H»i 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 and-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. Luk 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 Manichaean 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: I. 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 nows, 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 Guerk 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 JANSEXIUS, 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 OECUMIENICAL 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.

## Lateran, Church Of St. John[[@Headword: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.

## Latey, Gilbert[[@Headword: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, John, D.D[[@Headword:Lathrop, John, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born in Norwich, Connecticut, May 17, 1740. He graduated at Princeton College in 1763. For some months after his graduation he was engaged as assistant teacher in Moor's Indian School at Lebanon, Connecticut, and at the same time studied theology. He was licensed soon after this, labored as a missionary among the Indians, and in 1767 was invited to settle both at Taunton and Reading. In 1768 he accepted a call to become pastor of the Old North Church in Boston, preaching in that city until his death, January 14, 1816. He became a member of the Corporation of Harvard University in 1778. He was also one of the counsellors of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, vice-president of the Massachusetts Bible Society, and president of the Massachusetts Congregational Charitable Society. His publications consisted of single sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:68.

## Lathrop, Joseph, D.D.[[@Headword: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.

## Latil, Jean Baptiste Maie Anne Antoine, Duke de[[@Headword:Latil, Jean Baptiste Maie Anne Antoine, Duke de]]

             a French prelate, was born in one of the Isles of Sainte Marguerite, March 6, 1761. Being destined for the ecclesiastical calling, he entered the Seminary of St. Sulpice at Paris, and was ordained priest in 1784. Shortly after be was appointed grand-vicar of the bishop of Vence, who charged  him with representing him at the bailiwick assembly of his diocese at the convocation of the States-General. On the breaking-out of the French Revolution Latil refused to take the oath of the civil constitution of the clergy, and withdrew to Coblentz, but in 1792, having returned to France, he was arrested at Montfort l'Amaury, and remained for some time in the prisons of that city. Having recovered his liberty, he retired to Germany, and settled at Dusseldorf, where he devoted himself to preaching. He had determined to set out for America, when the count of Artois sent for him, in 1794, and made him almoner. Latil from this time never left this prince, and at the restoration became his chief almoner. Appointed bishop of Amyclea, in partibus infidelium, he was consecrated April 7,1816; became bishop of Cha,es in 1821, and archbishop of Rheims, August 11, 1824. He consecrated Charles X in the metropolis of Rheims, May 29, 1825. He was made a peer of France in 1823, made count by Charles X, and also minister of state. Pope Leo XII made him cardinal, March 12,1826, and the king gave him the title of duke. The same year he signed the declaration of the clergy of France touching the independence of the temporal power in civil matters. He was accused, however, of being a great partisan of the Jesuits, and of urging Charles X to adopt measures which aided the revolution of July. In view of this Latil fled to England. He soon returned to France and maintained his episcopal see, but refused the oath as peer of France. He died at Geminos in December 1839. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Latimer, Hugh[[@Headword: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 peop'e 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 Elngland 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, James Elijah, D.D[[@Headword:Latimer, James Elijah, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hartford, Connecticut, October 7, 1826. He graduated from Wesleyan University in 1848, and the same year became teacher of languages in Newberry Seminary, Vermont, and of Latin and geology in Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N.Y.; in 1851 principal of New Hampshire Conference Seminary, Northfield, N.H.; in 1854 principal of Fort Plain Seminary, N.Y.; in 1858 joined East Genesee Conference, and was pastor in Elmira and Rochester, where he made a deep and permanent impression by his learning and devotion. After this he travelled and studied in Europe. In 1869 he became pastor of a Church in Penn Yan, N.Y.; in 1870 professor of historic theology in school of theology of Boston University, and in 1874 dean and professor of systematic theology in the same school. He died at Auburndale, Massachusetts, November 27, 1884. Professor Latimer took high rank as a student of German literature. He possessed a genial temper, and was  greatly beloved by all under his instruction. His sermons, essays, and lectures are highly commended. See Alumni Record of Wesl. Univ. 1881, page 91; Meth. Rev. March 1886.

## Latimer, James Elijah, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Latimer, James Elijah, D.D (2)]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hartford, Connecticut, October 7, 1826. He graduated from Wesleyan University in 1848, taught in various schools until he joined the Genesee Conference, and held several pastorates until 1870, when he became professor of historical theology in Boston Theological Seminary. In 1874 he became dean and professor of systematic theology, which position he. held until his death, November 26, 1884. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.; Minutes of Annual Conferences (Fall), 1885, page 343.

## Latimer, William[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Latin]]

             ( ῾ΡωμαÞκός, Boman, Luk 23:38; ῾ΡωμαÞστί, in Roman, Joh 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 Versions Of The Holy Scriptures[[@Headword: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 Monoganmia, 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 sermonen 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 translationn; and this is rendered still more so by what follows: "Si autem veritas est qutarenda de pluribus, cur non ad Graecam originem revertentes ea quae vel a vitiosis interpretibus male reddita, vel a prasumptoribus 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, Lutini 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 . . . . quae, 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 syllablus between interpretationibus and usitata (thus INTEREPRETATIONIBUSITATA), 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 Aulgustine 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, Bibliorume SS. Latinae Vers. antiguae 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 Cantcabricdgian or Codex Beza, the Laudian, the Claromonztane, 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 lacunac. It is mentioned by Montfaticon in his Diariumn Italicumn, 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 smanu exaratus, ex autoegrapho ad unguemn 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 (Joh 4:48-52) from the edition of Irici:

AIT ERGO AD ILLVET IBAT JAMHIS NISI SIGIPSO DESCENNA ET PRODIGDENTE SERVI--VIDERITISOCCVRERNON---ILLI ET NVNTTIS DICIT ILLIVERVNT EIREG – S DMECENTES QVOL --------- ENIAM FILIVIS--------TVVS VIVIT---------INTER – GA------BAT HAIT HIS- ADE---FILIVS TVVSMELIVS HABVITVIVIT ET CREET DIXERVNTDIDIT HOMOHERI HORA SEPVERBO QVODTIMA – LIQVIDDIXIT ILLI IHSILLVM FEBRIS2. 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 Ma,tianay 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 Turiln, formerly in the monastery of Bobbio, containing portions of Matthew and Mark; fragments of Act 23:27-28; and of the Epistle of James, Jam 1:1-5; Jam 3:13-18; Jam 4:1-2; Jam 5:19-20; 1Pe 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 bly 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, waith 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. Amabrosianme (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 Speculumi Aulyustini, and he has since edited the Speculumn 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 Mar 16:14-20; the third an Irish MS. of the 7th or Sth century, containing Joh 11:14-44.

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

17. A fragment containing Mat 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 Rom 11:15, published by Knittel (q.v.) in 1762, and more correctly by Tischendorf, Anecdot. 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 Zeitschriftfiir 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 palmographists 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," Mat 12:12), προελπίζειν by prcesperare, κοσμοκράτορες by zmunditenentes, etc.; and we have such constructions as "stellam quam viderant in orientem" (Mat 2:9); "ut ego veniens adorem ei" (Mat 2:8); "qui autem audientes" (Mat 2:9); "pressuris quibus sustiletis" (2Th 1:4); "habitavit in Capharnaum maritimam" (Mat 4:13); "terra Naphthalim viam maris" (Mat 4:15); "verbum audit et continuo cum gautdio accipit eum" (Mat 13:20); "dominantur eorum, principantur eorum" (Mat 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 Col 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. Hieronoymians 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 Hebraos 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 Omniea (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 EIss, Pragmatisch-Krit. Gesch. der Vulgata (Tib. 1824); Wiseman, Two Letters on 1Jn 5:7, reprinted in his Essays, volume 1; Diestel, Gesch. d. Alten Test. (Jena, 1869); Rorsch, in the Zeitschrtfur 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.

## Latin, Use Of, In Tiie Administration Of The Sacraments[[@Headword:Latin, Use Of, In Tiie Administration Of The Sacraments]]

             The words of St. Augustine against heathen Rome in De civitate Dei. 19:7, "Opera data est, uit 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 ornes 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 Greekspeaking 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 1Co 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 Sfentopulcher, 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" (1.c. canon 9). Yet, in order to appear to make some concession to the requirements of the times, the synod decided (1.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, quse 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 Geschichtichle Darstelung d. Conec. 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).

Bellarmine (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 patria, filia et spiritua sancta."

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. Katholiciszmus, 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, 1Co 14:1-20, and continues: "Apostolus hoc loco ne de ordinario quidem linguae exterae in ecclesia usu sedc de extraordinario aliquo loquitur, quem argumentis ex visceribus rei petitis impulgnat. Quanto magis igitiur principiis suis inhaerens ordinarium ab ipsis mysteriorum ministris et universi cultus ducibus debuit corripere?" 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 understanded 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[[@Headword:Latinisms]]

             This word, which properly signifies idioms or phraseology peculiar to the Latin tongute, 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): Α᾿σσάριον, "farthing," from the Latin assarius (Mat 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 (Mat 17:25); κεντυρίον, cenlturio (Mar 15:39), etc.; λεγεών, legio, "legion" (Mat 26:53). Polybius (B.C. 150) has also adopted the Roman military terms (6:17) 1616. Σπεκουλάτωρ, speculator, "a spy," from speculor, 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" (Mar 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" (1Co 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" (Mat 5:41). This word is also used by Polybius (34:11, 8) and Strabo (5:332).

2. Latin Senses of Greek Words: as καρπός (Rom 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 (1Co 4:5).

3. Those forms of speech which are properly called Latinisms: as βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι "willing to content the people" (Mar 15:15), which corresponds to the phrase satisfacere alicui; λαβεῖν τὸ ἱκανὸν παρά, "to take security of," satis accipere ab (Act 17:9); δὸς ἐργασίαν, "give diligence," da operam (Luk 12:58) — the phrase remittere ad aliuom judicem is retained in Luke 23, σὺ ὔψει, "see thou to that," tu videris (Mat 27:4) (Aricler, Hermeneut. Biblica, Viennae, 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. Ηερωδιανός (Mat 22:16) alnd Χριστιανός (Act 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. HIad 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 Latinisnmis). 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 Latinifatis Historia (Prag. 1742). SEE NEW TESTAMENT.

## Latinus, Latinius[[@Headword:Latinus, Latinius]]

             an Italian critic, was born at Viterbo in 1513. He acted as secretary to cardinals Farnese and Colonna at Rome, and died January 21, 1593. He wrote. Observationies et Emendationes in Tertullianum: — Bibliotheca Sacra et Pronima (edited by D. Macer, Rome, 1659): — Epistolae, Conjectursce et Observationes Sacra Profanaque Eruditione Omatae (2. volumes). See Freher, Theatrum Eruditorum; Teissier, Eloges des Savants; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Latitudinarians[[@Headword: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 Laund 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 earnenestness 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 philosphihical 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 LowChurch 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 and-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. Stcaats-Kirche in Deutsch. Zeitschrsift. 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, Dogmengescicih. 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[[@Headword: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 Roccaberti 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 Comitiis Ratisbonensibus habitam (1544, 8vo). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 19:777.

## Latona[[@Headword:Latona]]

             in Greek mythology, was the daughter of Coeus and Phoebe, therefore a Titanide. Being loved by Jupiter, she reaped the hatred of Juno. The latter took an oath from the earth not to grant Latona a place, and persecuted her by the frightful dragon Python. Everywhere the earth refused to receive her. At last an island, Delos, arose from the sea, which had not existed when Juno exacted the oath, where Diana, hardly born, assisted her mother in the birth of her twin brother Apollo. Being one of the oldest goddesses, she was everywhere highly worshipped. Apollo and Diana would not forgive the smallest insult to their mother, as is fully shown by the fate of  Niobe, with whom she had stood on intimate friendship. Herodotus relates that she was also worshipped in Egypt.

## Latonius, Bartholomeus[[@Headword:Latonius, Bartholomeus]]

             a German controversial writer, was born at Arlon, Luxemburg, in 1485. He taught Latin at Treves, and rhetoric at Cologne and Freiburg. In 1534 he was called to Paris, and visited Italy in 1539. In 1541 he was appointed counsellor at the electoral court of Treves, with his residence at Coblentz, and died in 1566. Of his controversial writings we mention, Responsio ad Epistolam Buceri (1543): — Adversus Bucerum de Controversiis Quibusdam Altera Defensio: — Responsio ad Convicia et Calumnias Petri Datheni (concerning the communion and the sacrifice of the mass, Frankfort, 1558): — De Docta Simplicitate Primce Ecclesice (1559). At the instance of the emperor Charles V, he also took part in the Ratisbon Colloquy in 1546, and was appointed by him imperial counsellor in 1548. See Du Pin, Bibl. Eccles. 26:145 sq.; Jocher, Allgesmeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v.; Wagenmann, in Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Latour (DAuvergne Lauragais), Higues Robert Jean Charles[[@Headword:Latour (DAuvergne Lauragais), Higues Robert Jean Charles]]

## Latria[[@Headword:Latria]]

             (λατρεαί), 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 piaid to the Virgin, and dulis (q.v.), the worship paid to saints.

## Latroncinium[[@Headword:Latroncinium]]

             SEE EPHESUS, ROBBER COUNCIL OF.

## Latta, James[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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.

## Latta, William, D.D[[@Headword:Latta, William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, in May 1769. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania, studied theology with his father, Dr. James Latta, was ordained over the Church in Great Valley, Pennsylvania, in 1798, and continued there until his death in February 1847. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Latter-Day Saints[[@Headword:Latter-Day Saints]]

             SEE MORMONS.

## Lattice[[@Headword:Lattice]]

             stands in the Auth.Vers. for the following Hebrew words in certain passages: 1. אֶשְׁנָה(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 (Jdg 5:28; "casement," Pro 7:6). SEE WINDOW. חֲרִכַּים(charakkim', prop. nets; Sept. (δίκτυα), the net-work or lattices of a window (Son 2:9). 3. שְׂבָכָה(sebakah', an interweaving), the latticed balustrade before a window or balcony (2Ki 1:2; elsewhere a net or "snare," Job 18:8; "net-work," etc., around the capitals of columns).

"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.

## Latuinus, Saint[[@Headword:Latuinus, Saint]]

             traditionary first bishop of Seez, commemorated June 20, is said to have been sent into Gaul by Clement of Rome, and is assigned to some period earlier than A.D. 500. He is believed to be the saint popularly known as St. Lain, whom the Bollandists place at the beginning of the second century.

## Latzembock, Henry De[[@Headword: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.

## Lau, Johann Theodor[[@Headword:Lau, Johann Theodor]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Schleswig in 1813. In 1843 he was appointed second pastor at Hettstadt, near Husum, in 1855 pastor at Ottensen, near Altona, and died December 20, 1873. He is the author of, Gregor I, der Grosse, nach seinem Leben und Lehre geschildert (Leipsic,  1855) Refromations geschichte in Schneswig (Hamburg, 1867). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:770. (B.P.)

## Laub, Hardenack Otto Konrad[[@Headword:Laub, Hardenack Otto Konrad]]

             bishop of Viborg, was born in 1805. Having completed his theological studies, he was appointed to a pastorate in the isle of Funen. In 1854 he was made bishop of Viborg, and held this position till 1877, when feeble health obliged him to retire from his ecclesiastical duties. He spent the remainder of his life at Copenhagen, and died May 27, 1882. He was highly honored by the congregations as well as by the ministers of his diocese. (B.P.)

## Laud, William[[@Headword: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 ascendency 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 exclulsiveness 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-repented 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 comnendanm. 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 genufiexions, 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 Buclingham, 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, Lauld 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 bishops 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 kisng. 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, Bastvick, 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 eon 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 tyranical 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 con scientious 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 Indepeendecy, 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. Revelation 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[[@Headword: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:

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. Hygmnolocgicus, 2:97 sq. (Lips. 1855, 5 volumes, 8vo)

## Laudemium[[@Headword: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 ("quinquagesima 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 laudenzium 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.

## Lauder, Alexander[[@Headword:Lauder, Alexander]]

             a Scotch prelate, was rector of Ratho, promoted to the see of Dunkeld in May, 1440, and died October 11 following. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 87.

## Lauder, George[[@Headword:Lauder, George]]

             a Scotch prelate, was vicar of Crail in 1425, and was afterwards master, or preceptor, of the Hospital of St. Leonard's. He was promoted to the bishopric of Argyle as early as 1427, and was still bishop in 1462. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 287.

## Lauder, Robert[[@Headword:Lauder, Robert]]

             a Scotch prelate, was probably promoted to the see of Dunblane in 1448, and in 1451 was sent jointly with the bishops of Glasgow and Moray into England. He was probably bishop there in 1465. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 177.

## Lauder, Thomas[[@Headword:Lauder, Thomas]]

             a Scotch prelate, was preferred to the see of Dunkeld in 1452, which see he retained until 1476, when he resigned his charge on account of advanced age. He died November 4, 1481. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 89.

## Lauder, William[[@Headword:Lauder, William]]

             a Scotch prelate, was preferred to the see of Glasgow in 1408. He was bishop there and lord chancellor, April 14, 1424. He died about 1426. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 248.

## Laudiani Manuscript[[@Headword: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 Act 26:29 to Act 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.

## Laudisti[[@Headword:Laudisti]]

             a society which was instituted in Florence, in 1316, for the performance of religious lauds. The society still exists, and is in active operation.

## Lauds[[@Headword: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.

## Laue, Johann Gottfried[[@Headword:Laue, Johann Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born December 20, 1683. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1708 con-rector at Quedlinburg, in 1710 deacon, in 1715 pastor at Diffurt, and died May 30, 1721. He wrote, Meditationes  Exegetico-practicae: — Apparatus Exegetico-homileticus: — Historiae Arcanae Veteris Testamenti ad Judic. II et 1 Samuel III: — Disput. an Turriums et Campanarum Usus in Ecclesia Deo Displiceat? See Leporinus, Germania Literata Vivens; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laufeia[[@Headword:Laufeia]]

             in Norse mythology, was a Jote-woman, the wife of the giant Farbaute, and the mother of Loke, the evil one among the Asas.

## Lauffer, Jacob[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Laughter]]

             (צְחֹק, γέλως), an action usually expressing joy (Gen 21:6; Psa 126:2; Ecc 3:4; Luk 6:21); sometimes mockery (Gen 18:13; Ecc 2:2; Jam 4:9); and occasionally conscious security (Job 5:22). When used concerning God (as in Psa 2:4; Psa 59:8; Pro 1:26) it signifies that he despises or pays no regard to the person or subject. SEE ISAAC.

## Laughton, George, D.D[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 29:894.

## Launawater[[@Headword:Launawater]]

             in the mythology of the Finns, was an evil goddess, whose children were the plagues and sicknesses of men.

## Launay, Pierre De[[@Headword: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'Ecclesiaste (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 diffciles 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 diffciles de la sainte Ecriture (Geneva, 1667, 4to), a posthumous and highly esteemed work. See Haag, La France Protestante. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:907.

## Launoi, Jean De[[@Headword: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 rationunm quibus caussa Durandi de modo conjuctionis 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 argumnenti (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 Launoii 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: — Judiciun 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 Matrizmonium Potestas, vel de jure saecularium principum Christianorum in saciendis 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 Praemonstratenesis: — In Chartam immunitatis quam beatus Germanus, episcopus Parisiensis, suburbano monasterio dedisse fertur: — In privilegium quod Gregorius lus monasterio Sancti-Medardi Suessonensis 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 Launoi 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; Niceron, Memoires, volume 32; Colomies, Recueil de Particularites, page 329; Reiser, Elogium Joannis Launoii (Lond. 1685); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:912 sq., Herzog, Real-Encyclop. 8:230 sq.

## Launoy, Matthieu De[[@Headword:Launoy, Matthieu De]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Ferte-Alais, but embraced the Reformation at Geneva in 1560, and was admitted to the evangelical ministry. He was pastor at Heidelberg in 1573, afterwards at Sedan, where he had adulterous relations with one of his cousins, and was thus obliged to leave the place. Being excommunicated, he abjured Protestantism, and became one of the most furious preachers of the League. To justify his second apostasy he published, Defense de Launoy (Paris, 1578), and Declatrtion et Refutation, etc. (1579). To secure the favor of the Catholics, he published Reponse Chrietienne a xxiv Articles, etc. (1581). In consideration of his return to the Church of Rome, he was made canon of St. Gervais de Soissons, and. with Boucher, was one of the first four pillars of the League. He belonged to the council of sixteen who decreed the assassination of president Brisson. After the capitulation of Paris, Launoy went to Flanders, where he probably died. See Labitte, De la Demrnocratie Chez les Predicateurs de la Ligue et la France Protestante; Lichtenberger, Encyklop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laura[[@Headword: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 anchorets 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 willerness, 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[[@Headword:Laureate]]

             (from the Latin verb laureatus, crowned with the prize) was used of a successful theological candidate, in ancient times, at the Scotch universities.

## Laurel[[@Headword:Laurel]]

             a plant which was sacred to Apollo, the god of prophecy, and much used by those who pretended to inspiration. The heads of ancient seers were usually adorned with laurel wreaths, while they carried in their hands a laurel branch as a magic wand. The heads of victors in the national games  were also crowned with laurel wreaths; hence the expression, "winning the laurels."

## Laurence (1)[[@Headword:Laurence (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected bishop of the see of the Isles in 1249, but was drowned the same year. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 299.

## Laurence (2)[[@Headword:Laurence (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was made bishop of the see of Argyle about 1261. About 1269 he ratified to the monks of Paisley the churches of Kilfinan and Kiikeran. He was still bishop in 1299. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 286.

## Laurence Richard, D.C.L.[[@Headword: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 exhibitioner 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 abhine saeculis, ut videtur, ut id depreditum, nunc autem apud AEthiopas compertum et cum versione Latina Anglicanaque public jurisfactum (Oxon. 1819, 8vo): — Primi Ezrae Libri, qui aplud Vulgatum apellatur 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 systemalical 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 inmproperly 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.

## Laurent, Johann Theodor[[@Headword:Laurent, Johann Theodor]]

             a French prelate, was born July 6, 1804, at Aix-la-Chapelle. He made himself especially conspicuous by his opposition to the Hermesians (q.v.), and in recognition of his merits he was appointed bishop of Cherson, in partibus infidelium. As he could not reside in Hamburg, where he intended to live, he went to Rome, and was in 1841 appointed apostolic-vicar at Luxemburg, but was recalled, in 1848, on account of his too rigorous procedure. He retired to Simpelvelde, in the province of Limburg, and died February 20, 1884. (B.P.)

## Laurentia[[@Headword:Laurentia]]

             SEE ACCA.

## Laurentie, Pierre Sebastien[[@Headword:Laurentie, Pierre Sebastien]]

             a French Roman Catholic historian and publicist, was born January 21, 1793, at Houg (department of Gers). In 1817 he was professor of rhetoric at the Collige Stanislas in Paris, and in 1818 professor of history at the Polytechnic Institute. In 1823 he was appointed inspector-general of the public schools, but he lost this position in 1826 on account of his opposition to the ministry headed by Villele, whom he had attacked in his journal, La Quotidienne. Laurentie now devoted himself entirely to his journal, which, for a time, was called L'Union Monarchique, and after 1848 merely L'Union. Laurentie died at Paris, February 9, 1876. Besides his articles, he published, De la Justice au xix Siecle (1822): — De  lOrig'ine et de la Certitude des Connaisances Humaines (1826): — Introduction a la Philosophie (1829): — Theorie Catholiques des Sciences (1836; 4th ed. 1846): — Histoire de France (184143, 8 volumes): — Les Rois et le Pupe (1860): — Rome et le Pape (eod.): — Histoire de l'Empire Ronzain (1861-62, 4 volumes): — L'Athisme Scientifique (1862): — Le Livre de M. Renan sur la Vie de Jesus (1863). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laurentii, Laurentius[[@Headword:Laurentii, Laurentius]]

             a German hymn-writer, was born June 8, 1660, at Husum, in Holstein. aind died May 29, 1722, at Bremen. He published Evangelia Melodica, or spiritual hymns and songs, according to the Christian year, some of which have been translated into English; thus, Du wesentliches Wort ("O thou essential Word," in Lyra Germ. 1:15): — Wer im Herzen will eifahren ("Is thy-heart athirst to know," in Lyra Germ. 2:45): — Jesus was hat dich getrieben ("Jesus! what was that which-drew thee," in Hymns from the Land of Luther, page 79): — Fliesst ihr Augen, friesst von Thrdanen (ibid. page 92): — Ermuntert euch ihr Frommen (ibid. page 51). (B.P.)

## Laurentius[[@Headword: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.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 19:927. (J.N.P.)

## Laurentius (2)[[@Headword:Laurentius (2)]]

             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 (3)[[@Headword:Laurentius (3)]]

             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 Hymnn. in Laeur. (Prudentius, Peristeph.). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:232; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 6:365.

## Laurentius (4)[[@Headword:Laurentius (4)]]

             a Scotch prel ate, was promoted to the see of Dunblane in 1160, and was witness to a charter to the abbey of Dunfermline. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 170.

## Laurentius Valla[[@Headword: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 facetic; 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.

## Laurentius, Jacob[[@Headword:Laurentius, Jacob]]

             a Dutch theologian, who died at Amsterdam, March 19, 1664, is the author of, Refutatio Tripartita Fabulae Papisticae de Purgatorio, Limbo Patrum et Pueroruma: — Comment. in Epist. Jacobi ac Utramue Petri: —  Expositio Septem Epistolarum quas Johannes in Insula Pathmo Scripsit: — Apologia Catechesis Heidelbergensis contra Coppensteinium: — Explicatio in Loca Difficiliora Epistolarum Pauli: — Expositio Historiae Josephi Genesis xxxvi: — De Vera et Legitima S. Scripturae et Patrum Auctoritate. See Witte, Diarium Biographicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laurentius, Paulus[[@Headword:Laurentius, Paulus]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 30, 1554. He studied at Leipsic, was superintendent at Dresden, and died January 24, 1624, doctor of theology. He wrote, Erklarung und Auslegung der 2 Bucher Samuelis: — Auslegung des Propheten Amos: — Predigten uber den Propheten Jona: Eruklrung des xxii Psalmss: — Explicatio Symboli Athanasii, etc. See Witte, Diarium Eruditorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Laurentius, Saint[[@Headword:Laurentius, Saint]]

             In early Christian art St. Laurence usually carries a copy of the gospels, to denote his office of deacon. In the Church of St. Laurence, in Agro Verano, at Rome, there is a mosaic of the 6th century, representing the martyr with an open book in his hand, on which may be read the words "dispersit, dedit pauperibus " (Ciampini, Vet. Mon. tab. 66:2), in allusion to his kindness to the poor.

## Lauretti (or Laureti), Tommaso[[@Headword:Lauretti (or Laureti), Tommaso]]

             (called il Siciliano), an eminent-Sicilian painter, was born at Palermo about 1530, studied under Sebastiano del Piombo, and settled early in life at Bolomgna. He subsequently visited Rome, at the invitation of Gregory XIII, to finish the ceiling of the Sala de Constantino. He was honored with the appointment of president of the Academy of St. Luke. He died about 1610. Among his principal works at Rome are the fresco paintings of the History of Brutus; at Bologna are the Crowning of the Virgin, in Santa Mattia; the Resurrection, in San Giacomo Maggiore. He died about 1592. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lauria, Francis Laurent Brancate De[[@Headword: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.[[@Headword: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.

## Laurie, Robert[[@Headword:Laurie, Robert]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first minister and then dean of Edinburgh. He was advanced to the see of Brechin about 1670. He was allowed to retain his deanery, and continued to exercise a particular ministry at the Church of the Holy Trinity in Edinburgh until his death in 1677. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 168.

## Lauterbach, Erhard[[@Headword:Lauterbach, Erhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died December 16, 1649, at Naumburg, doctor of theology, is the author of, De Praedestinatione: —  De Persona Christi: — De Officio Christi Regio: — De Justificatione Hominis Peccatoris Coram Deo: — De Tripudio Solis Paschali: — Syntagma de Prcecipuis Fidei Articulis. See Witte, Diarium Biographicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lauterbach, Samuel Friedrich[[@Headword:Lauterbach, Samuel Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Poland, was born at Fraustadt, October 20, 1662. He studied at Breslau and Wittenberg, and died at his native place, June 4, 1728. He is the author of, Ariano-Socinianism Olim in Polonia (Frankfort and Leipsic, 1725): — Vita, Fama et Fata Valerii Herbergeri. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:770; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lavabo[[@Headword:Lavabo]]

             (I will wash) is a term expressing the act of washing the priest-celebrant's fingers prior to the celebration of mass. This occurs in the English rite, by custom, after the offertory. The act is performed as a sign of the purity with which he should approach the altar. In the Roman rite, before the priest assumes the sacerdotal vestments, he washes the tips of his fingers. This custom seems to have been almost universal. Whenever sacrifice was about to be offered,. the minister of the altar performed special ablutions. Such customs were current among the Jews, having been expressly enjoined by the law of Moses (Exo 30:17-21). In the Western Church priests ordinarily recite the last six verses of Psalms 26 during the act of washing, a practice which is referred to by several fathers, among others St. Clement and St. Cyril, and which became common throughout the whole Church about the 8th century. In St. Cyril's Catechetical Lectures, that bishop remarks, "You have seen the deacon provide water for the priest of sacrifice and presbyters around to wash their hands... That washing of hand is a symbol indicating that you ought to be pure from every sin and prevarication."

## Lavacrum[[@Headword:Lavacrum]]

             SEE FONT; SEE LAVATORY.

## Laval, Francois De Montmorency[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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. T'his 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.

## Lavalette, Louis De Nogaret Depernon[[@Headword:Lavalette, Louis De Nogaret Depernon]]

             a French prelate, was born at Angouleme in 1593, and was the third and last son of the duke of Epernon. Being destined by his parents for the ecclesiastical calling, he was sent while very young to the abbeys of St.  Mesmin of Gard, Bardona, in 1611; of Gimont, St. Victor de Marseille, the Grasse, etc., in 1621. As archbishop of Toulouse he assisted at the States- General held at Paris. Promoted to the Roman purple, January 11, 1621, he took part in the assembly of the clergy the same year, and of that held at Paris in 1625. In 1628 he resigned the archbishopric of Toulouse in favor of Charles de Montchol, his former preceptor, and devoted himself to military service. At his death, which occurred September 28, 1639, the pope refused him the honors customarily rendered to a cardinal, under the pretext that he had commanded the armies of the heretics against the Catholics. See Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lavater, Johann Kaspar[[@Headword: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 studelt, 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 lie 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 wvas 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 withoat 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. (Rom 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 tme e iscribed some beautiful poetical lines to him. During the intervals of suffering his mental activity ccontinued 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 (Aufgeklirte), 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 Cyclopedia, 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[[@Headword:Lavater, Louis]]

             a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Kybourg March l, 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. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 29:994.

## Lavatory[[@Headword: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 baptistery; 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[[@Headword:Laver]]

             ( כַּיּוֹרand כַּיּרֹ, kiyor', prop. a basin for boiling in, and so signifying a "pan" for cooking, 1Sa 2:14; or a fire-pan, "hearth," Zec 12:6; also a pulpit or "scaffold" of similar form for a rostrum, 2Ch 6:13; elsewhere spoken of the sacred wash-bowl of the tabernacle and Temple, Exo 30:18; Exo 30:28; Exo 31:9; Exo 35:16; Exo 38:8; Exo 39:39; Exo 40:7; Exo 40:11; Exo 40:30; Lev 8:11; 2Ki 16:17; plur. fem. 1Ki 7:30; 1Ki 7:38; 1Ki 7:40; 1Ki 7:43. plural masc. 2Ch 4:6; 2Ch 4:14; 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 diviue command (Exo 30:18) of brass (copper, נְחשֶׁת, 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 (Exo 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, 1Sa 2:22, where נָשַׁים, γυναικῶν, is inserted; Gesenius on the prep. בּ, 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, Kurtzg. 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 (Exo 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 (Exo 30:19; Exo 30:21; Reland, Ant. Hebr. Part 1, ch. 4:9; Clemens, De Labro AEneo, 3:9; ap. Ugolini Thes. 19). It rested on a basis (כֵּן, ken, 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 (Exo 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 (Num 5:17). Most probably this was water taken from the laver. Perhaps the same should be said of the 'water of purifying (Num 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 (Lev 8:10-11). No mention is found in the Ieebrew text of the mode of transporting it, but in Num 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 (2Ch 4:6). These lavers are more minutely described than that of the tabernacle. These likewise were of copper ("brass"), raised on bases ( מְכֹנוֹת, from כּוּן, to "stand upright," Gesenius, Thesaur. pages 665, 670, Sept. Graecizes μεχωνώθ, Vulg. bases) (1Ki 7:27; 1Ki 7:39), 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 (2Ch 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 (2Ki 16:17). Whether Hezekiah restored the parts cut off is not stated, but in the account of the articles taken by the Chalcdeans from the Temple only the bases are mentioned (2Ki 25:16; Jer 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 (1Ki 7:28; Thenins, ad loc.; Josephus, Aut. 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' (מַסְגְּרות, Sept. συγκλείσματα, Vulgate sculptur, probably panels. Gesenius (Thesaur. page 938) supposes these to have been ornaments like square shields, with engraved work.

(b) 'Ledges' (שְׁלִבּים, έξεχόμενα, juncture, from שָלִב, 'to cut in notches,' Gesenius, page 1411), joints in corners of bases or fillets covering joints.

(c) 'Additions' (לֹיוֹת, from לָוָה, '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' (סְרָנים, προέχοντα, axes, Gesenius, page 972; Lightfoot, massae aereae tetragonae), probably axles, cast in the same piece as the wheels.

(e) 'Undersetters' (כְּתֵפוֹת, ὠμίαι haeruli, eul, Gesen. page 724), either the naves of the wheels, or a sort of handles for moving the whole machine; Lightfoot renders 'columnae fulcientes lavacrum.'

(f) 'Naves' (חשּׂוּרים, modioli).

(g) 'Spokes' (חשֻּׁקַים, radii; the two words combined in the Sept. ἡ πραγματεία, Gesen. page 536; Schleusner, Lex. V.T. πραγμ).

(h) 'Felloes' (גִּבּים, νῶτοι, canthi, Gesen. page 256).

(i) 'Chapiter' (כֹּתֶרֶת, κεφαλίς, summites, Gesen. page 725), perhaps the rim of the circular opening (' mouth,' 1Ki 7:31) in the convex top.

(k) A 'round compass' (עָגֹל סָבַיב, Gesenius, pages 935, 989; στρόγγυλον κύκλῳ; 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).

"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 1Ki 7:31 to 1Ki 7:35, 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 (undersetters) rising from the four  corners of the base. Each laver contained 40 'baths' (Gr. χόας), or about 300 gallons. Its dimensions, therefore, to be in proportion to seven feet (four cubits, 1Ki 7:38) 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 (2Ch 4:1; Arias Montanus, De Templi Fabrsica, 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.

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.

## Laver Of Regeneration[[@Headword:Laver Of Regeneration]]

             a name sometimes given in the early Christian Church to baptism.

## Laverna[[@Headword:Laverna]]

             in Roman mythology, was a protecting goddess of thieves and deceivers at Rome, who had a temple hear the Lavernalian gate.

## Laverty, William W.[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 wrots 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 Devonsshire, 1:313; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 1:247, 306; Meth. Quart. Review, 1871, page 306 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Lavipedium[[@Headword:Lavipedium]]

             SEE FOOT-WASHNG.

## Lavish[[@Headword:Lavish]]

             (Heb. La'yish, לִיַשׁ, Jdg 18:14; Jdg 18:27; Jdg 18:29; 1Sa 25:44, a lion, as in Isa 30:6, etc., in pause לָיַשׁtext לָוַֹשׁ, 2Sa 3:15, with הlocal לָיְשָׁה; Jdg 18:7; Isa 10:30; Sept. Λάις in Samuel, Λαισά 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 (Jdg 18:7; Jdg 18:14; Jdg 18:27; Jdg 18:29), also called LESHEM (Jos 19:47), and subsequently, after being occupied by a colony of Danites (Jos 19:47; Jdg 18:27 sq.), also DAN (Jdg 18:29; Jer 8:16), a name sometimes given to it in anticipation (Gen 14:14; Deu 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 Gen 14:14), "Paneas" (see Winer, Diss. de vers. Saem. p. 54), which also Jerome (at Eze 27:15, and Amo 8:14) gives as an equivalent. Laish was long the seat of a corrupt worship of Jehovah (Jdg 18:14 sq.), and as it fell within the kingdom of Israel, Jeroboam established there the idolatry of the golden calf (1Ki 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 Isa 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 הִקְשַׁבַי לִיְשָׁה 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 Jdg 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 Jer 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 (Ε᾿λεασά, Cod. Alex. Α᾿λασά) mentioned in 1Ma 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 (1Sa 25:44; 2Sa 3:15, in which latter passage the text appears to have read לוּשׁ, 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 (Isa 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' (Jer 49:19); in the opposite direction we have a further trace of it in the Chephirah (' young lion,' now Kefir) of western Benjamin (Jos 9:17; Jos 18:26); northward, we find it encountering the disobedient prophet on his return from Bethel (1Ki 13:24); while in the pastures of Bethlehem to the south we see it vanquished by the superior prowess of the youthful David (1Sa 17:14-17)."

## Law[[@Headword: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 (Rom 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 (Hos 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 (Rom 1:20; Rom 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 (Heb 7:9; Heb 7:11; Heb 10:1; Eph 2:16; Col 2:14; Gal 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 (Psa 19:7), perpetual (Mat 5:17-18), holy (Rom 7:12), good (Rom 7:12), spiritual (Rom 7:14), exceeding broad (Psa 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 (Gal 3:13), or as a source of terror (Rom 8:1), although we must abide by it, together with the whole perceptive word of God, as the rule of our conduct (Rom 3:31; Romans 7). SEE LAW OF MOSES.

IV. Scriptural Uses of the Law. — The word "law" (תּוֹרָה, 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 Lev 6:9; Lev 6:14, 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, Lev 14:2), or even to an architectural design ("the law of the house," Eze 43:12): so in Rom 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 יָרָה, 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 Rom 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 proceeing from an evil power without. The same apostle even uses the term "law" to denote the Christian dispensation in contrast with that of Moses (Jam 1:25; Jam 2:12; Jam 4:11; comp. Rom 10:4; Heb 7:12; Heb 10:1); also for the laws or precepts established by the Gospel (Rom 13:8; Rom 13:10; Gal 6:2; Gal 5:23).

The occasional use of the word "law" (as in Rom 3:27, "law of faith;" in Rom 7:23, "law of my mind" [τοῦ νόος]; in Rom 8:2, "law of the spirit of life;" and in Jam 1:25; Jam 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 Joh 10:34, referring to Psa 82:6; in Joh 15:25, referring to Psa 35:19; and in 1Co 14:21, referring to Isa 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[[@Headword:Law Of Moses]]

             (תּוֹרָה משֶׁה) signifies the whole body of Mosaic legislation (1Ki 2:3; 2Ki 23:25; Ezr 3:2), the law given by Moses, which, in reference to its divine origin, is called תּוֹרָת יְהוֹה, the law of Jehovah  (Psa 19:8; Psa 37:31; Isa 5:24; Isa 30:9). In the latter sense it is called, by way of eminence, הִתּוֹרָה, THE law (Deu 1:5; Deu 4:8; Deu 4:44; Deu 17:18-19; Deu 27:3; Deu 27:8). 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" (2Ki 14:6; Isaiah 8:31; Isa 23:6) " Book of the La of the lord," or "Book of the Law of God" (Jos 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, שבכתב תורה, 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, תורה שבעל פה, νόμος ἄγραφος, which was subsequently written down, together with many rabbinical observations, and is contained in the twelve folio volumes which now constitut e 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 = ת+200 = ר+10-= י + 3 = ג Hence 613 = תריג 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 כמר =crown, viz., 400 =  ת + 200= ר + 20 כ; and others, again, observe that the numerical value of the letters תורה, law, amounts only to 611. The first in order of these laws is found in Gen 1:27, פרו ורבו, 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 Hebraeorus 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 understallning of the law, to remember its entire dependence on the Abrahamic Covenant, and its adaptation thereto (see Gal 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 saltune. 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 (Gen 9:6; Gen 38:24), in the existence of the Levirate law (Gen 38:8), in the distinction of clean and unclean animals (Gen 8:20), and probably in the observance of the Sabbath (Exo 16:23; Exo 16:27-29). 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 (Mat 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 (Deu 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 (Deu 17:14-20); and the prophetic office, in its political as well as its moral aspect, is spoken of still more vaguely as future (Deu 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 Lev 10:1-2, compared with Lev 10:8-11; Lev 24:11-16; Num 9:6-12; Num 15:32-41; Num 27:1-11, compared with Num 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 Ezkiel 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 (Exo 21:15; Exo 21:17; Lev 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 (Deu 21:18-21).

Right of the first-born to a double portion of the inheritance not to be set aside by partiality (Deu 21:15-17). For an example of the authority of the first-born, see 1Sa 20:29 ("My brother, he hath commanded me to be there").

Inuheritance by Daughters to be allowed in default of sons, provided (Num 27:6-8; comp. 36) that heiresses married in their own tribe.

Daughters unmarried to be entirely dependent on their father (Num 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 (Num 30:6-15). A widow or divorced wife became independent, and did not again fall under her father's power (Num 30:9).  Divorce (for uncleanness) allowed, but to be formal and irrevocable (Deu 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 (Exo 21:7-9; Deu 21:10-14).

Slander against a wife's virginity to be punished by fine, and by deprival of power of divorce; on the other hand, ante-connubial uncleanness in her to be punished by death (Deu 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 (Deu 25:5-10).

(C) Master and Slave.

Power of Master so far limited that death under actual chastisement was punishable (Exo 21:20); and maiming was to give liberty ipso facto (Exo 21:26-27).

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 (Exo 21:1-6; Deu 15:12-18). In any case (it would seem) to be freed at the jubilee (Lev 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 (Lev 25:47-54).

Foreign Slaves to be held and inherited as property forever (Lev 25:45-46); and fugitive slaves from foreign nations not to be given up (Deu 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 (Exo 22:21; Lev 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 (Lev 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 (Lev 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 (Deu 15:1-11).

(2) Interest (from Israelites) not to be taken (Exo 22:25-27; Deu 23:19-20).

(3) Pledges not to be insolently or ruinously exacted (Deu 24:6; Deu 24:10-13; Deu 24:17-18).

(C) Taxation.

(1) Census-money, a poll-tax (of a half shekel), to be paid for the service of the tabernacle (Exo 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 (Num 18:20-24).

(Of this, one tenth to be paid as a heave-offering [for maintenance of the priests] [Num 18:24; Num 18:32].)

(b) Second Tithe to be bestowed in religious feasting and charity, either at the Holy Place, or every third year at home (?) (Deu 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 (Deu 26:1-15; Num 18:12-13).

Firstlings of clean beasts; the redemption-money (5 shekels) of man, and (shekel, or 1 shekel) of unclean beasts, to be givein to the priests after sacrifice (Num 18:15-18).

(3) Poor-Laws:

(a) Gleanings (in field or vineyard) to be a legal right of the poor (Lev 19:9-10; Deu 24:19-22).

(b) Slight Trespass (eating on the spot) to be allowed as legal (Deu 23:24-25).

(c) Second Tithe (see 2, b) to be given in charity.

(d) Wages to be paid day by day (Deu 24:15).

(4) Maintenance of Priests (Num 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 (Exo 22:20), as e.g. Moloch (Lev 20:1-5), and generally all idolatry (Deuteronomy 13; Deu 17:2-5).

2d Command. Witchcraft and false prophecy (Exo 22:18; Deu 18:9-22; Lev 19:31).

3d Command. Blasphemy (Lev 24:15-16).

4th Command. Sabbath-breaking (Num 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 smitints of parents (Exo 21:15; Exo 21:17; Lev 20:9; Deu 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. 1Ki 21:10-14 (Naboth); 2Ch 24:21 (Zechariah).

6th Command.

(1) Murder, to be punished by death without sanctuary or reprieve, or satisfaction (Exo 21:12; Exo 21:14; Deu 19:11-13). Death of a slave, actually under the rod, to be punished (Exo 21:20-21).

(2) Death by negligence, to be punished by death (Exo 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 (Num 35:9-28; Deu 4:41-43; Deu 19:4-10).

(4) Uncertain Murder, to be expiated by formal disavowal and sacrifice by the elders of the nearest city (Deu 21:1-9).

(5) Assault to be punished by lex talionis, or danmages (Exo 21:18-19; Exo 21:22-25; Lev 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 (Deu 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 (Exo 22:16-17; Deu 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 (Exo 22:1-4).

(2) Trespass and injury of things lent to be compensated (Exo 22:5-15).

(3) Perversion of Justice (by bribes, threats, etc.), and especially oppression of strangers, strictly forbidden (Exo 23:9, etc.).

(4) Kidnapping to be punished by death (Deu 24:7).

9th Command. False Witness; to be punished by lex talionis (Exo 23:1-3; Deu 19:16-21).

Slander of a wife's chastity, by fine and loss of power of divorce (Deu 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, prolably by the people, with approbation of the supreme authority (as of Moses in the wilderness) (Exo 18:25; Deu 1:15-18), through all the land (Deu 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 Deu 17:8-13 (comp. appeal to Moses, Exo 18:26).

(c) Two witnesses (at least) required in capital matters (Num 35:30; Deu 17:6-7).

(d) Punsishment (except by special command) to be personal, and not to extend to the family (Deu 24:16).

Stripes allowed and limited (Deu 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 1Sa 22:11-19 (Saul); 2Sa 22:1-5; 2Sa 4:4-11; 1Ki 3:16-28; which extended even to the deposition of the high-priest (1Sa 22:17-18; 1Ki 2:26-27).

The practical difficulty of its being carried out is seen in 2Sa 15:2-6, and would lead, of course, to a certain delegation of his power.

2d. By the appointment of the Seventy (Num 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 2Ch 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 (Deu 17:14-20; comp. 1Sa 10:25). Yet he had power of taxation (to one tenth), and of compulsory service (1Sa 8:10-18); also the declaration of war (1 Samuel 11), etc. There are distinct traces of a "mutual contract" (2Sa 5:3 (David); a "league" (Joash), 2Ki 11:17); the remonstrance with Rehoboam being clearly not extraordinary (1Ki 12:1-6).

T'he Princes of the Congregation. The heads of the tribes (see Jos 9:15) seem to have had authority under Joshua to act for the people (comp. 1Ch 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 Jer 26:10-24; Jer 38:4-5, etc.).

3. ROYAL REVENUE.

(1)Tenth of produce.

(2) Domain land (1Ch 27:26-29). Note confiscation of criminal's land (1Ki 21:15).

(3) Bond service (1Ki 5:17-18), chiefly on foreigners (1Ki 9:20-22; 2Ch 2:16-17).

(4) Flocks and herds (1Ch 27:29-31).

(5) Tributes (gifts) from foreign kiings.

(6) Commerce; especially in Solomon's time (1Ki 10:22; 1Ki 10:29, 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 (Exo 29:38-42); and the fire on the altar never to be extinguished (Lev 6:8-13).

(b) The Meat-Offering (Leviticus 2; Lev 6:14-23) of flour, oil, and frankincense, unleavened, and seasoned with salt.  (c) The Peace-Offering (Lev 3:7; Lev 3:11-17) 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 (Lev 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" (Exo 19:5-6; Leviticus 11-15, 17, 18; Deu 14:1-21) shown in

[1] The Dedication of the first-born (Exo 13:2; Exo 13:12-13; Exo 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; Deu 23:1-14).

[4] Laws against disfigurement (Lev 19:27; Deu 14:1; compare Deu 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). 9).

[3] Their rights (Deu 18:1-6; Numbers 18) and authority (Deu 18:8-13).

(B) Holiness of Places and Things.

(a) The Tabernacle with the ark, the vail, 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; Deu 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 (Exo 20:9; Exo 20:11; Exo 23:12, etc.).

(b) The Sabbatical Year (Exo 23:10-11; Lev 25:1-7, etc.).

(c) The Year of Jubilee (Lev 25:8; Lev 25:16, etc.).

(d) The Passover (Exo 12:3; Exo 12:27; Lev 23:4-14).

(e) The Feast of Weeks (Pentecost) (Lev 23:15, etc.).

(f) The Feast of Tabernacles (Lev 23:33-43).

(g) The Feast of Trumpets (Lev 23:23-25).

(h) The Day of Atonement (Lev 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 antd 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 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 consecteion 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" (Lev 19:2, etc. comp. Mat 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. Rom 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 Deu 5:15; and the historical prefaces of the delivery of the second law [Deuteronomy 4]; of the renewal cf the covenant by Joshua [Jos 24:1-13]; and of the rebuke of Samuel at the establishment of the kingdom [1Sa 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" (Lev 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 Gen 47:23-26); and the offering of the first-fruits, with the remarkable declaration by which it was accompanied (see Deu 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 (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" (Exo 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 (Lev 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 ascendency. 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" (Deu 17:14-20; comp. 1Sa 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 (Act 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 (Mat 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, Exo 21:7-11; Exo 21:28-36; Exo 23:1-9; Deu 22:1-4; Deu 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 Deu 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" (Lev 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 (Heb 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 acceptation 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 νουικοί 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 Heb 7:19, "The law made nothing perfect" (οὐδὲν ἐτελείωσεν 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 (Jer 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 (Jos 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 (1Sa 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 (Jer 31:31-34). In this it did but carry out the prediction of the law itself (Deu 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 (2Ch 17:9). We find it especially spoken of in the oath taken by the king "at his pillar" in the  Temple, and mad e the standard of reference in the reformation of Hezekiah and Josiah (2Ki 11:14; 2Ki 23:3; 2Ch 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 Maccabaean struggle against the Syrians (note here the question as to the lawfulness of war on the Sabbath in this war [1Ma 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 (Act 2:23; 1Co 9:21) for the heathen, and even for the uneducated mass of their followers (Joh 7:49), marked and stereotyped their principle.  Against this idolatry of the law (which, when imported into the Christian Church, is described ad 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 Esssenes, 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 (Gal 3:24); and Christ was "the end" or object "of the law" (Rom 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 Deu 5:24-27; Num 17:12-13; Job 9:32-35; Job 13:21-22; Isa 45:1 l, 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 vehement and desperate antagonism the power of sin dwelling in man as fallen (Rom 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" (Jam 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" (Rom 6:14-15; Gal 5:18); "that we are dead to law" (Rom 7:4-6; Gal 2:19), " redeemed from under law" (Gal 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 reverenced 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 (Heb 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 (Mat 5:17-18; Luk 10:26-28; Rom 5:15 to Rom 8:39). Hence, when, in Rom 6:14; Rom 7:1-6; Gal 2:19; Gal 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 (Rom 4:12-14; Gal 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 (Mar 10:19; Rom 13:9). It is true Jesus sums up the spirit of the whole ten commandments in the two of love to God and man (Mat 22:37-40), and St. Paul (Rom 13:10), as well as St. John (1Jn 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 (Act 15:10), but still more emphatically the law of "good works," including, of course, especially the moral code (see Rom 2:21-22; Rom 7:7) — to the ante-Mosaic dispensation, the faith which Abraham had when yet a Gentile (Rom 4:10; Gal 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. Joh 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.
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## Law, Edmund[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 nublic and private duty of religion he was exact, fixed, old regular." — Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, page 22.

## Law, James[[@Headword:Law, James]]

             a Scotch prelate, was promoted to the see of Orkney in 1606, where he continued until 1615, when he was translated to the bishopric of Glasgow. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 227.

## Law, Joseph[[@Headword: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 superannnuated 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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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 Mandeille'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.

## Lawa Ailek[[@Headword:Lawa Ailek]]

             in the mythology of the Laplanders, was one of the three deities who are constant companions of the sun.

## Lawkapatim[[@Headword:Lawkapatim]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was worshipped by the Poles as a field-god, and his favor entreated before ploughing.

## Lawn Sleeves[[@Headword:Lawn Sleeves]]

             SEE ROCHETTE.

## Lawrence, Abbott[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lawrence, Amos]]

             a distinguished American philanthropist, was born at Groton Massachussetts, 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, Edward Alexander, D.D[[@Headword:Lawrence, Edward Alexander, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at St. Johnsbury, Vermont, October 7, 1808. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1834, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1838; became pastor of Centre Church, Haverhill, Massachusetts, in 1839, at Marblehead in 1845, professor in Hartford Theological Seminary in 1854 pastor at Oxford, N.H., in 1865, South  Church, Marblehead, in 1868, and remained there without charge from 1873 till his death, September 4, 1883. He published a number of religious essays. See Cong. Year-book, 1884, page 28.

## Lawrence, Francis Effingham, D.D[[@Headword:Lawrence, Francis Effingham, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was a graduate of St. Paul's College, at College Point, N.Y., and in 1852 of the General Theological Seminary; in 1853 he was assistant minister of the Church of the Holy Communion, New York city, and remained such until 1859, when he was chosen rector,  and continued in that relation until his death, June 11, 1879, at the age of fifty-three years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1880, page 171.

## Lawrence, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Lawrence, Samuel, D.D]]

             an English Presbyterian clergyman, was born at Nantwich, Cheshire, in 1693. His father was a Dissenting minister. He was educated at the Glasgow University, became tutor in the family of chief baron Ward, and settled as a minister first at Newcastle, Stafford, in 1714. In 1727 he became pastor at Newcastle-on-Tyne, but his health failing, in 1733, he had to go south, and settled at Monkwell Street, London, where he had a crowded audience for many years, and his ministry was very successful. He was learned, serious, cheerful, modest and polite, zealous and pious. He died, October 1, 1760, and was interred in Bunhill Fields. See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 3:208.

## Lawrence, Sir Henry Montgomery[[@Headword: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 Punjaub, 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 Oficers (London, 1867); Fraser's Magaazine, December 1857; North British Review, May 1860; Butler, Land of the Veda, page 319 sq.

## Lawrence, St[[@Headword:Lawrence, St]]

             SEE LAURENTIUS, ST.

## Lawrence, St., Regular Canons of[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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.

## Lawson, George, D.D[[@Headword:Lawson, George, D.D]]

             an eminent Scotch divine, was born March 13, 1749, near West Linton, Peeblesshire. At twenty he had finished his studies, and was licensed to preach. In 1771 he was ordained pastor of the Bergher Secession Church at Selkirk, where he continued during the remainder of his life. For more than thirty years he was also professor of divinity in the school of theology at the same place, and died there February 21, 1820. He was a man of marked ability, extensive scholarship, and earnest piety. Dr. Lawson published many volumes of Sermons and Lectures; also Discourses on the Whole Book of Esther, etc. (Edinb. 1804, 12mo; Lond. 1809, 12mo): — Lectures on the Whole Book of Ruth, etc. (Edinb. 1805, 12mo): — Lectures on the History of Joseph (1807, 2 volumes, 12mo): — Exposition of the Book of Proverbs (1821, 2 volumes, 12mo; posth. pub. from 80 MS. vols. left by the author). See Macfarlane, Life (Edinb. 1861; N.Y. 1881).

## Lawyer[[@Headword:Lawyer]]

             (νομικός, relating to the law, as in Tit 3:9), "in its general sense, denotes one skilled in the law, as in Tit 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 (Matthew 28:35; Luk 10:25). The same person who is called 'a lawyer' in these texts is in the parallel passage (Mar 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, Act 5:34). "By the use of the word νομικός (in Tit 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 Rom 4:14), and only used as a title in common parslance (comp. the use of it in Tit 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[[@Headword: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 Abbots Or Abbacomites[[@Headword: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.

## Lay Baptism [[@Headword:Lay Baptism ]]

             SEE BAPTISM, LAY.

## Lay Brothers[[@Headword: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[[@Headword: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[[@Headword:Lay Elders]]

             SEE ELDER.

## Lay Preaching[[@Headword: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" (1Pe 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" (Mat 5:16); "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples" (Joh 15:8) " Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God" (Luk 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 Luk 24:48; Act 1:21; Act 1:2; Act 2:32; Act 4:20; Act 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 Mat 10:5-42; Luk 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" (Act 8:1; Act 8:4). 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" (Act 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 Rom 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 Iconinu 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 4 th recognizes that at the commencement "omnibus concessum est et evangelizare, et baptizare, et scriptures 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[[@Headword: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.

T'he 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 wass 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, 1.872, 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.)

## Lay, Benjamin[[@Headword: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, Henry Champlin, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Lay, Henry Champlin, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal bishop, was born at Richmond, Virginia, December 6, 1823. He graduated from the University of Virginia in 1842, and from the theological seminary at Alexandria in 1846, became rector of the Church of the Nativity, Huntsville, Alabama, in 1847, and bishop of Arkansas in 1859, bishop of Easton in 1869, and died September 17, 1885.

## Layard, Charles Peter, D.D.[[@Headword: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.

## Laying on of Hands[[@Headword:Laying on of Hands]]

             SEE HANDS, IMPOSITION OF.

## Layish[[@Headword:Layish]]

             SEE LION.

## Laymann, Paul[[@Headword: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 Repertoriumn (Diling. 1644). See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 6:383.

## Laynez[[@Headword:Laynez]]

             SEE LAINEZ.

## Layritz, Friedrich[[@Headword:Layritz, Friedrich]]

             a famous German hymnologist, was born January 30, 1808, at Nemmersdorf, in Upper Franconia. He studied at Erlangen, was in 1837 preacher in Hirschlach, and died at Schwaningen, near Anspach, in 1859. He is the author of, Kern des deufschen Kirchengesanges (3d ed. Nordlingen, 1853-56): — Litusrgische Gemeindegesange (1855): — Geistliche Melodien meist aus dem 16. und 17. Jahrhundert (3d ed. Erlangen, 1860): — Die Lituyrie eines vollstandigen Hauptgottesdienstes  (1849). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:772; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:53 sq. (B.P.)

## Layritz, Johann Georg[[@Headword: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 simplici et composito (Jenae, 1668, 4to): — Auszug der Kirchengeschichte des Neuen Testans. (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[[@Headword: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, Stuttgard, 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[[@Headword:Lazae Or Lazi]]

             (Λᾶζαι), 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, it 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 Lazue 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-Lexikcon, 6:386; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.

## Lazarists, Or Priests Of The Mission[[@Headword:Lazarists, Or Priests Of The Mission]]

             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, Statisches Jathrbuch 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.)

## Lazarus[[@Headword:Lazarus]]

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

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

“The raising of Lazarus from the dead was a work of Christ beyond measure great, and of all the miracles he had hitherto wrought undoubtedly the most stupendous. ‘If it can be incontrovertibly shown that Christ performed one such miraculous act as this,' says Tholuck (in his Commentar zum Evang. Johannis), ‘much will thereby be gained to the cause of Christianity. One point so peculiar in its character, if irrefragably established, may serve to develop a belief in the entire evangelical record.' The sceptical Spinoza was fully conscious of this, as is related by Bayle (Dict. s.v. Spinoza). It is not surprising, therefore, that the enemies of  Christianity have used their utmost exertions to destroy the credibility of the narrative. The earlier cavils of Woolston and his followers were. however, satisfactorily answered by Lardner and others, and the more recent efforts of the German neologists have been ably and successfully refuted by Oertelius, Langius, and Reinhard, and by H. L. Heubner in a work entitled Miraculorum ab Evangelistis narratorun intempretat. grammatico-historica (Wittenb. 1807), as well as by others of still more recent date, whose answers, with the objections to which they apply, may be seen in Kuinoel.” See also Flatt, in Mag. für Dogmat. Und Moral. 14:91; Schott, Opusc. 1:259; Ewald, Lazarus für Gebildete Christusverehrer (Berl. 1790); and the older monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Proglrammatunn, p. 49; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 169. The rationalistic views of Paulus (Kritisch. Kommentar) and Gabler (Journal f. Auserl. Theol. Lit. 3:235) have been successfully refuted by Strauss (Leben Jesu), and the mythological dreams of the latter have been dissipated by a host of later German writers, and the reality of the story triumphantly established (see especially Neander, Das Leben Jesu Christi; Stier alnd Olshausen, ad loc.). The last modification of Strauss's theory (Die Halben und die Ganzen, p. 79 sq., Berl. 1865) has been demolished by Hengstenberg (Zeitschr. f. Protestant. u. Kirche, p. 39 sq., 1868); comp. Spith (Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. p. 339,1868) and Holzmann (ibid. p. 71 sq., 1869). The views of Paulus have just been revived in the lively romance of M. E. Rénan, entitled Vie de Jesus; and the latter's theory of a pious fraud has been completely demolished by Ebrard, Pressense, and Ellicott, in their works on our Lord's life. See also the Studien und Krit. 2:1861; Watson, Lazarus of Bethany (London, 1844). SEE JESUS; SEE MARY.

2. A beggar named in the parable of Dives (Luk 16:20-25) as suffering the most abject poverty in this life, but whose humble piety was rewarded with ultimate bliss in the other world; the only instance of a proper name in a parable, and probably selected in this instance on account of its frequency. He is an imaginary representative of the regard which God exercises towards those of his saints whom the world spurns and passes unnoticed; by others, however, he has been considered a real personage, with which accords the old tradition that even gives the name of the rich man as being Dobruk (see F. Fabri, Evagat. 1:35 sq.). Some interpreters think he was some well-known mendicant of Jerusalem (see Seb. Schmid, Fascic. disputat. p. 878 sq.), and have attempted to define his disease (see  Wedel, Exercit. Med. cent. 2, dec. 2, No. 2; Bartolini, Morb. bibl. 100, 21) with the success that might be expected (S. G. Feige, Doe morte Laz. [Hal. 1733]).

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

“It may be mentioned incidentally, as there has been no article under the head of DIVES, that the occurrence of this word, used as a quasi-proper name, in our early English literature, is another proof of the impression which was made on the minds of men, either by the parable itself, or by dramatic representations of it in the mediaeval mysteries. It appears as early as Chaucer (‘Lazar and Dives,' Sompnoure's Tale) and Piers Ploughman (‘Dives in the deyntees lyvede,' l. 9158), and in later theological literature its use has been all but universal. In no other instance has a descriptive adjective passed in this way into the received name of an individual. The name Nimeusis, which Euthymius gives as that of the rich man (Trench, Parables, 1. c.), seems never to have come into any general use.” See Klinkhardt, De homine divite et Lazaro (Lipsise, 1831); Walker,  Parable of Lazarus (Lond. 1850); Meth. Quar. Rev. July and Oct. 1859; Jour. Sac. Lit. April, July, and Oct. 1864. SEE PARABLE.

## Lazarus (2)[[@Headword:Lazarus (2)]]

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

## Lazarus, Levi[[@Headword:Lazarus, Levi]]

             a Jewish scholar, was born in 1822 at Filehne, duchy of Posen. He studied philosophy and Oriental languages at Berlin, and for twenty-five years was rabbi at Prenzlau. When Dr. L. Frankel (q.v.), the director of the Jewish rabbinical seminary, died, he was called in 1876 as his successor. Lazarus died April 16, 1879. He was a great Talmudist, and a clever thinker. In 1877 he published a very interesting brochure, Zur Charakteristik der talmudischen Ethik. (B.P.)

## Lazzari, Donato[[@Headword:Lazzari, Donato]]

             SEE BRAMANTE.

## Le[[@Headword:Le]]

             in the philosophical system of Confucius (q.v.), is the ultimate immaterial element of the universe. It is the absolute, regarded in association with material essences, and manifesting itself in virtue of such association as the cause of organization and order. The spirit of man is strictly of one substance with this principle. The Le, therefore, is identical with the Tai-ki, the Great Extreme. Beyond it, as the highest pinnacle of heaven, the one ultimate power, the entity without an opposite, no human thought is capable of soaring. "The absolute is like a stem shooting upwards; it is parted into twigs; it puts out leaves and blossoms; forth it springs incessantly until its fruit is fully ripe; yet even then the power of reproduction never ceases to be latent in it. The vital juice is there; and so the absolute still works and works indefinitely. Nothing hinders or can hinder its activity until the fruits have all been duly ripened, and activity gives place to rest."

## Le Camus, Etienne[[@Headword:Le Camus, Etienne]]

             a French prelate and theologian, was born at Paris, November 24, 1632, of an ancient family in the magistracy. He became doctor of the Sorbonne in 1650; — and almoner of the king, Louis XIV, while still a minor. He was appointed bishop of Grenoble in 1671, and from that time a great change took place in his life. He was indulgent to the faults of others, and gave an example of charity, modesty, and piety. In 1686 Louis XIV demanded the hat of the cardinal for M. de Harlay, archbishop of Paris. Innocent XI not  liking this prelate, sent the Roman purple to Le Camus. This irritated Louis XIV, and he called for the new cardinal, wishing to reproach him, but the bishop of Grenoble disarmed him by his pleasantry. Le Camus left-all his goods to the poor of his diocese. He founded two seminaries, one at Grenoble, the other at St. Martin de Misere, and several establishments of charity. He died at Grenoble, September 12, 1707. For mention of his works, see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Le Clerc, John[[@Headword:Le Clerc, John]]

             (1), first martyr of the Reformation in France, a mechanic by trade, was born at Meaux towards the close of the 15th century. He was brought to the knowledge of divine truth by reading the N.T. translated into French by Lefevre d'Étaples, and in his zeal for the cause he dared to post on the door of the cathedral a bill in which the pope was called antichrist. For this offense he was condemned to be whipped in Paris and at Meaux, was  branded on the forehead, and exiled. He retired to Rosoy, then to Metz in 1525, where he continued to work at his trade, wool-carding. Here he one day broke the images which the Romanists intended to carry in procession. Instead of trying to hide himself, he boldly confessed his deed, and was condemned to fearful bodily punishment. His right hand was cut off, his nose torn out, his arm and breast torn with red-hot pincers, and his head encircled with two or three bands of red-hot iron; amid all his torments he sung aloud the verse of Psalms 115, “Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men's hands.” He was finally thrown into the fire, and thus died. His brother Peter, also a wool-carder, was chosen by the Protestants of Meaux for their pastor, and fell a victim to persecution in 1546. See Haag, La France Protestante, vol. 6; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genenale, 30:193; Browning. History of the Huguenots, 1:23.

## Le Clerc, John (2)[[@Headword:Le Clerc, John (2)]]

             SEE CLERC, LE.

## Le Courrayer, Pierre Francois[[@Headword:Le Courrayer, Pierre Francois]]

             a French theologian, was born at Rouen in 1681. At the age of sixteen he was admitted to the congregation of St. Genevieve, and soon he instructed there in philosophy, and theology, was canon in 1701, and librarian in 1711. A dissertation which he published at Brussels in 1723, under the title Sur la Validite des Ordinations des Anglais, called forth the opposition of Gervaise, Hardouin, and Lequien, and an assembly of twenty-two bishops who met at St.Germain-des-Pres condemned the work, together with Le Courrayer's rejoinder to his opponent. Finally he was excommunicated by  the abbot of St. Genevieve and cardinal Noailles; but about the same time the Oxford University made him doctor of theology. He intended to write against the cardinal; but, afraid of being imprisoned, went to England, where he was received by archbishop Wake of Canterbury. Le Courrayer died at London in 1776. He published a French translation of Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, with notes (London, 1736, 2 volumes). See La France Protestante; Necrologes des Horn-nes Cilebres; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Le Coz, Claude[[@Headword:Le Coz, Claude]]

             a French prelate, was born at Plounevez Parzay, Brittany, September 2, 1740. He pursued his studies at the College of Quimper, and was a professor there at the time of the Revolution. In 1791 he was elected constitutional bishop of the department of Ille-et-Vilaine, and the same year deputy at the legislative assembly. During the Reign of Terror he was imprisoned and sent to Mont Michel, where he remained fourteen months. Obtaining his liberty in 1795, he resumed his episcopal duties, and adhered to the encyclicals published by the synod of the constitutional bishops reunited at Paris. Le Coz presided over the national council of the same bishops. held-at the capitol from August 15, 1797, to November 12 of the same year. In 1799 he assembled a synod at Rennes, but the priests of his diocese did not all recognize his authority. Being called to the presidency of the council of 1801, he opposed the project of a French sacramentarian. At the time of the Concordat of the first consul with the pope, Le Coz resigned, and was appointed archbishop of Besanion. In 1804 he went to Paris to visit the pope, and after some difficulties signed an article of adhesion and submission to the briefs of the holy father. He died at Villevieux, near Lons le Saulnier, May 3, 1815, leaving a number of works, for mention of which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Le Faucheur, Michel[[@Headword:Le Faucheur, Michel]]

             one of the most famous Protestant preachers of the 17th century, was born in the neighborhood of Geneva in 1585. In 1607 he was ordained, and appointed pastor at Annoanay. His fame as a pulpit orator was soon made known, and the authorities of Geneva wished him to come there. But Le Faucheur declined, and in 1609 went to Paris. In 1612 hewas called to Montpellier, and at different periods represented the churches of Languedoc at the synodical assemblies. He died at Paris in 1657, leaving, Sermons: — Traite de l'Action de l'Orateur (Paris, 1657): — Traite de la Cene du Seigneur (Geneva, 1635). See Bayle, Dict. Historique; Haag, La France Protestante, 6; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Le Fevre[[@Headword:Le Fevre]]

             SEE FABER STAPULENSIS.

## Le Gouverneur, Guillaume[[@Headword:Le Gouverneur, Guillaume]]

             a French prelate, was born at St. Malo. After being canon, then dean of the cathedral of his native place, he became bishop, January 29, 1610. He assisted as deputy of the clergy to the states of Brittany in 1614, founded in his diocese several establishments of charity and religion, and occupied his time in collecting the ecclesiastical regulations laid down by his predecessors. He died at St. Malo, June 25, 1630. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Le Hennuyer, Jean[[@Headword:Le Hennuyer, Jean]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1497 at St. Quentin. He was successively chief almoner of Henry I, Francis II, Charles IX, and Henry III. Appointed bishop of Lodeve in 1557, and afterwards of Lisieux, he was spiritual director of Catherine de Medicis and of Diane de Poictiers. In this position he always showed a disposition to persecute the Protestants, although some acts to the contrary have been falsely attributed to him. He died in 1578. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Le Maire, Guillaume[[@Headword:Le Maire, Guillaume]]

             a French prelate, was chosen as successor to Nicolas Gellent, bishop of Angers, having been first chaplain and penitentiary of the cathedral. The newly elected bishop went to Vincennes, May 16, 1291, and took the oath to king Philip. Some years later he excommunicated David de Lesmaisons, bailiwick of Angers, and his sub-bailiwick, Darien Bidoyn. The difficulty was concerning the ecclesiastical immunities. In the unfortunate condition of his treasury the king objected to the subsidies, and his officers levied upon the goods of the Church as well as others. This was opposed by Guillaume Le Maire, together with other bishops. He argued this question against the count of Anjou. The whole administration of Le Maire was laborious and discordant. He died May 13, 1314, leaving a historical work, for mention of which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Le Maitre, Antoine[[@Headword:Le Maitre, Antoine]]

             a French writer, brother of Isaac Louis le Maitre (better known as de Sacy), was born at Paris in 1607. For a time he practised law with great success, but abandoned his profession and joined the recluses of Port Royal. He died November 4, 1658. Le Maitre is the author of, Vie de Saint Bernard: — L'Aumone Chretienne (Paris, 1658, 2 volumes): — Vies de S. Ignace, de S. Jean Climaque, et des Martyrs de Lyon, in the Vies des Saints, published by Du Fosse (1685); from the Latin he translated Chrysostom's treatise, De Sacerdotio. See Clemencet, Hist. Generale de Port-Royal, volume 2 and 3; Besoigne, Histoire de l'Abbaye de Port- Royal, volume 3; De Vallee, Antoine le Maitre et ses Conteumporains; Sapey, Guillaume du Vair et Antoine le Maitre; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Le Mercier, Jacques[[@Headword:Le Mercier, Jacques]]

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

## Le Mire[[@Headword:Le Mire]]

             SEE MIREUTS.

## Le Neve, John[[@Headword:Le Neve, John]]

             an English clergyman and biographer, was born December 27, 1679, and educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He became rector of Thorntonle- Moor, Lincolnshire, about 1721, and died about 1741. He was an industrious collector of biographical materials, and has given to the world several important collections. They include, Lives of the Most Illustrious Persons who Died in 1711-12 (London, 1713-14, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae (1716), of which a new edition was published (1854, 3 volumes, 8vo) by T. Duffus Hardy, assistant keeper of the public records, with a. continuation to the year of publication; the first edition contained eleven thousand entries, while the new edition contains more than thirty thousand names of clergymen: — Memorials Concerning Dr. Richard Field (1716): — Monumenta Anglicana (1700-19, 9 volumes, 8vo): Lives of the Protestant Bishops (1720): — Lives of the Archbishops (1723). See, Biographical Notice of Le Neve in Hardy's edition of the Fasti.

## Le Quien, Antoine[[@Headword:Le Quien, Antoine]]

             SEE ANTHONY LE QUIEN.

## Le Quien, Michael[[@Headword:Le Quien, Michael]]

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

## Le-ke[[@Headword:Le-ke]]

             one of the sacred books of the Chinese. It is the acknowledged guide to rites and manners, prescribing rules for all the relationships of life, and the established orders of society. SEE CONFUCIUS.

## Leach[[@Headword:Leach]]

             SEE HORSE-LEECH.

## Leach, Beriah N., D.D[[@Headword:Leach, Beriah N., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Middletown, Vermont, April 28, 1801. He joined the Church in 1815, and was ordained in October 1826, over the Church at Cornwall. His subsequent pastorates were in Middlebury, Fredonia, Wyoming, Hamilton, and Brooklyn, N.Y., and in Middletown, Conn. His useful life closed January 23, 1869. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 676. (J.C.S.)

## Leach, James[[@Headword:Leach, James]]

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

## Leacock Hamble James[[@Headword:Leacock Hamble James]]

             a missionary of the Church of England, was born at Cluff's Bay, Barbadoes, Feb. 14.1795. His family was descended from a noble English ancestry. Slaves were an element of respectability in Barbadoes, and his father had many. Young Leacock received his early education at Codrington College, Barbadoes. Through Dr. Coleridge, bishop of Barbadoes and Leeward Islands, he became reader in his native parish, and in connection studied with his pastor, Rev. W. M. Harte. and obtained deacon's orders in January, 1826. While acting as assistant priest of St. John's Church he became very decided in his religious views, and extended the privileges of the Church to all the parish's slaves, at the same time liberating all his own slaves. The hatred and open reproach of the whites even the bishop could not calm. Leacock was transferred to the island of St. Vincent, and then to Nevis, where he became rural dean and pastor of St. Paul's Church, Charlestown. He there fought polygamy with success. But soon reverses came-difficulty with the bishop, insurrections of the slaves, and fall of property. He left for the United States, and settled in Lexington, Ky., in 1835. His confirmation, neglected in his youth, here took place on arrival.

He fell into the society of such men as Dr. Coit, Dr. Cooke, Amos Cleaver, and found many friends in Transylvania University. He gained a livelihood by teaching until 1836, when he became pastor of a new congregation, St. Paul's. Difficulty soon arose here also, and led to his removal. His friends scattered to different parts of the Union. Bishop Otey stationed him in Franklin parish, Tenn. Soon after, urged by friends, he preached six months to a new congregation in Louisville, Ky.; he then returned to his old parish. He bought a small farm in New Jersey, near the city of New Brunswick, and settled on it in. 1840. He now preached in different places — for a few Sundays in and about Bridgeport, Conn.; then he supplied the winter service of the absent pastor of Christ Church, New Brunswick. In 1841 his personal appearance in the West Indies recovered for him some of his property there. He returned to the States, and was appointed to two small stations near his farm. In 1843 he became rector of St. Paul's Church, Perth Amboy. In 1847 his health and property called him to the West Indies again. By a letter from bishop Doane, bishop Parry's reception was such that he decided to remain, and in 1848 his Perth Amboy congregation accepted his resignation. He revisited the island of Nevis, and, at the peril of his life, preached vehemently against some of the immoral practices prevalent there. In 1852 he preached again for one year  in St. Peter's Church, Speightstown, Barbadoes. In 1854 he preached in St. Leonard's Chapel, Bridgetown.

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

## Leacock, William T., D.D[[@Headword:Leacock, William T., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born on the island of Barbadoes in 1796, ordained in 1824, was rector of Christ Church, New Orleans, from 1852 to 1878, and died at Beauvoir, Mississippi, December 28, 1884.

## Lead[[@Headword:Lead]]

             (עֹפֶרֶת, ophe'reth, from its dusty color, in pause עֹפָרֶת, Exo 15:10; Num 31:22; Job 19:24; Jer 6:29; Eze 22:18; Eze 22:20; Eze 27:12; Zec 5:7-8; Sept. μόλιβδος), a well-known metal, generally found in veins of rocks, though seldom in a metallic state, and most commonly in combination with sulphur. Although the metal itself was well known to the ancients and to the Hebrews, yet the early uses of lead in the East seem to have been comparatively few, nor are they now numerous. One may travel far in Western Asia without discovering a trace of this metal in any of the numerous useful applications which it is made to serve in European countries. We are not aware that any native lead has been yet found within the limits of Palestine. But ancient lead mines, in some of which the ore has been exhausted by working, have been discovered by Mr. Burton in the mountains between the Red Sea and the Nile; and lead is also said to exist at a place called Sheff, near Mount Sinai (Kitto, Phys. Hist. Pal. p. 73).  The ancient Egyptians employed lead for a variety of purposes, but chiefly as an alloy with more precious metals. On the breasts of mummies that have been unrolled there is frequently found in soft lead, thin and quite flexible, the figure of a hawk, with extended wings, emblematical of Re, or Phra, the sun. Specimens of lead have also been discovered among the Assyrian ruins (Layard's Nin. and Bab. p. 357); and a bronze lion is found attached to its stone base by means of this metal (Bonomi, Nineveh, p. 325).

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

But, in addition to these more obvious uses of this metal, the Hebrews were acquainted with another method of employing it, which indicates some advance in the arts at an early period. Job (Job 19:24) utters a wish that his words, “with a pen of iron and lead, were graven in the rock  forever.” The allusion is supposed to be to the practice of carving inscriptions upon stone, and pouring molten lead into the cavities of the letters, to render them legible, and at the same time preserve them from the action of the air. Frequent references to the use of leaden tablets for inscriptions are found in ancient writers. Pausanias (9:31) saw Hesiod's Works and Days graven on lead, but almost illegible with age. Public proclamations, according to Pliny (13:21),were written on lead, and the name of Germanicus was carved on leaden tablets (Tacitus, Anni. 2:69). Eutychius (Ann. Alex. p. 390) relates that the history of the Seven Sleepers was engraved on lead by the cadi. The translator of Rosenmüller (in Bib. Cath. 27:64) thinks, however, that the poetical force of the scriptural passage has been overlooked by interpreters. “Job seems not to have drawn his image from anything he had actually seen executed: he only wishes to express in the strongest possible language the durability due to his words; and accordingly he says, ‘May the pen be iron, and the ink of lead, with which they are written on an everlasting rock,' i.e. Let them not be written with ordinary perishable materials.” The above usual explanation seems to be suggested by that of the Septuagint, “that they were sculptured by an iron pen and lead, or hewn into rocks.” SEE PEN.

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

In modern metallurgy lead is employed for the purpose of purifying silver from other mineral products, instead of the more expensive quicksilver. The alloy is mixed with lead, exposed to fusion upon an earthen vessel, and submitted to a blast of air. By this means the dross is consumed. This process is called the cupelling operation, with which the description in Eze 22:18-22, in the opinion of Mr. Napier (Met. of Bible, p. 20-24), accurately coincides. “The vessel containing the alloy is surrounded by the fire, or placed in the midst of it, and the blowing is not applied to the fire, but to the fused metals. . . . When this is done, nothing but the perfect  metals, gold and silver, can resist the scorifying influence.” In support of his conclusion he quotes Jer 6:28-30, adding, “This description is perfect. If we take silver having the impurities in it described in the text, namely, iron, copper, and tin, and mix it with lead, and place it in the fire upon a cupell, it soon melts; the lead will oxidize and form a thick coarse crust upon the surface, and thus consume away, but effecting no purifying influence. The alloy remains, if anything, worse than before...The silver is not refined, because ‘the bellows were burned' — there existed nothing to blow upon it. Lead is the purifier, but only so in connection with a blast blowing upon the precious metals.” An allusion to this use of lead is to be found in Theoghis (Gnom. 1127 sq., ed.Welcker), and it is mentioned by Pliny (33:31) as indispensable to the purification of silver from alloy. Comp. also Mal 3:2-3. SEE METAL.

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

## Leade Or Leadly, Jane[[@Headword:Leade Or Leadly, Jane]]

             all English mystic, founder of the Philadelphians, was born in the county of Norfolk in 1623. According to her own accounts she was convicted of sin in her sixteenth year by a mysterious voice whispering in her ear, and found peace in the grace of God three years after. Her parents, whose name was Ward, seriously opposed Jane's firm religious stand, and, having decided to withdraw from the parental roof, she removed in 1643 to London to join a brother of hers living there. She had spent a year in the English metropolis, constantly growing in grace and in the knowledge of Christian truths, when a summons came to her from her parents to return home, which request was at once obeyed. Shortly afterwards she was  married to William Leade, a pious, noble-hearted man, with whom she lived happily, blessed with a family of four daughters, until 1670, when William was suddenly removed at the age of forty-nine. From the time of her earliest conversion she had shown signs of a mystical tendency; she found the greatest delight in seeking private communion with God; now the loss of her husband drew her still further away from the world, and she became a confirmed mystic. As early as 1652, Dr. Pordage (q.v.) and his wife, together with Dr. Thomas Bromley (q.v.), had succeeded in gathering a congregation of mystics of the Jacob Böhme (q.v.) type, but the pestilence of 1655 had necessitated separation, and they were just gathering anew at London when Jane Leade was deprived of the earthly association of her husband. She joined them readily, and soon became one of the leading spirits of this new mystical movement, and rose until she finally became the founder of a distinct mystical school known as the Philadelphians (q.v.). As her motive for joining Pordage, she assigned certain secret divine revelations and visions which she claimed to have had in the spring of 1670, and shortly after she actually brought before the society a set of laws which she professed to have received of the Lord, in like manner as Moses had been entrusted with the Ten Commandments. (For a complete copy, see Zeitschriftf. hist. Theol. 1865, p. 187 sq.)

A still stronger hold she gained upon the society and upon the people at large by the publication of some of her writings in 1683, when she was enabled to send them forth by the pecuniary aid of a pious lady who believed in Jane Leade's divine mission. Her great object in publishing her writings (consisting of eight large octavo volumes very scarce at present — like those of Jacob Bohme though less original, abounding in emblematic and figurative language, and very obscure in style) was evidently to spread her peculiar views, and by these means to form a society of all truly regenerated Christians, from all denominations, which should be the visible Church of Christ upon earth, and be thus awaiting the second coming of the Lord, which she claimed to have been informed by revelation was near at hand (for 1700). She was led to seek the establishment of a distinct organization by the movements of the German Pietists and Chiliasts at this period. In 1690, Kilner, of Moscow, agitated this subject still further by an effort to establish a patriarchal and apostolical society of true and persecuted Christians, and in 1696 Mrs. Petersen, in her Anleitung z. Verständniss d. Offenbarung, and again in 1698 in Der geistliche Kampf (Halle, 8vo), called upon the regenerate Christians to separate from the world and to form a new Jerusalem. In 1695, Jane Leade, together with her  friends Bromley and Pordage, removed to carry out these projects in London, and proposed a new society, to consist only of Christians, who, without separating from the different churches to which they belonged, should form a pure and undefiled Church of true Christians, to be governed only by God's will and the Holy Spirit, and who should hasten the second coming of Christ and the beginning of the millennium.

So successful was this effort that by 1702 the Philadelphians, as they now called themselves, were able to send missionaries to Germany and Holland with a view to making proselytes; and, although they failed to accomplish their object immediately, the idea which constituted it took ground and spread, especially in Germany. Conrad Brüsske of Offenbach, a disciple of Beverley, Dr. Horch of Marburg, and Dr. Kaiser of Stuttgard, labored to propagate it; the latter wrote a number of works on the subject under the name of Timotheus Philadelphus, and established a Philadelphian community at Stuttgard. An approximate estimate of the extent of Jane Leade's influence on Germany and Holland may be obtained by a reference to the extensive list of her correspondents in those countries (comp. Zeitsch. f. hist. Theol. 1865, p. 222, note 38). Many, without being outwardly members of this and similar societies, were evidently favorable to them. But some enthusiasts, as Gebhard, Wetzel, Eva von Buttlar, etc., caused the movement to fall into discredit. The scattered elements of the divers societies were afterwards reunited by count Zinzendorf, and formed part of the Moravian institution. But to return to Jane Leade herself. In 1702 she felt that her end was near at hand. She wrote out her funeral discourse, to be read at her grave, and made all manner of preparations for departure. One of the strangest features of this period of her life is her study of the writings of cardinal Petrucci and of Richard of Samson. She died Aug. 19,1704. The most noted of her works are, The Wonders of God's Creation manifested in the Variety of eight Worlds, as they were made known experimentally to the Author (Lond. 1695, 24mo): — The Tree of Faith, or the Tree of Life, springing up in the Paradise of God (Lond. 1696, 24mo). See G. Arnold, Kirchenhistorie, vol. 2; Gichtel, Theosophiapractica; Poiret and Arnold, Gesch. d. Mystik; Corrodi, Kritische Gesch. des Chiliasmus, 3:403-421; Gobel, Gesch. d. Christl. Lebens, vols. 2 and 3; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. bk. 4, cent. 17, sec. 2, pt. 2, ch. 7, § 5; Lee, Life of Jane Leade; J. W. Joeger, Dissert. de Vita et Doctrina Jance Leadce; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:251; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 30:50; Hochhuth, Gesch. der philadelphischen Gemeinden. Part I, Jane Leade und die Philadelphier in England, in the  Zeitschrift für Hist. Theolog. 1865, p. 172-290. SEE PHILADELPHIANS. (J. H.W.)

## Leaders[[@Headword:Leaders]]

             This term has a technical significance as applied to leaders of religious classes in the original Methodist societies, and in the Methodist churches of the present day. SEE CLASS-MEETINGS. The leader's office is one of pastoral help. It therefore involves great responsibility, and requires for the proper discharge of its duties a deep religious experience, combined with a capacity to instruct believers in the practical details of religious truth, to console the afflicted, to encourage the despondent, to guide the erring, and, in short, both by precept and example, to lead Christians and penitents forward in the pathway of holiness. Leaders are expected to meet the several members of their classes weekly for religious worship and conversation, to visit those who are detained by sickness, and to take all suitable means for aiding the religious life and progress of those under their care. They are also required to meet their pastors weekly, to report respecting the welfare of the members and probationers attached to their classes. SEE LEADERS MEETINGS and SEE PROBATIONERS.

In some cases women are appointed leaders, more especially of classes composed of females or of children. That the office of class-leader has been greatly helpful to the pastorate in those churches which have employed it does not admit of question. Hence it is a recognised obligation of pastors in those churches not only to select the best persons for the office, but also to aid them in acquiring the best qualifications for its useful exercise. To aid in the task of instructing leaders various tracts and small books have been published. See Tract list of the Methodist Episcopal Church. (D. P. K.)

## Leaders Meetings[[@Headword:Leaders Meetings]]

             As an essential part of the Wesleyan system of subpastoral superintendence by means of class-leaders, SEE LEADERS, an organized meeting was appointed to be held weekly under the above title. A leaders' meeting is composed of the itinerant ministers of any circuit or station, and all persons regularly in office as leaders or stewards. SEE STEWARDS.

In England, the powers of leaders' meetings have been considerably enlarged since such meetings were instituted by Mr. Wesley. “They have now a veto upon the admittance of members into the society, when appealed to in such cases by any parties concerned: they possess the power of a jury in the trial of  accused members: without their consent, no leader or steward can be appointed to office, or removed from it, excepting when the crime proved merits exclusion from membership, in which case the superintendent can at once depose the offender from office, and expel him from the society. Without their consent, in conjunction with the trustees of the chapel in which their meeting is attached, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper cannot be administered in the said chapel; and the fund for the relief of poor and afflicted members of the society is distributed under their direction and management. Regular leaders' meetings have from the beginning been found essential to the pastoral care and spiritual prosperity of our societies, as well as to the orderly transaction of their financial concerns.

The ministers are directed attentively to examine, at each meeting, the entries made in the class-books in reference to the attendance of members, in order that prompt and timely measures may be adopted in cases which, on inquiry, shall appear to demand the exercise of discipline, or the interposition of pastoral exhortation and admonition” (Grindrod's Compendium of Wesleyan Methodism). In the Methodist Episcopal Church leaders' meetings have no judicial or veto powers as described above. They are held monthly, or at the call of the pastor. Their usual business embraces the following items:

a. That the leaders have an opportunity “to inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly and will not be reproved.”

b. That the pastor may examine the several class-books, and ascertain the Christian walk and character of each member of the Church, and learn what members of the flock especially need his watchcare and counsel.

c. To inquire into the religious state of all persons on trial, and ascertain who can be recommended by the leader for admission into full connection, and who should be discontinued.

d. To examine the several leaders respecting their “method of leading their classes.”

e. To recommend to the quarterly conference suitable candidates for appointment as local preachers. The leaders' meeting also becomes to pastors a convenient and appropriate body of men with whom they can take counsel from time to time respecting many minor matters of Church interest in reference to which advice or co-operation may seem desirable. SEE CLASS-MEETINGS. (D. P. K.)

## Leaf[[@Headword:Leaf]]

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

1. LEAF OF A TREE (prop. עָלֵה, aleh', so called from springing up; Gr. φύλλον; also עַפַר, ophi', foliage [Psa 104:12], or in Chald. the top of a tree [Dan 4:9; Dan 4:11; Dan 4:18], and טֶרֶŠ‘, to'reph, a fresh leaf [Eze 17:9] “plucked off” [Gen 8:11]). The olive-leaf is mentioned in Gen 8:11. Fig-leaves formed the first covering of our parents in Eden. The barren fig-tree (Mat 21:19; Mar 11:13) on the road between Bethany and Jerusalem “had on it nothing but leaves." The fig-leaf is alluded to by our Lord (Mat 24:32; Mar 13:28): “When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh.”' The oak-leaf is mentioned in Isa 1:30; Isa 6:13. Leaves, the organs of perspiration and inhalation in plants, are used symbolically in the Scriptures in a variety of senses; sometimes they are taken as an evidence of grace (Psa 1:3), while at others they represent the mere outward form of religion without the Spirit (Mat 21:19). Their flourishing and their decay, their restoration and their fragility, furnish the subjects of numerous allusions of great force and beauty (Lev 26:36; Isa 1:30; Isa 34:4; Jer 8:13; Dan 4:12; Dan 4:14; Dan 4:21; Mar 11:13; Mar 13:28; Rev 22:2). The bright, fresh color of the leaf of a tree or plant shows that it is richly nourished by a good soil, hence it is the symbol of prosperity (Psa 1:3; Jer 17:8). A faded leaf, on the contrary, shows the lack of moisture and nourishment, and becomes a fit emblem of adversity and decay (Job 13:25; Isa 64:6). Similar figures have prevailed in all ages (see Wemyss, Symbol. Dictionary, s.v.). In Ezekiel's vision of the holy waters, the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom are spoken of under the image of trees growing on a river's bank; there “shall grow all trees for food, whose leaf shall not fade” (Eze 47:12). In this passage it is said that “the fruit of these trees shall be for food, and the leaf thereof for medicine” (margin, for bruises and sores). With this compare John's vision of the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev 22:1-2): “In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life...and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.” There is probably here an allusion to some tree whose leaves were used by the Jews as a medicine or ointment; indeed, it is very likely that many plants and  leaves were thus made use of by them, as by the old English herbalists. SEE TREE OF LIFE.

2. LEAF OF A DOOR (צֵלָע, tse'la, a side, in 1Ki 6:34 [where the latter clause has, prob. by error, קֶלִע, ke'lang, a curtain], means the valve of a folding door; so also דֶּלֶת, de'leth, a door [Isa 45:1]). SEE DOOR.

3. LEAF OF A BOOK (דֶּלֶת, de'leth, a door-valve, as above, hence perhaps a fold of a roll [Jer 36:23], like our column of a volume). SEE BOOK.

## League[[@Headword:League]]

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

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

(2.) The Amalekites, or Canaanites of Arabia, were also destined to hereditary enmity, unceasing war, and total extermination (Exo 17:8; Exo 17:14; Deu 25:17-19, Jdg 6:3-5; 1Sa 15:1; 1Sa 15:33; 1Sa 27:8-9; 1Sa 30:1; 1Sa 30:17-18).

(3.) The Moabites and Ammonites were to be excluded forever from the right of treaty or citizenship with the Hebrews, but were not to be attacked in war, except when provoked by previous hostility (Deu 2:9-19; Deu 23:3-6; Jdg 3:12-30; 1Sa 14:47; 2Sa 8:2; 2Sa 12:26). With the Midianitish nation at large there was no hereditary enmity, but those tribes who had conspired with the Moabites were ultimately crushed in a war of dreadful severity (Num 25:17-18; Num 31:1-18). Yet those tribes which did not participate in the hostilities against the Hebrews were included among the nations with whom alliances might be formed, but in later times they acted in so hostile a manner that no permanent peace could be preserved with them (Jdg 6:1-40; Jdg 7:1-25; Jdg 8:1-21). No war was enjoined against the Edomites; and it was expressly enacted that, in the tenth generation, they, as well as the Egyptians, might be admitted to citizenship (Num 20:14-21; Deu 2:4-8). The Edomites also, on their part, conducted themselves peaceably towards the Hebrews till the time of David, when their aggressions caused a war, in which they were overcome. From that time they cherished a secret hatred against the Hebrews (2Sa 8:13-14).

War had not been determined on against the Amorites on the east of the Jordan; but, as they not only refused a free passage, but opposed the Hebrews with arms, they were attacked and beaten, and their country fell into the hands of the Hebrews (Num 21:21-35; Deu 1:4; Deu 2:24-37; Deu 3:1-18; Deu 4:46-49; Jdg 11:13-23). Treaties were permitted with all other nations, provided they were such as would tend to the public welfare. David accordingly maintained a friendly national intercourse with the kings of Tyre and Hamath, and Solomon with the kings of Tyre and Egypt, and with the queen of Sheba. Even the Maccabees, those zealots for the law, did not hesitate to enter into compact with the Romans. When the prophets condemn the treaties which were made with the nations. they did so, not because they were contrary to the Mosaic laws, but because they were impolitic and ruinous measures, which betrayed a want of confidence in Jehovah their king. The event always showed in the most striking manner the propriety of their rebukes (2Ki 17:4; 2Ki 18:20-21; 2Ki 20:12-13; 2 Kings 2  Chronicles 20:35-37; 28:21; Isa 7:2; Isa 30:2-12; Isa 31:1-3; Isa 36:4-7; Isa 39:1-8; Hos 5:13; Hos 7:11; Hos 12:1; Jer 37:5-10). See Alliance.

## League and Covenant[[@Headword:League and Covenant]]

             SEE COVENANT, SOLEMN LEAGUE AND.

## League of Cambray[[@Headword:League of Cambray]]

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

## League of Smalcalde[[@Headword:League of Smalcalde]]

             SEE SMALCALDE.

## League, Holy[[@Headword:League, Holy]]

             SEE HOLY LEAGUE.

## Leah[[@Headword:Leah]]

             (Heb. Leah', לֵאָה, weary; Sept. Λεία,Vulg. Lia), the eldest daughter of the Aramaean Laban, and sister of Rachel (Gen 29:16). Instead of the latter, for whom he had served seven years, Jacob took her through a deceit of her father, who was unwilling to give his younger daughter in marriage first, contrary to the usages of the East (Gen 29:22 sq.; compare Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 1:138 sq.). B.C. 1920. She was less beautiful than her younger sister (comp. Josephus, Ant. 1:19, 7), having also weak eyes ( עֵינִיַם רִכּוֹתSept. ὀφθαλμοὶ ἀσθενεῖς , Vulg. lippis oculis, Auth.Vers. “tender-eyed,” Gen 29:17; comp. the opposite quality as a recommendation, 1Sa 16:12), which probably accounts for Jacob's preference of Rachel both at first and ever afterwards, especially as he was not likely ever to love cordially one whom he did not voluntarily marry (comp. Gen 30:20). SEE RACHEL.

Leah bore to Jacob, before her sister had any children, six sons, namely, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah (Gen 29:32 sq.), Issachar, and Zebulon (Gen 30:17 sq.; compare 35:23); also one daughter, Dinah (Gen 30:21), besides the two sons borne by her maid Zilpah, and reckoned as hers, namely, Gad and Asher (Gen 30:9), all within the  space of seven years, B.C. 1919-1913. SEE CONCUBINE; SEE SLAVE.

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

## Leake, Lemuel Fordham[[@Headword:Leake, Lemuel Fordham]]

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

## Leaming, Jeremiah, D.D[[@Headword:Leaming, Jeremiah, D.D]]

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

## Leander[[@Headword:Leander]]

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

## Leang-Oo-Tee[[@Headword:Leang-Oo-Tee]]

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

## Leannoth[[@Headword:Leannoth]]

             (Heb. le-annoth', לְעִנּוֹת,for answering, i.e. singing; Sept. τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι, Vulg. ad respondendurn), a musical direction occurring in the title of Psalms 88, and denoting that it was to be chanted in the manner indicated by the associated terms. SEE PSALMS, BOOK OF.

## Learning[[@Headword:Learning]]

             skill in any science, or that improvement of the mind which were gain by study, instruction, observation, etc. An attentive examination of ecclesiastical history will lead us to see how greatly learning is indebted to Christianity, and that Christianity, in its turn, has been much served by learning. “All the useful learning which is now to be found in the world is in a great measure owing to the Gospel. The Christians, who had a great veneration for the Old Testament, have contributed more than the Jews themselves to secure and explain those books. The Christians, in ancient times, collected and preserved the Greek versions of the Scriptures, particularly the Septuagint, and translated the originals into Latin. To Christians were due the old Hexapla; and in later times Christians have published the Polyglots and the Samaritan Pentateuch. It was the study of the Holy Scriptures which excited Christians from early times to study chronology, sacred and secular; and here much knowledge of history, and some skill in astronomy, were needful. The New Testament, being written in Greek, caused Christians to apply themselves also to the study of that language. As the Christians were opposed by the pagans and the Jews, they were excited to the study of pagan and Jewish literature, in order to expose the absurdities of the Jewish traditions, the weakness of paganism, and the imperfections and insufficiency of philosophy.

The first fathers, till the 3d century, were generally Greek writers. In the 3d century the Latin language was much upon the decline, but the Christians preserved it from sinking into absolute barbarism. Monkery, indeed, produced many sad effects; but Providence here also brought good out of evil, for the monks were employed in the transcribing of books, and many valuable authors would have perished if it had not been for the monasteries. In the 9th century the Saracens were very studious, and contributed much to the restoration of letters. But, whatever was good in the Mohammedan religion, it is in no small measure indebted to Christianity for it, since Mohammedanism is made up for the most part of Judaism and Christianity. If Christianity had been suppressed at its first appearance, it is extremely probable that the  Latin and Greek tongues would have been lost in the revolutions of empires, and the irruptions of babarians in the East and in the West, for the old inhabitants would have had no coiascientious and religious motives to keep up their language; and then, together with the Latin and Greek tongues, the knowledge of antiquities and the ancient writers would have been destroyed...As religion has been the chief preserver of erudition, so erudition has not been ungrateful to her patroness, but has contributed largely to the support of religion. The useful expositions of the Scriptures, the sober and sensible defenses of revelation, the faithful representations of pure and undefiled Christianity — these have been the works of learned, judicious, and industrious men. Nothing, however, is more common than to hear the ignorant decry all human learning as entirely useless in religion; and, what is still more remarkable, even some, who call themselves preachers, entertain the same sentiments. But to such we can only say what a judicious preacher observed upon a public occasion, that if all men had been as unlearned as themselves, they never would ye have had a text on which to have displayed their ignorance” (Jortin's Sermons, vol. 7, Charge I). See More, Hints to a Young Princess, 1:64; Cook, Miss. Ser. on Mat 6:3; Stennett, Ser. on Act 26:24-25. SEE KNOWLEDGE.

## Leasing[[@Headword:Leasing]]

             (כָּזָב, kazab', Psa 4:2; v. 6), an old English word equivalent to lying or lies, as the term is elsewhere rendered.

## Leather    [[@Headword:Leather    ]]

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

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

2. הָמֵוֹ, chamets', ought not to be rendereds “leaven,” but leavened bread. It is a more specific term than the former, but is confounded in our translation with it. In Num 6:3, the cognate noun is applied to wine as an adjective, and is there properly translated "vinegar of wine.” In this last sense it seems to correspond to the Greek ὄξος, a sort of acid wine in very common use among the ancients, called by the Latins posca, vinum culpatum (Adam, Rom. Antiq. p. 393; Jahn, Bibl. Archceol. § 144). This  species of wine (and in hot countries pure wine speedily passes into the acetous state) [see DRINK] is spoken of by the Talmudists, who inform us that it was given to persons about to be executed, mingled with drugs, in order to stupefy them (Pro 31:6; Sanhedrin, folio 43, 1, c. vi). This serves to explain Mat 27:34. A sour, fermented drink used by the Tartars appears to have derived its name kumiss from the Hebrew chamets'. From still another root comes also מִצָּה, matstsah' (sweet, “without leaven” [Lev 10:11]), unleavened (i.e. bread, though in several passages “bread” and “cakes” are also expressed). In Exo 13:7, both seör´ and chamets' occur together, and are evidently distinct: "Unleavened bread (matstsah') shall be eaten during the seven days, and there shall not be seen with the fermented bread (chamets'), and there shall not be seen with thee leavened dough (seör´) in all thy borders.” See WINE.

The organic chemists define the process of fermentation, and the substance which excites it, as follows: "Fermentation is nothing else but the putrefaction of a substance containing no nitrogen. Ferment, or yeast., is a substance in a state of putrefaction, the atoms of which are in a continual motion” (Turner's Chemistry, by Liebig). This definition is in strict accordance with the views of the ancients, and gives point and force to many passages of sacred writ (Psalm 79:21; Mat 16:6; Mat 16:11-12; Mar 8:15; Luk 12:1; Luk 13:21; 1Co 5:5-8; Gal 5:9). Leaven, and fermented, or even some readily fermentible substances (as honey), were prohibited in many of the typical institutions both of the Jews and Gentiles. The Latin writers use corruptus as signifying fermented; Tacitus applies the word to the fermentation of wine. Plutarch (Romans Quaest. 109:6) assigns as the reason why the priest of Jupiter was not allowed to touch leaven, “that it comes out of corruption, and corrupts that with which it is mingled.” See also Aulus Gellius, 8:15. The use of leaven was strictly forbidden in all offerings made to the Lord by fire, as in the case of the meat-offering (Lev 2:11), the trespass- offering (Lev 7:12), the consecration-offering (Exo 29:2; Lev 8:2), the Nazarite-offering (Num 6:15), and more particularly in regard to the feast of the Passover, when the Israelites were not only prohibited on pain of death from eating leavened bread, but even from having any leaven in their houses (Exo 12:15; Exo 12:19) or in their land (Exo 13:7; Deu 16:4) during seven days, commencing with the 14th of Nisan.

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

The Greek word ζύμη, rendered "leaven," is used with precisely the same latitude of meaning as the Hebrew seor'. It signifies leaten, sour dough (Mat 13:33; Mat 16:12; Luk 13:21). Another quality in leaven is noticed in the Bible, viz., its secretly penetrating and diffusive power; hence the proverbial saying, “a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump” (1Co 5:6, Gal 5:9). In this respect it was emblematic of moral influence generally, whether good or bad, and hence our Savior adopts it as illustrating the growth of the kingdom of heaven in the individual heart and in the world at large (Mat 13:33). Leaven, or ferment, is therefore used tropically for corruptness, perverseness, of life, doctrine, heart, etc. (Mat 16:6; Mat 16:11; Mar 8:15; Luk 12:1; 1Co 5:7-8; comp. Col 4:6; Eph 4:29). The idea seems to have been familiar to the Jews; compare Otho, Lex Rabbin. Talm. p. 227. They even employed leaven as a figure of the inherent  corruption of man: “Alexander, when he had finished his prayers, said, Lord of the universe, it is clearly manifest before thee that it is our will to do thy will: what hinders that we do not thy will? The leaven which is in the mass (Gl., The evil desire which is in the heart)” (Babyl. Berachoth, 17:1; ap. Meuschen, N.T. ex Talmude ill.). We find the same allusion in the Roman poet Persius (Sat. 1:24; compare Casaubon's note, Comment. p. 74). See Wernsdorf, De fermento herodis (Alt. 1724). SEE UNLEAVENED BREAD.

“The usual leaven in the East is dough kept till it becomes sour, and which is kept from one day to another for the purpose of preserving leaven in readiness. Thus, if there should be no leaven in all the country for any length of time, as much as might be required could easily be produced in twenty-four hours. Sour dough, however, is not exclusively used for leaven in the East, the lees of wine being in some parts employed as yeast” (Kitto, Pictorial Bible, 1:161). In the Talmud mention is made of leaven formed of the קולן של סופריםbookmakers' paste (Pesach. 3:1). As the process of producing the leaven itself, or even of leavening bread when the substance was at hand, required some time, unleavened cakes were more usually produced on sudden emergencies (Gen 18:6; Jdg 6:19). SEE BAKE; SEE BREAD, etc.

## Leavitt, Jonathan, D.D[[@Headword:Leavitt, Jonathan, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Cornish, N.H., October 21, 1800. He was educated at Kimball Union Academy, graduated from Amherst College in 1825, and was a member of Andlover Theological Seminary for two years. He was ordained an evangelist in 1828, and became a home missionary in Pendleton and Wilmington, S.C., alternately; in 1830 was temporary supply successively in Lincolnton and Macon, Georgia, Westbrook, Maine, Atworth, N.H., and Waltham, Massachusetts. He was acting-pastor at Bedford in 1835, was installed in 1837, and remained until 1840, when he was next installed pastor of Richmond Street Church, Providence, R.I. He was without charge from 1863 until his death, at Providence, October 7, 1877. See Trienz. Cat. of Andover Theol. Sem. 1870, page 80. (W.P.S.)

## Leavitt, Joshua, D.D[[@Headword:Leavitt, Joshua, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Heath, Franklin County, Massachusetts, September 8, 1794. He graduated from Yale College in 1814, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1819. He soon secured a lucrative practice in his native town, and afterwards in Putney, Vermont, but left it to enter Yale Divinity School, where he graduated in 1825. The same year he was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Stratford, Connecticut. After a highly successful pastorate of three years he resigned and became secretary of the Seaman's Friend Society, and editor of the Sailor's Magazine, New York city. In 1831 he became editor of the New York Evangelist; in 1837 of the Emancipator; in 1848 managing editor of the Independent, retaining this position till his death, which occurred January 16, 1873, in Brooklyn, N.Y. Dr. Leavitt was a man of great suavity of manner, a graceful writer, and an eloquent speaker. He published, Easy Lessons in Reading (1823): Christian Lyre (1831): — and a series of Readers (1847).

## Lebana[[@Headword:Lebana]]

             (Neh 7:48). SEE LEBANAH.

## Lebanah[[@Headword:Lebanah]]

             (Heb. Lebanah' לְבָנָה, the moon as being white, as in Son 6:10, etc.; Sept. in Ezr 2:45 Λαβανώ; Chaldaistically written Lebana' לְבָנָא, in most MSS. in Neh 7:48, Sept. Λαβανά Auth. Vers. “Lebana”; Vulg. in both passages Lebanaz), one of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. B.C. ante 536.

## Lebanon[[@Headword:Lebanon]]

             the loftiest and most celebrated mountain range in Syria, forming the northern boundary of Palestine, and running thence along the coast of the Mediterranean to the great pass which opens into the plain of Hamath. The range of Anti-Lebanon, usually included by geographers under the same general name, lies parallel to the other, commencing on the south at the  fountains of the Jordan, and terminating in the plain of Hamath. The two are in fact but a northern partitions of the great central ridge or back-bone of the entire country. SEE PALESTINE.

I. The Name. — In the O. Test. these mountain ranges are always called

לְבָנוֹן, Lebanon', to which, in prose, the art. is constantly prefixed,

הִלֻּבָנוֹן; in poetry the art. is sometimes prefixed and sometimes not, as in Isa 14:8, and Psa 29:5. The origin of the name has been variously accounted for. It is derived from the root לָבָן, “to be white.” הִר הִלְּבָנוֹןis thus emphatically “The White Mountain” of Syria. It is a singular fact that almost uniformly the names of the highest mountains in all countries have a like meaning-Mont Blanc, Himalaya (in Sanscrit signifying “snowy”), Ben Naeris, Snowdon, perhaps also Alps (from alb, “white,” like the Latin albus, and not, as commonly thought, from alp, “high”). Some suppose the name originated in the white snow by which the ridge is covered a great part of the year (Bochart, Opera, 1:678; Gesenius, Thlesaurus, p. 741: Stanley, S. and P. p. 395). Others derive the name from the whitish color of the limestone rock of which the great body of the range is composed (Schulz, Leitungen des Hochsten, 5:471; Robhison, Biblic. Res. 2:493). The former seems the more natural explanation, and is confirmed by several circumstances. Jeremiah mentions the “snow of Lebanon” (18:14); in the Chald. paraphrase טוּר תַּלְגָא“snow mountain,” is the name given to it, and this is equivalent to a not uncommon modern Arabic appellation, Jebel eth-Thelj (Gesenius, Thesaurus, l. c.; Abulfeda, Tab. Syr. p. 18). Others derive the name Lebanon from λιβανωτός, “frankincense,” the gum of a tree called λίβανος (Reland, Palest. p. 312; Herod. 1:183), which is mentioned among the gifts presented by the magi to the infant Savior (Mat 2:11). This, however, is in Hebrew לְבוֹנָה, Lebonah (Exo 30:34; Isa 60:6). The Greek name of Lebanon, both in the Septuagint and classic authors, is uniformly Λίβανος (Strabo, 16:755; Ptol. 5:15). The Septuagint has sometimes Α᾿ντιλίβανος instead of Λίβανος (Deu 1:7; Deu 3:25 : Jos 1:4; Jos 9:1). The Latin name is Libanus (Pliny, 5:17), which is the reading of the Vulgate. It would appear that the Greek and Roman geographers regarded the name as derived from the snow. Tacitus speaks of it as a remarkable phenomenon that snow should lie where there is such intense heat (Hist. 5:6). Jerome writes, “Libanus λευκασμός— id est, clandor interpretatur” (Adersus Jovianum, in Opera, 2:286, ed. Migne); he also notes the identity  of the name of this mountain and frankincense (in Osee, in Opera, 6:160). Arab geographers call the range Jebel Libnon (Abulfeda, Tab. Sgr. p. 163; Edrisi, p. 336, edit. Jaubert). This name, however, is now seldom heard among the people of Syria, and when used it is confined to the western range. Different parts of this range have distinct names — the northern section is called Jebel Akkur, the central Sunnin, and the southern J. ed- Druze. Other local names are also used.

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

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

II. Physical Geography. —

1. Lebanon. —

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

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

Some writers regard the Litany as marking the southern limit of Lebanon; and it would seem that the ancient classical geographers were of this opinion (Smith, Dict. of G. and R. Geog. s.v. Libanus; Kitto, Physical Hist. of Pal. p. 32). Diodorus Siculus describes Lebanon as extending along the coast of Tripolis, Byblus, and Sidon (Hist. 19:58); and the Litany falls into the sea a few miles south of Sidon. The notices of Ptolemy are somewhat indefinite, and represent the two chains of Lebanon and Anti- Lebanon as commencing at the Mediterranean — the former on the north, the latter on the south (Geog. 5:15). Strabo is more definite and less accurate: “There are two mountains which inclose Coele-Syria lying parallel to each other. The commencement of both these mountains, Libanus and Anti-Libanus, is a little way above the sea. Libanus rises from the sea near Tripolis and Theoprosopon, and Anti-Libanus from the sea near Sidon. They terminate somewhere near the Arabian mountains, which are above the district of Damascus and the Trachones. . . . A hollow plain lies between them, whose breadth towards the sea is 200 stadia, and its length from the sea to the interior about twice as much. Rivers flow  through it, the largest of which is the Jordan” (16:754).

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

Anti-Lebanon is completely separated from this western range by a broad and deep valley. The great valley of the Jordan extends northward to the western base of Hermon, in the parallel of the chasm of the Litany. From this point a narrower valley, called wady el-Teim, runs northward, till it meets an eastern branch of Coele-Syria. These three valleys, forming a continuous line, constitute the western boundary of Anti-Lebanon. No part of that chain crosses them (Robinson, 2:438). The southern end of the plain of Coele-Syria is divided by a low ridge into two branches. Down the eastern branch runs wady el-Teim, conveying a tributary to the Jordan (Bib. Sac. 1. c.; Robinson, 3:428430); down the western runs the Litany. The latter branch soon contracts into a wild chasm, whose banks are in some places above a thousand feet high, of naked rock, and almost  perpendicular. At one spot the ravine is only 60 feet wide, and is spanned by a natural bridge, at the height of about 100 feet above the stream. Over it rise jagged walls of naked limestone, pierced with numerous caves. The scenery is here magnificent; as one stands on this arch of nature's own building, he can scarcely repress feelings of alarm. The cliffs almost meet overhead; rugged masses of rock shoot out from dizzy heights, and appear as if about to plunge into the chasm; the mad river far below dashes along from rapid to rapid in sheets of foam. In wild grandeur this chasm has no equal in Syria, and few in the world. Yet, from a short distance on either side, it is not visible. The mountain chain appears to run on in its course, declining gradually, but without any interruption. The ridge, in fact, has been cleft asunder by some terrible convulsion, and through the cleft the waters of Coele-Syria have forced their way to the Mediterranean instead of the Jordan, which is the natural outlet. It will thus be seen that the ridge on the south bank of the Litany is the prolongation of that on the north, and is a part of Lebanon (Robinson, 2:438); and that the chasm of the Litcny, though the drain of Coele-Syria, is no part of that valley. Neither Coele-Syria, therefore, nor Anti-Lebanon, at any point, approaches within many miles of the Mediterranean (Handbook for S. and P. p. 571; Robinson, 3:420 sq.; Van de Velde, Travels, 1:145 sq.).

(2.) Western Aspect. — The view of Lebanon from the Mediterranean is exceedingly grand. On approaching, it appears to rise from the bosom of the deep like a vast wall, the wavy top densely covered with snow during winter and spring, and the two highest peaks capped with crowns of ice on the sultriest days of summer. The western slopes are long and gradual, furrowed from top to bottom with deep rugged ravines, and broken everywhere by lofty cliffs of white rock, and ragged banks, and tens of thousands of terrace walls, rising like steps of stairs from the sea to the snow-wreaths. “The whole mass of the mountain consists of whitish limestone, or at least the rocky surface, as it reflects the light, exhibits everywhere a whitish aspect. The mountain teems with villages, and is cultivated more or less almost to the top; yet so steep and rocky is the surface, that the tillage is carried on chiefly by means of terraces, built up with great labor, and covered above with soil. When one looks upward from below, the vegetation on these terraces is not seen, so that the whole mountain side appears as if composed of immense rugged masses of naked whitish rock, severed by deep wild ravines, running down precipitously to the plain. No one would suspect among these rocks the existence of a vast  multitude of thrifty villages, and a numerous population of mountaineers, hardy, industrious, and brave” (Robinson, 2, d493; comp. Volney, Travels, 1:272 sq.).

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

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

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

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

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

(4.) Rivers. — Lebanon is rich in rivers and fountains, fed by the eternal snows that crown its summit, and the vapors which they condense. The “streams from Lebanon” were proverbial for their abundance and beauty in  the days of the Hebrew prophets (Son 4:15), and its “cold-flowing waters” were types of richness and luxury (Jer 18:14). Some of them, too. have obtained a classic celebrity (see Reland, Palaest. p. 269, 437). They are all small mountain torrents rather than rivers. The following are the more important:

1. The Eleutherus (now Nahr el-Kebir), rising in the plain of Emesa, west of the Orontes, sweeps round the northern base of Lebanon, and falls into the Mediterranean midway between Tripolis and Aradus. Strabo states that it formed the northern border of Phoenicia and Coele-Syria (16:753; Robinson, 3:576).

2. The Kadisha, or sacred river,” now generally called Nahr Abu-Aly, has its highest sources around the little cedar grove, and descends through a sublime ravine to the coast near Tripolis. At one spot its glen has perpendicular walls of rock on each side nearly 1000 feet high. Here, on opposite banks, are two villages, the people of which can converse across the chasm, but to reach each other requires a toilsome walk of two hours. In a wild cleft of the ravine is the convent of Kanobin, the chief residence of the Maronite patriarch (Handbook for Syr. and Pal. p. 586).

3. The Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim), famous in ancient fable as the scene of the romantic story of Venus and Adonis. Killed by a boar on its banks, Adonis dyed with his blood the waters, which ever since, on the anniversary of his death, are said to run red to the sea (Lucian, De Syria ulea, 6; Strabo, 15:170). Adonis is supposed to be identical with Tammuz, for whom Ezekiel represents the Jewish women as weeping (8:14). ‘The source is a noble fountain beside the ruins of a temple of Venus, and near the site of Apheca, now marked by the little village of Afka (Eusebius, Vit. Const. 3:55; Porter, Damascus, 2:297; Ritter, Pal. und Syr. 4:558). The Adonis falls into the sea a few miles south of the Biblical Gebal.

4. The Lycus flumen, now Nahr el-Kelb, or “Dog River,” rises high up on the flank of Sunnin, and breaks down through a picturesque glen. At its mouth is that famous pass on whose sculptured rocks Assyrian, Egyptian, Roman, and French (!) generals have left records of their expeditions and victories (Robinson, 3:618; Handbook, p. 407 sq.; Strabo, 16:755).  5. The Magoras of Pliny (v. 17) is probably the modern Nahr Beyrut.

6. The Tamyras or Damuras (Strabo, 16:756; Polybius, v. 68) rises near Deir el-Kamr, the capital of Lebanon. It is now called Nahr ed- Dammfir.

7. The Bostrenus of ancient authors appears to be identical with Nahr el-Awaley, though some doubt this.

8. The Leontes has already been mentioned. The lower section of it is now generally termed Kasimlyeh, and the upper section Litsiny. Its chief sources are at Chalcis and Ba'albek; but a large tributary flows down from the ravine of Zahleh, and is the only stream which descends the eastern slopes of Lebanon. SEE LEONTES.

2. Anti-Lebanon. —

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

Vegetation is abundant among the rocks; and though the inhabitants are few and far between, immense flocks of sheep and goats are pastured upon the mountains, and wild beasts — bears, boars, wolves, jackals, hysenas, foxes are far more abundant than in any other part of Syria or Palestine (Porter, Damascus, 2:315).  The lowest and last of the ridges that radiate from Hermon runs nearly due east along the magnificent plain of Damascus, and continues onward to Palmyra. Its average elevation is not more than 3000 feet, and it does not rise more than about 700 feet above the plain, though some of its peaks are much higher. Its rock is chalky, almost pure white, and entirely naked-not a tree, or shrub, or patch of verdure is anywhere seen upon it. It thus forms a remarkable contrast to the rich green of the plain of Damascus. From the central range to this ridge there is a descent, by a series of broad. bare terraces or plateaus, supported by long, continuous walls of bare, whitish limestone, varying from 100 to 1000 feet in height. Nothing could be more dreary and desolate than the scenery on these steppes. The gravelly soil, in many places thickly strewn with flints, is as bare as the cliffs that bound them. Yet they are intersected by several rich and beautiful glens, so deep, however, that their verdure and foliage can not be seen from a distance. Towards the east these steppes gradually expand into broad upland plains, and portions of them are irrigated and tilled. On them stand the small but ancient towns of Yabrud, Nebk, Jerud, etc., around which madder is successfully cultivated.

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

3. These parallel ranges enclose between them a fertile and well-watered valley, averaging about fifteen miles in width, which is the Coele-Syria (Hollow Syria) of the ancients, but is called by the present inhabitants, by way of pre-eminence, el-Bekaa, or “the Valley.” This is traversed through  the greater portion of its length by the river Litâny, the ancient Leontes. It is the “valley of Lebanon” (‘בַּקְעִת הִלְּבָנוֹן) mentioned in Jos 11:17; Jos 12:7, and later “the plain of Aveii” (בַּקְעִתאּאָוֶן) alluded to by Amos (Amo 1:5), where also Solomon constructed one of his palaces (1Ki 7:2; 1Ki 9:9; 1Ki 10:17; Son 7:4). SEE COELE- SYRIA.

III. Natural Science. —

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

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

Over the Jura limestone there is in many places a more recent cretaceous deposit; its color is gray, and sometimes pure white. It is soft, and abounds in flints and fossils, ammonites, echinites, ostrxea, chenopus, nerinea, etc., often occurring in large beds, as at Bhamdun above Beyrut. Fossil fish are also found imbedded in the rock near the ancient Gebal (Reland, Palaest. p. 321). These cretaceous deposits occur along the whole western flank of Lebanon, and the lower eastern ranges of Anti-Lebanon are wholly composed of them (D'Arvieux, Memoires, 2:393; Elliot, Travels, 2:257; Volney, 2:280).  Extensive beds of soft, friable sandstone are met with both in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. According to Anderson, the sandstone is of a more recent period than the cretaceous strata. This change in the geological structure gives great variety to the scenery of Lebanon. The regular and graceful outlines of the sandstone ridges contrast well with the bolder and more abrupt limestone cliffs and peaks, while the ruddy hue and somber pine forests of the former relieve the intense whiteness of the latter.

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

2. The Botany of Lebanon, like the geology, is to a great extent unknown. It appears to be very rich in the abundance, the variety, and the beauty of the trees, shrubs, and flowers of these noble mountains. The great variety of climate, from the tropical heat of the Jordan valley at the base of Hermon, to the eternal snows on its summit, affords space and fitting home for the vegetable products of nearly every part of the globe. The forests of Lebanon were celebrated throughout the ancient world. Its cedars were used in the temples and palaces of Jerusalem (1 Kings 6; 2Sa 5:11; Ezr 3:7; Isa 14:8; Josephus, War, v. 5, 2), Rome (Pliny, H. N. 13:11), and Assyria (Layard, Nin. and Bob. p. 356, 644); and the pine and oak were extensively employed in ship-building (Eze 27:4-6). SEE CEDAR.

On these mountains we have still the cedar, pine, oak of several varieties, terebinth, juniper, walnut, plane, poplar, willow, arbutus, olive, mulberry, carob, fig, pistachio, sycamore, hawthorn, apricot, plum, pear, apple, quince, pomegranate, orange, lemon, palm, and banana. The vine abounds everywhere. Oleanders line the streams, and rhododendrons crown the peaks higher up, with the rock-rose, ivy, berberry, and honeysuckle. The loftiest summits are almost bare, owing to the cold and extreme dryness. There are even here, however, some varieties of low prickly shrubs, which lie on the ground like cushions, and look almost as sapless as the gravel from which they spring. Many of the flowers are bright and beautiful — the anemone, tulip, pink, ranunculus, geranium, crocus, lily, star of Bethlehem, convolvulus, etc. Thistles abound in immense variety. The cereals and vegetables include wheat, barley, maize, lentils, beans, peas, carrots, turnips, potatoes, melons, pumpkins, cucumbers, tobacco, cotton, and numerous others.  Irrigation is extensively practiced, and wherever water is abundant the crops are luxuriant. Probably in no part of the world are there more striking examples of the triumph of industry over rugged and intractable nature than along the western slopes of Lebanon. The steepest banks are terraced; every little shelf and cranny in the cliffs is occupied by the thrifty husbandman, and planted with vine or mulberry (Robinson, 3:14,21, 615; Porter, Damascus, 2:283; Handbook, p. 410,413).

3. Zoology. — Considerable numbers of wild beasts still inhabit the retired glens and higher peaks of Lebanon, including jackals, hyenas, wolves, bears, and panthers (2Ki 14:9; Son 4:8; Hab 2:17). SEE PALESTINE.

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

IV. Climate. — There are great varieties of climate and temperature in Lebanon. In the plain of Dan, at the fountain of the Jordan, the heat and vegetation are almost tropical, and the exhalations from the marshy plain render the whole region unhealthy. The seminomads who inhabit it are as dark in complexion as Egyptians. The thermometer often stands at 98° Fahr. in the shade on the site of Dan, while it does not rise above 32° on the top of Hermon. The coast along the western base of Lebanon, though very sultry during the summer months, is not unhealthy. The fresh sea- breeze which sets in in the evening keeps the night comparatively cool, and the air is dry and free from miasma. Snow never falls on the coast, and it is very rarely seen at a lower elevation than 2000 feet. Frost is unknown. In the plains of Coele-Syria (3000 feet) and Damascus (about 2300 feet), snow falls more or less every winter, sometimes eight inches deep on the streets and terraced roofs of Damascus, while the roads are too rough and hard with frost for traveling. The main ridges of Lebanon and Anti- Lebanon are generally covered with snow from December to March, sometimes so deeply that the roads are for weeks together impassable. During the whole summer the higher parts of the mountains are cool and pleasant, the air is extremely dry, and malaria is unknown. From the beginning of June till about the 20th of September rain never falls, and clouds are rarely seen. At the latter date the autumn rains begin, generally  accompanied with storms of thunder and vivid lightning. January and February are the coldest months. The barley harvest begins, on the plain of Phoenicia, about the end of April, but in the upper altitudes it is not gathered in till the beginning of August. During the summer, in the village of Shumlan, on the western declivity of Lebanon, at an elevation of 2000 feet, in the hottest part of the day the thermometer does not rise above 830 Fahr., and in the night it usually goes down to 760. From June 20th to August 20th the barometer often does not vary a quarter of an inch; there are few cloudy days, and scarcely even a slight shower. At Bludan, in Anti- Lebanon, with an elevation of 4800 feet, the air is extremely dry, and the thermometer never rises in summer above 82° Fahr. in the shade. The nights are cool and pleasant. The sirocco wind is severely felt along the coast and on the western slopes of Lebanon, but not so much in Anti- Lebanon. It blows occasionally during March and April. Dew is almost unknown along the mountain ridges, but in the low plains, and especially at the base of Hermon, it is very abundant (Psa 133:3).

V. Historical Notices. — Lebanon is first mentioned as a boundary of the country given by the Lord in covenant promise to Israel (Deu 1:7; Deu 11:24). To the dwellers in the parched and thirsty south, or on the sultry banks of the Nile, the snows, and streams, and verdant forests of Lebanon must have seemed an earthly paradise. By such a contrast we can understand Moses's touching petition, “I pray thee let me go over and see the good land that is beyond Jordan, that goodly mountain, and Lebanon” (Deu 3:25). The mountains were originally inhabited by a number of warlike, independent tribes, some of whom Joshua conquered on the banks of Lake Merom (Deu 11:2-18). They are said to have been of Phoenician stock (Pliny, 5:17; Eusebius, Onom. s.v.; compare 1 Kings 5). Further north were the Hivites (Jdg 3:3), and the Giblites, and Arlites, whose names still cling to the ruins of their ancient strongholds. SEE GIBLITE, ARKITE.

The Israelites never completely subdued them, but the enterprising Phoenicians appear to have had them under their power, or in their pay, for they got timber for their fleets from the mountains, and they were able to supply Solomon from the same forests when building the Temple (1Ki 5:9-11; Eze 27:9 sq.). At a later period we find the king of Assyria felling its timber for his military engines (Isa 14:8; Isa 37:24, Eze 31:16), and it is mentioned on  the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.). Diodorus Siculus relates that in like manner Antigonus, having collected from all quarters hewers of wood, and sawyers, and ship-builders, brought down an immense quantity of timber from Libanus to the sea to build himself a navy (19:58). The same fact that this mountain was the famous resort for timber, whether for architectural, naval, or military purposes, appears from the Egyptian monuments, where the name is found in the corrupted form of Lemanon (Wilkinson, Egyptians, 1:403). It is there represented as a mountainous country, inaccessible to chariots, and abounding in lofty trees, which the affrighted mountaineers, having fled thither for refuge, are engaged in felling, in order to impede the advance of the invading Egyptian army.

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

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

During the reign of the Seleucidae several large cities were founded or rebuilt in these mountains as Laodicea at the northern end of Anti- Lebanon, Chalcis at its eastern base, Abila in the wild glen of the Abana (Luk 3:1). SEE ABILA. At the commencement of our era, Lebanon,  with the rest of Syria, passed into the hands of Rome, and under its fostering rule great cities were built and beautiful temples erected. The heights on which Baal-fires had burned in primeval times, and the groves where the rude mountain tribes worshipped their idols, became the sites of noble buildings, whose ruins to this day excite the admiration of every traveler. Greece itself cannot surpass in grandeur the temples of Ba'albek and Chalcis. There are more than thirty temples in Lebanon and Anti- Lebanon (Porter, Handbook, p. 454, 457, 557, 411; comp. Robinson, 3:438, 625).

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

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

V. Literature. — Robinson, Biblical Researches, 3:344, 345, 439; Kitto, Pictorial History of Palestine, Introd. p. 32-35, 55; Reland, Palaestina, 1:311; Rosenmüller, Biblisch. Alterthum. 2:236; Raumer, Palastina, p. 29- 35; D'Arvieux, Memoires, 2:250; Volney, Voyage en Syrie, 1:243; Seetzen, in Zach's Monatl. Correspond. June, 1806; Burckhardt, Travels in Syr. p. 1 sq.; Richter, Wallfahrten, p. 102, etc.; Irby and Mangles,  Travels, p. 206-220; Buckingham, Arab Tribes, p. 468 sq.; Fisk, in Missionary Herald, 1824; Elliot. Travels, 2:276; Hogg, Visit to Alexandria, Jerusalem, etc., 1:219 sq., 2:81 sq.; Addison, Palmyra and Damascus, 2:43-82; Ritter's Erdkunde, 17, div. 1; Robinson's Researches, new edit., 3:584-625; Bibliotheca Sacra, 1843, p. 205-253; 1848, p. 1-23, 243-262, 447-480, 663-700; Schwarz, Palest. p. 55; Kelly's Syria and Holy Land, p. 76-165; Porter, Damascus (Lond. 1855); Thomson, Land and Book, vol. 1; Van de Velde, Travels, etc., vol. 1; Churchill, Lebanon (London, 1853,1862); also Druses and Maronites (Lond. 1862); Tristram, Land of Israel (London. 1865); Palmer, in the Quarterly Statement of the “Palestine Exploration Fund,” April, 1871, p. 107 sq. SEE PALESTINE.

## Lebaoth[[@Headword:Lebaoth]]

             (Heb. Lebasth', לְבָאוֹתlionesses; Sept. Λαβαώθ), a city in the southern part of Judah, i.e. Simeon (Jos 15:32); elsewhere more fully BETH- LAEBAOTH (Jos 19:6); also BETH-BIREI (1Ch 4:31). The associated names in all these passages suggest a location in the wild south- western part of the tribe, possibly at the ruined site marked on Van de Velde's Map as Sbeta, on wady Suniyeh, not very far from Elusa, towards Gaza.

## Lebbaeus[[@Headword:Lebbaeus]]

             (Λεββαῖος), a surname of Judas or Jude (Mat 10:3), one of the twelve apostles; a member, together with his namesake “Iscariot,” James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, of the last of the three sections of the apostolic body. The name Judas only, without any distinguishing mark, occurs in the lists given in Luk 6:16; Act 1:13; and in Joh 14:22 (where we find “Judas not Iscariot” among the apostles), but the apostle has been generally identified with “Lebbeus whose surname was Thaddaeus” (Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς θαδδαῖος) (Mat 10:3; Mar 3:18), though Schleiermacher (Critical Essay on St. Luke, p. 93) treats with scorn any such attempt to reconcile the lists. In both the last quoted places there is considerable variety of reading, some MSS. having both in Matthew and Mark Λεββαῖος, θαδδαῖος alone, others introducing the name Ι᾿ούδας, or Judas Zelotes, in Matthew, where the Vulgate reads Thaddaeus alone, which is adopted by Lachmann in his Berlin edition of 1832. This confusion is still further increased by the tradition preserved by Eusebius (H. E. 1:13) that the true name of Thomas  (the twin) was Judas (Ι᾿ούδας ὁ καὶ θωμᾶς), and that Thaddaeus was one of the “seventy,” identified by Jerome in Matthew 10 with” Judas Jacobi,” as well as by the theories of modern scholars, who regard the “Levi” (Λευὶς ὁ τοῦ Α᾿λφαίου) of Mar 2:14 : Luke v. 27, who is called “Lebes” (Λεβὴς) by Origen (Cont. Cels. 1. 1, § 62), as the same with Lebb'aus. The safest way out of these acknowledged difficulties is to hold fast to the ordinarily received opinion that Jude, Lebbaeus, and Thaddaus were three names for the same apostle, who is therefore said by Jerome (in Matthew 10) to have been “trionimus,” rather than introduce confusion into the apostolic catalogues, and render them erroneous either in excess or defect. SEE THADDAEUS.

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

## Lebeuf, Jean[[@Headword:Lebeuf, Jean]]

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

## Lebi, Lebiyah[[@Headword:Lebi, Lebiyah]]

             SEE LION.

## Leblanc (de Beaulieu), Jean Claude[[@Headword:Leblanc (de Beaulieu), Jean Claude]]

             a French prelate, was born in Paris, May 26, 1753. After being canon- regular of St. Genevieve before the Revolution, he became, in 1791, constitutional rector of the parish of St. Genevieve, and subsequently of St. Eitienne du Mont. He was chosen archbishop of Roue n on the death of Gratian; consecrated January 18, 1800, at Paris, and held in his metropolitan church a council of the bishops of his diocese the following October. In 1801 he assisted at the national council held at Paris. After the signing of the Concordat, he gave in his resignation, and in 1802 was appointed bishop of Soissons. He established a seminary in his episcopal city. Being invited, in 1815; to be present at a reception of the emperor after his return from the island of Elba, Leblanc wrote to the minister to give assurance of his fidelity to Louis XVIII. This declaration was published, and the bishop of Soissons withdrew to England. The return of the king recalled him to his diocese, and in 1817 he was appointed archbishop of Aries, re-established by the new Concordat. Having resigned in 1822, he withdrew to the Seminary of Foreign Missions at Paris, took charge of the Savoyards, and was appointed member of the chapter of St. Denis. He died July 13, 1825. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Leblanc, Guillaume[[@Headword:Leblanc, Guillaume]]

             a French prelate, was bar at Alby in 1561. The position of his uncle, a distinguished theologian of the same name, aided his access to ecclesiastical honors. Having been chamberlain to pope Sixtus V, he was appointed, in 1588, to the bishopric of Vence, which a bull of Clement VIII reunited, in 1591, with the episcopal see of Grasse. This reunion, which the chapter of Vence vigorously repelled, became to Leblanc a great source of  embarrassment and litigation. He was even the object of an attempted assassination, and sought to destroy the act of union by the parliament of Aix. He died at Aix, November 21, 1601. For mention of his works, see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Leblond, Gaspard Michelt[[@Headword:Leblond, Gaspard Michelt]]

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

## Lebon, Joseph[[@Headword:Lebon, Joseph]]

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

## Lebonah[[@Headword:Lebonah]]

             SEE FRANKINCENSE.

## Lebonah (2)[[@Headword:Lebonah (2)]]

             (Heb. Lebonah', לְבוֹנָה, frankincense, as often; Sept. Λεβωνά), a town near Shiloh, north of the spot where the Benjamite youth were directed to capture the Shilonite maidens at the yearly festival held “on the north side of Bethel, on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem” (Jdg 21:19). The earliest modern mention of it is in the Itinerary of the Jewish traveler hap-Parchi (A.D. cir. 1320), who describes it under the name of Lubin, and refers especially to its correspondence with the passage in Judges (see Asher's Benjamin of Tudela, 2:435). Brocardus mentions it as a very handsome village, by the name of Lemna, four leagues south of Nablus, on the right hand of the road to Jerusalem (chap. 7, p. 178). The identity of this place was again suggested by Manndrell, who calls it Leban (Trav. p. 86). It is no doubt the Lubban visited by Dr.  Robinson on his way from Jerusalem to Nablûs (Bib. Researches, 3:90). He describes the khan el-Lubban as being now in ruins; but near by is a fine fountain of running water. From it a beautiful oval plain extends north about fifteen minutes, with perhaps half that breadth, lying here deep among the high rocky hills. About the middle of the western side, a narrow chasm through the mountain, called wady el-Lubban, carries off the waters of the plain and surrounding tract. The village of Lubban is situated on the north-west acclivity, considerably above the plain. It is inhabited; has the appearance of an old place; and in the rocks above it are excavated sepulchers (comp. De Saulcy, Narrative, 1:94, 95; Schwarz, Palest. p. 130; Wilson, 2:292 sq.; Bonar, p. 363; Mislin, 3:319; Porter, Handbook, p. 330; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 330; Tristram, p. 160).

## Lebonah (3)[[@Headword:Lebonah (3)]]

             The modern site, el-Lubban, is laid down on the Ordnance Map ten miles north of Beitin (Bethel), and is briefly described in the accompanying Memoirs (2:286, 360) as well as by Guerin (Siamzarnia, 2:112). Five pillars still remain standing, which seem to have been part of an ancient chapel.

## Lebrecht, Firchtegott S[[@Headword:Lebrecht, Firchtegott S]]

             a Jewish scholar, was born at Memmelsdorf, Bavaria, in 1800. He made his Talmudical studies at the rabbinical seminary in Presburg, Hungary, and his philological at Halle, under Gesenius. In 1832 he went to Berlin, where he died, October 13, 1876. Lebrecht contributed largely to the Literatur-Blatt des Orients (1841-44), and in connection with Biesenthal edited the  dictionary of David Kimchi, called Liber Radicum. Besides, he wrote an essay, Handschriffen und erste Ausgaben des babylonischen Talmuds, published in Wissenschafiliche Blatter aus der Veitel Ephraimischen Lehranstalt in Berlin (1862), and Die Stadt Bethelr, in Magazin fur die Wissenschhaft des Judenthums (Berlin, 1876), pages 27-40, 77-93. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:226 sq. (B.P.)

## Lebrija, Aelius Antonius Of[[@Headword:Lebrija, Aelius Antonius Of]]

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

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

## Lebrun, Charles[[@Headword:Lebrun, Charles]]

             an eminent French painter, was born in Paris, March 22, 1619. In 1662 he commenced his great work, The Battles of Alexander, which gained him a great reputation. In the Church of Notre Dame are two of his most celebrated pictures, The Stoning of St. Stephen, and The Martyrdom of St. Andrew. He died in Paris, February 12, 1690. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Lebrun, Jean Baptiste (surnamed Desmarets)[[@Headword:Lebrun, Jean Baptiste (surnamed Desmarets)]]

             a French scholar, was born at Rouen, and partly educated at Port Royal. He labored in different dioceses, and died at Orleans, March 19, 1731, never having been willing to proceed to a higher order than that of acolyth. He left an edition (the second) of the Latin work of John, bishop of Avranches, De Divinis Officiis (Rouen, 1679, 12mo): — An edition of St. Paulinus, with notes, etc. (Paris, 1685): — A Concordance of the Books of Kings and Chronicles (Lat.): — Le Voyage Liturgique de France, published under the name of the Sieur de Moleon (Paris, 1718, 8vo): — The Breviaries of Orleans and Nevers: — Lactantius, the edition which passed in MS. to his brother, a bookseller at Rouen, and from him to Langlet du Fresnoy, who published it (2 vols. 4to). He was working at a new edition of the Martyrology of Usuardus when he was put into the Bastile, where he remained five years. See Landon, Eccles. Dict. s.v.

## Lebrun, Pierre[[@Headword:Lebrun, Pierre]]

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

## Lebuin Or Liafwin[[@Headword:Lebuin Or Liafwin]]

             a noted colleague of Gregory in his mission among the inhabitants of Friesland. According to his painstaking biographer, Hunebald, a monk of the convent of Elnon in the 10th century (in Surius, 6:277, and in Pertz, 2:360), Lebuin was a native of Brittany, and joined Gregory at Utrecht, having been directed to do so in a dream. Gregory sent him on a mission to the neighboring people, and gave him the Anglo-Saxon Marchelin or Marcellin as assistant. They preached with great success, and soon established a church at Wulpen, on the eastern shore of the Yssel, and another at Deventer. These churches afterwards closing by an invasion of the Saxons, Lebuin courageously resolved to go as a missionary among that nation, and went to Marklo, one of their principal cities; later he went  further north, towards the Weser, and there was well received by an influential chief named Folkbert, who seems to have been a Christian. Folkbert advised him not to visit Marklo during the reunion which was held there yearly to discuss the general interests of the nation, but to conceal himself in the house of one of his friends, Davo. Lebuin, however, did not abide by this counsel, and went to the assembly.

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

## Lecah[[@Headword:Lecah]]

             (Heb. Lecah', לֵכָה, perh. for יְלֵכָה, a journey, but according to Fürst, annexation; Sept. Ληχά v. r. Ληχάδ and Ληχάβ; Vulg. Lecha), a place in the tribe of Judah founded by Er (or rather, perhaps, by a son of his named Lecah), the first-named son of Shelah (1Ch 4:21). As Mareshah is stated in the same connection to have been founded by a member of the  same family, we may conjecture that Lecah (if indeed a town) lay in the same vicinity, perhaps westerly.

## Lecanomancy[[@Headword:Lecanomancy]]

             a species of divination (q.v.), performed by means of a basin, with wedges of gold or silver marked with certain characters. The wedges were Suspended over the water, and the daemon formally invoked, when he gave the response in a low hissing sound passing through the water.

## Lecene, Charles[[@Headword:Lecene, Charles]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born in 1647 at Caen, in Normandy. After studying theology at Sedan, Geneva, and Saumur, he was in 1672 appointed pastor at Honfleur. In 1682 he supplied for one year the Church of Charenton, but was accused of Pelagianism by Sartre, pastor of Montpellier. Unable to obtain from the Consistory of Charenton a certificate of orthodoxy such as he desired, he appealed to the next national synod, where he was warmly sustained by Allix, but the revocation of the Edict of Nantes suddenly put an end to the discussion. Lecene went to Holland, and there connected himself with the Arminians. He then went to England, but, refusing to be reordained, and being, moreover, strongly suspected of Socinianism, he was unable to accomplish anything there, and returned to Holland, where he remained until 1697. He then went again to England, and settled at London. He vainly tried to found an Arminian Church in the English metropolis. He died in 1703. Lecene was, even by his theological adversaries, considered a very learned theologian. A plan of his for the translation of the Bible was taken up by his son, Michel Lecene (Amst. 1741, 2 vols. folio): Projet d'une nouvelle version Francoise de la Bible (Rotterdam, 1696, 8vo; translated, An Essay for a new Translation of the Bible, wherein is shown that there is a necessity for a new Translation, 2d ed., to which is added a table of the texts of Scripture [Lond. 1727, 8vo]). He wrote De l'Etat Deuteronomy 1'homme apres le peche et de sa predestination asu salut (Amsterd. 1684, 12mo): — Entretiens sur diverses matieres de theologie, etc. (1685,12mo): —Conversations sur diverses matieres de religion (1687, 12mo). See Colani, in Revue de Theologie, 7:343 sq., 1857; Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Gen. 29:185; and the sketch in the Avertissement de sa traduction de la Bible (Amst. 1742, 2 vols. folio). (J. H. W.)

## Lecerf de la Vieville, Philippe[[@Headword:Lecerf de la Vieville, Philippe]]

             a French Benedictine, who died March 11, 1748, is the author of, Bibliotheque Historique et Critique des Auteurs de la Congregation de Saint-Maur (Hague, 1726): — Defense de la Bibliotheque, etc. (Paris, 1727): — Histoire de la Constitution Unigenitus, en ce qu' Regarde la Congregation de Saint-Maur (Utrecht, 1726). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. — (B.P.)

## Lech, John[[@Headword:Lech, John]]

             an Irish prelate, was elected to the bishopric of Dunkeld, Scotland, in 1309, and was canon of the Church. In 1310 he was promoted to the see of Dublin. In 1312 he was constituted lord treasurer of Ireland. He died August 10, 1313. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 120.

## Leckey, William[[@Headword:Leckey, William]]

             a Presbyterian minister in Ireland, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He made himself conspicuous by the part he took in the Blood plot — an attempt, after the Restoration, to complicate the Nonconformists and the government by warring against Romanism. He was imprisoned May 22, 1663, and, refusing to conform, was condemned  to death, and executed on July 15 at Gallows Green, near Dublin. Leckey was a fine preacher and an able scholar, a fellow of the College of Dublin, which high school petitioned for his life. This request was granted upon the conformity of Leckey, which, as we have seen above, he refused. See Reid, Hist. of the Presbyterian Ch. in Ireland, 2:275-282. Leclerc, David, a Protestant theologian, was born at Geneva Feb. 19,1591. He studied at Geneva, Strasburg, and Heidelberg, and in 1615 went to England to perfect himself in the study of Hebrew. He subsequently returned to his native place, and in 1618 was appointed professor of Hebrew at the university. He was ordained for the ministry in 1628, and died April 21, 1654. He wrote Quaestiones sacrae, in quibus multa Scripturae loca variaque linguae sacrae idiomata explicatvur, etc.; accesserunt similium argumentorumn diatribm Steph. Clerici (Amst. 1685, 8vo): — Orationes (13), conspectus ecclesiasticus et poemata; accedunt Steph. Clerici Dissertationes philologicae (Amsterd. 1687, 8vo): — a Latin translation of Buxtorf's Synagogue (Basle, 1641, 8vo and 4to); etc. See La Vie de ravid Leclerc, in his Questiones sacrae; Senebier, Iist. Literaire de Geneve; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 30:195.

## Leclerc, James Theodore[[@Headword:Leclerc, James Theodore]]

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

## Leclerc, Laurent Jose[[@Headword:Leclerc, Laurent Jose]]

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

## Lecomte, Louis[[@Headword:Lecomte, Louis]]

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

## Lectern, Or Lettern[[@Headword:Lectern, Or Lettern]]

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

## Lecticarii[[@Headword:Lecticarii]]

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

## Lectionarium[[@Headword:Lectionarium]]

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

This part of worship is adopted from the Jews, and, like that of the synagogues, was at first restricted to the reading of their sacred books (O.T.). The first record we find of the reading of the N.-Test. Scriptures in the churches is in Justin, Apol. 1, cap. 67. But the fact of the reading of the Bible in general from the earliest times is clearly established by passages of Tertullian (Apolog. cap. 39; De aninza, cap. 9), Cyprian (Ep. 24,33, edit. Oberth. 34), Origen (Contra Cels. 3:45, ed. Oberth. 50), etc. It is self- evident that the canonical books and the homologoumena were those most generally read. But that lessons were occasionally read also from the Apocrypha and Antilegomena is shown by the yet remaining lists of libri ecclesiastici and ἀναγινωσκόμενα, i.e. of such books as, although not recognised as authorities in matters of faith, are still permitted to be read in the churches. Other writings, especially acta martyrum, and sermons of some of the most distinguished fathers, came afterwards to be also read to the people. The number of pieces (lectiones) read at each service varied;  the author of the Apostolic Constitutions (2, 100:57) mentions four; two was the minimumone from the Gospels, the other from the epistles or other books, including those of the O.T. SEE PERICOPAE. At first the portions to be read, at least on every ordinary Sunday, were taken in succession in the sacred books (lectio continua), but afterwards special portions were appointed to be read on certain Sundays, and the selection was made by the bishop, until at last a regular system of lessons was contrived, which is the base of the one still used at present in churches where the strictly liturgical service is adhered to. For feast-days, at first, special lessons were appointed (for instance, the account of the resurrection on Easter: see Augustine, Serm. 139, 140). But it is not known at what time the plan which forms the basis of the present system was first adopted. Yet Ranke (Das Kirchl. Perikopensystem, Berl. 1847) gives us good reasons for thinking that tradition may be correct in representing Jerome as the author of the ancient list of lessons known under the name of “comes,” and as the originator of the system in the Western Church.

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

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

## Lectisternium[[@Headword:Lectisternium]]

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

## Lector[[@Headword:Lector]]

             (ἀναγνώστης) or READER was the name of an officer in the ancient Church whose place it was to read the holy Scriptures and other lessons (for instance, the Acta martyrum) in public worship. He was also entrusted with the keeping of the sacred volumes. This reading of the Word of God formed an important part in the service of the Jewish synagogues (see Luk 4:16; Act 13:15; Act 13:27; 2Co 3:14), and was introduced into the Christian Church from thence. But we do not know at what period the performance of it became a special office. Yet Tertullian, De praescr. hapr. c. 41, expressly speaks of the lector as a special officer in the Church, and Cyprian (Ep. 33, and edit. Oberth. 34) mentions the ordination of two readers. The early Church councils (Concil. Chalcedon. a. 451, c. 13, 14; Tolet. 7, 2; Vasense, 2:2; Valentin. c. 1; A rausial, 1:18) give directions about the duties of readers. Still, although the most eminent fathers laid great stress on the reading of Scripture in the churches, and Cyprian declares their office one of great honor (Epist. 34), it was yet classed among the ordines inferiores. This is easily accounted for from the fact that the simple reading, wnithout any exegetical or homiletical explanations (which are not in the province of the reader), was a mere mechanical performance, and in after times often entrusted to children. After the form of the liturgy of the mass was finally settled, the lectors were forbidden to read the pericopes occurring in the missa fidelium. They were also thereafter excluded from the altar, and suffered to read only at the pulpitum, and finally were obliged to leave to the deacon or presbyter the pronouncing of the formula solennis. probably because the reader was of lower degree in the hierarchy. Yet in some churches the ordination of  readers was a very solemn affair, especially among the Greeks, where it was accompanied by imposition of hands. In course of time the office of reader in the Romish Church came to be absorbed in the deacon's, and identified with it. See C. Schone, Geschichtsforschungen ü.d. Kirchl. Gebr. 3:108 (Berlin, 1822); Jo. Andr. Schmidt, De primitivae eccles. lectoribus illustribus (Helmstadt, 1696); Bingham, De origin. eccles. 2:29; Suicer and Du Fresne, Lexica; Augusti, Denkwürd. vol. 6; Handb. d. chr. Arch. 1:262; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:268.

## Lectorium[[@Headword:Lectorium]]

             SEE LECTERN.

## Lecturers[[@Headword:Lecturers]]

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

## Lectures, Bampton[[@Headword:Lectures, Bampton]]

             SEE BAMPTON LECTURES.

## Lectures, Boyle[[@Headword:Lectures, Boyle]]

             SEE BOYLE LECTURES

## Lectures, Congregational[[@Headword:Lectures, Congregational]]

             SEE CONGREGATIONAL LECTURES.

## Lectures, Hulsean[[@Headword:Lectures, Hulsean]]

             SEE HULSEAN LECTURES.

## Lectures, Merchants[[@Headword:Lectures, Merchants]]

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

## Lectures, Monthly[[@Headword:Lectures, Monthly]]

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

## Lectures, Morning[[@Headword:Lectures, Morning]]

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

## Lectures, Moyers[[@Headword:Lectures, Moyers]]

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

## Lectures, Religious[[@Headword:Lectures, Religious]]

             are discourses or sermons delivered by ministers on any subject in theology. Besides lectures on the Sabbath day, many think proper to preach on week-days; sometimes at five in the morning, before people go  to work, and at seven in the evening, after they have done. In London there is preaching almost every forenoon and evening in the week at some place or other.

## Lectures, Warburtonian[[@Headword:Lectures, Warburtonian]]

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

## Lecturn[[@Headword:Lecturn]]

             SEE LECTERN.

## Led (or Leda)[[@Headword:Led (or Leda)]]

             in Slavonic mythology, is the god of war; also among the Russians. He appears armed with sword and shield, a helmet on his head, and a spear in his hand.

## Ledge[[@Headword:Ledge]]

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

## Ledieu, Francois[[@Headword:Ledieu, Francois]]

             abbe, a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer, was born at Peronne about the middle of the 17th century. In 1684 he became private secretary of the celebrated French pulpit orator Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, and was by this prelate made canon of the church at Meaux. He died at Paris Oct. 7,1713. He wrote Memoires et Journal de l'Abbe Ledieu sur la vie et les ouvrages de Bossuet (Paris, 1856-57,4 vols. 8vo), upon which the late Sainte-Beuve thus comments: “L'abbe Ledieu n'a pas le dessein de diminuer Bossuet, mais il souvient son illustre maitre h une epreuve it laquelle pas une grande figure ne resisterait; il note jour par jour a l'epoque de la maladie derniere et d dedeclin tous les actes et toutes les paroles de faiblesse qui lui echappent, jusqu'aux plaintes et doleances aux quelles on se laisse aller la  nuit quand on se croit seul, et dans cette observation il porte un esprit de petitesse qui se prononce de plus en plus en avanqant, un esprit has, qui n'est pas moins dangereux que ne le serait une malignite subtile” (Monitleur, Mar. 31, 1856). Ledieu also left in MS. Memoires sur l'Histoire et les Antiquiles du diocese de Mleaux. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 30:262.

## Leding[[@Headword:Leding]]

             in Norse mythology, is the chain with which the wolf Fenris was chained.

## Ledru, Andre Pierre[[@Headword:Ledru, Andre Pierre]]

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

## Ledwich, Edward, D.D[[@Headword:Ledwich, Edward, D.D]]

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

## Lee, Alfred, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Lee, Alfred, D.D., LL.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Cambridge, Massachusetts, September 9, 1807. Graduating from Harvard College in 1827, he studied law and was admitted to the bar, but in 1837 graduated from the Gelieral Theological Seminary, entered the ministry, and in 1841 was ordained bishop of Delaware. In 1884 he became presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church. He died April 12, 1887. He was a  member of the American Committee for the Revision of the New Testament, and the author of several volumes. See Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

## Lee, Andrew[[@Headword:Lee, Andrew]]

             D.D., a Congregational minister, was born May 7, 1745 (0. S.), at Lyme, Conn.; graduated at Yale College in 1766; entered the ministry in 1768; was ordained pastor at Lisbon, Conn., Oct. 26,1768; and died Aug. 25,1832. He was made a member of Yale College corporation in 1807. Dr. Lee published An Inquiry whether it be the Duty of Man to be willing to suffer Damnation for the Divine Glory (1786): — Sermons on varlious inportant Subjects (8vo, 1803); and several occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 1:668.

## Lee, Ann[[@Headword:Lee, Ann]]

             the founder of the sect of Shakers, was born in Manchester, England, Feb. 29, 1736. She was the daughter of a poor mechanic, a blacksmith by trade, and a sister of general Charles Lee of Revolutionary fame. When yet a young girl she married Abraham Standley, of like trade as her father, and  she became the mother of four children, who all died in infancy. When about twenty-two years of age Jane came under the influence of James Wardley, at this time the great exponent of the Millenarian doctrines of the Camisards and French Prophets. These religious fanatics, after enduring much persecution and great suffering in their native country, had sought a refuge in England in 1705. Gradually they spread their views — communicating inspiration, as they thought — finding ready followers, particularly among the Quakers, and one of this number James Wardle — in 1747 actually formed a separate society, consisting mainly of Quakers, claiming to be led by the Spirit of God, and indulging in all manner of religious excesses, similar to those of the Canmisards (q.v.) and French Prophets (q.v.). Wardley claimed to have supernatural visions and revelations, and as both he and his adherents were noted for their bodily agitations. they came to be known as Shaking Quakers. Of this sect Ann Lee, now Mrs. Standley, became one of the leading spirits. From the time of her admission she seems to have been particularly inspired for leadership and action. Naturally of an excitable temper, her experience in the performance of the peculiar religious antics of this society — by them termed “religious exercises” — was most singular and painful. Of a pious nature, she hesitated not to subject herself to all the torments of the flesh. Often in her fits or paroxysms, as she clinched her hands, it is said, the blood would flow through the pores of her skin in a kind of sanguinary perspiration. This her followers believe was a miraculous phenomenon, and they liken it to the “bloody sweat” of our Savior in the garden. Her flesh wasted away under these exercises, and she became so weak that her friends were obliged to feed her like an infant. Then, again, according to the account given by her followers, she would have “intervals of releasement, in which her bodily strength and vigor were sometimes miraculously renewed, and her soul filled with heavenly visions and divine revelations.” All these mortifications of the flesh were by her sect accepted not only as evidences of great spiritual fervor, but as proofs of the indwelling of the divine spirit in Ann in an uncommon measure.

She rose rapidly in the favor and confidence of her brethren, and we need not wonder that soon she came to have visions and revelations, and that they frequently and gladly “attested” them as manifestations of God to the believers. By the year 1770 she had grown so much in favor among her people that her revelations and visions were looked upon with more than ordinary interest; and when in this year she was subjected to persecution and imprisonment by the secular authorities, her followers claim that the  Lord Jesus manifested himself to her in an especial manner, and from this time dates the beginning of that “latter day of glory” in which they are now rejoicing. Immediately after her release from prison she professed supernatural powers in the midst of the little society gathered about her, and she was acknowledged as their spiritual mother in Christ. Ann was thereafter accepted as the only true leader of the Church of Christ — not in the common acceptation of that term, but as the incarnation of infinite wisdom and the “second appearing of Christ,” as really and fully as Jesus of Nazareth was the incarnition of infinite power, or Christ's first appearing, and she now hesitated not to style herself “Ann, the Word," signifying that in her dwelt the Word. Among other things revealed to her at this time was the displeasure of the Almighty against the matrimonial state, and she opened her testimony on the wickedness of marriage.

If nothing else could have provoked the secular powers to put a stop to her fanatic excesses in the garb of religion, her attack on one of the most sacred institutions of the civilized state demanded immediate action, and she was again imprisoned, this time for misdemeanor. Set free once more, she began to spread her revelations more generally, and actually entered upon an open warfare against “the root of human depravity,” as she called the matrimonial act, and the people of Manchester were so enraged that she was shut up in a madhouse, and was kept there several weeks. Thus harassed and persecuted on English soil, she finally decided to seek quiet and peace on this side of the Atlantic, and in 1773 professed to have a “special revelation” to emigrate to America. Several of her congregation asserted that they also had had revelations of a like nature, and she accordingly set out for this country. She came to America in the ship Maria, Captain Smith, and arrived at New York in May, 1774, having as her companions her brother, William Lee, James Whitaker, John Hocknell, called elders, and others. In the spring of 1776 she went to Albany, and thence to Niskayuna, now Watervliet, eight miles from Albany. Here she successfully established a congregation, which she called “the Church of Christ's second appearing," formally dissolved her connection with the man to whom she had in her youth given her hand and heart, and became their recognized head. It was not, however, until 1780 that Ann Lee succeeded in gathering about her a very large flock. At the beginning of this year an unusually great religious revival occurred at New Lebanon, and, improving this opportunity, she went prominently before the people, taking an active part in the religious commotion. This proved to her cause a fine harvest indeed. and the number of her deluded followers greatly  increased, and resulted in the establishment of the now flourishing society of New Lebanon. SEE SHAKERS.

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

Strange as must ever appear the fanatical excesses of Ann Lee, and her willingness to lead men to acts of depravity, to blasphemous religious pretensions, it must be conceded that she was certainly a wonderful woman. Deprived of all the advantages of education, she nevertheless, by the power of a will wholly unyielding and a mind of no common order, succeeded in establishing a religious sect, by which, at present consisting of more than four thousand people, some of them of marked intelligence and  superior talents, possessing, in the aggregate, wealth to the amount of more than ten millions of dollars, she is considered as the very Christ — standing in the Church as God himself, and at whose tribunal the world is to be judged. Over this society her influence is spoken of as complete. Her word was a law from which there was no appeal. Obedience then, as now, was the one lesson that a Shaker was required to learn perfectly — an obedience unquestioned and entire; and all this when the very foundation upon which they rested their faith, namely, her divine mission, was notoriously antagonized by a life accused, and not without some show of truthfulness, as openly and shamefully impure. See H. P. Andrews in the Ladies' Repository, 1858, p. 646 sq.; Marsden (Rev. J. B.), Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects, 2:320 sq.; Galaxy, 1872 (Jan. and April). SEE SHAKERS.

## Lee, Charles[[@Headword:Lee, Charles]]

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

## Lee, Chauncey[[@Headword:Lee, Chauncey]]

             D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Salisbury, Conn., 1763; graduated at Yale College ill 1784; entered the ministry June 3, 1789; and was ordained pastor in Sunderland, Vt., March 18, 1790, where he remained a few years, and in Jan., 1800, became pastor in Colebrook, Conn. ‘This connection he dissolved in 1827, to become pastor at Marlborougrh,Conn.. Nov. 18,1828, which place he held until Jan. 11. 1837. He died in Hartwick, N. Y., Dec., 1842. Lee published the American Accomptant: an Arithmetic (1797): — The Trial of Virtuen: a metrical Version of the Book of Job (1807): — Sermnons especially designed for  Revivals (12mo, 1824): — Letters from Aristarchus to Philemon (1833); and two or three occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 2:288.

## Lee, Edward[[@Headword:Lee, Edward]]

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

## Lee, Henry Washington, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Lee, Henry Washington, D.D., LL.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Hamdenl, Connecticut, July 26, 1815. He was ordained deacon in 1838; became rector at Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1840; and in 1848 of St. Luke's at Rochester, N.Y., where he was consecrated bishop of Iowa, October 18, 1854. His episcopal residence was at Davenport. Griswold College, located in that place, became the object of his special care. He died September 26, 1874. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1875, page 144.

## Lee, James, M.A[[@Headword:Lee, James, M.A]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Newmarket, March 4, 1823. After graduating from London University in 1848, he took charge of a church at Broseley, Salop, serving also churches at Churchtown, Portishead, and Crick in 1858, and the ten years following, he conducted a school at Broughton, Manchester. The remainder of his life, with the exception of three years in the pastorate, was spent in literary work. He died July 22, 1893. He was the author of Bible Illustrations (6 volumes), and several pamphlets. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1894.

## Lee, Jason[[@Headword:Lee, Jason]]

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

## Lee, Jesse[[@Headword:Lee, Jesse]]

             one of the most eminent preachers in the early history of the American Methodist Church, and recognized as the founder of Methodism in New England was born in Prince George's County, Virginia, March 12,1758. He received a fair education, was diligently instructed in the Prayer-book and Catechism, and early acquired skill in vocal music, which served him in all his subsequent labors. His early life was moral. “I believe I never did anything in my youth that the people generally call wicked,” is the record in his journal. His father was led to a more serious mode of life than prevailed generally in that community chiefly by the influence of Mr. Jarratt, an Episcopal clergyman. Jesse's parents, however, finally, in 1773, joined the Methodist Society then formed under Robert Williams, one of Wesley's preachers, the promoter of Methodism in those parts. In this very year Jesse experienced in a marked manner the sense of pardoned sin, and continued to benefit by the powerful revival influences which for some years prevailed in the neighborhood.

In 1776 he experienced a state of grace which he called “perfect love.” “At length I could say, ‘I have nothing but the love of Christ in my heart,' “is his record. In 1777 he removed from his home into the bounds of Roanoke Circuit, North Carolina. where the next year he was appointed a class-leader. He preached his first sermon November 17, 1779, and for a time supplied the preacher's place. In the summer of 1780 he was drafted into the militia to meet the approach of the British army in South Carolina. Excused from bearing arms on account of his religious scruples, he rendered various other services, especially by' preaching. Soon obtaining a discharge, he was earnestly solicited to enter the itinerant inistry, but shrank from the responsibility, “fearing lest he should injure the work of God.” At the tenth Conference, held at Ellis Meeting-house, Sussex County, Virginia, April 17,1782, Lee was deeply impressed with “the union and brotherly love” prevalent among the preachers, notwithstanding the warm difference that had of late existed among the Methodist preachers on the subject of the administration of the sacraments, and at a quarterly meeting in November he was prevailed upon to take charge, together with Mr. Dromgoole, of a circuit near Eldenton, North Carolina — the Amelia Circuit. At the Ellis Meeting-house Conference, May 6,1783, he was received on trial. ‘This year he preached with marked success. He writes, “I preached at Mr. Spain's with great liberty . . . the Spirit; of the Lord came upon us, and we were bathed in tears.” “I preached at Howel's Chapel from Eze 33:11 . . . I saw so clearly that the Lord was willing to bless the people, even while I was speaking, that I began to feel distressed for them. . . . After stopping and weeping for some time, I began again, but had spoken but a little while before the cries of the people overcame me, and I wept with them so that I could not speak. I found that love had tears as well as grief.” Under appointment of the Conference, which began at Ellis Preaching-house, Virginia, April 30, 1784, and ended at Baltimore May 28 following (see minute for that year), he labored in different circuits with like success, and was now regarded as an important mane in the connection. December 12 he was invited to meet Coke. Whatcoat, and Vasey at the celebrated Christmas Conference of 1784 at IBaltimore, where, with the aid of these persons, ordained (and sent out for the  purpose by in r. Wesley, the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized. Lee could not attend the Conference from his distant circuit on so short a notice and at that season of the year, but was immediately after requested by bishop Asbury to travel with him in a Southern tour. This was an important event for Lee. He preached with the bishop at (Gorgetown and Charleston. At Cheraw he met with a merchant who gave him such information of New England as awakened in him an eager desire to transfer his field of labor to that region. At the Southern Conference, held in North Carolina April 20, 1785, Lee, in ardent controversy with Coke, who was still in the country. sought the abrogation of certansin strigent rules on slavery adopted in 17 84, which required of each member of the society the gradual emancipation of his slaves. His views soon prevailed. He preached, 1786, in Kent Circuit, Maryland; 1787, in Baltimore; 1788, in Flanders Circuit, embracing a portion of New Jersey and New York.

Previously to the General Conference of 1796 there were no prescribed limits to the several conferences, but they were held at the discretion of the bishop as to time and place, the same preacher being sometimes appointed from different Conferences in the same year. At the Conference held in New York, May 28, 1789, Lee was appointed to Stamford Circuit, in Connecticut, and now began his career in New England, which continued for eleven years. New England, from the natural temperament of its inhabitants, and their previous theological education, was a hard field for the introduction of Methodism, into which though spread into all the other Atlantic States, far into the West, to Canada and Nova Scotia — it had not hitherto ventured with a set purpose of permanent occupancy. The dearth of earnest religious interest which succeeded the revivals under Edwards, Whitefield, and Tennant, as well as the prevalent reactionary tendency to rationalism, furnished sufficient demand for the zealous preaching of the Methodists. They felt themselves called also to a special mission in upholding their form of doctrine concerning entire sanctification in this life; but their views on the subject offree will were greatly misunderstood, the Methodist Arminianism being confounded with Pelagianism. “The argument,” says John Edwards, “most constantly used against Arminianism in those days was its tendency to prepare the way for Popery” (as being a doctrine of salvation by good works).

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

In February, 1790, he received three helpers, Brush, Roberts, and Smith, and formed the New Haven Circuit. He passed through Rhode Island, and appeared in Boston July 9. Boardmas and Garrettson had before preached there, but no permanent fruit remained of their labors. Lee, finding no house opened, preached on the Common to 3000 hearers. Though Lee often returned to the city, no society was formed there till July 13,1792. He had better success elsewhere, and constantly labored throughout New England in supervision of the work, till the General Conference of 1796. Soon after this date he began to travel at large with bishop Asbury, as his authorized assistant in preaching and in holding Conferences. Thus employed, he revisited the scenes of his former labors in the South, and traveled also through New England. The period of his labors in that section closed in 1800. It had continued for eleven years, amid great difficulties, frequent theological controversies, and no small degree of persecution. The statistical result at this date was 50 preachers and 6000 members. At the General Conference held May 6, 1800, at Baltimore, Lee was nearly elected a bishop, Whatcoat being chosen over him by four votes. The subsequent portion of his life was spent mostly in the South, in earnest and successful labor as pastor and presiding elder. He preferred, says his  biographer, the former position. At the Virginia Conference of 1807 his influence defeated, from an opinion of its unconstitutionality, the proposition to call an extraordinary General Conference, in order to elect a bishop in place of bishop Whatcoat, deceased. He had, for like reason, opposed his own ordination as assistant bishop in 1796. In the Virginia Conference of 1808 he advocated a petition to the following General Conference of May 20, 1808, to establish a delegated General Conference.

This proposition had been urged by Lee as early as 1792. Such action was taken by the Conference of 1808, and the powers of the General Conference, as the supreme authority of the Church, were defined in what are termed the Restrictive Rules. In the same year Lee made a last visit and journey throughout New England, which was “an humble but exultant religious ovation.” In the summer of 1807 he published at Baltimore his History of Methodism in America, which was the first work of the kind. During that year he served the House of Representatives at Washington as chaplain, as he did also in 1812 and 1813. In 1814 he was chaplain of the Senate. At the General Conference of 1812, in New York, Lee strongly advocated, as he had previously done, the proposition to make the office of presiding elder elective. He opposed with equal zeal the principle of advancing local preachers to elders' orders. He continued his faithful career as circuit preacher and as chaplain to Congress till 1816. He was present at the funeral services of his veteran colaborer, bishop Asbury, held by the General Conference of 1816 at Baltimore, and did not long survive himself, but died at the age of fifty-eight, Sept. 12, 1816. Dr. Stevens closes his history of the Methodist Episcopal Church with the following characterization of Jesse Lee; “A man of vigorous, though unpolished mind, of rare popular eloquence and tireless energy, an itinerant evangelist from the British Provinces to Florida for thirty-five years, a chief counsellor of the Church in its annual and general conferences,”” founder of Methodism in New England . . . he lacked only the episcopal office to give him rank with Asbury and Coke. Asbury early chose him for the position of bishop. Some two or three times it seemed likely that he would be elected to it, but his manly independence and firmness of opinion in times of party strife were made the occasion of his defeat.” “In public services he may fairly be ranked next to Asbury, and as founder and apostle of Eastern Methodism he is above any other official rank. In this respect his historic honor is quite unique; for, though individual men have in several other sections initiated the denomination, no other founder has, so completely as he, introduced, conducted, and concluded his work, and  from no other one man's similar work have proceeded equal advantages to American Methodism” (4:510. 511).

The same author, in another place, thus presents his qualities as a preacher: “Pathos was natural to him. Humor seems, in some temperaments, to be the natural counterpart, or, at least, reaction of pathos. Lee became noted for his wit; we shall see it serving him with a felicitous advantage in his encounters with opponents, especially in the Northeastern States. It flowed in a genial and permanent stream from his large heart, and played most vividly in his severest itinerant hardships; but he was full of tender humanity and affectionate piety. His rich sensibilities, rather than any remarkable intellectual powers, made him one of the most eloquent and popular preachers of his day. One of his fellow-laborers, a man of excellent judgment, says that he possessed uncommon colloquial powers and a fascinating address; that his readiness at repartee was scarcely equaled, and by the skillful use of this talent he often taught those who were disposed to be witty at his expense that the safest way to deal with him was to be civil. He was fired with missionary zeal, and, moreover, was a man of great moral courage” (1:413). “It was a kind of fixed principle with him,” says his biographer Lee (p. 350), “never to let a congregation go from his preaching entirely unaffected. He would excite them in some way. He would make them weep if he could. If he failed in this, he would essay to alarm them with deep and solemn warning of words and manner; and, if all failed, he would shake their sides with some pertinent illustration or anecdote, and then. having moved them, seek, by all the appliances of truth, earnestness, and affection, to guide their stirred-up thoughts and sympathies to the fountains of living waters.” — See Life and Times of Jesse Lee, by Leroy M. Lee (Richmond, Va., 1848); Stevens, History of the M. A. Church; Memoirs of Rev. T. Ware. (E. B. O.)

## Lee, Leroy Madison, D.D[[@Headword:Lee, Leroy Madison, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born at Petersburg, Virginia, April 30, 1808. He was converted in 1827, soon began to preach, was admitted into the Virginia Conference the next year, occupied important stations, in 1832 was appointed editor of the Christian Sentinel, Richmond, Virginia, in 1839 became the editor of the Richmond Christian Advocate, in 1858 returned to pastoral work, in 1881 became superannuated, and died April 20, 1882. He was an able preacher, a powerful controversialist, and the author of several books, of which the Life and Times of Jesse Lee (1847) is the most important. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1882, page 60.

## Lee, Nathanael H., D.D[[@Headword:Lee, Nathanael H., D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Campbell County, Virginia, April 29, 1816. He studied at Urania College, Kentucky, was converted in his twentieth year, in 1838 was admitted into the Kentucky Ccnference, in which he soon attained eminence, and continued to preach, with a few intermissions in other religious work, until his superannuation in 1880. He died June 14, 1881. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1881, page 300.

## Lee, Richard Henry, LL.D[[@Headword:Lee, Richard Henry, LL.D]]

             a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, rector of Trinity, Washington, Pennsylvania, died at that place, January 3, 1865, aged seventy-five years. For many years he was professor in Washington College. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. April 1865, page 140.

## Lee, Robert[[@Headword:Lee, Robert]]

             D.D., a noted Scotch Presbyterian divine, was born at Tweedmouth about 1796; was educated at St. Andrew's University, and became a minister of the Gospel. After occupying two other charges, he became, with Chalmers and others, minister of old Grayfriars, Edinburgh. He died in March, 1868, at Torquay, Devonshire. Dr. Robert Lee published a translation of the Thesis of Erastus (1844): — Prayers for Public Worships: — Handbook of Devotion: —Prayers for Family Worship: — The Bible, with New Marginal References; a work which brought upon him severe condemnation for Rationalistic tendency. It is, however, by no means to be  inferred from this that Dr. Lee was not of the evangelical school; he fought the Socinians with the utmost exertion, and, as a Scotchman expressed it, “Dr. Lee emptied the Unitarian chapel” at Edinburgh. Dr. Lee was the leader in innovations and changes in the Church Establishment of Scotland. His views were ultra-liberal; and from the year 1858, when the innovations were complained of before the Low-Church courts, till the commencement of his last illness, he fought a great battle, as the Daily Review expresses it, for what he deemed a more liberal construction of the laws of the Church in the matter of public worship-in other words, publishing, using? defending written prayers-and by his own force of character, his ingenuity and power as a controversialist, and his influence over the younger ministers of the Church, he probably did more to carry forward the movement with which his name is identified than all the rest of his brethren who took part with him. SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF. (J. H. W.)

## Lee, Robert P[[@Headword:Lee, Robert P]]

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

## Lee, Samuel[[@Headword:Lee, Samuel]]

             (1), D.D., a distinguished English Orientalist and Biblical scholar, was born at Longnor, in Shropshire, May 14, 1783; was educated but moderately, and apprenticed to a carpenter. His aptitude for learning, however, led him to continue his studies privately, and he thus acquired the Latin language. He next mastered the Greek, and from that he advanced to Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Samaritan, all of which he acquired by his own unaided efforts before he was twenty-five years of age. By this time he had married, and exchanged his former occupation for that of a schoolmaster. Attracting the notice of archdeacon Corbett and Dr. Jon. Scott, he was, by their aid, enabled to add to his other acquisitions a knowledge of Arabic, Persic, and Hindustanee, as well as some European and other tongues. In 1815 he accepted an engagement with the Church Missionary Society, and became a student of Queen's College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of B.A. in 1817. At this time he edited portions of the Scriptures, and of the Prayer-book, in several Oriental languages. In 1818 he took orders, and preached at Shrewsbury, still carrying on his Oriental studies; at this time he is said to have had the mastery over eighteen languages. In 1819 he was honored, as his talents certainly deserved, with the professorship of Arabic, and in 1834 was made regius professor of Hebrew at Cambridge University, besides receiving some pieces of Church preferment, and the title of D.D. first from the University of Halle, and then from that of Cambridge. Shortly before his death, Dec. 16,1852, he was made rector of Barley, in Somersetshire, where he died. Besides the editions of the Scriptures which he carried through the press, he published several valuable linguistical works, of which the most important are, Grammar of the Hebrew Language, compiled from the best authorities, chiefly Oriental, which has passed through several editions: — A Lexicon, Heb., Chald., and Engl. (Lond. 1840): — The Book of the Patriarch Job translated, with Introduction and Commentary (Lond. 1837): — An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy (Camb. 1849): — Prolegomena in Bib. Polygl. Londinens. Minora (Lond. 1828). He also published an edition of the controversial tracts of Martyn and his opponents; edited Sir William Jones's Grammar of the Persian Language, with an addition of his own, containing a synopsis of Arabic grammar; and translated a anannotated the travels of Ibn-Batuta from the Arabic. A minor work of his, Dissent Unscripturanl and Unreasonable, led to a controversy with Dr. J. Pye Smith (in 1834; the pamphlets were published  in 1835). Dr. Lee has generally been recognized not, only as a great scholar, but also as the greatest British Orientalist of his day, and his writings bear evident traces of a vigorous, earnest, and independent mind loving truth, and boldly pursuing it. See Lond. Gentl. Magazine, 1853, pt. 1, 203 sq.; Blackwood's Magazine, 49:597 sq.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. vol. 2, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors. vol. 2, s.v.

## Lee, Samuel (2)[[@Headword:Lee, Samuel (2)]]

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

## Lee, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Lee, Samuel, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in London, England, in 1625. From his father, Samuel Lee, he inherited a large estate. After remaining some time at St. Paul's school, he went, in 1640, to Oxford, and continued his studies there until 1648, when he received the degree of M.A. Soon after he was appointed to a fellowship in Wadham College, and became proctor of the university in 1656. At that time he was a lecturer in Great St. Helen's Church in London. In 1677 he became associated with the celebrated Theophilus Gale, as minister in a nonconforming congregation in Holborn. In September 1679, he was preaching at Bignel, in Oxfordshire, where he remained for some time. Afterwards, for several years, he was pastor of an Independent Church at Newington Green. Although strongly advised to enter the Established Church, conscientious scruples forbade it. In 1686 he landed in New England, and was employed to preach in Bristol, R.I. The next year, in May, he was chosen pastor of the newly organized Church there. As religious toleration began to prevail in England, he resolved to return thither. Resigning his pastorate in Bristol, he set sail in 1691, but was captured by a French privateer and carried to St. Malo, where he died in the latter part of the same year. It is said of him that there was scarcely a department of knowledge with which he was not familiar. At one time he devoted a great deal of attention to astrology, but disapproved of it afterwards, and burned a hundred books relating to it. His benevolence was manifested in frequent gifts to the poor. Besides a number of sermons, he  published several books. His Triumph of Mercy was popular in New England, and was reprinted in Boston in 1718. Another work, Orbis Miraculumn; or, The Temple of Solomon Portrayed by Scripture Light (1659, fol.), printed at the expense of the University of Oxford, was much admired. Another, De Excidio Anti-Christi (eod. fol.), was a study of popery. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:209.

## Lee, William, D.D[[@Headword:Lee, William, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was born in Ireland in 1815. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he was elected fellow in 1839, in 1857 was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history, and in 1863 lecturer on divinity. In 1874 he was archdeacon of Dublin, and he died May 11, 1883. He is the author especially of, Introductory Lectures on Ecclesiastical History (1858): — Examination of Remarks of Baden Powell (1861); but is best known by his Lectures on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures (1852).

## Lee, Wilson[[@Headword:Lee, Wilson]]

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

## Leech[[@Headword:Leech]]

             SEE HORSE-LEECH.

## Leechman, John, LL.D[[@Headword:Leechman, John, LL.D]]

             a Scotch Baptist minister and missionary, was born at Glasgow, September 2, 1803, and became a Baptist in 1820. He was educated at the Haldane Institution, Grantown, in the north of Scotland, in the Baptist College, Bristol, and the University of Glasgow. He was ordained a missionary to India at Edinburgh, July 3, 1832, and sailed from Liverpool on the 25th for the mission station at Serampore. He began work as tutor in the college, and preacher of the gospel. In 1835 he was ordained co-pastor of the Church at Serampore. In 1837 he sailed for England for the benefit of his wife's health, and to awaken greater interest at home in the mission in India. In 1838 he was induced to settle as pastor of the Church at Irvine, Ayrshire. He removed to London in 1848 as pastor of the Baptist Church in Hammersmith. In 1850 he was sent, with the Reverend Joshua Russell, as a deputation to India and Ceylon, in which they spent some four months. He resigned his pastorate in 1863, and removed to Bath for rest and recuperation. He afterwards engaged in various public labors, and at the close of 1867 accepted the pastorate at Kensington Chapel. He ceased to preach in 1870, and died March 16, 1874. See (Lond.) Bapt. Hand-Book, 1875, page 284.

## Leechman, William, D.D[[@Headword:Leechman, William, D.D]]

             a Scotch divine, was born in 1706, educated at the University of Edinburgh, licensed to preach in 1731, ordained minister of Beith in 1736, elected professor of theology in the University of Glasgow about 1743, principal in 1761, and died December 3, 1785. He was held in high estimation by his brethren in the ministry, having been elected by them, in 1740, to the moderatorship of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, and in 1757 of the General Assembly. He was a ripe theologian, a powerful preacher, and a warm advocate of all institutions of a worthy character. A collective edition of his sermons, with a life of the author, by James Wodrow, D.D., was published (Lond. 1789, 2 volumes, 8vo; new ed. 1816, 2 volumes, 8vo). See The (Lond.) Christian Observer, December 1812, page 753; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Leeds, George, D.D[[@Headword:Leeds, George, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Newburyport, Mass., in 1816. He graduated from Amherst College in 1835, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1839, served successively at Utica, N.Y., Salem, Massachusetts (1853-60), St. Peter's, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Grace Church, Baltimore, Maryland, and died in Philadelphia, April 15, 1885.

## Leek[[@Headword:Leek]]

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

In the passage at Num 11:5, where the Israelites in the desert long for “the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlic” of Egypt, it is evident that it was not grass which they desired for food, but some green, perhaps grass-like vegetable, for which the word chatsir is used. In the same way that in this country the word greens is applied to many varieties of succulent plants as food, in India subzi, from subz, "green," is used as a general term for herbs cooked as kitchen vegetables. It is more than probable, therefore, that chatsir is here similarly employed, though this does not prove that leeks are intended. Ludolphus, as quoted by Celsius (Hierobot. 2:264), supposes that it may mean lettuce, or salads in general, and others that the succory or endive may be the true plant. But Rosenmüller states, “The most ancient Greek and the Chaldee translators unanimously interpret the Hebrew by the Greek πράσα, or leeks.” The name, moreover,:seems to have been specially applied to leeks  from the resemblance of their leaves to grass, and from their being conspicuous for their green color. This is evident from minerals even having been named from πράσον on account of their color, as prasius, prasites, and chrvsoprasium. The Arabs use the word kûras, or kûrath, as the translation of the πράσον of the Greeks, and with them it signifies the leek, both at the present day sand in their older works. It is curious that of the different kinds described, one is called kurasal-bukl, or leek used as a vegetable. That the leek is esteemed in Egypt we have the testimony of Hasselquist, who says (Travels, p. 291), “The kind called karrat by the Arabs must certainly have been one of those desired by the children of Israel, as it has been cultivated and esteemed from the earliest times to the present time in Egypt.” The Romans employed it much as a seasoning to their dishes (Horace, Eph 1:12; Eph 1:21; Martial, 3:47, 8), and it is an ingredient in a number of recipes in Apicius referred to by Ceisius (Hierobot. 2:263; comp. Pliny, Hist. Nat. 19:6; Hiller, Hierophyt. pt. 2, p. 36; Diosc. 2:4; Athen. 4:137,170). The leek (Allium porrum) was introduced into England about the year 1562, and thence, in due time, into America; and, as is well known, it continues to be esteemed as a seasoning to soups and stews in most civilized countries.

There is, however, another and a very ingenious interpretation of chatsir, first proposed by Hengstenberg, and received by Dr. Kitto (Pictorial Bible, Num 11:5), which adopts a more literal translation of the original word, for, says Kitto, “among the wonders in the natural history of Egypt, it is mentioned by travelers that the common people there eat with special relish a kind of grass similar to clover." Mayer (Reise nach AEgyptien, p. 226) says of this plant (whose scientific name is Trigonella Faenum- graecum, belonging to the natural order Legumniose) that it is similar to clover, but its leaves more pointed, and that great quantities of it are eaten by the people. Forskal mentions the Trigonella, as being grown in the gardens at Cairo; its native name is Halbeh (Flor. AEgyptiaca, p. 81). Sonnini (Voyage, 1:379) says, “In this fertile country the Egyptians themselves eat the fenu-grec so largely that it may be properly called the food of man. In the month of November they cry ‘Green halbeh for sale!' in the streets of the town; it is tied up in large bunches, which the inhabitants purchase at a low price, and which they eat with incredible greediness without any kind of seasoning.” The seeds of this plant, which is also cultivated in Greece, are often used; they are eaten boiled or raw,  mixed with honey. Forskal includes it in the materia medica of Egypt (Matthew Med. Kahir. p. 155). There does not appear, however, sufficient reason for ignoring the old versions, which all seem agreed that the leek is the plant denoted by chatsir, a vegetable from the earliest times a great favorite with the Egyptians, as both a nourishing and savory food. Some have objected that, as the Egyptians held the leek, onion, etc., sacred, they would abstain from eating these vegetables themselves, and would not allow the Israelites to use them (compare Juvenal, Sat. 15:9). We have, however, the testimony of Herodotus (2:125) to show that onions were eaten by the Egyptian poor, for he says that on one of the pyramids is shown an inscription, which was explained to him by an interpreter, showing how much money was spent in providing radishes, onions, and garlic for the workmen. The priests were not allowed to eat these things, and Plutarch (De Isaiah et Osir. 2, p. 353) tells us the reasons. The Welshman reverences his leek, and wears one on St. David's day; he eats the leek nevertheless, and doubtless the Egyptians were not overscrupulous (Script. Herbal. p. 230).

## Lees[[@Headword:Lees]]

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

## Leeser, Isaac[[@Headword:Leeser, Isaac]]

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

## Left[[@Headword:Left]]

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

## Left-Handed[[@Headword:Left-Handed]]

             ( אַטֵּר יִד יְמַינוֹ, shut as to his right hand [Jdg 3:15; Jdg 20:16]; Sept. ἀμφοτεροδέξιος ', Vulgate qui utraque manu pro dextera uitebatur, and itca sinistra ut dextra proelians), properly one that is unable skilfully to use his right hand, and hence employs the left; but also, as is usual, ambidexter, i.e. one who can use the left hand as well as the right, or, more  literally, one whose hands are both right hands. It was long supposed that both hands are naturally equal, and that the preference of the right hand, and comparative incapacity of the left, are the result of education and habit. But it is now known that the difference is really physical (see Bell's Bridgewater Treatise on the Hand), and that the ambidexterous condition of the hands is not a natural development. SEE AMBIDEXTER.

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

## Leg[[@Headword:Leg]]

             is the rendering of several words in the A.V. Usually the Heb. term is כָּרָע, karla' (only in the dual כְּרָעִיַם), the lower limb or shank of an animal (Exo 12:9; Exo 29:17; Lev 1:9; Lev 1:13; Lev 4:11; Lev 8:21; Lev 9:14; Amo 3:12) or a locust (Lev 11:21); the σκέλος of a man (Joh 19:31-33). שֹׁוֹק, shôk (Chald. שָׁק, shâk, of an image, Dan 2:33), is properly the shin or lower part of the leg, but used of the whole limb, e.g. of a person (Deu 28:13; Psa 147:10; Pro 26:7; “thigh,” Isa 47:2; in the phrase "hip [q.v.] and thigh,” Jdg 15:7; spoken also of the drawers or leggins, Song of Solomon v. 15); also the “heave shoulder" (q.v.) of the sacrifice (Exo 29:22, etc.; 1Sa 9:24). Once by an extension of רֶגֶל, re'gel (1Sa 17:6), properly a foot (as usually rendered). Elsewhere improperly for שֹׁבֶל  , sho'bel, the train or trailing dress of a female (Isa 47:2); and צְעָדָה , tseada', a step-chain for the feet, or perh. bracelet for the wrist (“ornament of the leg,” Isa 3:20). SEE THIGH.

Goliath's greaves for his legs doubtless extended from the knee to the foot (1Sa 17:6). SEE GREAVES. The bones of the legs of persons crucified were broken to hasten their death (Joh 19:31). SEE CRUCIFIXION.

## Legalists[[@Headword:Legalists]]

             Properly speaking, a legalist is one who “acts according to the law;" but in general the term is made use of to denote one who seeks salvation by works of law (not of the law, but of “law” generally, whether moral or ceremonial, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, Romans v. 20) instead of by the merits of Christ. Many who are alive to the truth that it is impossible to do anything that can purchase salvation, and who desire that this doctrine should be earnestly and constantly inculcated by Christian ministers in their teaching, conceive that there is a danger also on the opposite side; and that while plain Antinomian teaching would disgust most hearers, there is a kind of doctrine scarcely less mischievous in its consequences, that which only incidentally touches on good works. They think that whatever leads or leaves men, without distinctly rejecting Christian virtue, to feel little anxiety and take little pains about it; anything which, though perhaps not so meant, is liable to be so understood by those who have the wish as to leave them without any feeling of real shame, or mortification, or alarm on account of their own faults and moral deficiencies, so as to make them anxiously watchful only against seeking salvation by good works, and not at all against seeking salvation without good works — all this (they consider) is likely to be much more acceptable to the corrupt disposition of the natural man than that which urges the necessity of being “careful to maintain good works.” Those who take such a view of the danger of the case think that Christian teachers should not shrink, through fear of incurring the wrongful imputation of “legalism,” from earnestly inculcating the points which the apostles found it necessary to dwell on with such continual watchfulness and frequent repetition. But in general the term is made use of to denote one who expects salvation by his own works. We may further consider a legalist as one who has no proper conviction of the evil of sin; who, although he pretends to abide by the law, yet has not a just idea of its spirituality and demands. He is ignorant of the grand scheme of  salvation by free grace: proud of his own fancied righteousness, he submits not to the righteousness of (God; he derogates from the honor of Christ by mixing his own works with his; and, in fact, denies the necessity of the work of the Spirit by supposing that he has ability in himself to perform all those duties which God has required. Such is the character of the legalist, a character diametrically opposite to that of the true Christian, whose sentiment corresponds with that of the apostle, who justly observes, “By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph 2:8-9). — Eden, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Buck, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Buchanan, Doctrine of Justification, Lect. 6, especially p. 153 sq.

## Legates[[@Headword:Legates]]

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

Among the delegates of the bishop of Rome we must also put the Apocrisiarii SEE APOCRISIARIUS, sent to the imperial court at Constantinople. Leo I, and particularly Gregory I, carefully continued the relations established by their legates, and created more, in order to improve the condition of the churches, and to increase the influence of Rome. Gregory appointed bishop Maximus of Syracuse over all the churches of  Sicily (“ super cunctas ecclesias Sicilie te . . . vices sedis apostolicae ministrare decernimus”), with the right of deciding on all except the causce masjores. This office was, however, vested only in the individual, not in the see (“Quas vices non loco tribuimus, sed personae,” 100:6, X. Depraesumtionibus, 2:23, a. 592; 100:3, Song of Solomon 7, qu. 1:30 [a. 594], 100:39; can. 11, qu. 1, and Gonzalez Tellez to c. 1, X. De officio legati. 1:30, a. 9). To England Gregory sent Augustine (a. 601), with the mission of improving the Church organization of that country, and particularly of upholding the episcopacy (Epist. 64, a. 601, in 100:3, can. 25, qu. 2); and Agathon (678) also sent the Roman abbot John to that country to organize worship, convoke a council to inquire into the state of religion, and report thereon at his return (Beda, Hist. Eccl. lib. 4, cap. 18). Augustine is said to have himself taken part in settling ecclesiastical affairs during a journey through Gaul, and conferred with the bishop of Aries as his legate. Gregory I sent also other special delegates to Gaul, in order to improve the state of the churches there, with the aid of the bishops and the king (Thomassin, 100:118). In the course of time the legates were empowered to act by themselves on the orders communicated to them at Rome. The vicariates became connected with some of the ancient bishoprics, by whose incumbents they had long been exercised, and it became difficult to erect new permanent ones on account of the opposition of the other dignitaries of the Church; so that special delegates were only sent when affairs of importance rendered such a step necessary. Even then it became customary to await the wish, or at least to secure the sanction, of the governments into whose states they were sent. There were, then, two kinds of legates, the legati nuti, and the legayci dati or meissi.

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

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

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

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

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

The Reformation gave occasion for the sending of a large number of legates, and also for the nomination of permanent nuncios at Lucerne, 1579; Vienna, 1581; Cologne, 1582; Brussels, 1588: this, however, gave rise to fresh disturbances in the Church. The troubles caused by the nuncios were the cause of the adoption of a new article under the gravamina nationis Germanicae. In the mean time the French Revolution broke out, disturbing all preconceived plans. After the restoration of order in the hierarchy the system of legations was revived, but with many modifications altering its Middle-Age features. The second article of the French Concordat of 1801 states expressly: “Aucun individu se disant nonce, legat, vicaire ou commissaire apostolique, ou se prevalant de toute autre denomination, ne pourra, sans l'autorisation du gouvernement, exercer sur le sol Franqais ni ailleurs, aucune fonction relative aux affaires de l'eglise Gallicane.” This clearly removed the original foundation of the intercourse formerly existing between the papal see and these countries. Moreover, several Roman Catholic governments, such as Austria, France, Spain, etc.,  reserved to themselves the right to point out the parties who should be accredited to their courts as nuncios (Klüber, Europäisches Völkerr. § 186, Anm. a.). The formula of the oath of obedienco to the pope, which, since Gregory VII, is taken by bishops at their ordination, says: “Legatum apostolicas sedis . . . honorifice tractabo et inll sis inecessitatibus adjuvabo” (100:4, X. De jurejurando, 2:24). This involves the duty of supporting the procurations. But the state is also enlisted on account of its power.

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

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

2. Legtuli dati, missi, which are divided into

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

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

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

## Legend[[@Headword:Legend]]

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

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

We find St. Patrick performing the miracle of raising the dead to life no less than seventeen times, and on one occasion he restores animation to thirty-four persons at once. Gerald, bishop of Mayo, however, surpassed St. Patrick, for he not only resuscitated the dead daughter of the king of Connaught, bent miraculously changed her sex, that she might inherit the crown of the province, in which the Salic law was then established. We find, also, in the ecclesiastical writers, many miracles specially worked to support individual doctrines, particularly the mystery of transubstantiation. Indeed, a miracle appears to have been no unusual resource of a puzzled controversialist. On one occasion the sanctity of the wafer is stated to have been proved by a mule's kneeling to worship it; at another time a pet lamb kneels down at the elevation of the host; a spider, which St. Francis d'Ariano accidentally swallowed while receiving the sacrament, came out of his thigh; and when St. Elmo was pining at being too long excluded from a participation in ithe sacramental mysteries, the holy elements were brought to him by a pigeon. But the principal legends devised for the general exaltation of the Romish Church refer to the exercise of power over the devil. In the south of Ireland nothing is more common than to hear of Satan's appearance in proper person, his resistance to all the efforts of the Protestant minister, and his prompt obedience to the exorcisms of the parish priest. In general, the localities of the stories are laid at some neighboring village; yet, easy as this renders refutation, it is wonderful to find how generally such a tale is credited. From the archives of the Silesian Church, we find that some German Protestants seem to believe in the exorcising powers of the Romish priests.

Next to the legends of miracles rank those of extraordinary austerities, such as that St. Polycronus always took up a huge tree on his shoulders when he went to pray; that St. Barnadatus shut himself up in a narrow iron cage; that St. Adhelm exposed himself to the most stimulating temptations, and then defied the devil to make him yield; and that St. Macarius undertook a penance for sin six months, because he had so far yielded to passion as to kill a flea. It is unnecessary to dwell upon these, because they are manifestly derived from the habits of the Oriental fanatics, and are evident exaggerations made without taste or judgment. See History of Popery (Lond. 1838, 8vo).  The most celebrated of these popular mediaeval fictions is the Legenda Aurea, or Golden Legend, originally written in Latin, in the 13th century, by Jacob de Voragine (q.v.), a Dominican friar, who afterwards became archbishop of Genoa, and died in 1298, This work was the great text-book of legendary lore of the Middle Ages. It was translated into French in the 14th century by Jean de Vigny, and in the 15th into English by William Caxton. It has lately been made more accessible by a new French translation: La Legende Doree, traduite du Latin, par M. G. B. (Par. 1850). There is a copy of the original, with the Gesta Longobardorum appended, in the Harvard College Library, Cambridge, printed at Strasburg in 1496. Longfellow, in a note to his beautiful poem, says, “I have called this poem the Golden Legend, because the story upon which it is founded seems to me to surpass all other legends in beauty and significance. It exhibits, amid the corruptions of the Middle Ages, the virtue of disinterestedness and self-sacrifice, and the power of Faith, Hope, and Charity sufficient for all the exigencies of life and death.” The story is told, and perhaps invented, by Hartmann von der Aue, a Minnesinger of the 12th century. The original may be found in Marlath's Alt-deutsche Gedichte, with a modern German version. There is another in Marbach's Volksbücher, No. 32. We may mention also, among other productions, the Kaiserchronik (Imperial Chronicle), where the legendary element forms a very important part of the whole, and Werner's versified Marienleben (Life of Mary), written in 1173, etc. The authors of these works were ecclesiastics, but in the following age, when the mediaeval poetry of Germany was in its richest bloom, and the fosterers of the poetic art were emperors and princes, the legend was employed by laymen on a grand scale, and formed the subject-matter of epic narratives. Thus Hartmann von der Aue worked up into a poem the religious legends about Gregory; Konrad von Fussesbrunnen those concerning the childhood of Jesus; Rudolph von eElms those about Barlaam and Josaphat; and e Kimbat von Durne those about St. George. Between the 14th and 16th centuries legends in prose began also to appear, such as Hermann von Fritzlar's Von dem Heiligen Leben (written about 1343), and gradually supplanted the others.

Much of this legendary rubbish was cleared away by Tillemont, Fleury, Baillet, Lasunoi, and Bollandus, but the faith in many of them still remains strong in the more ignorant minds of the Romish Church. The repeated and  still continued editions of the Acta Sanctorum (q.v.) afford sufficient evidence of this.

The most comprehensive and valuable work on the subject of the legends is that commenced by the Bollandists in the 17th century, Acta Sanctorum, and still in process of publication. Legends are found not only in the Roman Catholic, but also in the Greek Church. They also found an entrance into the national literature of Christian nations. Among the Germans especially was this the case, particularly in the 12th century, although specimens of legendary poems are not altogether wanting at an earlier period. In Great Britain, also, the legends of King Arthur and his Round Table have sprung afresh into popular favor, after centuries of comparative obscurity, and have once more become the treasure-house from which poet and painter draw subjects for their pictures, and in which essayists, weary of the old heathen classics, seek for illustrations and allusions.

The first of the recent poets, however, who clearly apprehended the poetic and spiritual elements of the old Christian legend was Herder, and his example has been followed by other poets, for example, the romantic school in Germany, and Bulwer and Tennyson in England. ‘he tendency to mythic embellishment showed itself more particularly in regard to the Virgin Mary, the later saints, and holy men and women. Of all these, the most captivating, as an amiable weakness, was the devotion to the Virgin. The denial of the title “The Mother of God” by Nestorius was that which sounded most offensive to the general ear; it was the intelligible, odious point in his heresy, and contributed, no doubt, to the passionate violence with which that controversy was agitated; and the favorable issue to those who might seem most zealous for the Virgin's glory gave a strong impulse to the worship; for, from that time, the worship of the Virgin became in the East an integral part of Christianity. Among Justinian's splendid edifices arose many churches dedicated to the Mother of God. The feast of the Annunciation was celebrated both under Justin and Justinian. Heraclius had images of the Virgin on his masts when he sailed to Constantinople to overthrow Phocas; and before the end of the century the Virgin is become the tutelar deity of that city, which is saved by her intercession from the Saracens. “The history of Christianity,” says dean Milman, “cannot be understood without pausing at stated periods to survey the progress and development of the Christian mythology, which, gradually growing up, and springing as it did from natural and universal instincts. took a more perfect and systematic form, and at length, at the height of the  Middle Ages, was as much a part of Latin Christianity as the primal truths of the Gospel. This religion gradually molded together all which arose out of the natural instincts of man, the undying reminiscences of all the older religions — the Jewish, the Pagan, and the Platonic — with the few and indistinct glimpses of the invisible world, and the future state of being in the New Testament, into a vast system, more sublime, perhaps, for its indefiniteness, which, being necessary in that condition of mankind, could not but grow up out of the kindled imagination and religious faith of Christendom.

The historian who should presume to condemn such a religion as a vast plan of fraud, or a philosopher who should venture to disdain it as a fabric of folly only deserving to be forgotten, would be equally unjust, equally blind to its real uses, assuredly ignorant of its importance and its significance in the history of man; for on this, the popular Christianity — popular, as comprehending the highest as well as the lowest in rank, and even in intellectual estimation — turns the whole history of man for many centuries. It is at once the cause and the consequence of the sacerdotal dominion over mankind, the groundwork of authority at which the world trembled, which founded and overthrew kingdoms, bound together or set in antagonistic array nations, classes, ranks, orders of society. Of this, the parent, when the time arrived, of poetry, of art, the Christian historian must watch the growth and mark the gradations by which it gathered into itself the whole activity of the human mind, and quickened that activity till at length the mind outgrew that which had been so long almost its sole occupation. It endured till faith, with the schoolmen, led into the fathomless depths of metaphysics, began to aspire after higher truths; with the Reformers, attempting to refine religion to its primary spiritual simplicity, this even yet prolific legendary Christianity, which had been the accessory and supplementary Bible, the authoritative and accepted, though often unwritten Gospel of centuries, was gradually dropped, or left but to the humblest and most ignorant, at least to the more imaginative and less practical part of mankind.” “The influence that these works exerted on the mediaeval mind,” says Hardwick, “was deep and universal. While they fed almost every stream of superstition, and excited an unhealthy craving for the marvelous and the romantic, they were nearly always tending, in their moral, to enlist the affections of the reader on the side of gentleness and virtue, more especially by setting forth the necessity of patience, and extolling the heroic energy of faith. One class of those biographies deserve a high amount of credit; they are written by some friend or pupil of their subject; they are natural and life-like pictures of the  times, preserving an instructive portrait of the missionary, the recluse, the bishop, or the man of business; yet most commonly the acts and sufferings of the mediaeval saint have no claim to a place in the sphere of history, or at best they have been so wantonly embellished by the fancy of the author that we can distinguish very few of the particles of truth from an interminable mass of fiction. As these ‘Lives' were circulated freely in the language of the people, they would constitute important items in the fireside reading of the age; and so warm was the response they found in men of every grade, that, notwithstanding feeble efforts to reform them, or at least to eliminate a few of the more monstrous and absurd, they kept their hold on Christendom at large, and are subsisting even now in the creations of the mediaeval artist” (Ch. Hist. Middle Ayes).

On the origin of these legends there is a great diversity of opinion among the learned. Some trace it to the northern Skalds, who, accompanying the army of Rollo in his warlike migrations southward, carried with them the lays of their own mythology, but replaced their pagan heroes by Christian kings and warriors. Salmasius adopted the theory, which was endorsed by Warton, that the germs of romantic fiction originated with the Saracenls and Arabians, and ascribes its introduction into Europe to the effects of the Crusades, or, according to Warton himself, to the Arab conquests in Spain; that from thence they passed into France, and took deepest root in Brittany. Others, again, have seen in the tales of chivalry only a new development of the classic legends of Greece and Italy. As Christianity unquestionably borrowed and modified to its own use many of the outward ceremonies of paganism, so they held that the Christian trouveur only adopted and transmuted the heroes of classical poetry. The researches of count Villemarque and lady Charlotte Schreiber, however, to which the attention of the learned world had been directed before by Leyden, Douce, and Sharon Turner, conclusively prove that the true theory as to their origin is that they are Cymric or Armorican, or both. The wealth of the old Cymric literature in this particular respect was never even suspected until lady Charlotte Schreiber, with the aid of an eminent Welsh scholar, the Rev. Thomas Price, brought to light in their original form, accompanied by an English version. the collection of early Cymric tales known as the Mabinogion. M. de la Villemarque, for his own side of the Channel, not only confirms the evidence of lady Schreiber, but brings forward additional items of proof, from fragments of Breton songs and poems, that the roots of their renowned fiction lie deep in their literature also. Their very form —  the eight-syllabled rhyme, in which the French metrical version is written — he claims, and apparently wvith justice, as Cynmric. See Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Cyclop. Brit. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyk. 8:274 sq.; Vogel, Versuch. einer Gesch. u. Würdigung der Legenden in Illgein's Hist. theol. Abhandl. (Lpz. 1824), p. 141 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Monastic Orders, and her Legends of the Madonna. SEE MYTH.

## Legend, Golden[[@Headword:Legend, Golden]]

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

## Leger, Antoine[[@Headword:Leger, Antoine]]

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

Leger, Antoine

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

## Leger, Jean[[@Headword:Leger, Jean]]

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

## Leger, Saint[[@Headword:Leger, Saint]]

             SEE LEODEGAR.

## Legerdemain[[@Headword:Legerdemain]]

             SEE MAGIC.

## Legge, George, LL.D[[@Headword:Legge, George, LL.D]]

             a Scotch Congregational minister, was born at Huntley, Aberdeenshire, October 10, 1802. He became a student of King's College, Aberdeen, in 1819, completing his curriculum in 1825, and receiving his degree of M.A.; was converted in 1828; entered Highbury College to prepare for the ministry in 1830, and in 1832 became pastor at Bristol. In 183,5 he accepted a call to the pastorate of Gallowtree-gate Chapel, Leicester, and  in that capacity continued till his death, January 24, 1861. In 1859 he was chairman of the Congregational Union. Dr. Legge was a man of noble qualities, endowed with a strong intellect, a glowing imagination, a loving heart, and great constancy of purpose. His principal publications were, Principles of Noncorformity: — Christianity: in Harmony with Man's Nature, Present and Progressive: — The Range and Limitations of Human Knowledge, besides several single sermons. See (Loud.) Cong. Year-book, 1862, page 247.

## Legion[[@Headword:Legion]]

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

The word legion came to be used to express a great number or multitude (e.g. of angels, Mat 26:53). Thus the unclean spirit (Mar 5:9; compare Mar 5:15), when asked his name, answers, “My name is Legion, for we are many.” Many illustrations of this use of the word might be cited from the Rabbinical writers, who even apply it (לַגְיוֹן לֶגְיוֹן) to inanimate objects, as when they speak of “a legion of olives,” etc. (see Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. et Talm.; Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s.v.). — Kitto. SEE ARMY.

## Legion, Theban[[@Headword:Legion, Theban]]

             according to Eucherius, was a legion of 6600 men (the usual number) which had come from the East to render assistance to Maximian. The latter having issued orders to his whole army to persecute the Christians, this legion alone refused to obey. The emperor was in the neighborhood, at Octodurum (Martinach, at the foot of Mount St. Bernard); irritated when he heard of the refusal of the Theban legion, he had it decimated twice, and finally, as he failed to secure its members to join in persecuting their Christian brethren, he ordered their extermination by the remainder of his army. Another account, giving I substantially the same version of this  event, embellishes it by what seems to have taken place about the year 286, although it mentions a pope Marcellinus as having advised them rather to submit to death than to act against the dictates of their conscience, while this Marcellinus only became pope ten years after the above time. This second version appears to be but a rear regement of the legend of Eucherius, just as there have been others until the time of the Reformation (by Petrus Canisius and Gulielmus Baldesanus). This legend was first treated as untrue in Magdeburg; then Jean Armand Dubourdieu, a French Reformed minister at London, undertook to prove that the number of the legion did not by any means amount to 6666 (the figures given in the second version). This led to a protracted controversy. The silence of the leading early ecclesiastical historians — Eusebius, Lactantius, Sulpicius Severus, and Orosius — over the event some have advanced to prove that it is simply a fable, but their silence does not, in our mind, go far to disprove it. Eusebius says little of the Western martyrs, yet mentions that an officer picked out the Christians in the Roman army before the beginning of the great persecution, and gave them the choice of renouncing their religion or of leaving the army, adding that many Christians were killed by his orders.

The others either do not mention the martyrs of that period, or were by other circumstances prevented from becoming acquainted with much of their history. On the other hand, Ambrose († 397) says, “Every city prides itself that has had one martyr; how much more, then, can Milan prilde herself, who had a whole army of divine soldiers?” Eucherius takes this as an allusion to the Theban legion. Another testimony to the same effect is contained in St.Victricius's work, De laudibus martyrum (390). The third is the discovery of a shield in the bed of the Arve, near Geneva, representinhg the Thebas, with the inscription Largitas D. M. Valentiniani Augusti. A fourth is found ins the life of St. Romanus (520), who mentions, among others, his journey to Agaunumn (Castra martyrum), probably between the years 460 and 470. It also corroborates Eucherius's figures (6600). The fifth is that of Avitus, archbishop of Vienna, a breastplate originally belonging to whom is yet kept in the convent: this dates from the year 517. A sixth is given in the Vita of Victor of Marseilles. It is most probable, however, that while the legend rests on a foundation of facts, these facts were generalized and amplified, so that a number of Christian soldiers in the Roman army became a legion first of 6600, then of 6666. Those who deny the truth of the legend take their stand on its similarity with that of a certain SimesonMetaphrastes, according to whom, also, one Mauritiuis, under the same emperor, is said  to have suffered mart yrdom with Photinus, Theodorus, Philippus, and sixty-seven others, all of the military order. But, aside from the name of Mauritius, all the others have different names, while the details of the event also vary. Among the writers who have contested the truthfulness of the legend concerning the Theban legion, the most important are Dubourdieu, Hottinger, Moyle, Burnet, and Mosheim; it has been defended by George Hickes, M. Felix de Balthasar (Defense de la Legion Thebeenne, Lucerne. 1760, 8vo), Dom Joseph de Lisle (Defense de sla Verite du Martyre de la Legion Thebeenne, 1737, 8vo), Rossignoli (Historia di San Maurizio), and P. de Rivaz (Eclaircissements sur les Martyres de la Legion Thebeenne, Paris, 1779, 8vo). See Herzog, Real — Encyklopädie, vol. 9, s.v. Mauritius. SEE MAURITIUS.

## Legion, Thundering[[@Headword:Legion, Thundering]]

             (Legio fulminatrix), the title of a Roman legion in the time of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, which, after the expulsion of the Marcomnanni and Quadi from Hungary, while the emperor Aurelius was pursuing these German tribes with a detachment of his forces (A.D. 174), was shut up in a valley surrounded on every side by high mountains, and both by the heat of the weather and the want of water was suffering more cruelly than from the attacks of the enemy, when suddenly, in this crisis, a shower of rain reanimated the Roman soldiers, while at the same time a storm of hail, attended with thunder, assailed the enemy, who were then easily repulsed and conquered. Both heathen and Christian authors agree in their relation of the principal circumstances of this event. The adherents of each religion saw in it the influence of the prayers of their brethren. According to Dio Cassius (Excerpta Xiphilin. I, 71, cap. 8), the miracle was wrought by an Elgyptian sorcerer in the train of the emperor; according to Capitolinus (Vita Marc. Aurel. cap. 24), it was the effect of the emperor's prayers; but according to Tertullian (Apologet. cap. 5; Ad Scopul. cap. 4) and Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. lib. 5, cap. 5), it was brought about by the prayers of the Christians in his army; hence the legion to which these Christians belonged was denominated fulminatrix. The letter of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, commonly printed in Greek in the first Apology of Justin Martyr, gives the same account with the Christian writers, but it is spurious. The marble pillar erected at Rome in honor of Marcus Aurelius, and still standing, represents this deliverance of the Roman arm — the Roman soldiers catching the falling rain, and a warrior praying for its descent. It is not, however, to be considered as a memorial of any influence exercised by the  Christians in that event. See Milman, History of Christianity, 2:145 sq.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. I, bk. 1, cent. 2, part 1, chap. 1, § 9; Pressense, History of Early Christianity, p. 129. (J. H. W.)

## Legists And Decretists[[@Headword:Legists And Decretists]]

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

## Legobien, Charles[[@Headword:Legobien, Charles]]

             a French Jesuit, was born at St. Malo in 1653; in 1671 he entered the society of Jesus; shortly after taught at Tours; then removed to Paris, where he became first secretary, and afterwards superintendent, of the missions of his order to China. He published, about 1702, a collection of letters from missionaries in China, etc., entitled Lettres Edifantes et Curieuses, Ecrites des Missions Etrangeres. He died March 5, 1708, at Paris. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Legrand, Antoine[[@Headword:Legrand, Antoine]]

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

## Legrand, Joachim[[@Headword:Legrand, Joachim]]

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

## Legrand, Louis[[@Headword:Legrand, Louis]]

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

## Legras, Louise De Marillac, Madame[[@Headword:Legras, Louise De Marillac, Madame]]

             foundress of an order of nuns, was born at Paris, August 12, 1591. She was daughter of Louis de Marillac, brother of the celebrated guard of the seals, and of the marshal of this name. In 1613 she married Antoine Legras, secretary of the queen Marie de Medicis. Being eventually left a widow, she devoted herself entirely to religious matters. In connection with Vincent de Paul she bore an important part in the establishment of various charitable institutions. They founded the institution of the sisters of charity called Saeurs Grises, on account of the color of their costume. Placed at the head of a community of this order at Paris, madame Legras devoted herself with great self-abnegation to the care of the sick. She aided Vincent  de Paul in bestowing large charities in various ways. Her death occurred at Paris in 1662. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Legris-Duval, Rene Michel[[@Headword:Legris-Duval, Rene Michel]]

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

## Legros, Antoine[[@Headword:Legros, Antoine]]

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

## Legros, Nicolas[[@Headword:Legros, Nicolas]]

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

## Lehabim[[@Headword:Lehabim]]

             (Heb. Lehabim', לְהָבַים, preb.for לוּבַים, Lubim; Sept. Λαβιείμ, v. r. in Chron. Λαβείν; Vulg. Laabim), a people reckoned among the Midianitish stock (Gen 10:13; 1Ch 1:11). See ETHNOLOGY. The word is in the plural, and evidently signifies a tribe, doubtless taking the name of Lehab, Mizraim's third son (Gen 10:13). Bochart affirms that the Lehabim are not, as is generally supposed, identical with the Libyans. His reasons are, That Libya was much too large a country to have been peopled by one son of Mizraim; and that in other parts of Scripture Libya is either called Phut (פוט, Jer 46:9; Eze 30:5), or Lubim לובים, 2Ch 12:3; Nah 3:9), and Phut was a brother, and not a son of Mizraim (Gen 10:6; Bochart, Opera, 1:279). These arguments do not stand the test of historical criticism. Phut and Lubim are not identical (Nah 3:9); and the Lehabim may have been joined by other tribes in colonizing Libya. It is quite true there is no direct evidence to identify the Lehabim and Lubim; yet there seems a high probability that the words are only different forms of the same name — the former being the more ancient, the middle radical ה was afterwards softened (as is not unusual in Hebrew, Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 743, 360) into ו quiescent.

The Lehabim are not again mentioned in Scripture, but we find the Lubim connected with Mizraim (2Ch 12:3), and the Kushites or Ethiopians (16:8). We may therefore safely infer that the Lehabim were the ancient Lubim or Libyans, who perhaps first settled on the borders of the Nile, among or beside the Mizraim; but, as they increased in number, migrated to the wide regions south-west, and occupied the vast territory  known to classical geographers as Libya (Kalisch On Gen 10:13; see also Michaelis, Spicileg. Geogr.; Knobel Völkertafel des Pent.). Dr. Beke maintains that the Lehabim, as well as the Mizraim, were a people of north-western Arabia; but his views are opposed alike to the opinions of ancient and modern geographers, and his arguments (do not appear of sufficient weight to command acceptance (Origines Biblicae, p. 167, 198 sq.). There can be no doubt that the Lubim are the same as the ReBU or LeBU of the Egyptian inscriptions, and that from them Libya and the Libyans derived their name. These primitive Libyans appear, in the period at which they are mentioned in these two historical sources, that is, from the time of Menptah, B.C. cir. 1250, to that of Jeremiah's notice of them late in the 6th century B.C., and probably in the case of Daniel's, prophetically to the earlier part of the second century B.C., to have inhabited the northern part of Africa to the west of Egypt, though latterly driven from the coast by the Greek colonists of the Cyrenaica, as is more fully shown under LUBIM. Geographically, the position of the Lehabim in the enumeration of the Mizraites immediately before the Naphtuhim suggests that they at first settled to the westward of Egypt, and nearer to it, or not more distant from it than the tribes or peoples mentioned before them. SEE MIZRAIM. Historically and ethnologically, the connection of the ReBU and Libyans with Egypt and its people suggests their kindred origin with the Egyptians. SEE LIBYA.

## Lehi[[@Headword:Lehi]]

             (Heb. Lechi', לְחַי, in pause Le'chi, לֶחַי, a cheek or jaw-bone [usually with the art. הִלְּחַי,]; Sept. Λεχί v. r. Λευί), a place in the tribe of Judah where Samson achieved one of his single-handed victories over the Philistines (Jdg 15:9; Jdg 15:14; Jdg 15:19, in which last passages the Sept. translates (σιάγων,Vulg. maxilla). It contained an eminence — Ramath- lehi, and a spring of great and lasting repute (see Ortlob, De fonte Simeonis, Lips. 1703) — En hak-kore (Jdg 15:17). The name of the place before the conflict was evidently Lehi, as appears from Jdg 15:9; Jdg 15:14; perhaps so called from the form of some hill or rock (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 752). After the slaughter of the Philistines, Samson, with a characteristic play upon the name, makes it descriptive of his signal and singular victory. Lehi is possibly mentioned in 2Sa 23:11 — the relation of another encounter with the Philistines hardly less disastrous than that of Samson. The Heb. there has לִחִיָּה, as if חִיָּה, from the root חִי(Gesenius, Thesaur.  p. 470). In this sense the word very rarely occurs (see A. V. of Psa 68:10; Psa 68:30; Psa 74:19). It elsewhere has the sense of “living,” and thence of wild animals, which is adopted by the Sept. in this place, as remarked above. In Psa 74:13 it is again rendered “troop.”

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

## Lehi (2)[[@Headword:Lehi (2)]]

             On the identification of this site Lieut. Conder remarks as follows (Tent Work in Palestine, 1:276):

"A little way north-west of Zoreah, seven miles from Belt 'Atab, is a low hill, on the slope of which are springs called 'Ayun Abu Meharib, or the 'fountains of the place of battles.' Close by is a little Moslem chapel, dedicated to Sheik Nedhir, or 'the Nazarite chief;' and, higher up, a ruin with the extraordinary title Ism Allah — 'the name of God.' The Nazarite chief is probably Samson, whose memory is so well preserved in this small district, and the place is perhaps connected with a tradition of one of his exploits. The Ism Allah is possibly a corruption of Esm'a Allah — 'God heard' — in which case the incident intended might be the battle of Ramath Lehi. Finally, we were informed by a native of the place that the springs were sometimes called 'Ayun KAra, in which name we should recognize easily the En hak-Kore, or fountain of the crier' (Jdg 15:19). To say that this spot certainly represents Rlamath Lehi — 'the hill of the jaw-bone ' — would be too bold. It seems, however, clear that a tradition of one of Samson's exploits lingers here; the position is appropriate for the scene of the slaughter with the jaw-bone, and we have not succeeded in finding any other likely site."

## Lehmann, Wilhelm Friedrich[[@Headword:Lehmann, Wilhelm Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born October 16, 1820, in Wurtemberg. In 1824 he came with his parents to America. He studied at the theological seminaries, of Columbus, Ohio, and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and was for some time preacher at Somerset, Ohio. In 1846 he was appointed  professor at the University at Columbus. He died December 1, 1880. For many years he was president of the Lutheran Synod of Ohio. (B.P.)

## Lehmnann, Christian Abraham[[@Headword:Lehmnann, Christian Abraham]]

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

## Lehmus, Adam Theodor Albert Franz[[@Headword:Lehmus, Adam Theodor Albert Franz]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Soest, December 2, 1777. He entered the ministry in 1801, was in 1819 dean and pastor at Anspach, and died August 18, 1837, doctor of theology. He wrote, Die Lehre von der Versohnung des Menschen mit Gott durch Christum (Sulzbach, 1821): — Ueber die Taufe (Heidelberg, 1807): — Aufsatze theologischen Inhalts, etc. (1835): — Die Rechtfertigungslehre der evangelischen Kirche in ihren Hauptmomenten dargestellt (1836). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:439, 450; 2:19, 65, 75, 100, 166; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:780 sq. (B.P.)

## Lehnberg, Magnus[[@Headword:Lehnberg, Magnus]]

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

## Lehnin, Hermann Von[[@Headword:Lehnin, Hermann Von]]

             a monk of the convent of that name, said to have flourished about the close of the 13th century, as the author of a prophetic poem, in 100 Latin hexameter verses, concerning his convent and the house of Brandenburg, entitled Vatficinzium Lehninense. According to the legend, the MS. was discovered in an old wall, in the 17th century, by the elector, when the latter intended to build a palace on the ruins of the convent. The poem is written in the interest of the hierarchy; it deplores the heresy of the former house of Brandenburg in the ascendant house of Hohenzollern (the latter family adhering to Protestantism), and prophesies the downfall of the now ruling family, to be followed by the restoration of the unity of Germany and the reestablishment of the Roman Catholic Church. The existence of this poem is not, however, to be traced with any certainty further back than the year 1693. It was first published in Lilienthal (Konigsb. 1723, 1741), then at Berlin and Vienna, 1745; Bern, 1758; Leipsic, 1807; also in France, in 1827 and 1830, by W. Meinhold, with a metrical translation, Leips. 1849; C. Kosch, Stuttgard, 1849; Gieseler, Die Lehkinsche Weisagyunr (Erf. 1849); Guhrauer, Die Weissayungen v. Lehnin (Bresl. 1850); M. Heffter, Geschichte des Klosters Lehnin (Brandenburg, 1851). Those who consider this poem a mere mystically-shaped narrative of past events, name as its author M. F. Seidel, assessor of the privy council († at Berlin in 1693); or  Andrew Fromm, counsellor of the Consistory († at Prague in 1688); or Nicolas von Zitzwitz, abbot ofHuysburg, who, they say, composed it about 1692; or the Jesuit Frederick Wolf, chaplain to the Austrian embassy at Berlin in 1685-86 († 1708); or (Elven, captain of cavalry at Stettin († 1727). See L. de Bouverois, Extracit d'un manuscrit relatif a la prophetie du frere St. de Lehninz (German transl. by W. von Schütz (Würzb. 1847); J. A. Boost, Die Weissagungene des Mönchs H. z. Lehnin (Augsb. 1848). — Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 8:273; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 5:757 sq.

## Leib Olmai[[@Headword:Leib Olmai]]

             in the mythology of the Laplanders, was a deity of the atmosphere, who made the weather favorable to hunting and fishing.

## Leibnitz, Gottfried Wilhelm[[@Headword:Leibnitz, Gottfried Wilhelm]]

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

“Suaveis Daedala tellus Summittit flores.”

Life. — Leibnitz was the son of Frederick Leibnitz, professor of ethics in the University of Leipsic, and was born there July 3, 1646. He was early placed at school. At six years of age he lost his father, from whom he inherited a small fortune and an extensive library. This library inspired, molded, and furnished forth his career. He buried himself in his young years amid its volumes, and delighted in the unaided perusal of the ancient  classics. His attention was not confined to the great masters of style, nor to linguistic pursuits. He read with like diligence poets, orators, jurists, travelers -works of science, medicine, philosophy, and general information. Nothing came amiss to his insatiable appetite and incredible industry. At fifteen he entered the University of Leipsic, and was directed by Jacobus Thomasius to mathematical and philosophical studies. He applied himself assiduously to the writings of Plato and Aristotle, and already, at the age of eighteen, was endeavoring to harmonize and combine their antagonistic systems. One year he spent at the University of Jena, but he returned to his own city to prosecute his professional studies. Applying for the degree of doctor of law when he had scarcely attained his twentieth year, he was refused the diploma on the pretext of his youth. It was cheerfully accorded by the University of Altdorf, which tendered him a professorship; but this was declined. To this period belong his Ars Combinatoria — a curious adaptation of Raymond Lully's Art of Meditation and Logical Invention — and his Mathematical Demonstration of the Existence of God. His estimate in declining life of the former treatise may be seen from his fourth letter to Remond de Montmort in 1714.

From Altdorf Leibnitz proceeded to Nuremberg, where, in consequence of an application filled with cabalistic terms, unmeaning to himself and to every one else, he was admitted into an association for the pursuit of the philosopher's stone, and was appointed its secretary. Half a century before, Des Cartes had been similarly seduced in the same regions. From these visionary occupations the young alchemist was soon withdrawn by the baron De Boineburg, chancellor of the elector of Mayence, who recommended him to prosecute history and jurisprudence, and invited him to Frankfort, with the promise of preferment. He illustrated his change of abode by publishing Nova metholdus discendae docendeque Jurispruldenticae (1667), to which was appended a Catatlogus Desilderatolrum. The unsystematic treatment of jurisprudence had long needed reform.

Leibnitz continued his efforts in this direction by an essay, De Corpore Juris reconcinnando. He contemplated at this time a new and enlarged edition of Alsted's Encyclopaedia. and never abandoned, but never commenced his design. From these vast projects he was diverted by Boineburg, at whose instance he composed a diplomatic exposition of the claims of Philip William, duke palatine of Neuburg, to the vacant throne of Poland. He declined an invitation to the duke's court, remained at Frankfort, and brought out a new edition of the forgotten work of Marius  Nizolius, De Veris Principiis et Vetra Ratione Philosophandi. He added notes, and prefixed two dissertations; one on The Philosophical Style of Composition, the other On Writing the History of Philosophy. In the latter he treated of Des Cartes, Aristotle, and the schoolmen, and on the mode of harmonizing the Peripatetic with later philosophy. All his writings exhibit pronounced Cartesianism. His first approaches to physical science were made in his Theoria Motus Abstracti, containing the germs of his Calculus, and his Theoria Motus Concreti (1671). They were not favorably received; but Leibnitz was still only twenty-five years old. Next year appeared his Sacrosancta Trinitas per novan argumenta defensa, directed against Wissowatius, a Polish Unitarian. Thus, say the writers in the Biographie Universelle, “each year brought a new title of glory to Leibnitz, and gave him rank among the masters of the different sciences.” He was already a counselor of the chancery of Mayence. At length his desire of seeing Paris was gratified. Boineburg sent him thither as tutor to his sons, and in charge of some public affairs. He was at once admitted into the most brilliant scientific circles, in the most brilliant period of the reign of Louis XIV. Here he made the acquaintance of Huyghens, and improved the calculating machine of Pascal. He was also induced to aid in preparing the Latin classics in usum Delphini.

On the death of Boineburg (1673) he passed over into England, where he was received with distinction by Boyle, Oldenburg, and other members of the recent Royal Society. Intelligence of the demise of the elector of Mayence reached him in London. He was thus deprived of the means of support. Flattering proposals had been made to him by Louis XIV, but they had been refused, as they required adhesion to the Catholic communion. Inhis anxietv and distress, he was appointed by the dukef Brunswick a counsellor, with an adequate pension, and with the privilege of remaining abroad. He returned to Paris, and remained there fifteen months. In 1676 he revisited England, and thence proceeded to Hanover by way of Holland. Here he entered upon his duties as counselor, and-strange duties for a minister of state employed himself in arranging and enlarging the library of his protector, and improving the drainage of his mines. His services were rewarded with a considerable salary, but the duke soon died (1679). He found other employment, for he was never idle, and composed a treatise on The Rights of Ambassadors, arguing the question of States' Rights, which has assumed such prominence in Germany in recent years. The new duke of Brunswick engaged Leibnitz to compose the History of the House of Brunswick. To prepare for the task, he visited southern Germany and Italy, consulting the learned, exploring monasteries,  ransacking libraries, examining old charters, deciphering moldy manuscripts, and transcribing worm-eaten documents. Whatever he undertook he projected on a scale proportionate to his own vast comprehension and various knowledge, with little regard to the legitimate magnitude of the subject, or to the brevity of human life. He brought back from his wanderings an abundant supply of diplomatic materials, which he arranged, and from which he extracted extensive works, sometimes having little direct connection with the Chronicles of Brunswick. The first-fruits of these collections were the Codex Juris Gentiumn Diplomaticus, of which the first volume was issued in 1693, in folio; the second in 1700, with the title Mantissa Codicis.

Valuable as were the documents, the most valuable part of the work was the Introduction, reviewing the principles of natural and international law, and sketching the reform of civil jurisprudence ultimately achieved by Napoleon. Other works of wide comprehension were due to these archaeological researches: the demonstration of the descent of the Guelphic line from the Italian house of Este; the Accessiones Historicae (1698, 2 vols. 4to, containing a multitude of unpublished papers), and the Scriptores Rerum Brunsvicensium. The first volume of this historical collection appeared in 1707, folio; the second in 1710; the third in 1711. These extensive accumulations were only materials to be employed for The History of the House of Brunswick. In the Introduction to the Corpus Scriptorume Leibnitz discussed everything connected with the family, the realm, and the country of the Guelphs, investigating the traditions of the early tribes that dwelt on the Elbe and the Weser, tracing their changes and migrations, marshalling the passages of the ancient authors in which they were mentioned, and examining their language and the mixture of their dialects. It inaugurated ethnological science and comparative philology. His inquiries, however, stretched far beyond the incunabula gentis, and contemplated the primitive condition of the abode of the race. This preliminary outline is given in the Protogaea (1693), which founded the modern sciences of geology and physical geography. It is interesting to compare this fragmentary sketch with the Vulgar Errors of Sir Thomas Browne, and to note the immense stride which was made by Leibnitz. Of the main work, to which this essay was to be introductory — the History of the House of Brunswick — only a brief and imperfect outline was ever drawn by the accomplished author. It was published after his death by Eccard, in the Acta Eruditorium, in 1717.  These historical labors were the real task of the life of Leibnitz. But the long years of plodding industry were abundantly filled with other enterprises, and it is to them that his reputation is mainly due.

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

The conception of dynamical science continually occupied the mind of Leibnitz, and was the natural tendency of his philosophical method. The Acta Eruditorunm for 1695 contained his Specimen Dynamicum; and in the same year he gave to the world, through the Journal des Scavans, his Systenma de Natura et Comamunicatione Substantiarum, itenzque Unione inter Corpus et Animam intercedente. In the latter he propounded his celebrated dogma of Pre-established Harmony. The connection between mind and body, between force and matter, between the natura naturans and the natura naturata, is still an insoluble enigma, after all the  speculations of transcendental philosophy, and all the researches of modern philosophy and modern chemistry. We still grope for life in the dust and ashes of death. The veil of His has not been raised. Spencer, and Huxley, and Tyndall, et id genus onsne, are compelled to acknowledge their inability to penetrate the mystery of the connection. However tutenable, however hazardous, however absurd the Pre-established Harmony of Leibnitz may be, it was a beautiful dream, generated in some sort by the atmosphere of the time, and certainly a bold and ingenious attempt to escape from the brute mechanism of Des Cartes, the pantheism of Spinoza, the puppetry of Malebranche. and the materialism of the Sensationalists.

The doctrine was illustrated, explained, and expanded in the Theodicee, and in many short essays and letters. So much, indeed, of the philosophy of Leibnitz was communicated only by occasional papers and correspondence, so little by systematic works, that it is impossible to trace the course and development of his views in any brief notice. His two formal metaphysical works belong to the last period of his life. The Nouveaux Essais, in reply to Locke, answering the English philosopher chapter by chapter, and section by section, were completed in 1704, but were not published for more than half a century. They were withheld from the press in consequence of Locke's death in that year, and were first published by Raspe in 1763. The Theodicee, which was designed as a refutation of Bayle, and was undertaken at the request of the queen of Prussia, was completed two years after the death of that princess and of Bayle, but was not published till 1710, six years before Leibnitz's own decease. Like the Nouveaux Essais, it was composed in French, of which language Leibnitz was a perfect master. It is exquisitely written, and is the finest specimen of philosophical literature since the Dialogues of Plato. A very large portion of the metaphysical and other writings of Leibnitz have been transmitted to us only by posthumous publication.

Though Leibnitz composed only these two formal treatises, his philosophical and scientific labors were multitudinous and multifarious. He was indefatigable in labor, and his mind ranged with equal rapidity and splendor over the whole domain of knowledge. Nothing was too vast for his comprehension, too dark for his penetration, too humble for his notice. He corresponded with Pelisson on the conciliation and union of the Protestant and Catholic communions, and was thus brought into connection with Bossuet. With Burnet he discussed the project of uniting the Anglicans and the Continental Protestants. He expended much time  over the invention of a universal language. He wrote extensively on etymology, and the improvement of the German language, which he so rarely employed. Medicine, botany, and other branches of natural history attracted his earnest regards. He addressed a memoir to Louis XIV on the Conquest and Colonization of Egypt, with the view to establishing a Suprenacy over Europe.The age of chivalry and the Crusades was not over withhim. He certainly pointed out the road to Napoleon.He was deeply interested in the accounts of the Chinese, and in the Jesuit missions for their conversion. He wrote much upon the philosophis Sinzensis, in accordance with the delusion of the age. He engaged in an active but courteous controversy with Samuel Clarke, in which the highest and most abstruse riddles of metaphysics were discussed. From his historical researches he drew the materials for an instructive essay, De Origine Francorum (1715); and so various was the range of topics that engaged his attention, that he commented on the political position and rights of English freeholders. His mind, like the sun, surveyed all things, and brightened all that it shone upon. This enumeration of his inquiries gives a very imperfect view of either the number or the variety of his productions. The catalogue of his writings fills thirty-three pages in the 4to edition of his works by Dutens.

The literary fecundity of Leibnitz was equaled by his activity in promoting the practical interests of intelligence. His correspondence linked together the scholars of all countries, furnished a bond of connection between all learning and science, and created for the first time a universal republic of letters. He thus communicated an impulse to the dissemination of knowledge lot less potent than that given by Bacon's New Atlantis, and by the institution of the Royal Society of England. Of that society he was an adjunct member, as he was the chief of the foreign associates of the Academy of Sciences of France. He suggested to the first king of Prussia the foundation of the Royal Academy of Berlin, aided in its establishment, and became its first president (1700). He proposed a like institution for Dresden, but was frustrated by the wars in Poland, for his zeal for liberal studies was contemporaneous with the conquering campaigns of Charles XII of Sweden. When the Berlin Academy was endangered by the death of its royal founder, Leibnitz sought to open a new home for learning by establishing a similar society at Vienna (1713). The design was not carried into effect. The .exhaustion of the finances by the War of the Spanish Succession, which was scarcely closed, was unfavorable .to the scheme.  Leibnitz was warmly received, was encouraged by prince Eugene, was created a baron of the empire, and was appointed aulic counselor, with a salary of 2000 florins. Two years previously he had been consulted at Torgau, in regard to the civilization of Russia, by Peter the Great, who had made him a counselor of the Russian empire, and had conceded a handsome pension to him. All the while he remained historiographer of Brunswick. It is reported that the elector .of Brunswick was much dissatisfied with the slow progress of the history of his house. When the elector became king of England (1714), Leibnitz hastened from Vienna to pay his court to the monarch, but his new majesty had departed for his new dominions. He met the sovereign, however,. on his return to his paternal domain. The years of Leibnitz were now drawing to an end. He suffered from acute rheumatism and other painful disorders. Having much acquaintance with medicine, he tried novel remedies upon himself, with no good result. He prolonged his studies almost to his last days, and died tranquilly, with scarcely a word, on Nov. 14,1716, having reached the age of “threescore and ten years” His monument at the gates of Hanover, erected by king George, bears the modest inscription Ossa. Leibmitii.

Leibnitz was of medium height, and slender. He had a large head, black hair, which soon left him bald, and small eyes. He was very short-sighted, but his vision was otherwise sound to the end of his days. His constitution was remarkably good, for he reached old age without serious malady, notwithstanding the strain to which it was subjected. He drank moderately, but ate much, especially at supper, and immediately after this heavy meal retired to rest. He was wholly irregular in eating. He took his food whenever he was hungry, usually in his library, without abandoning his books. Frequently he took his only repose in his chair, and occasionally pursued his reflections or researches, without change of place, for weeks — Fontenelle says for months. He read everything — good books and bad books, and books on all manner of subjects. He extracted largely from the authors perused, and made copious annotations upon them.

His memory was so tenacious that he rarely recurred to these Adversaria. He sought intercourse with men of all occupations and of all grades of intelligence. Every work of God or man was an object of interest and regard to him. He stretched forth his hand to everything — the election of a king of Poland, the revival of the Crusades, the conversion of the heathen, the reunion of the churches, the codification of laws, the history of a dynasty and people, the constitution of the universe, the creation of new sciences, the  derivation of words, the invention of a calculating machine, the projection of a universal languages the construction of windmills, or the improvement of pleasure carriages. The extent of his correspondence was amazing, and may be conjectured from the list of distinguished correspondents culled by Brucker from the ampler catalogues of Feller and Ludovici. The courtesy of his epistles was as notable as their multitude. They were scattered over all civilized nations, and were on an endless diversity of topics, but they were uniformly marked by deference for the persons and opinions of others. This gentleness sprung from an amiable and cheerful nature. It was cultivated and refined by intercourse with princes, and statesmen, and philosophers, and scholars, and also with the humblest classes of society. It was confirmed by his belief that no honest conviction can be entirely wrong. His conversation was easy and abundant — as full of charm as of instruction. It may be conceded to Gibbon that completeness was sacrificed by Leibnitz to universality of acquirement; but, when all his gifts and accomplishments are embraced in one view, he may be justly deemed to merit the eulogy of his French editor, Jacques: “In point of speculative philosophy he is the greatest intellect of modern times; and had but two equals, but no superiors, in antiquity.”

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

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

Philosophy. — The mathematical and scientific, the historical and juridical, the linguistic and miscellaneous speculations of Leibnitz have been noticed very inadequately, but as fully as comports with the design of this Cyclopaedia. His philosophy awaits and merits niore precise consideration. It must be premised that all his labors, however remote in appearance from philosophical speculation, were inspired and animated by his own peculiar scheme of doctrine, and were really fragmentary applications of his  distinctive principles. Hence proceeded that pervading spirit of reform which is manifested in all the departments of knowledge handled by him, and which was rewarded by numerous great triumphs in so many and such dissimilar directions. When details are neglected, the whole body of his writings is found to be connected by many lines of interdependence, and to be harmonized into unity by a common relation to the central thought around which his own reflections incessantly revolved. God is one, and there must be consistency and concord in the creation of God. It is no easy a task t discern this unity, and to detect the general scheme of the Leibnitzian philosophy. Leibnitz nowhere presents a symmetrical exposition of his whole doctrine. His Monadologie, or Principia Philosophiae, seu Theses in Gratiam Principis Eugenii, furnishes a clew to his system, but it is only a slender clew. Even if the Principes de la Nature et de la Grace be added as a supplement, the guiding thread is very frail. His views must be painfully gathered from elaborate treatises, from occasional essays, from scientific papers, from passing hints, from explanations of controverted points, from elucidations of obscure or misapprehended statements, and from the series of his multifarious epistles. Here a principle is thrown out, there its applications are illustrated; in one place an erroneous conclusion or a mistaken inference is corrected, in another, or in many others, fresh limitations or further expansions of a hypothesis are proposed. These different members of the imperfect whole are separated by months or years in the life of the author, or by hundreds of pages, or whole volumes in his collected works.

It required the patient diligence of Christian Wolf to combine, complete, and organize in cumbrous quartos leaves scattered like the oracles of the Sibyl. Leibnitz had, indeed, no system to propound; he had no thought of promulgating a system or of establishing a sect. Yet his mind was thoroughly systematic. The system which resulted from perfect coherence of thought was latent in his own mind from the beginning, and was consistently evolved as the occasion furnished the opportunity of presenting its several parts. The highest intellect attaches itself instinctively to a principle, and allows accident to determine how far and when its consequences shall be unrolled. Leibnitz only desired to reconcile the opinions of his illustrious predecessors; to correct the errors and to supply the deficiencies which he recognized in the theory of his chief leader, Des Cartes, and to redress the evils which had flowed logically from those errors. The main design of his profound investigations was to give precision, harmony, and veracity to the immense stock of his own acquisitions and meditations. Had he reached the  years of Methuselah he might have proposed a system, but it would have been simply the rectification of Cartesianism, or the conciliation of Plato and Aristotle, of Buonaventura and Aquinas. It must be remembered that, of his two systematic treatises, one was published towards the close of his life, the other not till half a century after his death. His natural disposition apparently inclined him to accumulate knowledge for its own sake, and to reflect upon his acquisitions from his own satisfaction. He seemed to be impelled to publication only by some accidental stimulus. His whole life was a discipline and preparation for what he never found time to execute — never, perhaps, seriously thought of executing — a vast encyclopaedia embracing all that could be known by man. The hints thrown out in his long career, apt as they are for the construction of a consistent globe of speculation, only indicate an undeveloped system, which is revealed by glimpses as the need or provocation of the moment inspired. From such broken and dispersed lights his philosophy must be divined.

Leibnitz was essentially a Cartesian. He was Cartesian in his method, and Cartesian in his fundamental principles. He never revolted from his great teacher. He pursued the Cartesian mode of analysis and abstraction, he employed the Cartesian procedure by mathematical demonstration, he reasoned, like Des Cartes, from presumptive principles, he accepted the Cartesian indicia of truth; but he rendered them more irecise, and was not wholly negligent of experience. He also rehabilitated the Scholastic or Aristotelian logic. He endeavored to combine with the dominant doctrine all that seemed valuable in elder systems, and he found some truth in all the schemes that he rejected. His imagination was too bold and too active to permit him to be the servile follower of any master, and his perspicacity was too acute to overlook the fatal defects of the principles and conclusions of Des Cartes. The main errors to be corrected sprung from the distinction made by the French reformer between mind and matter. According to his theory, the one could not act upon the other. The intelligent and the material universe were thus hopelessly divorced. Mind was pure thought; matter was simple extension; the apparent concurrence of the two in the phenomena of existence was due to divine assistancy. See DES CARTES. Beasts were machines galvanized into the semblance of vohlutary action by the intervention of divine power. Every movement was a nodus vindice dignus. If mind is pure thought, all mental action must be an effluncee, an effect, or a manifestation of the one sole Intelligence. The distinction of minds was an impossibility. To Leibnitz the want of any  principium individuationis — that old war-cry of the schoolmen — was apparent. He discussed this topic in a public thesis before he was seventeen (May 30, 1663, Opera, tom. 2, part 1, p. 400, ed. Dutens). He ascribed entitative activity to matter, and a distinct entity to each individual mind. He regarded the human mind as an assemblage of dormant capacities (ἐντελεχείαι), to be called into action by the stimulation of sensations from without, and of promptings from within. He departed so far from the teachings of Des Cartes that he ascribed soul and reason to brutes. and in some sort to all matter also (Leibnitiana, § c, Opera, t. 6, part 1, p. 315; comp. § 181, p. 331; see Bayle, Dict. Hist. Crit. Lit. Rorarius, Pereira). If matter is mere extension, it must be identical with space, and is “without form and void,” impalpable, inconceivable, unreal. To give shape to “that which shape had none,” motion must be recognised as an essential quality of matter, because form is produced by movement in space. Leibnitz at times goes so far as to suspect that all space is matter. For the production of motion, force — determinate power in action — is necessary. Of the real existence of force the human consciousness affords assurance. From these corrections of the Cartesian postulates proceeded the mathematical and philosophical speculations of Leibnitz in regard to vis rivaer, his Theory of Motion, Abstract and Concrete. His Dynamics, and even his Calculus of lnfinitesimals. All internal and external change, all properties and accidents of matter, are only “modes of motion.” The latest science is returning to similar hypotheses, though the langulage of science is altered. Observed phenomena appeared to be contradicted by the definition of body, as the conjunction of extension and motion. Bodies were often at rest, undergoing no sensible change. Motion could not belong to them essentially as aggregates, but only to the constituents from whose conjoint operation the external os the internal movements of the mass proceeled. If a property was to inhere in such constituents, matter could not be infinitely divisible: the process of division must be ultimately arrested by reaching an irreducible atom:

“Fateare necesse ‘st,

Esse ea, quse nullis jam praedita partibus exstent,

Et minima constuent natura.”

The motion attributed to these primordial particles is due to an indwelling force. Thus, from his definition of matter as the union of motion with extension, Leibnitz was led to recognize as the primary units of the universe an infinity of simple elementary substances or forces, which he  designated MONADS. These monads have some resemblance to those of Pythagoras, Democritus, and Epicurus, and also to the Ideas of Plato; but, unlike the Epicurean atoms, they are not solida, though they are aeterna. They are not material, but they are the souls of matter. This vaporous dematerialization of matter may be illustrated by Plotinus's definition of matter by the successive segregation of all the properties of specific body. Is not the theory of Boscovich, that matter is only an assemblage of points of force, an adaptation of Leibnitz's conception? Has not the theory of Boscovich won admiration and hesitating approval from many distinguished men of science?

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

Here presents itself the ancient insoluble enigma, How can bodies act upon each other? How can matter be molded or modified by vital action? How can it be subdued or directed by the intelligent volition of man? How can it be conjoined with spirit in any form of animate existence? Des Cartes so completely contradistinguished mind and matter that it was impossible for mind to act upon matter or matter upon mind frustra ferro diverberat  umbras. Leibnitz so completely assimilated material to spiritual existence, giving body to spirit, and spirit to body (Theod. § 124), that they were indistinguishable except by their properties the one possessing perception only, the other having apperception also. There could be no intercommunion, no reciprocal influence between them, or between any monads. To cut rather than to loose the intellectual knot, which was only rendered more intricate, Leibnitz proposed an explanation in his Systema Naturae (1695). It is his celebrated doctrine of Pre-established Harmony. The monads are forces, sometimes active, sometimes suspended, ἐνεργείαι and δυνάμεις, governed by their own inherent tendencies, and without power of acting upon each other; but their separate actions are so foreknown on one side, and predetermined on the other, in the moment of creation, that their concurrent evolutions reciprocally correspond, and effectuate all the phenomena of the universe. Mind, therefore, does not coerce matter, nor does one form of matter control another, but the inclination of the will and the disposition of the matter, or the diverse evolutions of different monads, conjoin independently and without connection in the production of one result, in consequence of the preadaptation of all the elementary forces to that particular change, at that particular moment, in that particular composition, and with that particular consequence. Dugald Stewart illustrates this harmony by the supposition of two clocks so regulated and adjusted as to strike the hours in unison. It may be an illustration; it is scarcely an elucidation of the doctrine. The agreement is only in time and performance: there is no concordance of dissimilar processes. The machinery of Divine Assistance, which Des Cartes had employed for the explanation of the phenomena of animal life, was generalized by Leibnitz, applied to the whole order of things, and transferred to the original of all creation.

There is thus much more than a poetic symbolism — there is a distinctive philosophical tenet involved in his fine expression that “the universe is the knowledge of God.” This preordination of concurrences, apt for each occasion, between monadic developments, each of which is determined by its own inherent force, which is will in intelligences and nature in material things, makes the whole endless series of change the realization of foreseen and prearranged correspondences. It is the continual evolution of the immeasurable plan entertained by the Creator before the beginning of the ages, and brought into act at the appointed time and in the appointed order, with mathematical precision, though beyond the calculation of mathematical devices. Certain fabrics are curiously woven with colors so arranged in the  yarn that when the weaving is performed each color falls with exact propriety into its due place, and contributes accurately to form, to tint, to perfect the contemplated pattern. So, in the system of pre-established harmony, “the web of creation is woven in the loom of time,” with threads prepared from the beginning to fall into the requisite connections, and to produce a foreknown design. Each concurrent movement arrives at the appropriate time and place in consequence of the whole antecedent series of changes in each case, for nowhere is there any solution of continuity, and the present is always the progeny of the past and the parent of the future. The innumerable lines of evolution continually interosculate with each other, but never are blended together. It will readily be perceived that the whole intricate phantasmagoria of these unconnected monads is only a grand and beautiful variation of the Cartesian hypothesis, and is neither more valid nor more satisfactory than the fantasy it was designed to supplant.

This doctrine of pre-established harmony is in perfect consonance with Leibnitz's vindication of the ways of God to man, if it did not necessitate his theological expositions. The Theodicee is the most exquisite, the most brilliant, the most profound, the most learned, and, in some respects, the most satisfactory of all treatises of philosophical theology. Many of its conclusions are either true, or as near the truth as the human intellect can attain in such inquiries. Others are merely conjectural, and are sometimes fantastic, as they lie beyond the domain of possible knowledge. Several of its positions have furnished pretexts for sweeping censures; but in such speculations error is inevitable, and a slight error opens the way for a host of pernicious and undesigned heresies. The most notable and characteristic of Leibnitz's theological dogmas, which provoked the malicious wit of Voltaire's Candide, is intimately associated with the explanation of the combined action of monads. This is the theory known as Optimism. Without absolutely asserting that “Whatever is, is best,” it alleges that the actual world is the best of all possible worlds, despite of acknowledged evils and defects. This is supposed to be proved, among other evidences, by the Leibnitzian principle of the sufficient reason, since, if any better world had been possible, it is reasonable to suppose that it would have been selected by God in preference to that which He actually created. The acute conceptions, the ingenious arguments, the various illustrations, the abundant analogies by which this thesis is maintained and adorned, can receive here only their merited tribute of admiration. When God looked  upon the work of each of the six days of creation, “He saw that it was good.” More than this it is not given man to know: “that which is wanting cannot be numbered.” But, if all events, if all changes, if all composite actions occur by divine pre-adaptation, it must be presumed that this is the best of worlds. There is wonderful coherence in the views of Leibnitz, interrupted and fragmentary as is their exposition. This dialectical consistency is so perfect, and in its evolution so splendid and imposing, that his scheme presents, both in the process of its construction and in its structure, the charm of a dream of the imagination. Nothing approaches it in magnificence but the ideal universe of Plato.

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

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

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

The unfathomable immensity of the creation can be but dimly apprehended by the finite and fallible mind of man. The mighty plan and purpose of God cannot be compressed within the compass of human intelligence. “We see as through a glass darkly.” Schemes of the universe framed from broken and darlling glimpses become more delusive as they become more systematic. Leibnitz's intuitive principles, abstract analysis and scholastic deduction were peculiarly apt to produce hallucinations.  Analysis for the discovery of ultimate abstracts; intuition for the acceptance of clear, distinct, and adequate ideas; the principle of contradiction as the test of verity; the principle of the sufficient reason as the canon of actuality — these are the metaphysical principles or postulates of Leibnitz. The resulting philosophy, both in conception and in construction, is exposed to “such tricks as hath strong imagination,” and wants firm and assured foundation. It is a complex fantasy, a mathematical romance, a universe of shadows. Still, it is marked by wonderful acuteness, logical coherence, and purity of spirit. It preludes, if it does not anticipate, the main doctrines of Kant, and is the fruitful parent of all the subsequent philosophy of Germany.

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

             a noted Poman Catholic prelate, probably a Bavarian flourished in the 8th century. He was librarian to Charlemagne until 798, when he was made archbishop of Lyons. He was sent soon after by Charlemagne, together with the bishop of Orleans and other prelates, into the southern provinces of France, to suppress by moral means the spreading heresy of Adoptianism, and they succeeded in bringing the chief teacher of this doctrine, Felix, to acknowledge his error before the council held at Aix in 799. In 800 Leidradt was successful with his co-laborers in restoring 20.000 Adoptianists. He zeal which he everywhere displayed appears in a  letter written to Charlemagne not long before the latter's death. He writes: “I have done my best to increase as far as necessary the number of priests. I have established the Psalm service after the model of that observed in your palace, and have erected singing-schools by which the instruction may be continued. I have reading-schools where not only the appointed services are repeated, but where the holy Scriptures in general are studied and explained, and in which are those who understand the spiritual meaning not only of the Gospels, but also of the prophets, the books of Samuel, the Psalms, and Job. I have had as many books as possible transcribed for the churches in Lyons, procured vestments and other necessary appointments for divine service, and have repaired the churches.” After Charlemagne's death, in the subscription to whose will the name of Leidradt appears, he resigned the bishopric and retired to the convent of the Holy Medardus. where he died. Neither the year of his death nor of his birth are known. He wrote in a clear and concise style some works which have since been edited. Of special value is a treatise of his on baptism, which was published by Mabillon (Annales, vol. 2). See Herzog, Real-Encycklop. art. Baluze; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. vol.6i, s.v.

## Leifchild, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Leifchild, John, D.D.]]

             an eminent Etnglish Independent minister, was born in 1780 of Methodist parentage, and was brought up, and began to preach among the Methodists; but afterwards embracing Calvinistic opinions, it was impossible for him to continue preaching among them, and he was advised bv Mr. Bunting, then the junior preacher in the circuit, to seek other associations. Accordingly, in 1804, he entered Hoxton Academy, but he retained through life a friendly feeling for the friends of his youth, and profited largely by what he learned among them. He died in June, 1862. Without possessing any very extraordinary natural endowments, he attained by faithful, earnest, and diligent labor a most successful and honorable career, and his life is a noble example of what may be effected by the right cultivation of the powers a man possesses within himself. Irreproachable in character, faithful in pastoral attentions, powerful in the pulpit, he filled every chapel he occupied, built up every Church he was the pastor of, and, when enfeebled by age, retired from his work laden with honors, and not without very substantial tokens of the love and gratitude of those whom he had served in the Gospel. One of the deacons of Craven Chapel states that, during the twenty-three years of his ministry there, more than fifteen hundred persons had been brought to decision and added to the  Church through his faithful ministry. The catholic spirit of Dr. Leifchild was almost as prominent a feature in his character as his intense and pervadingm earnestness. He was well known and well liked by Christians of various denominations, with whom he mingled freely, and whom he loved for the truth's sake. See J. R. Leifchild, John Leifchild, his public Labors, private Usefulness, and personal Characteristics (Lond. 1860); Grant, Metropolitan Pulpit (1839), 2:152; Penn Pictures of Popular English Preachers (1852), p. 130: Allibone, Dict. of British and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Leiffthus[[@Headword:Leiffthus]]

             in Norse mythology, was one of the rivers of hell, which: take their origin from the spring Hwergelmer.

## Leigh, Edward[[@Headword:Leigh, Edward]]

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

## Leigh, Hezekiah G[[@Headword:Leigh, Hezekiah G]]

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

## Leigh, Sir Egerton[[@Headword:Leigh, Sir Egerton]]

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

## Leighlin, Synod of[[@Headword:Leighlin, Synod of]]

             was held in Campo-Lene, Ireland, near Old Leighlin, A.D. 633, with the purpose of settling the time as to the observance of Easter. A few years before (630), Honorius I had addressed an expostulatory letter to the Irish clergy on the paschal question; and it is worthy of remark that this was the first notice taken by the bishops of Rome in regard to the Church founded by St. Patrick, and was about 200 years after its commencement. At this period the Irish were divided on the time of keeping Easter, some advocating the Roman practice, others the Irish way of observing the 14th day of the first vernal month (if a Sunday), instead of adopting its celebration on the Sunday following the 14th, and the matter even resulted in a controversy. Laurentius of Canterbury relates that Dengan, an Irish bishop, when in North Britain, declared that he would neither eat, drink, or sleep under the same roof with those who held to the Roman practice. Cummian, who for twelve years had been an abbot of Iona, was greatly troubled about it. and in its investigation he said, “I turned over the holy Scriptures, studied history and all the cycles I could find. I inquired diligently what were the sentiments of the Hebrews, Grecians, Latins, and the Egyptians concerning this solemnity.” A deputation was sent from this  synod, of which most probably Cummian was one, to ascertain from personal inspection whether, as they had heard in Ireland, other nations kept Easter at the same time that the Romans did. The object of this deputation has been greatly perverted in the interest of Romanism. It was not to get a decision from the pope, for this they had had for years, and had not obeyed it; but it was, as before stated, simply to determine for themselves. They remained at Rome or in the East about two years. On their return they reported that all they had heard in Ireland they had seen in Rome — even more (valde certiora) than they had heard. But even this report was not decisive, for the Venerable Bede says, “Though the south of Ireland partially conformed, the northern prove inces and all Iona adhered to their former practice.” This and other questions of nonconformity were for a long time pressed and resisted. In A.D. 664, when Theodore, the Italian archbishop of Canterbury, by order of the pope, came to establish the entire regime of Roman Catholicism in North Britain, the paschal and many other questions were again so fiercely urged that Colman and most of the former clergy left and returned to Ireland. Again, in 1070, when Malcolm Canmore brought Margaret, his Saxon wife, to Scotland, she was shocked to find the faith and public worship of her new subjects so different from the Catholic Church of England. After laboring long to induce her husband to adopt the rites and order of the Saxon Catholics, she had a three days' discussion with the existing clergy and the Culdees of Iona, she speaking in Saxon and her husband interpreting in Irish. See Todd, Irish Church, chap. 6; Usher, Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. 17 (Works, 6:492-510).

## Leighton, Alexander[[@Headword:Leighton, Alexander]]

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

## Leighton, Henry De[[@Headword:Leighton, Henry De]]

             a Scotch prelate, was consecrated bishop of Moray, March 8, 1414, where he continued ten years. In 1424 he was translated to the see of Aberdeen. He was one of the commissioners sent to London for negotiating the ransom of king James I, and returned home with him. He died in 1441. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, pages 113-142.

## Leighton, Robert[[@Headword:Leighton, Robert]]

             a Scottish prelate, one of the most distinguished preachers and theologians of the 17th century, was born in Edinburgh, or, as others think, in Londlon, in the year 1611. He was educated at the university of the former city, and there took his degree of M.A. in 1631, when he went to the Continent to study, especially in France. Here he resided with some relatives at Douay, and formed the acquaintance of several Rom'an Catholic students, whose Christian virtues made him a charitable Christian towards all who bore the name of his Master. “Gentle, tender, and pious from his earliest years, he shrunk from all violence and intolerance; but his intercourse with men whose opinions were so different from his own convinced his reason of the folly and sinfulness of ‘thinking too rigidly of doctrine.'“

He returned to Scotland in 1641, and was immediately appointed to the parish of Newbattle, near Edinburgh; but as Leighton identified himself with the cause of Charles I when the latter was confined, by the commissioners of the Parliament, in Holmby House, he brought upon his head the displeasure of the Presbyterians, and, according to bishop Burnet, “He soon came to dislike their Covenant, particularly their imposing it, and their fury against all who differed from them. He found they were not capable of large thoughts; theirs were narrow as their tempers were sour; so he grew weary of mixing with them,” and became an Episcopalian. For this change, however, there were serious obstacles in Leighton's case, and it has therefore been a matter of general disapprobation. Certainly the facility with which he fraternized with the party that had inflicted such horrid cruelties on his excellent father, Dr. Alexander Leighton, in 1630, for merely publishing a book in favor of Presbyterianism, cannot be altogether approved (comp. Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 4:463 sq.). In 1652 he resigned his charge, and in the following year was elected principal of the University of Edinburgh, a dignity which he retained for ten years. Earnest, spiritual, and utterly free from all selfish ambition, he labored without ceasing for the welfare of the students. He delivered lectures especially to the students of theology, and occasionally supplied the place of divinity professor. His theological lectures are known to the learned world, and have been translated into English. For pure Latin, sublime thought, and warm diction, they have never been surpassed, and seldom equaled. In that office Dr. Leighton was truly the ornament and delight of the university, and a blessing to studious youth. After the restoration of Charles II and the re-establishment of the episcopacy in  Scotland, Leighton, after much reluctance, accepted the bishopric of Dunblane, a small and poor diocese, and was consecrated at Westminster Dec. 15, 1661. Unfortunately for his peace, the men with whom he was now allied were even more intolerant and unscrupulous than the Presbyterians.

The despotic measures of Sharpe and Lauderdale sickened him. Twice he proceeded to London (in 1665 and 1669) to implore the king to adopt a milder course — on the former of these occasions declaring “that he could not concur in the planting of the Christian religion in such a manner, much less as a form of government.” Nothing was really done, though much was promised, and Leighton had to endure the misery of seeing an ecclesiastical system which he believed to be intrinsically the best, perverted to the worst of purposes, and himself the accomplice of the worst of men. In 1670, on the resignation of Dr. Alexander Burnet, he was made, quite against his personal wishes, archbishop of Glasgow, and he finally accepted this great distinction only on the condition that he should be assisted in his attempts to carry out a liberal measure for “the comprehension of the Presbyterians.” But finding, after a time, that his efforts to unite the different parties were all in vain, and that he could not stay the high-handed tyranny of his colleagues, he finally determined to resign the ecclesiastical dignity (in 1673). After a short residence in Edinburgh, he went to live with his sister at Broadhurst, in Sussex, where he spent the rest of his days in a retired manner, devoted chiefly to works of religion. He died at London June 25,1684.

Leighton published nothing du.ring his lifetime. His great work is his Practical Commentary upon the First General Epistle of St. Peter; not a learned exposition by any means, for the writer hardly notices questions of philology at all, but perhaps no more remarkable instance is extant of the power which sympathy with the writer gives in enabling an expositor to bring out and elucidate his meaning. Another able work of his is Praelectiones Theologiae, of which an edition was published a few years ago by the late professor Scholefield of Cambridge; also some sermons and charges. There is an edition of his work in 4 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1819; but the best edition is that of Pearson (Lond. 1828; N. Y. 1859, 8vo). Another good edition was published in 1871, in 6 vols. 8vo. All of Leighton's writings have received the highest commesndations because of the lofty and evangelical spirit that pervades them. They present the truths of Christianity in the spirit of Plato, and it was this that recommended them so much to Coleridge, whose Aids to Reflection are simply commentaries on the teachings of archbishop Leighton. “Few uninspired writings,” says Dr. Dodderidge, “are better  adapted to mend the world: they continually overflow with love to God and man.” See Hetherington, Ch. of Scotland, 2:22 sq., 70 sq.; Burnet's History of his Own Times; Burnet's Pastoral Care; Doddridge's Preface to Leighton's Words; The Remains of Archbishop Leighton, by Jerment (1808); his Select Works, by Cheever (Boston, 1832); Pearson, Life of Robert Leighton (1832); Kitto, Cycl. Libl. Lifer. vol. 2, s.v.; Chambers, Cyclop. vol. 6, s.v.; Chambers, Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. Brit. And Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.

## Leimburg, Johann Leiss Von[[@Headword:Leimburg, Johann Leiss Von]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate of Germany, was born in 1821. For some time dean at Bregenz and Innsbruick, he was in 1879 appointed prince-bishop of Brixen, and died April 24, 1884. He was a man of peace, and tolerant against non-Catholics. (B.P.)

## Leinbach, Thomas Hartman[[@Headword:Leinbach, Thomas Hartman]]

             an earnest and successful minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Berks County, Pennsylvania, January 18, 1802. He studied privately under the Reverend Dr. F.L. Herman; was licensed and ordained in 1822. After serving for several years a few congregations, located partly in Lancaster and partly in Berks County, he accepted a call from the Tulpehocken charge, where he concluded his long and useful ministry, March 31, 1864. Father Leinbach was celebrated as a "catechist," which eminently fitted him for the particular field to which he was called. He was besides a very able, earnest, and effective preacher; and a most conscientious and successful pastor. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Germ. Ref. Church, 4:175. (D.Y.H.)

## Leipsic Discussion Of[[@Headword:Leipsic Discussion Of]]

             SEE ECK; SEE CARLSTADT, etc.

## Leipsic, Colloquy of[[@Headword:Leipsic, Colloquy of]]

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

It was intended that this conference should be of a private character, yet with the hope that the other parts of Germany would follow the example. The Reformed party demanded only that the court preacher Matthias Hoe, of Hohenegg, should in the discussions abstain from the vehemence which distinguished his writings, and the theologians of Leipsic failed not to grant this request, with the assurance  that Hoe was very gentle in conversatione. The elector George having sanctioned the plan of a private conference, the meetings commenced, March 3, at the residence of the upper court preacher, and under his presidency. They were held daily, and continued until March 23. On motion of the Reformed party the Confession of Augsburg was taken as a basis, they announcing their willingness to sign it, such as it then was in the Saxon form (published by order of the elector George, in 1628). They also thought that the princes of their different provinces were ready to do the same, without, however, undertaking to vouch for it. They stated furthermore that they would neither reject the altered edition of the Colloquy of Worms (in 1540) nor that of Regensburg (in 1541); they referred to the position taken at the convention of Naumburger in 1561, and by the Saxons in the preface to the Book of Concord. The Confession of Augsburg being thus adopted as a whole, every article was taken up separately and examined.

They thus found that both parties fully coincided in the articles 5-7 and 7-28, while their differences on the articles 1 and 2 were comparatively unimportant. With regard to the 3d article, they all agreed as to the interpretation of the words, but the Saxon theologians maintained that not only the divine, but also the human nature of Christ possessed omniscience, omnipotence, etc., by virtue of the union of the two natures in his personality, and that all the glory which Christ received was only received by his human nature. The Reformed theologians, on the contrary, denied that Christ, as man, was omnipresent, or that in him the human nature had become omniscient and omnipotent. They agreed also in the 4th article, and the Reformed theologians affirmed that they did not believe Christ had come to save all men. They also agreed in the 9th article, to which they made some addition on the necessity of baptism, and on infant baptism. The 10th article, concerning the Eucharist, came up on March 7. Here they could not agree, the Reformed theologians denying the physical participation in the body and blood of Christ, and asserting a spiritual participation through faith; of unworthy communicants, they asserted that these partook only of simple bread and wine. The Reformed theologians, however, maintained that if it was impossible to agree on this point, it was at least possible for the two parties to bear charitably with each other, and to unite in opposing Romanism. The Saxons, who did not wish to bind themselves by any promises in a private conference, said that this proposition would have to be further considered in the fear of the Lord.

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

## Leipsic, Interim of[[@Headword:Leipsic, Interim of]]

             SEE INTERIM (III).

## Leiptr[[@Headword:Leiptr]]

             in Norse mythology, was one of the rivers of hell, which have their source in the spring Hwergelmer.

## Leire[[@Headword:Leire]]

             SEE LETHRA.

## Leitch, William, D.D[[@Headword:Leitch, William, D.D]]

             a Scotch divine, was born in 1814 in the town of Rothesay, a famous watering-place on the island of Bute, Scotland, and was educated at the University of Glasgow, which he entered at the age of eighteen, and graduated as master in 1836 with the highest honors in the departments of mathematical and physical science. While a student he also lectured in the  university on astronomy, and as a result of his studies in this department we have from him a work entitled God's Glory in the Heavens; or, Contributions to Astro-theology, which contains the most recent astronomical discoveries stated with special reference to theological questions. In 1838 he was licensed as a preacher of the Gospel in the Church of Scotland by the Presbytery of Dunoon. In 1843 he received a presentation to the parish of Monimail. He continued minister of this parish until 1859, when he was selected as principal of Queen's University. He is well known to have been the author of certain articles in which, in a masterly manner, the views of the late Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow, on the subject of miracles, are controverted. For several years he conducted a series of investigations on the subject of partheno-genesis and alternate generations, as illustrated by the phenomena of sexual development in hymenoptera. The result of these researches, which conflicts with that of the German physiologist Siebald in the same field, is given in the Transactions of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and in the Annals of the Botanical Society of Canada. Several separate publications of his also appeared on the subject of education. In 1860 he became principal of Queen's University, and this connection afforded him a seat in the Presbytery of Kingston, and, in consequence, in the synod also. His position also gave him a seat in the senatus of the University of Toronto, and he was appointed an examiner of that university. He died in 1862. See Appleton's Amer. Ann. Cyclop. 1864, p. 625.

## Leiter, Samuel B., D.D[[@Headword:Leiter, Samuel B., D.D]]

             a German Reformed minister, was born at Leitersburg, Maryland, April 19, 1809. His literary and theological training he received at York, Pennsylvania. He was licensed and ordained by the Maryland Classis of the Reformed Church in 1835; immediately left for the West, and settled in Ohio, where he successfully exercised his ministry in different sections of the state. Dr. Leiter was a man of good natural parts and extensive requirements, which he conscientiously employed in the service of his Master. He died March 31, 1883. (D.Y.H.)

## Leitomysl Or Leitomischel, John[[@Headword:Leitomysl Or Leitomischel, John]]

             a Bohemian prelate noted for his energetic character and his unrelenting hostility to the Hussites, flourished in the latter part of the 14th and the early years of the 15th century. He first comes under our notice as one of the two prelates — the archbishop of Prague being the other — before whom John Huss was to be cited for heresy. His position and influence in Bohemia were such that Stephen Paletz, writing against Huss, dedicated to him his Dialogus Volatilis. As the troubles at Prague increased, he was one of those to whom the archbishop of Prague applied for advice, and his response was in accordance with his notoriously stern and unbending character. When the Council of Constance met in 1414, he was present as a member, and took a leading part in its proceedings. He was the first to denounce the Calixtine practice, recently introduced by Jacobel at Prague, and he was commissioned by the council to take measures for its suppression. His enmity to Huss was signalized by the language used by  him in the council, and excited the deep indignation of the friends of the Reformer, who did not hesitate to reprehend his course publicly in severe terms. His persistent energy, however, merited the euloginms of the council, and by them he was appointed to bear their threatening letter to Bohemia, in which they attempted to terrify the followers of Huss into submission. The mission, however, proved a failure. The person of the bishop was no longer safe in his own country, and he returned to the council. The first reward of his diligence was his promotion, about A.D. 1416. to the bishopric of Olmutz, in Moravia. On the secession of Conrad, archbishop of Prague, to the Calixtines a short time afterwards, he was promoted to the vacant dignity. This, however, he was not destined to enjoy. The ascendency of the Calixtines must have excluded him from Prague, if not from Bohemia; and perhaps among all the enemies of the Hussites, during the period of their religious wars, there was no one who could have been sooner made the victim of their vengeance than the obnoxious bishop. But as no mention is made of him at a subsequent date, and as he does not appear to have fallen into the hands of the Hussite leaders, we may presume that his life must have closed soon after the dissolution of the Council of Constance. He was eminently a martial prelate, and was known by the sobriquet of “John the Iron.” Notices of him will be found in many histories of his times. See Von der Hardt, Authorities on the Council of Constance; Lenfant, Council of Constance; Gillett, Life and Times of John Huss, vols. 1 and 2; F. Polacky, Mag. J. Hus Documenta. — Neander, Ch. Hist. 5: 296 sq. (E. 11. G.)

## Lejay (Lat. Laius), Claude[[@Headword:Lejay (Lat. Laius), Claude]]

             one of the fathers of the Jesuit order, was born at Aise, in Faucigny, in the diocese of Geneva, about 1505. He commenced his studies at the College of La Roche, and completed them at Paris. He allied himself in friendship with Peter Fadire, which, in 1535, led to his becoming a Jesuit, and a great help to his order. In 1545 he assisted at the Council of Trent. He afterwards directed the College of Boulogne, where he received the degree  of doctor of theology. He then returned to Germany, taught at Ingolstadt, then at Vienna, in June 1551, where he died, August 6, 1552. He composed various works, which were only published in the Speculum Praesulis ex Sacrce Scripturae, Canonum et Doctorum Verbis (Ingolstadt, 1625, and in volume 17 of the OEuvres of P. Gretser, Ratisbon, 1741). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lejay, Gui-Michel[[@Headword:Lejay, Gui-Michel]]

             a noted French scholar in exegetical theology, was born at Paris in 1588. While at the high school he paid particular attention to the Eastern languages, and in 1615 projected a polyglot of the Bible, known as the Palis Polyglot (Paris, 1629-45, 10 vols. folio), and entitled Biblia Hebraica, Samaritana, Chaldaica, Graeca, Syriaca, Latina, Arabica, quibus textuts originales totius Scripturae sacrae, quarums pars in editione Complutensi, deide in Antwerpiensi regiis sumptibus extat, nuunc integri ex manuscriptis toto fere orbe quaesitis exemplaribus exhibentur. The first four vols. contain the Heb., Chald., Sept., and Vulg. texts of the O.T.; vols. 5 and 6 the N.T. in Gr., Syr., Arab., and Lat.; vol. 7, the Heb. Samar. Pent. the Sam. version, with translation by Morinus, the Arab. and Syr. Pent.; vols. 8-10, the rest of the books of the O. Test. in Syr. and Arab. Lejay lost largely by this publication; but, as a reward for his labor  and cost, he was ennobled. The work was the best of its kind till the London Polyglot appeared, by which it was soon superseded. See Lelong, Discours historique sur les principales editions des Bibles polyglottes (Paris, 1713, 12mo), p. 104 sq., 379, 399 sq., 545, 546 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 30:512 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. vol. 2, s.v.

## Lejbowicz[[@Headword:Lejbowicz]]

             SEE FRANK.

## Lejuive[[@Headword:Lejuive]]

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

## Lekkio[[@Headword:Lekkio]]

             in Finnish mythology, was an evil spirit of the woods, who appeared in various frightful forms.

## Lel[[@Headword:Lel]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was the god of love, son of Lada, the goddess of beauty, and brother of Did and Polel.

## Leland, Aaron[[@Headword:Leland, Aaron]]

             a Baptist minister, sixth in descent from Henry Leland, the Puritan ancestor of all the Lelands in America, but in a different line from his more noted contemporary, Rev. John Leland, was born in Holliston, Mass., May 28,1761. Of a naturally vigorous and inquisitive mind, he grew up with a larger measure of intelligence than his limited means of early culture would have indicated as probable. He united in 1785 with the Baptist Church in Bellingham, by which Church he was licensed to preach, and subsequently ordained. He soon after removed to Chester, Vt., where he gathered a small Church, which in thirteen years had become five — in Chester, Andover, Grafton, Wethersfield, and Cavendish. From Chester he visited Jamaica, in the same county, guided through the wilderness by marked trees: these visits resulted in the formation of several churches in that vicinity. He was not only an active and successful minister, but had important civil trusts committed to him by the suffrages of his fellow- citizens. He sat in the state Legislature several years; three years he was speaker of the House; four years a member of the council; five years successively lieutenant governor; and nothing but his own conviction of its incompatibility with the duties of his higher calling prevented his election to the governorship of the state. He refused to permit any civil engagements to hinder his usefulness and success as a Christian minister, and he continued to fulfill his calling with great energy, zeal, and success, until worn out with toil. He died August 25, 1833. He was a popular and  effective preacher. His commanding form and countenance; his musical and sonorous voice; his ready and fervid, often impassioned utterance; his vigorous intellect and great tenderness of spirit, gave him unusual power over congregations. He was often sought as an orator on public occasions, and called to give counsel in ecclesiastical questions. His zeal was enlisted in the temperance cause, insisting on total abstinence from intoxicating beverages, and in promoting ministerial education and all liberal culture. He was in the board of fellows of Middlebury College from the year 1800 till his death. (L. E. S.)

## Leland, John[[@Headword:Leland, John]]

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

## Leland, John (2)[[@Headword:Leland, John (2)]]

             (2), a Baptist minister, distantly related to Aaron Leland (see above), was born in Grafton, Massachusetts, May 14, 1754. About the age of eighteen he had strong and painful religious impressions; he emerged into light and peace gradually, and, after the lapse of several months, was baptized in June, 1774, in Bellingham, and was regularly licensed by the Church. He removed in 1776 to Virginia, where for above fourteen years he exercised an itinerant ministry, preaching over all the eastern section of the state, sometimes extending his tours southward into North Carolina, and northward as far as Philadelphia. He was ordained in Virginia, somewhat irregularly, in 1777, and again ten years later, with more regard to form and customary usage. His evangelical labors were attended with large success. He baptized seven hundred persons, and gathered churches at Orange and Louisa, one of three hundred and the other of two hundred members. He made the acquaintance of Mr. Madison, with whom he maintained a pleasant correspondence for many years, effectively co- operating with him to secure the ratification by Virginia of the Constitution of the United States. In 1791 he returned to New England, and the year following settled in Cheshire, Mass., where he resided till his death. Though acting for a limited period as pastor of the Church in Cheshire, he was always an itinerant, making extensive tours over western Massachusetts, often into the adjacent parts of New York, and into more distant sections of New England; twice visiting Virginia, and, wherever he went, preaching and baptizing — these two items of “the great commission” (Mat 28:19-20) being all to which he felt himself called. His last record of baptism was Aug. 17,1834, when he was over eighty years of age, which brought up the number of baptisms in his ministry to 1524.

He still continued to preach, and died in the work at North Adams, Mass., Jan. 14,1841. He recorded, when at the age of sixty- six, that he had then preached eight thousand sermons, and in order to do it had traveled distances which would thrice girdle the globe. His Life and Remains, edited by his daughter, including an autobiography, additional memoirs, and eighty pieces — sermons, tracts, public addresses, and essays on religious, moral, and political topics — most of which had been printed in pamphlet form during his life, were published not long after his decease, forming a volume of 700 pages 8vo. “Elder” Leland, as he was commonly styled, was in theology a Calvinist of the old school. He was always popular as a preacher and writer, especially among the less-cultivated class.  The elements of his success were a strikingly-original, often eccentric cast of thought; a terse, telling expression, abounding in compact, apothegmatic, easily-remembered sentences; a vigorous Saxon-English diction; slightly provincial (“Yankee”), homely illustration, often a spice of humor, and his sermons were never wanting in earnest appeal. These qualities were aided by his tall figure, the compass of his voice, and a peculiar but effective action. His singular views as to the limit of his ministerial duty, leading him to baptize converts without gathering them into churches, caused his success as an evangelist to leave less durable traces than might otherwise have been looked for. The relations of Church and State in Virginia and in most of New England, during the earlier period of his ministry, led him into a habit of political activity which was sometimes censured by persons unable to appreciate a state of society which had passed away. Two hymns, published anonymously in most hymn-books — one the popular evening hymn, “The day is past and gone;” the other beginning, “Now the Savior standeth pleading” — are ascribed to his pen, and not improbably the simple melodies in which they are oftenest sung. His productions, consisting of several sermons, essays, and addresses, were published after his death, with a memoir of the author by Miss L. F. Greene (1845, 8vo). See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 6:174. (L. E. S.)

## Leland, Thomas[[@Headword:Leland, Thomas]]

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

## Lelli (Saint), Camillo De[[@Headword:Lelli (Saint), Camillo De]]

             founder of an order of Italian friars, was born at Bucchianico, May 25, 1550. An ulcer, resulting from his early vices, led him to enter a convent. The Franciscans rejected him, and he went to Rome, where he was received at the hospital of St. James. He speedily recovered, and was afterwards expelled for misconduct. In 1569 he enrolled himself among the troops of Venice, and after the close of the war, having been dismissed, hired out to the Capuchins of Manfredonio. He wished to become a monk, but was repulsed on all sides on account of his infirmity. He returned to the hospital of St. James, where this time his good conduct obtained for him the position of steward. Thinking that the diseases even then were not well treated at the hospitals, he completed his studies among the Jesuits, was made priest, and founded in 1584 the congregation of Clercs Regulars, especially intended for the care of the sick. This congregation, being approved by Sixtus V, March 8, 1586. was established as a religious order by Gregory XIV, October 15, 1591. St. Camillo de Lelli resigned his supervision in 1607, and was beatified by Benedict XVI in 1742. He died at Rome, July 14, 1614. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lelong, Jacques[[@Headword:Lelong, Jacques]]

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

## Lemaistre De Saci (Or Sacy)[[@Headword:Lemaistre De Saci (Or Sacy)]]

             ISAAC Louis, a noted French Jansenist theologian, a nephew of Antoine Arnauld le Grand, was born in Paris March 29,1613; was ordained a priest in 1650, and became confessor or principal director of the recluses of Port  Royal. Entangled in a controversy with the Jesuits, he was persecuted by the authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, in 1661, and, after having vainly sought refuge among friends, was confined in the Bastile in 1666. During his imprisonment, which lasted two years, he made a French translation of the Old Testament. He had previously been one of the translators of the New Testament of Mons (1667). which was often reprinted. In consequence of renewed persecution, he left Port Royal in 1679, seeking peace and quiet at the country seat of a friend of his. There he died, Jan. 4, 1684. He published French versions of several classical works, and of valuable theologicaltreatises; also of Thomas à Kempis's Imitation. See Hoefr, Nouv. Biog. Genetrale, 30:568; Ste. Beuve, Port Royal, 2:1,2; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v. Sacy, de.

## Lemke, Heinrich[[@Headword:Lemke, Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born December 31, 1601, at Lubeck. He studied at different universities, and died at Bergen, Norway, March 7, 1674. — He wrote, Vindicatio Librorum Apocryphorum Veteris et Novi Testamenti: — Vindicatio Incarnati Veri Messiae Promissi ex Thalmud et Rabbinorum Scriptis Desumta: — Schola Papistarum  Reformata. See Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lemoine, Francois[[@Headword:Lemoine, Francois]]

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

## Lemoine, Jean[[@Headword:Lemoine, Jean]]

             a French prelate, was born at Cressy, in the 13th century. Having completed his studies, he took the degree of doctor of theology at the University of Paris, and made a journey to Rome, where he was well received, and appointed auditor of the rota. His commentary upon the sixth book of the Decretales, which he wrote at Rome, gained for him the title of cardinal. Boniface VIII appointed him legate to France in 1302, and in this position he strove to re-establish peace between Philip the Fair and the holy see. He acted with so much discretion that he won the esteem of-the king without losing his credit with the pope. He assisted, in 1305, at the conclave held at Perugia for the election of Clement V, and accompanied that pontiff to Avignon, where he died, August 22, 1313. His body was borne to Paris, and interred in the church of the college which he had founded in 1303 in that city, on Rue St. Victor, upon the site of the houses, chapel, and cemetery which had belonged to the Augustinian monks.

His brother, ANDRE LEMOINE, bishop of Noyon, aided him in the founding of the college which bore the name of the cardinal Lemoine. He died in 1315, and the two brothers were laid in the same tomb. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lempriere, John[[@Headword:Lempriere, John]]

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

## Lemuel[[@Headword:Lemuel]]

             (Hebrew Lemnuel', לְמוּאֵל, Pro 31:1; Sept. ὑπὸ θεοῦ, Vulgate Lamuel; also Lemoël, לְמוֹאֵל Pro 31:4; Sept. πάντα ποιεῖ, Vulgate Lamuel), an unknown prince, to whom the admonitory apothegms of Pro 31:2-9 were originally addressed by his mother. Most interpreters understand Solomon to be meant either symbolically (the name signifying to God, i.e. created by him) or by a pleasing epithet (see Rosenmüller, Scholia acl Prov. p. 718). The Rabbinical commentators identify Lemuel with Solomon, and tell a strange tale that when he married the daughter of Pharaoh, on the day of the dedication of the Temple, he assembled musicians of all kinds, and passed the night awake. On the morrow he slept till the fourth hour, with the keys of the Temple beneath his pillow, when his mother entered, and upbraided him in the words of Pro 31:2-9. Others (e.g. Grotius) refer it to Hezekiah (by a precarious etymology), while still others (e.g. Gesenius) think that no Israelite is referred to, but some neighboring petty Arabian prince. On the other hand, according to Eichhorn (Einleitulq, v. 106), Lemuel is altogether an imaginary person (so Ewald; comp. Bertholdt, v. 2196 sq.). Prof. Stuart (Comment. on Prov. p. 403 sq.) renders the expression “Lemuel, the king of Massa,” and regards him as the brother of Agur, whom he makes to have been likewise a son of the queen of Massa, in the neighborhood of Dumah. SEE AGUR; SEE ITHIEL.

In the reign of Hezekiah, a roving band of Simeonites drove out the Amalekites from Mount Seir and settled in their stead (1Ch 4:38-43), and from these exiles of Israelitish origin Hitzig conjectures that Lemuel and Agur were descended, the former having been born in the land of Israel; and that the name Lemuel is an older form of Nemuel, the firstborn of Simeon (Die Sprüche Salomo's, p. 310-314). But this interpretation is far-fetched; and none is more likely than that which fixes the epithet upon Solomon. SEE PROVERBS.

## Lemures[[@Headword:Lemures]]

             the general designation given by the Romans to all spirits of departed persons, of whom the good were honored as Lares (q.v.), and the bad (Larvae) were feared, as ghosts or spectres still are by the superstitious. The common idea was that the Lemures and Larve were the same, and were said to wander about during the night, seeking for an opportunity of inflicting injury on the living (Horat. Epist. 2:2, 209; Pers.v. 185). The  festival called Lemurias was held on the 9th, 11th, and 13th of May, and was accompanied with ceremonies of washing hands, throwing black beans over the head, etc., and the pronunciation nine times of these words: “Begone, you spectres of the house!” which deprived the Lemures of their power to harm. Ovid describes the Lemuria in the fifth book of his Fasti. See De Deo Sacr. p. 237, ed. Bip.; Servius, ad AEn. 3:63; Varro, ap. Nov. p. 135; comp. Hartung, Die Religion der Römer. 1:55, etc.; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Myth. vol. 2, s.v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.

## Lenaus, Johann Canutus[[@Headword:Lenaus, Johann Canutus]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1573, at Lenna, near Upsala. He studied at Wittenberg, Helmstadt, and Rostock, was professor of Greek and Hebrew at Upsala, and died April 25, 1669, doctor of theology, archbishop of Sweden, and pro-chancellor of the Upsala Academy. He wrote, Conmm. in Evangelium Johannis: — Comm. in Lucae Acta Apostolorum: — Comm. in Canonicas. Epistolas Jacobi, Petri, Johannis et Judae: — Brevis Informatio de Veritate et Excellentia Christiana Religionis: — Judicium de Unione a Calvinianis Petita. See Witte, Diarium Biographicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:185. (B.P.)

## Lend[[@Headword:Lend]]

             (represented by several Heb. words which in other forms likewise signify to borrow, e.g. לָוָה, lavah'; גָשָׁה; = עָבִט,abat'; Gr. . δανείζω, χράω). Among the Israelites, in the time of Moses, it must have been very common to lend on pledge, in the strict sense, according to the meaning of the word in natural law, which allows the creditor, in case of non-payment, to appropriate the pledge to his own behoof, without any authoritative interference of a magistrate, and to keep it just as rightfully as if it had been bought with the sum which has been lent for it, and which remains unpaid. But while pledges are under no judicial regulation, much extortion and villainy may be practiced, when the poor man who wishes to borrow is in straits, and must of course submit to all the terms of the opulent lender. It will not be imputed to Moses as a fault that his statutes contain not those legal refinements, which probably were not then invented, and which even yet may be said rather to be on record in our statute-books than to be in our practice. They would have been dangerous to his people, and peculiarly oppressive to the poor. He let pledge remain in its proper sense, pledge, and thus facilitated the obtaining of loans, satisfying himself with making laws against some of the chief abuses of pledging (Michaelis, Mos. Recht.). See PLEDGE. These laws may be found in Exo 22:25; Deu 24:6; Deu 24:10-13. By the analogy of these laws, other sorts of pledges equally, if not more indispensable, such as the utensils necessary for agriculture, or the ox and ass used for the plow, must certainly, and with equal, and even greater reason, have been restored. The law in Deu 24:12-13, is expressed in such general terms, that we cannot but see that the pledge under which the debtor must sleep is merely given as an example, and conclude, of course, that, in general, from the needy no pledge was to be exacted, the want of which might expose him to an inconvenience or hardship, more especially when we find the lawgiver  here declaring that God would regard the restoration of such pledges as almsgiving, or righteousness. So it was in fact, and at the same time it was attended with no loss whatever to the creditor; for he had it in his power, at last, by the aid of summary justice, to lay hold of the whole property of the debtor, and if he had none, of his person; and in the event of non- payment, to take him for a hired servant. The law gave him sufficient security; but with this single difference, that he durst not make good payment at his own hand, but must prosecute (Lev 25:39-55; Neh 5:5). See DEBT. In the book of Job, the character of a lender upon pledge is thus depicted: “He extorts pledges without having lent, and makes his debtors go naked” (Job 22:6; Job 24:7); “He takes the widow's ox for a pledge” (Job 24:3); “He takes the infant of the needy for a pledge” (Job 24:9-11). On this subject our Savior exhorted his disciples to the most liberal and forbearing course towards all whom they could aid or who were indebted to them (Luk 6:30-35). SEE LOAN; SEE USURY.

## Lenet, Philibert Bernard[[@Headword:Lenet, Philibert Bernard]]

             a French monk, was born at Dijon, August 24, 1677. Having been received among the canons regular of St. Genevieve, he soon distinguished himself  by his piety and learning. For a time professor at Senlis and at Provins, he became director of the seminary at Rheims, and abbot of Grand-Val-des- Ecoliers, in the diocese of Langres. Being accused of Jansenism, Lenet was obliged to retire from his position, and died in 1748. He wrote some works, for which see Necrologie des Plus Celebres Defenseurs de la Verite, volume 3; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lenfant, Alexandre-Charles-Anne[[@Headword:Lenfant, Alexandre-Charles-Anne]]

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

## Lenfant, David[[@Headword:Lenfant, David]]

             a French Dominican, who died at Paris, May 31, 1688, is the author of, Concordantice Augustiniance (1655-1656, 2 volumes, fol.): — Biblia Augustiniana (2 volumes): — St. Bernardi Biblia (1665): — St. Thomae Aquinatis Biblia (1657-59, 3 volumes): — Histoire Generale de Tous les Siecles (1684, 6 volumes). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lenfant, Jacques[[@Headword:Lenfant, Jacques]]

             a very noted French preacher and theologian, the son of Paul Lenfant, the Protestant minister of Chatillon-sur-Seine, was born at Bazoche, in Beaure, a district of the ancient province of Orleannois, in France, April 13, 1661. Intended for the same profession as his father, he was sent to prosecute his studies at Saumur; and during his residence at that university he lived with the learned Jacques Cassel, the professor of Hebrew, with whom he formed a friendship which continued during their lives. He completed his theological education at Geneva and Heidelberg, in which latter town he  was admitted to the ministry of the Protestant Church in 1684. Soon after his ordination he obtained the appointment of minister of the French Church at Heidelberg, and chaplain to the dowager electress Palatine. The invasion of the Palatinate by the French troops, under marshal Turenne, compelled Lenfant to leave Heidelberg in 1688, and he settled at Berlin. The fear of meeting his countrymen arose from his having rendered himself obnoxious to the Jesuits by two letters which he had written against that society, and which are appended to his work, entitled A Preservative against a Reunion with the Church of Rome. Though the Protestant French church of that city had already a sufficient number of pastors attached to it, the reigning elector of Brandenburg, Frederick, afterwards king of Prussia, who knew Lenfant by reputation, appointed him to that church, where for upwards of thirty-nine years he performed duty. In 1707, on a visit to England, he preached before queen Anne, and it is said that he so pleased the queen that she desired him to enter the Church of England, and offered him the appointment as her chaplain. In 1710 he obtained the situation of chaplain to the king of Prussia, and councelor of the High Consistory. Lenfant was suddenly attacked with paralysis, while in the apparent enjoyment of perfect health, July 29, 1728, and died on the 7th of August following. His disposition is represented as having been extremely amiable, and his manner simple and modest. Of a reflective turn of mind, he spoke but little, and that little well.

Though a most voluminous writer, he was fond of society, and opened himself without reserve to the confidence of his friends. As a preacher, his manner was pleasing and persuasive; the matter of his discourse was chiefly of a practical nature, and his eloquence was rather chaste than energetic. The style of his writing is elegant, though never florid; it has less force than that of Jurieu, and less eloquence than that of Saurin, but the French is purer, and the diction more refined. It is not certain whether he was the first to form the design of the Bibliotheque Germusnique, which was commenced in 1720, but he took a prominent part in its execution, and is the acknowledged author of the preface. Lenfant's first work, which appeared in 1683, was a review of one of Brueys, who, though a celebrated French dramatist, has written several theological works in defense of the Roman Catholic faith. In 1688 he published a translation of a selection from the letters of St. Cyprian; in 1690, a defense of the Heidelberg Catechism, which is generally annexed to his Preservative, etc., a work we have before alluded to; and in 1691, a Latin translation of the celebrated work of the pere Malebranche, La Recherche de la Verite. His history of the female pope Joan appeared in  1694: the arguments in it are drawn from the Latin dissertation on that subject of Spanheim. It is said, however, that in after life Lenfant discovered and acknowledged the absurdity of this fiction. See JOAN, POPE. In 1708 appeared his remarks on the Greek edition of the New Testament by Mill, which are in the Bibliotheque Choisie of Le Clerc, vol. 16.

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

## Leng, John[[@Headword:Leng, John]]

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

## Lengerke, Casar[[@Headword:Lengerke, Casar]]

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

## Lenglet-Dufresnoy, Nicolas[[@Headword:Lenglet-Dufresnoy, Nicolas]]

             a French writer, was born at Beauvais, October 5, 1674. He studied theology at Paris, and took holy orders, but soon exchanged his clerical dress for that of a politician and diplomatist. He died January 16, 1755. Of  his numerous works we mention the following, bearing upon theology: Novaum Jesu Christi Testamentum Notis Historicis et Criticis Illustratum (Paris, 1703, 2 volumes; reprinted 1735): — Imitation de Jesus Christ, Traduite et Revue (1771): — Traite Historique et Dogmatique du Secret Inviolable de la Confession (1713 and often): — Refutation des Erreurs de Spinosa, avec sa Vie a la Tete (Amsterdam, 1731): — Traite Historique et Dogmatique des Operations, des Visions et des Revelations Particulieres (1751, 2 volumes): — Recueil des Dissertations Anciennes et Modernes sur les Apparitions, les Visions et les Songes (1752, 4 volumes). He also edited Lucii Caecilii Lactantii Opera Omnsia (1748, 2 volumes), the most complete edition of Lactantius's works. See Michault, Memoir es pour Servir a Histoire de la Vie et des Ouvrages de l'Abbe Lenglet; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lengnich, Karl Benjamin[[@Headword:Lengnich, Karl Benjamin]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Dantzic, February 19, 1743. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1772 second preacher at his native place, and died Nov. 5, 1795, leaving, Predigten (Dantzic, 1770): — Beitrag zur Kenntniss seltener und merkwurdiger Bucher (ibid. 1776, 2 volumes): — Nachrichten zur Bucher-und Munzkunde (ibid. 1780-82, 4 vols.). See Doring, Die deutschen Kanzelredner, page 200. (B.P.)

## Lenoir, John[[@Headword:Lenoir, John]]

             a French Jansenist priest, was born at Alencon in 1622. He became theological canon of Seez in 1652, and acquired great reputation as a preacher both in Normandy and at Paris. He was accused of Jansenism, and by his quarrelsome disposition was made the subject of many annoyances. Rouxel de Medavy, bishop of Seez, who had issued a charge for the publication of the Formulary, accused him of various errors, namely, of having permitted the publication of a work entitled Le Chretien Champetre by a layman, who said expressly that “there are four divine persons who are to be worshipped by the faithful, namely, Jesus Christ, St. Joseph, St. Anna, and St. Joachim; and that our Lord is present in the sacrament of the altar like a chicken in an egg-shell.” Lenoir presented then a petition to Louis XIV, together with an attack on some propositions which he considered as heretical. His writings on these subjects were exceedingly violent: he attacked Rouxel de Medavy, who was then archbishop of Roueni, and even De Harlay, the archbishop of Paris. A commission was appointed to judge him, and he was condemned, April 24,1684, to make a public apology in front of the cathedral at Paris, and to work for life on the galleys. The sentence was not fully carried out; but he remained a prisoner successively in the prisons of St. Malo, Brest, and Nantes until his death,  April 22, 1692. He wrote, Avantages incontestables de l'Eglise sur les Calvinsistes (Paris and Sens, 1673, 12mo): — Nouvelles Lumieres politiques, ou l'Evangile nouveau (1676 and 1687, 12mo: this work arrested the publication of a French translation of the History of the Council of Trent by Pallavicini, and went through a third edition under the title of Politique et Intrigues de la cour de Rome [1696, 12mo]): — L'eveque de cour oppose a l'eveque epostolique (Cologne, 1682, 2 vols, 12mo): — Lettre a Mme la duchesse de Guise sur la domination piscopale, etc. (1679,12mo). See Supplem. au Necrolog. de Port Royal, 1735; Dict. hist. des auteurs eccles.; Feller, Dict. hist.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 38:203. (J. N. P.)

## Lenormant, Charles[[@Headword:Lenormant, Charles]]

             a French archaeologist and numismatician, was born in Paris, June 1, 1802. In 1828 he travelled in Egypt, was in 1837 conservator at the national library, and after 1835 acted as Guizot's substitute at the Sorbonne, where his lectures, savoring too much of Romish orthodoxy, often caused disturbances, especially in 1846, so that he had finally to give up his lecturing. In 1848 he was called as professor of Egyptian archaeology at the Colldge de France, and died at Athens, November 24, 1859. Of his works we mention, Tresor de Numismatique et de Glyptique (1836-50, 5 volumes): Elite des Monuments Ceranzographiques (1844-57, 3 volumes). (B.P.)

## Lenormant, Francois[[@Headword:Lenormant, Francois]]

             son of Charles, was born in Paris, January 17, 1837. He pursued the same studies which distinguished his father. In 1862 he was sub-librarian of the Institute, in 1874 professor of atchaeology at the large Paris library, and  died December 10, 1883, leaving, Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient Jusqu' aux Guerres Inediques (3d ed. 1869, 3 volumes; transl. into German, Berlin, 1869, 2 volumes; 2d ed. 1871): — Lettres Assyriologiques et Epigraphiques (1871-72, 4 volumes): — Les Premieres Civilisations (1874, 2 volumes; Germ. transl. Jena, 1875): — Les Sciences Occultes en Asie (1874-75; Germ. transl. Jena, 1878), two parts; the first treating of La Magie chez les Chaldeens et les Origines Accadiennes; the second of La Divination et la Science des Presages chez les Chaldeens: — Les Origines de l'Histoire d'Apres la Bible et les Traditions des Peuples Orientaux (1880-82, 2 volumes; Engl. transl. New York, 1882): — Monnaies et Mdcailles (Paris, 1883). (B.P.)

## Lenox, James[[@Headword:Lenox, James]]

             a philanthropic layman, was born in New York city in August 1800. He graduated from Princeton College, studied law, and spent his life in literary pursuits and charity. Possessed of ample wealth, he founded the Lenox library in 1870, which is particularly rich in rare Bibles and other specialties, and gave large sums to public institutions of the Presbyterian Church, of which he was a member. He died in New York city, February 17, 1880.

## Lent[[@Headword:Lent]]

             the forty days' fast, is the preparation for Easter in the Western, Eastern, and Lutheran churches, and in the Church of England, and was instituted at a very early age of Christianity. In most languages the name given to this fast signifies the number of the days — Forty; but our word Lent signifies the Sparing Fast, for “Lenten-Tide” in the Anglo-Saxon language was the season of spring, in German Lenz. (For another etymology, SEE LENTILE. )

It is observed in commemoration of our Lord's fast in the wilderness (Matthew 4); and although he did not impose it on the world by an express commandment, yet he showed plainly enough by his example that fasting, which God had so frequently ordered in the old covenant, Twas also to be practiced by the children of the new. The observance of Lent was doubtless strongly confirmed by those words of the Redeemer in answer to the disciples of John the Baptist: “Can the children of the Bridegroom mourn as long as the Bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the Bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast” (Luk 5:34-35). Hence we find, in the Acts of the Apostles, that the disciples, after the foundation of the Church, applied themselves to fasting. In their epistles, also, they recommended it to the faithful. The primitive Christians seem to have considered Christ, in the above-mentioned passage, as alluding to the institution of a particular season of fasting and prayer in his future Church, and it was therefore only natural that they should have made this period of penitence to consist of forty days, seeing that our divine Master had consecrated that number by his own fast, and before him Moses and Elijah had done the same, it was even deduced from the forty years' staying of the Israelites in the desert (Augustine, Serms. 264, § 5). SEE FASTING,

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

But even at this comparatively late date there was no universal agreement in the practice of the Church in this matter, neither had fasts been established by law. Only later was the number of days (namely, forty) fixed  according to the Greek and Latin names (τεσσαρακόστη = quadragesima). But for a long time the Oriental and Occidental churches differed. As the former did not permit its members to fast on the Sabbath, their fast continued one week longer (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 1, 5, 100:22; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 5:24; Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 7:19). The custom, so far as it existed, had been silently introduced into the Church, and its observance was altogether voluntary at first. This fasting consisted in abstinence from food until three o'clock in the afternoon, but at a later period a custom was introduced, probably by the Montanists, affecting the kind of food to be taken, which was limited to bread, salt, and water.

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

“The rule of fasting for Lent varied greatly. It was usual to abstain from food altogether until evening, change of diet not being accounted sufficient. St. Ambrose exhorts men: Differ aliquantulum, non longe fines est diei' (Serm. 8 in Psalmn 118). The food, when taken, was to be of the simplest and least delicate kind, animal food and wine being prohibited. St. Chrysostom (Hom. 4 on Stat.) speaks of those who for two days abstained from food, and of others who refused not only wine and oil, but every other dish, and throughout Lent partook of bread and water only. The  Eastern Church, at the present day, observes a most strict rule of fasting. Wine and oil are allowed on Saturdays and Sundays, but even these days are only partially excepted from the restrictions of Lent. The discipline of Holy Week is exceedingly rigorous. During Lent corporeal punishment was forbidden by the laws of Theodosius the Great: ‘Nulla supplicia sint corporis quibus (diebus) absolutio expectatur animarum' (Cod. Theodos. 9, tit. 35, leg. 5.). Public games, and the celebration of birthdays and marriages, were also interdicted (Concil. Laodic. 51, 53). It was the special time for preparing catechumens for baptism, and most of St. Cyril's catechetical lectures were delivered during Lent. St. Chrysostom's celebrated Homilies on the Statutes were preached during this season. Daily instruction formed a part of the service, and holy communion was celebrated at least every Lord's day. The last week, the Holy or Great Week, was kept with still greater strictness and solemnity” (Blunt, Dict. Of Doctrinal and Historical Theology, p. 408).

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

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

1. The annual fast of forty days before Easter, or the Season of Lent. The duration of this fast at first was only forty hours (Tertull. De Jejun. 100:2, 13; Irenaeus, ap. Euseb. ist. Eccl. E . 5, 100:24). By the time of Gregory  the Great (in the 8th century) it had extended to thirty-six days, and it had beein so accepted by the Council of Nicaea; but by Gregory the Great, or by Gregory II, it was extended to forty days, the duration of the recorded fasts of Moses, Elias, and our blessed Savior (Exo 34:28; 1Ki 19:8; Mat 4:2). Hence the term Quadragesima (q.v.), — which had already been used to denote this period, became strictly applicable. Socrates (Hist. Eccl. 1. 7, 100:19), Basil the Great, Ambrode, and Leo the Great speak of this quadragesimal fast as a divine institution but this can mean no more than that the fast was observed in imitation of the example of the divine Redeemer (Concil. Genonsens. 100:7 — in canone apostolorum, 68: “Si quis Episcop., aut Presbyt., etc., sac. Quadragesimam Paschae, aut quartam feriam, aut Parasecevem non jejunaverit,” etc.: Concil. Coloniens. ii, pt. 9, Song of Solomon 6).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the English Church Lent was first commanded to be observed in England by Ercombert, seventh king of Kent, before the year 800. The Lenten fast does not embrace all the days included between Ash- Wednesday and Easter, for the Sundays are so many days above the  number of forty. They are excluded because the Lord's day is always held as a festival, and never as a fast. These six Sundays are therefore called Sundays in Lent, not Sundays of Lent. The principal days of Lent are the first day of Lent (Caput Jejunii, or Dies Cinerune), Ash Wednesday, and the Passion-week, particularly Thursday and Friday in that week. There is also a solemn service appointed for Ash-Wednesday, under the title of a “Commination or denounlcing of God's anger and judgments against sinners.” The last week of Lent, called Passion-week, has always been considered as its most solemn season. It is called the great week, for the important transactions which are then commemorated.

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

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

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

## Lentile[[@Headword:Lentile]]

             (only in the plural עֲדָשַׁים, adashim', prob. from an obsolete root signifying to fodder; Sept. φακός, Vulg. lens) is probably a correct rendering of the plant thus designated (Gen 25:34; 2Sa 17:28; 2Sa 23:11; Eze 4:9). In Syria lentiles are still called in Arabic addas (Russel, N. H. of Aleppo, 1:74). They appear to have been chiefly used for making a kind of pottage. The red pottage, for which Esau bartered his birthright, was of lentiles (Gen 25:29-34). The term red was, as with us, extended to yellowish-brown, which must have been the true color of the pottage if derived from lentiles, being that of the seeds rather than that of the pods, which were sometimes cooked entire (Mishna, Shabb. 7:4). The Greeks and Romans also called lentiles red (see  authorities in Celsius, Hieroboltalic. 1:105). Lentiles were among the provisions brought to David when he fled from Absalom (2Sa 17:28), and a field of lentiles was the scene of an exploit of one of David's heroes (2Sa 23:11). From Eze 4:9, it would appear that lentiles were sometimes used as bread (comp. Athen. 4:158).

This was doubtless in times of scarcity, or by the poor (compare Aristoph. Plut. 1005). Sonnini (Travels, p. 603) assures us that in southernmost Egypt, where corn is comparatively scarce, lentiles mixed with a little barley form almost the only bread in use among the poorer classes. It is called bettan, is of a golden yellow color, and is not bad, although rather heavy. In that country, indeed, probably even more than in Palestine, lentiles anciently, as now, formed a chief article of food among the laboring classes. This is repeatedly noticed by ancient authors; and so much attention was paid to the culture of this useful pulse that certain varieties became remarkable for their excellence (comp. Dioscor. 2:129). The lentiles of Pelusium, in the part of Egypt nearest to Palestine, were esteemed both in Egypt and foreign countries (Virgil, Georg. 1:228), and this is probably the valued Egyptian variety which is mentioned in the uishna (Kilnaim, 18:8) as neither large nor small. Large quantities of lentiles were exported from Alexandria (Augustine, Comm. in Psalms 46). Pliny, in mentioning two Egyptian varieties, incidentally lets us know that one of them was red (compare Diog. Laertius, 7:3), by remarking that they like a red soil, and by speculating whether the pulse may not have thence derived the reddish color which it imparted to the pottage made with it (Histor. Nattur. 18:12). This illustrates Jacob's red pottage. Dr. Shaw (1:257) also states that these lentiles easily dissolve in boiling, and form a red or chocolate- colored pottage mulch esteemed in North Africa and Western Asia (see Thomson, Land and Book, 1:409).

Dr. Kitto also says that he has often partaken of red pottage, prepared by seething the lentiles in water and then adding a little suet to give them a flavor, and that he found it better food than a stranger would imagine; “the mess,” he adds, “had the redness which gained for it the name of adorn” (Pict. Bible, Gen 25:30; Gen 25:34). Putting these facts together, it is likely that the reddish lentile, which is now so common in Egypt (Descript. de l'Egypte, 19:65), is the sort to which all these statements refer. The tomb-paintings actually exhibit the operation of preparing pottage of lentiles, or, as Wilkinson ( Anc. Egyptians, 2:387) describes it, “a man engaged in cooking lentiles for a soup or porridge; his companion brings a bundle of fagots for the fire, and the lentiles themselves are seen standing near him in wicker baskets.” The  lentiles of Palestine have been little noticed by travelers (e.g. Burckhardt, Arab. p. 51). Nau (Voyage Nouveau, p. 13) mentions lentiles along with corn and peas, as a principal article of traffic at Tortura; D'Arvieux (Mem. 2:237) speaks of a mosque, originally a Christian church, over the patriarchal tomb at Hebron, connected with which was a large kitchen where lentile pottage was prepared every day, and distributed freely to strangers and poor people, in memory of the transaction between Esau and Jacob, which they (erroneously) believe to have taken place at this spot. When Dr. Robinson was at Akabah, he says: “The commissary in the castle had also a few stores for sale at enormous prices, but we bought little except a supply of lentiles, or small beans, which are common in Egypt and Syria under the name of addas (the name in Hebrew and Arabic being alike) the same from which the pottage was made for which Esau sold his birthright. We found them very palatable, and could well conceive that, to a weary hunter faint with hunger, they might be quite a dainty” (Bib. Res. 1:146). Again, when at Hebron, on the 24th of May, he observes: “The wheat harvest here in the mountains had not yet arrived, but they were threshing barley, addas or lentiles, and also vetches, called by the Arabs kersuma, which are raised chiefly for camels” (Bib. Res. 2:242).

The lentile (Ervum lens of Linnaeus, class 17:3) is an annual plant, and the smallest of all the leguminosme which are cultivated. It rises with a weak stalk about eighteen inches high, having pinnate leaves at each joint composed of several pairs of narrow leaflets, and terminating in a tendril, which supports it by fastening about some other plant. The small flowers which come out of the sides of the branches on short peduncles, three or four together, are purple, and are succeeded by the short and flat legumes, which contain two or three flat round seeds, slightly curved in the middle (as indicated in the Latin lens, which optical science has appropriated as a name for circular glasses with spherical surfaces), and of a color varying from tawny red to almost black. The flower appears in May, and the seeds ripen in July. When ripe, the plants are rooted up if they have been sown along with other plants, as is sometimes done, but they are cut down when grown by themselves. They are threshed, winnowed, and cleaned like grain. There are three or four kinds of lentiles, all of which are still much esteemed in those countries where they are grown, viz., the south of Europe, Asia, and North Africa. The red lentile is a small kind, the seeds of which, after being decorticated, are commonly sold in the bazaars of India.  To the present day a favorite dish among the Portuguese and Spaniards is lentiles, mixed with their unfailing oil and garlic, and flavored with spices and aromatic herbs. In the absence of animal food, it is a great resource in Catholic countries during the season of Lent, and some say that from hence the season derives its name. It is occasionally cultivated in England, but only as fodder for cattle; it is also imported from Alexandria. From the quantity of gluten the ripe seeds contain, they must be highly nutritious, though they have the character of being heating if taken in large quantities. Under the high-sounding name “RIevalenta Arabica,” we pay a high price for lentile flour, and in various culinary preparations are unawares repeating Jacob's pottage (Playfair, Analysis; Hogg, Veg. Kingdom, p. 275). In Egypt the haulm is used for packing.

## Lentulus, Epistle Of[[@Headword:Lentulus, Epistle Of]]

             (Epistola Lentuli), is the well-known title of an apocryphal letter on the physical appearance of Christ, which the Romish Church receives as authentic, and as having been written by Publius Lentulus, a Roman of Palestine, and perhaps of Jerusalem, to Rome. . Manuscript copies of it are to be found, according to Job. Albert Fabricius (Cod. apocryph. Novi Testamenti, 1:302), in several libraries of England, France, and Italy (viz., in those of the Vatican and of Padua), Germany (at Augsburg and Jena, where two copies formerly existed, one of which was embellished with a fine image of Christ, and had been presented to the elector Frederick the Wise by pope Leo X). A librarian of Jena, Christopher Mylius (Memorab. biblioth. academ. Jesensis, Jen. 1746, 8vo, p. 301 sq.), states that this copy was written in golden letters upon red paper, very richly bound, and beautifully illustrated. This copy, however, is lost. The work was first printed in the Magdeburg Centuries (q.v.) (Basil. 1559), 1:344; it was then reproduced in Mich. Neandri Apocrypha (Basil. 1567), p. 410 sq., afterwards in Job. Jac. Grynsei Monumenta s. Patrum orthodoxographa (Basil. 1569, fol.). Joh. Reiskius, in Exercitatt. histor. de imaginibus Jes. Chr. rel. (Jen. 1685, 4to), gave a twofold version of it, one after Grynaeus, the other a reproduction of that described by Mylius. This epistle was highly regarded in former times; the papal legate, Jerome Xavier, translated it into Portuguese (in his history of Christ, a work full of legends and fables), and from this language it was subsequently translated into Persian; Reiske and Fabricius translated it into German, and published it at Nurenberg and at Erfurt. It is also to be found in a condensed form in the introduction to the works of archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, which,  though without date or name of place, are, from internal evidence, supposed to have been published at Paris towards the close of the 15th or the beginning of the 16th century; in this work it is accompanied by a description of the personal appearance of the Virgin Mary.

In the earliest ages of the Church the question of the personal appearance of Christ while on earth had begun to attract considerable attention. Had there been anything positively known on the subject then, it would certainly have been eagerly received. Yet, although the Church fathers Justin, Tertullian, Hegesippus. and Eusebius mention a letter of Pilate to Tiberius, one of Abgarus to Christ, and one of Jesus to Abgarus, they make no mention of any letter of Lentulus concerning Christ. On the contrary, during the first century, while the Christian Church was suffering persecution, the impression prevailed, derived from Isa 53:2-3, that the Lord's personal appearance was very unprepossessing. But as the Church grew in prosperity and power this idea underwent a complete change. Eusebius and Augustine are heard to complain that nothing is known as to the Lord's personal appearance. In the Middle Ages a directly opposite opinion from that of the ancients prevailed, and the Lord was considered as having been an eminently handsome man, which opinion was only based on the passage Psa 45:2. In the works of the Greek historian Nicephorus (surnamed Callistus Xanthopulus), who lived in the 14th century, and whom Weismann considers a credulous, uncritical writer, we find a description of Christ's personal appearance, for which, however, the writer gives no authority, saying only that it is derived from the ancients. As it greatly resembles that of Lentulus, and perhaps served as its basis, we give it here as a curiosity: ῾Ημέντοι διάπλασις τῆς μορφῆς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἐξ ἀρχαίων παρειλήφαμεν, τοία δέ τις ὠς ἐν τύπῳ παραλαβεῖν ῆν, ὠραῖος μὲν ῆν τὴν ὄψιν σφόδρα. Τήν γε μὲν ἡλικίαν εἰτ οῦν ἀναδρομὴν τοῦ σώματος, ἑπτὰ σπιθαμῶν ῆν τελείων. Ε᾿πίξανθον ἔχων τὴν τρίχα καὶ οὐ πάνυ δασεῖαν, μᾶλλον μὲν οῦν καὶ πρὸς τὸ οὔλον μετρίως πῶς ἀποκλίνουσαν, μελαίνας δἐ γε τὰς ὄφρυς εῖχε καὶ τὸ πάνυ ἐπικαμπεῖς, τοὺς δὲ ὀφθαλμοὺς χαρόπουςτινὰς καὶ ἤρμα (sic !) ἐπιξανθίζοντας, εὐοφθαλμὸς δ᾿ην καὶ ἐπίῤῥιν τὴν μέντοι τρίχα τοῦ πωγῶνος ξανθὴν τινὰ εῖχε, καὶ οὐκ εἰς πολὺ καθειμένην. Μακροτέραν δὲ τὴν τρὶχα κεφαλῆς περιέφερεν οὐδέποτε γὰρ ξυρὸς ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ χεῖρ ἀνθρώπου, πλὴν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ νηπιάζοντιος. ῎Ηρεμα ἐπικλινὴς τὴν αὐχένα, ὡς μηδὲ πάνυ ὀρδίου, καὶ εὐτεταμένην ἔχειν τἡν ἡλικίαν τοῦ σώματος σιτόχρουςδὲ καὶ οὐ στρογγύλην ἔχων τὴν ὄφιν ἐτύγχανεν, ἀλλ᾿ éσπερ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ  μικρὸν ὑποκαταβαίνουσαν, ὀλίγον δὲ ἐπιφοινισσομένην, ὅσον ὑποφαίνεν τὸ σεμνόν το καὶ τὸ σύνετον τοῦ ἤθους καὶ ἣμερον καὶ τὸ κατάπαξ ἀόργητον. Κατὰ πάντα δὲ ῆν ἐμφερὴς τῇ δείᾷ καὶ πανασπίλῳ ἐκείνου μητρί. Ταῦτα μὲν ἐντούτοις. Compare the articles CHRIST, IMAGES AND PORTRAITS OF; JESUS CHRIST (II, 11, in vol. 4, p. 884). The same tendency prevailed also in the Western Church until the Reformation, when Luther took a more reasonable view of the question, saying, “It is very possible that some may have been as handsome, physically, as Christ. Perhaps some were even handsomer, for we do not see it mentioned that the Jews ever wondered at his beauty.” The same view was taken by a Roman Catholic writer (Il libro de forma Christi, Paris, 1649), who said that the Redeemer was not either ill favored nor more handsome than other men. In other cases, however, the Roman Catholic Church has retained the ideas presented in the epistle of Lentulus.

If we now look more closely into this epistle of Lentulus, we find in the edition of Grynaeus (Monum. orthodoxographa) that it reads, “Lentulus, Hierosolymitanorum Preses, S. P. Q. Romano S.: Apparuit temporibus nostris et adhuc est homo magne virtutis, nominatus Christus Jesus, qui dicitur a gentibus propheta veritatis, quem ejus discipuli vocant filium Dei, suscitans mortuos et sanans languores [MS. Vatic. “languentes”]. Homo quidem staturie procerme [Goldast. addit. “scilicet xv palmorum et medii”], spectabilis, vultum habens venerabilem, quem intuentes possunt et diligere et formidare: Capillos vero circinos, crispos aliquantum caeruliores et fulgentiores [MS. 1 Jen. “Capillos habens coloris nucis avellanae praema.turme et planos usque ad aures, ab nuribus vero circinos, crispos aliquantulum ceruliores (t fulgentiores”], ab humeris volitantes [omnes alii: “ventilantes”], discrimen habens in medio capitis juxta-norem Nazarenorum [Centur. Magd. et Anselmi opp. ‘Nazaraeorum"]: frontem planam et serenissimam, cu i facie sine ruga (ac) macula aliqua, quam rubor moderatus venustat. Nasi et oris nulla prorsus est reprelensio, nbarba habens copiosam et rubram [fere omn ss alii: “impuberem”], capillorum colore, non longam ssd bifurcatam [omnes addunt: “adspectum habet simplicem et maturum”], oculis variis et claris existentibus. In increpatione terribilis, in admonitione placidus [plurimi alii: “blandus”] et amabilis, hilaris servata gravitate, qui nunquam visus est ridere, flere autem saepe. Sic in statura corporis propagatus [plurimi alii addunt: “et rectus”] manus habens et membra [ceteri omnes: “brachia”] visu delectabilia in eloquio [rectius ceteri: colloquio”] gravis, rarus et modestus speciosus inter filios hominum. Valete [Hoc Valete deest in reliquis MSS. et edd.].”  The very contents of the letter are sufficient evidence of its spuriousness. Had it really been written by a Roman, it would not have been addressed to the senate, but to the emperor, who was the immediate master of the Syrian provinces. It appears that this objection was already noticed in former times, for in the Magdeburg Centuries it is said to have been addressed to the emperor Tiberius. A fact of still greater importance is that Lentulus designated as Hierosolymitanorum praeses. No such office existed. There was a Praeses Syriae and a Procurator Judaeae but no Praises of the Roman inhabitants at Jerusalem.

For this reason he is called in the Manuscr. Jen. 1, Proconsul in partibus Judaeae, and in the Manuscr. Vatic. and Jen. 2, in a thoroughly Roman Catholic manner, Officialis in provinicia Judaea, while there was no such office known in one at that period. But he is nowhere represented as a friend of Pilate, as Zimmermann attempts to make him in his Lebensgeschichte d. Kirche Christi, 1:70. We know most of the proconsuls or presides of Syria, and all the procurators of Judaea. but none of them was nalmed Lentulus. In the classics there are forty-three persons of that name mentioned, but four only belonged to the times of Tiberius. One of them only, Enaeus Lentulus Gaetulicus, was, according to Tacitus (Ann. 4:46), in the year 26, consul with Tiberius, and in 34 was the chief of the legions in upper Germany (Tacitus, Annal. 6:30); he may, indeed, according to Suetonius (Calig. c. 8) and Pliny (Epist. 5:3), have been in Judaea during the years 26 to 33, but there is no proof of it. On the other hand, the Lentulus who wrote the epistle is expressly called in the MS. Jen. 1, Putblius. Moreover, there is no mention at all made of the epistle by any of the ancient writers, whilst other epistles, even some of an apocryphal nature, are mentioned by them, and this one, had it then been known, would certainly have attracted the attention of the apologists at a time when the general impression was so strong against the fine personal appearance of the Lord. Nicephorus Xanthopulus, whose description of Christ's personal appearance we gave above, states only that it is based on old traditions, while, if such a description as that given in the Epistle of Lentulus had been known in the Greek Church in the 14th century, he would certainly not have failed to quote it as an authority.

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

Having thus seen how this epistle carries within itself the proofs of its spuriousness, the question arises, When was it written? If it were included in the works of Anselm, we would have to consider it as having been composed in the 11th century. Yet it is simply appended to the works of this author, and was never made use of until the 15th century, to give favor  to an opinion which the monks had an interest to propagate. Laurentius Valla, who lived in the 15th century, was the first who made any mention of it in his argument against the pseudo donation of Constantine. A postscript of great interest is appended to the 2d Jena MS., and it, in our estimation, tends to reveal the true character of the work: “Explicit epistola Jacobi de Columpna anno Domini 1421 reperit earn in annalibus Romge, in libro antiquissimo in Capitolio ex dono Patriarchye Constantinopolitani.” If this postscript is to be relied on, this epistle was sent to Rome in the 14th century by a patriarch of Constantinople as a present, just as it was afterwards sent to the elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony by pope Leo. But as from Constantinople there were generally sent Greek MSS. only. and as there is no mention made of the name of the patriarch supposed to have sent it, and as, moreover, the work is claimed to be a very old one, it is most likely that this description is a Latin translation of that of Nicephorus, which we gave above, that the translator added the postscript with the intention of rendering his spurious work more credible, and that consequently both epistle and postscript are spurious.

The imitator or translator of Nicephorus, who gives ample proofs in his work of the source whence he drew when he speaks of the stature of Christ (in a copy in Goldast we find, after statura procerus, “scilicet xv palmorun et medii"), gave the work the form of an epistle, and gave it the name of Lentulus, taken from some tradition, or which otherwise seemed suitable to him. It is now evident that the epistle could only have been written at some time after Nicephorus, and before the year 1500, consequently in the 14th century. Dr. Edward Robinson, after carefully examining all the evidences for and against the authenticity of this work, thus presents the results of his inquiry — “In favor of the authenticity of the letter we have only the purport of the inscription. There is no external evidence whatever. Against its authenticity we have the great discrepancies and contradictions of the inscription; the fact that no such official person as Lentulus existed at the time and place specified, nor for many years before and after; the utter silence of history in respect to the existence of such a letter; the foreign and later idioms of its style; the contradiction in which the contents of the epistle stand with established historical facts; and the probability of its having been produced at some time not earlier than the 11th century.” See Joh. Bened. Carpzov, Theologi Helmstadiensis progsramma: de oris et corporis Jesu Christi, etc. (Helmstadt, 1774, 4to); Joh. Philippians Gabler, Theologus Altofjensis an. 1819 and 1822 in Authentiam epistole ublii Lentuli cad Senatum Romanum de Jesu Christo scripptce; Herzog, Real-  Encyklopädie, 8:292 sq.; Dr. Robinson in Biblical Repository, 2:367; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3:569; Jamieson, Ourlord, 1:35; Friends' Review, March 3, 1867, p. 769 sq. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Leo I[[@Headword:Leo I]]

             saint and pope, surnamed the Great, noted as the real founder of the papacy, was born about the year 390, though the exact date is not ascertained. We have also no precise information as to his birthplace; for while the liber pontificalis describes him as a Tuscan,. and names Quintianus as his father, Quesnel, on the authority of an expression in one of Leo's own letters. (31:4), and an account of his election by a certain Prosper, stated that he was born at Rome, and this opinion has been accepted without further inquiry by most subsequent ecclesiastical writers. While yet an acolyte, Leo was dispatched, in A.D. 418, to Carthage, for the purpose of conveying to Aurelius and the other African bishops the sentiments of Zosimus concerning the Pelagian doctrines of Coelestius (q.v.). Under Celestine (q.v.) he discharged the duties of a deacon; and the reputation. even then (431) enjoyed by him is clearly indicated by the terms of the epistle prefixed to the seven books De Incarnatione Christi of Cassianus, who at his request had undertaken this work against the Nestorian heresy. About this time he was applied to by Cyril of Alexandria to settle a difficulty between Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, and the primate of the ecclesiastical province of Jerusalem. Having obtained a great reputation for his knowledge, energy, and untiring activity, he failed not to secure the full confidence of Sixtus III (432. 440), to whom he rendered  valuable service. in several. important offices entrusted to him. Attracting also the notice of Valentinian III, he undertook, by request of this emperor, a mission to Gaul, to soothe the formidable dissensions existing between the two generals Aetius and Albinus. While Leo was engaged in this delicate negotiation, which was conducted with singular prudence and perfect success, Sixtus III died, Aug. 3, 440, and by the unanimous voice of the clergy and laity the absent deacon Leo was chosen to fill the vacant seat. Envoys were at once sent to Gaul to apprise him of his election, and having returned to Rome he was duly installed, Sept. 29,440.

Both the State and the Church were then in a critical position; the former in consequence of the frequent invasions of barbarians; the Church through its inner dissensions and quarrels. From the earliest ages until this epoch no man who combined lofty ambition with commanding intellect and political dexterity had presided over the Roman see; and although its influence had gradually increased, and many of its bishops had sought to extend and confirm that influence, yet they had merely availed themselves of accidental circumstances to augment their own personal authority, without acting upon any distinct and well — devised scheme. But Leo, while he zealously watched over his own peculiar flock, concentrated all the powers of his energetic mind upon one great design, which he seems to have formed at a very early period, and which he kept steadfastly in view during a long and eventful life, following it out with consummate boldness, perseverance, and talent. This was nothing less than the establishment of the “apostolic chair” as a spiritual supremacy over every branch of the Catholic Church, and the exclusive appropriation for its occupant of the title of Papa, or father of the whole Christian world.

Leo may therefore be regarded as the precursor of Gregory the Great, and in this respect certainly deserved the surname of Great, which was given him. The evil days amid which his lot was cast were not unfavorable, as might at first sight be supposed, to such a project. The contending parties among the orthodox clergy, terrified by the rapid progress of Arianism, were well disposed to refer their minor disputes to arbitration. Leo, who well knew, from the example of his predecessor Innocent I, that the transition is easy from instruction to command, in the numerous and elaborate replies which he addressed to inquiries proceeding from various quarters, studiously adopted a tone of absolute infallibility, and assumed the right of enforcing obedience to his decisions as an unquestionable prerogative of his office, deriving authority for such a position from the relation of Peter to Christ and to the other apostles. He represented Peter as most intimately connected with Christ: “Petrum in  consortium individine unitatis assumtum, id quod ipse erat, voluit nominari dicendo: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, ut oeterni templi aedificatio, mirabili munere gratia dei, in Petri soliditate consisteret; hac ecclesiam suam firmitate corroborans, ut illam nec humana temeritas posset appetere, nec portue contra illam inferi pravalerent” (Letters, 10:1). This community of person into which the Lord received Peter is then made to extend into a community of power: “Q Quia tu es Petrus, i.e. cum ego sim lapis angularis, qui facio utraque unum, ego fundamentum, prmeter quod nenmo potest aliud ponere; tamen tu quoque petra es, quia mea virtute solidaris, et qua mihi potestate sunt propria, sint tibi mecume participatione communia” (Letters, 4:2). Peter had been received into the community of person with the Lord as a reward for his recognition and worship of Christ: true, he had denied his Master, but this the Lord had intentionally permitted to happen. But, in comparison with the other apostles, he possessed not only all that every one of them did, but also much that the others did not (Letters, 4:2), and was their original chief: “Transivit quidem etiam in alios apostolos jus potestatis istius (ligandi et solvendi) et ad omnes ecclesie principes decreti hujus constitutio commeavit, sed non frustra uni commendatur, quod omnibus intimetur. Petro enim ideo hoc singulariter creditur, qui cunctis ecclesiae rectoribus Petri forma preeponitur.” It is only in him that the apostles were entrusted with their mission — in him they are all saved; and it is for this reason that the Lord takes special care of hinm, and that his faith is prayed for specially, “tanquam aliorum status certior sit futurus, si meus principis victa non fuerit.” After identifying the Church with the incarnation of Christ, Leo identifies Peter with Christ. This primacy of Peter continues, therefore, for while the faith of Peter is retained, all the privileges attached to this faith in Peter remain also.

This primacy continues among the followers of Peter, for they hold the same relation towards Peter that Peter held towards Christ; as Christ was in Peter, so is Peter in his successors; it is still Peter who, through them, fulfills the command of Christ, "Feed my sheep!" — “Christus tantam potentiam dedit ei, quem totius ecclesiae principem fecit, ut si quid etiam nostris temporibus recte per nos agitur recteque disponitur, illius operibus, illius sit gubernaculis deputandum, cui dictum est: Et tu conversus confirma fratres tuos” (Sermon. 4:4). While affecting the utmost humility when speaking of himself personally as unworthy of his high office, he speaks of that office itself as the most exalted station.  It was more difficult for Leo, however, to prove that the bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter. Rome, says Leo, has been glorified by the death of the two greatest apostles, Peter and Paul, who brought the Gospel to the Eternal City; and Leo claims to discover a special Providence in this coming of Peter to Rome, so that that city should through him and in him become the center of the Christian world. “Ut hujus enarrabills gratise (incarnationis) per totum mundum diffunderetur effectus, Romanum regnum divina providentia praeparavit; cujus ad eos limites incrementa perducta sunt, quibus cunctarum undique gentium vicina et contigua esset universitas. Disposito namque divinitus operi maxime congruebat, ut multa regna uno confederarentur imperio et cito pervios haberet populos praedicatio generalis, quos unius teneret regimen civitatis” (Serm. 82:2). Here, finding dogmatical arguments unavailable for his purpose, Leo turns to history, which he arranges to suit himself. With regard now to the relation existing between the bishop of Rome and the other bishops, Leo says expressly, “All the bishops have indeed the same office, but not the same power. For even among the apostles, although they were all called apostles, there existed a remarkable distinction, for one only, Peter, held the first rank. From this results the difference among the bishops. It is a fundamental law of the Church that all have not the equal right to express all things, but that in each province there is one (the bishop of the principal place in the province) who has the first voice among his brethren. Again, those who occupy more important sees (the metropolitans of dioceses) have still greater power.

But the direction of the whole Church is the care of the chair of St. Peter, and no one can take anything away from him who is the head of all.” Potent but unconscious instruments in forwarding Leo's ambitious schemes were found in the barbarian chiefs whose power was not yet consolidated, and who were eager to propitiate one who possessed such weight with the priesthood, and through them could either calm into submission or excite to rebellion an ignorant and fanatic multitude. But, though the minds of men were in some degree prepared and disposed to yield to such domination, it was scarcely to be expected that the efiort should not provoke jealousy and resistance. A strong opposition was speedily organized both in the West and in the East, and soon assumed the attitude of open defiance. In the West the contest was brought to an issue by the controversy with Hilary of Aries, SEE HILARIUS ARELATENSIS, concerning the deposition of Chelidonius, bishop of Vesontio (Besanon), who had married a widow, which was forbidden by the canons. Chelidonius appealed to Leo, who reinstated him in his see. Hilary was  summoned to Rome upon several charges brought against him by other bishops of Gaul, to whom his severity was obnoxious; and Leo obtained a rescript from the emperor Valentinian III suspending Hilary from his episcopal office. This suspension, however, does not appear to have been lasting, although the fact has been taken hold of by controversial writers as a stretch of jurisdiction in the see of Rome. Quesnel published a dissertation upon this controversy in his edition of the works of Leo (Paris, 1675). The total defeat and severe punishment of the Gallican bishop filled his supporters with terror, and the edict of Valentinian served as a sort of charter, in virtue of which the Roman bishops exercised for centuries undisputed jurisdiction over France, Spain, Germany, and Britain. In the East the struggle was much more complicated and the result much less satisfactory. The archimandrite Eutyches (q.v.), in his vehement denunciation of Nestorius. having been betrayed into errors, very different, indeed, but considered equally dangerous, was anathematized, deposed, and excommunicated, in A.D. 448, by the synod of Constantinople. Against this sentence he sought redress by soliciting the interference of the bishops of Alexandria and Rome.

His cause was eagerly espoused by the former. As for Leo, he wrote to the patriarch Flavianus (q.v.), telling him that “he had been informed of the disturbances which had taken place in the Church of Constantinople by the emperor, and was surprised that Flavianus had not at once written to him about it, and informed him thereof before the subject had been disclosed to any one else.” Leo also informed Flavianus that he had received a letter from Eutyches complaining that his excommunication had been without just cause, and that his appeal to Rome had not been considered. Flavianus was to send to Rome a competent envoy, with full information of all the particulars of the case, to render final judgment in the matter. In a case like the present, says Leo, in his conclusion, the first thing of all to be attended to is “ut sine strepitu concertationum et custodiatur caritas et veritas defendatur.” In a letter of the same date to the emperor, Leo rejoices that Theodosius has not only a royal, but also a priestly heart, and carefully guarded against schism, for “the state also is in the best condition when the holy Trinity is worshipped in unity.” Meanwhile a general council was summoned to be held on the 1st of August, 449, at Ephesus, and thither the ambassadors of Leo repaired, for the purpose of reading publicly the above letter to Flavianus. But a great majority of the congregated fathers, acting under control of the president, Dioscurus of Alexandria, refused to listen to the document, passed tumultuously a series of resolutions favorable to Eutyches,  excommunicated the most zealous of his opponents, and not only treated the Roman envoys with indignity, but even offered violence to their persons. Hence this assembly, whose acts were all subsequently annulled, is known in ecclesiastical history as the Synoldus Latrocinalis.

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

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

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

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

II. EPISTOLAE. — These, extending to the number of 173, are addressed to the reigning emperors and their consorts, to synods, to religious communities, to bishops and other dignitaries, and to sundry influential personages connected with the ecclesiastical history of the times. They afford an immense mass of most valuable information on the prevailing heresies, controversies, and doubts on matters of doctrine, discipline, and Church government. Besides the 96 Sermones and 173 Epistolae mentioned above, a considerable number of tracts have from time to time  been ascribed to this pope, but their authenticity is either so doubtful or their spuriousness so evident that they are now universally set aside. A list of these, and an investigation of their origin, will be found in the edition of the brothers Ballerini, more particularly described below. In consequence of the reputation deservedly gained by Leo, his writings have always been eagerly studied. But, although a vast number of MSS. are still in existence, none of these exhibit his works in a complete form, and no attempt seems to have been made to bring together any portion of them for many hundred years after his death. The Sermones were dispersed in the Lectionaria, or select discourses of distinguished divines, employed in places of public worship until the 11th century, when they first began to be picked out of these cumbrous storehouses and transcribed separately, while the Epistolae were gradually gathered into imperfect groups, or remained embodied in the general collections of papal constitutions and canons.

Of the numerous printed editions of Leo I's works, the first was published by Sweynheym and Pannartz (Rome, 1470, fol.), under the inspection of Andrew, bishop of Aleria, comprising 92 Sermones and 5 Epistole. The best two editions were published at Paris (1675, 2 vols. 4to) by Pasquier Quesnel and by the Ballerini (Verona, 1755-57, 3 vols. fol.). Of Quesnel's edition it is due to say that, by the aid of a large number of MSS., preserved chiefly in the libraries of France, he was enabled to introduce such essential improvements into the text, and by his erudite industry illustrated so clearly the obscurities in which many of the documents were involved, that the works of Leo now for the first time assumed an unmutilated, intelligible, and satisfactory aspect. But the admiration excited by the skill with which the arduous task had been executed soon received a check. Upon attentive perusal the notes and dissertations were found to contain such free remarks upon many of the opinions and usages of the primitive Church, and, above all, to manifest such unequivocal hostility to the despotism of the Roman see, that the volumes fell under the ban of the Inquisition very shortly after their publication, and were included in the Index Librorum Prohibitorurn of 1682.

Notwithstanding these denunciations, the book enjoyed great popularity, and was reprinted, without any suppression or modification of the obnoxious passages, at Lyons, in 1700. Hence the heads of the Romish Church became anxious to supply an antidote to the poison so extensively circulated. This undertaking was first attempted by Peter Cacciari, a Carmelite monk of the Propaganda, whose labors (S. Leonis Magni Opera omnia [Rome, 1753-  1755, 2 vols. fol. ]; Exercitationes in Universa S. Leonis Magni Opera [Rome, 1751, fol.]) might have attracted attention and praise had they not been, at the very moment when they were brought to a close, entirely thrown into the shade by those of the brothers Peter and Jerome Ballerini, presbyters of Verona. Their edition, indeed, is entitled to take the first place, both on account of the purity of the text, corrected from a great number of MSS., chiefly Roman, not before collated, the arrangement of the different parts, and the notes and disquisitions. A full description of these volumes, as well as of those of Quesnel and Cacciari, is to be found in Schonemann (Bibl. Patrumn Lat. vol. ii, § 42), who has bestowed more than usual care upon this section. See Maimbourg, Histoire da Pontificat de Leon (Paris, 1687,4to); Arendt, Leo d. Grosse (Mainz, 1835, 8vo); Gesch. d. Romans Literat. (Suppl. Band. 2d part, § 159-162); Alex. de Saint-Cheron, Histoire du Pontificat de St. Leon le Grand et de son siecle (2 vols. 8vo.); Ph. de Mornay, Histoire Pontificals (1612, 12mo, p. 71); Bruys, Hist. des Papes (La Haye, 1732, 5 vols. 4to), 1:218; Baronius, Annales Ecclesiastici (Lucques, 1738, 19 vols. fol.), 7:535-638; 8:1-240; G. Bertazzolo, Breve Descrittione della Vita di san Leone primo et di Attila Flagello di Dio (Mantua, 1614, 4to); Gfrörer, Kirchengesch. 2:1; E. Perthel, Pabst Leo's I Leben u. Lehren (1843); C. T. Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, vol. 2; Milman, Hist. Latin Christianity, vol. 1, ch. 4; Neander, Church History, 2:104, 169 sq., 508 sq., 708 sq.; Dumoulin, Vie et Religion de deux bons Papes Leon I et Gregoire I (1650); Baxmann, Politik der Papste, 1:13 sq. Lea, Studies in Ch. Hist. (Philippians 1869, 8vo: see its Index); Riddle, Hist. Papacy, 1:171 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 17:90 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 8:296-311; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Myth. 2:746 sq.; Migne, Nouv. Encyc. Theol. 2:1152; Bergier, Dict. de Theol. 4:34 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Generale, 30:704 -708; Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Christian Remembrancer. 1854, p. 291 sq.

## Leo II[[@Headword:Leo II]]

             Pope, was born at Cedelle, in Sicily, in the early part of the 7th century. He became first canon regular, then cardinal priest, and finally pope, as successor of Agatho. Although his predecessor had died in January of the same year, he was installed as late as August, 682, by the emperor Constantine V, as “the most holy and blessed archbishop of old Rome, and universal pope.” The reasons of this delay are unknown. Soon after his election Constantine requested him to send to Constantinople an  ambassador, with full authority to decide at once on all questions of dogmas and canons, and other ecclesiastical interests. But Leo, perceiving the aim of the request, sent only a sub-deacon, who would not act in matters of any importance without first consulting with Rome. He also immediately assembled a synod to approve of the acts of the sixth oecumenical council held at Constantinople in 681, which had been brought to Rome by the legates of Agatho. In 683 he sent a legate to Constantine, with a letter anathematizing the heresy of the Monothelites, and also pope Honorius (625-638), “who, instead of purifying the Apostolic Church by the doctrines of the apostles, has come near overthrowing the faith by his treason” (Labbe, Conc. 6:1246). Leo sought to induce all the churches to accept the decisions of that council, and for that purpose translated them from Greek into Latin, sending a copy of them in the latter language to the Spanish bishops. He appears also to have given his ambassador four letters, somewhat similar as to their contents (see Mansi, 11:1050-1058), addressed to the bishops of Ostrogothia, count Simplicius, king Erwig, and the metropolitan bishop Quiricus of Toledo, expressing his wish that all the bishops of Spain would endorse the acts of the Council of Constantinople. In these letters he says: “Honorius has falsified the inviolable rule of apostolic succession which he had received from his predecessors.” Baronius, wishing to rehabilitate Leo, denies the authenticity of these letters, while Pagi attempts to uphold it; Gfrörer (Kirchengesch. vol. 3, pt. 1, p. 397 sq.) also maintains their genuineness, and adduces in proof of it their corresponding precisely with the decisions of the fourteenth Council of Toledo. Leo also obtained from Constantine a promise that after the death of the titular archbishop of Ravenna his successors should, according to an old custom fallen into disuse, come to Rome to be consecrated. In exchange for this concession, Leo relieved the see of Ravenna from the obligation of paying the taxes formerly levied on the occasion of such consecration. Leo was a great friend of Church music, and did much towards improving the Gregorian chant. He built a church to St. Paul, and is said to have originated the custom of sprinkling the people with holy water. He died in July, 683: the exact date is not ascertained, and the Roman Catholic Church commemorates him on the 28th of June. See Dupin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. 5:105; Platina, Historia delle Vite dei Sommni Pontusci; Ciaconius, Vitae Res gestce Pontificum Romanorum (Romans 1677, 4 vols. folio), 1:478; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:311; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 30:708; laxmann, Politik der Papste, 1:185;  Bower, History of the Popes, 3:134 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:300.

## Leo III[[@Headword:Leo III]]

             Pope, who brought about the elevation of the Frankish king to the position of emperor of the West, and thus relieved the Recman pontificate of further subjection to the Greek emperors, was a native of the Eternal City, and was elected after the death of Adrian 1, Dec. 25, 795, Immediately after his election be communicated the intelligence to Charlemagne, and, like his predecessors acknowledged allegiance. Charlemagne replied by a letter of congratulation, which he entrusted to the abbot Angilbertus, whom he commissioned to confer with the new pontiff respecting the relations between the see of Rome and the “Patrician of the Romans,” for this was the title which Charlemagne had assumed. In 796 Leo sent to Charlemagne the keys of St. Peter and the standard of the city of Rome, requesting the king to send some of his nobles to administer the oath of allegiance to the people of Rome, and thus the dominion of Charlemagne was extended over the city and duchy of Rome. In the year 799, an atrocious assault, the motive of which is not clearly ascertained, was committed on the person of the pope. While Leo was riding on horseback, followed by the clergy, and chanting the liturgy, a canon by the name of Paschal and a sacristan called Campulus. accompanied by many armed ruffians, fell upon him, threw him from his horse, and dragged him into the convent of St. Sylvester, when they stabbed him in many places, endeavoring to put out his eyes and cut out his tongue.

Leo, however, was delivered by his friends from the hands of the assassins, and taken to Spoleti under the protection of the duke of Spoleti, where he soon after recovered; thence he traveled as far as Paderborn in Germany, where Charlemagne then was, by whom the pope was received with the greatest honors. Charlemagne sent him back to Rome with a numerous escort of bishops and counts, and also of armed men. The pope was met outside of the city gates by the clergy, senate, and people, and accompanied in triumph to the Lateran palace. A court composed of the bishops and counts proceeded to the trial of the conspirators who had attempted the life of the pope, and the two chiefs, Paschal and Campulus, were exiled to France. From this very lenient sentence and other concomitant circumstances, it appears that Charlemagne had greatly at heart the conciliation of the Romans in general, in order to deter them from betaking themselves again to the protection of the Greek emperors. In 800 Charlemagne himself visited Italy, and was met  at Nomentum, outside of Rome, by the pope, and the next day he repaired to the Basilica of the Vatican, escorted by the soldiers and the people. After a few days Charlemagne convoked a numerous assembly of prelates, abbots, and other persons of distinction, Franks as well as Romans, to examine certain charges brought against the pope by the partisans of Paschal and Campulus, but no proofs were elicited, and Leo himself, taking the book of gospels in his hand, declared himself innocent. On Christmas- day of that year the pontiff officiated in the Basilica of the Vatican, in presence of Charlemagne and his numerous retinue. As Charlemagne was preparing to leave the church, the pontiff stopped him, and placed a rich crown upon his head, while the clergy and the people, at the same moment, cried out “Carolo piissimo,” “Augusto magno imperatori,” with other expressions and acclamations which were wont to be used in proclaiming Roman emperors.

Three times the acclamations were repeated, after which the pope was the first to pay homage to the new emperor. From that time Charlemagne left off the titles of king and patrician, and styled himself Augustus and emperor of the Romans, and he addressed the emperor of Constantinople by the name of brother. Thus was the Western empire revived 325 years after Odoacer had deposed Romulus Augustulus, the last nominal successor of the Caesars on the throne of the West. From that time all claim of the Eastern emperors to the supreme dominion over the duchy of Rome was at an end, and the popes from the same date assumed the temporal authority over the city and duchy, in subordination, however, to Charlemagne and his successors; they began, also, to coin money, with the pontiff's name on one side and that of the emperor on the other. In 804 the pope, during Christmas, visited Charlemagne at his court at Aquisgrana (Aix-la-Chapelle). In the division which Charlemagne made by will of his dominions among his sons, the city of Rome was declared to belong to him who should bear the title of emperor. Louis le Debonnaire was afterwards invested with that title by Charlemagne himself, and we find him accordingly, after the death of his father, assuming the supreme jurisdiction over that city on the occasion of a fresh conspiracy which broke out against Leo, the heads of which were convicted by the ordinary courts of Rome, and put to death.

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

## Leo IV[[@Headword:Leo IV]]

             Pope, was a native of Rome, and succeeded Sergius II in 847. He was hastily elected, and consecrated without waiting for the consent of the emperor Lotharius, because Rome was then threatened by the Saracens, who occupied part of the duchy of Benevento, and who a short time before had landed on the banks of the Tiber, and plundered the basilica of St. Peter's on the Vatican, which was outside of the walls. Leo's consecration, however, was undertaken with the express reservation of the emperor's rights, and when, in order to prevent a recurrence of the violence of the Saracens, Leo undertook to surround the basilica and the suburb about it with walls, the emperor sent money to assist in the work. The building of this Roman suburb occupied four years, and it was named after its founder, Civitas Leonina. Leo also restored the town of Porta, on the Tiber, near its mouth, settling there some thousands of Corsicans, who had run away from their country on account of the Saracens. Towers were built on both  banks of the river, and iron chains drawn across to prevent the vessels of the Saracens from ascending to Rome. The port and town of Centum Cellhe being forsaken on account of the Saracens, Leo built a new town on the coast, about twelve miles distant from the other, which was called Leopolis; but no traces of it remain now, as the modern Civita Vecchia is built on or near the site of old Centum Cellae. Leo IV held a council at Rome in 853, in which Anastasius, cardinal of St. Marcel, was deposed for having remained five years absent from Rome, notwithstanding the orders of the pope. Leo died in July, 855, and fifteen days after his death Benedict III was elected in his place, according to the most authentic text of Anastasius, who was a contemporary; but later writers introduce between Leo IV and Benedict III the fabulous pope Joan (q.v.). Leo has left us two entire epistles, as also fragments of several others, and a good homily, which are contained in Labbe's Cone. See Baronius, Annal. 14:340; Ciaconius, 1:614; Gfrörer, Kirchengeschichte, 3:1, 2; Baxmann, Politik d. Papste, 1:281, 352; Lea, Studies in Ch. History, p. 61, 91; Riddle, Hist. of Papacy, 1:336 sq.; Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 96; Labbe, Concil. 9:995; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 2:220 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:312; Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. 2:77; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 30:711; English Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Leo IX[[@Headword:Leo IX]]

             (BRUNO), Pope, bishop of Toul, was born in Alsace in 1002, and was cousin-german of the emperor Conrad the Salic. He was noted for great scholarly attainments, and was elected in 1049 to succeed Damasus II, at the joint recommendation of the emperor Henry III and of the famous Hildebrand (afterwards Gregory VII), who became one of Leo IX's most trusted advisers and guides. Indeed, it has often been a matter of comment that the reign of Leo IX was rather Gregorian in tendency. Leo was continually in motion between Germany and Italy, holding councils and endeavoring to reform the discipline and morals of the clergy, and also to check the progress of the Normans in Southern Italy, against whom he led an army, but was defeated in Apulia and taken prisoner by the Normans, who treated him with great respect, but kept him for more than a year in Benevento. Having made peace with them by granting to them as a fief of the Roman see their conquests in Apulia and Calabria, he was allowed to return to Rome, where he died in 1054, and was succeeded by Victor II. Among the councils held by Leo IX, one was convened at Rome (1050) against Berengar (q.v.), and in favor of Lanfranc (q.v.). Another important council held during his pontificate was that of Rheims in 1049, where many laws were enacted against simony, clerical matrimony, and the conditions and relations of monks and priests. Labbe and Cossart's Conc. contain nineteen letters of this pope (9:949-1001). See Baronius, Annsl. 17:19- 107; Muratori, Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, 3:277, 278; Gfr6rer, Kirchengeschichte, 4:1; Höfler, Die deutschen Pabste, 2:3-214; Baxmann, Politik dera Papste, 1:359 sq.; 2:191 sq.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, v. 164 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2:105 sq.; Hunkler, Leo IX u.s. Zeit (Mayence, 1851); Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 3:240 sq.; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy; Reichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 189 sq., 191 sq., 217, 244, 292; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:317 sq.; English Cyclop. s.v., Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 30:714.

## Leo Of Achris Or Achridia[[@Headword:Leo Of Achris Or Achridia]]

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

## Leo Of Modena[[@Headword:Leo Of Modena]]

             SEE LEON DA MODENA.

## Leo Of Saint-Jean[[@Headword:Leo Of Saint-Jean]]

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

## Leo Of Thessalonica[[@Headword:Leo Of Thessalonica]]

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

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

## Leo Stypiuta or STYPPA, or STYPA [[@Headword:Leo Stypiuta or STYPPA, or STYPA ]]

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

## Leo The Great[[@Headword:Leo The Great]]

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

## Leo The Isaurian[[@Headword:Leo The Isaurian]]

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

1. Early History. — He was born in or on the borders of the rude province of Isauria, and his original name was Conon. He emigrated with his father, a wealthy farmer or grazier of that country, to Thrace. Young Conon obtained the place of spatharius, or broadswordsman, in the army of Justinian II, and soon, by his military talents, excited the jealousy of the emperor, as he drew the eyes of the people, and especially of the soldiers, towards him as one fitted to command, and competent even for the empire. He was sent forward, therefore, with a few troops, against the Alani, and then abandoned by the emperor without succor, in the hope that he would be cut off and destroyed, but from this critical position Leo extricated himself with consummate dexterity and courage. Anastasius II (A.D. 713- 716) gave him the supreme command of the troops in Asia, which was exposed to the terrible onslaughts of the Arab or Saracen hordes, by whom it had already been half overrun and conquered. This command was still in his hands when Theodosius III, at the beginning of 716, rose against Anastasius, deposed him, and seated himself upon the throne. Leo, being summoned to acknowledge Theodosius, at once denounced hirm as a usurper, and attacked him under pretext of restoring the rightful sovereign to the throne, but probably with the design of seizing for himself the imperial dignity. He secured the support of the principal leaders in the army, reached the imperial troops before they could be gathered in sufficient force to resist him, and slew them. At Nicomedia he met the son of Theodosius, whom he defeated and captured. He next marched direct  upon Constantinople, and Theodosius, seeing no hope of resistance, quietly resigned his scepter in Mkarch, 718, and retired into a convent, while the vacant throne was forthwith occupied by Leo himself, by the suffrages of the troops.

2. Imperial History. — No sooner was Leo arrayed in the purple than the caliph Soleiman, together with the noted Moslima, appeared before Constantinople with an immense and enthusiastic army, supported by a powerful fleet, determined to retrieve their sullied fame. The city was invested by sea and land, and its capture was considered certain; but the indefatigable energy, military skill, and fearless courage of Leo, aided by the new invention of the Greek fire, saved the capital from falling, five centuries before its time, into the hands of the Moslems. The superstitious people ascribed their deliverance to the constant interposition of the Virgin, in which they gave the greatest possible praise to the genius of Leo. This third (Gibbon calls it the second) siege of Constantinople by the Saracens lasted precisely two years (Gibbon calls it thirteen months) from the 15th of August, 718. On the 15th of August, 720, the caliph (now Omar, who had succeeded Soleiman shortly after the commencement of the siege) was compelled to raise the siege, losing in a storm the greater part of the remnants of his third fleet before reaching the harbors of Syria and Egypt. So close had been the investment of the city, so enormous the preparations, and so loud the boasts of the Saracens, that in the provinces Constantinople was given up as lost, notwithstanding all the splendid victories of Leo, for the very news of those victories had been intercepted by the vigilant blockade of the besiegers. The whole empire was in consternation, and in the West the rumor was credited that the caliph had actually ascended the throne of Byzantium. Accordingly, Sergius, governor of Sicily, took measures to make himself independent, and to secure the crown for himself in case of complete success; but Leo immediately dispatched a small force to Sicily, which soon crushed the rebellion. The deposed monarch Anastasius, also, was tempted to plot the recovery of the throne, and in the attempt lost his life. In spite of his defeats before Constantinople, Omar continued the war for twenty years; and though, in 726, he captured Caesarea in Cappadocia, and Neo-Caesarea in Pontus, yet Leo maintained an acknowledged superiority. The great work of ecclesiastical reform occupied the attention of the empire, without any considerable interruption from the infidels, until the year 734. What belongs to this chapter of domestic history, though it includes elements and  facts of political and military significance, is reserved for the next head. During the last seven years of Leo's reign (from 734) falls the protracted life-struggle with the Saracens. The caliph Hesham instigated the Syrians to support an adventurer who pretended to be the son of Justinian II, and who, under the protection of the caliph, entered Jerusalem arrayed in the imperial purple. This proved a mere farce. But something more serious happened when, in 739, the Arab general Soleiman invaded the empire with an army of 90,000 men, distributed into three bodies. The first entered Cappadocia, and ravaged it with fire and sword; the second, commanded by Malek and Batak, penetrated into Phrvgia; the third, utnder Soleiman, covered the rear. Leo was actually taken by surprise; but he soon assembled an army and defeated the second body, in Phrygia, in a pitched battle, and obliged Soleiman to withdraw hastily into Syria. The Saracens had, in the mean time, been routed in their invasion of Europe by Charles Martel in 732, and the progress of their conquests seemed now for some time to be checked both in the East and in the West. The remaining great event of Leo's reign was the terrible earthquake of October, 740, which caused great calamities throughout the empire.

3. The Iconoclastic Controversy. — In this business Leo would seem to have begun of his own motion, and almost single-handed. No party of any account against image-worship existed in the Church, but he believed that by taking the side of iconoclasm he could hasten the conversion of the Jews and Mohammedans, and though at first very cautious, he finally, after some nine or ten years of his reign, issued his edict prohibiting the worship of all images, whether statues or pictures, of Christ, the Virgin, or the saints. Christendom was astounded by this sudden proscription of its then common religious usages. SEE ICONOCLASM.

Leo, in fact, found arrayed against him not only the bigoted and exasperated monastics, but the superstitious masses of the people of the East and West, and almost all the clergy, with all the bishops, excepting Claudius, bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia, and Theodosius, metropolitan of Ephesus, and perhaps two or three more. Even Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, joined with Gregory II of Rome in the universal outcry against the emperor's attempt, and thus, almost for the first time, the bishops of the two Romes were (like Pilate and Herod) united in one common cause. Whether provoked by the violence, and unreasonableness. and rebellious spirit of the opposition, or prompted by a growing zeal for the purity of religion, or by the obstinacy of personal pride and arbitrary power, or guided by considerations of  presumed policy, or from whatever motives, the emperor soon after issued a second edict far more stringent and decisive. It commanded the total destruction of all images (or statues intended for worship) and the effacement of all pictures by whitewashing the walls of the churches. The image-worshippers were maddened. The officer who attempted, in Constantinople, to execute the edict upon a statue of Christ renowned for its miracles, was assaulted by the women and beaten to death with clubs. The emperor sent an armed guard to suppress the tumult, and a frightful massacre was the consequence. Leo was regarded as no better than a Saracen. Even his successes against the common foe were ingeniously turned against him. A certain Cosmas was proclaimed emperor in Leo's stead, a fleet was armed, and Constantinople itself was menaced; but the fleet was destroyed by the Greek fire. The insurrection was suppressed, the leaders either fell or were executed along with the usurper. A second revolt at Constantinople was not suppressed till after much bloodshed. Everywhere in the empire the monks were busy instigating and fomenting rebellion. Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, already an octogenarian, as he could not conscientiously aid in the execution of the imperial decree, quietly retired, or suffered himself to be removed from his see.

Not quite so peaceful was the position pope Gregory II of Rome assumed. Following the bent of his own superstitious character, he seized the opportunity when the emperor had his hands full with seditious tumults and disturbances at home, and, confidently relying upon the support of the ignorant, and monk- ridden, and half-Christianized population of the West, dispatched to the emperor two most arrogant and insolent letters, and condemned in unmeasured terms his war upon images as a war upon the Christian religion itself. The emperor ordered the exarch of Ravenna to march upon Rome; but the pope, by the aid of the Lombards, compelled him to retire, and he had enough to do to maintain himself even at home. In fact, he was reduced to live in one quarter of Ravenna as a sort of captive; and finally Gregory III, the successor of Gregory II, in 731 held a council at Rome in which the Iconoclasts were anathematized. The emperor hereupon sent a formidable expedition against Italy, with special orders to reduce Ravenna. The expedition, however, failed, and Ravenna, with the Exarchate, fell into the hands of the Lombards, and thus Italy and the pope became practically independent of the Eastern empire. Leo now only sought the accomplishment of one object, viz., the detachment of Greece, Illyria, and Macedonia from the spiritual authority of the popes, and he consequently annexed them to that of the patriarchs of Constantinople, and this created  the real effective cause of the final schism of the Latin and Greek churches (734). The pope henceforth never submitted to the emperor, nor did he ever recover the lost portions of his patriarchate. Meantime, from the East, another voice joined in the fray-John of Damascus. He issued his culminations against the emperor securely from under the protection of the caliphs, who were more pleased with the attacks upon Leo than scandalized by the defense of image worship. SEE JOHN OF DAMASCUS. It was in the midst of this wild and protracted controversy that Leo died of dropsy in 741, and left to his son the accomplishment of a task which he had hoped he would himself effect.

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

Besides, it is not probable that the images or the pictures of Leo's time were any very admirable specimens of esthetic achievement; and, if they had been, it is not likely that they would have attracted the reverence of the vulgar so much as they did. Artistic perfection tends rather to distract and dissipate than to intensify the religious reverence for images. With the development of Grecian art  Grecian idolatry lost its hold. It is a remarkable fact that the ugliest, and most misshapen, and hideous idols among the heathen have secured the widest and intensest devotion; and among the Christians, it has been some winking or bleeding statue, rudely imitating the human form, and not some Sistine Madonna, that has bent the knees of adoring multitudes. The image whose toe is now devoutly kissed by the faithful at St. Peter's, in Rome, is not remarkable for its esthetic claims. If Leo was a barbarian, Gregory was hardly less so, as is evident from the letters of the latter to his emperor. The ignorance of the pope is almost as remarkable as his impudence. He expressly and repeatedly confounds the pious Hezekiah, who destroyed the brazen serpent, with his pious ancestor Uzziah, and under this last name pronounces him a self-willed violator of the priests of God. He apparently confounded them both with Ahaz, who was the grandson of the one and the father of the other. It is true, he professes to quote the passage from the emperor's edict, but it is plain from internal evidence that, in the terms in which he gives it, it could not have been in that edict; and if it had been, he did not know enough to correct the blunder. It is said that Leo was cruel in the execution of his decree. It may be so.

He was a soldier, a Byzantine emperor, and lived in the 8th century. But if the monks, and the pope; and the priests, and the populace, which they controlled, had not violently resisted the imperial decree, there would have been no cruelty. It is said that Leo acted arbitrarily, as if he had been the master of the minds and consciences of men, to make and unmake their religion for them. This is too true, and this was his mistake; but all his predecessors, with Constantine the Great, had made the same mistake. It was a Byzantine tradition. It was the theory of the age. Protestantism, with the same creed in regard to images, has proceeded upon a different theory, and has succeeded. It is said that the Church, in her general councils, has decided against Leo. If so, it was not till after, in his son's reign, a council styling itself oecumenical, and regularly convoked as such, consisting of no less than 348 bishops, had unanimously decided in his favor. It is said that, at all events, the question has been historically settled against Leo in the subsequent history of the Church: that iconoclasm was crushed and brought to naught in the East and in the West, and images achieved a complete triumph. Iconoclasm was indeed crushed by the unnatural and murderous monster Irene, whose character will hardly be regarded as superior to that of Leo. In fact, far as images are distinguished from pictures, iconoclasm has thus far triumphed in the East; and in the West it was not until after the earnest and manly resistance of Charlemagne and the  Council of Frankfort that the image-worshipping pope and priests finally, or rather for a time, carried their point.

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

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

## Leo The Magentian[[@Headword:Leo The Magentian]]

             (Μαγεντῆνος, or Μαγεντῖνος), a commentator on Aristotle, flourished during the first half of the 14th century. His first name, Leo, is frequently omitted in the MSS. of his works. He was a monk, and afterwards archbishop of Mytilene. He wrote Ε᾿ξηγησις εἰς τὸ Περὶ ἑρμηνείας Α᾿ριστοτέλους, Commentarius in Aristotelis De Interpretatione Librum (published by Aldus, Venice, 1503, folio, with the ccmmcntary of Ammonius, from which Leo borrowed very largely, and the paraphrase of Psellus on the same book of Aristotle, and the commentary of Ammonius on Aristotle's Categoriae s. Praedicamenta. In the Latin title of this edition, by misprint, the author is called Margentinus. A Latin version of Leo's commentary, by J. B. Rasarius, has been repeatedly printed with the Latin version of Ammonius. Another Latin version by Jerome Leustrius has also been printed): — Εξήγησις εἰς τὰ Πρότερα ἀναλυκτικὰ τοῦ Α᾿ριστοτέλους, Commentarius in Priora Analytica Aristotelis (printed with the commentary of John Philoponus on the same work by Trincavellus [Venice, 1536, fol.]; and a Latin version of it by Rasarius has been repeatedly printed, either separately or with other commentaries on Aristotle). The following works in MS. are ascribed, but with doubtful correctness, to Leo Magentenus: Conmnentalriuss in Casgorias Aristotelis (extant in the King's library, Paris): — Α᾿ριστοτέλους σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγχων ἑρμηνεία, Expositio Aristotelis De Sophisisicis lenchis; and Α᾿ριστοτέλους περὶ εὐπορίας προτάσεων. These two works are mentioned by Montfaucon (Bibl. Coislin. p. 225); the latter is perhaps not a distinct work, but a portion of the above. In the MS. the author is called Leontius Magentenus: — Commentarius in Isagogen s. Quinque Voces Porphyrii. Buhle doubts if this work, whidh is in the Medicean library at Florence (Bandini, Catalog. Codd. Laur. Medic. 3:239), is correctly ascribed to Magentenus. In the catalogue of the MSS. in the King's library at Paris (2:410, 421), two MSS., No. 1845 and 1928, contain scholia on the Categorie, the Analytica Priora et Posteriora and the Topica of Aristotle, and the Isagoge of Porphyry, by “Magnentius.” Buhle conjectures, and with probability, that Magnentius is a corruption of Magentenus or Magentinus; if so, and the works are assigned to their real author, we must add the commentaries on Topica and Analytica Posteriora to the works already mentioned. Nicolaus Comnenus Popadopoli speaks of many other works of Leo, but his authority is of little value. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 3:210, 213, 215, 218, 498, 7:717;  8:143; 12:208; Montfaucon, 1. c., and p. 219; Buhle, Opera Aristolelis, 1:165, 305, 306, ed. Bipont; Catalog. Mistor. Biblioth. Regim (Paris, 1740, fol.), l. c. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. 2:744 sq.

## Leo The Philosopher[[@Headword:Leo The Philosopher]]

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

How Leo came by the exalted name of Philosopher it is difficult to understand, except it be taken in an ironical sense. Gibbon, with a few striking words, gives the following character to this emperor: “His mind was tinged with the most puerile superstition; the influence of the clergy  and the errors of the people were consecrated by his laws; and the oracles of Leo, which reveal in prophetic style the fates of the empire, are founded in the arts of astrology and divination. If we still inquire the reason of his sage appellation, it can only be replied that the son of Basil was only less ignorant than the greater part of his contemporaries in Church and State; that his education had been directed by the learned Photius, and that several books of profane and ecclesiastical science were composed by the pen or in the name of the imperial philosopher.”

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

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

1. Oracula, written in Greek iambic verse, and accompanied by marginal drawings, on the fate of the future emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople, showing the superstition of Leo if he believed in his divination, and that of the people if they believed in the absurd predictions. The seventeenth oracle, on the restoration of Constantinople, was published in Greek and Latin by John Leunclavius (ad calcem Const.  Manassee, Basil. 1573, 8vo). Janus Rutgersius edited the other sixteen, with a Latin version by George Dousa (Leyden, 1618, 4tso). Other editions, Epositione delli Oracoli di Leoni imperatore, by T. Patricius (Brixen, 1596), by Petrus Lambecius, with a revised text from an Amsterdam codex, also notes and new translation (Par. 1655, fol., ad calcem Codini). A German and a Latin translation by John and Theodore de Bry appeared (Frankf. 1597, 4to). It is doubtful whether Leo is actually the author of the Oracles. Fabricius gives a learned disquisition on the subject:

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

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

4. ῾Η γεγονυῖα διατύπωσις παρὰ τοῦ Βασιλέως Λεόντος τοῦ Σοφοῦ κ. τ. λ.. . ispositio fucta per Imnperatoremn Leontens Sapientem, etc. (Greek and Latin, by J. Leunclavius, in Jus Graeco-Romeranum; by Jac. Goar, ad calcem Codini, Par. 1648, folio): — 5. Εἰς τὰ Μονομεριου , In spectaculum Unius Dei, an epigram of little value, with notes by Brodneus and Opsopaeus, in Epigram. libri 7, edit. Wechel (Frankfort, 1600). See Zonoras, 2:174, etc.; Cedrenus, p. 591, etc.; Joel, p. 179, etc.; Manass. p. 108, etc.; Glycas. p. 296, etc.; Genesius, p. 61, etc.; Coclin. p. 63, etc.; Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, 7:693 sq.; Hamberger, Nachrichten von Gelehrten Mannern; Cave, list. Litt.; Hankius, Script.  Ryzant.; Oudin, Comment. de SS. Eccl. 2:394 sq. — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. 2:739 sq.

## Leo The Thracian[[@Headword:Leo The Thracian]]

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

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

## Leo V[[@Headword:Leo V]]

             Pope, was born at Priapi, near Ardea (according to some at Arezzo). He entered the order of Benedictines, became cardinal, and was finally elected to the papal chair Oct. 28. 903. A few days afterwards, Christopher, cardinal priest of St. Lorenzo, in Damaso, and chaplain of Leo, instigated an insurrection at Rome, and made the pope prisoner, under the plea that he was incapable of governing. Christopher now exacted from Leo a formal abdication, and the promise of returning into his convent. According to Sigonius, Leo died “of grief” in his prison one month and nine days after his election. He was buried in St. John of Lateran. But Christopher himself did not remain long in the papal chair, as a new revolt of the Romans drove him from the usurped see, and put in his place Sergius III, who was the favorite of the celebrated Marozia, a powerful but licentious woman, who disposed of everything in Rome. The 10th century may well be termed the darkest sera of the papacy. See Platina, Historia de Vitis Pontificum, etc.; Artaud de Montor, Hist. des souverains Pontifes Ronmains, 2:62; Du Chene, Hist. des Papes; Baxmann, Politik der Papste, 2:76 sq.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 5:86; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy,  2:36; Genebrard, Chron.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:315; English Cyclopaedia; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 30:711.

## Leo VI[[@Headword:Leo VI]]

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

## Leo VII[[@Headword:Leo VII]]

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

## Leo VIII[[@Headword:Leo VIII]]

             Pope, a Roman, succeeded John XII, who was deposed for his misconduct by a council assembled at Rome, in presence of the emperor Otho I, in 963. But soon after Otho had left Rome, John XII came in again at the head of his partisans, obliged Leo to run away, and resumed the papal office. John, however, shortly after died or was murdered while committing adultery, and the Romans elected Benedict V. Otho, returning with an army, took the city of Rome, exiled Benedict. and reinstated Leo, who died about 965, and was succeeded by John XIII. See Baronius, Annal. 16:129; Platina, Historia, p. 14; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 5:112 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2:42; Reichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 126 sq., 216;  Baxmann, Politik der Papste, 2:114; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 30:713.

## Leo X[[@Headword:Leo X]]

             (Giovanni de Medici), pope from 1513 to 1521, was born at Florence Dec. 11, 1475. He was the second son of the celebrated Lorenzo de' Medici (born Jan. 31, 1448; died April 8, 1492), surnamed “the Magnificent,” and  grandson of Cosmo de Medici (born in 1389, died in 1464). From infancy Giovanni had been destined by his father to an ecclesiastical career, for to the lot of Pietro, the elder child, fell the succession in the Florentine government, and, as Giovanni early showed signs of ability, the great aim of Lorenzo was to secure for his house, by his second child, the influence of the Church. At the tender age of seven Giovanni was subjected to the tonsure, and at once presented by Louis XII of France with the rich living of the abbey of Fontdouce, and by pope Sixtus IV himself with that of the wealthy convent of Passignano. Various other rich livings were added to these successively, and in 1488, finally, the youthful ecclesiastic, of but thirteen years of age, was by pope Innocent VIII (father-in-law of Giovanni's sister Maddalena) presented with the cardinal's rank, limited by the condition only that the insignia of this distinction should not be assumed until his studies had been completed at Pisa. Hitherto his education had been entrusted to tutors mainly, and among them were the famous Greek historian Chalcondylas, and the learned Angelo Poliziano; he now set out at once for Pisa, and having there completed his theological studies in 1492, was on March the 9th of this same year installed at Florence into the cardinal's position, and three days after set out for and took up his residence in the Eternal City. Scarce had a month passed his induction to the cardinal's dignity when intelligence reached Rome that Lorenzo the Magnificent was no more, and hastily Giovanni retraced his steps to Florence, to afford succor and support to his weak but elder brother Pietro, upon whom now depended the continuance of the power of the Medici over Florence.

In July of this year (1492) Innocent VIII died, and as Giovanni had opposed the election of his successor, Alexander VI, the Medici could no longer hope for support from the papacy. Blindly and madly, amid all these disadvantages, Pietro, unsatisfied with absolute power unless he could display the pomp and exercise the cruelties of despotism, contrived, in the short space of two years, to secure, instead of the love and good will, the hatred of the Florentines. Their enthusiastic devotion to the house of the Medici hitherto alone prevented any attempt to subvert his authority. They remained quiet even in 1494, when Charles VIII of France came into Italy to enforce his claim to the throne of Naples, and when Pietro joined the house of Aragon, instead of becoming a confederate of the French, as his ancestors had always been. But when Pietro, equally presumptuous in security and timid in danger, terrified by the unexpected success of the French, fled to the camp of Charles, and, kneeling at his feet, abandoned himself and his country to his mercy, the  indignation of the Florentines could no longer be stayed, and, entering into a treaty with the French, they stipulated especially the exile of the Medici (Nov. 1494). After his capitulation to king Charles, Pietro had returned to Florence, but the enraged populace made his stay impossible, and he quickly fled the city. Giovanni, bolder and more courageous than his elder brother, assisted by a few faithful friends, well-armed, made a last attempt to assert the Medicean authority, and put down the insurrection by a bold exercise of force. It soon, however, became but too apparent to the young cardinal that his hope was all vanity. “The people multiplied themselves against Pietro,” as Guicciardini (Storia Fiorentina [Opere inedite]. 3:110) phrases it, and Giovanni, in the disguise of a friar, was glad enough to find himself outside the city gates, and on the open Bologna road, taking the same road as Pietro, followed by their younger brother Giuliano, still a mere lad.

They went first to John Bentivoglio in Bologna, but, as they were not received here, went to Castello, and found a refuge with Vitelli. In this and other places, the Medici, the cardinal included, lived for some time, having frequent endeavors made for their restoration. But when Giovanni was finally persuaded that all such efforts were fruitless, he decided to quit his native country, now ravaged by foreign armies, and betrayed by the wretched policy of pope Alexander VI, and he set out on a journey to France, Germany, and the Netherlands. For the assertion that the cardinal undertook this journey for political ends there is not the slightest foundation. While abroad he sought literary associations mainly. He courted the acquaintance of men of learning, and not unfrequently displays his own taste for literature and the liberal arts. In 1503, upon the death of Alexander VI, against whom he cherished a bitter hatred, and on whose account only he had avoided Rome after the expulsion of his family from Florence, he returned to the banks of the Tiber. Pius III, who succeeded Alexander VI, lived only a few weeks, and, upon a further election, the pontifical chair was occupied by Julius II, a friend and admirer of Giovanni de' Medici. Our cardinal's elder brother had died in the mean time (in the battle of Garigliano in 1503), and, no longer distracted by the imprudent conduct and the wild plans of an imbecile, he gave himself up wholly to the interests of his ecclesiastical position. By the friendship of a nephew of the pontiff, Galeotto della Rovere, he was brought into closer relations with Julius II, and, after the latter had entered Perugia in 1506 (Sept. 12), cardinal Giovanni was entrusted with the government of that town, and only a short time after was honored with the appointment of papal field marshal, under the title of “legate of Bologla,” to the army against the  French. The campaign, however, proved rather unsuccessful, and at the battle of Ravenna the cardinal was taken prisoner and sent to Milan, whence he made his escape while the French soldiers were busy in preparations for their removal to France. ‘The cardinal's great aim, now that the French had quitted Lombardy and the Florentine republic, was to re-establish his house in the government of Florence. During the first eight years of their exile the Medici had made four unsuccessful attempts to regain their power; on the failure of their last attempt, their successful opponent. Pietro Soderini, had been chosen gonfaloniere for life: to dethrone Soderini, then, was the great object to be accomplished by the cardinal.

The gonfaloniere's reign thus far had been noted for its moderation and benign influence on Florence, and had secured to the country great prosperity; but Soderini's integrity was not unimpeachable to the mind of the Medici, and Giovanni appealed to the Holy League, consisting of the pope, the emperor, the Venctians, and Ferdinand of Aragon, to undertake the restoration of the Medici, on the ground that Soderini showed great partiality to foreigners, and that his government was extremely corrupt. To secure the services of the Holy League no charges against Soderini were really needed, but he brought them, and promptly they replied. A body of 5000 Spaniards, brave to ferocity, were marched under Raymond de Cardona against Florence in August, 1512. On their way they stormed the town of Prato, and massacred the citizens, which so intimidated the Florentines that they immediately capitulated, and consented to the return of the Medici as private citizens. Cardinal de' Medici and his brother Giuliano soon after entered Florence, and, though they had asked only their restoration as private citizens, without any share in the government, they had hardly been readmitted when they forced the signoria, or executive to immediately call a “parlamento,” or general assembly of the people, in the great square (September). This general assembly of the sovereign people had repeatedly been used by ambitious men as a ready instrument of their views, and it proved such on this occasion. All the laws enacted since the expulsion of the Medici in 1494 were abrogated. A “balia,” or commission, was appointed, consisting of creatures of that family, with dictatorial powers, to reform the state. No bloodshed, however, accompanied the reaction; but Soderini, having been deposed by the establishment of this new form of government, he and other citizens opposed to the Medici were banished, and “thus once again, after an exile of eighteen years, the fatal Medici were restored to Florence; once again fixed their fangs in the prey they had been scared away from, and ‘the  most democratical democracy in Europe' was once again muzzled and chained. A conspiracy of priest and soldier — that detestable and ominous combination, more baneful to humanity than any other of the poisonous mischiels compounded out of its evil passions and blind stupidities — had as usual trampled out the hopes and possibilities of social civilization and progress” (Trollope, 4:348).

Scarcely had the Medici re-established themselves at Florence when news came from Rome that the supreme pontiff had died. It was on the 20th of February, 1513, that “the furious nature” of his holiness the pope Julius II was quieted forever. Leaving his brother Giuliano, and his nephew Lorenzo, son of Pietro, at the head of the affairs of Florence, “our cardinal posts up in all haste to Rome,” says Trollope (4:351), “to see whether mayhap Providence, in the utter inscrutableness of its wisdom, may consider him, Giovanni de' Medici, as the best and fittest person to be intrusted with heaven's vicegerency,” accompanied in this excursion to the conclave by Filippo Strozzi-son of the great banker, the founder of the still well-known Strozzi palace, possessor of one of the then largest fortunes in Florence, and “on whose young shoulders was one of the longest heads that day in Florence” — as his friend, companion, and banker. “Especially in this last capacity was Filippo necessary to the aspiring cardinal, so soon to become pope by the grace of God and the capital of Strozzi.” The younger members of the conclave had previously decided to elect one of their own age as successor to Julius II, and upon cardinal de' Medici, only thirty-seven years old, fell their choice, influenced, as we have seen by the quotation from Trollope, in a great measure by the exertions of the banker Strozzi.

One of the first acts of the new pontiff, who assumed the name of Leo X, was to appoint two men of learning, Bembo and Sadoleto, for his secretaries. He next sent a general amnesty to be published at Florence, where a conspiracy had been discovered against the Medici, for which two individuals had been executed, and others, with the celebrated Machiavelli among the rest, had been arrested and put to the torture. Leo ordered Giuliano even to release the prisoners and recall those that were banished, Soderini among the rest. This accomplished, Giuliano was invited to Rome, where he was made gonfalionere of the Holy Church. “All the rich and lucrative offices of the apostolic court were conferred on Florentines, not a little to the disgust of the Roman world” (Trollope, 4:359). Of course, that Leo should do anything and everything to enhance the dignity and greatness of the Medicean family no one could object to, and,  consequently, no one had ought to say when he appointed his nephew Lorenzo, the eldest son of Pietro, a profligate young scape-grace, but the only heir remaining to succeed in the government of Florence, governor of the republic and general in chief, with absolute and supreme authority over all the Tuscan forces contributed by the commonwealth to the armies of a new league formed in 1515 by the emperor, the king of Aragon, the duke of Milan, and the Florentines against France and Venice.

To have made Lorenzo, as Leo would have liked to do, sovereign prince, under the title of duke or some other like distinction, would have been premature, but with the appointment as made no one found fault, and it passed generally approved. Nor was any objection raised to Leo's further action in behalf of Florence, constituting it a dependency of Rome, which it continued during the remainder of his life. His cousin Giulio de' Medici, archbishop of Florence, on the decease of Julius II, Leo X at once promoted to the cardinal's dignity, and, in addition, entrusted him with the legateship of Bologna. By these new positions the influence of the Medici had been greatly improved, but the ever-plotting Leo, farseeing as he was, comprehended clearly that still more was needed to secure to his house the throne of Florence. Upon his accession to the pontificate he found the war renewed in Northern Italy. Louis XII had sent a fresh army, under La Trimouille, to invade the duchy of Milan. The Swiss auxiliaries of duke Maximilian Sforza defeated La rimouille at Novara, and the French were driven out of Italy. The Venetians, however, had allied themselves with Louis XII, and Leo sent Bembo to Venice to endeavor to break the alliance. Differences occurred between Leo and Alfonso d'Este, duke of Ferrara, who demanded the restoration of Reggio, taken from him by Julius II, which Leo promised, but never performed; on the contrary, he purchased Modena of the emperor Maximilian, disregarding the rights of the house of Este to that town. The pope held likewise Parma and Piacenza, and it appears that he intended to form out of these a territory for his brother Giuliano, and he made attempts to surprise Ferrara also with the same view. His predecessor Julius had had in view the independence of all Italy, and he boldly led on the league for this purpose — Leo had a narrower object — his own aggrandizement and that of his family, and he pursued it with a more cautious and crooked policy. To secure the adhesion of Louis XII, Leo reopened the Council of the Lateran, which had begun under Julius II, for the extinction of the schism produced by the Council of Pisa, convoked by Louis XII in order to check the power of Julius, who was his enemy. For such proceedings there was now no longer  any reason, and Louis XII gladly made his peace with Leo in 1514, renounced the Council of Pisa, and acknowledged that of the Lateran. But in the following year Louis XII died, and his successor, Francis I, among other titles assumed that of duke of Milan. Under him a new Italian war opened. The Venetians joined Francis I, while the emperor Maximilian, Ferdinand of Spain, duke Sforza, and the Swiss made a league to oppose the French. The pope did not openly join the league, but he negotiated with the Swiss by means of the cardinal of Sion. and paid them considerable sums to induce them to defend the north of Italy.

The Swiss were posted near Susa, but Francis, led by old Trivulzio, passed the Alps by the Col de l'Argentier, entered the plains of Saluzzo, and marched upon Pavia, while the Swiss hastened back to defend Milan. The battle of Marignano was fought on the 14th of September, 1515. The Swiss made desperate efforts, and would probably have succeeded had not Alviano, with part of the Venetian troops, appeared suddenly with cries of “Viva San Marco.” which dispirited the Swiss, who believed that the whole Venetian army was coming to the assistance of the French. The result was the retreat of the Swiss, and the entrance of the French into Milan, who took possession of the duchy. Leo now saw clearly that the salvation of his house lay in a union with France, and at once made proposals to Francis, who, in turn, eagerly embraced the proffered aid of the Church. It was on the 21st of October, 1515, that news reached Florence of this new alliance concluded by the holy father and the French king Francis I for the mutual defense of their Italian states, the king obliging himself specially to protect the pontiff, Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici, and the Florentines, and that both Lorenzo and Giuliano should receive commissions in the French service, with pay and pensions. If there had been danger to the Medici government in Florence, it threatened from the side of France, but that danger they escaped by this new alliance, brought about, in a great measure, by the sympathy which the two parties felt for each other.

At a meeting which these new allies subsequently held at Bologna (December, 1515) a marriage was agreed upon between Lorenzo, the pope's nephew, and Madeleine de Boulogne, niece of Francis de Bourbon, duke of Vendcme, from which marriage Catharine de' Medici, afterwards queen of France, was born, and thus the union of the French and Florentine interests became more closely cemented. But in ecclesiastical affairs also new measures were taken by a concordat, only abrogated by the French Revolution, which regulated the appointment to the sees and livings in the  French kingdom. Instead of capitular election, the king was to nominate, the pope to collate to episcopal sees. Annates were restored to the pope, who also received a small stipulated patronage in place of his indefinite prerogative of reserving benefices.

It is true the Parliament and University of Paris both opposed this concordat, but the king and the pope each secured what they desired. To the king thus fell the real power and the essential patronage of the Church; by the pope the recognition of his own authority was obtained. The two, as Reichel (See of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 538) has aptly said, by this new measure, “shared between them the ancient liberties of the Gallican Church. The rising freedom of the laity was thereby crushed; the pope recovered most of his ancient power.” Nothing could seem brighter now than the Medicean prospects and the future of the papacy. There was only one more thing to be immediately accomplished — to make Lorenzo a sovereign prince “by grace of God, or, at all events, clearly by grace of God's vicegerent on earth.” Upon the most flagrant of pretenses, the duke of Urbino, Francesco Maria della Revere, was deposed, and upon Lorenzo fell the mantle of the duchy's sovereignty, and at last the measure of Leo's ambition was nearly full. (In 1519, upon the death of Lorenzo, the duchy of Urbino was added to the territory of the Church.) This family ambition, however, by no means found pleasure in the eyes of the Roman people, while the Florentines were flattered by the advance of their “first citizens” to the position of prince and pope. Prominent among the enemies of the Medici was the house of Petrucci, headed by the cardinal of that name, who was led into a conspiracy to murder the pope by the latter's expatriation of his brother from Sienna.

Not satisfied with the acquisition of the duchy of Urbino, Leo longed also for the possession of the free state of Sienna, lying between the territories of the Church and those of the republic of Florence, and to this end sent Borghesi, its governor, into exile. At first Borghesi's brother, cardinal Petrucci, formed the mad design of stabbing Leo on their first meeting, but he finally abandoned this enterprise as too daring, and a conspiracy was formed instead to cause the death of Leo X by poison. Fortunately for Leo, the plot to take his life was timely discovered, and the cardinal expiated the intended crime with his life by secret strangling, while many others of like social standing suffered abasement and other punishment. To secure himself against a second attempt of the kind, Leo now (in 1517) created a whole host of able and experienced Florentines cardinals — no less than thirty-one of them altogether.  It was about this time also that the Lateran Council approached its close, and that the measures were inaugurated which resulted so unfavorably to the cause of the papacy and the Church of Rome, and have made the year 1517 forever memorable in the ecclesiastical annals for the foundation and commencement it gave to the revolution in the Church, commonly known by the name of the Reformation (q.v.). One of the greatest desires of Leo X, as pope of Rome, was the continuation of the incomplete structure commenced under Julius II — the building of St. Peter's church. Leo, who had made for himself a name as the protector and patron of art, and had well-nigh revived the Periclean age of the Greeks, could not brook the thought that, while he was pontiff within the walls of the Eternal City, this great enterprise, likely to immortalize the name of its patron in the annals of art, should be passed over, and, finding the coffers of the papacy drained by his predecessor, saw only one way in which to secure the necessary funds for so stupendous an undertaking — the sale of indulgences (q.v.), securing to the contributor for this object forgiveness of sin in any form (comp. Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. 2:66, note 6; Bower, Hist. of Papacy, 7:409 sq.; Robertson, Hist. of Reign of Charles V, Harper's edit., p. 125 sq., especially the footnotes on p. 126). Such utter disregard of the essence of religion resulted in one of the boldest assaults on the Romish Church that it had ever sustained.

The very thought that forgiveness of sin was to be offered on sale for money “must have been mortally offensive to men whose convictions on that head had been acquired from contemplating the eternal relation between God and man, and who, moreover, had learned what the doctrine of Scripture itself was on the subject” (Ranke, Hist. Pap. 1:66). In Saxony, especially, men of piety and thought generally commended the interpretation which Luther gave to this subject. They all regretted the delusion of the people, who, being taught to rely for the pardon of their sins on the indulgences which they could secure by purchase, did not think it incumbent on themselves either to study the doctrines of genuine Christianity, or to practice the duties which it enjoins. Even the most unthinking were shocked at the scandalous behavior of the Dominicans — John Tetzel (q.v.) and his associates, who had the sale of indulgences entrusted to them — and at the manner in which they spent the funds accumulated from this traffic. These sums, which had been piously bestowed in hope of obtaining eternal salvation and happiness, they saw squandered by the Dominican friars in drunkenness, gaming, and low debauchery, and all began to wish that some check were given to this commerce, no less detrimental to society than destructive to religion”  (Robertson, p. 126). Indeed, even the princes and nobles objected to this traffic; they were irritated at seeing their vassals drained of so much wealth in order to replenish the treasury of a profuse pontiff, and when Luther's warm and impetuous temper did not suffer him any longer to conceal his aversion to the unscriptural doctrine of the Thomists, or to continue a silent spectator of the delusion of his country, from the pulpit in the great church of Wittenberg he inveighed bitterly against the false opinions, as well as the wicked lives, of the preachers of indulgences (see Löscher's Reformationsakten, 1:729). “Indignation against Roman imposture increased; universal attention and sympathy were directed towards the bold champion of the truth” (Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. [Harper's edit.] 4:33). On Oct. 31, 1517, finally, to gain also the suffrage of men of learning, Luther published ninety-five theses against the traffic in indulgences, setting forth his objections to this abuse of ecclesiastical power. Not that he supposed these points fully established or of undoubted certainty, but he advanced them as the result of his own investigation, and as subjects of inquiry and disputation unto others, that he might be corrected if his position could be impugned. He sent them to the neighboring bishops with a petition for the abolition of the evil if his views were found to be well grounded, and appointed a day on which the learned churchmen might publicly dispute the point at issue, either in person or by writing; subjoining to them, however, solemn protestations of his high respect for the apostolic see, and of his implicit submission to its authority. Many zealous champions immediately arose to defend opinions on which the wealth and power of the Church were founded; in especial manner the opposition of the Dominicans (q.v.) was roused, for the spirit of this order had become peculiarly sensitive on account of some recent humiliations, particularly by the fate of Savonarola (q.v.), the events at Berne, and by the still surviving controversy with l'euchlin (q.v.), aside from the fact that the different mendicant orders cherished constant jealousy against each other. (The conjecture of some that the jealousy of the Augustine monk was apparent in Luther's attack on Tetzel because to the Dominicans had been entrusted the indulgence traffic is too ridiculous to need repetition here. Comp. however, Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 4:25, note 17; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. bk. 4, cent. 16, sec. 1, ch. 2, note 18.) In opposition to Luther's theses, Tetzel himself came forward with counter theses, which he published at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Prominent among others also were Eck (q.v.), the celebrated Augsburg divine, and Prierias (q.v.), the inquisitor general, who both replied to the Augustine monk with all the virulence of scholastic disputants. “But the  manner in which they conducted the controversy did little service to their cause. Luther attempted to combat indulgences by arguments founded in reason or derived from the Scriptures; they produced nothing in support of them but the sentiments of the schoolmen, and the conclusions of the canon law, and the decrees of popes. The decision of judges so partial and interested did not satisfy the people, who began to call into question even the authority of these venerable guides when they found them standing in direct opposition to the dictates of reason and the determination of the divine law” (Robertson, p. 128). SEE LUTHER; SEE REFORMATION.

At Rome these controversies, though they had become a matter of interest to all the German people, were looked upon with great indifference. Leo judged it simply a wrangling of two mendicant orders, and he was determined to let the Augustinians and Dominicans settle their own quarrels. The adversaries of Luther, however, feared for their cause, and they saw no other way by which to secure anew peace to themselves, and the respect of the people, than by a wholesale slaughter of the Reformer and his friends. The solicitations of the Dominicans at the Vatican became daily more frequent and urgent; and when at last it became necessary for Leo to take some decided action, he simply commissioned his cardinal legate Cajetan (q.v.) to bring the Augustinian friar to his senses, and Luther was summoned to and promptly appeared at the Diet of Augsburg, in October, 1518. If Leo ever committed a blunder, it was done in this instance by appointing to the task of converting Luther a monastic of the very order he had so seriously attacked for its complicity in the indulgence traffic. If Luther was ever so much inclined to yield, a Dominican was certainly not the proper agent to accomplish such a purpose.

Cajetan, moreover, treated Luther rather imperiously, and peremptorily required him to confess his errors, before the least attempt had been made to reply to his arguments, and of course our Augustinian, high-spirited as he was, turned away in disgust, and appealed a papa non bene informato ad melius informandum; and afterwards, when the whole doctrine of indulgence, as it had been developed up to the present time, was confirmed by a papal bull, the new heretic appealed from the pope to a general council (at Wittenberg, Nov. 28, 1518). By this time, however, the strife had assumed more gigantic proportions; around Luther were now gathered the great, and the strong, and the learned of the Teutonic race. A special helpmeet he had found in his colleagues of the lately founded high school of learning at Wittenberg; and as in the 13th century from Oxford and Prague had  proceeded the action against the Latin system, so it now proceeded from Wittenberg, until it terminated in the Reformation. When too late, the Roman court realized the mistake it had committed in entrusting Cajetan with the settlement of this difficulty, and another legate, the pope's own chamberlain, Charles of Miltitz (q.v.), was dispatched in December (1518) to give assurances to the electoral prince Frederick, by the valuable present of the consecrated golden rose (q.v.), of the good intentions of pope Leo towards Saxony, and at the same time, if possible, to conciliate Luther, in whom was now seen the representative of Wittenberg University, and at whose back stood one to whom even his enemies confess but few men of any age can be compared, either for learning and knowledge of both human and divine things, or for richness, suavity, and facility of genius, or for industry as a scholar — Philip Melancthon (q.v.). Unfortunately for the cause of the Dominicans, this very elector of Saxony, who had identified himself with and become the champion of the cause of. the Wittenberg reform movement, was now, upon the death of Maximilian I, made regent of the empire in northern Germany (Jan. 12, 1519), and Miltitz saw only one way in which to settle the controversy-by appeasing the wrath of Luther. He accordingly flattered “the friar of Wittenberg,” as he was contemptuously called at Rome, by all manner of kindness, assured him that his case had been misrepresented to Leo, and actually succeeded in inducing Luther to promise, not, indeed, recantation, as he desired, but a promise to be silent if his opponents were silent, and an open declaration of obedience to the see of Rome: thus the whole matter apparently had reached its end. The opponents, however, were not silent; the controversy was renewed with greater animosity than before. SEE CARLSTADT; SEE ECK; SEE LEIPSIC DISPUTATION.

Luther was forced to reply; the primacy of the pope and other questions became involved, which obliged additional research and study on the part of the reformers, and “in this way Luther gained so thorough an insight into the errors and corruption of the Roman Church that he gradually began to see the necessity of separating himself from it. He felt himself called as a soldier of God to fight against the wiles and deceit of the devil, by which the Church was corrupted” (Gieseler, 4:42). This he did hereafter, fearless of consequences, by both his pen and tongue. Luther's was a nature that recoiled from no extremity. The result was “the bull of condemnation,” issued June 15, 1520, which brought about the formal abjuration of the papacy on the part of Luther by the public burning of the bull, together with the papal law-books, Dec. 10 of this very year. January 3, 1521, came the bull of excommunication, and  a demand for its execution by the Diet of Worms, the body to which Luther appealed. SEE REFORMATION.

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

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

The services which Leo rendered to literature are many. He encouraged the study of Greek, founded a Greek college at Rome, established a Greek press, and gave the direction of it to John Lascaris; he restored the Roman University, and filled its numerous chairs with professors; he directed the collecting of MSS. of the classics, and also of Oriental writers, as well as the searching after antiquities; and by his example encouraged others, and among them the wealthy merchant Chigi, to the same, he patronized men  of talent, of whom a galaxy gathered round him at Rome. He corresponded with Erasmus, Machiavelli, Ariosto, and other great men of his time. He restored the celebrated library of his family, which, on the expulsion of the Medici, had been plundered and dispersed, and which is known by the name of the Biblioteca Laurenziana at Florence. In short, Leo X, if not the most exemplary among popes, was certainly one of the most illustrious and meritorious of Italian princes. See Guicciardini, Storia d'litalia; Roscoe, Life and Pontificate of Leo X (Lond. 1805, 4 vols. 4to); Farroni, Vita Leonis X (1797) Audin, Leon X (1844); Giovio, Vita Leonis X (1651); Artaud de Montor, Histoire des Souverains papes, vol. 4. For the bulls and speeches of pope Leo X, see Fabricius, Bibliotheca Latina Medaic et Infirme E Statis; Sismondi, Hist. des Republiques Italiennes; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, vol. 1, ch. 2; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 32:491 sq.; 34:83, 91; and his Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref. 1:76 sq., 314 sq.; 3:207 sq., 211 sq.; Raumer, Gesch. der Padaclogik, 1:54 sq.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 7:400 sq.; Trollope, History of Flaorence (Lond. 1865, 4 vols. 8vo), especially vol. 4, book 10; Leo, Gesch. Italiens, vol. 5, ch. 3. (J. H. W.)

## Leo XI[[@Headword:Leo XI]]

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

## Leo XII[[@Headword:Leo XII]]

             Pope (cardinal Annibale della Genga), was born in the district of Spolcto in 1760, of a noble family of the Romagna; was made archbishop of Tyre in 1793, and was later employed as nuncio to Germany and France by Pius VII, who made him a cardinal in 1816. On the death of this pontiff he was elected pope, in September, 1823. He was well acquainted with diplomacy  and foreign politics, and in the exercise of his authority, and in asserting the claims of his see, he assumed a more imperious tone than his meek and benevolent predecessor. He re-established the right of asylum for criminals in the churches, and enforced the strict observance of fast days. He was a declared enemy of the Carbonari and other secret societies. He proclaimed a jubilee for the year 1825; and in his circular letter accompanying the bull, addressed to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, he made a violent attack on the Bible Societies, as acting in opposition to the decree of the Council of Trent (session 4) concerning the publication and use of the sacred books. Leo also entered into negotiations with the newstates of South America for the sake of filling up thevacant sees. He gave a new organization to the university of the Sapienza at Rome, which consists of fivecolleges or faculties, viz., theology, law, medicine, philosophy, and philology; and he increased the number of the professors, and raised their emoluments. He published in October, 1824, a Moto Proprio, or decree, reforming the administration of the papal state, and also the administration of justice, or Procedura Civile, and: he fixed the fees to be paid by the litigant parties. He corrected several abuses, and studied to maintain order. and a good police in his territories. He died February 10, 1829, and was succeeded by Pius VIII. See Engl. Cyclop. s. 5.; Rudoni, Leone XII e Pio VIII (1829);. Schmid, Trauerre de of Leo XII (1829); Artaud de Montor, Histoire clu pape Leon XII (1843, 2 vols. 8vo); Wiseman, Recollections of the last four Popes (see Index).

## Leo, Aegyptius[[@Headword:Leo, Aegyptius]]

             or THE EGYPTIAN. The early Christian writers, in their controversy with the heathen, refer not unfrequently to a Leo or Leon as having admitted that the deities of the ancient Gentile nation had originally been men, agreeing in this respect with Evemerus, with whom he was contemporary, if not perhaps rather earlier. Augustine (De Consensu Evangel. 1:33, and De Civ. Dei, 8:5), who is most explicit in his notice of him, says he was an Egyptian priest of high rank, “magnus antistes,” and that he expounded the popular mythology to Alexander the Great in a manner which, though differing from those rationalistic explanations received in Greece, accorded with them in making the gods (including even the Dii majorum gentium) to have originally been men. Augustine refers to an account of the statements of Leo contained in a letter of Alexander to his mother. It is to be observed, though Leo was high in his priestly rank at the time when  Alexander was in Egypt (B. C. 332-331), his name is Greek; and Arnobius (adv. Gentes, 4:29) calls him Leo Pellceus, or Leo of Pella, an epithet which Fabricius does not satisfactorily explain. Worth (Not. ad Tatian. p. 96, ed. Oxford, 1700) would identify our Leo with Leo of Lampsacus, the husband of Themista or Themisto, the female Epicurean (Diog. Laert. 10:5, 25); but the husband of Themista was more correctly called Leonteus, while the Egyptian is never called by any other name than Leo. Arnobius speaks in such a way as to lead us to think that in his day the writings of Leon on the human origin of the gods were extant and accessible, but it is possible he refers, like Augustine, to Alexander's letter. The reference to Leon in Clemens Alexandrinus is not more explicit (Stromata, 1:21, § 106, 1. 139, Sylburg; p. 382, edit. Pott; 2:75, edit. Klotz, Lipsiae, 1831, 12mo). But Tatian's distinct mention of the ῾Υπομνήματα, or Commentaries of Leo, shows that tI is system had been committed to writing by himself; and Tertullian (De Corona, 100:7) directs his readers “to unroll the writings of Leo the Egyptian.” Hyginus (Poeticon Astronomicon, 100:20) refers to Leon as though he wrote a history of Egypt (“Quires AEgyptiacus scripsit”); and the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius (4:262) gives a reference here to what Leon had said respecting the antiquity of the Egyptians, probably depending upon the statements of Alexander. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 7:713, 719; 11:664; Voss, De Hist. Graec. libri 3, p. 179, edit. Amsterdam, 1699. — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. 2:742.

## Leo, Diaconus, Or The Deacon[[@Headword:Leo, Diaconus, Or The Deacon]]

             a Byzantine historian of the 10th century, of whose personal history but little is known, except the incidental notices in his principal works (collected by C. B. Hase in his Praefitio to his edition of Leo), was born at Caloe, a town of Asia, beautifully situated at the side or foot of Mount Tmolus, near the sources of the Casstrus, in Asia Minor, and was at Constantinople pursuing his studies A.D. 966, where he was an admiring spectator of the firmness of the emperor Nicephorus 11, Phocas, in the midst of a popular tumult (4:7). Hase places his birth in or about A.D. 950. He was in Asia in or about the time of the deposition of Basilius I, patriarch of Constantinople, and the election of his successor, Antonius III. A.D. 973 or 974, and relates that at that time he frequently saw two Cappadocians, twins of thirty years' age, whose bodies were united from the armpits to the flanks (10, 3). Having been ordained deacon, he accompanied the emperor Basilius II in his unfortunate expedition against  the Bulgarians, A.D. 981, and when the emperor raised the siege of Tralitza or Triaditza (the ancient Sardica), Leo barely escaped death in the headlong flight of his countrymen (10:8). Of his history after this nothing is known; but Hase observes he must have written his history after A.D. 989, as he adverts to the rebellion and death of Phocas Bardas (10:9), which occurred in that year. He must have lived later than Hase has remarked, and at least till A.D. 993, as he notices (10:10) that the emperor Basilius II restored “in six years the cupola of the great church (St. Sophia's) at Constantinople, which had been overthrown by the earthquake (comp. Cedren. Compend. 2:438, ed. Bonn) of A.D. 987.” His works are, ῾Ιστορία Βιβλίοις ύor Historia libris decem: — Oratio ad Basiliaum Imperatforem: — and, unless it be the work of another Leo Diaconus, Hlomnilia in Michcelcem Achasgelium. The two last are extant only in MS. The history of Leo includes the period from the Cretan expedition of Nicephorus Phocas, in the reign of Romansus II, A.D. 959. to the death of John I, Tzimisces, A.D. 975. It relates the victories of the emperors Nicephorus and Tzimisces over the Mohammedans in Cilicia and Syria, and the recovery of those countries, or the greater part of them, to the Byzantine empire, and the wars of the same emperors with the Bulgarians and Russians. According to Hase, Leo employs unusual and unappropriate words (many of them borrowed from Homer, Agathias the historian, and the Septuagint) in the place of simple and common ones, and abounds in tautological phrases. His knowledge of geography and ancient history is slight, but with these defects his history is a valuable contemporary record of a stirring time, honestly and fearlessly written. Scylitzes and Cedrenus are much indebted to Leo, and Hase considers Zonaras also to have used his work. The Historia was first published at the cost of count Nicholas Romanof, chancellor of Russia, by Car. Bened. Hase (Paris, 1818). Combefis had intended to publish it in the Paris edition of Coryus Historie Byzanlinma, with the Historia of Michael Psellus, but was prevented by death. A.D. 1679. The Latin version which he had prepared was communicated by Montfaucon to Pagi, who inserted some portions in his Critice in Baronitnt (ad ann. 960, No. 9). The papers of Combefis were, many years after, committed to Michael le Quien, that he might publish an edition of Psellus and Leo, and part of the latter's work was actually printed. In the disorders of the French RevolutionI the papers of Combefis were finally lost or destroyed. Hase, in his edition, added a Latin version and notes to the text of Leo, and illustrated it by engravings from ancient gems: this edition is, however, scarce and dear, the greater part of the  copies having been lost by shipwreck, but his text, preface, version, and notes (not engravings) have been reprinted in the Bonn ed. of the Corpus Hist. Byzantine (1828, 8vo). See Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 7:684, note 1; Cave, Hist. Litt. 2:106; Hase, Praestio ald Leon Diacon. Historianm. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2:743 sq.

## Leo, Gottlob Eduard[[@Headword:Leo, Gottlob Eduard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1803, and died at Waldenburg, May 7, 1881, member of consistory and doctor of theology, He is the author of, Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche (Leipsic, 1831): — Das Leben Gellert's (Dresden, 1846): — Stimmen aus der Kirche (1845): — Pauli Epistola i ad Timotheum Graece (1837): — Geschichte der Reformation in Dresden und Leipzig (1839): — Das Leben August Hermann Francke's (1848). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:786. (B.P.)

## Leo, Heinrich[[@Headword:Leo, Heinrich]]

             a famous German historian, was born at Rudolstadt, March 19, 1799. He studied at Breslau and Jena, and commenced his academical career at Erlangen in 1820. In 1824 he was at Berlin, accepted a call to Halle in 1830, and died April 24, 1878. Leo was orthodox in religion, and conservative in politics, and from this standpoint wrote his Lehrbuch der Universalgeschichte (Halle, 1835-44, 6 volumes; 3d ed. 1849-53). Liberalism found in him a violent opponent, and the liberal tendencies in State and Church he assailed in Studien und Skizzen zur Naturgeschichte des Staates (ibid. 1833), Die Hegelingen (1838), Signatura Temporis (1849), more especially in. the KreuzZeitung, the organ of the political conservatives, and in Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, the organ of orthodoxy. His political tendencies were acknowledged by king Frederick William IV, and in 1863 he was made a member of the Prussian upper house for life. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Brockhaus, Conversations-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Leo, Rudolf[[@Headword:Leo, Rudolf]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 6, 1806, at Rudolstadt. He studied at Jena and Gottingen, was tutor of prince Guinther of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt from 1829 to 1839, and professor at the gymnasium of his native place from 1839 to 1844. In the latter year he was appointed second deacon, in 1851 court-preacher and member of consistory, and in 1852 general-superintendent. He retired from the ministry in 1879, and died January 18, 1883. (B.P.)

## Leodegar[[@Headword:Leodegar]]

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

## Leon Da Modena (Ben-Isaac Ben-Mordecai)[[@Headword:Leon Da Modena (Ben-Isaac Ben-Mordecai)]]

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

It was then drawn from its hiding-place, and was published under the supervision of the late rabbi Reggio in בחינת הקבלה (Gorz, 1852); an English translation appeared in The Jewish Tines (New York), in the last numbers of 1871. This work contains a concise and terse exposition of the religious philosophy of Judaism, and of the ideas embodied in the various ceremonial practices, and is written from a most liberal stand-point. He also wrote  בן דבד, a treatise on Metempsychosis, in which he takes ground against the Cabalists (published in רעם קנים, p. 61 sq.): — Hebrew and Italian Dictionary, called גלות יהודה (“The Captivity of Judah”), or פשר דבר(“Explanation of Words”), in which he explains in Italian all the difficult expressions in the Hebrew Bible, and which is preceded by grammatical rules (Venice, 1612; Padua, 1640; also printed in the margin of the Hebrew Bibles published for the use of the Italian Jews, following the order of the canonical books): — Rabbiiical and Italian Vocabulary, called פי אריה (“The Lion's Mouth”), of which the Italian title is Raccolta delle voci Rabin. non Hebr. ne Chald., etc. (Padua, 1640; appended to the preceding work; afterwards printed separately in Venice, 1648): — A polemical treatise against the Cabalists, whom he despised and derided, on the genuineness of their interpretation of the Pentateuch (Sochr), entitled נוהם ספר ארי (edited by Dr. Fürst, Leipzic, 1840): — Historia dei Riti Hebraici ed observanza degli Hebrei di questi tempi,or the history of the rites, customs, and manner of lifeof the Jews, consisting of thirteen hapters, and writtenin Italian (Paris, 1637; in a revised form,Venice, 1638).This celebrated and most useful manual was translatedinto English by Edmund Chilmead (Lond. 1650); andalso edited by Simon Ocklev, under the title History of the present Jews throughout the World (London, 1707), in Picard's Ceremonies and Religious Custons of the various Nations of the known World, vol. 1 (London, 1733); into French by father Simon, who prefaced it with an elaborate account of the Karaites and Samaritans (Par. 1674); into Dutch (Amsterd. 1683), and into Latin by Grosgebauer, Historia rituum Judaeorum (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1693): — Commentary on the Books of Samuel: — Commentary on the five Megilloth, i.e. the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther: — Commentary on the Psalms: — Commentary on Proverbs: — Commentary on the Sabbatic Lessons: — and a polemical work against Christianity, entitled מגן וחרב; but several of these works have not as yet been published. Leo died in Venice, where he was chief rabbi, in 1648. See his autobiography, entitled היי יהידה, extant only in MS., from which extracts were made by Carmoly. Rev. Orientale (1842), p. 49 sq., and Reggio, בחינת הקבלה. (1852); Fürst, Bibl. Judaica, 2:383 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Fibl. Bodleiana, col. 1345-56; Der Israelitische Volkslehrer (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1854), 4:91 sq., 186 sq., 247 sq.; 1855, v. 396 sq.; Geiger, in Liebermann's Volkskalender-  Jahrbuch, 1856; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:141 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. vol. 2, s.v.

## Leon Or Leone, Jacob Jehudah[[@Headword:Leon Or Leone, Jacob Jehudah]]

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

## Leon, Luis Ponce de[[@Headword:Leon, Luis Ponce de]]

             a Spanish ecclesiastic, was born at Belmonte, in the south of Spain, in 1527 (according to the Tesoro de los Prosadores Espanoles por Ochod [Paris, 1841], at Granada; and according to St. Antonio and Ticknor at Belmnonte in 1528). He studied at Salamanca, entered in 1543 the order of the Augustines, and was thereafter known under the name of Luis de Leon. Having been received D.D., he was in 1561 appointed to a professorship at St. Thomas. His knowledge and success created him many enemies, at the head of whom were the Dominicans of Granada. Accused of heresy and of having translated parts of the Bible into the vernacular, contrary to the orders of the Sanctum Officium, he was in 1572 imprisoned in the dungeon of the Inquisition at Valladolid, and appeared over fifty times before the high court. His defense, which is extant, contains 200 closely-written pages in the purest Castilian. Although unable to prove anything against him, his judges condemned him to the rack; but this sentence was reversed by the Inquisitorial high court of Madrid, and he was liberated with the advice of being more careful in future. In 1578 he returned to his convent and resumed his office. He thereafter devoted himself exclusively to theology and to the duties of his order; but his health never recovered entirely from the shock it had undergone while in the prisons of the Inquisition. He became general and provincial vicar of his order in Salamanca, and died in 1591. His principal writings are poems in Latin and in Spanish; the latter  are distinguished for beauty of language and purity of style. His original pieces have been published, with a German translation, by C. B. Schliiter and W. Storck (Miinster, 1853). His whole works, consisting of the above, together with translations from the classics, the Psalms, and parts of the book of Job, were collected and published (Madrid, 1804-16, 6 vols.). See Quevedo, Vita de L. de L. (Madrid, 1631); Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, s.v.

## Leonard, Abiel[[@Headword:Leonard, Abiel]]

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

## Leonard, Alexander S., S.T.D[[@Headword:Leonard, Alexander S., S.T.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in New York city, June 28, 1806. He graduated from Columbia College in 1825; was engaged in mercantile pursuits for twenty years; ordained deacon in 1848; assistant at St. Clement's Church, N.Y.; rector of Emmanuel Church, in the same city, from 1849 to 1865, and died there, May 17, 1878. See Prot. Episc. AImanac, 1879, page 169; Church Almanac, 1879, page 93.

## Leonard, George[[@Headword:Leonard, George]]

             (1), a Congregational, and subsequently an Episcopal, minister, was born in Middleborough, Mass., April 6, 1783; graduated at Dartmouth College in  1805; studied with Dr. Perkins, of West Hartford; and was ordained over the Church in Canterbury, Conn., in 1808. After two years he was dismissed, and preached in various places in Massachusetts. In 1817 he was ordained a deacon in the Episcopal Church by bishop Griswold; admitted to priest's orders the following year at Marblehead; and was rector of Trinity Church, Cornish, N. H., and of St. Paul's, Windsor, Vt., until his death, which took place at the house of his sister in Salisbury, N. H., June 28, 1834. “Disinterested and judicious counsellor, open-hearted and honest man, and a sincere Christian.” Several of his sermons were published. See Cong. Quar. 1859, p. 354.

## Leonard, George (2)[[@Headword:Leonard, George (2)]]

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

## Leonard, Josiah[[@Headword:Leonard, Josiah]]

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

## Leonard, Levi Washburn[[@Headword:Leonard, Levi Washburn]]

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

## Leonard, St.[[@Headword:Leonard, St.]]

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

## Leonard, Zenas Lockwood[[@Headword:Leonard, Zenas Lockwood]]

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

## Leonardo Da Vinci[[@Headword:Leonardo Da Vinci]]

             SEE VINOI.

## Leonardo, Da Porto Maurizio[[@Headword:Leonardo, Da Porto Maurizio]]

             a noted missionary priest and the founder of the Brotherhood of the Heart of Jesus, was born in Liguria in 1676. While yet a youth he became a pupil of the Jesuits, and a member of the Order of the Reformed Franciscans. He  was especially active in promoting the doctrine of the immaculate conception. He died about the middle of the 18th century, and was sainted by Pius VI in 1796.

## Leonardoni, Francesco[[@Headword:Leonardoni, Francesco]]

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

## Leonbruno, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Leonbruno, Lorenzo]]

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

## Leonhard Johann[[@Headword:Leonhard Johann]]

             a Moravian missionary, was born in 1706 at Münchsroth. He went to Herrnhut in 1725, and in 1732 was sent as first Moravian missionary to the negroes of St. Thomas. He returned in 1735; became general elder of the congregation; labored for some time for the conversion of the Jews in Amsterdam; and in 1741 resigned his office as general elder, which at the London Conference of September 16,1741, was transferred to Christ himself. In 1747 he became bishop of the Moravians. He died in 1766. He is the author of many hymns in the Moravian Hymn-book.

## Leonhard, Matthaei Dudine[[@Headword:Leonhard, Matthaei Dudine]]

             a famous Dominican, who died in 1470, provincial of Lombardy, was a doctor of law and divinity. He preached in the principal cities of Italy, especially at Florence, before pope Eugene IV and his court. His Sermones have often been printed. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Leoni, Ottavio[[@Headword:Leoni, Ottavio]]

             (called il cav. Padovano and Padovanino), an eminent painter and engraver, was born in Rome in 1578. Among his historical works is The Virgin and Infant, in Santa Maria della Minerva; The Annunciation, in San Eustachio; and St. Carlo. St. Francesco, and St. Niccolo, in San Urbano. He was chosen director of the Academy of St. Luke, and was appointed knight of the order of Christ, on which occasion he painted the Martyrdom of St. Martina. for the Church of the Academy. As an engraver, he did not succeed very well. He, however, executed a number of works. He died in 1630. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Leonidas[[@Headword:Leonidas]]

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

## Leonista[[@Headword:Leonista]]

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

## Leontes[[@Headword:Leontes]]

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

## Leontius[[@Headword:Leontius]]

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

## Leontius Of Antioch[[@Headword:Leontius Of Antioch]]

             a learned Syrian theologian of the early Church, was born in Phrygia about the close of the 3d or the opening of the 4th century. He was a disciple of the martyr Lucianus, and, having entered the Church, was ordained a presbyter. In order to enjoy without scandal the society of a young female, Eustolius or Eustolia, to whom he was much attached, he mutilated himself, but, notwithstanding, did not escape suspicion, and was finally deposed from his office. On the deposition, however, of Stephanus, or Stephen, bishop of Antioch, he was, by the favor of the emperor Constantius and the predominant Arian party, appointed to that see about 348 or 349. Leontius died about A.D. 358. Of his writings, which were numerous, nothing remains except a fragment of what Cave describes, we know not on what authority, as Oratio in Passionem S. Babylae (cited in the Paschal Chronicle, in the notice of the Decian persecution). In this fragment it is distinctly asserted that both the emperor Philip and his wife were avowed Christians (Socrates, Hist. Ecc 2:26; Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 3:20; Theodoret, Hist. Ecc 2:10; Ecc 2:24; Philostorgius, Hist. Ecc 3:15; Ecc 3:17-18; Athanasius, Apolog. de Fuga suat, 100:26; Hist. Ariatnor. ad Monachos, 100:28; Chron. Pasch. 1:270, 289, ed. Paris; p.  216, 231. ed.Venice; p. 503, 535, ed. Bonn; Cave, Hist. Literaria, 1:211, ed. Oxon. 1740-43; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, 8:324). — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Romans Biog. vol. 2, s.v.

## Leontius Of Arabissus[[@Headword:Leontius Of Arabissus]]

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

## Leontius Of Arelate[[@Headword:Leontius Of Arelate]]

             or ARLES, was bishop of that city about the middle of the 5th century. Several letters were written to him by pope Hilarius, A.D. 461467, which are given in the Concilia, and a letter of Leontius to the pope, dated A.D. 462, is also given in the Concilia and in D'Achery's Spicilegium (v. 578 of the original edition, or 3:302 in the edition of De la Barre, Paris, 1723, folio). Leontius presided in a council at Aries, held A.D. 475, to condemn an error into which some had fallen respecting the doctrine of predestination. He appears to have died in A.D. 484. He is mentioned by Sidonius Apollinaris (Epist. 7:6). See Concil. 4, col. 1039,1041,1044 (1828, ed. Labbe); Cave, Hist. Litt. 1:449; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 8:324; 12:653; Bibl. Med. et Infim. Latinitastis, v. 268 (ed. Mansi); Tillemont, Memoires, 16:38. — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. vol. 2, s.v.

## Leontius Of Byzantium[[@Headword:Leontius Of Byzantium]]

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

1. Σχόλια (Scholias), taken down from the lips of Theodorus (first published with Latin version by Leunclavius, and commonly cited by the title De Sectis in a volume containing several other pieces [Basle, 1578, 8vo], and reprinted in the Auctariumn Bibliothecae Patrum of Ducaeus, vol. 1 [Paris, 1624, folio], in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. 9 [Paris, 1644, fol.], and in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland, 12:625, etc. [Venice, 1728, folio]. The Latin version alone is given in several other editions of the Biblioth. Patrum).

2. Contra Eutychianos et Nestorianos Libri tres, s. confutatio utriusque Fictionis inter se contrarice. Some inaccurately speak of the three books into which this work is divided as distinct works.

3. Liber adversuzs eos qui proferunt nobis qucedamn Apollinarii, falso inscriptal nomine Sanctonrum Patrum, s. adversus Fraudes Apollinaristarum.

4. Solutiones Argumentationzum Severi.

5. Dubitationes hypotheticae et definientes contra eos qui negant in Christo post Unionern duas veras Naturas.These pieces have not been printed in the original, butin a Latin version from the papers of Franciscus Turrianus (published by Canisius in his Lectiones Antique, vol. 4, or 2:525, etc., ed. Basnage, and reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. 9 [Lyons, 1677, folio], and in the above-mentioned volume of Galland).

6. Apologia Concilii Chalcedonensis (printed, with a Latin version and notes, by Antonio Bougivianni, in the Concilia, 7:799, ed. Mansi [Florence, 1762, folio], and reprinted by Galland, 1. c.). In the title of this work Leontius is called Monachus Hierosolymitanus, but the word Hierosolymitanus is possibly an error of the transcriber. At any rate, Galland identifies the writer with our Leontius, and the subject of the work makes it probable that he is right.

7. Adversus Eutychianus (s. Severianos) et Nestorianos in octo libros distincturn (described by Canisins as being extant in MS. at Munich, and by Fabricius as occurring in the catalogue of the Palatine library).

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

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

## Leontius Of Byzantium (2)[[@Headword:Leontius Of Byzantium (2)]]

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

(1.) The history of the emperor Leo V, the Armeniar, Michael It of Aurorium, Theophilus, the son of Michael, and Michael III and Theodora, the son and widow of Theophilus; by the so-called Leontius, from the materials supplied by Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

(2.) The life of Basil the Macedonian, by Constantine himself (though Labbe and Cave would assign this also to Leontius); and

(3.) The lives of Leo VI and Alexander, the sons of Basil, and of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and the commencement of the reign of Romanus II; by an unknown later hand. This third part is more succinct than the former parts, and is in a great degree borrowed, with little variation, from known and existing sources. The first edition of the Chronographia prepared for publication with a Latin version was by Combefis, and was published in the Paris edition of the Byzantine historians, forming a part of the volume entitled Οἱ μετὰ θεοφάνην, Scriptores post Theophanem (1685, folio); again published in the Venetian reprint (1729, folio), and again, edited by Bekker (Bonn, 1838, tvo). The life of Basil by Constantine Porphyrogenitus was printed separately as early as 1653, in the Συμμικτά of Allatius (Cologne, 8vo). See Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 7:681; 8:318; Cave, Hist. Litt. 2:90. — Smith. Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, 2:757 sq.

## Leontius Of Neapolis[[@Headword:Leontius Of Neapolis]]

             (or of Hagiopolis, according to his own authority), in Cyprus, who was bishop of that city, which Le Quien (Oriens Christianus, 2:1061) identifies with the Nova Lemissus, or Nemissus, or Nemosa, that rose out of the ruins of Amathus, flourished in the latter part of the 6th and the early part of the 7th century. Baronins, Possevinlo, and others call Leontius bishop of Salamis or Constantia, but in the records of the second Nicene or seventh General Council, held A.D. 787, Actio 4 (Concilia, 7, col. 236, ed. Labbe; 4, col. 193, ed. Hardouin; 8, col. 884, ed. Coleti; and 13, col. 44, ed. Mansi), he is expressly described as bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus. His death is said to have occurred between 620 and 630. His principal works are Λόγοι ὑπὲρ τῆς Χριστιανῶν ἀπολογίας κατὰ Ι᾿ουδαίων καὶ περὶ εἰκόνων τῶν ἁγίων, Sermones pro Defensione Christianorum contra Judaeos ac de incmainsibus sanctis. A long extract from the fifth of these sermons was read at the second Nicene Council (Concilia, 1. c.) to support the use of images in worship; and several passages, most of them  identical with those cited in the council, are given by John of Damascus in his third oration, and in De lmnaginibus (Opera, 1:373, etc., ed. Le Quien). A Latin version of another portion of one of these discourses of Leontius is given in the Lectiones Antiquae of Canisius, 1:793, edit. Basnage: Βίος τοῦ ἁγίου Ι᾿ωάννου ἀρχειπισκόπου Α᾿λεξανδρείας τοῦ ῾Ελεήμονος, Vita Sancti Joannis Arcaiepiscopi Alexandria c Coynomento En leemonis, s. Eleemosynarii. SEE JOHN THE ALMSGIVER.

This life by Leontius was mentioned in the second Nicene Council (Concilia, vol. cit., col. 246 Labbe. 202 Hardouin, 896 Coleti. 53 Mansi), and is extant in No. 8 in the Imperial Library at Vienna. An ancient Latin version by Anastasius Bibliothecarius is given by Rosweid (De his Patrunm, pars 1), Surius (De Probatis Sanctorunm his), and Bollandus (Acta Sanctorum, January, 2:498, etc.). The account of St. Vitalis or Vitalius, given in the Acta Sanctorum of Bollandus (January), 1:702, is a Latin version of a part of this life of John the Almsgiver: Βίος τοῦ ὁσίου Συμεὼν τοῦ σαλοῦ, Vita Sancta Symneonis Simplicis, or Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ἀββᾶ Συμεὼν τοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐπονομασθέντος Σαλοῦ, Vita et Conversatio Abbatis Symeonis qui cognomisnatus est Stultus propter Christum, was also mentioned in the Nicene Council (1:(.), and published in the Acta Sauclt. of the Bollandists (July), 1:136, etc. The other published works of Leontius are homilies: Sermo in Simeonem quando Dominum in Ulnas suscepit: — In Diem festum mediae Pentecostes; both with a Latin version in the Novum Auctariumsn of Combis, vol. 1 (Par. 1648, fol.). As Leontius is recorded to have written many homilies in honor of saints (ἐγκώμια) and for the festivals of the Church (πανηγυρικοὶ λόγοι), especially on the transfiguration of our Savior, it is not unlikely that some of those extant under the name of Leontius of Constantinople may be by him. He wrote also Παραλλήλων λόγοι β῎, Parallelorum, s. Locorum communium Theologicorum Libri ii; the first book consisted of τῶν θειων, and the other τῶν ἀνθρωπινων.

Turrianus possessed the second book; but whether that or the first is extant, we know not; neither has been published. It has been thought that John of Damascus, in his Parallela, made use of those of Leontius. Fabricius also inserts among the works of our Leontius the homily Εἰς τὰ βαϊvα, In Festumn (s. Ratwos) Pulnarum, generally ascribed to Chrysostom, and printed among his doubtful or spurious works (7:334, ed. Savill; 10:767, ed. Montfaucon, or 10:915, and 13:354, in the recent Parisian reprint of Montfaucon's edition). Maldonatus (ad Joan. 7) mentions some MS. Commentarii in Joannem by Leontius, and an Oratio  in ltaudem S. Epiphanii is mentioned by Theodore Studita in his Antirrheticus Secundus,pud Sismondi, Opp. 5. 130. (See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 8:320, etc.; Cave, Hist. Litt. 1:550; Oudin, De Scriptor. Sirach , 1, col. 1575, etc.; Vossius, De Histor. Graec. lib. 2. 100:23; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, 2, col. 1062; Acta Sanctor. July, 5:131.) Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, 2:758.

## Leopard[[@Headword:Leopard]]

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

The variety of leopard, or rather panther, of Syria is  considerably below the stature of a lioness, but very heavy in proportion to its bulk. Its general form is so well known as to require no description beyond stating that the spots are rather more irregular, and the color more mixed with whitish, than in the other pantherine felins, excepting the Felis Uncia or Felis Irbis of High Asia, which is shaggy and almost white (Sonnini, Trav. 1:395). It is a nocturnal, cat-like animal in habits, dangerous to all domestic cattle, and sometimes even to man (comp. Plin. 10:94; Hom. Hymn in Ven. 71; Oppian, Cyneg. 3:76 sq.; Cvrill. Alex. in Hos. l. c.; Tsetz. Chiliad. 2:45; Poiret, Voyage, 1:224). In the Scriptures it is constantly placed in juxtaposition with the lion (Isa 11:6; Jer 5:6; Hos 13:7 : Sir 28:23 [27]; comps. AElian, V. H. 14:4) or the wolf. The swiftness of this animal, to which Habakkuk (Hab 1:8) compares the Chaldean horses, and to which Daniel (Dan 7:6) alludes in the winged leopard, is well known. So great is the flexibility of its body that it is able to take surprising leaps, to climb trees, or to crawl snake-like upon the ground. Jeremiah and Hosea (as above) allude to the insidious habit of this animal, which is abundantly confirmed by the observations of travelers: the leopard will take up its position in some spot near a village, and watch for some favorable opportunity for plunder. From the Canticles (as above) we learn that the hilly ranges of Lebanon were in ancient times frequented by these animals, and it is now not uncommonly seen in and about Lebanon, and the southern maritime mountains of Syria (Kitto, Pict. Bible, note on Son 4:8).

There is in Asia Minor a species or variety of panther, much larger than the Syrian, not unfrequent on the borders of the snowy tracts even of Mount Ida, above ancient Troy; and the group of these spotted animals is spread over the whole of Southern Asia to Africa. From several names of places (e.g. Beth-Nimrah, etc.), it appears that, in the earlier ages of Israelitish dominion, it was sufficiently numerous in Palestine, and recent travelers have encountered it there (see Bibliotheca Sacra, 1848, p. 669; Lynch's Expedition, p. 212). Leopard skins were worn as a part of ceremonial costume by the superiors of the Egyptian priesthood, and by other personages in Nubia; and the animal itself is represented in the processions of tributary nations (Wilkinson, 1:285, 291, 319). In Dan 7:7, the third stage of the prophetical vision is symbolized under the form of a leopard with wings, representing the rapidly formed Macedonian empire; its four heads corresponding to the division of Alexander's dominions among his four generals. In Rev 13:2, the same animal is made a type of the spiritual power  of the Roman hierarchy, supported by the secular power in maintaining Paganism in opposition to Christianity. See generally Bochart, Hieroz. 2:100 sq.; Schoder, Specin. hieroz. 1:46 sq.; Wemyss, Clavis Symbolica, s.v.; Wood, Bible Animals, p. 29 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, 2:156 sq.

## Leopard-worship[[@Headword:Leopard-worship]]

             The leopard is held in great dread by the natives of different parts of Africa, not only on account of its ferocity, but from the superstitious notion that wicked men metamorphose themselves into these animals, and commit all sorts of depredations without the liability or possibility of being killed. In southern Guinea large villages are sometimes abandoned by their inhabitants, because they are afraid to attack these animals on account of their supposed supernatural powers. In Dahomey, the leopard is accounted so sacred that if any one should kill it he would be convicted of having committed sacrilege, and would be offered in sacrifice to the offended god as a propitiation. The leopard is there looked upon as an impersonation of the supreme god, whom they call Seh. If any one is killed by a leopard, his relatives rejoice at the event, and treat the animal with great kindness. SEE LEOPARD.

## Leopold II[[@Headword:Leopold II]]

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

He advocated the use of the liturgy in the oral language of the country, he exposed the abuse of indulgences, approved of the four articles of the Gallican Council of 1682,  and, lastly, appealed to a national council as a legitimate and canonical means for terminating controversies. Several of Ricci's propositions were condemned by the pope in a bull as scandalous, rash, and injurious to the Holy See. Leopold supported Ricci, but he could not prevent his being annoyed in many ways, and at last he saw him forced to resign his charge. (For further details of this curious controversy, see Potter, Vie de Scipion de Ricci [Brussels, 1825, 3 vols. 8vo].) Leopold himself convoked a council at Florence of the bishops of Tuscany in 1787, and proposed to them fifty-seven articles concerning the reform of ecclesiastical discipline. He enforced residence of incumbents, and forbade pluralities; suppressed many convents, and distributed their revenues among the poor benefices, thus favoring the parochial clergy, and extending their jurisdiction, as he had supported and extended the jurisdiction of the bishops. He forbade the publication of the bulls and censures of Rome without the approbation of the government; he enjoined the ecclesiastical courts not to interfere with laymen in temporal matters, and restrained their jurisdiction to spiritual affairs only; and he subjected clergymen to the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts in all criminal cases. All these were considered in that age as very bold innovations for a Roman Catholic prince to undertake. SEE RICCI.

## Leopold IV[[@Headword:Leopold IV]]

             margrave of Austria, son of Leopold III, was born Sept. 29, 1073. He was educated by the priest Udalrich, under the direction of Altmann. bishop of Passau, and succeeded his father in 1096. His chief object during his whole reign was to promote the happiness of his subjects. He avoided war, and husbanded the resources of his country with great care. He was about to accompany the emperor, Henry IV, in a crusade to Jerusalem, when the insurrection of the emperor's son, Henry V, obliged him to change his plans. At first he went to assist the emperor (in 1105), but somewhat later he was influenced by his brother-in-law, Borzywoy II, duke of Bohemia, and the promises of Henry V, to join the latter, to whose sister Agnes, widow of Frederick of Suabia, he was married in 1106. The remainder of his reign passed in peace and prosperity, although occasionally (especially in 1118) he was subjected to annoyances by the inroads of the Hungarians. In 1125, after the death of Henry V, he was spoken of for emperor, but declined in favor of Lothaire, duke of Saxony. Leopold died Nov. 15, 1136, and was canonized by pope Innocent VIII in 1485. He founded a large number of convents, among which are those of Neuburg, of Mariazell, and of the Holy Cross, and built a number of churches. See A.  Klein, Gesca. des Christenthums in Oesterreich (Vienna, 1840), vol. 1 and 2; Leopold d. Heiliqe (Vien. 1835); L. Lang, D. hl. Leopold (Reutlingen, 1836); Pez, Vita sancti Leopoldi; same, Scriptores Rerum Austriacarum, 1:575; Poltzmann, Compendium vitae S. Leopoldi; Jaffe, Gesch. des deutschen Reiches unter Lothasr dem Sachsen (Berlin, 1843); and his Geschichsfe d. deutsch. Reiches u. Konrad III (Han. 1845); Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 8:332; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 30:797.

## Lepcha Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Lepcha Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Lepcha is a dialect spoken by an aboriginal mountain-tribe in north-east India, near Darjeeling. The first attempt at a translation into that dialect was made by the Reverend W. Start, in 1855 or 1856, who printed the gospel of Matthew at his own expense. The Calcutta Auxiliary Bible Society published, in 1871, the gospels of Matthew and John, Genesis, and part of Exodus. (B.P.)

## Leper[[@Headword:Leper]]

             (some form of צָרִע, to smite with a providential infliction; λεπρός). SEE LEPROSY.

## Leporius[[@Headword:Leporius]]

             a monastic who flourished in the second half of the 4th and the early part of the 5th century, a native of Gaul, embraced asceticism under the auspices of Cassianus about the opening of the 5th century, at Marseilles, where he enjoyed a high reputation for purity and holiness. Advancing the view that man did not stand in need of divine grace, and that Christ was born with a human nature only, he was excommunicated in consequence of these heretical doctrines. He betook himself to Africa, and there became familiar with Aurelius and St. Augustine, by whose instructions he profited so much that he not only became convinced of his errors, but drew up a solemn recantation addressed to Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, and Cyllinnius, the bishop of Aix (see below as to the title and value of this treatise), while four African prelates bore witness to the sincerity of his conversion, and made intercession on his behalf. Although now reinstated in his ecclesiastical privileges, Leporius does not seem to have returned to his native country, but, laying aside the profession of a monk, was ordained a presbyter by St. Augustine, A.D. 425, and appears to be the same Leporius so warmly praised in the discourse De Vita et Moribus Clericorum.

We know nothing further regarding his career except that he was still alive in 430 (Cassianus, De Incarn. 1:4). The treatise above alluded to is still extant, under the title Libellus emendationis sie satifactionis ad Apiscopos Galliae, sometimes with the addition Confessionem Fideii Catholicae continens de Mysterio Incarnationis Christi, cum Erroris pristini Detestatione. It was held in very high estimation among ancient divines, and its author was regarded as one of the firmest bulwarks of orthodoxy against the attacks of the Nestorians.  Some scholars in modern times, especially Quesnel, who has written an elaborate dissertation on the subject, have imagined that we ought to regard this as a tract composed and dictated by St. Augustine, founding their opinion partly on the style, and partly on those terms in which it is quoted in the acts of the secoend Council of Chalcedon and early documents, and partly on certain expressions in an epistle of Leo the Great (165, edit. Quesnel); but their arguments are far fromrr being conclusive, and the hypothesis is generally rejected. Fragments of the Libellus were first collected Sismondi from Cassianus, and inserted in his collection of Gaulish councils (1:52). The entire work was soon discovered and published by the same editor in his Opuscula. Dogmatica Veterumn quinque Sacristorum (Par. 1630, 8vo), together with the letter of the African bishops in favor of Leporius. It will be found also in the collection of councils by Labbe (Paris, 1671, folio); in Garnier's edition of Marisus Mrcator (Paris, 1673, fol.), 1:224; in the Bibliotheca. Patrune Max. (Lugd. 1677), 7:14; and in the Biblioteca Patrum of Galland (Ven. 1773), 9:396. Consult the dissertation of Quesnel in his edition of the works of Leo, 2:906 (ed. Paris); Histoire Litteraire de la France, 2:167 the second dissertation of Garnier, his edition of M. Mercantor, 1:230; the Prolegomena of Galland: Schoncmannn, Biblioteca Patr. Latt. 2, § 20. — Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biography, vol. 2, s.v.

## Leprosy[[@Headword:Leprosy]]

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

(I.) Leprosy in Human Beings. —

1. Cases and Symptomns of Biblical Leprosy. — Lev 13:2-44, which descrilbes this distemper as laying hold of man, gives six different circumstances under which it may develop itself. They are as follows:

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

As the description of these symptoms is very concise, and requires to be specified more minutely for practical purposes, the spiritual guides of Israel defined them as follows: Both the bright pimple (בהרת) and the swelling spot (שאת), when indicative of leprosy, assume respectively one of two colors, a principal or a subordinate one. The principal color of the bright pimple is as white as snow (עזת כשלג), and the subordinate resembles plaster on the wall (כסיד ההיכל); whilst the principal color of the rising spot is like that of an eggshell (כקרום בצה), and the secondary one  resembles white wool (כצמר לבן, Negaim, 1:1); so that if the affected spot in the skin is inferior in whiteness to the film of an egg it is not leprosy, but simply a gathering (Maimonides, On Leprosy, 1:1). Any one may examine the disease, except the patient himself or his relatives, but the priest alone can decide whether it is leprosy or not, and accordingly pronounce the patient unclean or clean, because Deu 21:5 declares that the priest must decide cases of litigation and disease. But though the priest only can pronounce the decision, even if he be a child or a fool, yet he must act upon the advice of a learned layman in those matters (Negaim, 3:1; Maimonides, l. c., 9:1, 2). If the priest is blind of one eye, or is weak-sighted, he is disqualified for examining the distemper (Mishna, l. c., 2:3). The inspection must not take place on the Sabbath, nor early in the morning, nor in the middle of the day, nor in the evening, nor on cloudy days, because the color of the skin cannot properly be ascertained in these hours of the day; but in the third, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, or ninth hour (Negayim, 2:2); and the same priest who inspected it at first must examine it again at the end of the second seven days, as another one could not tell whether it has spread. If he should die in the interim, or be taken ill, another one may examine him, but not pronounce him unclean (Maimonides, On Leprosy, 9:4). There must be at least two hairs white at the root and in the body of the bright spot before the patient can be declared unclean (Maimonides, 1. c., 2:1). If a bridegroom is seized with this distemper he must be left alone during the nuptial week (Negayim, 3:2).

(2.) The second case is of leprosy reappearing after it has been cured (Lev 13:9-17), where a somewhat different treatment is enjoined. If a person who has once been healed of this disease is brought again to the priest, and if the latter finds a white rising in the skin (לבנה שאת), which has changed the hair into white and contains live flesh (בשר חי), he is forthwith to recognize therein the reappearance of the old malady, and declare the patient unclean without any quarantine whatever, since the case is so evident that it requires no trial (Lev 13:9-11). There were, however, two phases of this returned distemper which exempted the patient from uncleanness. If the leprosy suddenly covered the whole body so that the patient became perfectly white, in which case there could be no appearance of live flesh (Lev 13:12-13), or if the whiteness, after having once diminished and allowed live flesh to appear, covers again the whole body, then the patient was clean (Lev 13:14-17). This, most probably, was regarded as  indicative of the crisis, as the whole evil matter thus brought to the surface formed itself into a scale which dried and peeled off. The only other feature which this case represents besides the symptoms already described is that leprosy at times also spread over the whole skin and rendered it perfectly white. As to the live flesh (בשר חי), the Sept., the Chaldee, the Mishna, and the Jewish rabbins, in accordance with ancient tradition, take it to denote soundflesh, or a spot in the flesh assuming the appearance of life after it had been paled by the whiteness overspreading the whole surface. The size of this spot of live flesh which renders the patient unclean must, according to tradition, be at least that of a lentil (Maimonides, 1. c., 3:1-3).

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

(4.) The fourth case is leprosy on the head or chin (Lev 13:29-37), which is to be recognized by the affected spot being deeper than the general level of the skin, and by the hair thereon having become thin and  yellowish. When these symptoms exist, the priest is to pronounce it a scall (נתק), which is head or chin leprosy, and declare the patient unclean (Lev 13:30). But if this disorder on the head or chin does not exhibit these symptoms, the patient is to be remanded for seven days, when the priest is again to examine it, and if he finds that it has neither spread nor exhibits the required criteria, he is to order the patient to cut off all the hair of his head or chin, except that which grows on the afflicted spot itself, and remand him for another week, and then pronounce him clean if it continues in the same state at the expiration of this period (Lev 13:31-34); and if it spreads after he has been pronounced clean, the priest is forthwith to declare him unclean without looking for any yellow hair (Lev 13:35-36). The Jewish canons define נתק by “an affection on the head or chin which causes the hair on these affected parts to fall off by the roots, so that the place of the hair is quite bare” (Maimonides, On Leprosy, 8:1). The condition of the hair, constituting one of the leprous symptoms, is described as follows: “ דק is small or short, but if it be long, though it is yellow as gold, it is no sign of uncleanness. Two yellow and short hairs, whether close to one another or far from each other, whether in the center of the nethek or on the edge thereof, no matter whether the nethek precedes the yellow hair or the yellow hair the nethek, are symptoms of uncleanness” (Maimonides. 1. c., 8:5). The manner of shaving is thus described: “The hair round the scall is all shaved off except two hairs which are close to it, so that it might be known thereby whether it spread” (Negaim, 10:5).

(5.) The fifth case is leprosy which shows itself in white polished spots, and is not regarded as unclean (Lev 13:38-39). It is called bohak ( בֹּהק', from בָּהִק, to be white), or, as the Sept. has it, ἀλφός, vitiligo alba, white scurf.

(6.) The sixth case is of leprosy either at the back or in the front of the head (Lev 13:40-44). When a man loses his hair either at the back or in the front of his head, it is a simple case of baldness, and he is clean (Lev 13:40-41). But if a whitish red spot forms itself on the bald place at the back or in the front of the head, then it is leprosy, which is to be recognized by the fact that the swelling or scab on the spot has the appearance of leprosy in the skin of the body; and the priest is to declare the man's head leprous and unclean (Lev 13:42-44). Though there is only one symptom mentioned whereby head leprosy is to be recognized, and nothing is said about remanding the patient if the distemper should appear doubtful,  as in the other cases of leprosy, yet the ancient rabbins inferred from the remark, “It is like leprosy in the skin of the flesh,” that all the criteria specified in the latter are implied in the former. Hence the Hebrew canons submit that “there are two symptoms which render baldness in the front or at the back of the head unclean, viz. live or sound flesh, and spreading; the patient is also shut up for them two weeks, because it is said of them that ‘they are land therefore must be treated like leprosy in the skin of the flesh' “(Lev 13:43). Of course, the fact that the distemper in this instance develops itself on baldness, precludes white hair being among the criteria indicating uncleanness. The manner in which the patient in question is declared unclean by two symptoms and in two weeks is as follows: “If live or sound flesh is found in the bright spot on the baldness at the back or in the front of the head, he is pronounced unclean; if there is no live flesh he is shut up and examined at the end of the week, and if live flesh has developed itself, and it has spread, he is declared unclean, and if not he is shut up for another week. If it has spread during this time, or engendered live flesh, he is declared unclean, and if not he is pronounced clean. He is also pronounced unclean if it spreads or engenders sound flesh after he has been declared clean” (Negaim, 10:10; Maimonides, On Leprosy, 5:9,10).

2. Regulations about the Conduct and Purification of leprous Men. — Lepers were to rend their garments, let the hair of their head hang down disheveled, cover themselves up to the upper lip, like mourners, and warn off every one whom they happened to meet by calling out “Unclean! unclean!” since they defiled every one and everything they touched. For this reason they were also obliged to live in exclusion outside the camp or city (Lev 13:45-46; Num 5:1-4; Num 12:10-15; 2Ki 7:3, etc.). “The very entrance of a leper into a house,” according to the Jewish canons, “renders everything in it unclean” (Negaim., 12:11; Kelim, 1:4). “If he stands under a tree and a clean man passes by, he renders him unclean. In the synagogue which he wishes to attend they are obliged to make him a separate compartment, ten handbreadths high and four cubits long and broad; he has to be the first to go in, and the last to leave the synagogue” (Negaim, 12:12; Maimonides, On Leprosy, 10:12); and if he transgressed the prescribed boundaries he was to receive forty stripes (Pesachim, 67, at). All this only applies to those who had been pronounced lepers by the priest, but not to those who were on quarantine (Negaim, 1:7). The rabbinic law also exempts women from the obligation to rend their garments and let the hair of their head fall down (Sota, 3:8). It is therefore  no wonder that the Jews regarded leprosy as a living death (comp. Josephus, Ant. 3:11, 8, and the well-known rabbinic saying מצורע חשוב כמת), and as an awful punishment from the Lord (2Ki 5:7; 2Ch 26:20), which they wished all their mortal enemies (2Sa 3:29 : 2Ki 5:27).

The healed leper had to pass through two stages of purification before he could be received back into the community. As soon as the distemper disappeared he sent for the priest, who had to go outside the camp or town to convince himself of the fact. Thereupon the priest ordered two clean and live birds, a piece of cedar wood, crimson wool, and hyssop; killed one bird over a vessel containining spring water, so that the blood might run into it, tied together the hyssop and the cedar wood with the crimson wool, put about them the tops of the wings and the tip of the tail of the living bird, dipped all the four in the blood and water which were in the vessel, then sprinkled the hand of the healed leper seven times, let the bird loose, and pronounced the restored man clean (Lev 14:17; Negtaime, 12:1). The healed leper was then to wash his garments, cut off all his hair, be immersed, and return to the camp or city, but remain outside his house seven days, which the Mishina (Negailm, 14:2), the Chaldee Paraphrase, Maimonides (On Leprosy, 11:1), etc., rightly regard as a euphemism for exclusion from connubial intercourse during that time (Lev 14:8), in order that he might not contract impurity (comp. Lev 15:18). With this ended the first stage of purification. According to the Jewish canons, the birds are to be “free, and not caged,” or sparrows; the piece of cedar wood is to be “a cubit long, and a quarter of the foot of the bed thick;” the crimson wool is to be a shekel's weight, i.e. 320 grains of barley; the hyssop must at least be a handbreadth in size, and is neither to be the so- called Greek, nor ornamental, nor Roman, nor wild hyssop, nor have any name whatever; the vessel must be an earthen one, and new; and the dead bird must be buried in a hole dug before their eyes (Negaim, 14:1-6; Maimonides, On Leprosy, 11:1).

The second stage of purification began on the seventh day, when the leper had again to cut off the hair of his head, his beard, eyebrows, etc., wash his garments, and be immersed (Lev 14:9). On the eighth day he had to bring two he-lambs without blemish, one ewe-lamb a year old, three tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil, and one log of oil; the one he-lamb is to be a trespass-offering, and the other, with the ewe-lamb, a  burnt and a sin-offering; but if the man was poor he was to bring two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, for a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, instead of a he-lamb and a ewe-lamb (Lev 14:10-11; Lev 14:21). With these offerings the priest conducted the healed leper before the presence of the Lord. What the offerer had to do, and how the priest acted when going through these ceremonies, cannot be better described than in the following graphic language of the Jewish tradition. “The priest approaches the trespass- offering, lays both his hands on it, and kills it, when two priests catch its blood, one into a vessel, and the other in his hand; the one who caught it into the vessel sprinkles it against the wall of the altar, the other goes to the leper, who, having been immersed in the leper's chamber [which is in the women's court], is waiting [outside the court of Israel, or the men's court, opposite the eastern door] in the porch of Nicanor [with his face to the west]. He then puts his head into [the court of Israel], and the priest puts some of the blood upon the tip of his right ear; he next puts in his right hand, and the priest puts some blood upon the thumb thereof; and, lastly, puts in his right ear, and the priest puts some blood on the toe thereof. The: priest then takes some of the log of oil and puts it into, the left hand of his fellow-priest, or into his own left hand, dips the finger of his right hand in it, and sprinkles it seven times towards the holy of holies, dipping his finger every time he sprinkles it; whereupon he goes to the leper, puts oil on those parts of his body on which he had previously put blood [i.e. the tip of the ear, the thumb, and the toe], as it is written, ‘on the place of the blood of the trespass-offering' [Lev 14:28], and what remains of the oil in the hand of the priest he puts on the head of him who is to be cleansed, for an atonement” (Negaim, 14:8-10; Maimonides, Michoth Mechosrei Kepora, 4). It is in accordance with this prerogative of the priest, who alone could pronounce the leper clean and readmit him into the congregation, that Christ commanded the leper whom he had healed to show himself to this functionary (Mat 8:2, etc.).

(II.) Leprous Garments and Vessels. — Leprosy in garments and vessels is indicated by two symptoms, green or reddish spots, and spreading. If a green or reddish spot shows itself in a woolen or linen garment, or in a leather vessel, it is indicative of leprosy, and must be shown to the priest, who is to shut it up for a week. If, on inspecting it at the end of this time, he finds that the spot has spread, he is to pronounce it inveterate leprosy (צרעת ממארת), and unclean, and burn it (Lev 13:47-52); if it has not spread he is to have it washed, and shut it up for another week, and  if its appearance has then not changed, he is to pronounce it unclean and burn it, though it has not spread, since the distemper rankles in the front or at the back of the material (Lev 13:53-55). But if, after washing it, the priest sees that the spot has become weaker, he is to cut it out of the material; if it reappears in any part thereof, then it is a developed distemper, and the whole of it must be burned; and if it vanishes after washing, it must be washed a second time, and is clean (Lev 13:56-59). The Jewish canons define the color green to be like that of herbs, and red like that of fair crimson, and take this enactment literally as referring strictly to wool of sheep and flax, but not to hemp and other materials. A material made of camel's hair and sheep's wool is not rendered unclean by leprosy if the camel's hair preponderate, but is unclean when the sheep's wool preponderates, or when both are equal, and this also applies to mixtures of flax and hemp. Dyed skins and garments are not rendered unclean by leprosy; nor are vessels so if made of skins of aquatic animals exposed to leprous uncleanness (Negaim, 11:2,3; Maimonides, ut sup. 11:1; 12:10; 13:1-3).

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

As to the purification of the houses which have been cured of leprosy, the process is the same as that of healed men, except that in the case of man the priest sprinkles seven times upon his hand, while in that of the house he sprinkles seven times on the upper door-post without. Of course the sacrifices which the leprous man had to bring in his second stage of  purification are precluded in the case of the house (Maimonides, On Leprosy, 15:8).

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

That the disease was not contagious is evident from the regulations themselves. The priests had to be in constant and close contact with lepers, had to examine and handle them; the leper who was entirely covered was pronounced clean (Lev 13:12-13); and the priest himself commanded that all things in a leprous house should be taken out before he entered it, in order that they might not be pronounced unclean, and that they might be used again (Lev 14:36), which most unquestionably implies that there was no fear of contagion. This is, moreover, corroborated by the ancient Jewish canons, which were made by those very men who had personally to deal with this distemper, and according to which a leprous minor, a heathen, and a proselyte, as well as leprous garments, and houses of non-Israelites, do not render any one unclean; nor does a bridegroom, who is seized with this malady during the nuptial week, defile any one during the first seven days of his marriage (comp. Negaim,  3:1, 2; 7:1; 11:1; 12:1; Maimonides, On Leprosy, 6:1; 7:1, etc.). These canons would be utterly inexplicable on the hypothesis that the distemper in question was contagious. The enactments, therefore, about the exclusion of the leper from society, and about defilement, were not dictated by sanitary caution, but had their root in the moral and ceremonial law, like the enactments about the separation and uncleanness of menstruous women, of those who had an issue or touched the dead, which are joined with leprosy. Being regarded as a punishment for sin, which God himself inflicted upon the disobedient (Exo 15:26; Lev 14:35), this loathsome disease, with the peculiar rites connected therewith, was especially selected as a typical representation of the pollution of sin, in which light the Jews always viewed it. Thus we are told that “leprosy comes upon man for seven, ten, or eleven things: for idolatry, profaning the name of God, unchastity, theft, slander, false witness, false judgment, perjury, infringing the borders of a neighbor, devising malicious plans, or creating discord between brothers” (Erachin, 16, 17; Baba Bathra, 164; Aboth de R. Nathan, 9; Midrash Rabba on Leviticus 14). “Cedar wood and hyssop, the highest and the lowest, give the leper purity. Why these? Because pride was the cause of the distemper, which cannot be cured till man becomes humble, and keeps himself as low as hyssop” (Midrash Rabba, Koheleth, p. 104).

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

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

1. The Greeks distinguished three species of lepra, the specific names of which were ἀλφος, λευκή, and μέλας which may be rendered the vitiligo, the white and the black. Now, on turning to the Mosaic account, we also find three species mentioned, which were all included under the generic term of בִּהֶרֶת, bahereth, or “bright spot” (Lev 13:2-4; Lev 13:18-28). The first is called בֹּהִק, bhak, which signifies “brightness,” but in a subordinate degree (Lev 13:39). This species did not render a  person unclean. The second was called לְבָנָה בִּהֶרֶת, bahereth lebandh. or a bright white baherleth. The characteristic marks of the bahe'eth lebandh mentioned by Moses are a glossy white and spreading scale upon an elevated base, the elevation depressed in the middle, the hair on the patches participating in the whiteness, and the patches themselves perpetually increasing. This was evidently the true leprosy, probably corresponding to the white of the Greeks and the vulgaris of modern science. The third was בִּהֶרֶת כְּהָה, bahereth khadh, or dusky bahereth, spreading in the skin. It has been thought to correspond with the black leprosy of the Greeks and the nigricans of Dr. Willan. These last two were also called צָרִעִת, tsardath (i.e. proper leprosy), and rendered a person unclean. There are some other slight affections mentioned by name in Leviticus (chap. 13), which the priest was required to distinguish from leprosy, such as שְׂאֵת, seeth; שָׁפָל, shaphdl; תּפק, nethek; שְׁחַין-, shechen, i.e. “elevation,” “depressed,” etc.; and to each of these Dr. Good (Study of Med. 5:590) has assigned a modern systematic name. But, as it is useless to attempt to recognize a disease otherwise than by a description of its symptoms, we can have no object in discussing his interpretation of these terms. We therefore recognize but two species of real leprosy.

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

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

Moses prescribes no natural remedy for the cure of leprosy (Leviticus 13). He requires only that the diseased person should show himself to the priest, and that the priest should judge of his leprosy; if it appeared to be a real leprosy, he separated the leper from the company of mankind (Lev 13:45-46; comp. Num 5:2; Num 12:10; Num 12:14; 2Ki 7:3; 2Ki 15:5; Josephus, Apion, 1:31; Ant. 3:11,3; Wars, 5:5,6; see Wetstein, N. t. 1:175; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 861; Withob, Opusc. p. 169 sq.). Although the laws in the Mosaic code respecting this disease are exceedingly rigid (see Michaelis, Orient. Bibl. 17:19 sq.; Medic. hermeneuet. Untersuch. p. 240 sq.), it is by no means clear that the leprosy was contagious. The fear or disgust which was felt towards such a peculiar disease might be a sufficient cause for such severe enactments. All intercourse with society, however, was not cut off (Mat 8:2; Luk 5:12; Luk 17:12), and even contact with a leper did not necessarily impart uncleanness (Luk 17:12). They were even admitted to the synagogue (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 862). Similar liberties are still allowed them among the Arabians (Niebuhr, Beschr. p. 136); so that we are probably to regard the statements of travelers respecting the utter exclusion of modern lepers in the East as  relating to those affected with entirely a different disease, the elephantiasis. In Leviticus 14 are detailed particular ceremonies and offerings (compare Mat 8:4) to be officially observed by the priest on behalf of a leper restored to health and purity. See D. C. Lutz, De duab. avtib. purgationi leprosi destinatis earundenzque mysterio, Hal. 1737; Bihr, Symbol. 2:512 sq.; Baumgarten, Commnent. I, 2:170 sq.; Talmud, tract Negaim, 6:3; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 365 sq.; Rhenferd, in Meuschen, N.T. Talmud. p. 1057.

(II.) Elephantiasis. — This more severe form of cutaneous, or, rather, scrofulous disease has been confounded with leprosy, from which it is essentially different. It is usually called tubercular leprosy (Lepra nodosa, Celsus, Med. 3:25), and has generally been thought to be the disease with which Job was afflicted (שְׁחין רִע, Job 2:7; comp. Deu 28:35). SEE JOBS DISEASE.

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

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

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

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

2. That the Mosaic cases of true leprosy were confined to the former of these two dreadful forms of disease is evident. The reason why this kind of cutaneous distemper alone was taken cognizance of by the law doubtless was because the other was too well marked and obvious to require any diagnostic particularization. With the scriptural symptoms before us, let us compare the most recent description of modern leprosy of the malignant type given by an eye-witness who examined this subject: “The scab comes on by degrees, in different parts of the body; the hair falls from the head and eyebrows; the nails loosen, decay, and drop off; joint after joint of the fingers and toes shrink up, and slowly fall away; the gums are absorbed, and the teeth disappear; the nose, the eyes, the tongue, and the palate are slowly consumed; and, finally, the wretched victim shrinks into the earth and disappears, while medicine has no power to stay the ravages of this fell disease, or even to mitigate sensibly its tortures” (Thomson, Land and Book, p. 653, etc.); and again, “Sauntering down the Jaffa road, on my approach to the Holy City, in a kind of dreamy maze, I was startled out of my reverie by the sudden apparition of a crowd of beggars, sans eyes, sans nose, sans hair, sans everything. They held up towards me their handless arms, unearthly sounds gurgled through throats without palates” (ibid. p.  651). We merely ask by what rules of interpretation can we deduce from the Biblical leprosy, which is described as consisting in a rising scab, or bright spot deeper than the general level of the skin, and spreading, sometimes exhibiting live flesh, and which is non-contagious and curable, that loathsome and appalling malady described by Dr. Thomson and others?

3. As to the leprosy of garments, vessels, and houses, the ancient Jewish tradition is that “leprosy of garments and houses was not to be found in the world generally, but was a sign and a miracle in Israel to guard them against an evil tongue” (Maimonides, On Leprosy, 16:10). Some have thought garments worn by leprous patients intended. The discharges of the diseased skin absorbed into the apparel would, if infection were possible, probably convey disease, and it is known to be highly dangerous in some cases to allow clothes which have so imbibed the discharges of an ulcer to be worn again. The words of Jude, Mar 1:23, may seem to countenance this, “Hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.” But, 1st, no mention of infection occurs; 2d, no connection of the leprous garment with a leprous human wearer is hinted at; 3d, this would not help us to account for a leprosy of stone walls and plaster. Thus Dr. Mead (ut sq).) speaks at any rate plausibly of the leprosy of garments, but becomes unreasonable when he extends his explanation to that of walls. There is more probability in the idea of Sommer (Bibl. Abhandlugen, 1:224) that what is meant are the fusting-stains occasioned by damp and want of air, and which, when confirmed, cause the cloth to moulder and fall to pieces. Michaelis thought that wool from sheep which had died of a particular disease might fret into holes, and exhibit an appearance like that described in Lev 13:47; Lev 13:59 (Michaelis, art. 211, 3:290, 291).

But woolen cloth is far from being the only material mentioned; nay, there is even some reason to think that the words rendered in the A.V. “warp” and “woof” are not those distinct parts of the texture, but distinct materials. Linen, however, and leather are distinctly particularized, and the latter not only as regards garments, but “anything (lit. vessel) made of skin” — for instance, bottles. This classing of garments and house-walls with the human epidermis as leprous has moved the mirth of some and the wonder of others. Yet modern science has established what goes far to vindicate the Mosaic classification as more philosophical than such cavils. It is now known that there are some skin- diseases which originate in an acarus, and others which proceed from a fungus. In these we may probably find the solution of the paradox. The  analogy between the insect which frets the human skin and that which frets the garment that covers it, between the fungous growth that lines the crevices of the epidermis and that which creeps in the interstices of masonry, is close enough for the purposes of a ceremonial law, to which it is essential that there should be an arbitrary element intermingled with provisions manifestly reasonable. Michaelis (ibid. art. 211:3:293-9) has suggested a nitrous efflorescence on the surface of the stone, produced by saltpetre, or rather an acid containing it, and issuing in red spots, and cites the example of a house in Lubeck; he mentions, also, exfoliation of the stone from other causes; but probably these appearances would not be developed without a greater degree of damp than is common in Palestine and Arabia. It is manifest, also, that a disease in the human subject caused by an acarus or a fungus would be certainly contagious, since the propagative cause could be transferred from person to person. Some physicians, indeed, assert that only such skin-diseases are contagious. Hence, perhaps, arose a further reason for marking, even in their analogues among lifeless substances, the strictness with which forms of disease so arising were to be shunned.

Whatever the nature of the disorder might be, there can be no doubt, as Baumgarten has remarked (Comm. 2:175), that in the house respect was had to its possessor, since when it came to be in a good condition a cleansing or purification quite analogous to the man's was prescribed. He was thus taught to see in his external environments a sign of what was or might be internal. The later Jews appear to have had some idea of this, though others viewed it differently. Some rabbins say that God sent this plague for the good of the Israelites into certain houses, that, they being pulled down, the treasure which the Amorites had hidden there might be discovered (Patrick on Lev 14:34). But “there is good reason,” adds the learned prelate, “from these words [‘I put the plague of leprosy upon a house], to think that this plague was a supernatural stroke. Thus Aberbanel understands it: ‘When he saith “I put the plague,” it shows that this thing was not natural, but proceeded from the special providence and pleasure of the blessed God.' So the author of Sepher Cosri (pt. 2, § 58): God inflicted the plague of leprosy upon houses and garments as a punishment for lesser sins, and when men continued still to multiply transgressions, then it invaded their bodies. Maimonides will have this to be the punishment of an evil tongue, i.e. detractions and calumny, which began in the walls of the offender's house, and went no farther, but  vanished if he repented of his sin; but if he persisted in his rebellious courses, it proceeded to his household stuff; and if he still went on, invaded his garments, and at last his body” (More Nebochim, pt. 3, cap. 47).

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

Literature. — Besides the above notices and canons on leprosy given in the Mischna, tract Negaim; also by Maimonides, Yod Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Mechosse Kapara, cap. 4, and Hilchoth Tamath Tsoraoth; and by Rashi and Rashbarn, Commentar. on Leviticus 13, 14; see, among modern writers, Mead, Medica Sacra, in his Medical Works (Edinb. 1765), 3:160, etc.; Michaelis, Laws of Moses (Lond. 1814), 3:257-305; Mason Good, The Study of Medicine (Lond. 1825), v. 585 sq.; Schilling, De lepra Commentationes (Lugd. Bat. 1778); Hensler, Vorn abendlandischen Aussatze im Mittelalter (Hamb. 1790); Jahn, Biblische A rchaologie (Vienna, 1818), I, 2:355 sq.; Bahr, Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus (Heidelb. 1830), 2:459 sq., 512 sq.; Sommer, Biblische Abhacndlungen, vol. 1 (Bonn, 1846); Pruner, Die Krankheiten des Orients (Erlang. 1847), p. 163 sq.; Trusen, Die Sitten, Gebrauche und Kranklheiten der A lten Hebr. (Bresl. 1833); Saalschütz, Das Mosaische Recht (Berlin, 1853), 1:217 sq.; Keil, Handbuch der Biblischen A rchaologie (Frankfort-on-the- Main, 1858), 1:270 sq., 288 sq.; Bonorden, Lepra squamosa (Hal. 1795); Lutz, De avibus purgat. leprosi (Hal.1757); Withof, De leprosariis vet. Hebrueorum (Duisb. 1756); Murray, Historia leprce (Gott. 1749); J. Thomas, De lepra Grcecor. et Judaeor. (Basil. 1708); Norberg, De lepra A rabums (Lond. 1796); Hilary, Observ. on the Diseases of Barbadoes (Lond. 1759), p. 326 sq.; Sprengel, Pathol. 3:794-835; Frank, De curandis honzin. morbis, I, 2:476; Schnurrer, in the Halle Encyklop.  6:451 sq.; Rust, Handb. d. Chirurg. 2:581 sq.; Roussille-Chamseru. Recherches sur ie veritable. Caractere de la Lepre des Hebreux, and Relation Chirurg. de l'Armee de l'Orient (Paris, 1804); Cazenave and Schedel, A breg Pratique des Maladies de la Peau; Aretaeus, Maorb. Chron. 2:13; Fracastorius, De Morbis Contagiosis; Johannes Manardus, Epist. Medic. 7:2, and to 4:3, 3, § 1 Avicenna, De Medic. v. 28, § 19; also Dr. Sim in the North American Chirurgical Review, Sept. 1859, p. 876: Hecker, Die Elephantiasis oder Lepra Arabica (Lehr, 1858); also the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index, p. 42; and by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 137. The ancient authorities are Hippocrates, Prophetica, lib. 12, ap. fin.; Galen, Explicati Linguaruam Hippocratis, and De Art. Curat. lib. 2; Celsus, De Medic. 5:28, § 19. SEE DISEASE.

## Lepsius, Karl Richard[[@Headword:Lepsius, Karl Richard]]

             a noted German Egyptologist, was born at Naumburg, December 23, 1810. Well prepared by seven years of classical training at Pforta, he went in 1829 to Leipsic and Gottingen to study philology. When he took his degree, he showed at once by his dissertation that he knew how best to utilize the principles of comparative philology by applying them to the solution of difficult problems of classical scholarship. He took for his subject the Umbrian Inscriptions, and thus laid the foundation of what has proved in the end one of the most successful achievements of the science of language — namely, the decipherment and grammatical analysis of the Eugubian tables. In 1833 he went to, Paris to attend lectures, and study in libraries and museums.

In 1834 he published Palaographie als Mittel fur die Sprachforschung, for which was awarded by the French Institute the Prix Volney. In 1835 another essay of his, Ueber die Anordnung und Verwandtschaft des semitischen, indischen, athiopischen, altpersischen  zund altegyptischen Alphabets, was read before the Berlin Academy; and in the same year. while still at Paris, he wrote his paper, Ueber den Ursprung und die Verwandtschaft der Zanhlworter in der indogermanischen, semitischen, und der koptischen Spraache. At the time of his residence at Paris. Champollion's star was just rising, but Egyptian studies were only in their infancy. Lepsius felt attracted towards these new studies. Having acquired the first principles of the decipherment of hieroglyphs from Champollion's works, he proceeded from Paris to Italy, which was rich in Egyptian antiquities. He spent some time with Rosellini, at Pisa, and then settled down to steady work at Rome. Here he was attracted by Bunsen, who did everything he could for him. By his Lettre a M. Rosellini sur l' Alphabet Hyroglyphique (1837), Lepsius took his position as one of the leading Egyptologists of the day, and thus entered upon a career which he never left again. But, although Egypt formed the principal object of his studies, his classical tastes, too, found ample food in Italy, as was shown by his edition of the Inscriptiones Umbricae et Oscae (Leipsic, 1841), and by his papers on Die Tyarrheneschen Pelasger in Etrurien (1842). From Italy he went to England, where he spent two years studying in the British Museum, and shaping plans for future work. In 1842 we find Lepsius established as professor at Berlin. In the meantime he had published some of his bestknown works — his Auswahl der wichtigsten Urkunden des agyptischen Alterthums (1842, fol. with 23 tables), and Das Todtenbuch der AEgyptera (eod. with 79 tables). In the same year followed the great expedition to Egypt, projected by Bunsen, and carried out at the expense of the king of Prussia, Frederick William IV. Lepsius was the leader, and he acquitted himself of this most difficult task with perfect success.

Every student of Egyptology knows the fruits of that expedition, as gathered partly in Denkmaler aus Egypten und AEthiopien (1849-59, 12 volumes of the largest folio, with 894 tables). In 1849 he published his Chronologie der AEgypter, one volume; the second never appeared. Without enumerating the many works which he published after his return from Egypt, we will state that in 1866 he went to the land of the Pharaohs once more, and this second expedition was crowned by the discovery of a new trilingual tablet, a worthy companion of the Rosetta stone. In 1869 he paid his last visit to the land of his lifelong love, being present at the opening of the Suez canal. and afterwards travelled with the crown-prince of Prussia to Upper Egypt and Nubia. The last years of his life were devoted chiefly to the elaboration of his Nubian Grammar, a work of enormous labor, full not only of new materials, but of new views  on the relationship of the numerous languages of Africa. "Taken all in all," says Max Miiller, "Lepsius was the perfect type of the German professor, devoted to his work, full of ideals and convinced that there is no higher vocation in life than to preserve and to add to the sacred stock of human knowledge, which, though it is seen by the few only, has to be carried, like the Ark of the Covenant. from battle to battle, and kept safe from the hands of the Philistines." Lepsius died July 10, 1884, only one day after Dorner and Lange. Like a Christian. he prepared himself for his last journey. being strengthened before his departure by the Lord's Supper, which he received from the hands of the court-preacher, Dr. Kogel. Besides having received different orders from the hands of kings, he was made doctor of theology by the Leipsic University in 1859. He. also introduced the so-called missionary alphabet, or Standard Alphabet for Reducing Unwritten Languages and Foreign Graphic Systems to a Uniform Orthography in European Letters, a system which gained support both by scholars and missionaries. See Max Muller, in the Academy (Lond. July 19, 1884); Ebers, Richard Lepsius, ein Lebenisbild (Leipsic, 1885; a list of Lepsius's works is found on pages 376-390); Dillmann, Geddchtnissrede auf Karl Richard Lepsius, read before the Berlin Academy of Sciences, July 2, 1885 (Berlin, 1885). (B.P.)

## Lerad[[@Headword:Lerad]]

             in Norse mythology, is a mighty tree, standing in Walhalla, in whose boughs the reindeer Eikthyrnir and the goat Hejdrun live and find nourishment. From the drops which fall from the antlers of the former all the rivers of the world are formed.

## Lercari, Nicolas Marie[[@Headword:Lercari, Nicolas Marie]]

             an Italian cardinal, was born at Tabia, Genoa, November 19, 1675. He filled various offices at the pontifical court, and afterwards became successively governor of Lodi, of Benevento, of Camerino, of Ancona, of Civita Vecchia, and of Perugia. Being called to Rome in 1724 by Benedict XIII, with whom he had allied himself at Benevento, he was consecrated archbishop in partibus, and two years later appointed prime-minister. The foreign ambassadors refusing to treat with him, under the pretext that his  position was not sufficiently honorable, he was made cardinal in December, 1726. In his position as secretary of state he showed himself an able negotiator, and several times thwarted the purposes of the imperial court. In 1730, on the death of Benedict XIII, he was despoiled of his honors, and arraigned before a congregation of cardinals to give an account of his administration. His integrity was established, but his influence was gone. He died March 20, 1757. See Hoefer, Nouv Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lerins, Convent Of[[@Headword:Lerins, Convent Of]]

             one of the oldest, and once one of the most important monastic establishments in France, is situated in the island of St. Honore, on the coast of Provence, opposite Antibes. The legend concerning its origin is as follows: Honorarus, a man of noble descent, and who had even been once consul, embraced the Christian faith, together with his brother, in spite of the remonstrances of his family. They first retired to an island near Marseilles, but Honoratus afterwards went back to Provence, where he settled at Lerins, under the protection of the bishop of Fry us. His reputation for sanctity induced many to join him, and they lived, some in communities (coenobites), others as hermits in separate cells. It was the time when monachism was lately introduced into Europe from the East, and convents were arising along the shores of the Mediterranean, and on the coasts of Italy (Gallinara, Gorgona, Capraja), of Dalmatia, and of France. Martinus had just established a convent at Turonum, whose rules  were adopted in those that were established by Cassian. The statement that the Cassian rules were first introduced at Lerins is therefore erroneous. Under Honoratus, who was afterwards appointed bishop of Aries, the last- named convent made rapid progress. Lerins became one of the most important schools for the clergy of Southern Gaul, and furnished a large number of bishops, among whom we will mention Hilarius of Arles and Eucherius of Lyons: at that time monks were often made bishops. In the 5th century the convent became imbued with semi-Pelagian ideas, which thence spread into Southern France. In the 7th century the monks of Lerins seem to have relaxed in their obedience to their rule, for Gregory wrote to the abbot Conon inviting him to reform their morals.

This reform was accomplished by a Benedictine abbot, Aigulf, but only after a struggle which for a while threatened to destroy the convent, the opposition party going so far as to call in the assistance of neighboring lords, and murdering the abbot and some of his followers. Still, as the reform had been inaugurated, the convent resumed its former prosperity, and in the beginning of the 8th century its abbot counted 3700 monks under his command. Soon after, however, it was overrun by the Saracens from Spain; the abbot Porcarius, in prevision of this event, sent thirty-six of the younger monks and forty children to Italy, while he and those who remained were murdered, with the exception of four, who were retained prisoners. They escaped after a while, and, having returned to Lerins, formed the nucleus of a new convent. In 997, under the renowned Odilo, the convent once more rose to eminence, and attained its greatest fame under Adalbert (1030-1066). Raymund, count of Barcelona, gave the monks a whole convent in Catalonia, and they had possessions in France, Italy, Corsica, and the islands belonging to Italy. A nunnery at Tarascon, established by the seneschal of Provence, was also subject to their rule, together with a large number of canonici regulares, to whom the abbot Giraud gave two churches in 1226, under the condition that they should always remain subject to the rule of Lerins. Their prosperity decreasing, the abbot, Augustin Grimald, afterwards bishop of Grasse, connected them with the Benedictines in 1505, and this fusion received in 1515 the sanction of pope Leo X and of Francis I. In 1635 the island was taken by the Spaniards, who retained it until 1657; and, although the convent continued to exist, it lost henceforth all its importance. See Vincentius Barralis, Chronologiumn Sanctolrumi et aliorum clarorume vmirorum insulce Lerinensis (1613); Abregy de l'Histoire de l'Ordre (de S. Benoist, par la  Conqgregation de St. Maur, 1:215 sq., 468 sq.; 2:245; Hist. des Ordres Monastiques, 1:116 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 8:333 sq.

## Lesbonax[[@Headword:Lesbonax]]

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

## Leschies[[@Headword:Leschies]]

             in Slavonic mythology, were evil spirits of the woods, whose existence is still believed by the Russians and Lithuanians. They were similar to the Pan or Fauns of the Greeks and Romans, and were brought north probably by the latter.

## Leshelm[[@Headword:Leshelm]]

             (Heb. id. לֶשֶׁם, a gemr, as in Exo 28:19, etc.; Sept. Λέσεμ v. r. Λαχίς), a city in the northern part of Palestine (Jos 19:47); elsewhere called LAVISH (Jdg 18:7). SEE DAN.

## Leshem[[@Headword:Leshem]]

             SEE LIGURE.

## Lesley, John[[@Headword:Lesley, John]]

             a very celebrated Scotch prelate, was born in 1527, and was educated in the University of Aberdeen. In 1547 he was made canon of the cathedral church of Aberdeen and Murray, and after this he traveled into France, and, pursuing his studies in the universities of Toulouse, Poitiers, and Paris, finally took the degree of doctor of laws. He continued abroad till 1554, when he was commanded home by the queen regent, and made official and vicar general of the diocese of Aberdeen; and, entering into the priesthood, he became parson of Une. About this time, the Reformed doctrine, beginning to spread in Scotland, was zealously opposed by Lesley; and at a solemn dispute between the Protestants and Papists, held in 1560 at Edinburgh, Lesley was a principal champion on the side of the latter. However, this was so far from putting an end to the divisions that they daily increased, and, occasioning many disturbances and commotions, both parties agreed to invite home the queen, who was then absent in France. On this errand Lesley was employed by the Roman Catholics, and made such dispatch that he came to Vitri, where queen Mary was then lamenting  the death of her husband, the king of France, several days before lord James Stuart, sent by the Protestants. Having delivered to her his credentials, he told her majesty of lord James Stuart's mission, and actually succeeded in persuading her to embark with him for Scotland. Immediately upon his arrival home he was appointed senator to the College of Justice and a privy councilor, and a short time after was presented with the living of Lundores, and, upon the death of Sinclair, was made bishop of Koss. While in this position he took a prominent part in the civil as well as ecclesiastical affairs of his country, and secured to the Scots what are commonly called “the black acts of Parliament” (1566). During the flight of queen Mary to England he defended her cause against the Covenanters. In 1579 he was made suffragan bishop and vicar general of Rouen, in Normandy, and, after persecution and imprisonment, died in 1596. His writings are not of particular interest to theological students. See Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, vol. 2. s.v.; Collier, Eccl. Hist. of England (see Index, vol. 8).

## Leslie, Charles[[@Headword:Leslie, Charles]]

             a prominent writer in the political and theological controversies of the 17th century, was the son of bishop John Leslie, of the Irish sees of Raphoe and Clogher, and was born in Ireland about 1650, and educated at Trinity College, Dublin. His course in life was very eccentric. In 1671 he went to England to study law, but in a few years turned himself to divinity, was admitted into orders, and settling in Ireland, became chancellor of Connor. He was living in Ireland at the time of the Revolution, and distinguished himself in some disputations with the Roman Catholics on the side of the Protestant Church. Though a zealous Protestant, he scrupled to renounce his allegiance to king James, and to acknowledge king William as his rightful sovereign. There was thus an end to his prospects in the Church, and, leaving Ireland, he went to England, and there employed himself in writing many of his controversial works, especially those on the political state of the country. When James II was dead, Leslie transferred his allegiance to his son, the Pretender; and, as he made frequent visits to the courts of the exiled princes, he so far fell under suspicion at home that he thought proper to leave England, and join himself openly to the court of the Pretender, then at Bar-le-Duc. He was still a zealous Protestant. and had in that court a private chapel, in which he was accustomed to officiate as a minister of the Protestant Church of England. When the Pretender removed to Italy, Leslie accompanied him; but, becoming at length sensible  of the strangeness of his position, a Protestant clergyman in the court of a zealous Roman Catholic, and age coming on, and with it the natural desire of dying in the land which had given him birth, he sought and obtained from the government of king George I, in 1721, permission to return. He died at Glaslough, in the county of Monaghan, in 1722. Leslie's writings in the political controversies of the time were all in support of high monarchical principles. His theological writings were controversial; they have been distributed into the six following classes: those against, 1, the Quakers; 2, the Presbyterians; 3, the Deists; 4, the Jews; 5, the Socinians; and, 6, the Papists. Some of them, especially the book entitled A short and easy Method with the Deists, are still read and held in esteem. Towards the close of his life he collected his theological writings, and published them in two folio volumes (1721). They were reprinted at Oxford (1832, 7 vols. 8vo). His other numerous works have not been published uniformly. Among them we notice A View of the Times, their Principles and Practices, etc. (2d ed. Lond. 1750, 6 vols. 12mo): — The Massacre of Glencoe (Anon., Lond. 1703, 4to) — The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity, etc. (Lond. 1706, 4to): — Querela, temporum, or the Danger of the Church of England (Lond. 1695, 4to): — A Letter, etc., against the sacramental Test (Lond. 1708, 4to): — Answer to the Remarks on his first Dialogue against the Socinians. Bayle styles him a man of great merit and learning, and adds that he was the first who wrote in Great Britain against the fanaticism of Madame Bourignon: his books, he further says, are much esteemed, and especially his treatise The Snake in the Grass. Salmon observes that his works must transmit him to posterity as a man thoroughly learned and truly pious. Dr. Hickes says that he made more converts to a sound faith and holy life than any man of the age in which he lived; that his consummate learning, attended by the lowest humility, the strictest piety without the least tincture of narrowness, a conversation to the last degree lively and spirited, vet to the last degree innocent, made him the delight of mankind. See Biog. Brit.; Encyc. Brit.; Jones, Christ. Biog.; Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2:1825; Allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors, vol. 2. s.v.

## Leslie, John[[@Headword:Leslie, John]]

             D.D., a noted prelate of the Irish Church, father of the celebrated Charles Leslie, was descended from an ancient family, and born in the north of Scotland about the beginning of the 17th century, and was educated at Aberdeen and at Oxford. Afterwards he traveled in Spain, Italy, Germany,  and France. He spoke French, Spanish, and Italian with the same propriety and fluency as the natives; and was; so great a master of the Latin that it was said of him when in Spain, “Solus Lesleius Latine loquitur.” He continued twenty-two years abroad, and during that time was at the siege of Rochelle, and in the expedition to the isle of Rhe with the duke of Buckingham. He was all along conversant in courts, and at home was happy in that of Charles I, who admitted him into his privy council both in Scotland and Ireland, in which stations he was continued by Charles II after the Restoration. His chief preferment in the Church of Scotland was the bishopric of the Orkneys, whence he was translated to Raphoe, in Ireland, in 1633, and the same year sworn a privy councilor in that kingdom. During the Rebellion he openly and valiantly espoused the cause of his royal master, and after the Restoration was translated to the see of Clogher. He died in 1671. See Chambers, Biog. of Eminent Scotsmen, s.v.

## Lesly[[@Headword:Lesly]]

             SEE LESLEY; SEE LESLIE.

## Less(Ius), Leonhard[[@Headword:Less(Ius), Leonhard]]

             a Jesuit moralist, was born at Brecht, in Brabant, Oct. 1, 1554, and was educated at the University of Leyden, to which, after a two years' stay at Rome, he was called as professor of philosophy and theology in 1585. The pope had just condemned seventy-six propositions of Bajus, whom the Jesuits, disciples of Scotus, had attacked; but soon Less and Hamel falling into the opposite extreme of Pelagianism, the faculty, after due remonstrance, solemnly condemned also fifty-four propositions contained in their lectures. Still, as several universities of note were inclined to judge moderately of Less's heretical tendency, he retained his position, and  remained in high standing, especially with his order. He died Jan. 5,1623. His numerous and well-written essays on morals partake (of the sophistry so often employed in his order. Among the most important, we notice his Libri iv dejustitia et jure, ceterisque virtutibus cardinalibus, often reprinted since 1605 (last edit. Lugd. 1653, folio), with an appendix by Theophile Raynaud pro Leon. Less. de licito usu sequivocationum et mzentaliumn reservationumn. Also the first volume of his Opp. theol. (Paris, 1651, fol.; Antw. 1720); and his essays De libero arbitrio, De providentia, De perfectionibus divinis, etc. He followed the system of the scholastic moralists, of whom Schrockh (Kirchenqesch. seit d. Reform. 4:104) says: “They, in fact, continued the old method of their predecessors since the 13th century, in so far as that branch of theology was then advanced, i.e. treating it as a dependence of the dogmatic system; yet they differed from them inasmuch as they set forth their views in large works of their own, evinced more learning, a better style, and a certain regard for the times in which they lived.” Less attacked also the Protestant Church in his Consultatio, quse fides et religio sit capessenda (Amstelod. 1609; last edit. 1701). His chief argument was that that Church did not exist before the Reformation; he was triumphantly answered on this point by Balthasar Meisner, of Wittenberg († 1626), in his Consultatio catholica defide Lutherana capessenda et Romano-papistica deserenda (1623). Still Less always retained the highest consideration in his Church, was even reputed to work miracles, and was finally canonized. See Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 8:340; Gieseler, Kirchen Gesch. vol. 3; Linsenmann, Michael Baius (Tüb. 1867).

## Less, Gottfried[[@Headword:Less, Gottfried]]

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

## Lesser, Friedrich Christian[[@Headword:Lesser, Friedrich Christian]]

             a German theologian, was born May 29,1692, at Nordhausen. In early life he manifested a desire for the knowledge of natural history, and in this department he afterwards distinguished himself greatly. In 1712 he entered the University of Halle, to study medicine, but soon altered his plan, and entered on the study of theology, by the advice of the learned theological professor Francke. He finished his theological studies at the University of Leipsic, and became pastor of a Church in his native city in 1716; in addition to it, he assumed in 1724 the supervision of the Orphan House. In 1739 he became pastor at the collegiate church of St. Martin, and in 1743 of St. Jacob's Church. He died Sept. 17,1754. Besides his works on natural history, in some of which he endeavored to combine natural history with theology, e.g. Theology of Stones (Lithotheologia, Hamb. 1735, 8vo);  Theology of Insects (De sapientia, omnipotentia et providentia ex partibus insectoruen cognoscenda, etc., Nordh. 1735, 8vo), etc., he left productions of a theological character, of which a complete list is given by Doring in his Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschlands, 2:287 sq.

## Lessey, Theophilus[[@Headword:Lessey, Theophilus]]

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

## Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim[[@Headword:Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim]]

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

Life. — Lessing was born at Kamentz (Camenz), in Upper Lusatia, Jan. 22, 1729. His father was the Protestant (Lutheran) “pastor primarius” of the place, and was widely noted for his learning, especially in the historical department. Designed for the ministry, young Lessing was trained by his pious parents “in the way he should go;” and he was not simply taught what he should believe, but how and why he should believe. Long before he was old enough to be sent to school the youth displayed an uncommon desire for books. After thorough preparation at an elementary school, he entered at the age of twelve the high-school at Meissen, and of his extraordinary diligence in study a sufficient idea may be formed when it is stated that while there he perused a number of classic authors besides those  which entered into the regular course, translated the third and fourth books of Euclid, drew up a history of mathematics, and, on taking leave of it, delivered a discourse “De Mathematica Barbarorum.” In 1746 he was ready to proceed to the university, and, as his parents had fondly hoped, to enter upon the studies which should fit him for the ministry of the word of God. His mother, in particular, designed that her Gotthold Ephraim “should be a real man of God.”

Like an earnest and ardent student, which he always proved himself, Lessing now devoted his time to all the studies which that university encouraged, except the one upon which the family hopes were set — theology; and this need not be wondered at, if we will but glance for a moment at a programme of the lectures in the four faculties of that high- school upon Lessing's entry. In theology, jurisprudence, medicine, and philosophy twenty-two lectures were delivered weekly, yet the names of the lecturers were prominent only in the last-named department; they were notably obscure in that of theology. In philosophy Gottsched was lecturing upon the early Greek philosophers, Christ upon Horace and Ovid, Jocher upon the Reformation, Winckler upon Epictetus, Miller upon logic, May upon ethics, and Heinsius upon rectilinear and spherical trigonometry. Ernesti, the future noted theologian, was yet lecturing in the department of ancient literature, and it was by his direct and permanent influence, as well as by the exertions of professor Christ, that Lessing was led to enter upon the profound philological studies, which finally resulted in such great service to classical literature and art. Thrown into company with Mylius, an old schoolmate of his, and an ardent advocate of the stage as a means of moral reform, and other auditors of professor Kastner, who was then lecturing on dramatic art, Lessing acquired a decided taste for the theater, and was finally led to abandon his classical studies altogether, not only devoting himself more fully to this one study, but actually coming to entertain the thought of going on the stage himself.

His conduct greatly displeased his parents and his sister, who warned him against it as being not merely trifling, but sinful. But Lessing continued in his course. Driven further, also, by the announcement that the family could contribute no allowance for his support except with extreme difficulty, he determined to shift for himself, and decided for his subsistence hereafter to devote his talents to poetry, criticism, and belles-lettres, as that field of literature which had been least of all cultivated by his countrymen, and where, besides having few rivals, he might employ his pen with greater advantage  to others as well as to himself. His first productions were one or two minor dramatic pieces, which were printed in a journal entitled Ermunterungen zum Vergniigen. In the meanwhile the gossip about his relation to the ungodly Mylius, who had by this time become his most intimate associate, spread, and reached the ears of his aged parents. Desperate measures only could secure his return to the parental hearthstone. Madame Lessing was overwhelmed with grief; her Gotthold Ephraim must be restored to her immediate influence, or he would forever be lost to the Church and the blessings of religion, and for once the end should justify the means. Accordingly, the youthful sinner was written to: “On receipt of this, start at once; your mother is dying, and wishes to speak to you before her death.” Of course, no sooner had the letter reached Lessing than we find him starting for the little country town. His personal appearance and assurances of his good intentions, both as a Christian and an obedient son, soon quieted the disconsolate parents, and he was suffered once more to return to Leipsic. From this place he removed in 1750 to Berlin-the home of freethinkers, whither the arch-atheist Mylius had preceded him some time- certainly not a very comforting turn in his personal history for his well-nigh despairing parents.

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

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

In 1760 the Academy of Sciences of Berlin honored itself by conferring membership on Lessing, and shortly after a somewhat lucrative position fell  to his lot in Breslau, whither he at once removed, and where he remained five years. It is in this, the chief city of Silesia, that most of Lessing's valuable contributions to the department of general literature were prepared. After a short visit to his parents, Lessing returned in 1765 to Berlin, then removed to Hamburg, and in 1770 finally started for Wolfenbüttel, to assume the duties of librarian to the duke Frederick William Ferdinand of Brunswick, a position congenial to his taste, and here he remained until his death, Feb. 15, 1781.

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

The great German philosopher Wolf, following closely  in the footsteps of Leibnitz, had sought to check this rapid flow of the Germans towards infidelity by a system of philosophy that should lay securely the foundations for religion and morality, “fully persuaded that the so-called natural religion, which he . . . expected to be attained by the efforts of reason, and which related more to the belief in God and in immortality than to anything else, would become the very best steppingstone to the temple of revealed religion” (Hagenbach. Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent. 1:78). Indeed, the theologians themselves sought to prove, by the mathemlatical, demonstrative method, the truth of the doctrines of revelation, and the falsity of infidelity, forgetting altogether the great fact that “that sharp form of thought which bends itself to mathematical formulas is not for every man, least of all for the great mass;” and had it not been for the influence which pietism was exerting in the 18th century upon orthodox Christianity, the latter must have suffered beyond even the most ardent expectations of the most devoted German Voltaireans. As it was, even, there gradually arose a shallow theology, destitute of ideas, and limited to a few moral commonplaces, known under the name of neology (q.v.), which, at the time of Lessing's appearance, controlled the German mind. See SEMLER. An active thinker like Lessing, who, when yet a youth, could write to his father that the Christian religion is not a thing which one can accept upon the word and honor of a parent,” but that the way to the possession of the truth is for him only “who has once wisely doubted, and by the path of inquiry attained conviction, or at least striven to attain it,” such a one was not likely to remain passive in this critical period of the history of thought. Unfortunately, however, the mature Lessing had shifted from the position of the youthful inquirer, and, instead of accepting the truth when attained by conviction, he had come to believe that truth is never to be accepted. “It is not the truth of which a man is, or thinks he is, in possession that measures the worth of the man, but the honest effort he has made to arrive at the truth, for it is not the possession of truth, but the search for it, that enlarges those powers in which an ever-growing capacity consists.

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

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

1, of the tolerance of the Dists;

2, of the accusations brought against human reason in the pulpit;

3, of the impossibility of a revelation which all men could believe in in the same manner;

4, of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea;

5, of the O. Test. not having becn wvritten with the intention of revealing a religion;

6, of the history cf the resurrection.

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

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

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

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

The English Deists, as Bolingbroke and Hobbes, had regarded religion only from the standpoint of politics. “Man,” they held, “can know nothing except what his senses teach him, and to this the intelligent confine themselves; a revelation, or, rather, what pretends to be one, might be a good thing for the populace.” SEE DEISM. Lessing came forward, and, while seeking to make morality synonymous with religion, aye, with Christianity, taught that in revelation only lies man's strength for development. “Revelation,” says Lessing, “is to the whole human race what education is to the individual man. Education is revelation which is imparted to the individual man, and revelation is education which has been and still is imparted to the human race. Education no more presents everything to man at once than revelation does, but makes its communications in gradual development.” First Judaism, then Christianity; first unity, then trinity; first happiness for this life, then immortality and never-ending bliss. (See the detailed review on these points in Hurst's  Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of 18th and 19th Cent. 1:291 sq.) The elementary work of education was the O.T. The progress to a more advanced book is marked by the timely coming of Christ, “the reliable and practical teacher of immortality;...reliable through the prophecies which appeared to be fulfilled in him, through the miracles which he performed, and through his own return to life after the death by which he had sealed his doctrine;” whose disciples collected and transmitted in writing his doctrines, “the second and better elementary book for the human race,” expecting (according to Ritter [Lessing's philosophische u. religiose Grundsatze, p. 56 sq.]) the complete treatise itself in the fulfillment of the promises of Christianity. Some have interpreted Lessing, because Christianity is spoken of as the second elementary work, as anticipating another religion, to be universally enjoyed, to supersede Christianity, but for this we can see no reason, and side with Ritter.

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

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

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

Of his service to German literature generally, it may be truly said “he found Germany without a national literature; when he died it had one. He pointed out the ways in poetry, philosophy, and religion by which the national mind should go, and it has gone in them” (Westmn. Rev. Oct. 1871, p. 223). “Honor,” says Menzel (German Lit. [transl. by C. C. Felton, Bost. 1840, 3 vols. 12mo], 2:405), “was the principle of Lessing's whole life. He composed in the same spirit that he lived. He had to contend with obstacles  his whole life long, but he never bowed down his head. He struggled not for posts of honor, but for his own independence. He might, with his extraordinary ability, have rioted in the favor of the great, like Goethe, but he scorned and hated this favor as unworthy a free man. His long continuance in private life, his services as secretary of the brave general Tauenzien during the Seven Years' War, and afterwards as librarian at Wolfenbüttel, proved that he did not aspire to high places....He ridiculed Gellert, Klopstock, and all who bowed their laurel-crowned to heads to heads encircled with golden crowns; and he himself shunned all contact with the great, animated by that stainless spirit of pride which acts instinctively upon the motto Noli me tangere."

Literature. — The complete works of Lessing were first published at Berlin (1771, 32 vols. 12mo), then with annotations by Lachmann (1839, 12 vols.), and by Von Maltzahn (1855, 12 vols). See Karl Gotthelf Lessing, Lessing's Biographie (Berl. 1793, 2 vols.); Danzel, Lessing, sein Leben und seine Werke (1850), continued by Guhrauer (1853-54); Stahr, G. E. Lessing, sein Leben u. s. Werke (6th ed. Berl. 1859, 2 vols. 12mo, transl. by E. P. Evans, late professor at Mich. Univ., Boston, 1867, 2 vols. 12mo); H. Ritter, in the Göttingen Studien (1847); Ritter, Gesch. d. christi. Philos. 2:480 sq.; Bohtz, Lessing's Protestantismnus und Nath. der Weise; Lang, Religiose Charaktere, 1:215 sq.; Röpe, Lessing und Gotze; Rohr, Kleine theoloqische Schriften (Schleusingen, 1841, vol. 1); Schwarz, Lessing als Theologe (1854); Gervinus, National-Liter. d. Deutschen, 4:318 sq.; Mohnike, Lessingianea (Lpz. 1843, 8vo); Schlosser, Gesch. d. l8ten Jahrhund. 3:2; Schmidt, Gesch. d. geist. Lebens in Deutschld. von Leibnitz bis auf Lessing's Tod; Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. History 18th and 19th Cent. vol. 1, lect. 13; For. Quart. Review, 25:233 sq.; Westmnist. Rev. 1871, Oct., art. 8; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:336 sq.; Kahnis, Hist. of German Protestantisn, p. 145 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Lessons[[@Headword:Lessons]]

             SEE LECTIONARIUM.

## Lestang, Christophe[[@Headword:Lestang, Christophe]]

             a French prelate, was born at Brives in 1560. When not more than twenty years of age he was made bishop of Lodeve, in which position he devoted himself to the destruction of Calvinism, then very rite in Languedoc, and for this he received of Henry III a pension of twelve thousand crowns per month. The League counted him among its most fervent advocates. He had a contest with the duke of Montmorency. Lestang lost all the revenues of his bishopric, and the palace which he had built was destroyed. To make  amends, Henry III gave to him the episcopal house and the revenues of the bishopric of Carcassonne, which Montmorency had enjoyed. In 1604 he was made bishop of Carcassonne. Louis XIII made him commander of his orders, grand master of his chapel, member of his private council, and director of his finances. Lestang continued to fill important offices until his death, which occurred at Carcassonne, August 11, 1621. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lestines [[@Headword:Lestines ]]

             SEE LIPTINES.

## Lestonac, Jeanne De[[@Headword:Lestonac, Jeanne De]]

             foundress of an order of French nuns, was born at Bordeaux in 1556. .She was the daughter of a councillor of the parliament of Bordeaux, and of Jeanne d'Eyquem of Montagne, sister of the celebrated philosopher Michel de Montague. Although her mother was a Protestant, her father and uncle made her adopt the Catholic religion. In 1573 she married Gaston de Montferrand. After the death of her husband she consecrated herself to the Virgin, and entered, in 1603, the house of the Feuillantines of Toulouse. Shortly after, Jeanne de Lestonac placed herself at the head of a society of young ladies, the greater part taken from Calvinistic families. These new nuns bore the name of Jesuitines. Cardinal de Sourdis opposed the foundation of this order, but the pope favored it and ordered its consecration, which took place, March 25, 1606, and it was confirmed by a brief of Paul V, April 7, 1607. The order grew rapidly in importance. At the time of the death of Jeanne, she had control of twenty-nine houses of Jesuitines. She died at Bordeaux, April 2, 1640. After her death some of her bones were sent to the principal convents of the order, or were used, according to some hagiographers, to perform various miracles. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lestrange, Louis Henri De (dom Augustine)[[@Headword:Lestrange, Louis Henri De (dom Augustine)]]

             the renovator of the order of La Trappe, was born at Viverais in 1754. On his nomination as coadjutor to the archbishop of Viehne in 1780, he retired to La Trappe, in the department of Orne, near Mortaque, the seat of Cistercian monks since 1140, but reformed by the abbe de Rance in 1662, and which has given its name to all monasteries which have adopted the rigorous rule of Raned. SEE TRAPPISTS.

In 1791 the French government seized the property of the monks of La Trappe, and Lestrange led twenty- four of the religious to Val Sainte, canton of Fribourg, Switzerland, where they were heartily welcomed, constituted an abbey by Pius VI, and  Augustine placed at its head. On the invasion of Switzerland, in. 1798, by a French army, the Trappists were compelled to flee. They wandered with their leader through various parts of Austria and Bavaria, until Paul I promised them hospitality in his states, and they established themselves in Russian Poland in 1799. In the following year the czar issued a ukase ordering all French emigrants to leave his territories. Augustine then led his brethren to Protestant Prussia, where they found a temporary asylum. Then it was that a party of them, guided by Urban Guillet, embarked at Amsterdam for Baltimore, May 29, 1803. The deliverance of Switzerland, in 1804, soon permitted the monks to return to Val Sainte, and in 1805 Napoleon granted them authority to establish themselves in his empire.

Mont Valerian, which rises at the gates of Paris, soon beheld a monastery of this austere order arise, but when the emperor began to persecute the pope, the fervent disciples of Rance and Lestrange resisted him. In 1810 Dom Augustine accordingly made his monks solemnly retract the oath of fidelity to the constitution of the empire, and Napoleon ordered all houses of La Trappe to be closed, and the abbot Lestrange to be tried by court- martial; but Augustine escaped to Switzerland, and thence traversing Germany, pursued by the imperial police, embarked at Riga for London, and thence for the United States. There (in the city of Boston) he found a second colony of Trappists, under Vincent of Paul, awaiting him. Dom Augustine Lestrange arrived in New York in 1813, to which place he ordered Guillet from Missouri, and Vincent of Paul from Boston, and concentrated at one place the scattered and feeble forces of the brethren. The energetic Lestrange also founded a community of Trappist nuns. Meanwhile the fall of Napoleon opened France to the Trappists, and Dom Augustine returned to restore the black-girdled monks to their home. He embarked for Havre in October 1814, with twelve monks, the sisters and pupils, when he restored the order to Europe. Lestrange, the indefatigable and heroic successor of Bernard and Rance, died at Lyons, France, July 16, 1827. See De Courcy and Shea, Hist. of the Cath. Church in the U.S. page 370.

## Letaah [[@Headword:Letaah ]]

             SEE LIZARD.

## Letfete[[@Headword:Letfete]]

             in Norse mythology, was one of the twelve famous Asa-horses mentioned in the Edda.

## Lethe[[@Headword:Lethe]]

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

## Lethe (2)[[@Headword:Lethe (2)]]

             in Greek mythology, is the stream of forgetfulness, out of which the souls drank when entering Elysium.

## Lethech[[@Headword:Lethech]]

             (לֶתֶךְ, le'thek, Septuag. νέβελ ), a Hebrew word which occurs in the margin of Hos 3:2; it signifies a measure for grain, so called from emptying or pourinq out. It is e rendered "a half homer" in the A.V. (after the Vulg.), which is probably correct. SEE HOMER.

## Lethra[[@Headword:Lethra]]

             (now Leire), in the island of Zealand, the city of the gods among the ancient Danes. This was the holy place where the nation assembled to offer up their sacrifices, to present their prayers, and to receive the choicest blessings from the gods.

## Leti, Gregory[[@Headword:Leti, Gregory]]

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

## Letter[[@Headword:Letter]]

             stands in only two passages of the Bible in its narrow sense of an alphabetical character (γράμμα, in the plural, Luk 23:38; and prob. Gal 6:11, πηλίκοις γράμμασι; A. V. “how large a letter,” rather in what a bold hand); elsewhere it is used (for סֵפֶר, a book; γραμμα, either sing. or plur.; but more definitely for the later Heb. אַגֶּרֶת[Chald. אגְּרָא, נַשְׁתְּוָן: [Chald. id. also פַּתְגָּם; ἐπιστολή ) in the sense of an epistle (q.v.). SEE ALPHABET; SEE WRITING.

## Letter The[[@Headword:Letter The]]

             a term used especially by the apostle Paul in opposition to the spirit; a way of speaking very common in the ecclesiastical style (Rom 2:27; Rom 2:29; Rom 7:6; 2Co 3:6-7). In general, the word letter (γράμμα) is used to denote the Mosaic law. The law, considered as a simple collection of precepts, is but a dead form, which can indeed command obedience, but cannot awaken love. This distinction is shown with great skill in Schleiermacher's Sermon: Christus, d. Befreier a. d. Sunde u. d. Gesetz (in  his Sämmt. Werke, 2:25 sq.). The law cannot but be something outward, which, as the expression of another's will, appeals more to our comprehension than to our will or to our feelings. This is the reason why the law is the source of the knowledge of sin, and does not impart the life- giving power. But that the Mosaic law was called the letter (γράμμα) results from the fact of its being the written law. So Rom 2:27; Rom 2:29 : “And shall not uncircumcision, which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.” The meaning of this passage is, When the heathen does by nature that which the law requires, he puts to shame the Jew who in Scripture and by circumcision transgresses the law. For he is not a true Israelite who is so outwardly only, and merely through physical circumcision (as the sign of the covenant); but he only who is inwardly a Jew, his heart also being circumcised, and consequently after the spirit, and not merely after the letter (or outward form). Such a one is not merely praised by men, but loved by God. Again, Rom 7:6 : “But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.” Being now Christians, we ought to carry the law in our heart, and not merely fulfill it outwardly as a mere letter. 2Co 3:6, for the letter (i.e. the Mosaic law) killeth (brings about death inasmuch as it discovers sin, Rom 7:9; Rom 6:23; 1Co 15:56), but the Spirit (the holy Spirit imparted through faith) giveth life (i.e.eternal life, Rom 8:10). Once more, 2Co 3:7 : “But if the ministration of death (of the letter), written and engraven in stoies, was glorious . . . how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?” The law of Moses is incapable of giving life to the soul, and justifying before God those who are most servilely addicted to the literal observance of it. These things caln be effected only by means of the Gospel of Christ, and of that Spirit of truth and holiness which attends it, ands makes it effectual to the salvation of the soul. — Krehl, Neu-Test. Handwörterbuch. SEE LAW OF MOSES.

## Letters of Orders[[@Headword:Letters of Orders]]

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

## Letters, Encyclical[[@Headword:Letters, Encyclical]]

             SEE LITERAE ENCYCLICA.

## Lettice, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Lettice, John, D.D.]]

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

## Lettish Version[[@Headword:Lettish Version]]

             SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

## Lettus[[@Headword:Lettus]]

             (Λαττούς v. r. Α᾿ττούς '; Vulg. Acchus), a “son of Sechenias,” one of the Levites who returned from Babylon (1Es 8:29), evidently the HATTUSI SEE HATTUSI (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 8:2).

## Letushim[[@Headword:Letushim]]

             (Heb. Letushiim', לְטוּשַׁים, hammered, plur.; Sept. Λατουσιείμ), the second named of the three sons of Dedan (grandson of Abraham by Keturah), and head of an Arabian tribe descended from him (Gen 30:3; and Vulg. at 1Ch 1:32). B.C. considerably post 2024. SEE ARABIA. “Fresnel (Journ. Asiat. 3e serie, 6:217) identifies it with Tasm, one of the ancient and extinct tribes of Arabia, just as he compares Leummim with Umeiyim. The names may perhaps be regarded as commencing with the article. Nevertheless, the identification in each case seems to be quite untenable. It is noteworthy that the three sons of the Keturahite Dedan are named in the plural form, evidently as tribes descended from him” (Smith). “Forster supposes (Geor. of Arabia, 1:334) that the Letushim were absorbed in the generic appellation of Dedanim  (Jer 25:23; Eze 25:13; Isa 21:13), and that they dwelt in the desert eastward of Edom.” SEE LEUMMIM.

## Leuchars, Patrick De[[@Headword:Leuchars, Patrick De]]

             a Scotch prelate, was invested with the see of Brechin in 1354, and some time after was made lord high chancellor of the kingdom. In 1370 he resigned his office of chancellor. He was bishop, and present at Parliament in 1373. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 162.

## Leucippus[[@Headword:Leucippus]]

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

## Leucopetrians[[@Headword:Leucopetrians]]

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

## Leummim[[@Headword:Leummim]]

             (Heb. Leiimmimn', לְאֻמַּים, peoples, as often; Sept. Λαωμείμ), the last named of the three sons of Dedan (grandson of Abraham by Keturah), and head of an Arabian tribe descended from him (Gen 25:3; and Vulgate at 1Ch 1:32). B.C. considerably post 2024. SEE ARABIA.

They are supposed to be the same with the Allumoeotoe (Α᾿λλουμαιῶται), named by Ptolemy (6:7, 24) as near the Gerrhaei, which appears to be a corruption of the Hebrew word with the art. prefixed. He also enumerates Luma among the towns of Arabia Deserta (5:19), and Forster (Geogr. of Arabia, 1:335) suggests that this may liave been an ancient settlement of the same tribe” (Kitto). “They are identified by Fresnel (in the Journ. Asiat. iiie serie, 6:217) with an Arab tribe called Umeiyim, one of the very ancient tribes of Arabia of which no genealogy is given by the Arabs, and who appear to have been ante-Abrahamic, and possibly aboriginal inhabitants of the country.” SEE LETUSHIM.

## Leun, Johann Georg Friedrich[[@Headword:Leun, Johann Georg Friedrich]]

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

## Leusden, Johann[[@Headword:Leusden, Johann]]

             a very celebrated Dutch Orientalist and theologian, was born at Utrecht in 1624, and was educated at the then recently founded university of his native place and at Amsterdam, paying particular regard to the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. In 1649 he was appointed professor of Hebrew at Utrecht, and for nearly fifty years he most creditably discharged the duties of this office, for which he had fitted himself, not simply at the universities already mentioned, but also by private study with several learned Jewish rabbis. He died in 1699, regarded by all as one of the best Hebrew scholars of his day, the Buxtorfs only taking precedence in rank. Of his works we may say that the writings of but few Biblical scholars of that day have descended to us which can be said to be of more solid utility than Leusden's. “If they are defective in originality of genius (the amount of which quality, however, it is impossible rightly to determine in works like our author's), they undoubtedly afford evidence of their author's varied resources of learning, adorned by clearness of method and an easy style, characteristics which made Leusde.n one of the most renowned and successful teachers of his age.” His numerous works, which were all Biblical, may be classed as follows: (1) Critical, (2) Introductory, and (3) Exegetical. Under the first head we have his valuable Biblia Hebsrea accuratissima notis lHebraicis et lemmatibus illustrata: typis Josephi Athias (Amstel. 1617 [2d ed. 1667], the first critical edition by a Christian editor [“Estimatissima primum numeratis versibus, primaque a Christiano adhibitis MSS. facta.” Steinschneider, Catal. Bodl.]) In 1694 he joined Eisenmenger in publishing a Hebrew Bible without points. The Greek Scriptures also received his careful attention, as is proved by his editions of  the Greek Test. in 1675, 1688, 1693, 1698, 1701, and by his edition of the Septuagint (Amsterdam, 1683). After his death, Schaaf completed a valuable edition of the Syriac New Test. (with Tremnellius's version) which Leusden had begun. Under this first head we may also place his Hebrew Lexicon (1688); Elementary Heb. Gram., which was translated into English, French, and German (1668); his Compendia of the 0. T. and the N. Test. (comprising selections of the originals, with translations and grammatical notes in Latin), frequently reprinted; his Onomasticon Sacr. 1665, 1684), and his still useful Clavis Hebr. Vet. Test. (containing the Masoretic notes, etc., besides much grammatical and philological information), first published in 1683, and his Clavis Graec. NV. T. (1672).

His contributions to the second head of Introduction (Einleitung) and sacred archaeology were not less valuable than the works we have already commended. Of these we mention three (sometimes to be met with in one volume) as very useful to the Biblical student: Philologus Hebr. continens Quaestiones Hebr. quae circa V. Test. Hebr. fere moveri solent (Utrecht, 1656, 1672, 1695, Amst. 1686, are the best editions, and contain his edition and translation of Maimonides's Precepts of Moses, p. 56); Philologus Hebraeomixtus, una cume. Spicileg. Philol. (Utr. 1663, etc., contains treatises on several interesting points of Hebrew antiquities and Talmudical science); Philologus Hebraeo Graecus gemeralis (Utr. 1670, etc.) treats questions relating to the sacred Greek of the Christian Scriptures, its Hebraisms, the Syriac and other translations, its inspired authors, etc., well and succinctly handled (with this work occurs Leusden's translation into Hebrew of all the Chaldee portions of the O.T.). Under the last, or Exegetical head, we have less to record. In 1656 (reprinted in 1.692) Leusden published in a Latin translation David Kimchi's Commentary on the prophet Jonah (Jonas illustratus), and in the following year a similar work (again after David Kimchi) on Joel and Obadiah (Joel explicatus, adjunctus Obadjas illustratus). Well worthy of mention are also his editions (prepared. with the help of Villemandy and Morinus) of Bochart's works, and the works of Lightfoot (which he published in Latin, in 3 vols. folio, in the last year of his life) and Poole (whose Synopsis occurs in its very best form in Leusden's edition, 1684, 5 vols. folio). See Burmann, Trajectums eruditorum?; De Vries, Oratio in Obitlim J. Leusdenii (1699); Fabricius, Ilist. ibliot. Graec. 1 244; Walch, Biblioth. Theol. Selecta, vols. 3, 4; Biograuphie universelle anc. et mod. (1819) 24:357; Elogia Philogorum quorundam Hebraeorum (Lub. 1708, 8vo); Meyer, Gesch. d. Schsrifterklarung,. p. 111, 174 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog.  Generale, 31:11 sq.; Kalisch, Heb. Gram. pt. 2 (Historical Introd.), p. 37; and in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:345, 346; Kitto, Cyclop. Biblical Literature, vol. 2, s.v.

## Leutard Or Leuthard[[@Headword:Leutard Or Leuthard]]

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

## Levellers[[@Headword:Levellers]]

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

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

In religion they claimed,

1, absolute liberty of conscience, as true religion, with them, consisted in inward concurrence with revealed religion;

2, freedom for every one to act according to the best of his knowledge, even if this knowledge should be false — the government acting on the knowledge and conscience of the people through the ministers it appoints;

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

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

## Lever, Thomas[[@Headword:Lever, Thomas]]

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

## Levi[[@Headword:Levi]]

             (Heb. Levi', לֵוי, wreathed [see below], being the same Heb. word also signifying “Levite;” Sept. and N.T. Λευϊv or Λευεί), the name of several men.

1. The third son of Jacob by his wife Leah. This, like most other names in the patriarchal history, was connected with the thoughts and feelings that gathered round the child's birth. As derived from לָוָה, to twine, and hence to adhere, it gave utterance to the hope of the mother that the affections of her husband, which had hitherto rested on the favored Rachel, would at last be drawn to her. “This time will my husband be joined (יַלָּוֶה) unto me, because I have borne him three sons” (Gen 29:34). B.C. 1917.

The new-born child was to be a κοινωνίας βεβαιωτής (Josephus, Ant. 1:19, 8), a new link binding the parents to each other more closely than before.  The same etymology is recognized, though with a higher significance, in Num 18:2 (יַלָּווּ). One fact only is recorded in which he appears prominent. The sons of Jacob had come from Padan-Aram to Canaan with their father, and were with him “at Shalem, a city of Shechem.” Their sister Dinah went out “to see the daughters of the land” (Gen 34:1), i.e. as the words probably indicate, and as Josephus distinctly states (Ant. 1:21), to be present at one of their great annual gatherings for some festival of nature-worship, analogous to that which we meet with afterwards among the Midianites (Num 25:2). The license of the time or the absence of her natural guardians exposed her, though yet in earliest, youth, to lust and outrage. A stain was left, not only on her, but on the honor of her kindred, which, according to the rough justice of the time, nothing but blood could wash out. The duty of extorting that revenge fell, as in the case of Amnon and Tamar (2Sa 13:22), and in most other states of society in which polygamy has prevailed (compare, for the customs of modern Arabs, J. D. Michaelis, quoted by Kurtz, Hist. of Old Covenant i, § 82, p. 340), on the brothers rather than the father, just as, in the case of Rebekah, it belonged to the brother to conduct the negotiations for the marriage. We are left to conjecture why Reuben, as the first-born, was not foremost in the work, but the sin of which he was afterwards guilty makes it possible that his zeal for his sister's purity was not so sensitive as theirs. The same explanation may perhaps apply to the non-appearance of Judah in the history. Simeon and Levi, as the next in succession to the first-born, take the task upon themselves. Though not named in the Hebrew text of the O.T. till 34:25, there can be little doubt that they were “the sons of Jacob” who heard from their father the wrong over which he had brooded in silence, and who a planned their revenge accordingly. The Sept. does introduce their names in 2Sa 13:14. The history that follows is that of a cowardly and repulsive crime. The two brothers exhibit, in its broadest contrasts, that union of the noble and the base, of characteristics above and below the level of the heathen tribes around them, which marks much of the history of Israel. They have learned to loathe and scorn the impurity in the midst of which they lived, to regard themselves as a peculiar people, to glory in the sign of the covenant. They have learned only too well from Jacob and from Labant the lessons of treachery and falsehood. They lie to the men of Sheclem as the Druses and the Maronites lie to each other in the prosecution of their blood-feuds. For the offense of one man they destroy and plunder a whole city.

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

After this we trace Levi as joining in the migration of the tribe that owned Jacob as its patriarch. He, with his three sons, Gershon, Kohath, Merari, went down into Egypt (Gen 46:11). As one of the four eldest sons we may think of him as among the five (Gen 47:2) that were specially presented before Pharaoh. (The Jewish tradition [Targ. Pseudojon.] states the five to have been Zebulun, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher.) Then comes the last scene in which his name appears. When his  father's death draws near, and the sons are gathered round him, he hears the old crime brought up again to receive its sentence from the lips that are no longer feeble and hesitating. They, no less than the incestuous first- born, had forfeited the privileges of their birthright. “In their anger they slew men, and in their wantonness they maimed oxen” (marg. reading of the A. V.; Sept. ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον). Therefore the sentence on those who had been united for evil was, that they were to be “divided in Jacob and scattered in Israel.” How that condemnation was at once fulfilled and turned into a benediction, how the zeal of the patriarch reappeared purified and strengthened in his descendants, how the very name came to have a new significance, will be found elsewhere. SEE LEVITE.

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

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

3. Father of another Matthat and son of Melchi, third preceding Mary, among Christ's ancestors (Luk 3:24). B.C. considerably ante 22.

4. (Λευϊvς.) One of the apostles, the son of Alphaeus (Mar 2:14; Luk 5:27; Luk 5:29), elsewhere called MATTHEW SEE MATTHEW (Mat 9:9).

## Levi ben-Gerson[[@Headword:Levi ben-Gerson]]

             SEE RALBAG.

## Levi, David[[@Headword:Levi, David]]

             a noted English Jewish writer, was born at London in 1740. He was a hatter by profession, but ardently devoted himself to the study of Jewish literature, and gained great reputation by several learned. publications, of which the principal is his Linageua Sacra, a dictionary and grammar of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and ‘Talmudic dialects (London, 1785-89, 3 vols. 8vo). He wrote also Dissertations on the Prophecies of the Old Testament (1793, 2 vols. 8vo): — Defence of the Old Testamente, in, Letters, in  answer to Thomas Paine's Age of Reason (1797, 8vo). Levi died in 1799. See Lvson's Environs, sup. vol. European Magazine (1799); London Gent. Mag. (1801); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.

## Levi, Giuseppe Emanuelo[[@Headword:Levi, Giuseppe Emanuelo]]

             a Jewish writer, was born at Vercelli, Italy, in 1814. In 1848 he was appointed "laureatus" (graduate) professor of literature at the University of Turin, and died June 10, 1874, leaving, Parabole, Legende e Pensieri Raccolti dei Libri Talmudici: — Christiani et Ebrei nel Medio Evo (Germ. transl. by Seligmann, Leipsic, 1863): — Teocrazia Mosaica: — Autobiografia di un Padre di Famigli: — Ceremoniale per le Cenna di Pasqua: — Dei. Pregi della Lingua Ebraica, Discorso Academico. (B.P.)

## Leviathan[[@Headword:Leviathan]]

             (Heb. לוְיָתָן, usually derived from לַוְיָה, a wreath, with adject. ending ןָ but perhaps compounded of לַוי, wreathed, and תִּן, a sea-monster; occurs Job 3:8; Job 41, I [Hebrew xl, 25], Psa 74:14; Psa 104:26; Isa 27:1; Sept. δράκων, but τὸμέγα κῆτος in Job 3:8; Vulg. Leviathan, but draco in Psa.; Auth. Vers. “Leviathan,” but ‘“their mourning” in Job 3:8) probably has different significations, e.g.:

(1.) A serpent, especially a large one (Job 3:8), hence as the symbol of the hostile kingdom of Babylon (Isa 27:1).

(2.) Specially, the crocodile (Job 41:1).

(3.) A sea-monster (Psa 104:26); tropically, for a cruel enemy (Psa 74:14; compare Isa 51:9; Eze 29:3).

This Heb. word, which denotes any twisted animal, is especially applicable to every great tenant of the waters, such as the great marine serpents and crocodiles, and, it may be added, the colossal serpents and great monitors of the desert. SEE BEHEMOTH; SEE DRAGON.

In general it points to the crocodile, and Job 41 is unequivocally descriptive of that saurian. But in Isaiah and the Psalms foreign kings are evidently apostrophized under the name of Leviathan, though other texts more naturally apply to the whale, notwithstanding the objections that have been made to that interpretation of the term. “It is quite an error to assert, as Dr. Harris (Dict. Nat. Hist. Bib.), Mason Good (Book of Job translated), Michaelis (Supp. 1297), and Rosenmüller (quoting Michaelis in not. ad Bsochart Wie roz. 3:738) have done, that the whale is not found in the Mediterranean. The Orca gladiator (Gray) — the grampus mentioned by Lee — the Physalus antiquorumn (Gray), or the Rorqual de la Mediterranee (Cuvier), are not uncommon in the Mediterranean (Fischer, Synops. Mamm. p. 525, and Lacepede, H. N. des Cetac. p. 115), and in ancient times the species may have been more numerous.” SEE WHALE.

 The word crocodile does not occur in the Auth.Vers., although its Greek form κροκόδειλος 'is found in the Sept. (Lev 11:29, where for the “tortoise, צָב, it has κροκόδειλος χερσαῖος, Vulg. crocodilus); but there is no specific word in the Hebrew of which it is the acknowledged representative.” Bochart (3:769, edit. Rosenmüller) says that the Talmudists use the word livyathân to denote the crocodile; this, however, is denied by Lewysohn (Zool. des Talm. p. 155, 355), who says that in the Talmud it always denotes a wchale, and never a crocodile. For the Talmudical fables about the leviathan, see Lewysohn (Zool. des Talm.), in passages referred to above, and Buxtorf, Lexicon Chald. Talm. s.v. לויתן(Smith). Some of these seem to be alluded to in 2Es 6:49; 2Es 6:52. The Egyptians called it tsmok (see Biunsen's AEgyptens Stellung, 1:581), the Arabs name it tamse (compare χάμψη, Herod. 2:69); but Strabo says that the Egyptian crocodile was knolwn by the name stuchus, σοῦχος, probably referring to the sacred species). It is not only denoted by the leviathan of Job 41:1, but probably also by the tannin of Eze 29:3; Eze 32:2 (compare Isa 27:1; Isa 51:9); and perhaps by the reedbeast ( חִיִּת קָנֶה“spearmen”) of Psa 68:30. Others confound the leviathan with the orca of Pliny (9:5), i.e. probably the Physter macrocephalus of Linn. (see Th. Hase, De Leviacthan Jobi, Brem. 1723); Schultens understands the fabulous dragons (Comment. in Job. p. 1174 sq.; compare Oedmann, Satnmml. 3:1. sq.); not to dwell upon the supposed identification with fossil species of lizards (Koch, in Lidde's Zeitschrift verygleich Erdk. Magdleb. 1844). In the detailed description of Job (ch. 41), probably; the Egyptian crocodile is depicted in all its magnitude, ferocity, and indolence, such as it was in early days, when as yet unconscious of the power of man, and only individually tamed for the purposes of an imposture, which had sufficient authority to intimidate the public and protect the species, under the sanctified pretext that it was a type of pure water, and an emblem of the importance of irrigation; though the people in general seem ever to have been disposed to consider it a personification of the destructive principle. At a later period the Egyptians, probably of such places as Tentyris, where crocodiles were not held in veneration, not only hunted and slew them, but it appears from a statue that a sort of Bestiarii could tame them sufficiently to perform certain exhibitions mounted on their backs. The intense musky odor of its flesh must have rendered the crocodile at all times very unpalatable food, but breast-armor was made of the horny and ridged parts of its back. Viewed as the crocodile of the  Thebaid, it is not clear that the leviathan symbolized the Pharaoh, or was a type of Egypt, any more than of several Roman colonies (even where it was not indigenous, as at Nismcs, in Gaul, on the ancient coins of which the figure of one chained occurs), and of cities in Phoenicia, Egypt, and other parts of the coast of Africa. During the Roman sway in Egypt, crocodiles had not disappeared in the Lower Nile, for Seneca and others allude to a great battle fought by them and a school of dolphins in the Heracleotic branch of the Delta. During the decline of the state even the hippopotamus reappeared about Pelusium, and was shot at in the 17th century (Radzivil). In the time of the Crusades crocodiles were found in the Crocodilon river of early writers, and in the Crocodilorum lacus, still called Moiat el-Temsah, which appear to be the Kerseos river and marsh, three miles south of Casarea, though the nature of the locality is most appropri ta at Nahr-el Arsuf or el-Haddar” (For a full account of the treatment of the crocodile and its worship in Egypt, see Wilkinson's Anc. Agypt. 1:243 sq.). SEE RAHAB.

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

## Levings, Noah D.D[[@Headword:Levings, Noah D.D]]

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

## Levirate[[@Headword:Levirate]]

             (from the law-Latin term levir, a husband's brother), the name applied to an ancient usage of the Hebrews (Gen 38:8 sq.), reordained by Moses (Deu 25:5-10; comp. Josephus, Ant. 4:8, 23; Mat 22:24 sq.), that when an Israelite died without leaving male issue, his brother (יָבָם, yabam', which was the specific term applied to this relation), resident with him, was compelled to marry the widow, and continue his deceased brother's family through the first-born son issuing from such union as the heir of the former husband (comp. Jul. Afric. in Eusebius, Hist. Ev. 1:7). If he was unwilling to do so, he could only be released from the obligation by undergoing a species of insult (Deu 25:9). This is illustrated in the case of Ruth (ch. 3, 4), where, however, as an estate was involved. Boaz is styled by a different term (גֹּאֵל, an avenger). The Talmud contains a very subtile exposition of this statute (see Mishna, Jebamoth, 3:1; comp. Eduj. 4:8, on Deu 25:9; see also Jebam. 12:6; comp. Selden, Uxor Heb 1:12; (Gans, Eherecht, 1:167 sq.). The high-priest appears to have been free from this law (Lev 21:13), and there must doubtless have been other exceptions, especially in the case of aged persons and proselytes (Mishna, Jebam. 11:2). A similar law prevails among the natives of Central Asia (Bernary, p. 34 sq.; Niebuhr, Beschr. p. 70; Bergeron, Voyages, 1:28) and Abyssinia (Bruce, Trav. 2:223), and traces of it existed among the ancient Italians (Diod. Sic. 12:18). This law no doubt originated in the love of offspring, proverbially strong in the Eastern bosom, which sought this method at once of perpetuating a deceased person's name and of procuring progeny for the widow (Jahn's Archeol. § 157). SEE KINSMAN.

The law, however, was unquestionably attended with great inconveniences, for a man cannot but think it the most unpleasant of all necessities if he must marry a woman whom he has not chosen himself. Thus we find that the brother in some instances had no inclination for any such marriage (Genesis 38; Ruth 4), and stumbled at this, that the first son produced from it could not belong to him. Whether a second son might follow and continue in life was very uncertain; and among a people who so highly prized genealogical immortality of name, it was a great hardship for a man to be obliged to procure it for a person already dead, and to run the risk meanwhile of losing it himself. Nor was this law very much in favor of the morals of the other sex; for, not to speak of Tamar, who, in reference to it, conceived herself justified in having recourse to most improper conduct, it may be observed that what Ruth did (Rth 3:6-9), in order to obtain for a husband the person whom she accounted as the nearest kinsman of her deceased husband, is, to say the least; by no means conformable to that modesty and delicacy which we look for in the other sex. A wise and good legislator couldl scarcely have been inclined to patronize any such law but then it is not advisable directly to attack an inveterate point of honor, because. in such a case, for the most part nothing is gained; and in the present instance, as the point of honor placed immortality of name entirely in a man's leaving descendants behind him, it was so favorable to the increase of population that it merited some degree of forbearance and tenderness. Moses therefore left the Israelites still in possession of their established right, but, at the same time, he studied as much as possible to guard against its rigor and evil effects by limiting and moderating its operation in various respects.

In the first place, he expressly prohibited the marriage of a brother's widow if there were children of his own alive. Before this time, brothers were probably in the practice of considering a brother's widow as part of the inheritance, and of appropriating her to  themselves, if unable to buy a wife, as the Mongols do, so that this was a very necessary prohibition. For a successor praesumptivus in thoro, whom a wife can regard as her future husband, is rather a dangerous neighbor for her present one's honor, and if she happen to conceive any predilection for the younger brother, her husband, particularly in a southern climate, will hardly be secure from the risk of poison. In the second place, Moses allowed, and, indeed, enjoined the brother to marry the widow of his childless brother; but if he was not disposed to do so, he did not absolutely compel him, but left him an easy means of riddance, for he had only to declare in court that he had no inclination to marry her, and then he was at liberty. This, it is true, subjected him to a punishment, which at first appears sufficiently severe — the slighted widow had a right to revile him in court as much as she pleased; and from his pulling off his shoe and delivering it to the widow, he received the appellation of Baresole, which anybody might apply to him without being liable to a prosecution. But this infliction was, after all, merely nominal, and we find that it did not prevent the rejection of the widow when there was a decided aversion to it on the part of the surviving relative (Rth 4:8). The law, however, only extended to a brother living in the same city or country, not to one residing at a greater distance.

Nor did it affect a brother having already a wife of his own. At least, if it had its origin in this, that by reason of the price required for a wife, often only one brother could marry, and the others also wished to do the same, it could only affect such as were unmarried; and in the two instances that occur in Genesis (ch. 38) and Ruth (ch. 4), we find the brother-in-law, whose duty it was to marry, apprehensive of its proving hurtful to himself and his inheritance. which could hardly have been the case if he had previously had another wife, or (but that was at least expensive) could have taken one of his own choice. When there was no brother alive, or when he declined the duty, the levirate law, as we see from the case of Ruth, extended to the nearest relation of the deceased husband, as, for instance, to his paternal uncle or nephew; so that at last even quite remote kinsmen, in default of nearer ones, might be obliged to undertake it. Boaz does not appear to have been very nearly related to Ruth, as he did not so much as know who she was when he met her gleaning in the fields. Nor did she know that he was any relation to her until apprised of it by her mother-in-law. Among the Jews of the present day levirate marriages have entirely ceased, so much so that in the marriage contracts of the very poorest people among them it is generally stipulated that the bridegroom's brother shall abandon all those rights to the bride to  which he could lay claim by the law in question (Michaelis, Mos. Recht. 2:197 sq.). See Perizon. De constitutione div. super defuncti fratris uxore ducenda (Hal. 1742); F. Bernary, De Hebraor. leviratu (Berlin, 1835); J. M. Redslob, Die Leviratsche bei den Hebraern (Leipsic, 1836); C. W. F. Walch , De lege levir. ad fratres non germ. sed tribules referenda (Götting. 1763); Htillman, Staatszverf: d. Israel, p. 190 sq.; Rauschenbusch, De lege leviratus (Götting. 1765). SEE MARRIAGE.

## Levis[[@Headword:Levis]]

             (Λευίς), given (1Es 9:14) as a proper name, but meaning simply a Levite, as correctly rendered in the parallel Hebrew passage (Ezr 10:15).

## Levison, Mordecai Gumpel[[@Headword:Levison, Mordecai Gumpel]]

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

## Levite[[@Headword:Levite]]

             (בֶןאּלֵוַי, son of Levi, or simply לֵוי, Levi, for לֵוַיַּי, Deu 12:18; Jdg 17:9; Jdg 17:11; Jdg 18:3; usually in the plur. and with the art.

הִלְוַיַּים; Sept. Λευῖται), a patronymic title which, besides denoting all the descendants of the tribe of Levi (Exo 6:25, Lev 25:32, etc.; Num 35:2; Jos 21:3; Jos 21:41), is the distinctive title of that portion of it which was set apart for the subordinate offices of the sanctuary, to assist the other and smaller portion of their own tribe, invested with the superior functions of the hierarchy (1Ki 8:4; Ezr 2:70. Joh 1:19, etc.), and this is the meaning which has perpetuated itself. Sometimes, again, it is added as an epithet of the smaller portion of the tribe, and we read of “the priests the Levites” (Jos 3:3; Eze 44:15). SEE PRIEST. In describing the institution and development of the Levitical order, we shall treat of it in chronological order, availing ourselves of the best systematizations hitherto produced.

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

1. Origin and Institution of the Levitical Order. The absence of all reference to the consecrated character of the Levites in the book of Genesis is noticeable enough. The prophecy ascribed to Jacob (Gen 49:5-7) was indeed fulfilled with singular precision, but the terms of the prophecy are hardly such as would have been framed by a later writer, after the tribe had gained its subsequent pre-eminence. The only occasion on which the patriarch of the tribe appears the massacre of the Shechemites — may indeed have contributed to influence the history of his descendants, by fostering in them the same fierce, wild zeal against all that threatened to violate the purity of their race, but generally what strikes us is the absence of all recognition of the later character. In the genealogy of Gen 46:11, in like manner, the list does not go lower down than the three sons of Levi, and they are given in the order of their birth, not in that which would have corresponded to the official superiority of the Kohathites. There are no signs, again, that the tribe of Levi had any special pre- eminence over the others during the Egyptian bondage. As tracing its descent from Leah, it would take its place among the six chief tribes sprung from the wives of Jacob, and share with them a recognized superiority over those that bore the names of the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah. Within the tribe  itself there are some slight tokens that the Kohathites were gaining the first place. The classification of Exo 6:16-25 gives to that section of the tribe four clans or houses, while those of Gershon and Merari have but two each.

To it belonged the house of Amram, and “Aaron the Levite” (Exo 4:14) is spoken of as one to whom the people would be sure to listen. He married the daughter of the chief of the tribe of Judah (Exo 6:23). The work accomplished by him, an by his yet greater brother, would naturally tend to give prominence to the family and the tribe to which they belonged, but as yet there are no traces of a caste-character, no signs of any intention to establish a hereditary priesthood. Up to this time the Israelites had worshipped the God of their fathers after their fathers' manner. The first-born of the people were the priests of the people. The eldest son of each house inherited the priestly office. His youth made him, in his father's lifetime, the representative of the purity which was connected from the beginning with the thought of worship (Ewald, Alterthüm. p. 273. and comp. PRIEST). It was apparently with this as their ancestral worship that the Israelites came up out of Egypt. The “young men” of the sons of Israel offer sacrifices (Exo 24:5). They, we may infer, are the priests who remain with the people while Moses ascends the heights of Sinai (Exo 19:22-24). They represented the truth that the whole people were “a kingdom of priests” (Exo 19:6). Neither they, nor the “officers and judges” appointed to assist Moses in administering justice (Exo 18:25), are connected in any special manner with the tribe of Levi. The first step towards a change was made in the institution of a hereditary priesthood in the family of Aaron during the first withdrawal of Moses to the solitude of Sinai (Exo 28:1).

This, however, was one thing; it was quite another to set apart a whole tribe of Israel as a priestly caste. The directions given for the construction of the tabernacle imply no pre-eminence of the Levites. The chief workers in it are from the tribes of Judah and Dan (Exo 31:2-6). The next extension of the idea of the priesthood grew out of the terrible crisis of Exodus 32. If the Levites had been sharers in the sin of the golden calf, they were, at ally rate, the foremost to rally round their leader when he called on them to help him in stemming the progress of the evil. Then came that terrible consecration of themselves, when every man was against his son and against his brother, and the offering with which they filled their hands (מַלְאוּ יֶדְכֶם, Exo 32:29; comp. Exo 28:41) was the blood of their nearest of kin. ‘The tribe stood forth separate and apart, recognizing even in this stern work the spiritual as higher than the natural,  and therefore counted worthy to be the representative of the ideal life of the people, “an Israel within an Israel” (Ewald, Alterthüm. p. 279), chosen in its higher representatives to offer incense and burnt-sacrifice before the Lord (Deu 33:9-10), not without a share in the glory of the Urim and Thummim that were worn by the prince and chieftain of the tribe. From this time, accordingly, they occupied a distinct position. Experience had shown how easily the people might fall back into idolatry — how necessary it was that there should be a body of men, an order, numerically large, and, when the people were in their promised home, equally diffused throughout the country, as attestators and guardians of the truth. Without this the individualism of the older worship would have been fruitful in an ever-multiplying idolatry. The tribe of Levi was therefore to take the place of that earlier priesthood of the first-born as representatives of the holiness of the people.

The tabernacle, with its extensive and regular sacrificial service, which required a special priestly order regularly to perform the higher functions of the sanctuary, was the special occasion which also called into being the Levitical staff to aid the priests in their arduous task, inasmuch as the primitive and patriarchal mode of worship which obtained till the erection of the tabernacle, and according to which the first-born of all Israelites performed the priestly offices (comp. Exo 24:5 with Exo 19:24, and see FIRST-BORN), could not be perpetuated under the newly-organized congregational service without interfering with the domestic relations of the people. It was for this reason, as well as to secure greater efficiency in the sacred offices, that the religious primogeniture was conferred upon the tribe of Levi, which were henceforth to give their undivided attention to the requirements of the sanctuary (Num 3:11-13). The tribe of Levi were selected because they had manifested a very extraordinary zeal for the glory of God (Exo 32:26, etc.), had already obtained a part of this religious primogeniture by the institution of the hereditary priesthood in the family of Aaron (Exo 28:1), and because, as the tribe to which Moses and Aaron belonged, they would most, naturally support and promote the institutions of the lawgiver.

To effect this transfer of office, the first-born males of all the other tribes and all the Levites were ordered to be numbered, from the age of one month and upwards; and when it was found that the former were 22,273, and the latter 22,000 (see below), it was arranged that 22,000 of the first-born should be replaced by the 22,000 Levites, that the 273 first-born who were in excess of the Levites  should be redeemed at the rate of five shekels each, being the legal sum for the redemption of the first-born child (Num 18:16), and that the 1365 shekels be given to Aaron and his sons as a compensation for the odd persons who, as first-born, belonged to Jehovah. As to the difficulty how to decide which of the first-born should be redeemed by paying this money, and which should be exchanged for the Levites, since it was natural for every one to wish to escape this expense, the Midrash (On Num 3:17) and the Talmud relate that “Moses wrote on 22,000 tickets Levite (לוי בן), and on 273 Five Shekels (המש שקלים), mixed them all up, put them into a vessel, and then bid every Israelite to draw one. He who took out one with Levite on it was redeemed by a Levite, and he who drew one with Five Shekels on it had to be redeemed by payment of this sum” (Sanhedrin, 17, a). There is no reason to doubt this ancient tradition. It was further ordained that the cattle which the Levites then happened to possess should be considered as equivalent to all the first-born cattle which all the Israelites had, without their being numbered and exchanged one for one, as in the case of the human beings (Num 3:41-51), so that the firstlings should not now be given to the priest, or be redeemed, which the Israelites were hereafter required to do (Num 18:15). In this way the Levites obtained a sacrificial as well as a priestly character. They for the first-born of men, and their cattle for the firstlings of beasts, fulfilled the idea that had been asserted at the time of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt (Exo 13:12-13).

There is a discrepancy between the total number of the Levites, which is given in Num 3:39 as 22,000, and the separate number of the three divisions which is given in Num 3:22; Num 3:28; Num 3:34, as follows: Gershonites, 7500 + Kohathites, 8600 + Mierarites, 6200 22,300. Compare also Num 3:46, where it is said that the 22,273 first-born exceeded the total number of Levites by 273. The Talmud (Bechoroth, 5, a) and the Jewish commentators, who are followed by most Christian expositors, submit that the 300 surplus Levites were the first-born of this tribe, who, as such, could not be substituted for the first-born of the other tribes, and therefore were omitted from the total. To this, however, it is objected that if such an exemption of first-born had been intended, the text would have contained some intimation of it, whereas there is nothing whatever in the context to indicate it. Houbigant therefore suggests that a לhas dropped out of the word שלשin Num 3:28, making it שש, and that by retaining the former word we obtain 8300 instead of 8600, which removes all the difficulty.  Philippson, Keil, and others adopt this explanation. The number of the first-born appears disproportionately small as compared with the population. It must be remembered, however, that the conditions to be fulfilled were that they should be at once (1) the first child of the father, (2) the first child of the mother, and (3) males. (Compare on this question, and on that of the difference of numbers, Kurtz, History of the Old Covenant, 3:201.)

2. Division of the Tribe of Levi. — As different functions were assigned to the separate houses of the Levitical branch of the tribe, to which frequent references are made, we subjoin the following table from Exo 6:16-25, italicizing the Aaronic or priestly branch in order to facilitate these references.

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

It will thus be seen that the Levitical order comprises the whole of the descendants of Gershon and Merari, and those of Kohath through Izhar and Uzziel, as well as through Amram's second son, Moses; whilst Aaron,  Amram's first son, and his issue, constitute the priestly order. It must here be remarked that, though Kohath is the second in point of age and order, yet his family will be found to occupy the first position, because they are the nearest of kin to the priests.

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

4. Duties and Classification of the Levites. — The commencement of the march from Sinai gave a prominence to their new character. As the tabernacle was the sign of the presence among the people of their unseen King, so the Levites were, among the other tribes of Israel, as the royal guard that waited exclusively on him. The warlike title of “host” is specially applied to them (comp. use of צָבָא, in Num 4:3; Num 4:30; and of מחֲנֶה, in 1Ch 1:19). As such they were not included in the number of the armies of Israel (Num 1:47; Num 2:33; Num 26:62), but were reckoned separately by themselves. When the people were at rest they encamped as guardians around the sacred tent; no one else might come near it under pain of death (Num 1:51; Num 18:22). The different families pitched their tents around it, in the following manner: the Gershonites behind it on the west (Num 3:23), the Kohathites on the south (Num 3:29), the Merarites on the north (Num 3:35), and the priests on the east (Num 3:38). SEE CAMP.

They were to occupy a middle position in that ascending scale of consecration which, starting from the idea of the wshole nation as a priestly people, reached its culminating point in the high-priest, who alone of all the people might enter “within the veil.” The Levites might come nearer than the other tribes, but they might not sacrifice, nor burn incense, nor see the “holy things” of the sanctuary till they were covered (Num 4:15). When on the march no hands but theirs might strike the tent at the commencement of the day's journey, or carry the parts of its structure during it, or pitch the tent again when they halted (Num 1:51). It was obviously essential for such a work that there should be a fixed assignment of duties, and now, accordingly, we meet with the first outlines of the organization which afterwards became permanent. The division of the tribe into the three sections that traced their descent from the sons of Levi formed the groundwork of it. The Levites were given as a gift (נתינים, Nethinim) to Aaron and his sons, the priests, to wait upon them, and to do the subordinate work for them at the service of the sanctuary (Num 8:19; Num 17:2-6). They had also to guard the tabernacle and take  charge of certain vessels, whilst the priests had to watch the altars and the interior of the sanctuary (1:50-53; 8:19; 18:1-7). To carry this out effectually, the charge of certain vessels ande portions of the tabernacle, as well as the guarding of its several sides, was assigned to each of the three sections into which the tribe was divided by their respective descent from the three sons of Levi. i.e. Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, as follows:

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

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

(3.) The Merarites, who out of 6200 yielded 3200 active men. and who were under the leadership of Zuriel, had to occupy the north side of the tabernacle, and take charge of the boards, bars, pillars, sockets, tent-pins, etc. (Num 3:33-37; Num 4:39-40). The two latter companies, however, were allowed to use the six covered wagons and the twelve oxen which were offered as an oblation to Jehovah; the Gershonites, having the less heavy portion, got two of the wagons and four of the oxen; whilst the  Merarites, who had the heavier portions, got four of the wagons and eight of the oxen (Num 7:3-9).

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

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

Such, if one may so speak, was the ideal of the religious organization which was present to the mind of the lawgiver. Details were left to be developed as the altered circumstances of the people might require. The great principle was, that the warrior-caste who had guarded the tent of the captain of the hosts of Israel should be throughout the land as witnesses that the people still owed allegiance to him. It deserves notice that, as yet, with the exception of the few passages that refer to the priests, no traces  appear of their character as a learned caste, and of the work which afterwards belonged to them as hymn-writers and musicians. The hymns of this period were probably occasional, not recurring (comp. Exodus 15; Num 21:17; Deuteronomy 32). Women bore a large share in singing them (Exo 15:20; Psa 68:25). It is not unlikely that the wives sand daughters of the Levites, who must have been with them in all their encampments, as afterwards in their cities, took the foremost part among the “damsels playing with their timbrels,” or among the “wise- hearted,” who wove hangings for the decoration of the tabernacle. There are, at any rate, signs of their presence there in the mention of the “women that assembled” at its door (Exo 38:8, and comp. Ewald, Alterthüm. p. 297).

5. Consecrations of the Levites. — The first act in the consecration of the Levites was to sprinkle them with the water of purifying (מי חטאת), which, according to tradition, was the same used for the purification of persons who became defiled by dead bodies, and in which were mingled cedar-wood, hyssop, scarlet, and ashes of the red heifer (Num 19:6; Num 19:9; Num 19:13), and was designed to cleanse them from the same defilement (comp. Rasli, On Num 8:7). They had, in the next place, as an emblem of further purification, to shave off all the hair from their body, “to teach thereby,” as Ralbag says, “that they must renounce, as much as was in their power, all worldly things, and devote themselves to the service of the most high God,” and then wash their garments. After this triple form of purification, they were brought before the door of the tabernacle, along with two bullocks and fine flour mingled with oil, when the whole congregation, through the elders who represented them, laid their hands upon the heads of the Levites, and set them apart for the service of the sanctuary, to occupy the place of the first-born of the whole congregation; whereupon the priests waved them before the Lord (Num 8:5-14), which in all probability was done, as Abrabanel says, by leading them forward and backward, up and down, as if saying, Behold, these are henceforth the servants of the Lord. instead of the firstborn of the children of Israel.

The part which the whole congregation tool in this consecration is a very important feature in the Hebrew constitution, inasmuch as it most distinctly shows that the Levitical order proceeded from the midst of the people (Exo 28:1), was to be regarded as essentially identical with it, and not as a sacred caste standing in proud eminence above the rest of the nation. This principle of equality, which, according to the Mosaic law, was  not to be infringed by the introduction of a priesthood or monarchy (Deu 17:14-20), was recognized throughout the existence of the Hebrew commonwealth, as is evident from the fact that the representatives of the people took part in the coronation of kings and the installment of highpriests (1Ki 2:35; with 1 Chronicles 29:32), and even in the days of the Maccabees we see that it is the people who installed Simon as high-priest (1Ma 14:35).

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

But, though they were to have no territorial possessions, still they required a place of abode. To secure this, and at the same time to enable the Levites to disseminate a knowledge of the law and exercise a refined and intellectual influence among the people at large, upon whose conscientious payment of the tithes they were dependent for subsistence, forty-eight cities were assigned to them, six of which were to be cities of refuge for those who had inadvertently killed any one (Num 35:1-8). From these forty-eight cities, which they obtained immediately after the conquest of Canaan, and which were made up by taking four cities from the district  of every tribe, thirteen were allotted to the priestly portion of the Levitical tribe. Which cities belonged to the priestly portion of the tribe, and which to the non-priestly portion, and how they were distributed among the other tribes, as recorded in Joshua 21, will be seen from the following table:

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

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

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

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

4. It is assumed that the city was built in a circular form, with a radius of 1500 cubits, that a circle was then described with a radius of 2500 cubits from the center of the city, i.e. at a distance of 1000 cubits from the walls of the city, and that the suburbs were enclosed between the circumferences of the two circles, and that the corner of the circumscribed square was 1000 cubits from the circumference of the outer circle. Compare diagram IV. But the objection to this is that by Euclid, 1:47, the square of the diagonal equals the sum of the square of the sides, whereas in this figure 1 35002 does not equal 25002 + 25002. The assigned length of the diagonal varies about 35 cubits from its actual value.

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

6. The 1000 cubits are measured from the center in four directions at right angles to one another, and perpendicular to each of these a side of  2000 cubits long is drawn, the whole forming a square. But in this case the condition of “1000 cubits round about” is not fulfilled, the distance of the center from the corners of the square being plainly more than 1000 cubits.

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

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

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

1. The tithes were not a regular tax, but a religious duty, which was greatly neglected by the people;

2. Even from these irregular tithes the Levites had to give a tithe to the priests;

3. The tithes never increased, whereas the Levites did increase.

4. Thirteen of the forty-eight cities were assigned to the priests, and six were cities of refuge; and,

5. Of the remaining twenty-nine cities, the Levites were by no means the sole occupants or proprietors; they were simply to have in them those houses which they required as dwellings, and the fields necessary for the pasture of their cattle.

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

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

7. Modifications under Joshua and the Judges. — The submission of the Gibeonites, after they had obtained a promise that their lives should be spared, enabled Joshua to relieve the tribe-divisions of Gershon and Merari of the most burdensome of their duties. The conquered Hivites became “hewers of wood and drawers of water” for the house of Jehovah and for the congregation (Jos 9:27). The Nethinim (Deo dati) of 1Ch 9:2; Ezr 2:43, were probably sprung from captives taken by David in later wars, who were assigned to the service oft the tabernacle,  replacing possibly the Gibeonites who had been slain by Saul (2Sa 21:1). SEE NETHINIM.

The scanty memorials that are left us in the book of Judges are rather unfavorable to the inference that for any length of time the reality answered to the Mosaic idea of the Levitical institution. The ravages of invasion, and the pressure of an alien rule, marred the working of the organization which seemed so perfect. Levitical cities, such as Aijalon (Jos 21:24; Jdg 1:35) and Gezer (Jos 21:21; 1Ch 6:67), fell into the hands of their enemies. Sometimes, as in the case of Nob, others apparently took their place. The wandering, unsettled habits of such Levites as are mentioned in the later chapters of Judges are probably to be traced to this loss of a fixed abode, and the consequent necessity of taking refuge in other cities, even though their tribe as such had no portion in them. The tendency of the people to fall into the idolatry of the neighboring nations showed either that the Levites failed to bear their witness to the truth or had no power to enforce it. Even in the lifetime of Phinehas, when the high-priest was still consulted as an oracle, the very reverence which the people felt for the tribe of Levi becomes the occasion of a rival worship (Judges 17). The old household priesthood revives (see Kalisch, On Gen 49:7), and there is the risk of the national worship breaking up into individualism. Micah first consecrates one of his own sons, and then tempts a homeless Levite to dwell with him as “a father and a priest” for little more than his food and raiment. The Levite, though probably the grandson of Moses himself, repeats the sin of Korah. SEE JONATHAN.

First in the house of Micah, and then for the emigrants of Dan, he exercises the office of a priest with “an ephod, and a teraphim, and a graven image.” With this exception the whole tribe appears to have fallen into a condition analogous to that of the clergy in the darkest period and in the most outlying districts of the mediaeval Church, going through a ritual routine. but exercising no influence for good, at once corrupted and corrupting. The shameless license of the sons of Eli may be looked upon as the result of a long period of decay, affecting the whole order. When the priests were such as Hophni and Phinehas, we may fairly assume that the Levites were not doing much to sustain the moral life of the people.

The work of Samuel was the starting-point of a better time. Himself a Levite, and, though not a priest, belonging to that section of the Levites which was nearest to the priesthood (1Ch 6:28), adopted, as it were, by a special dedication into the priestly line and trained for its offices  (1Sa 2:18), he appears as infusing a fresh life, the author of a new organization. There is no reason to think, indeed, that the companies or schools of the sons of the prophets which appear in his time (1Sa 10:5), and are traditionally said to have been founded by him, consisted exclusively of Levites; but there are many signs that the members of that tribe formed a large element in the new order, and received new strength from it. It exhibited, indeed, the ideal of the Levitical life as one of praise, devotion, teaching; standing in the same relation to the priests and Levites generally as the monastic institutions of the 5th century, or the mendicant orders of the 13th did to the secular clergy of Western Europe. The fact that the Levites were thus brought under the influence of a system which addressed itself to the mind and heart in a greater degree than the sacrificial functions of the priesthood, may possibly have led them on to apprehend the higher truths as to the nature of worship which begin to be asserted from this period, and which are nowhere proclaimed more clearly than in the great hymn that bears the name of Asaph (Psalms 1, 7-15). The man who raises the name of prophet to a new significance is himself a Levite (1Sa 9:9). It is among the prophets that we find the first signs of the musical skill which is afterwards so conspicuous in the Levites (1Sa 10:5). The order in which the Temple services were arranged is ascribed to two of the prophets, Nathan and G(ad (2Ch 29:25), who must have grown up under Samuel's superintendence, and in part to Samuel himself (1Ch 9:22). Asaph and Heman, the psalmists, bear the same title as Samuel the Seer (1Ch 25:5; 2Ch 29:30). The very word “prophesying” is applied not only to sudden bursts of song, but to the organized psalmody of the Temple (1Ch 25:2-3). Even of those who bore the name of a prophet in a higher sense a large number are traceably of this tribe.

The capture of the ark by the Philistines did not entirely interrupt the worship of the Israelites, and the ministrations of the Levites went on, first at Shiloh (1Sa 14:3), then for a time at Nob (1Sa 22:11), afterwards at Gibeon (1Ki 3:2; 1Ch 16:39). The history of the return of the ark to Beth-shemesh after its capture by the Philistines, and its subsequent removal to Kirjath-jearim, points apparently to some strange complications rising out of the anomalies of this period, and affecting, in some measure, the position of the tribe of Levi. Beth-shemesh was, by the original assignment of the conquered country, one of the cities of the priests (Jos 21:16). They, however, do not appear in the  narrative, unless we assume, against all probability, that the men of Beth- shemesh who were guilty of the act of profanation were themselves of the priestly order. Levites, indeed, are mentioned as doing their appointed work (1Sa 6:15), but the sacrifices and burnt-offerings are offered by the men of the city, as though the special function of the priesthood had been usurped by others, and on this supposition it is easier to understand how those who had set aside the law of Moses by one offense should defy it also by another. The singular reading of the Sept. in 1Sa 6:19 (καὶ οὐκ ἠσμένισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ι᾿εχονίου ἐν τοῖς ἄνδρασι Βαιθσαμὺς ὅτι ειδον κιβωτὸν Κυρίου) indicates, if we assume that it rests upon some corresponding Hebrew text, a struggle between two opposed parties, one guilty of the profanation, the other — possibly the Levites who had been before mentioned — zealous in their remonstrances against it. Then comes, either as the result of this collision, or by direct supernatural infliction, the great slaughter of the Beth-shemites, and they shrink from retaining the ark any longer among them. The great Eben (stone) becomes, by a slight paronomastic change in its form, the “great Abel” (lamentation), and the name remains as a memorial of the sin and of its punishment. SEE BETH-SHEMESH.

We are left entirely in the dark as to the reasons which led them, after this, to send the ark of Jehovah, not to Hebron or some other priestly city, but to Kirjath-jearim, round which, so far as we know, there gathered legitimatcly no sacred associations. It has been comrmonly assumed, indeed, that Abinadab, under whose guanrdianship it remained for twenty years, must necessarily have been of the tribe of Levi. SEE ABINADAB.

Of this, however, there is not the slightest direct evidence, and against it there is the language of David in 1Ch 15:2, “None ought to carry the ark of God but the Levites, for them hath Jehovah chosen,” which would lose half its force if it were not meant as a protest against a recent innovation, and the ground of a return to the more ancient order. So far as one can see one's way through these perplexities of a dark period. the most probable explanation — already suggested under KIRJATH-JEARIM — seems to be the following: The old names of Baaleh (Jos 15:9) and Kirjath-baal (Jos 15:60) suggest there had been of old some special strictly attached to the place as the center of a Canaanitish local worship. The fact that the ark was taken to the house of Abinadab in the hill (1Sa 7:1), the Gibcah of 2Sa 6:3, connects itself with that old Canaanitish reverence for high places which, through the whole history of the Israelites, continued to have such strong attractions for them. These may have seemed to the panic-stricken  inhabitants of that district, mingling old things and new, the worship of Jehovah with the lingering superstitions of the conquered people, sufficient grounds to determine their choice of a locality. The consecration (the word used is the special sacerdotal term) of Eleazar as the guardian of the ark is, on this hypothesis, analogous in its way to the other irregular assumptions which characterize this period, though here the offense was less flagrant, and did not involve, apparently, the performance of any sacrificial acts. While, however, this aspect of the religious condition of the people brings the Levitical and priestly orders before us as having lost the position they had previously occupied, there were other influences at work tending to reinstate them.

II. During the Monarchy. — The deplorably disorganized condition of the Levitical order was not much improved in the reign of the first Hebrew monarch. The rule of Samuel and his sons, and the prophetical character now connected with the tribe, tended to give them the position of a ruling caste. In the strong desire of the people for a king we may perhaps trace a protest against the assumption by the Levites of a higher position than that originally assigned them. The reign of Saul, in its later period, was at any rate the assertion of a self-willed power against the priestly order. The assumption of the sacrificial office, the massacre of the priests at Nob, the slaughter of the Gibeonites who were attached to their service, were parts of the same policy, and the narrative of the condemnation of Saul for the two former sins, no less than of the expiation required for the latter (2 Samuel 21), shows by what strong measures the truth, of which that policy was a subversion, had to be impressed on the minds of the Israelites. The reign of David, however, brought the change from persecution to honor. The Levites were ready to welcome a king who, though not of their tribe, had been brought up under their training, was skilled in their arts, prepared to share even in some of their ministrations, and to array himself in their apparel (2Sa 6:14); and 4600 of their number, with 3700 priests, waited upon David at Hebron — itself; it should be remembered, one of the priestly cities — to tender their allegiance (1Ch 12:26). When his kingdom was established, there came a fuller organization of the whole tribe. Its position in relation to the priesthood was once again definitely recognized. When the ark was carried up to its new resting-place in Jerusalem, their claim to be the bearers of it was publicly acknowledged (1Ch 15:2). When the sill of Uzza stopped the procession, it was placed for a time under the care of Obed-edom of Gath — probably  Gath-rimmon — as one of the chiefs of the Kohathites (1Ch 13:13, Jos 21:24; 1Ch 15:18). In the procession which attended the ultimate conveyance of the ark to its new resting-place the Levites were conspicuous, wearing their linen ephods, and appearing in their new character as minstrels (1Ch 15:27-28). The Levites engaged in conveying the ark to Jerusalem were divided into six father's houses, headed by six chiefs, four belonging to Kohath, one to Gershon, and one to Merari (1Ch 15:5, etc.). The most remarkable feature in the Levitical duties of this period is their being employed for the first time in choral service (1Ch 15:16-24; 1Ch 16:4-36); others, again, were appointed as door-keepers (1Ch 15:23-24). Still the thorough reorganization of the whole tribe was effected by the shepherd-king in the last days of his eventful life, that the Levites might be able at the erection of the Temple “to wait on the sons of Aaron for the service of the house of Jehovah, in the courts and the chambers, and the purifying of all holy things, and the work of the service of the house of God” (1Ch 23:28). This reorganization may be described as follows:

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

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

2. The chronicler plainly indicates, in Num 4:25, etc., that he is about to impart a different statement from that communicated in Num 4:3; for he mentions therein the reason which induced David not to abide by the Mosaic institution, which prescribes the age of service to commence at thirty, and in Num 4:27 expressly points out the source from which he derived this deviating account. The two accounts are, therefore, entirely different; the one records that the Levites, in David's time, were numbered from their thirtieth year; while the other, which appears to the chronicler more trustworthy, states that David introduced the practice which afterwards obtained (2Ch 31:17; Ezr 3:8) of appointing Levites to office at the age of twenty.

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

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

(1.) The first class consisted of 24,000 Levites. These were appointed to assist the priests in the work of the sanctuary (λειτουργοῦντες). They had the custody of the official garments and sacred vessels, had to deliver them when wanted. and collect and lock them up again after they had been used; to replenish the sacrificial storehouse with cattle, flour, wine, oil, incense, and other articles used as sacrifices, and mete out each time the required quantity; to provide the different spices from which the priests compounded the incense (1Ch 9:30); to prepare the shewbread the the other baked things used at sacrifices; to assist the priests in slaughtering the victims, and to attend to the cleaning of the Temple, etc. (1Ch 23:28-32; 1Ch 9:29). They had most probably, also, the charge of the sacred treasury (1Ch 26:20-28). Like the priests, they were subdivided into twenty-four courses or companies, according to the above-named twenty-four Levitical fathers' houses, and were headed respectively by one of the twenty-four representatives of these houses.  Each of these courses was a week on duty, and was relieved on the Sabbath (2 Kings 11) by the company those turn it was to serve next, so that there were always a thousand men of this class on duty, and each man had to serve two weeks during the year. The menial work was done by the Nethinim, who were appointed to assist the Levites in these matters. SEE NETHINIM.

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

(3.) The third class also consisted of 4000. They were the gate-keepers (שוערים, πυλωροί, 1Ch 26:11), and, as such, bore arms (1Ch 9:19; 2Ch 31:2). They had to open and shut the gates, to keep strangers and excommunicated or unclean persons from entering the courts, and to guard the storehouse, the Temple, and its courts at night. They, too, were subdivided into twenty-four courses, and were headed by twenty-four chiefs from the three great families of Levi: seven were sons of Meshelmiah, a descendant of Kohath; thirteen were from Obed-edom, a descendant of Gershon; and four were sons of Hosah, a descendant of Merari. These three families, including the twenty-four chiefs, consisted of ninety-three members, who, together with the three heads of the families, viz. Meshelmiah, Obed-edom, and Hosah, made ninety-six, thus yielding four chiefs for each course. We thus obtain a watch-course every week of  162 or 163 persons, under the command of four superior watches, one of whom was the commander-in-chief. As 24 sentinel posts are assigned to these guards, thus making 168 a week, it appears that each person only served one day in the week (1 Chronicles 26).

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

The Levites lived for the greater part of the year in their own cities, and came up at fixed periods to take their turn of work (1 Chronicles 25, 26). The predominance of the number twelve as the basis of classification might seem to indicate monthly periods, and the festivals of the new moon would naturally suggest such an arrangement. The analogous order in the civil and military administration (1Ch 27:1) would tend to the same conclusion. It appears, indeed, that there was a change of some kind every week (1Ch 9:25; 2Ch 23:4; 2Ch 23:8); but this is, of course, compatible with a system of rotation, which would give to each a longer period of residence, or with the permanent residence of the leader of each division within the precincts of the sanctuary. Whatever may have been the system, we must bear in mind that the duties now imposed upon the Levites were such as to require almost continuous practice. They would need, when their turn came, to be able to bear their parts in the great choral hymns of the Temple, and to take each his appointed share in the complex structure of a sacrificial liturgy, and for this a special study would be required. The education which the Levites received for their peculiar duties, no less than their connection, more or less intimate, with the schools of the prophets (see above), would tend to make them, so far as there was any education at all, the teachers of the others (there is, however, a curious Jewish tradition that the schoolmasters of Israel were of the tribe of Simeon [Solom. Jarchi on Gen 49:7, in Godwyn's  Moses and Aaron], the transcribers and interpreters of the law, the chroniclers of the times in which they lived. We have some striking instances of their appearance in this new character. One of them, Ethan the Ezrahite, takes his place among the old Hebrew sages who were worthy to be compared with Solomon, and (Psalms 89, title) his name appears as the writer of the 39th Psalm (1Ki 4:31; 1Ch 15:17). One of the first to bear the title of “scribe” is a Levite (1Ch 24:6), and this is mentioned as one of their special offices under Josiah (2Ch 34:13). They are described as “officers and judges” under David (1Ch 26:29), and, as such, are employed “in all the business of Jehovah, and in the service of the king.” They are the agents of Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah in their work of reformation, and are sent forth to proclaim and enforce the law (2Ch 17:8; 2Ch 30:22). Under Josiah the function has passed into a title, and they are “the Levites that taught all Israel” (2Ch 35:3). The two books of Chronicles bear unmistakable marks of having been written by men whose interests were all gathered round the services of the Temple, and who were familiar with its records. The materials from which they compiled their narratives, and to which they refer as the works of seers and prophets, were written by men who were probably Levites themselves, or, if not, were associated with them.

This reorganization effected by David, we are told, was adopted by his son Solomon when the Temple was completed (2Ch 8:14, etc.). The revolt of the ten tribes, and the policy pursued by Jeroboam, led to a great change in the position of the Levites. They were the witnesses of an appointed order and of a central worship. Jeroboam wished to make the priests the creatures and instruments of the king, and to establish a provincial and divided worship. The natural result was that they left the cities assigned to them in the territory of Israel and gathered round the metropolis of Judah (2Ch 11:13-14). Their influence over the people at large was thus diminished, and the design of the Mosaic polity so far frustrated; but their power as a religious order was probably increased by this concentration within narrower limits. In the kingdom of Judah they were from this time forward a powerful body, politically as well as ecclesiastically. They brought with them the prophetic element of influence. in the wider as well as in the higher meaning of the word. We accordingly find them prominent in the war of Abijah against Jeroboam (2Ch 13:10-12). They are, as before noticed, sent out by Jehoshaphat  to instruct and judge the people (2Ch 19:8-10).

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

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

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

How strictly during this post-exilian period the Levitical duties were enforced, and how severely any neglect in performing them was punished, may be gathered from the following description in the Mishna: “The Levites had to guard twenty-four places: five were stationed at the five gates of the Mountain of the House (שערי הר הבית), four at the four corners inside, five at the five gates of the outer court, four at its four corners inside, one at the sacrificial storehouse, one at the curtain depository, and one behind the holy of holies. The inspector of the Mountain of the House went round through all the guards [every night] with burning torches before him. If the guard did not immediately stand up, the inspector of the Mountain of the House called out to him, ‘Peace be with thee!' and if he perceived that he was asleep, he struck him with his stick, and even had the liberty of setting his garments on fire, and when it was asked, ‘What is that noise in the court?' they were told, ‘It is the noise of a Levite who is beaten, or whose clothes have been burnt, because he  slept when on duty' “(Middoth, 1:1, 2). It is thought that allusion is made to the fact in the Apocalypse when it is said “Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments” (Rev 16:15). As for the Levites who were the singers, they were summoned by the blast of the trumpet after the incense was kindled upon the altar, when they assembled from all parts of the spacious Temple at the orchestra which was joined to the fifteen steps at the entrance from the women's outer court to the men's outer court. They sung psalms in antiphonies, accompanied by three musical instruments — the harp, the cithern, and cymbals — while the priests were pouring out oni the altar the libation of wine. On Sunday they sung Psalms 24, on Monday Psalms 48, on Tuesday Psalms 82, on Wednesday Psalms 94, on Thursday Psalms 81, on Friday Psalms 93, and on the Sabbath Psalms 92. Each of these psalms was sung in nine sections, with eight pauses (פרקים), and at each pause the priests blew trombones, when the whole congregation fell down every time worshipping on their faces (Tamid, 7:3, 4).

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

The Levites appear but seldom in the history of the N.T. Where we meet with their names it is as the type of a formal, heartless worship, without sympathy and without love (Luk 10:32). The same parable indicates Jericho as having become — what it had not been originally (see Joshua 21 :1 Chronicles 6) — one of the great stations at which they and the priests resided (Lightfoot, Cent. Chorograph. 100:47). In Joh 1:19 they appear as delegates of the Jews — that is, of the Sanhedrim coming to inquire into the credentials of the Baptist, and giving utterance to their own Messianic expectations. The mention of a Levite of Cyprus in Act 4:36, shows that the changes of the previous century had carried that tribe also into "the dispersed among the Gentiles." The conversion of Barnabas and Mark was probably no solitary instance of the reception by them of the new faith, which was the fulfillment of the old. If “a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Act 6:7), it is not too bold to believe that their influence may have led Levites to follow their example; and thus the old psalms, and possibly also the old chants of the Temple service, might be transmitted through the agency of those who had been specially trained in them to be the inheritance of the Christian Church. Later on in the history of the first century, when the Temple had received its final completion under the younger Agrippa, we find one section of the tribe engaged in a new movement.

With that strange unconsciousness of a coming doom which so often marks the last stage of a decaying system, the singers of the Temple thought it a fitting time to apply for the right of wearing the same linen garment as the priests, and persuaded the king that the concession of this privilege would be the glory of his reign (Joseph. Ant. 20:8, 6). The other Levites at the same time as for and obtained the privilege of joining in the Temple choruses, from which hitherto they had been excluded. The destruction of the Temple so soon after they had attained the object of their desires came as with a grim irony to sweep away their occupation, and so to deprive them of every vestige of that which had distinguished them from other Israelites. They were merged in the crowd of captives that were scattered over the Roman world, and disappear from the stage of history. The rabbinic schools, that rose out of the ruins of the Jewish polity, fostered a studied and habitual depreciation of the Levitical order as compared with their own teachers (M'Caul, Old Paths, page 435). Individual families, it may be, cherished the tradition that their fathers, as priests or Levites. had taken part in the services of the Temple. If their claims were recognized, they received the old marks of reverence in the worship of the synagogue (comp. the Regulations of the Great Synagogue of London, in Margoliouth's Hist. of the Jews in Great Britain, 3:270), took precedence in reading the lessons of the day (Lightfoot, Ior. Heb. on Mat 4:23), and pronounced the blessing at the close (Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, 6:790). Their existence was  acknowledged in some of the laws of the Christian emperors (Basnage, 1.c.). The tenacity with which the exiled race clung to these recollections is shown in the prevalence of the names (Cohen, and Levita or Levy) which imply that those who bear them are of the sons of Aaron or the tribe of Levi, and in the custom which exempts the first-born of priestly or Levitical families from the payments which are still offered, in the case of others, as the redemption of the first-born (Leo of Modena, in Picart's Cerenonies Religieuses, 1:26; Allen's Modern Judaism, page 297). In the mean time, the old name had acquired a new signification. The early writers of the Christian Church applied to the later hierarchy the language of the earlier, and gave to the bishops and presbyters the title (ἱερεῖς) that had belonged to the sons of Aaron, while the deacons were habitually spoken of as Levites (Suicer, Thes. s.v. Λευίτης).

Though the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews have necessarily done away with the Levitical duties which were strictly local, yet the Levites, like the priests, still exist, have to this day certain functions to perform, and continue to enjoy certain privileges and immunities. On those festivals whereon the priests pronounce the benediction on the congregation of Israel during the morning service, as prescribed in Num 6:22-27. the Levites have "to wait on the priests," and wash their hands prior to the giving of the said blessing. At the reading of the law in the synagogue, the Levite is called to the second section, the first being assigned to the priest. SEE HAPHTARAH.

Moreover, like the priests, the Levites are exempt from redeeming their first-born, and this exemption even extends to women of the tribe of Levi who marry Israelites, i.e. Jews of any other tribe.

IV. Literature. — Mishna, Erachin, 2:3-6; Tamid, 7:3,4; Succa, 5:4; Bikkurim, 3:4; Maimonides, Jod Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Kele Ha-Mikash, 3:1-11; Michaelis, Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, sec. 52 (English translation, 1:252 sq.); Bahr, Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus, 2:3, 39, 165, 342, 428; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel mon der Zerstorung des ersten Tempels, pages 126, 204, 387-424 (Bruns. 1847); the same, Geschichte des Volkes Israel von der Vollendung es zweiten Tempels, 1:55-58, 63-66, 141 (Nordhausen, 1855); Saalschtitz, Das Mosaische Recht, 1:89-106 (Berl. 1853); the same, Archaologie der Hebraer, volume 2, chapter 78, page 342 (Konigsb. 1856); Keil, Handbuch der biblischen Archiologie, 1:160 (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1858); Kalisch, Historical and Critical Commentary on Genesis, pages 735-744 (Lond. 1848); Brown,  Antiquities, 1:301-347; Godwyn, Moses and Aaron, 1:5; Witsius, Dissert. II. de Theocrat. Israelitar.; Jennings, Antiquities, pages 184-206; Carpzov, Apparat. Crit. (see Index); Saubert, Comm. de Sacerdot. et sacris Hebr. personis, in Opp. page 283 sq.; Gramberg, Krit. Geschichte d. Religionsideen des Alten Test. volume 1, 100:3; Reland, Antiq. Sacr. 2:6; Ugolino, Sacerdot. Hebr. chapter 12, in his Thesaur. volume 13; Schacht, Animadvers. ad ken. page 525 sq.; Bauer, Gottesd. Verfassung. 2:377 sq.; Otho, Lex. Rab. page 368 sq.; Willisch, Defiliis Levitarum (Lips. 1708).

## Levites, Military[[@Headword:Levites, Military]]

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

## Levitical City[[@Headword:Levitical City]]

             SEE LEVITE.

## Leviticus[[@Headword:Leviticus]]

             so called in the Vulgate from treating chiefly of the Levitical service; in the Heb. וִיַּקְרָא, and he called, being the word with which it begins; in the Sept. ΛευÞτικόν; the third book of the Pentateuch, called also by the later Jews תּוֹרִת כֹּהֲנַים, "law of the priests," and תּוֹרִת קָרְבָּנוֹת, "law of offerings." In our treatment of it we have especial regard to the various sacrifices enumerated.

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

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

(I.) The Laws directly relating to Sacrifices (chapters 1-7). — At first God spoke to the people out of the thunder and lightning of Sinai, and gave them his holy commandments by the hand of a mediator; but henceforth his presence is to dwell not on the secret top of Sinai, but in the midst of his people, both in their wanderings through the wilderness and afterwards in the Land of Promise. Hence the first directions which Moses receives after the work is finished have reference to the offerings which were to be brought to the door of the tabernacle. As Jehovah draws near to the people in the tabernacle, so the people draw near to Jehovah in the offering. Without offerings none may approach him. The regulations respecting the sacrifices fall into three groups, and each of these groups again consists of a decalogue of instructions. Bertheau has observed that this principle runs through all the laws of Moses. They are all modeled after the pattern of the ten commandments, so that each distinct subject of legislation is always treated of under ten several enactments or provisions.  1. The first group of regulations (chapters 1-3) deals with three kinds of offerings: the burnt-offering (עוֹלָה), the meat-offering (מַנְחָה), and the thank-offering (שְׁלָמַים זֶבִח)

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

(1) a male without blemish from the herds (מַן הִבָּקָר) (Lev 1:3-9), or

(2) a male without blemish from the flocks, or lesser cattle (הִצּאֹן) (Lev 1:10-13), or

(3) it might be fowls, an offering of turtle-doves or young pigeons (Lev 1:14-17). The subdivisions are here marked clearly enough, not only by the three kinds of sacrifice, but also by the form in which the enactment is put. Each begins with, "If his offering," etc., and each ends with, "An offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto Jehovah."

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

(1) in its uncooked form, consisting of fine flour with oil and frankincense (Lev 2:1-3);

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

(3) the prohibition of leaven, and the direction to use salt in all the meat-offerinrgs (Lev 2:11-13);

(4) the oblation of first-fruits (Lev 2:14-16).

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

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

(1) the sin-offering for the priest, Lev 4:3-12;

(2) for the whole congregation, Lev 4:13-21;

(3) for a ruler, Lev 4:22-26;

(4) for one of the common people, Lev 4:27-35.

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

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

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

(1.) The first decalogue.

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

(b.) "'And this is the law of the meat-offering" (Lev 6:14), again in five enactments, each of which is, as before contained in a single verse (Lev 6:14-18).

(2.) The next decalogue is contained in Lev 6:19-30.

(a.) Lev 6:19 is merely introductory; then follow, in five verses, five distinct directions with regard to the offering at the time of the consecration of the priests, the first in Lev 6:20 the next two in Lev 6:21, the fourth in the former part of Lev 6:22, and the last in the latter part of Lev 6:22 and Lev 6:23.

(b.) "This is the law of the sin-offering" (Lev 6:25). Then the five enactments, each in one verse, except that two verses (Lev 6:27-28) are given to the third.

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

(4.) The fourth decalogue, after an introductory verse (Lev 7:11), is contained in ten verses (Lev 7:12-21).

(5.) The last decalogue consists of certain general laws about the fat, the blood, the wave-breast, etc., and is comprised again in ten verses (Lev 7:23-33), the verses, as before, marking the divisions.

The chapter closes with a brief historical notice of the fact that these several commands were given to Moses on Mount Sinai (Lev 7:35-38).

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

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

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

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

With the house of Aaron began this wickedness in the sanctuary; with them, therefore, began also the divine punishment. Very touching is the story which follows. Aaron, though forbidden to mourn his loss (Lev 10:6-7), will not eat the sin-offering in the holy place; and when rebuked by Moses, pleads in his defense, "Such things have befallen me: and if I had eaten the sin-offering today, should it have been accepted in the sight of Jehovah?" Moses, the lawgiver and the judge, admits the plea, and honors the natural feelings of the father's heart, even when it leads to a violation of the letter of the divine commandment.

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

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

(1) beasts of the earth (Lev 11:2-8), or

(2) fishes (Lev 11:9-12), or

(3) birds (Lev 11:13-20), or

(4) creeping things with wings.

The next four are intended to guard against pollution by contact with the carcass of any of these animals:

(5) Lev 11:24-26;

(6) Lev 11:27-28;

(7) Lev 11:29-30;

(8) Lev 11:39-40. The ninth and tenth specify the last class of animals which are unclean for food,

(9) Lev 11:41-42, and forbid any other kind of pollution by means of them,

(10) Lev 11:43-45. Lev 11:46-47 are merely a concluding summary.

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

(1) the first law of this decalogue.

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

(2) Lev 13:1-8;

(3) Lev 13:9-17;

(4) Lev 13:18-23;

(5) Lev 13:24-28;

(6) Lev 13:29-37;

(7) Lev 13:38-39;

(8) Lev 13:40-41;

(9) Lev 13:42-46;

(10) Lev 13:47-59.

This arrangement of the several sections is not altogether free from objection, but it is certainly supported by the characteristic mode in which each section opens. Thus, for instance, Lev 12:2 begins with אַשָּׁה כַּי תִזְרַיע; Lev 13:2 with אָדָם כַּי יַהְיֶה, Lev 13:9 with נֶגִע צָרִעִת כַּי תַהְיֶה and so on, the same order being always observed, the substantive being placed first, then כַּי, and then the verb, except only in Lev 13:42, where the substantive is placed after the verb.

3. "The law of the leper in the day of his cleansing," i.e., the law which the priest is to observe in purifying the leper (Lev 14:1-32). The priest is mentioned in ten verses, each of which begins one of the ten sections of this law: Lev 14:3-5; Lev 14:11-12; Lev 14:14-16; Lev 14:19-20. In each instance the word הִכֹּהֵן is preceded by ו consecut. with the perf. It is true that in Lev 14:8, and also in Lev 14:14, the word הִכֹּהֵן occurs twice; but in both verses there is MS. authority, as well as that of the Vulg. and Arab. versions, for the absence of the second. Lev 14:21-32 may be regarded as a  supplemental provision in cases where the leper is too poor to bring the required offering.

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

(1) Lev 14:34-35;

(2) Lev 14:36-37;

(3) Lev 14:38;

(4) Lev 14:39;

(5) Lev 14:40;

(6) Lev 14:41-42;

(7) Lev 14:43-45.

Then, as usual, follows a short summary which closes the statute concerning leprosy, Lev 14:54-57.

5, 6. The law of uncleanness by issue, etc., in two decalogues (Lev 15:1-31). The division is clearly marked, as Bertheau observes, by the form of cleansing, which is so exactly similar in the two principal cases, and which closes each series:

(1) Lev 15:13-15;

(2) Lev 15:28-30. We again give his arrangement, though we do not profess to regard it as in all respects satisfactory.

(a.)

(1) Lev 15:2-3;

(2) Lev 15:4;

(3) Lev 15:5;

(4) Lev 15:6;

(5) Lev 15:7;

(6) Lev 15:8;

(7) Lev 15:9;

(8) Lev 15:10;

(9) Lev 15:11-12 [these Bertheau considers as one enactment, because it is another way of saying that either the man or thing which the unclean person touches is unclean; but, on the same principle, Lev 15:4-5 might just as well form one enactment];

(10) Lev 15:13-15.

(b.)

(1) Lev 15:16;

(2) Lev 15:17;

(3) Lev 15:18;

(4) Lev 15:19;

(5) Lev 15:20;

(6) Lev 15:21;

(7) Lev 15:22;

(8) Lev 15:23;

(9) Lev 15:24;

(10) Lev 15:28-30.

In order to complete this arrangement, he considers Lev 15:25-27 as a kind of supplementary enactment provided for an irregular uncleanness, leaving it as quite uncertain, however, whether this was a later addition or not. Lev 15:32-33 form merely the same general conclusion which we have had before in Lev 14:54-57.

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

(1) Lev 16:2, Aaron not to enter the holy place at all times;

(2) Lev 16:3-5, with what sacrifices and in what dress Aaron is to enter the holy place;

(3) Lev 16:6-7, Aaron to offer the bullock for himself, and to set the two goats before Jehovah;

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

(5) Lev 16:9-10, Aaron to offer the goat on which the lot falls for Jehovah, and to send away the goat for Azazel into the wilderness; of the goat to make atonement for himself. for his house, and for the whole congregation, as also to purify the altar of incense with the blood;

(7) Lev 16:20-22, Aaron to lay his hands on the living goat, and confess over it all the sins of the children of Israel;

(8) Lev 16:23-25, Aaron after this to take off his linen garments, bathe himself, and put on his priestly garments, and then offer his burnt- offering and that of the congregation;

(9) Lev 16:26, the man by whom the goat is sent into the wilderness to purify himself;

(10) Lev 16:27-28, what is to be done by him who burns the sin-offering without the camp.

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

Here again we may trace, as before, a group of seven decalogues; but the several decalogues are not so clearly marked, nor are the characteristic phrases and the introductions and conclusions so common. In ch. 18 there are twenty enactments, and in chapter 19, thirty. In chapter 17 on the other hand, there are only six, and in chapter 20 there are fourteen. As it is quite manifest that the enactments in chapter 18 are entirely separated by a fresh usual arrangement of the laws in decalogues, would transpose this chapter, and place it after chapter 19. He observes that the laws in chapter 17, and those in Lev 20:1-9, are akin to one another, and may very well constitute a single decalogue, and, what is of more importance, that the words in Lev 18:1-5 form the natural introduction to this whole group of laws: "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, I am Jehovah your God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do; and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do; neither shall ye walk in their ordinances," etc. There is, however, a point of connection between chapters 17 and 18 which must not be overlooked, and which seems to indicate that their position in our present text is the right one. All the six enactments in chapter 17 (Lev 17:3-5, Lev 17:6-7, Lev 17:8-9, Lev 17:10-12, Lev 17:13-14, Lev 17:15) bear upon the nature and meaning of the sacrifice to Jehovah as compared with the sacrifices offered to false gods. It would seem, too, that it was necessary to guard against any license to idolatrous practices which might possibly be drawn from the sending of the goat for Azazel into the wilderness, SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF, especially, perhaps, against the Egyptian custom of appeasing the evil spirit of the wilderness and averting his malice (Hengstenberg, Mose u. Egypten, page 179; Movers, Phonicier, 1:369). To this there may be an allusion in Lev 17:7. Perhaps, however, it is better and more simple to regard the enactments in these two chapters (with Bunsen, Bibelwerk, II, 1:245) as directed against two prevalent heathen practices, the eating of blood and fornication. It is remarkable, as showing how intimately moral and ritual observances were blended together in the Jewish mind, that abstinence "from blood and things strangled, and fornication," was laid down by the apostles as the only condition of communion to be required of Gentile converts to Christianity. Before we quit this chapter one observation may be made. The rendering of the A.V. in Lev 17:11, "for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul," should be, "for it is the blood that maketh an atonement by means of the life." This is important. It is not blood merely as such, but blood as having in it the principle of life that God accepts in sacrifice; for, by thus giving vicariously the life of the dumb animal, the sinner confesses that his own life is forfeit.

In chapter 18, after the introduction to which we have already alluded, Lev 18:1-5 — and in which God claims obedience on the double ground  that he is Israel's God, and that to keep his commandments is life (Lev 18:5) — there follow twenty enactments concerning unlawful marriages and unnatural lusts. The first ten are contained one in each verse (Lev 18:6-15). The next ten range themselves in like manner with the verses, except that Lev 18:17; Lev 18:23 contain each two. Of the twenty the first fourteen are alike in form, as well as in the repeated עֶרוָה לאֹ תְגִלֶּה.

In chapter 19 are three decalogues, introduced by the words, "Ye shall be holy, for I Jehovah your God am holy," and ending with, “Ye shall observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them. I am Jehovah." The laws here are of a very mixed character, and many of them a repetition merely of previous laws. Of the three decalogues, the first is comprised in Lev 18:3-13, and may be thus distributed:

(1) Lev 19:3, to honor father and mother;

(2) Lev 19:3, to keep the Sabbath;

(3) Lev 19:4, not to turn to idols;

(4) Lev 19:4, not to make molten gods (these two enactments being separated on the same principle as the first and second commandments in the Great Decalogue or Two Tables);

(5) Lev 19:5-8, of thank-offerings;

(6) Lev 19:9-10, of gleaning;

(7) Lev 19:11, not to steal or lie;

(8) Lev 19:12, not to swear falsely;

(9) Lev 19:13, not to defraud one's neighbor;

(10) Lev 19:13, the wages of him that is hired, etc.

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

The third decalogue may be thus distributed: Lev 19:26 a, Lev 19:26 b, Lev 19:27, Lev 19:28, Lev 19:29, Lev 19:30, Lev 19:31, Lev 19:32, Lev 19:33-34, Lev 19:35-36.

We have thus found five decalogues in this group. Bertheau completes the number seven by transposing, as we have seen, chapter 17, and placing it immediately before chapter 20. He also transfers Lev 20:27 to  what he considers its proper place, viz., after Lev 20:6. It must be confessed that the enactment in Lev 20:27 stands very awkwardly at the end of the chapter, completely isolated as it is from all other enactments; for Lev 20:22-26 are the natural conclusion to this whole section. But, admitting this, another difficulty remains, that, according to him, the seventh decalogue begins at Lev 20:10, and another transposition is necessary, so that Lev 20:7-8 may stand after Lev 20:9, and so conclude the preceding series of ten enactments. It is better, perhaps, to abandon the search for complete symmetry than to adopt a method so violent in order to obtain it.

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

Like the other sections, it has some characteristic expressions:

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

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

(V.) We come now to the last group of decalogues — that contained in chapters Lev 21:1 to Lev 26:2. The subjects comprised in these enactments are —

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

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

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

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

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

a. Leviticus 21, ten laws, as follows:

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

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

b. Lev 22:1-16.

(1) Lev 22:2; (2) Lev 22:3; (3) Lev 22:4; (4) Lev 22:4-7; (5) Lev 22:8-9; (6) Lev 22:10; (7) Lev 22:11; (8) Lev 22:12; (10) Lev 22:14-16.

c. Lev 22:17-33.

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

d. Leviticus 23.

(1) Lev 23:3; (2) Lev 23:5-7; (3) Lev 23:8; (4) Lev 23:9-14; (5) Lev 23:15-21; (6) Lev 23:22; (7) Lev 23:24-25; (8) Lev 23:27-32; (9) Lev 23:34-35; (10) Lev 23:36; Lev 23:37-38 contain the conclusion, or general summing up of the Decalogue.

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

e. Lev 25:1-22.

(1) Lev 25:2; (2) Lev 25:3-4; (3) Lev 25:5; (4) Lev 25:6; (5) Lev 25:8-10; (6) Lev 25:11-12; (7) Lev 25:13; (9) Lev 25:15; (10) Lev 25:16; with a concluding formula in Lev 25:18-22.

f. Lev 25:23-38.

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

g. Lev 25:39 to Lev 26:2.

(1) Lev 25:39; (2) Lev 25:40-42; (3) Lev 25:43; (4) Lev 25:44-45; (5) Lev 25:46; (6) Lev 25:47-49; (7) Lev 25:50; (8) Lev 25:51-52; (9) Lev 25:53; (10) Lev 25:54.

It will be observed that the above arrangement is only completed by omitting the latter part of chapter 23 and the whole of chapter 24. But it is clear that Lev 23:39-44 is an addition, containing further instructions respecting the Feast of Tabernacles. Lev 23:39, as compared with Lev 23:34, shows that the same feast is referred to; while Lev 23:37-38 are no less manifestly the original conclusion of the laws respecting the feasts — which are enumerated in the previous part of the chapter. Chapter 24, again, has a peculiar character of its own. First, we have a command concerning the oil to be used in the lamps belonging to the tabernacle, but this is only a repetition of an enactment already given in Exo 27:20-21, which seems to be its natural place. Then follow directions about the  shewbread. These do not occur previously. In Exodus the shewbread is spoken of always as a matter of course. concerning which no regulations are necessary (comp. Exo 25:30; Exo 35:13; Exo 39:36). Lastly come certain enactments arising out of a historical occurrence. The son of an Egyptian father by an Israelitish woman blasphemes the name of Jehovah, and Moses is commanded to stone him in consequence; and this circumstance is the occasion of the following laws being given:

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

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

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

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

(5) We have then a repetition in an inverse order of Exo 21:17-18; and

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

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

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

(VI.) These decalogues are now fitly closed by words of promise and threat-promise of largest, richest blessing to those that hearken unto and do these commandments; threats of utter destruction to those that break the covenant of their God. Thus the second great division of the law closes like the first, except that the first part, or Book of the Covenant, ends (Exo 23:20-33) with promises of blessing only. There nothing is said  of the judgments which are to follow transgression, because as yet the covenant had not been made. But when once the nation had freely entered into that covenant, they bound themselves to accept its sanctions its penalties, as well as its rewards. Nor call we wonder if in these sanctions the punishment of transgression holds a larger place than the rewards of obedience; for already was it but too plain that "Israel would not obey." From the first they were a stiff-necked and rebellious race, and from the first the doom of disobedience hung like a fiery sword above their heads.

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

II. Integrity. — This is very generally admitted. Those critics even who are in favor of different documents in the Pentateuch assign nearly the whole of this book to one writer, the Elohist, or author of the original document. According to Knobel, the only portions which are not to be referred to the Elohist are — Moses's rebuke of Aaron because the goat of the sin-offering had been burnt (Lev 10:16-20); the group of laws in chapters 17-20; certain additional enactments respecting the Sabbath and the feasts of Weeks and of Tabernacles (23, part of Lev 23:2, from מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָֹה, and Lev 233, Lev 23:18-19; Lev 23:22; Lev 23:39-44); the punishments ordained for blasphemy, murder, etc, (Lev 24:10-23), the directions respecting the sabbatical year (Lev 25:18-22), and the promises and warnings contained in chapter 26.

With regard to the section chapter 17-20, Knobel does not consider the whole of it to have been borrowed from the same sources. Chapter 17 he believes was introduced here by the Jehovist from some ancient document, while he admits, nevertheless, that it contains certain Elohistic forms of expression, as כֹּל בָּשָׂר, "all flesh," Lev 25:14; נֶפֶשׁ, soul" (in the sense of "person"), Lev 25:10-12; Lev 25:15 חִיָּה, " beast," Lev 25:13, קָרְבָּן, "offering,"  Lev 25:4, ניחוֹחִ רְיח, "a sweet savor," Lev 25:6; "a statute forever," and "after your generations," Lev 25:7. But it cannot be from the Elohist, he argues, because (a) he would have placed it after chapter 7, or at least after chapter 15; (b) he would not have repeated the prohibition of blood, etc., which he had already given; (c) he would have taken a more favorable view of his nation than that implied in Lev 25:7; and, lastly, (d) the phraseology has something of the coloring of chapter 18-20 and 26, which are certainly not Elohistic. Such reasons are too transparently unsatisfactory to need serious discussion. He observes further that the chapter is not altogether Mosaic. The first enactment (Lev 25:1-7) does indeed apply only to Israelites, and holds good, therefore, for the time of Moses. But the remaining three contemplate the case of strangers living among the people, and have a reference to all time.

Chapters 18-20, though they have a Jehovistic coloring, cannot have been originally from the Jehovist. The following peculiarities of language, which are worthy of notice, according to Knobel (Exod. und Leviticus erklart, in the "Kurzg. Exeg. Hdbuch." 1857), forbid such a supposition, the more so as they occur nowhere else in the O.T.: רָבִע, "lie down to" and "gender," Lev 18:23; Lev 19:19; Lev 20:16, תֶּבֶל, "confusion," Lev 18:23; Lev 20:12; לֶקֶט, "gather," Lev 19:9; Lev 23:22; פֶּרֶט, "grape," Lev 19:10; שִׁאֵָרה, "near kinswomen," Lev 18:17; בַּקּרֶת"scourged," Lev 19:20; חֻפְשָׁה, "free," ibid.; כְּתֹבֶת קִעֲקִע, “print marks," Lev 19:28; הֵקיא, "vomit," in the metaphorical sense, Lev 18:25; Lev 18:28; Lev 20:22, עָרְלָה', "uncircumcised," as applied to fruit-trees, Lev 19:23; and מוֹלֶדֶת, "born," Lev 18:9; Lev 18:11; as well as the Egyptian word (for such it probably is) שִׁעֵטְנֵז, "garment of divers sorts," which, however, does occur once beside in Deu 22:11.

According to Bunsen, chapter 19 is a genuine part of the Mosaic legislation, given, however, in its original form, not on Sinai, but on the east side of the Jordan; while the general arrangement of the Mosaic laws may perhaps be as late as the time of the judges. He regards it as a very ancient document, based on the Two Tables, of which, and especially of the first, it is, in fact, an extension, consisting of two decalogues and one pentad of laws. Certain expressions in it he considers as implying that the people were already settled in the land (Lev 19:9-10; Lev 19:13; Lev 19:15), while, on the other hand, Lev 19:23 supposes a future occupation of the land. Hence he  concludes that the revision of this document by the transcribers was incomplete, whereas all the passages may fairly be interpreted as looking forward to a future settlement in Canaan. The great simplicity and lofty moral character of this section compel us, says Bunsen, to refer it at least to the earlier time of the judges, if not to that of Joshua himself.

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

The section in chapter 8-10 is said to have a mythical coloring. This assertion is grounded on the miracle narrated in Lev 9:24. But what could have been the inducement to forge this section? It is said that the priests invented it in order to support the authority of the sacerdotal caste by the solemn ceremony of Aaron's consecration. But to such an intention the narration of the crime committed by Nadab and Abihu is strikingly opposed. Even Aaron himself here appears to be rather remiss in the observance of the law (comp. Lev 10:16 sq., with Lev 4:22 sq.). Hence it would  seem that the forgery arose from an opposite or anti-hierarchical tendency. The fiction would thus appear to have been contrived without any motive which could account for its origin.

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

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

The book of Leviticus has a prophetical character. This is especially manifest in chapters 25, 26, where the law appears in a truly sublime and divine attitude, and when its predictions refer to the whole futurity of the nation. It is impossible to say that these were vaticinia ex eventu, unless we would assert that this book was written at the close of Israelitish history. We must rather grant that passages like this are the real basis on which the authority of later prophets is chiefly built. Such passages prove also in a striking manner that the lawgiver had not merely an external aim, but that his law had a deeper purpose, which was clearly understood by Moses himself. That purpose was to regulate the national life in all its bearings, and to consecrate the whole nation to God. Seen especially, Lev 25:18 sq. Although this section has a general bearing, it is nevertheless manifest that it originated in the times of Moses. At a later period, for  instance, it would have been impracticable to promulgate the law concerning the Sabbath and the year of jubilee; for it was soon sufficiently proved how far the nation in reality remained behind the ideal Israel of the law. The sabbatical law bears the impress of a time when the whole legislation, in its fullness and glory, was directly communicated to the people in such a manner as to attract, penetrate, and command.

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

V. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole or major part of this book, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Origen, Selecta (in Opp. 2:179); also Homiliae (ibid. 4:184); Ephrem Syrus, Explanatio (in Syriac, in Opp. 2:236); Theodoret, Quaestiones (in Greek, in Opp. 1); Isidorus Hispalensis, Commentaria (in Opp. 1); Bede, Quaestiones (in Opp. 8); also In Levit. (ibid. 4); Hesychius,  In Levit. (in Greek, Paris, 1581, 4to; also in the Biblia Max. Patr. 12); Claudius Taurinensis, Praefatio (in Mabillon, Veter. Analect. page 90); Hugo St.Victor, Annotationes (in Opp. 1); Rupertus Tuitiensis, In Levit. (in Opp. 1:220); Radulphus Flaviacensis, Commentaria (Col. 1536, folio; also in the Biblia Max. Patr. 17:47); Pesiktha-Minus, Commentarius (includ. Numbers and Deut.] (from the Heb. in Ugolino, Thesaur. 15:997; 16 sq.); Phrygio, AExplanatio [together with 1 Timothy] (Basil. 1543, 4to; 1596, 8vo); Brentius, Commentarii (in Opp. 1); Chytraeus, Enarrationes (Vitemb. 1569, 1575, 8vo) Serranus, Commentarius (Antwp. 1572, 1609, fol.); Brocardus, Interpretatio (L.B. 1580, 8vo); Babington, Notes (in Works, page 349); Pelargus, Commentarins (Lips. 1604, 4to); Lorinus, Commentarii (Ludgun. 1619, 1622; Duac. 1620; Antwerp, 1620, fol.); Willet, Sixfold Commentarie (Lond. 1631, fol.); Franzius, Conmmentarius (Lips. 1696, 4to); Spanheim, Observationes (in Opp. 3:617); Cocceius, Observationes (in Opp. 1:158); \*Patrick, Commentary (Lond. 1698, 4to; also in Patrick, Lowth, and Whitby's Commentary); Dassovius, Scholia (Kilom. 1707, 4to); Hagemann, Betrachtungen (Brunswick, 1741, 4to); \*Rosenmüller, Scholia (Lips. 1824, 8vo); Horsley, Notes (in Bibl. Crit. 1); \*Bertheau, Die Sieben Gruppen Mos. Gesetze (Lpz. 1840, 8vo); James, Sermons (Lond. 1847, 8vo); \*Bonar, Commentary (Lond. 1851 [3d ed.], 1861; N.Y. 1851, 8vo); \*Bush, Notes (N.Y. 1852,12mo); Cumming, Readings (Lond. 1854, 12mo); \*Knobel, Erklarung [includ. Exod.] (volume 2 of the Kurtzgef. Exeg. Hdbch. Lpz. 1857, 8vo); Newton, Thoughts (Lond. 1857,12mo); \*Kalisch, Commentary (London, 1857 sq., 2 volumes, 8vo); Seiss, Gospel in Levit. (Phila. 1860, 12mo); \*Keil, Commentar (in volume 2 of his Pentateuch, Leipsic, 1862, Edinb. 1866, 8vo); Siphra, Commentar (in Heb. Vienna, 1862, folio); Wogue, Levitique (volume 3 of his Pentateuque, Par. 1864, 8vo); \*Murphy, Commentary (Lond. and Andover, 1872, 8vo). SEE PENTATEUCH.

## Levity[[@Headword:Levity]]

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

## Levy[[@Headword:Levy]]

             (כמִס, mas, tribute, as usually rendered), a tax or requirement of service imposed by Eastern kings for public works, hence a gang or company of men impressed into such service (1Ki 5:13-14; 1Ki 9:15). In two passages other terms (עָלָה. 1Ki 9:21; רוּם, Num 31:28) are employed in connection with this, to denote the exaction of tribute. SEE TRIBUTE.

## Lew Chew[[@Headword:Lew Chew]]

             SEE LOO CHOO.

## Lewd[[@Headword:Lewd]]

             (πονηρός, bad, Act 17:5), Lewdness (ῥαδιοϋργημα, mischief Act 18:14), are used elsewhere in their proper sense of licentiousness (זַמָּה, etc., Jdg 20:6; Ezekiel often; Jer 11:15; Jer 13:27; Hos 6:9; once for נַבְלוּת, the parts of shame, Hos 2:10).

## Lewin, Hirschel[[@Headword:Lewin, Hirschel]]

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

## Lewis, Isaac, D.D[[@Headword:Lewis, Isaac, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born January 21, 1746 (O.S.), in Stratford (now Huntington), Connecticut; graduated at Yale College in 1765; entered the ministry in March, 1768; and was ordained pastor at Wilton, Connecticut, October 26, 1768. He resigned his charge in June, 1786, and was installed October 18, 1786, pastor in Greenwich, and there he labored until December 1, 1818, when he gave up the work on account of the infirmities of age. He died August 27, 1840. In 1816 he was made a  member of Yale College Corporation, but resigned in 1818. He published a few occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals of the Anmerican Pulpit, 1:662.

## Lewis, Isaac, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Lewis, Isaac, D.D (2)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Wilton, Connecticut, January 1, 1773. He graduated from Yale College in 1794, with his twin brother, Zechariah Lewis. Remaining at New Haven, he prosecuted the study of theology, and was ordained May 30, 1798. He was installed pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Cooperstown, N.Y., in 1800; in 1806 of the Presbyterian Church in Goshen; and in 1812 preached in Bristol, R.I.; subsequently served in New Rochelle and West Farms, N.Y., as a stated supply, and succeeded his father in Greenwich, Connecticut, in December,  1818. He assumed charge of the Church in Bristol, R.I., November 12, 1828. In September 1831, the failure of his voice compelled him to resign his charge, though he still preached occasionally until the time of his death, which occurred in New York city, September 23, 1854. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:667.

## Lewis, John J., LL.D[[@Headword:Lewis, John J., LL.D]]

             a Baptist minister and educator, was born at Utica, N.Y., December 25, 1843. He graduated from Hamilton College in 1864, became professor in the Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute the same year, in 1867 pastor at Syracuse, in 1868 professor in Madison University, and died at Hamilton, N.Y., December 5, 1884.

## Lewis, John Nitchie[[@Headword:Lewis, John Nitchie]]

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

## Lewis, John W[[@Headword:Lewis, John W]]

             an eminent Baptist minister of Georgia, was born near Spartansburg, S.C., February 1, 1801. He studied medicine, and practiced with success, but was drawn to the ministry, and ordained in 1832. About 1840 he removed to Canton, Georgia, where he was pastor for a time, and afterwards of other churches in Cherokee County. In such secular concerns as he undertook he exhibited good judgment and sagacity. During the civil war he was a senator in the Congress of the Confederate States, and had much to do with the establishment of the Supreme Court of Georgia. As a preacher, he was instrumental in the conversion of many souls. His death took place in Cherokee County, Georgia, in June 1865. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 691. (J.C.S.)

## Lewis, Josiah, D.D[[@Headword:Lewis, Josiah, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, graduated with honors from Emory College in 1859, began the study of law, entered the ministry in 1861, joined the Georgia Conference in 1866, served as professor in Emory College, in 1871 engaged in pastoral work, in 1876  was transferred to the Alabama Conference, and appointed president of the university at Greenasborough, in 1882 was transferred to pastoral work in the North Georgia Conference, and died at Sparta, February 13, 1885. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1885, page 98.

## Lewis, Moses[[@Headword:Lewis, Moses]]

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

## Lewis, Samuel Seymour, D.D[[@Headword:Lewis, Samuel Seymour, D.D]]

             a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Springfield, Vermont, September 4, 1804. His early education was acquired in the district school, but at the age of fiteen he entered the High School at South Berwick, Maine, where he prepared for college. After entering Dartmouth, failing sight compelled him to dissolve his connection with it, and he entered into partnership with a friend in Utica, N.Y., and devoted himself to mercantile pursuits. Consulting a distinguished oculist in New York, he was assured that he was simply near-sighted, whereupon he immediately closed up his business, and entered Trinity (then Washington) College, Hartford, Conn. At the end of two years he graduated, August 6, 1829. Shortly after he entered the General Theological Seminary in New York city, but before the end of the year he was elected a tutor in Trinity College, which post he held until he was ordained deacon, June 10, 1832. In the fall of that year he took charge of Christ Church, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, and in the following year he was admitted to priest's orders. Accepting an invitation from Mobile, he went there in the latter part of 1835, occupying the only parish in the city, and that a feeble one. Here he remained for ten years. He died there July 9, 1848. His style of preaching  was of the evangelical type, and he was especially successful as a pastor. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:714.

## Lewis, Tayler, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Lewis, Tayler, D.D., LL.D]]

             a distinguished Biblical scholar and Congregational divine, was born in Northumberland, Saratoga County, N.Y., March 27, 1802. He graduated from Union College in 1820, studied law in Albany, and, being admitted to the bar, entered on the practice of his profession at Fort Miller, In 1833 he gave up the practice of law, and opened a classical school at Waterford, and in 1835 removed his school to Ogdensburg. In 1838 he was chosen professor of Greek in the University of New York, which chair he occupied until 1849, when he was appointed professor of the Greek language and literature in his Alma Mater, and occupied that position until his death, May 11, 1877. Through all the years of his professorate he was a thorough, indefatigable student of Oriental and Biblical literature. He employed his attainments to defend and illustrate the truths of divine revelation. Among his first publications were translations and texts of Plato's works, accompanied with valuable notes and critical dissertations. In 1855 he published his Six Days of Creation, the work by which he became widely known as one of the ablest defenders of divine revelation. Dr. Lewis contributed largely to magazines, both monthly and quarterly, and his contributions to religious journals were almost without number. To mention only one, the New York Observer, that paper contains numerous valuable articles. Among them are, "State Rights," "A Photograph from the Ruins of Ancient Greece," "Heroic Periods in a Nation's History," "A Defence of Capital Punishment," "The People of Africa, their Character, Condition, and Future Prospects." He was one of the authors of the recently published Life of President Nott, of Union College, and the translator of Genesis and Ecclesiastes in Lange s Commentary. (W.P.S.)

## Lewis, Thomas[[@Headword:Lewis, Thomas]]

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

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

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

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

## Lewis, William Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Lewis, William Henry, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Litchfield, Connecticut, Decdember 22, 1803. He was rector for a number of years of the Church of the Holy Trinity, in Brooklyn, N.Y., until 1861, when he became rector of Christ Church, Watertown, Connecticut, of which he continued to have charge until 1874. He died at the latter place, October 2, 1877. He published, Sermons for the Christian Year: — Confession for Christ: — The Early Called: — Position of the Church, besides several tracts. See  Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1878, page 169; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Lewis, Zechariah[[@Headword:Lewis, Zechariah]]

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

## Lewis, Zechariah (2)[[@Headword:Lewis, Zechariah (2)]]

             a Congregational minister and editor, son of Reverend Isaac Lewis, D.D., was born at Wilton, Connecticut, January 1, 1773. With his twin brother, Isaac, he graduated from Yale College in 1794, and after studying theology at Philadelphia under Ashbel Green, D.D., was licensed to preach in 1796; and in the same year was appointed tutor in Yale College, remaining in that office until 1799. While a theological student he was a private tutor in general Washington's family. Convinced that his health was too much impaired to fulfil the duties of the ministry, he became the editor of the Commercial Advertiser, and New York Spectator, continuing in that employment until 1820. For six years he was corresponding secretary of the New York Religious Tract Society, out of which sprang the American Tract Society. Resigning this position in February 1820, he was elected, in May, a secretary of the United Foreign Missionary Society, which office he held for five years. For several years he was editor of the American Missionary Register, which he began to publish in July 1820. He died in Brooklyn, N.Y., November 14, 1840. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:666.

## Leyczon Nobla[[@Headword:Leyczon Nobla]]

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

## Leydecker, Melchior[[@Headword:Leydecker, Melchior]]

             a Calvinistic theologian, was born at Middelburg in 1642. He became pastor in the province of Zealand in 1662, was appointed professor at Utrecht in 1678, and died in 1721. He was an ardent exponent of the doctrines of the Reformed Church, and violently opposed the systems of Cocceius and Descartes, the works of Drusius, Spencer's book De Legibus Hebraeorum, and the Lutheran tendencies of Witsius. Very learned in theological, rabbinical, and ecclesiastical literature, he distinguished himself by wielding a strong pen in favor of the Reformed theological system. Among his apologetical works are De veritate Jidei Reformatae ejusdemque sanctitate, s. Comnmentarius ad Catech. Palatin. (Ultrajecti. 1694, 4to): — De oeconomia trium personarum in negotio salutis hum. libri iv, quibus universa Reformata fides certis principiis congruo nexu  explicatur (Traj. ad Rhen. 1682,12mo): — Veritas evangelica troiumphans de erroribus quorumvis seculorum — opus, quo principia fidei Reformatae demonstrantur (Traj. 1688, 4to): — also, Historia ecclesice Africanae illustrata pro ecclesiae Reformate veritate et libertate (Ultraj. 1690,4to). His controversial works against Cocceius met with great success, because they discussed the question with great clearness. Among them we notice his Synopsis controversiarum de foedere et testamento Dei, quae hodie in Belgio moventur (Traj. 1690, 8vo): — Vis veritatis s. disquisitionum ad nonnullas controversias, quae hodie in Belgio moventur de oeconomia foederum Dei, libri v (Traj. 1679, 4to): — Fax veritatis (Leidoe, 1677, 4to).

When yet a youthful student at the university Leydecker had paid special attention to Biblical studies, and, guided by a learned rabbi, made rapid strides in the exploration of Biblical lore. In after life, when, tired of polemical and clerical pursuits, he looked about for a field on which he might profitably venture, this department of theological study allured him anew. Attempting to fit the works of Godwin (Moses and Aaron) and Cunseus (De Republica Hebreor.) to his academical purposes, he soon discovered their insufficiency, and set about to prepare himself a more copious treatise, which is everywhere marked by a vigorous and independent judgment. While he conceals not his aversion to the "futilities" of the Talmud, he quotes the great rabbins with respect. He, moreover, keeps a sharp eye on the extravagancies of Christian writers, and his work censures with evenhanded justice the well-known rabbinism of the Buxtorfs and the Egyptism of Spencer (De Legibus Hebr.). It is only characteristic of this unsparing criticism of the orthodox author that he adds an appendix of severe animadversion against the cosmogony of Thomas Burnet, to whose Theoria telluris he prefixes the predicate profana.

The six dissertations of this appendix, whatever may be thought of the author's views, are valuable for their learning, and interesting as closely bearing on the questions now raised on the Mosaic cosmogony. Especial mention among his Biblical works is due to his archaeological treatise entitled De Republica Hebraeoarum (Amst. 1704, thick fol. vol.), which is one of the largest repertories ever written on the wide subject of Hebrew antiquities, and exhibits in an eminent degree vast stores of scriptural, rabbinical, and historical learning. Added to the interest of the subject are dissertations on the Hebrew laws and customs, both political and religious, interwoven in a historical narrative, in which the sacred history is developed, by epochs, from the earliest period to the latest. The author, in his progress, learnedly investigates the history, pari  passu, of the leading Gentile nations, very much after the manner of Shuckford and Russell in their Connections. This valuable work, on which Leydecker's fame deserves mainly to depend, is singularly enough ignored in Schweizer's sketch of the author in Herzog (see below). A complete list of his works is to be found in the Unpartheiische Kirchen-Hist. A. u. N. Test., etc., 2:625. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:360; Gass, Dozmengeschichte, volumes 1-3; Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. volume 2, s.v.

## Leyden, John of[[@Headword:Leyden, John of]]

             SEE BOCHOLD.

## Leyden, Lucas van[[@Headword:Leyden, Lucas van]]

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

## Leyden, School of, Theologians Of The[[@Headword:Leyden, School of, Theologians Of The]]

             is the name given to that class of Dutch theologians who follow in the wake of the rationalistic professors of the University of Leyden (founded in 1575) and of whom J.H. Scholten (in 1840 professor in Franeker, since 1843 in Leyden) and his pupils are at present the main interpreters. The Leyden school is in reality nothing more nor less than a Dutch Tübingen school. In his younger days Scholten belonged to the orthodox school, and at one time (1856) even went forth to battle against the negative criticism of Baur and his Tübingen confreres; but in 1864 he came out boldly in  defense of the very man and principles he had previously warred against, and in a short time became the principal leader in the movement of modern Dutch theologians "to establish a connection between the faith of the Reformers and our own... to unite the old traditions with the new opinions" (the Rationalism of the Tübingen theologians). "Man," the Leyden school teaches, "arrives at a knowledge of the truth by the holy Scriptures, but they must not be understood as containing the only revelation from God; he also reveals himself to the world through the hearts of all believers. The Bible is the source of the original religion. There is a difference between the Scriptures and the word of God. The latter is what God reveals in the human spirit concerning his will and himself.

The writing down of the communication is purely human; therefore the Bible cannot be called a revelation.... To prove the certainty of the facts of revelation historical criticism must be called in." Unfortunately, however, with them "historical criticism" means nothing else than the application of that negative criticism of the German Rationalists De Wette, Ewald, and Hitzig, and they dispose of the "historical by asserting (e.g. Kuenen) that we cannot go further back than the middle of the 8th century before Christ, or the time of Hosea and Amos; that "all the preceding times are enveloped in hopeless myth. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the founders of Israel, are not persons, but personifications. They are purely ideal figures, for modern 'historical' inquiry teaches us that races are not derived from one progenitor, but many. The development and preservation of Israel — its whole history were the result of purely national causes." Christianity itself, they came naturally enough, from such grounds, to regard as "neither superhuman nor supernatural. It is the highest point of the development of human nature itself, and in this sense it is natural and human in the highest acceptation of those terms. It is the mission of science to put man in a condition to comprehend the divine volume presented by Christianity." But what the idea of the modern theologians of Holland is on the relation of science to faith we may well learn from Prof. Opzoomer, of Utrecht University (The Truth anc its Sources of Knowledge, page 43): "Science is not to appear before the bar of faith, but faith before that of science; for it is not the credibility of knowledge, but of faith, that is to be proved.... Science needs no justification.... The believer, on the contrary, must justify his faith, and that before the bar of science.

Thus, as a matter of course, the final decision and the supreme power rest with science." Great indeed is the science of Opzoomer, and in like ratio is the insignificance of the thing he calls faith. His manner of rejecting miracles is the old threadbare argument  of Hume. "Modern science is established on the experience acquired by the observance of nature. What experience teaches is the touchstone for testing the historical value of the accounts that reach us from past ages." Again, and more positively: "It is the duty of the historian to reject every narrative which is in manifest contradiction with everything known to him concerning the time of its alleged occurrence.... Nothing in all nature gives probability to the supposition that moral and religious greatness can be established by dominion over natural phenomena" (The Nature of Knowledge, pages 31, 33). "We know nothing of the supernatural; to us there is not a single miracle" (The Spirit of the new Tendency, page 28). "Experience — it, and it alone! What is beyond it is from an evil source. For our knowledge there is but one way — the way of observation" (Free Science, page 26).

Perhaps we can do no better than insert here a resume by Dr. Hurst of the object of the Dutch modern theologians, as follows: " 1. History must be reconstructed; for every miracle must disappear from the Biblical narrative, since philosophy teaches that there can be no miracles. 2. Philosophy must be liberated from the so-called divine revelation, because the history of the present time, or experience, teaches that there can be nothing supernatural; hence there never was. Thus the argument whirls in a hopeless circle; history demonstrates from (untrue) philosophy, and philosophy from (untrue) history, that there is no such thing as miracle, nor even anything supernatural! Can we wonder at the sorry plight of the modern theologians which Pierson (formerly pastor of the Walloon Church in Rotterdam, now professor at Heidelberg University) divulges on the very first page of his Mirror of the Times: We do not conceal the fact that our theology is involved in ceaseless vacillation?" Besides Scholten we have Kuenen, the great exegetical scholar, and Ravenhoff, the ecclesiastical historian, both professors at Leyden, actively engaged in promoting the interests of these Rationalistic opinions, and, unfortunately enough for Christianity in Holland, it must be confessed that at present no Dutch theologians exert more influence over the young theologians of that country than professor Scholten and his associates just mentioned. See Dr. Hurst in the Meth. Quart. Rev. 1871 (April), page 250 sq.; and his Hist. of Rationalism, page 368 sq.; Scholten, De Leer der Hervormde Kerk in hare grondbeginselen nit de bronnen voorgesteld en beordeeld. (1848; 2d ed. 1850; 4th ed. 1861); and his article on "Modern Materialism and its Causes" in Progress of Religious Thought in the Protest. Ch. of France (Lond. 1861), page 10 sq. SEE REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH. (J.H.W.)

## Leydt, Johannes[[@Headword:Leydt, Johannes]]

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

## Leyser[[@Headword:Leyser]]

             SEE LYSER.

## Lha Ma[[@Headword:Lha Ma]]

             in Lamaism, is one of the five upper worlds through which the soul of the departed has to wander.

## Lha-Ssa-Morou[[@Headword:Lha-Ssa-Morou]]

             an annual festival observed by the Lamas of Thibet on the third day of the first moon, at Lha-Ssa. It lasts six days, and is designed to give the devout an opportunity to implore the blessings of the Tale-Lama, and to make a pilgrimage to the celebrated Buddhist monastery called Morou, which occupies the centre of the town. See Huc, Travels in Tartary and Thibet.

## Lhamoghiuprul[[@Headword:Lhamoghiuprul]]

             in Lamaian mythology, was the wife of the 'hibetanian king, Sazan, one of the most beautiful, pure, and sacred nymphs of the lower heaven. SEE CIO CONCIOA.

## Liar[[@Headword:Liar]]

             SEE LIE.

## Libamen[[@Headword:Libamen]]

             a name given by the ancient Romans to denote the bunch of hair which was cut from the forehead of the victim about to be sacrificed, and which was thrown into the fire as a kind of first-fruits.

## Libanius[[@Headword:Libanius]]

             a celebrated sophist of the 4th century, noted as a friend of the emperor Julian, was born about A.D. 314 at Antioch, where he studied in early youth, devoting his attention to the purest classic models. After a stay of  four years at Athens, where he attracted much attention, he pursued his studies at Constantinople, and here entered upon a brilliant career as teacher, which excited the envy of others, especially of the sophist Bemarchius, his former instructor. The latter falsely charged him with the practice of sorcery and many vices, so that the prefect was persuaded to expel him from the city, A.D. 346. He went to Nice, and shortly after to Nicomedia, and there pleasantly passed five years with great success as an instructor, and returned, by invitation of emperor Julian, who had frequently attended his lectures, to Constantinople, only to leave it, however, shortly after, on account of the opposition still existing. He retired, by permission of Cessar Gallus, to his native city. Here he continued to reside till his death which is supposed to have occurred after the accession of Arcadius, A.D. 395. In the death of Julian, Libanius lost much of his hope for the restoration of paganism.

He complains to the gods that they had granted so long a life to Constantius, and only so brief a career to Julian. He interchanged many letters with Julian. Under Valens he defended himself successfully against a charge of treason, and seems to have obtained the emperor's favor. He besought from him a law, in which Libanius himself, on account of his own natural offspring by a mistress, was personally interested, granting to natural children a share in their father's property at his death. Libanius was the preceptor of Basil and Chrysostom; and, although himself a pagan to the end, always maintained friendly relations with these Christian fathers. He was a warm advocate for tolerance, and sought to defend the Manichaeans of the East from the violent measures directed against them. He addressed Theodosius in one of his Discourses in defense of the heathen temples, which the monks were eager to despoil.

He lived long enough to see Christianity everywhere triumphant, and his personal efforts no longer applauded. Separate works of Libanius have from time to time been discovered and edited, but many yet lie in MS. only in different libraries. His style is rhetorically correct, but, in accordance with the spirit of his times, highly artificial. Gibbon's criticism may be considered too severe (Decline and Fall, chapter 24). Among the writings of Libanius are his Progymnasmata, or Examples of Rhetorical Exercises, divided into thirteen sections; and Discourses, many of which were never pronounced, nor designed for that purpose. Some of the latter are moral dissertations, after the fashion of the times, on such subjects as Friendship, Riches, Poverty. One is entitled Mova Sia, a lament on the death of Julian. Another, the most interesting of all his writings, is his autobiography, which he first wrote at the age of sixty years, entitled  Βίος ἣ λόγος περὶ πῆς ἑαυτοῦ τυχῆς. A fragment of his Discourses, addressed to Theodosius in defense of the heathen temples, was discovered by Mai in 1823 in the Vatican. 'The Declamlations , exceeding forty in number, are exercises on imaginary subjects. There are not less than 2000 Letters addressed to over 500 persons, among whom are Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom. He wrote also a Life of Demosthenes, and Arguments to the Orations of Demosthenes. There is no complete edition of Libanius. His Discourses and Declamations were edited by Reiske (Lips. 1791-97, 4 volumes, 8vo). The most copious edition of his Letters (1605 in the Greek, and 522 translated into Latin) is that by J.C. Wolf (Amsterd. 1738, fil.). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. volume 8, s.v.; Wetzer u.Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, volume 6, s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. volume 2, s.v.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Emnpire, chapters 23, 24; Sievers, Leben des Libanius (Berl. 1868).

## Libanomancy[[@Headword:Libanomancy]]

             (from λἱβανος, the frankincense tree, and μαντεία, divination), a species of divination (q.v.) which was performed by throwing a quantity of frankincense into the fire, and noting the odor which it emitted. If it burned quickly and gave out an agreeable smell, the omen was favorable; but if the reverse took place, it was unfavorable.

## Libanus[[@Headword:Libanus]]

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

## Libation[[@Headword:Libation]]

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

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

## Libel[[@Headword:Libel]]

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

## Libellatici[[@Headword:Libellatici]]

             is the name of that class of the lapsed who received from the heathen magistrate a written certificate (libellue) as a warrant for their security; either testifying that they were not Christians, or containing a dispensation from the necessity of sacrificing to the gods in confirmation of their adherence to heathenism. Another class of the lapsed were the sacrificati — that is, those who had offered sacrifice to the heathen gods in testimony of their renunciation of the faith; manother the traditores, because they had delivered up into the hands of the heathen either copies of the sacred writings, baptismal registers, or any other property of the Church. See  Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1 (see Index); Mosheim, Commentary (see Index). SEE LAPSED.

## Libelli Pacis Or Letters Of Peace[[@Headword:Libelli Pacis Or Letters Of Peace]]

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

## Libelli Pcenitentiales[[@Headword:Libelli Pcenitentiales]]

             (certificates ofpenitence), documents frequently issued during and after the 8th century by the Romish priesthood, granting immediate absolution to those who confessed their sins to the priest, and declared themselves ready to fulfil the appointed penance, even though they were not prepared to partake of the communion. Great opposition was made to this practice by the reformers in the time of Charlemagne. SEE PENITENTIAL.

## Liber Albus[[@Headword:Liber Albus]]

             (swhite book) of the ancient monasteries and guilds contained a personal history of visitors or benefactors, frequently recorded in the handwriting of the persons themselves commemorated.

## Liber Diurnus[[@Headword:Liber Diurnus]]

             ROMANÔRUM PONTIFICUM is the name given by the see of Rome to a collection of formulas used in its correspondence and other business transactions. These formulas are very like those written for secular affairs by the monk Marculph (about 660) and others, and received from the compiler the name of Liber Diurnus because they relate to negotia diurna (see Marino Marini, Diplonmatica pontifiscia, ed. nov. Romans 1852 sq., page 64). They are interesting as scientific and historical monuments as well as for their practical use; and this is specially the case with the Liber Diurnus Pontificalis, which contains copies of the letters addressed by the Roman bishops to the emperor, the empress, consuls, kings, patriarchs, bishops, and other members of the clergy, and in general to all who were in any way concerned in the nomination of the Roman bishops; the professio pontificia, the exemptions granted on the occasion of nominating neighboring bishops, on bestowing the pallium (q.v.), conferring privileges and immunities, etc. On all these points, and the manner in which these things were practiced from the 6th to the 8th century, the Liber Diurnus contains more or less complete information, particularly on the relations existing between the see of Rome and the emperor, the mode of election of the Roman bishops, the ritual, etc.

To judge from its contents, this collection was probably written before the year 752, for it speaks of the relation between the see of Rome and the eparchs, who were abolished in that year; but, on the other hand, it must be posterior to 685, for in caput 2, tit. 9, the emperor Constantine (Pogonatus) is spoken of as being already dead. It must also have been written under some successor of Agatho (t 682), as this Roman bishop is also mentioned as dead. Garnerius supposed it to have been composed in the time of Gregory II, somewhat after 714, on the ground that in the second professio fidei pontificis, given in the Liber Diurnus, there are expressions and views which correspond exactly to those we find in the letters of that pope to the emperor Leo. It is likely, though, that the Liber Diurnus existed originally in a more elementary form before it assumed that under which it is known at present, for the different MS. copies of it differ somewhat from each other. The Liber Diurnus was frequently consulted by all writers on canon law, such  as no of Chartres, Anselm of Lucca, Deusdedit, Gratian (c. 8, dist. 16). As the ritual and various points of law underwent modifications in the course of time, it was less used, and its existence even came to be concealed by the popes for fear lest it might recall their former dependence upon the emperors and eparchs. Still there were copies of it in existence, and a codex contained in the library of the Vatican was published in 1660 by the care of Lucas Holstenius; it was, however, at once suppressed by the Roman see. Hoffmann (Novas collectio scriptorum ac monumentorum, Lipsiae, 1733, 4to, 1:389) attributes to Baluze (in the remarks on Petrus de Marca, De concordia sacerdotii ac imperil, lib. 1, cap. 9, No. 8) the statement that at the time of Holstenius the Vatican library possessed no codex of the Liber Diurnzus, and that his publication was based upon a MS. entrusted to him by the Cistercian monk Hilarius Rancatus.

But as both editions of the works of P. de Marca, published at Paris by Baluze, state only (lib. 2, cap. 16, No. 8) that Holstenius's publication of the Liber Diurmus was suppressed, and Baluze again, in his notes appended to Anton. Augustinus, De emnendatione Gratiani, lib. 1, dialogus 20, § 13 (ed. Par. 1760, page 433), says that there were various copies of the Liber Diurnus in existence, from one of which, that in the Vatican library, Holstenius published his edition, it seems reasonable to suppose that Hoffmann's statement lacks support. As for Rancatus, Mabillon names Leo Allatius, and not Holstenius, as the party to whom he imparted the MS. (see also Cave, Scriptorum eccl. hist. literaria, Basle, 1741, 1:621). The MS. of the Vatican has actually been described by Pertz (Italienische Reise, in Archiv. f. altere deutsche Geschichtskunde, 5:27). He says that it is an 8vo volume of parchment,and that, according to the statement found on its firstpages, it dates from the 8th century. The Jesuit Joannes Garnerius, with the aid of a similar codex and a MS. found in Paris,. published in 1680 another edition of the Liber Dimurnus, "cum privilegio regis Christianissimi." Mabillon, in the Museum Italicum (folio II, 2:32 sq.), published additions to it by means of the MS. which had been used by Leo Allatius. With the aid of all these works, Hoffmann published a new edition of it in the Nova collectio cit. (volume 2), which was subsequently done also by Riegger (Vienna, 1762, 8vo). All this gave rise afterwards to collections of formulas to replace the obsolete Liber Diurnus. There are several such collections still extant in MS. Among them the Formulariumn et stylus scriptorum curiae Romanae, from John XXII to Gregory XII and John XXIII, in Summa cancellaria Joannis XXII. We may also consider as belonging to this class of works the Rituum ecclesiasticorum sive  ceremoniarum libri tres of bishop Augustinus Patricius Piccolomini, printed by Hoffmann (2:269 sq.), and containing a description of the rites accompanying the election of the popes in the 14th century. Collections of formulas similar to the Liber Diurntus were also made for the use of bishops, abbots, etc. See Rockinger, Nachweisunqen über Formelbücher v. xiii-xvi Jahrhund. (Munich, 1855, pages 64,126,173, 183, etc.); Palacky, Ueber Formelbücher (Prague, 1842); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:366; Wetzer u.Welte, Kirchen-Lex. volume 5, s.v.

## Liber Pontificalis[[@Headword:Liber Pontificalis]]

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

The oldest source known at present of the liber is generally considered to have been a list of the popes down to Liberius, and probably written during his life (352-366), as it makes no mention of his death (see Schelstrate, Dissertatio, etc., chapter 2, 3; Hefele, Tübinger theolog. Quartalschrift, 1845, page 312 sq.). The original MS. of this so-called Codex Liberii is now lost. In 1634 a copy was made of it from an Antwerp MS. by Bucher, the Bollandists give one in the Acta Sanctorunm, April, volume 1:1675,  and Schelstrate another from a Vienna codex. These three texts are given side by side in the Origines de l'eglise Romaine, par les membres de la communauute de Solermes (Paris, 1826), volume 1.

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

Both lists were subsequently continued, and this is what produced the Liber Pontificalis. This filiation, however, can only be traced by the aid of MSS. The oldest copy known belongs to the close of the 7th or the beginning of the 8th century. It ends at the death of Conon (686-687). A  rather incomplete Codex rescriptus, discovered by Pertz (Archiv. page 50 sq.) at Naples, gives the list of the popes down to Conon; it must have been written, at the latest, in the early part of the 8th century. Another is found in a codex of the cathedral chapter of Verona, ending also with Conon, but to it was added afterwards a list of the names of the popes down to Paul I (t 767). This MS. was published in the fourth volume of Bianchini's collection, but, unfortunately, we have no description of this codex; it was to have been given in the fifth volume, which never appeared (see Rostell, Beschreibung der Stadt Romans 1:209, 210), so that it is impossible clearly to establish its relation to the Neapolitan MS. A continuation of this first work goes down to Gregory II (from 714), and is to be found in the Codex of the Vatican, No. 5269, which must be a copy of an older MS. (Schelstrate, chapter 5, § 3). Then there is another continuation from the second part of the 8th century, contained in a codex of the Ambrosian Library of Milan (M. no. 77, 4to), which is of the same date. The biographies close with Stephen III (t 757), and at the end is simply remarked, "xcv Paulus sedit annis x, mensibus ii, diebus v" (Muratori, Rerum Ital. Scriptores, 3:7). The variations on this MS. are given by Muratori under the letter A. It belonged originally to the convent of Bobbio. According to a very plausible supposition of Niebuhr, the above-mentioned Neapolitan Codex came also from that convent. It will probably be possible, when the subject shall have been more thoroughly studied, to trace a connection between the two, and the Liber Pontiicalis also. After the middle of the 8th century there appeared several continuations, as is shown by the numerous MSS. of them in existence (see, in Muratori, B, C, D; and Pertz, who gives notices of several MSS. of the kind). Some of these codices extend down to Nicolas I (t 867), others to Stephen VI (t 891), which is as far as the so-called Liber Pontificalis extends.

If from what we have stated it is concluded that the work dates back as far as the 7th century, it is clearly impossible that the librarian Anastasius should have been its author. He could at best only have continued it. Schelstrate thinks that the biography of Nicolas I can alone be ascribed to him (c. 8, § 10); while Ciampini is induced by some peculiarities of the style to consider him also as the author of the four preceding ones (1.c. sect. 5, 6). Ii the present state of the question it is impossible to decide between the two opinions. But it is clearly a mistake to attribute the biographies of Adrian II and Stephen IV to a certain Bibliothecarius  Gulielntus, as is generally done (Ciampini names the librarian Zachary, sect. 4, 7, 8). This error originated in an inscription in the Vatican Codex (3762, fol. 90 b-96), which, however, states only that a certain Peter Guillermus of Genoa, librarian of the convent of S. AEgidius, wrote this Vatican Codex in the year 1142 (see Giesebrecht, in the Kieler Allgem1. Monatsschrift, etc., April, 1852, pages 266, 267; Monumental Germaniae, 11:318).

The sources of the Liber Pontificalis, besides those above mentioned, consist partly in traditions, partly in MS. documents, and remaining monuments, auch as buildings, inscriptions, etc. The collection of canon law of the 7th or 8th century, published by Zachary from a codex of Modena, stands in close connection with the Liber Pontificalis (see Zaccaria, Dissertazioni varie Italiane a storia eccleslastica appartenenti, Romans 1780, volume 2, diss. 4; reproduced by Galland, De vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge, Mogunt. 1770, 4to, 2:679 sq.); yet it is not to be considered as one of its sources, but rather appears to have been based on the Liber Pontificalis. The Liber Pontificalis has become particularly valuable for the correctness of the information since the latter part of the 7th century, when the Roman archives were regularly organized, and the continuation of the Liber Pontificalis could only be intrusted to the librarians or other members of the clergy having free access to the archives. The Liber Pontificalis is especially useful for the history of particular churches, ecclesiastical institutions, the discipline, etc. Schelstrate names as its first edition Peter Crabbe's Concilien (Cologne, 1538); but this is neither complete nor well connected. It only contains extracts on each pope, like Baronius's Annutles and subsequent collections of canons, and as the "editio priinceps," the edition of J. Busäus (Mayence, 1602, 4to) is generally accepted, which is based on a MS. of Marcus Welser, of Augsburg. It was followed by the edition of Hannibal Fabrotti (Par. 1649), for which several codices were consulted. Lucas Holstenius prepared another by collating Busaus's with a number of MSS., and, although never published, it was greatly used by Schelstrate and others (see Schelstrate, cap. 5, No. 3 sq.). From the hands of Schelstrate the MS. of Holstenius passed into the library of the Vatican in 1734 (see Dudik, Iter Romanum, part 1 [Vienna, 1855, page 169]). The next edition was published by Francis Bianchini (Romans 1718, folio), and this served as a basis for Muratori's, contained in the 3d volume of his Scriptores rearum Italicarulm (1723); Bianchini's work was continued by his nephew, Joseph  Bianchini (volumes 2-4, Romans 1735; there was to have been a 5th volume, but it never appeared). There also appeared at Rome an edition by John and Peter Joseph Vignoli (1724, 1752, 1755, 3 volumes, 4to). Risstell recently undertook another for the Monumenta Germaniae, while Giesebrecht announced for the same work a continuation of the Libel Pontificalis (see Giesebrecht, Ueber die Quellen d. früheren Papstgesch., art. ii in the Kieler Allgem. Monatsschrift f. Wissenschajft u. Literatur, April 1852, pages 257-274).

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

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

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

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

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

2. Another continuation of the Liber Pontificalis, composed in the 12th century, extends from Gregory VII to Honorius II (1124-1129). Onuphrius Panvini and Baronius name as its author either the subdeacon Pandulph of Pisa or a Roman librarian named Peter Constant. Gaetani published in 1638 a biography of Gelasius II alone, and asserted that the continuation of the Liber Pontifticis down to Innocent III was due to cardinal Pandulph Masca of Pisa, and was written in the time of Innocent III. But Papebroch brings forth very plausible arguments to prove that the subdeacon Peter of Pisa wrote only the biography of Paschal II, and that the subsequent ones are due to the subdeacon Peter of Alatri, still Muratori, in the 3d volume of the Scriptores, gives this collection of biographies under the name of Pandulph of Pisa, and the question of authorship has not been further inquired into since. Giesebrecht (page 262 sq.) maintains that the Codex Vaticanus 3762, of the 12th century, is the original from which all the other IMSS. were copied (also the codex No. 2017, of the 14th century, in the Barberini Library at Rome; comp. Vignoli, Liber Pontisf volume 3; Pertz, Archiv.  page 54), and also that the author of the life of Paschal I was the cardinal- deacon Peter. The life of Gelasiuts II and that of Calixtus II were written by Pandulph after 1130, as is shown by his own statement (Muratori, 3:389, 419). The similarity of style shows that he wrote also the life of Ionorius II. But it is highly probable that Pandulph is the same person afterwards designated as the cardinal-deacon of the church of St.Cosmas and Damianus, a nephew of Hugo of Alatri, cardinal-priest and for a long time governor of Benevento. Peter and Pandulph were partisans of Anacletus II, and were afterwards declared schismatics by the adherents of Innocent II; this put an end to their work.

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

## Liber Sextus And Septimus[[@Headword:Liber Sextus And Septimus]]

             SEE CANONS AND DECRETALS, COLLECTIONS OF.

## Libera nos[[@Headword:Libera nos]]

             (deliver us) is the amplification of the petition, "Deliver us from evil," in the Lord's Prayer, found in almost all liturgies. For instance, that of the Gallican (which is variable) is on Christmas day — “Libera nos, omnipotens Deus, ab omni malo et custodi nos in omni opere bono, perfecta veritas et vera libertas Deus, qui regnas in ssecula saeculorum." Many liturgies contain supplications for the intercession of saints in the Libera nos.

## Liberalia[[@Headword:Liberalia]]

             a festival observed annually by the ancient Romans on March 17, in honor of Liber or Bacchus. A procession of priests and priestesses, wearing ivy garlands, marched through the city, bearing wine, honey, cakes, and sweetmeats, along with a portable altar, having in the middle of it a fire- pan, ill which the sacrifices were burned. On this occasion the Roman youths who had reached the age of sixteen were invested with the toga virilis or dress of manhood. The Liberalia were much more innocent in their character than the Bacchanalia (q.v.), and continued to be celebrated in Rome after that festival was suppressed.

## Liberalism[[@Headword:Liberalism]]

             SEE RATIONALISM.

## Liberality[[@Headword:Liberality]]

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

## Liberality Of Sentiment[[@Headword:Liberality Of Sentiment]]

             a generous disposition a man feels towards another who is of a different opinion from himself; or, as one defines it, "that generous expansion of mind which enables it to look beyond all petty distinctions of party and system, and, in the estimate of men and things, to rise superior to narrow prejudices." Unfortunately, liberality of sentiment is often a cover for error and skepticism on the one hand, and is most generally too little attended to by the ignorant and bigoted on the other. "A man of liberal sentiments," says an eminent English writer, "must be distinguished from him who has no religious sentiments at all. He is one who has seriously and effectually  investigated, both in his Bible and on his knees, in public assemblies and in private conversations, the important articles of religion. He has laid down principles, he has inferred consequences; in a word, he has adopted sentiments of his own. He must be distinguished also from that tame, undiscerning domestic among good people, who, though he has sentiments of his own, yet has not judgment to estimate the worth and value of one sentiment beyond another. Now a generous believer of the Christian religion is one who will not allow himself to try to propagate his sentiments by the commission of sin. No collusion, no bitterness, no wrath, no undue influence of any kind, will he apply to make his sentiments receivable; and no living thing will be less happy for his being a Christian. He will exercise his liberality by allowing to those who differ from him as much virtue and integrity as he possibly can."

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Liberatus[[@Headword:Liberatus]]

             a deacon of the Church of Carthage, flourished in the 6th century. He was in Rome A.D. 533, when pope John II received the bishops sent by the emperor Justinian I to consult him on the heresies broached by the monks, designated Acoemetne (or, as Liberatus terms them, Acumici), who had imbibed Nestorian opinions. He was again at Rome in 535, having been sent the previous year, together with the bishops Caius and Petrus, by the synod held at Carthage under Reparatus, bishop of that see, to consult pope John II on the reception into the Church of those Arians who recanted their heresies. John was dead before the arrival of the African delegates; but they were received by pope Agapetus, his successor. When, in 552. Reparatus was banished by Justinian to Euchaida, or Eucayda. Liberatus accompanied him and probably remained with him till the bishop's death in 563. Nothing further is known of him. Liberatus is the author of a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical history, entitled Breviarium Caussae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum (from the ordination of Nestorius, A.D. 428, to the time of the fifth oecumenical [or second Constantinopolitan] council, A.D. 553). In this work he is charged with partiality to the Nestorians, or with following the Nestorians too implicitly. It is contained in most editions of the Concilia (volume 5, edit. Labbe; volume 6. edit. Coleti; volume 9, edit. Mansi). In those of Crabbe (volume 2, fol., Cologn., 1538 and 1551) are some subjoined passages derived from various extant sources illustrative of the history, which are omitted by subsequent editors. Hardouin omitted the Breviarium. It was  separately published, with a revised text, and a learned preface and notes, and a dissertation, in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland, volume 12 (Venice, 1778, fol.). — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biograph, 2:777.

## Liberi, Pietro[[@Headword:Liberi, Pietro]]

             an eminent Italian painter, was born at Padua in 1605, and studied under Alessandro Varotari, also the works of the best masters, as Michael Angelo, Raphael, Correggio, and Titian. Among his best productions are the Murder of the Innocents, at Venice; Noah just Landed from the Ark; in the cathedral at Vicenza and The Deluge, in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, at Bergamo. Others of his grand pictures are the Destruction of Pharaoh's Host, ill the cathedral at Vicenza; Moses Striking the Rock, at Bergamo; and the Sufferings of Job. He died in 1687. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Liberia[[@Headword:Liberia]]

             or the United States of Liberia, a negro republic in Western Africa, on the upper coast of Upper Guinea. The boundaries are not definitely fixed, but provisionally the River Thebar has been adopted as the north-western, and the San Pedro as the eastern frontier. The republic has a coast-line of 600 miles, and extends back 100 miles, on an average, but with the probability of a vast extension into the interior as the tribes near the frontier desire to conclude treaties providing for the incorporation of their territories with Liberia. The present area is estimated at 9700 square miles. The republic owes its origin to the "American Colonization Society," which was established in December, 1816, for the purpose of removing the negroes of the United States from the cramping influences of American slavery, and placing them in their own fatherland. There, it was hoped, they would be able to refute, by practical demonstration, the views of those American politicians who contended that the institution of American slavery was essentially righteous and signally beneficent. The society, in November, 1817, sent two agents to Western Africa, the Reverend Dr. Ebenezer Burgess and Samuel J. Mills, to select a favorable location for a colony of American negroes. After visiting Gambia, Sierra Leone, and Sherbro, they fixed upon the last-named place. The first expedition of emigrants, 86 in number, was sent out in February, 1820.

After various disappointments, the emigrants succeeded in obtaining a foothold on Cape Mesurado, in lat. 60 19' N., long. 100 49' W., where now stands Monrovia, the capital of the republic of Liberia. The purchase of the Mesurado territory, including Cape Mesurado and the lands, forming nearly a peninsula, between the Mesurado and the Junk rivers about 36 miles along the coast, with an average breadth of about two miles, was effected in December 1821. For a hundred years the principal powers of Europe, in particular France and England, had repeatedly tried to gain possession of this territory, but the native chiefs had invariably refused to part with even one acre, and were  known to be extremely hostile to the whites. On January 7, 1822, the smaller of the two islands lying near the mouth of the Mesurado River was occupied by the colonists, who called it Perseverance Island. They remained here until April 25, when they removed to Mesurado Heights, and raised the American flag.

The colony henceforth grew, and expanded in territory and influence, taking under its jurisdiction from time to time the large tribes contiguous. In 1846 the board of directors of the American Colonization Society invited the colony to proclaim their independent sovereignty, as a means of protection against the oppressive interference of foreigners, and a special fund of $15,000 was raised to buy up the national title to all the coast from Sherbro to Cape Palmas, in order to secure to the new nationality continuity of coast. In July 1847, the declaration of independence, prepared by Hilary Teoge, was published. Representatives of the people met in convention, and promulgated a constitution similar to that of the United States. Soon after the new republic was recognized by England and France; in 1852 it was in treaty stipulations with England, France, Belgium, Prussia, Italy, the United States, Denmark, Holland, Hayti, Portugal, and Austria.

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

1. The Veys, extending from Gallinas, their northern boundary, southward to Little Cape Mount; they stretch inland about two days' journey. They invented, some 20 years ago, an alphabet for writing their own language, and, next to the Mandingoes, they are regarded as the most intelligent of the aboriginal tribes. As they hold constant intercourse with the Mandingoes and other Mohammedan tribes in the far interior, Mohammedanism is making rapid progress among them. The Anglican missionary, bishop Payne, has recently suggested a plan of occupying the country of the Veys with an extensive and vigorous mission, and the mission-school opened by the Episcopalians at Totocorch, which is nearer to Cape Mount than to Monrovia, is regarded as the first outpost towards the vast interior.  2. The Pessehs, who are located about seventy miles from the coast, and extend about one hundred miles from north to south, are entirely pagan. They may be called the peasants of West Africa, and supply most of the domestic slaves for the Veys, Bassas, Mandingoes, and Kroos. A missionary effort was attempted among them about fifteen years ago by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, but it was abandoned in consequence of the death of the first missionary, George L. Seymour.

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

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

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

6. The Greboes, who border upon the south-eastern boundaries of the Kroos, extend from Grand Sesters to the Cavalla River, a distance of about seventy miles. In 1834 a mission was established among them by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which continued  in operation for seven years. A Church was organized, the language reduced to writing, and parts of the New Testament and other religious books translated into it; but in 1842 the mission was transferred to Gabun. A mission established by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States among the same tribe a few years previously still continues in operation, and has recently established at Bohlean a missionary station, about seventy miles from the coast.

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

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

A new sera may therefore be now said to have dawned upon the "Dark Continent," in a religious, as well as secular point of view, and Liberia, which is the oldest of the modern mission fields there, will doubtless still continue to be the center of missionary action, at least for the immense and densely populated middle region of that quarter of the globe. The Protestant Episcopal Church likewise has a bishop there, and its mission in 1889 had 60 stations, 17 clergy, 17 candidates for orders (8 Liberians), 6 postulants (3 Liberian and 3 native), confirmations 106, communicants 612, marriages 12, burials 32, Sunday-school scholars 908, boarding and day-scholars 877, total contributions, $1,416,56. There are 22 day-schools, 11 boarding-schools, and 29 Sunday-schools in all connected with the mission. The Baptist churches in Liberia have mostly been organized by the Southern Board of American Baptists. Their work was suspended during the war, and the American Baptist Missionary Union commenced their work in Liberia with the understanding that the Southern Board would not resume the work; but in 1870 the Southern Baptists sent an agent to Africa with a view of renewing their labors there. The Missionary Union continued, however, to give a partial support to several pastors. In March, 1868, the Baptist churches of Liberia organized the "Liberian Baptist Missionary Union" for "the evangelization of the heathen" within the borders of the Republic of Liberia, "and contiguous thereto."

At this first meeting of the union ten Baptist churches were represented, and twelve fields of missionary labor were designated and commended to the care of the nearest churches. The Baptist churches have a training-school for preachers and teachers at Virginia. The Presbyterian Church of the United States has congregations at Monrovia, Kentucky, Harrisburg, Greenville or Sinou, Marshall, Robertsport, and a few other places, with an aggregate membership of about 280. The Liberian churches in union with those of Gaboon and Corisco form the presbytery of Western Africa. The Alexander High-school is intended to be an academy of high grade, conducted under the supervision of the Presbytery, and designed especially to aid young men preparing for the ministry. It is situated on a farm of about twenty acres, eighteen miles from Monrovia, near the St. Paul's River. The American Lutherans have three stations in Liberia. See Newcomb, Cyclopaedia of Missions; Annual Reports of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church; Baptist Missionary Magazine, July 1872; Proceedings of the Board of Missions of the  Protestant Episcopal Church, October 1871; Annual Reports of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Grundemann, Missionsatlas; Stockwell, The Republic of Liberia (New York, 1868); Blyden (professor in Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone, W.A.), The Republic of Liberia, its Status and ifs Field (Meth. Quart. Rev. July 1872, art. 6). (A.J.S.)

## Liberius[[@Headword:Liberius]]

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

## Libertine[[@Headword:Libertine]]

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

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

2. Conjectural readings have been proposed, especially Libyans, either in the form Λιβοστίνων ((Ecumen., Beza, Clericus,Valckenaer), or Λιβύων (Schultness, De Char. Sp. S. page 162, in Meyer, ad loc.); inasmuch as Libertini here occurs among the names of nations, and Josephus (Ant. 12:1,  and Apion. 2:4) has told us that many Jews were removed by Ptolemy, and placed in the cities of Libya. The difficulty is thus removed, but every rule of textual criticism is against the reception of a reading unsupported by a single MS. or version.

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

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

5. The earliest explanation of the word (Chrysostom) is also that which has been adopted by the most recent authorities. The Libertini are Jews who, having been taken prisoners by Pompey and other Roman generals in the Syrian wars, had been reduced to slavery, and had afterwards been emancipated, and returned, permanently or for a time, to the country of their fathers. Of the existence of a large body of Jews in this position at Rome we have abundant evidence. Under Tiberius, the Senatus-Consultum for the suppression of Egyptian and Jewish mysteries led to the banishment of 4000 "libertini generis" to Sardinia, under the pretense of military or police duty, but really in the hope that the malaria of the island might be fatal to them. Others were to leave Italy unless they abandoned their religion (Tacitus, Anal. 2:85; comp. Sueton. Tiber. c. 36). Josephus (Ant. 18:3, 5), narrating the same fact, speaks of the 4000 who were sent to Sardinia as Jews, and thus identifies them with the "libertinum genus" of Tacitus. Philo (Legat. ad Caiunm, page 1014, C) in like manner says that the greater part of the Jews of Rome were in the position of freedmen (ἀπελευθερωθέντες), and had been allowed by Augustus to settle in the Trans-Tiberine part of the city, and to follow their own religious customs unmolested (comp. Horace, Sat. 1:4, 143; 1:9, 70). The expulsion from Rome took place A.D. 19; and it is an ingenious conjecture of Mr. Humphreys (Comm. on Acts, ad loc.) that those who were thus banished from Italy may have found their way to Jerusalem, and that, as having  suffered for the sake of their religion, they were likely to be foremost in the opposition to a teacher like Stephen, whom they looked on as impugning the sacredness of all that they most revered. The synagogue in question had doubtless been built at the expense of these manumitted Jews, and was occupied by them. Libertini is thus to be regarded as a word of Roman origin, and to be explained with reference to Roman customs. Among the Romans this term was employed to denote those who had once been slaves, but had been set at liberty, or the children of such persons (see Adam's Romans Ant. pages 34, 41 sq.; Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Ingenui, Libertus). This view is further confirmed by the fact that the word συναγωγῆς does not occur in the middle of the national names, but stands first, and is followed by τῆς λεγομένης, whence it clearly appears that Λιβερτῖνοι is at least not the name of a country or region. On this subject, see further in Bloomfield, Kuinll, Wetstein, etc., on Act 6:9; and comp. D. Gerdes, De Synog. Libertinoraum (Gron. 1736); J.F. Scherer, De Synag. Libertin. (Argent. 1754); Briam, De Libertinis (Hafn. 1698); Cademann, De schola Libertinorum (Lips. 1704); Lösner, Obs. in N. Test. page 180; Deyling, Observ. 2:437 sq.; K. Döring, Ep. qua synagogam Libert. scholamn Latinamz fuisse conjicit (Laube, 1755). SEE DISPERSED; SEE SLAVERY.

## Libertines[[@Headword:Libertines]]

             THE, or as they called themselves, Spiritualists, were a Pantheistic and Antinomian sect of the Reformation days. They appeared first in the Netherlands as an ultra division of the "Brethren of the Free Spirit." They spread into France, and, by the interest they manifested in political affairs, gained considerable influence also in Switzerland, especially in Geneva. The impulse given to thought by the Reformation gave rise also to many errors, which flourished by the side of evangelical truth. "Lofty as our ideas of the Reformation should be, we must not be blind to the fact that.... Protestantism [referring especially to the Continent] bears sad evidence of early mismanagement" (Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism, page 37). Foremost among the heretics of this period were the Brethren of the Free Spirit, who, although hotly persecuted, had never been entirely exterminated, and who were yet numerous in Germany and the Netherlands. They now suddenly emerged from the secrecy in which they had lately hidden themselves, as soon as the power of the Church began to wane. Luther clearly saw, however, that not to Romanism, but to Protestantism as well, the influence of the Libertines must be baneful, and he took an early  opportunity to warn the Christians of those countries against them (Gieseler, Kirchenlesch. 3 [1], 557). Calvin also had to contend against the influence of these Rationalists, and, in speaking of them, mentions a certain Coppin, of Lille, as the first who attempted to introduce, as early as 1529, the doctrines of the Free Spirit in his native city.

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

We have said above that the system of the Libertines was pantheistic; it was, in fact, pure pantheism. They held that there is one universal spirit, which is foundi in every creature, and is the Spirit of God. This one spirit and God is distinguished from itself according as it is considered in heaven or on earth. "Deum a se ipso diversum esse, quod alius omnino in hoc mundo sit quam in coelo" (Calvin, Instr . adv. Libert. 100:11). All creatures, angels, etc., are nothing in themselves, and have no real existence aside from God. Man is preserved only by the Spirit of God, which is in him, and exists only luntil that spirit again departs from him; instead of a soul, it is God himself who dwells in man, and all his actions, all that takes place in the world, is direct from him, is the immediate work of God ("Quiduid in mundo lit, opus ipsius [Dei] directo censendum esse," c. 13). Everything else, the world. the flesh, the devil, souls, etc., are by this system considered as illusions, mere suppositions (opinatio). Even sin is not a mere negation of right, but, since God is the active agent of all  actions, it can be but an illusion also, and will disappear as soon as this principle is recognized ("Peccatum — non solum aiunt boni privationem esse, sed est illis opinatio, quae evanescit et aboletur, cum nulla habetur ejus ratio," c. 12. Pocquet says, in regard to that, “Et quia omnia quae fiunt extra Deum, nihil sunt quam vanitas," c. 23).

There is, therefore, but one evil, and that evil is this very illusion, this imagination of evil, of a distinction between it and the right. Thus the original fall or sin was nothing else than a separation of man from God, or rather the result of man's desire to be something by himself, separating himself from sunion and identity with God. Thus unintentionally man subjected himself to the world and to Satan, and became himself an illusion, a smoke which passes away and leaves nothing behind. So Pocquet says. "Ideo scriptuim est (?), 'Qui videt peccatum, peccatum ei manet et veritas in ipso non est'" (in Calvin, c. 23). From the Libertine point of view the nature of Christ did not materially differ from ours; he consisted, like other human beings, in divine spirit, such as dwells in us all, and in the sacrifice only the illusionary, or worldly part, was lost. However considered the whole history of Christ, and especially his crucifixion, death, and resurrection, had for them but a symbolical significance; his passion, etc., was, according to Calvin's strong expression, only "une farce on moralite jouee pour nous figurer le mystere de notre salut" — only a type of the idea that sin was effaced and atoned for, while in reality, and in God's view, it was of no account in itself ("Chr. solum velut typus fuit, in quo contemplamur ea, quae ad salutem nostram requirit scriptura; e.g. cum aiunt, Christum abolevisse peccatum, sensus eorum est, Christum abolitioneem illam in persona sua representasse," c. 17).

But in so far as we are one in spirit with Christ, all that he underwent is as if we had undergone it; his exclamation, "It is finished," is true as well for us as for himself; sin has lost all significance so far as we are concerned, and the fight against sin, repentance, mortification of the flesh, etc., are no longer necessary. Neither can nor should the spirituialist be any longer subject to suffering, since Christ has suffered all. Here the idea and the reality, however, are in conflict ("Nam scriptum est: Factus sum totus homo. Cum factus sit totus homo [tout homme, in a twofold sense], accipiens naturam humanam, ac mortuus sit, potestne adhuc in his inferioribus locis mori? Magni esset erroris hoc credere," etc., ibidem, c. 23). Of course man should be born anew, but this new birth is secured when he regains the state of innocence of Adam before the fall; when in absolute filial unity with God, he neither sees nor knows sin, or, in other words, when he is no longer able to distinguish it from righteousness  (modo ne amplius opinemur), and when able to follow the dictates of God's Spirit by virtue of natural impulse ("Sed si adhuc committamus delictum et ingrediamur hortum voluptatis, qui adhuc nobis prohibitus est, ne quid velimus facere, sed sinamus nos duci a vohulttate Dei. Alioqui non essemus exuti veteri serpente, qui est primus parens noster Adam, et videremus peccatum, sicut ipse et uxor ejus, etc. Nunc vivificati sumus cum sectundo Adamo; qui est Christus, non cernendo amplius peccatum, quia est mortuum," etc. ibidem; compare c. 18). Such a twice-born one is Christ, is God himself, to whom the Libertine returns after death, to be absorbed in him ("Hoc enim imaginantur, animam hominis, quae est Deus, ad seipsam redire, cum ad mortem ventum est, non ut tanquam anima humana, sed tanquam Deus ipse vivat, sicuti ab initio," c. 3 and 22).

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

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

## Liberty[[@Headword:Liberty]]

             "The idea of liberty," says Locke, "is the idea of a power in any agent to do or forbear any particular action, according to the determination or thought of the mind, whereby either of them is preferred to the other. When either of them is not in the power of the agent, to be produced by him according to his volition, then he is not at liberty, but under necessity." From this, and the extract which follows, it will be seen that Locke's ideas of liberty and of power are very nearly the same. "Every one," he observes, "finds in  himself a power to begin or forbear, continue or put an end to, several actions in himself. From the consideration of the extent of this power of the mind over the actions of the man, which every one finds in himself, arise the ideas of liberty and necessity." These definitions, however, merely extend to the ability of the individual to execute his own purposes without obstruction; whereas Locke, in order to do justice to his own decided opinion on the subject, ought to have included also in his idea of liberty a power over the determinations of the will. "By the liberty of a moral agent," says Dr. Reid, "I understand a power over the determinations of his own will. If, in any action, he had power to will what he did, or not to will it, in that action he is free.

But if, in every voluntary action, the determination of his will be the necessary consequence of something involuntary in the state of his mind, or of something in his external circumstances, he is not free; he has not what I call the liberty of a moral agent, but is subject to necessity." On the other hand, some affirm that necessity is perfectly consistent with human liberty; that, is, that the most strict and inviolable connection of cause and effect does not prevent the full, free, and unrestrained development of certain powers in the agent, or take away the distinction between the nature of virtue and vice, praise and blame, reward and punishment, but is the foundation of all moral reasoning. "I conceive," says Hobbes, " that nothing taketh beginning from itself, but from the action of some other immediate agent without itself; and that therefore, when first a man hath an appetite or will to do something to which immediately before he had no appetite nor will, the cause of his will is not the will itself, but something else not in his own disposing; so that whereas it is out of controversy that of voluntary action the will is the necessary cause, and by this which is said the will is also caused by other things whereof it disposeth not. it followeth that voluntary actions have all of them necessary causes, and therefore are necessitated.

I hold that to be a sufficient cause to which nothing is wanting that is needful to the producing of the effect. The same is also a necessary cause. For if it be possible that a sufficient cause shall not bring forth the effect, then there wanteth somewhat which was needful to the producing of it, and so the cause was not sufficient; but if it be impossible that a sufficient cause should not produce the effect, then is a sufficient cause a necessary cause (for that is said to produce an effect necessarily that cannot but produce it). Hence it is manifest that whatsoever is produced a hath had a sufficient cause to produce it, or else it had not been, and therefore also voluntary actions are necessitated." "I conceive liberty," he observes, "to be rightly  defined in this manner: Liberty is the absence of all impediments to action that are not contained in the nature and intrinsical quality of the agent: as, for example, the water is said to descend freely, or to have liberty to descend by the channel of the river, because there is no impediment that way, but not across, because the banks are impediments; and, though the water cannot ascend, yet men never say it wants the liberty to ascend, but the faculty or power, because the impediment is in the nature of the water, and intrinsical. So also we say, he that is tied wants the liberty to go, because the impediment is not in him, but in his bands; whereas we say not so of him that is sick or lame, because the impediment is in himself. I hold that the ordinary definition of a free agent — namely, that a free agent is that which, when all things are present that are needful to produce the effect, can nevertheless not produce it implies a contradiction, and is nonsense; being as much as to say the cause may be sufficient, that is to say, necessary, and yet the effect shall not follow."

He afterwards defines a moral agent to be one that acts from deliberation, choice, or will, not from indifference; and, speaking of the supposed inconsistency between choice and necessity, he adds: "Commonly, when we see and know the strength that moves us, we acknowledge necessity; but when we do not, or mark not the force that moves us, we then think there is none, and thus conclude that it is not cause, but liberty, that produceth the action. Hence it is that we are apt to think that one doth not choose this or that who of necessity chooses it; but we might as well say fire doth not burn because it burns of necessity." The general question is thus stated by Hobbes in the beginning of his treatise: the point is not, he says, "whether a man can be a free agent; that is to say, whether he can write or forbear, speak or be silent, according to his will, but whether the will to write or the will to forbear come upon him according to his will, or according to anything else in his power. I acknowledge this liberty, that I can do if I will; but to say I can will if I will, I take to be an absurd speech. In fine, that freedom which men commonly find in books, that which the poets chant in the theaters and the shepherds on the mountains, that which the pastors teach in the pulpits and the doctors in the universities, and that which the common people in the markets, and all mankind in the whole world, do assent unto, is the same that I assent unto, namely, that a man hath freedom to do if he will; but whether he hath freedom to will is a question neither the bishop nor they ever thought on." Thus it will readily be perceived that Hobbes entirely denies the main point at issue, namely, the freedom of the will itself, and confines the subject — as his definition — purely to liberty of action. This  latter is simply a physical question, and applies to all agents, whether human, animal, or even material; that liberty which concerns, and indeed constitutes, a being as a moral agent, is quite a different thing. - Hobbes as a materialist, and therefore a necessitarian, of course finds no room for this kind of moral or self-determining power.

It is unquestionable that the source of most of the confusion on the subject is in the ambiguity lurking under the term necessity, which includes both kinds of necessity, moral and physical. The double meaning of the word has been the chief reason why persons who were guided more by their own feelings and the customary associations of language than by formal definitions have altogether rejected the doctrine, while persons of a more logical turn, who could not deny the truth of the abstract principle, have yet, in their explanation of it and inference from it, fallen into the same error as their opponents. The partisans of necessity have given up their common sense, as they supposed, to their reason, while the advocates of liberty rejected a demonstrable truth from a dread of its consequences, and both have been the dupes of a word.

The obnoxiousness of the name unquestionably has been the cause of nearly all the difficulty and repugnance which many who really hold the doctrine find in admitting it. It was to remove this prejudice that Dr. Jonathan Edwards was induced to write his celebrated treatise on the Will. In a letter written expressly to vindicate himself from the charge of having, in his great work, confounded moral with physical necessity, he says: "On the contrary, I have largely declared that the connection between antecedent things and consequent ones, which take place with regard to the acts of men's wills, which is called moral necessity, is called by the name of necessity improperly, and that all such terms as must cannot, impossible, unable, irresistible, unavoidable, invisible, etc., when applied here, are not employed in their proper signification, and are either used nonsensically and with perfect insignificance, or in a sense quite diverse from their original and proper meaning and their use in common speech, and that such a necessity as attends the acts of men's wills is more properly called certainty than necessity."

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

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

The ground assumed on this vexed question by Sir William Hamilton and Mansell is that liberty and necessity are both incomprehensible, both being beyond. the limits of legitimate thought; that they are among those questions which admit of no certain answer, the very inability to answer them proving that dogmaticdecisions on either side are the decisions of ignorance, not of knowledge. "How the will can possibly be free," says Hamilton, "must remain to us, under the present limitation of our faculties, wholly incomprehensible. We are unable to conceive an absolute commencement; we cannot, therefore, conceive a free volition. A determination by motives cannot, to our understanding, escape from necessitation — nay, were we even to admit as true what we cannot think as possible, still the doctrine of a motiveless volition would be only casualistic, and the free acts of an indifferent are morally and rationally as worthless as the fore-ordained passions of a determined will. How, therefore, I repeat, moral liberty is possible in man or God we are utterly unable speculatively to understand. But practically the fact that we are free is given to us in the consciousness of our moral accountability; and this fact of liberty cannot be reargued on the ground that it is incomprehensible, for the philosophy of the conditions proves, against the necessitarian, that things there are which may, nay, must be true, of which the understanding is wholly unable to construe to itself the possibility. But this philosophy is not only competent to defend the fact of our moral liberty, possible, though inconceivable, against the assault of the fatalist; it retorts against himself the very objection of inconceivability by which the fatalist had thought to triumph over the libertarian. It shows that the scheme of freedom is not more inconceivable than the scheme of necessity; for, whilst fatalism is a recoil from the more obtrusive inconceivability of an absolute commencement, on the fact of which commencement the doctrine of liberty proceeds, the fatalist is shown to overlook the equal but less obtrusive inconceivability of an infinite non-commencement, on the assertion of which non-commencement his own doctrine of necessity must ultimately rest. As equally unthinkable, the two counter, the two one-sided schemes, are thus theoretically balanced." Sir William, however as it seems to us, in  this extract does not closely adhere to the conditions of the problem. According to his own admission, it is not the fact of a self-determining power in the will that is "inconceivable," but only the mode (the how) of its exercise. This, like many other well-known processes, is a mystery. Again, it is not claimed that the will acts without motive, but only that it is not controlled by external motive; that it has the power of itself choosing what motive shall be strongest with it, irrespective of the intrinsic force of that motive. It is this distinction that preserves-as no other can-the truly moral character of the agent.

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

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

## Libnah[[@Headword:Libnah]]

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

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

2. (Sept. Λεβνά, sometimes Λοβνά, occasionally Λοβνάν, and even Λεβονά.) One of the royal cities of the Canaanites (Jos 12:15), taken and destroyed by Joshua immediately after Makkedah and before Lachish (Jos 10:29-32; Jos 10:39). It lay in the plain within the territory assigned to Judah (Jos 15:42), and became one of the Levitical towns in that tribe, as well as an asylum (Jos 21:13; 1Ch 6:57). In the reign of king Jehoram, Libnah is said to have revolted from him (2Ki 8:22; 2Ch 21:10). From the circumstance of this revolt having happened at the same time with that of the Edomites, it has been supposed by some to have reference to another town of the same name situated in that country. But such a conjecture is unnecessary and improbable, for it appears that the Philistines and Arabians revolted at the same time (2Ch 21:16). Libnah of Judah rebelled because it  refused to admit the idolatries of Jehoram; and it is not said in either of the passages in which this act is recorded, as of Edom, that it continued in revolt "unto this day." It may be inferred either that it was speedily reduced to obedience, or that, on the re-establishment of the true worship, it spontaneously returned to its allegiance, for we find it was the native place of the grandfather of two of the last kings of Judah (2Ki 23:31; 2Ki 24:18; Jer 52:1). It appears to have been a strongly fortified place, for the Assyrian king Sennacherib was detained some time before it when he invaded Judaea in the time of Hezekiah. SEE HEZEKIAH.

On completing or relinquishing the siege of Lachish — which of the two is not quite certain — Sennacherib laid siege to Libnah (2Ki 19:8; Isa 37:8). While there he was joined by Rabshakeh and the part of the army which had visited Jerusalem (2Ki 19:8; Isa 37:8), and received the intelligence of Tirhakah's approach; and it would appear that at Libnah the destruction of the Assyrian army took place, though the statements of Herodotus (2:141) and of Josephus (Ant. 10:1, 4) place it at Pelusium (see Rawlinson, Herod. 1:480). Libnah was the native place of Hamutal or Hamital, the Queen of Josiah, and mother of Jehoahaz (2Ki 23:31) and Zedekiah (24:18; Jer 52:1). It is in this connection that its name appears for the last time in the Bible. It existed as a village in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, and is placed by them in the district of Eleutheropolis (Onomast. s.v. Λοβανά; compare Josephus, Ant. 10:5, 2). Dr. Robinson was unable to discover the least trace of its site (Bib. Res. 2:389). Stanley inclines to find the site at Tell es-Safieh (Sinai and Pal. pages 207, 258); but this is probably Gath. Van de Velde suggests Arak el-Mensahiyeh, a hill about four miles west of Beit-jebrsin (Memoir, page 330), which seems to answer to the requirements of location. It stood near Lachish, west of Makkedah, and probably also west of Eleutheropolis (Keil, Comment. on Jos 10:29), and was situated in the district immediately west of the hill region, in the vicinity of Ether, Ashan, etc. (Jos 15:42).

## Libnah (2)[[@Headword:Libnah (2)]]

             Some would locate this place at Beit-Jibrin, and others at Ibiza, on the coast road, but Tristram (Bible Places, page 44) and Trelawney Saunders (Map of the O.T.) accept the identification with Arakc el-Menshiyeh, which the Ordnance Map lays down at six and a half miles west of Beit- Jibrin, and the accompanying Memoirs describe thus (3:259): "A mud village on a flat plain, surrounded with arable land, and supplied by three wells. It is of moderate size, with two sacred places. The curious mound north of it is a remarkable feature in the landscape, two hundred and fifty feet high, and consisting of natural rock, but scarped, and appearing to have been artificially made steeper. On the top is a sacred mukdam, with a few hedges of prickly pear. This site is evidently ancient and important. The hills near it are of very white chalk, and the name Libnah signifies ‘milk white.'"

## Libnath[[@Headword:Libnath]]

             SEE SHIHOR-LIBNATH.

## Libneh[[@Headword:Libneh]]

             SEE POPLAR.

## Libni[[@Headword:Libni]]

             (Heb. Libni', לבְנַי, white; Sept. Λοβενεί, Λοβενί), the first-named of the two sons of Gershon, the son of Levi (Exo 6:17; Num 3:18; Num 3:21; 1Ch 6:17; comp. Num 26:58); elsewhere called LAADAN (1Ch 23:7; 1Ch 26:21). B.C. post. 1856. His son is called Jahath (1Ch 6:20; 1Ch 6:43), and his descendants were named LIBNITES (Num 3:21; Num 26:58). In 1Ch 6:29, by some error he is called the son of Mahli and the father of Shimei.

## Libnite[[@Headword:Libnite]]

             (Heb. Libni', לַבֵנַי; being a patronymic of the same form from Libni; Sept. Λοβενί), a descendant of Libni the Levite (Num 3:21; Num 26:58).

## Liborius[[@Headword:Liborius]]

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

## Libra[[@Headword:Libra]]

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

## Libra (2)[[@Headword:Libra (2)]]

             (a balance), the seventh sign of the zodiac. It was supposed that those who were born under this constellation loved equity. There were other kindred superstitions connected with this sign by the ancients.

## Libraries[[@Headword:Libraries]]

             In the early Church, as soon as churches began to be erected, it was customary to attach libraries to them. In these were included not only the liturgical and other Church books, and MS. copies of the holy Scriptures in the original languages, but also homilies and other theological works. That they were of some importance is evident from the manner in which they are referred to by Eusebius and Jerome, who mention having made use of the libraries at Jerusalem and Caesarea. Eusebius says he found the principal part of the materials for his Ecclesiastical History in the library at  Jerusalem. One of the most famous was that attached to the church of St. Sophia, which is supposed to have been commenced by Constantine, but was afterwards greatly augmented by Theodosius the Younger, in whose time there were not fewer than one hundred thousand books in it, and a hundred and twenty thousand in the time of Basilicus and Zeno. No doubt a particular reason for thus collecting hooks was their great expense and rarity before the art of printing enabled men to possess themselves the works they needed for thorough research. In churches where the itinerant system prevailed libraries possessed by churches would even in our very day prove a source of pleasure, and timesaving as well. Indeed, in some of the larger cities here and there, cogregations are already advocating this plan.

## Libri Carolini[[@Headword:Libri Carolini]]

             SEE CAROLINE BOOKS.

## Libs[[@Headword:Libs]]

             in Greek mythology, was the south-west wind. He was represented in Athens, on the tower of winds, as a young man, clothed in a light mantle. In his hands he carries a ship's ornament. SEE NOTUS.

## Libya[[@Headword:Libya]]

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

Libya is supposed to have been first peopled by, and to have derived its name from, the Lehabim or Lubin (Gen 10:13; Nah 3:9; see Gesenius, Montum. Phan. page 211; comp. Michaelis, Spicil. 1:262 sq.; Vater, Comment. 1:132). These its earliest inhabitants, appear, in the time of the Old Testament, to have consisted of wandering tribes, who were  sometimes in alliance with Egypt (compare Herod. 4:159), and at others with the Ethiopians, as they are said to have assisted both Shishak, king of Egypt, and Zerah the Ethiopian in their expeditions against Judea (2Ch 12:4; 2Ch 14:8; 2Ch 16:9). In the time of Cambyses they appear to have formed part of the Persian empire (Herod. 3:13), and Libyans formed part of the immense army of Xerxes (Herod. 7:71, 86). They are mentioned by Daniel (Dan 11:43) in connection with the Ethiopians and Cushites. " They were eventually subdued by the Carthaginians; and it was the policy of that people to bring the nomad tribes of Northern Africa which they mastered into the condition of cultivators, that by the produce of their industry they might be able to raise and maintain the numerous armies with which they made their foreign conquests. But Herodotus assures us that none of the Libyans beyond the Carthaginian territory were tillers of the ground (Herod. 4:186,187; compare Polybius, 1:161,167, 168,177. ed. Schweighaeuser). Since the time of the Carthaginian supremacy, the country, with the rest of the East, has successively passed into the hands of the Greeks, Romans, Saracens, and Turks." SEE AFRICA.

## Libyan[[@Headword:Libyan]]

             (only in the plur.), the rendering adopted in the A.V. of two Heb. names,

לֻבַּים. (Lubbim', Sept. Λίβυες), Dan 11:43 (elsewhere written לוּבַים, "Lubim," 2Ch 12:3; 2Ch 16:8; Nah 3:9; prob. i.q. לְהָבים"Lebabim." Gen 10:13 1Ch 1:11) and פּוּט(Put, Jer 46:9; Sept. Λίβυες; elsewhere rendered "Libya," Eze 30:5; Eze 38:5; "Phut," or "Put"). SEE LIBYA.

## Lice[[@Headword:Lice]]

             (כֵּן, ken, perh. from כָּנִן, to nip; only once in the sing. used collectively, Isa 2:6, and there doubtful, where the Sept., Vulg., and Engl. Vers. confound with כֵּן, so, and render ταῦτα, haec, "in like manner;" elsewhere plural, כַּנַּים, Exo 8:16-18; Psa 105:31 : Sept. σκνῖφες, Psa 105:17 σκνίψ, v.r. σκνῖπες; Vulg. sciniphes, in Psalm cinifes; also the cognate sing. collective כַּנָּם, cinnam, Exo 8:17-18, Sept. and Vulg. σκνῖφες, sciniphes), the name of the creature employed in the third plague upon Egypt, miraculously produced from the dust of the land. Its exact  nature has been much disputed. Dr. A. Clarke has inferred, from the words "in man and in beast," that it was the acarus sanguisuqus, or "tick" (Comment. on Exo 8:16). Michaelis remarks (Suppl. ad Lex. 1174) that if it be a Hebrew word for lice it is strange that it should have disappeared from the cognate tongues, the Aramaic, Samaritan, and Ethiopic. The rendering of the Sept. seems highly valuable when it is considered that it was given by learned Jews resident in Egypt, that it occurs in the most ancient and best executed portion of that version, and that it can be elucidated by the writings of ancient Greek naturalists, etc. Thus Aristotle, who was nearly contemporary with the Sept. translators of Exodus, mentions the κνῖπες (the σκνῖφες of the Sept.) among insects able to distinguish the smell of honey (Hist. Animnal. 4:8) and refers to species of birds which he calls σκνιποφάγα, that live by hunting σκνῖπες (8:6). His pupil Theophrastus says, "The κνῖπες are born in certain trees, as the oak, the fig-tree, and they seem to subsist upon the sweet moisture which is collected under the bark. They are also produced on some vegetables" (Hist. Plant. 4:17, and 2, ult.). This description applies to aphides, or rather to the various species of "gall-flies" (Cynips, Linn.). Hesychius, in the beginning of the third century, explains σκνίψ as "a green four-wcinged creature," and quotes Phrynichus as applying the name to a sordid wretch, and adds, "From the little creature among trees, which speedily devours them." Philo (A.D. 40) and Origen, in the second century, who both lived in Egypt, describe it in terms suitable to the gnat or mosquito (Philo, Vita Mosis, 1:97, 2, ed. Mangey; Origen, Homilia tertia introd.), as does also Augustine in the third or fourth century (De Convenientia, etc.).

But Theodoret, in the same age, distinguishes between σκνῖπες and κώνωπες (Vitac Jacobi). Suidas (A.D. 1100) says σκνίψ, "resembling gnats," and adds, "a little creature that cats wood." These Christian fathers, however, give no authority for their explanations, and Bochart remarks that they seem to be speaking of gnats under the name σκνῖπες, which word, he conjectures, biased them from its resemblance to the Hebrew. Schleusner adds (Glossema in Octateuch) σκνῖφες, "less than gnats," and (Lex. Cyrilli, MS. Brem.), "very small creatures like gnats." From this concurrence of testimony it would appear that not lice, but some species of gnats, is the proper rendering, though the ancients, no doubt, included other species of insects under the name. Mr. Bryant, however, gives a curious turn to the evidence derived from ancient naturalists. He quotes 'Theophrastus, and admits that a Greek must be the best judge of the meaning of the Greek word, but urges that the Sept. translators  concealed the meaning of the Hebrew word, which he labors to prove is lice, for fear of offending the Ptolemies, under whose inspection they translated, and the Egyptians in general, whose detestation of lice was as ancient as the time of Herodotus (2:37) (but who includes "any other foul creature"), and whose disgust, he thinks, would have been too much excited by reading that their nation once swarmed with those creatures through the instrumentality of the servants of the God of the Jews (Plagues of Egypt, Lond. 1794, page 56, etc.).

This suspicion, if admitted, upsets all the previous reasoning. But a plague of lice, upon Bryant's own principles, could not have been more offensive to the Egyptians than the plague on the River Nile, the frogs, etc., which the Sept. translators have not mitigated. Might it not be suggested with equal probability that the Jews in later ages had been led to interpret the word lice as being peculiarly humiliating to the Egyptians (see Josephus, 2:14, 3, who, however, makes the Egyptians to be afflicted with phthiriasis). The rendering of the Vulg. affords us no assistance, being evidently formed from that of the Sept., and not being illustrated by any Roman naturalist, but found only in Christian Latin writers (see Facciolati, s.v.). The other ancient versions, etc., are of no value in this inquiry. They adopt the popular notion of the times, and Bochart's reasonings upon them involve, as Rosenmüller (apud Bochart) justly complains, many unsafe permutations of letters. If, then, the Sept. be discarded, we are deprived of the highest source of information. Bochart's reasoning upon the form of the word (Hieroz. 3:518) is unsound, as, indeed, that of all others who have relied upon etymology to furnish a clew to the insect intended. It is strange that it did not occur to Bochart that if the plague had been lice it would have been easily imitated by the magicians, which was attempted by them, but in vain (Exo 8:18). Nor is the objection valid that if this plague were gnats, etc., the plague of flies would be anticipated, since the latter most likely consisted of one particular species having a different destination, SEE FLY, whereas this may have consisted not only of mosquitoes or gnats, but of some other species which also attack domestic cattle, as the oest rus, or tabanus, or zimb (Bruce, Travels, 2:315, 8vo), on which supposition these two plagues would be sufficiently distinct. SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

But, since mosquitoes, gnats, etc., have ever been one of the evils of Egypt, there must have been some peculiarity attending them on this occasion which proved the plague to be "the finger of God." From the next chapter, Exo 8:31, it appears that the flax and the barley were smitten by the hail; that the former was beginning to grow, and that the latter was in the ear, which,  according to Shaw, takes place in Egypt in March. Hence the kinnim would be sent about February, i.e., before the increase of the Nile, which takes place at the end of May or beginning of June. Since, then, the innumerable swarms of mosquitoes, gnats, etc., which every year affect the Egyptians, come, according to Hasselquist, at the increase of the Nile, the appearance of them in February would be as much a variation of the course of nature as the appearance of the oestruts in January would be in England. They were also probably numerous and fierce beyond example on this occasion, and, as the Egyptians would be utterly unprepared for them (for it seems that this plague was not announced), the effects would be signally distressing. Bochart adduces instances in which both mankind and cattle, and even wild beasts, have been driven by gnats from their localities. It may be added that the proper Greek name for the gnat is ἐμπίς, and that probably the word κώνωψ, which much resembles κνίψ, is appropriate to the mosquito. Hardouin observes that the κνῖπες of Aristotle are not the ἐμπίδες, which latter is by Pliny always rendered culices, a word which he employs with great latitude. SEE GNAT.

For a description of the evils inflicted by these insects upon man, see Kirby and Spence, Introduction to Entymology, Lond. 1828, 1:115, etc.; and for the annoyance they cause in Egypt, Maillet, Descript. de l'Egypte par l'Abbe Mascrier,(Paris, 1755), 90:37; Forskal, Descr. Animal. page 85. Michaelis proposed an inquiry into the meaning of the word σκνῖφες to the Societ des Savants, with a full description of the qualities ascribed to them by Philo, Origen, and Augustine (Recueil, etc. Amst. 1744). Niebuhr inquired after it of the Greek patriarch, and also of the metropolitan at Cairo, who thought it to be a species of gnat found in great quantities in the gardens there, and whose bite was extremely painful. A merchant who was present at the inquiry called it dubabel-keb, or the dog-fly (Description de l'Arabie, Pref. pages 39, 40). Besides the references already made, see Rosenmüller, Scholia in Exod.; Michaelis, Suppl. ad Lex. Hebraic. 1203 sq.; Oedmann, Verm. Samml. aus der Naturkunde, 1:6, 74-91; Bakerus, Annotat. in Et. M. 2:1090; Harenberg, Observ. Crit. de Insectis AEgypt. infestantibus, in Miscell. Lips. Nov. 2:4, 617-20; Geddes, Crit. Rem. on Exo 8:17; Montanus, Critic. Sac. on Exo 8:12; Kitto, Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.; Bochart, Hieroz. 2:572. SEE GNAT.

"The advocates of the other theory, that lice are the animals meant by kinnim, and not gnats, base their arguments upon these facts:

(1) because the kinnim sprang from the dust, whereas gnats come  from the waters;

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

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

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

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

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

## License[[@Headword:License]]

             the name given to the liberty and warrant to preach.

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

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

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

## Licentiate[[@Headword:Licentiate]]

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

## Licentiate (2)[[@Headword:Licentiate (2)]]

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

## Lichtenberg, Johann Conrad[[@Headword:Lichtenberg, Johann Conrad]]

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

## Lichtenstein, Anton August Heinrich[[@Headword:Lichtenstein, Anton August Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 25, 1753, at Helmstadt, where he also pursued his studies. In 1773 he commenced his academical career in his native place, was in 1777 rector at the Johanneum at Hamburg, and in 1782 professor of Oriental languages there. In 1798 he was called to his native place as professor of theology, general superintendent, and first preacher at St. Stephen's. He died February 17, 1816, leaving, Doctinarum Theologicarum Examen ad 1Co 3:10-17 (Helmstadt, 1771): — Num Liber Jobi cum Odyssea Homeri Comparari Possit. (1773): — Descriptio Duorum Codicum Hebraicorum adhuc Paruam Cognitoruam (1776): — Recensio Codicis Hebr. AlMS. Helmnstadiensis Quinti (1777), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:245; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:96; 2:167. (B.P.)

## Lichtenstein, Friedrich Wilhelm Jacob[[@Headword:Lichtenstein, Friedrich Wilhelm Jacob]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born of Jewish parentage at Munich, October 8, 1826. In 1842, his mother joining the Church, he was baptized, together with his brother Moritz, at Wurzburg. In 1843 he commenced his theological. studies at Erlangen, and pursued the same at Halle. In 1848 he was ordained, and appointed assistant pastor at Munich, In 1855 the University of Erlangen bestowed on him the diploma of doctor of philosophy, for a work entitled, Lebensgeschichte des Herrn Jesu Christi in chronologischer Uebersicht (Erlangen, 1855). In 1863 he was called to Culmbach, and died March 24, 1875. (B.P.)

## Lichtenstein, George Philip[[@Headword:Lichtenstein, George Philip]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main, March 26, 1606, of Jewish parents. Towards the end of that same year he was baptized, together with his father, who made an open profession of Christ. Lichtenstein made his philosophical studies at Giessen and Marburg, and his theological at Strasburg. He was offered by the Swedish field-marshal, count Horn, who was at that time in Germany, the chaplaincy of the court of Sweden, but he preferred to remain at home, and was ordained to the ministry in 1634. He ministered for several years in the neighborhood of Frankfort, till he was called, in 1657, to the pastorate of St. Catharine's Church. He died February 7, 1682, his funeral sermon being preached by his friend, the famous Dr. Spener. (B.P.)

## Lichtenstein, Johannes Leopold[[@Headword:Lichtenstein, Johannes Leopold]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born of Jewish parentage, at Hechingen, April 10, 1813. At the age of sixteen he was appointed teacher at Habsheim, in Upper Alsace. When twenty-one years old his way led him to Basle, where a Hebrew Christian prepared himself for missionary work. To bring this lost sheep back to the fold of the synagogue was Lichtenstein's intention, but the would be victor was soon conquered, and the former teacher became now a disciple of Christ. On September 28, 1834, he was baptized at Strasburg, adding the name Johannes to his Jewish name Leopold. Soon' after his baptism he went to Geneva, where he attended the Ecole de Theol. Oratoire, and where Merle d'Aubigne was one of his teachers. From Geneva he went to Strasburg, and attended the upper classes of the Protestant gymnasium. Having passed his examination in 1839, he then went to Erlangen, where Hoffman, Harless, Thiersch, and others were his professors. In 1841 he went to Berlin to complete his theological studies under Hengstenberg, Stahl, Neander, Twesten, and others. In 1842 he was ordained for the ministry at Erlangen, and accepted a call from the Jewish Missionary Society at Strasburg. In 1845 he received a call from New York, to act as superintendent of the Jewish mission there, which he accepted. In 1847 he left his position, and in 1848 was appointed pastor of the German Presbyterian Church at Paterson, N.J. From 1851 to 1854 he labored at New Albany, Indiana; accepted a call of the German Reformed Church at Buffalo, N.Y., where he remained till 1862, when the First German Reformed Church of Cincinnati, Ohio, called him as its pastor. In 1866 he exchanged his position for the pastorate of the First German  Presbyterian Church there, and fell asleep in Jesus, November 3, 1882. (B.P.)

## Lichtenstein, Moritz[[@Headword:Lichtenstein, Moritz]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germnany, brother of Jacob, was born January 3, 1824. Like his brother, he studied theology first at Erlangen, and subsequently at Halle. In 1855 he entered actively upon the ministerial career, by being made curate to anr aged minister at Burglen. in Franconia. In 1857 he was appointed to the living-of Tann. The place proving injurious, Lichtstnstein was transferred to Ritterebach, Central Franconia, in 1860, and died September 3, 1876. (B.P.)

## Licinius[[@Headword:Licinius]]

             SEE CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

## Licnon[[@Headword:Licnon]]

             SEE LIKNON.

## Lida, David De[[@Headword:Lida, David De]]

             a Jewish writer of the 18th century, is the author of, מגדל דוד, or a cabalistic commentary on Ruth (Amsterdam, 1610): — עיר דוד, homilies on the Pentateuch (ibid. 1719): — עיר מקלט, or a commentary on the 613 precepts (1690). His writings were edited and published under the title of כל בו ספר י8 8ד, by his son (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1727). See First, Bibl. Jud. 2:247. (B.P.)

## Lidbir[[@Headword:Lidbir]]

             SEE LO-DEBAR.

## Liddon, Henry Parry[[@Headword:Liddon, Henry Parry]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Stoneham, Hants, August 20, 1829. He was educated at Eton and at Christ Church, Oxford, graduating in 1850. The following year he was Johnson theological scholar. He was ordained deacon in 1852, and priest in 1853. From 1854 to 1859 he was vice- principal of the Theological College of Cuddesdon, and at the same time examining chaplain to the bishop of Salisbury. In 1864 he was appointed prebendary in Salisbury Cathedral; in 1863-65, 1870-72, 1877-79, and 1884, he was select preacher at Oxford; in 1870 he was promoted to be canon residentiary of St. Paul's, London, and the same year was appointed Ireland professor of exegesis in the University of Oxford, which latter position he held until 1882. He died September 10, 1890. In 1866 he was Bampton lecturer, and in 1884 select preacher at Cambridge. He has written, Lenten Sermons (1858): — Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (Bampton lect., 1866): — Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford (1st series, 1869; 2d series, 1880): — Walter Kew Iamilton, Bishop of Salisbury: a Sketch (1869): — Some Elements of Religion (1871): — Sermons on Various Subjects (1872, 1876,1879): — Report of Proceedings at the Bonn Reunion Conference in 1875: — Thoughts on Present Church Troubles (1881): — Easter in St. Paul's: — Sermons on the Resurrection (1885, 2 volumes). See Contemporary Review, October 1890.

## Lideke, Christoph Witheim[[@Headword:Lideke, Christoph Witheim]]

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

## Lie[[@Headword:Lie]]

             (prop. כָּזָב, ψεῦδος), an intentional violation of truth. In Scripture we find the word used to designate all the ways in which mankind denies or alters truth in word or deed, as also evil in general. In general the good is in it designated as the truth, evil as its opposite, or lie, and consequently the devil (being the contrary to God) as the father of lies, and liars or impious persons as children of the devil. Hence the Scriptures most expressly condemn lies (Joh 8:44; 1Ti 1:9-10; Rev 21:27; Rev 22:15). When, in Rom 3:4, it is said that all men are liars, it is synonymous with saying that all are bad. The Bible nowhere admits of permitted, praiseworthy, or pious lies, yet it recommends not to proclaim the truth when its proclamation might prove injurious. Hence Christ commands (Mat 7:6) not to present the truth of the Gospel to those who are unworthy when he recommends, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine." In Joh 16:12 we see that he could not tell his disciples all that he would have wished to tell them on account of their weakness. He did not answer the inquiries of Pilate (Joh 19:9), nor of Caiaphas (Mat 26:63). But we nowhere find that either in levity, or to do others good, or to glorify God, Christ ever spoke an untruth. Peter, on the contrary, denied both Christ by word in the moment of danger (Mat 26:69 sq.; Mar 14:66 sq.; Luk 22:56 sq.; Joh 18:17 sq.) and the evangelical truth by his actions (Gal 2:12; Gal 2:14).

But Paul, in Act 23:5, made use of an implication to clear himself, or, at any rate, concealed part of the truth in order to create dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and thus save himself. Strict truthfulness requires that we should never alter the truth, either in words or actions, so as to deceive others, whether it be for pleasure, or to benefit others or ourselves, or even for the best cause. Yet, although there can, absolutely considered, be no injurious truth. it is not expedient to tell all truth to those who are not able to receive or comprehend it. Thus evil might result from telling everything to children, fools, mischief-makers, spies, etc. But this does not imply that we I may tell them that which is not true, only that we are to remain silent when we perceive that the truth would be useless, or might result in inflicting injury on ourselves or others. This, of course, does  not apply to perjury, as this is positive lying, and indeed, by its calling on God, becomes diabolical lying, the Father of truth being invoked to confirm a lie, and the highest attribute of man, his consciousness of God, is made use of to deceive others, and to gain an advantage. SEE OATH.

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

There are various kinds of lies.

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

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

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

4. Pious frauds, as they are improperly called, pretended inspirations, forged books, counterfeit miracles, are species of lies.  5. Lies of the conduct, for a lie may be told in gestures as well as in words; as when a tradesman shuts up his windows to induce his creditors to believe that he is abroad.

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

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

The evil and injustice of lying appear,

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

2. From its being a violation of God's sacred law (Php 4:8; Lev 19:11; Col 3:9).

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

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

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

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

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

## Liebermann, Franz Leopold Bruno[[@Headword:Liebermann, Franz Leopold Bruno]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Molsheim, near Strasburg, in 1759. At the time of the French revolution, to avoid being imprisoned, he fled to Germany, but returned to his parochial work at Ernolsheim in 1795. In 1801 he was called to Strasburg as cathedral-preacher and episcopal secretary, but returned again to Ernolsheim in 1803. In 1804 Liebermann was imprisoned under the pretext of having relations with the Bourbon family. He was released, however, in 1805, and his friend, the bishop of Mayence, appointed him superior of the clerical seminary and canon at the cathedral of Mavence. Liebermann, who died in 1844, is the author of Institutiones Thelogiae Dogmaticae (1819, 5 volumes), a work still used in the. seminaries of France, Belgium, Germnany, and America. It has also been translated intui French in 1856. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:307. (B.P.)

## Liebetrut, Friedrich[[@Headword:Liebetrut, Friedrich]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, who died October 17, 1881, at Charlottenburg, near Berlin, doctor of theology, is the author of, Die Ehe nach ihrer Idee und nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung (Berlin, 1834): — Der Tag des Herrn und seine Feier (1837): — Christliche Andachtsstunden fur Frauen und Jungfrauen evangelischer Konfession (1847): — Ueber die Verehrung der Heiligen, Reliquien und Bilder (1845): — Katechismus der christlichen Lehre (1853): — Reise nach dem Morgenlande (1858): — Dr. Beck und seine Stellung zu Kirche (1857): — Ueber die Heuchelei und wider dieselbe (1859). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol 2:793 sq. (B.P.)

## Liebknecht, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Liebknecht, Johann Georg]]

             a German theologian, was born at Wasungen April 23, 1679. In 1699 he entered the University of Jena. Besides pursuing the common course, he was led by Dr. Danz into a thorough study of the Talmud and Rabbinical literature. He also gave especial attention to the science of mathematics. On the latter he gave lectures after he was graduated A.M. in 1703. These  were highly approved by many scholars, e.g. by the philosopher Leibnitz, with whom he corresponded. His devotion to mathematics, however, did not cause him to neglect his theological studies, for he afterwards lectured with success on exegesis of the Old and New Testaments. In 1706 he was called as professor of mathematics to the University of Halle, but was obliged to decline this, as well as the call of tutor to two princes, in 1707, because his health failed him. In the same year, however, he accepted a call as professor of mathematics to the University of Giessen. In 1715 he became a member of the Imperial Leopold Society, and in 1716 of the Royal Prussian Society of Sciences. In 1719 he became doctor of divinity, in 1721 professor extraordinary of theology, and in 1725 was advanced to the ordinary or full professorship; and was also made assessor of the consistory and superintendent at Giessen. He died September 17, 1749. Although many of his numerous productions are in the department of mathematics, yet his dissertations on exegesis, Church history, and dogmatical theology prove him to have been a profound, acute, and investigating theologian. Besides his contributions to the Actal Eruditorum, we mention Progr. penecostale, causae Spiritus S. caritatis immemorem hacetificem, etc. (Gissa, 1717, 4to): — Diss. hist. theol. de evangelicae veritatis ante reformationem in Hassia confessionibus (ibid. 1727, 4to): — Von dem Tode u. dessen eingebildete Bitterkeit (ibid. 1733, 8vo): — Diss. theol. de Deo et attributis divinis, in qua Art. I Aug. Conf. etc. (ibid. 1736, 4to): — Adscensio Christi ante adscensionem in caelos nulla, Diss. theol. qua Socinianorum commenta, etc. (ibid. 1737, 4to). — Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, volume 2, s.v.

## Liebner, Karl Theodor Albert[[@Headword:Liebner, Karl Theodor Albert]]

             a prominent Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Schkolen, ear Naumburg, March 3, 1806. He studied at Leipsic, Berlin, and Wittemberg, was in 1832 pastor at Kreisfeld, in Saxony, in 1835 professor at Gottingen, in 1851 at Leipsic, and in 1855 general superintendent and courtpreacher at Dresden. He died June 24, 1871, at Meran. Switzerland. Liebner is the author of, Hugo von St. Victor und die theologischen Richtungen seiner Zeit (Leipsic, 1832): — Die christliche Dogmatik aus dem christologischen Princip dargestellt (Gottingen, 1849): — Introductio in Dogmaticam Chsristianam (Leipsic, 1854). Besides, he published Predigten in der Universitats-Kirche gehalten (Gottingen, 1841; 2d ed. 1856): — Predigt-Beitrage zur Forderung der Erkenntniss Christi in der Genzeinde (1861), and contributed largely to the Jahrbucher fur deutsche Theologie. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:794; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop s.v. (B.P.)

## Liemaeker, Nicolas[[@Headword:Liemaeker, Nicolas]]

             (called the Rose), an eminent Flemish painter, was born at Ghent in 1575, and first studied under Mark Gerards, and, after the death of that master, with Ottovenius. The name of Rose was given him when a boy on account of his ruddy cheeks. He was one of the most eminent painters of the Flemish school, and his works are in almost every town in the Low Countries. He painted sacred and historical subjects. In the Church of St. Nicholas, at Ghent, are two of his best works, The Good Samaritan, and The Fall of the Rebel Angels, which last is considered his masterpiece. Also in the Church of St. James are several of his works, one of which is a  grand composition, representing The Last Judgment. He died at Ghent in 1647. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Liempereur, Constantine[[@Headword:Liempereur, Constantine]]

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

## Lieutenant[[@Headword:Lieutenant]]

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

## Lievens (Livens, or Lywyns), Jan[[@Headword:Lievens (Livens, or Lywyns), Jan]]

             a Dutch painter and engraver, was born at Leyden, October 24, 1607, and was placed under the direction of George van Schooten, but when ten years of age was placed under Peter Lastman. He painted a number of fine works while quite young, which procured him a favorable reception at the court of England, where he resided three years. At Brussels, in the Church of the Jesuits, is his Visitation of the Virgin, and in the Church of St. James, at Antwerp, a fine picture of The Holy Family. In 1641 he returned, to Leyden, where he executed his celebrated pictures of David sand Basthsheba and The Sacrifice of Abraham. He died probably in 1663. The following is a list of some of his best prints: The Holy Family; The Virgin Presenting a Pear to the Infant Jesus; St. John the Evangelist; St. Jerome in a Cell, holding a Crucifix; The Raising of Lazarus. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Lif and Lifthrasser[[@Headword:Lif and Lifthrasser]]

             in Norse mythology, are two human beings who hide themselves with Ragnarokr (destruction of the world), and feed on dew. From them all men are born who will inhabit the rejuvenated earth after the fire of Sutur.

## Life[[@Headword:Life]]

             (properly חִי, usually in the plur. with a sing. meaning, חִיַּים; Gr. ζωή), generally of physical life and existence, as opposed to death and non- existence (Gen 2:7; Gen 25:7; Luk 16:25; Act 17:25; 1Co 3:22; 1Co 15:19; Heb 7:3; Jam 4:14; Rev 11:11; Rev 16:3). SEE LONGEVITY. The ancients generally entertained the idea that the vital principle (which they appear to have denoted by the term spirit, in distinction from the soul itself, comp. 1Th 5:23) resided particularly in the blood, which, on that account, the Jews were forbidden to use as food (Lev 17:11). SEE BLOOD. Other terms occasionally rendered "life" in the Scriptures are נֶפֶשׁ(ne'phesh, a living creature), יוֹם(yorn, a day, i.e., a lifetime), βίος (lifetime), πνεῦμα (breath, i.e., spirit), ψυχή (soul, or animating principle).

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

(1.) For existence, life, absolutely and without end, immortality (Heb 7:16). So also "tree of life," or of immortality, which preserves from death (Rev 2:7; Rev 22:2; Rev 22:14; Gen 2:9; Gen 3:22); "bread of life" (Joh 6:35; Joh 6:51); "way of life" (Psa 16:11; Act 2:28); "water of life," 1. living fountains of water, perennial (Rev 7:17); crown of life, the reward of eternal life (Jam 1:12; Rev 2:10). SEE BOOK; SEE BREAD; SEE CROWN; SEE FOUNTAIN; SEE TREE, etc.

(2.) The manner of life, conduct, in a moral respect; "newness of life" (Rom 6:4); "the life of God," i.e., the life which God requires, a godly life (Eph 4:18; 2Pe 1:3).

(3.) The term "i.e." is also used for spiritual life, or the holiness and happiness of salvation procured by the Savior's death. In this sense, life or eternal life is the antithesis of death or condemnation. Life is the image of all good, and is therefore employed to express it (Deu 30:15; Joh 3:16-18; Joh 3:36; Joh 5:24; Joh 5:39-40; Joh 6:47; Joh 8:51; Joh 11:26; Rom 5:12; Rom 5:18; 1Jn 5:1); death is the consummation of evil, and so it is frequently used as a strong expression in order to designate every kind of evil, whether temporal or spiritual (Jer 21:8; Eze 18:28; Eze 33:11; Rom 1:32; Rom 6:21; Rom 7:5; Rom 7:10; Rom 7:13; Rom 7:24; Joh 6:50; Joh 8:21).

(4.) Life is also used for eternal life, i.e., the life of bliss and glory in the kingdom of God which awaits the true disciples of Christ (Mat 19:16-17; Joh 3:15; 1Ti 4:8; Act 5:20; Rom 5:17; 1Pe 3:7; 2Ti 1:1).

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

## Life Everlasting[[@Headword:Life Everlasting]]

             SEE ETERNAL LIFE; SEE FUTURE LIFE.

## Lift[[@Headword:Lift]]

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

## Lifters[[@Headword:Lifters]]

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

## Lifuan Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Lifuan Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Lifu is a language spoken on the Loyalty Islands. In 1869 the book of Psalms, in the Lifu language, was printed in the island of Mare. In 1872 the New Test. was printed in England, under the care of the translator, the Reverend M. Macfarlane, one of the missionaries at Lifu. In 1877 the Pentateuch was issued from the press, under the editorship of the Reverend S.M. Creagh, of the London Missionary Society. From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society of 1885, we learn that the completion of the revision of the translation of the Bible was made August 29, 1884. The translator, Reverend S.M. Creagh “is now copying the corrections made in the parts already printed, viz. Pentateuch, Psalms, and New Test., and the number of changes in these amount to 52,310. The whole is being prepared for publication." The same translator is also preparing marginal references. (B.P.)

## Lifur[[@Headword:Lifur]]

             in Norse mythology, is a dwarf formed of and living in the earth. He was slain by Thor at Baldur's funeral, and thrown into the burning ship.

## Ligature[[@Headword:Ligature]]

             (ligatura, ligamentum, δέσις παρίαμμα, etc.) was a kind of amulet worn by the ancient heathen, either upon their own persons or those of their animals, for the purpose of averting evil. Their use is condemned by early Christian writers (Chrysostom, Homil. adv. Jud. 8:7; Const. Apostol. 8, 32, etc.).

## Light[[@Headword:Light]]

             (properly אוֹר, or φῶς, from its shining) is represented in the Scriptures as the immediate result and offspring of a divine command (Gen 1:3), where doubtless we are to understand a reappearance of the celestial luminaries, still partially obscured by the haze that settled as a pall over the grave of nature at some tremendous cataclysm which well-nigh reduced the globe to its pristine chaos, rather than their actual formation, although they are subsequently introduced (Gen 1:14 sq.). In consequence of the intense brilliancy and beneficial influence of light in an Eastern climate, it easily and naturally became, with Orientals, a representative of the highest human good. From this idea the transition was an easy one, in corrupt and superstitious minds, to deift the great sources of light. SEE SUN; SEE MOON. When "Eastern nations beheld the sun shining in his strength, or the moon walking in her brightness, their hearts were secretly enticed, and their mouth kissed their hand in token of adoration (Job 31:26-27). SEE ADORATION. This 'iniquity' the Hebrews not only avoided, but when they considered the heavens they recognized the work of God's fingers, and learned a lesson of humility as well as of reverence (Psa 8:3 sq.). On the contrary, the entire residue of the East, with scarcely any exception, worshipped the sun and the light, primarily, perhaps, as symbols of divine power and goodness, but, in a more degenerate state. as themselves divine; whence, in conjunction with darkness, the negation of light, arose the doctrine of dualism, two principles, the one of light, the good power, the other of darkness, the evil power, a corruption which rose and spread the more easily because the whole of human life, being a checkered scene, seems divided as between two conflicting agencies, the bright and the dark, the joyous and the sorrowful, what is called prosperous and what is called adverse." But in the Scriptures the purer symbolism is everywhere maintained (see Wemyss, Symbol. Dict. s.v.). "All the more joyous emotions of the mind, all the pleasing sensations of the frame, all the happy hours of domestic intercourse, were habitually described among the Hebrews under imagery derived from light (1Ki 11:36; Isa 58:8, Est 8:16; Psa 97:11). The transition was natural from earthly to heavenly, from corporeal to spiritual things, and so light came to typify true religion and the felicity which it imparts. But as light not only came from God, but also makes man's way clear before him, so it was employed to signify moral truth, and preeminently that divine system of truth which is set forth in the Bible, from its earliest gleamings onward to  the perfect day of the great sun of righteousness. The application of the term to religious topics had the greater propriety because the light in the world, being accompanied by heat, purifies, quickens, enriches, which efforts it is the peculiar province of true religion to produce in the human soul (Isa 8:20, Mat 4:16; Psa 119:105; 2Pe 1:19; Eph 5:8; 2Ti 1:10; 1Pe 2:9)."

Besides its physical sense (Mat 17:2; Act 9:3; Act 12:7; 2Co 4:6), the term light is used by metonymy for a fire giving light (Mar 14:54; Luk 22:56), for a torch, candle, or lamp (Act 16:29); for the material light of heaven, as the sun, moon, or stars (Psa 136:7; Jam 1:17). In figurative language it signifies a manifest or open state of things (Mat 10:27; Luk 12:3), and in a higher sense the eternal source of truth, purity, and joy (1Jn 1:5). God is said to dwell in light inaccessible (1Ti 6:16), which seems to contain a reference to the glory and splendor that shone in the holy of holies, where Jehovah appeared in the luminous cloud above the mercy seat, and which none but the high-priest, and he only once a year, was permitted to approach (Lev 16:2; Eze 1:22; Eze 1:26; Eze 1:28). This light was typical of the glory of the celestial world. SEE SHEKINAH.

Light itself is employed to signify the edicts, laws, rules, or directions that proceed from ruling powers for the good of their subjects. Thus of the great king of all the earth the Psalmist says, "Thy word is a light unto my path" (Psa 119:105), and "Thy judgments are as the light" (Hos 6:5). Agreeably to the notion of lights being the symbols of good government, light also signifies protection, deliverance, and joy. Light also frequently signifies instruction both by doctrine and example (Mat 5:16; Joh 5:35), or persons considered as giving such light (Mat 5:14; Rom 2:19). It is applied in the highest sense to Christ, the true light, the sun of righteousness, who is that in the spiritual which the material light is in the natural world, the great author not only of illumination and knowledge, but of spiritual life, health, and joy to the souls of men (Isa 60:1). "Among the personifications on this point which Scripture presents we may specify,

(1.) God. The apostle James (1:17) declares that 'every good and perfect gift cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning,' obviously referring to the faithfulness of God and the constancy of his goodness, which shine on undimmed and unshadowed. So Paul (1Ti 6:16), 'God who dwelleth in the light  which no man can approach unto.' Here the idea intended by the imagery is the incomprehensibleness of the self-existent and eternal God.

(2.) Light is also applied to Christ: 'The people who sat in darkness have seen a great light' (Mat 4:16; Luk 2:32; Joh 1:4 sq.). 'He was the true light;' 'I am the light of the world' (Joh 8:12; Joh 12:35-36).

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

(4.) Light is moreover employed of men: John the Baptist 'was a burning and a shining light' (Joh 5:35); 'Ye are the light of the world' (Mat 5:14; see also Act 13:47; Eph 5:8)." SEE LIGHTS.

## Light Of Nature[[@Headword:Light Of Nature]]

             SEE NATURE.

## Light, Divine[[@Headword:Light, Divine]]

             SEE KNOWLEDGE; SEE RELIGION.

## Light, Friends of[[@Headword:Light, Friends of]]

             SEE FREE CONGREGATIONS.

## Light, George C[[@Headword:Light, George C]]

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

In 1792 his father removed to Kentucky, and in 1799 to Ohio, where in 1803 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1804 the son was converted at a campmeeting; in 1806 he entered the itinerant ministry in the Western Conference, and in 1807 he was ordained deacon. Locating after his marriage in 1808, he was employed as a surveyor till 1822, when he entered the Kentucky Conference. From this time until 1859 he labored actively as an itinerant preacher, filling the most important stations in Kentucky, Missouri, and Mississippi. He died February 27, 1859. Mr.  Light was held to be one of the most eloquent and useful ministers in the West during many years. No man of his day, it is thought, had greater control over the popular mind. Camp, Sketch of the Rev. G.C. Light (Nashville, 1860).

## Light, Inward[[@Headword:Light, Inward]]

             SEE QUAKERS.

## Light, Old and New[[@Headword:Light, Old and New]]

             SEE UNITED PRESBYTERIANS.

## Lightenstein, John, D.D[[@Headword:Lightenstein, John, D.D]]

             a member of the Cincinnati Presbytery, was born at Hechingen, Hohenzollern, Germany, in 1818. The occasion of his conversion was his zealous efforts to bring back to the Jewish faith a companion who had become a Christian. At different universities he enjoyed the teachings of such men as Merle D'Aubigne, Hengstenberg, Neander, Stahl, and Schelling. He was ordained in 1842, and was for a time a missionary among the Jews of Alsace. He came to New York in 1845, on the invitation of the Society for Ameliorating the Condition of the Jews, and was superintendent of their mission-house. He afterwards became pastor of a German Presbyterian Church in Paterson, N.J., and subsequently of a German Reformed Church in Buffalo, N.Y., where he remained eight years. He removed to Cincinnati in 1866, took charge of the First German Presbyterian Church, and continued there, until his death, Nov. 3,1882. He was a ripe scholar, an able preacher, and a thoroughly evangelical mall. See N.Y. Observer, November 23, 1882. (W.P.)

## Lightfoot, John[[@Headword:Lightfoot, John]]

             (1), D.D., a noted English divine and Hebraist, was born at Stoke-upon- Trent in 1602. He was educated first at a grammar-school at Morton Green, in Cheshire, and afterwards at Cambridge. He was remarkable, at Cambridge and afterwards, for his eloquence and his proficiency in Latin and Greek. Quitting the university, he became assistant at the well-known school of Repton, in Derbyshire. A year or two after he entered into orders, and settled at Norton-under-Hales, in Shropshire, where he began the study of the Hebrew, which ripened into the most familiar and consummate knowledge of the whole range of Biblical and Rabbinical literature.

In 1627 he accepted the cure of Stone, in Staffordshire. Two years later he removed to Hornsey, in order to be near the library of Sion College, and later accepted the rectory of Ashford, in Staffordshire. Here he remained during the turbulent years which led to the death of Charles I, the establishment of the Commonwealth, and the temporary subversion of the Church of the Church of England. During the civil war he was identified with the Presbyterians, and became a member of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, where he displayed great courage and learning in opposing many of those tenets which the divines were endeavoring to establish. While in London he was minister of St. Bartholomew's. In 1653 he was presented by Parliament with the living of Great Munden, in Hertfordshire.

In 1655 he entered upon the office of vice-chancellor of Cambridge, to which he was chosen that year, having taken the degree of doctor in divinity in 1652. The living of Great Munden was given to Dr. Lightfoot by Parliament, and upon the restoration of Charles II it was bestowed upon another person. Through the influence of Sheldon, then bishop of London, Lightfoot was, however, reinstated in his living, as well as confirmed in the mastership of Catharine Hall, which he had offered to resign, he having previously complied with the terms of the Act of Uniformity. Through the influence of Sir Orlando Bridgeman he was  appointed to a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Ely, where he died peaceably, December 6, 1675. "Lightfoot was a very learned Hebraist for his time, but he was not free from the unscienitific crotchets of the period, holding, for example, the inspiration of the vowel-points, etc. He has done good service to theology by pointing out and insisting upon the close connection between the Talmudical and Midrashic writings and the New Testament, which, to a certain extent, is only to be understood by illustrations from the anterior and contemporaneous religious literature' (Chambers). His object at first was "to produce one great and perfect work — a harmony of the four evangelists, with a commentary and prolegomena. But the little probability of his being able to publish at once so vast a work as he saw it would become were he to carry out the idea in its completeness — in an age when brevity was essential to everything which issued from the press — determined him to give to the world from time to time the result of his labors in separate treatises. The subject matter of these treatises may be classed under the general heads of chronology, chorography, investigation of original texts and versions, examination of Babbinical comments and paraphrases" (Kitto). Lightfoot's works are: Erubhin, or Miscellanies, Christian, and Judaical (1629): — A few and new Observations upon the Book of Genesis (1642): — A Handful of Gleanings out of the Book of Exodus (1643): — The Harmony of the four Evlangelists among themselves and with the O.T. (1644): — A Commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles, 1st part (1645): — The Harmony, 2d part (no date): — The Temple Service in the Days of our Savior (1649): — The Harmony, 3d part (1649): — The Temple (1650): — Horce Hebraicae et Talmnudicae (1658): — Horae, etc., upon the Gospel of St. Mark (1661; new ed. by Reverend R. Gandell, Oxf 1859, 4 volumes, 8vo): — Jewish and Talmudical Exercitations upon St. Luke: — Jewish, etc., upon St. John: — Horace Hebraicae, etc., Acts of the Apostles: — Horae, etc., upon the first Epistle to the Corinthians. During the latter years of his life he contributed the most valuable assistance to the authors of Walton's Polyglot Bible, Castell's Heptaglot Lexicon, and Pool's Symnopsis Criticorum. His works were published entire, (1) with a preface by Dr. Bright and a life by the editor, John Strype, at London in 1684 (2 volumes, fol.); (2) at Amsterdam in 1686 (2 volumes, fol.); (3) at Utrecht, by John Leusden, in 1699 (3 volumes, fol.); and (4) by Pitman, at London, in from 1822-25 (13 volumes, 8vo), which is the best edition, and contains a very elaborate biography of Lightfoot. Dr. Adam Clarke says: "In Biblical criticism I consider Lightfoot the first of all English writers; and in this I  include his learning, his judgment, and his usefulness." See, besides the biographies connected with the various collections of his works, Brevis Descriptio Vitce J. Lightfoot (1699); Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. volume 2, s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, volume 8, s.v.

## Lightfoot, John (2)[[@Headword:Lightfoot, John (2)]]

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

## Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, D.D[[@Headword:Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born at Liverpool, April 13, 1828. He graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1851, and was made fellow in 1852. In 1853 he was Norrisian university prizeman; in 1854 he was ordained deacon, and in 1855 priest. Dr. Lightfoot's appointments were: tutor at Trinity College, 1857; select preacher at Cambridge, 1858; chaplain to the late prince consort, 1861; honorary chaplain in ordinary to her majesty,- 1862; Hulsean professor of divinity in the University of Cambridge, 1861; Whitehall preacher, 1866; examining chaplain to Dr. Tait, archbishop of Canterbury, 1868; canon residentiary of St. Paul's Cathedral, 1871; honorary fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1872; one of the deputy clerks of the closet to her majesty, 1875; Margaret professor of, divinity at Cambridge, 1875. In 1879 he was consecrated bishop of Durham, and died in that office, December 23, 1890. He was one of the original members of the New Testament Revision Committee. Dr. Lightfoot wrote, commentaries on Galatians (1865): — Philippians (1868): — Colossians and Philemon (1875): — The Apostolic Fathers (1885, 3 volumes): — On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament (1871).

## Lightning[[@Headword:Lightning]]

             (properly בָּרָק, barak', Dan 10:6; collectively lightninqs, Psa 144:6; 2Sa 22:15; Ezra 1:13; plur. Job 38:35; Psa 18:15; Psa 77:19, etc.; trop. the brightness of a glittering sword, Eze 21:15, Deu 32:41, etc.; (ἀστραπή, Mat 24:27; Mat 28:3; Luk 10:18; Luk 11:36; Luk 17:24; Rev 4:5; Rev 8:5; Rev 11:19; Rev 16:18; once בָּזָק, baza'c, a flash of lightning, Eze 1:14; less properly אוֹר, dr, light, Job 37:3; Job 37:11; לִפַּיד, lalppid', a burning torch, Exo 20:18; fig. חָזַיז, chaziz', an arrow, i.e., ethunder-fash, Zec 10:1; comp. Job 28:26; Job 38:25). Travelers state that in Syria lightnings are frequent in the autumnal months. Seldom a night passes without a great deal of lightning, which is sometimes accompanied by thunder and sometimes not. A squall of wind and clouds of (dust are the uasual forerunners of the first rains. SEE PALESTINE.

To these natural phenomena the sacred writers frequently allude. In directing their energies, "the Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet; the mountains quake at him, and the hills melt, and the earth is burned at his presence; his fury is poured out like fire. and the rocks are thrown down by him" (Nah 1:3-6). The terrors of the divine wrath are often represented by thundler and lightning; and thunder, on account of its awful impression on the minds of mortals. is also spoken of in Scripture as the "voice of the Lord" (Psa 135:7; Psa 144:6; 2Sa 22:15; Job 28:26; Job 37:4-5; Job 38:25; Job 40:9; Zec 9:14; Rev 4:5; Rev 16:18-21). On account of the fire attending their light,  they are the symbols of edicts enforced with destruction to those who oppose them, or who hinder others from giving obedience to them (Psa 144:6; Zec 9:14; Psa 18:14; Rev 4:5; Rev 16:18). Thunders and lightnings, when they proceed from the throne of God (as in Rev 4:5), are fit representations of God's glorious and awful majesty; but whenfire comes down from heaven upon the earth, it expresses some judgment of God on the world (as in Rev 20:9). The voices, thunders, lightnings, and great hail, in Rev 16:18-21, are interpreted expressly of an exceeding great plague, so that men blasphemned on account of it (see Wemyss, Symb. Dict. s.v.). SEE THUNDER.

## Lights[[@Headword:Lights]]

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

Lighted candles were, according to St. Jerome (Epist. cont. Vigilant. cap. 3; comp. also Cave, Prim. Christ. lib. 1, c. 7, page 203), sometimes used in the Eastern churches when the Gospel was read, and were designed to show the joy of those who received the glad tidings, and also to be a symbol of the light of truth. The lighting of candles on the communion table is observed only in the Romish Church. See Farrar, Eccles. Dictionary, s.v.; Bingham, Aniquities of the Christ. Church, book 12, chapter 4, sect. 4; Alt, Christlich. Cultus (1851), page 95; Herzog, Real-  Encyklop. 8:517 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, 2:769 (Kerzen). SEE CANDLES.

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

"Nocte dieque mliclant.

Sic nox splendore dici Fulget: et ipsa dies ccelesti illnstris honore

Plus micat inlumeris lucem geminata lucernis." (Paulin. Nat. 3, S. Felicis.)

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

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

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

## Lights of Walton[[@Headword:Lights of Walton]]

             a class of enthusiasts who appeared in the 17th century at Walton-on- Thames, Surrey, England. The story of their origin is related as follows: In the beginning of Lent, 1649, Mr. Fawcet, then minister of Walton, having preached in the afternoon, when he had concluded it was nearly dark, and six soldiers came into the church, one with a lighted candle in a lantern,  and four with candles unlighted. The first soldier addressed the people, declaring that he had received in a vision a message from God, which they must listen to and believe on pain of damnation. The message consisted of five lights:

1. The Sabbath is abolished; "and here," said he, "I should put out my first light, but the wind is so high that I cannot light it."

2. Tithes are abolished.

3. Ministers are abolished.

4. Magistrates are abolished, repeating the same words as he had uttered under the first head.

Then taking a Bible from his pocket, he declared that it is also abolished, as containing only beggarly elements, which are unnecessary now that Christ is come in his glory, with a full measure of his Spirit. Then taking the lighted candle from his lantern, he set fire to the pages of the Bible, after which, extinguishing the candle, he added, and here my fifth light is extinguished."

## Lights, Feast Of[[@Headword:Lights, Feast Of]]

             a name applied by Josephus to the Jewish Feast of Dedication (q.v.).

## Lights, Feast of[[@Headword:Lights, Feast of]]

             SEE EPIPHANY.

## Ligitsch[[@Headword:Ligitsch]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was the god of atonement and rest. The wives pray to him after having been angry with their husbands.

## Lign-aloe[[@Headword:Lign-aloe]]

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

There is considerable confusion among naturalists in their attempts to identify the exact tree which yields the far-famed wood. "Dr. Roxburgh states that uguru is the Sanscrit name of the incense or aloe-wood, which in Hindostanee is called ugur, and in Persian aod-hindi, and that there is little doubt that the real calambac, or agallochum of the ancients, is yielded by an immense tree, a native of the mountainous tracts east of and southeast from Silhet, in about 24° of N. latitude. This plant, he says,  cannot be distinguished from thriving plants, exactly of the same age, of the Garo de Malacca, received from that place, and growing in the garden of Calcutta. He further states that small quantities of agallochum are sometimes imported into Calcutta by sea from the eastward, but that such is always deemed inferior to that of Silhet (Flora Ind. 2:423). The Garo de Malacca was first described by Lamarck (Encyclopädie Methodique, 1:47 sq.), from a specimen presented to him by Sonnerat as that of the tree which yielded the bois d'aigle of commerce. Lamarck named this tree Aquilaria Malaccensis, which Cavanilles afterwards changed unnecessarily to Aquilariac ouvata. As Dr. Roxburgh found that his plant belonged to the same genus, he named it Aquilaria agallochum, but it is printed Agallocha in his Flora Indica, probably by an oversight. He is of opinion that the Agallochum secundarium of Rumphius (Herb. Amb. 2:34, t. 10), which that author received tinder the name of Agallochum Malaccense, also belongs to the same genus, as well as the Sinfu of Kaempfer (Amaen. Exot. page 903), and the Ophispermum sinense of Loureiro.

This last- named missionary describes a third plant, which he names Aloexylum agaellochulln, representing it as a large tree growing in the lofty mountains of Champava, belonging to Cochin China, about 13° of IT. lat. near the great river Lavum, and producing calambac (Flora Cochin Chinenisis, edit. Wildenow, 1:327). This tree, belonging to the class and order Decandria monogynia of Linnaeus, and the natural family of Leguaminosae, has always been admitted as one of the trees yielding agallochum. But, as Loureiro himself confesses that he had only once seen a mutilated branch of the tree in flower, which, by long carriage, had the petals, anthers, and stigma much bruised and torn, it is not impossible that this may also belong to the genus Aquilaria, especially as his tree agrees in so many points with that described by Dr. Roxburgh. Rumphius has described and figured a third plant, which he named Arbor excaecans, from 'Blindhout,' in consequence of its acrid juice destroying sight, whence the generic name of Excaecaria; the specific one of agallochum he applied because its wood is similar to, and often substituted for agallochum, and he states that it was sometimes exported as such to Europe, and even to China. This tree, the Exccecaria agallochum, of the Linnaean class and order Dimecia triandria, and the natural family of Euphorbiaecae, is also very common in the delta of the Ganges, where it is called Geria; 'but the wood-cutters of the Sunderbunds,' Dr. Roxburgh says, 'who are the people best acquainted with the nature of this tree, report the pale, white, milky juice thereof to be highly acrid and very dangerous.' The only use made of  the tree, as far as Dr. Roxburgh could learn, was for charcoal and firewood. Agallochum of any sort is, he believed, never found in this tree, which is often the only one quoted as that yielding agila-wood; but, notwithstanding the negative testimony of Dr. Roxburgh, it may, in particular situations, as stated by Rumphius, yield a substitute for that fragrant and longfamed wood. In Arabian authors numerous varieties of agallochum are mentioned (Celsus, Hierobot. page 143). Persian authors mention only three:

1. Aod-i-hindi; that is, the Indian;

2. Aod-i-chini, or Chinese kind (probably that from Cochin China);

3. Sumunduri, a term generally applied to things brought from sea, which may have reference to the inferior variety from the Indian islands.

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

1. Agallochum praestantissimum, also called Calambac;

2. A. Officinarum, or Palo de Aguilla of Linschoten;

3. A. sylvestre, or Aguillae brava.

But, besides these varieties, obtained from different localities, perhaps from different plants, there are also distinct varieties, obtainable from the same plant. Thus, in a MS. account by Dr. Roxburgh, to which Dr. Royle had access, it is stated, in a letter from B1. K. Dick, at Silhet, that four different qualities may be obtained from the same tree: 1st, Ghurki, which sinks in water, and sells from 12 to 16 rupees per seer of 2 lbs.; 2d, Doinl, 6 to 8 rupees per seer; 3d, Siniula, which floats in water, 3 to 4 rupees; and 4, 4th, Chrunm, which is in small pieces, and also floats in water, from 1 to 1 1/2 rupees per seer, and that sometimes 80 lbs. of these four kinds may be obtained from one tree. All these tuggur-trees, as they are called, do not produce the aggur, nor does every part of even the most productive tree. The natives cut into the wood until they observe dark-colored veins yielding the perfume; these guide them to the place containing the aggur, which generally extends but a short way through the center of the trunk or branch. An essence, or attur, is obtained by bruising the wood in a mortar, and then infusing it in boiling water, when the attur floats on the surface. Early decay does not seem incident to all kinds of agallochum, for we possess specimens of the wood gorged with fragrant resin (Illustr. Him. Bot. page 173) which show no symptoms of it, but still it is stated that the  wood is sometimes buried in the earth. This may be for the purpose of increasing its specific gravity. A large specimen in the museum of the East- India House displays a cancellated structure in which the resinous parts remain, the rest of the wood having been removed, apparently by decay." Notwithstanding the uncertainty respecting the identity of some of the above-described varieties, we have, at all events, two trees ascertained as yielding this fragrant wood — one, Aquilaria agallochum, a native of Silhet, and the other A. ovata or Mallaccensis, a native of Malacca, although it is still not clear that they are anything more than local variations of the same species. The former is described as a magnlicent tree, growing to the height of 120 feet, being 12 feet in girth. "The bark of the trunk is smooth and ash-colored, that of the branches gray and lightly striped with brown. The wood is white, and very light and soft. It is totally without smell, and the leaves, bark, and flowers are equally inodorous" (Script. Heb. page 238). The fragrance appears to reside wholly in the resin deposited in the pores, and is developed by heat. Both plants belong to the Linnaean class and order Decandria monogynia, and the natural family of Aquilarineae.

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

"It must be confessed, however, that, notwithstanding all that has been written to prove the identity of the ahalim-trees with the aloes-wood of commerce, and notwithstanding the apparent connection of the Hebrew word with the Arabic aghlagûn and the Greek agallochon, the opinion is not clear of difficulties. In the first place, the passage in Num 24:6,  'as the ahalim which Jehovah hath planted,' is an argument against the identification with the Aquiluria agallochum. The Sept. seem to have read אַהָלַים, ohalim', tents; and they are followed by the Vulg., the Syriac, the Arabic, and some other versions. If this is not the true reading — and the context is against it — then if ahalim be the Aq. agallochum, we must suppose that Balaam is speaking of trees concerning which, in their growing state, he could have known nothing at all. Rosenmuller (Schol. in V.T. ad Num 24:6) allows that this tree is not found in Arabia, but thinks that Balaam might have become acquainted with it from the merchants. Perhaps the prophet might have seen the wood. But the passage in Numbers manifestly implies that he had seen the ahalim growing, and that in all probability they were some kind of trees sufficiently known to the Israelites to enable them to understand the allusion in its full force. But if the ahalim be the agallochum, then much of the illustration would have been lost to the people who were the subject of the prophecy; for the Aq. agallochum is found neither on the banks of the Euphrates, where Balaam lived, nor in Moab, where the blessing was enunciated. Michaelis (Supp. pages 34, 35) believes the Sept. reading to be the correct one, though he sees no difficulty, but rather a beauty, in supposing that Balaam was drawing a similitude from a tree of foreign growth.

He confess that the parallelism of the verse is more in favor of the tree than the tent; but he objects that the lign-aloes should be mentioned before the cedars, the parallelism requiring, he thinks, the inverse order. But this is hardly a valid objection, for what tree was held in greater estimation than the cedar? And even if ahalim be the Aq. agallochum, yet the latter clause of the verse does no violence to the law of parallelism, for of the two trees the cedar 'is greater and more august.' Again, the passage in Psa 45:8 would perhaps be more correctly translated thus: 'The myrrh, aloes, and cassia, perfuming all thy garments, brought from the ivory palaces of the Minni, shall make thee glad.' The Minni, or Minaei, were inhabitants of spicy Arabia, and carried on a great trade in the exportation of spices and perfumes (Pliny, 12:14, 16; Boclhart, Phaleg, 2:22, 135). As the myrrh and cassia are mentioned as coming from the Minni, and were doubtless natural prodiuctions of the country, the inference is that aloes, being named with them, were also a production of the same region." But SEE MINNI.

See generally Abulfeda, in Busching's Magazin, 4:277; Bokin, in Notices et Extraits de la Biblioth. du Roi, 2:397; Linneus, Pflanzensystem nach  Houttyn (Nounb. 1777), 2:422 sq.; Michaelis, Supplem. page 32; Wahl, Ostindien, 2:772; the Fundgruben des Orients. 5:372; Bondi, Or-Esther, page 13; Sylv. de Saez, ad Abdollatiphi Descrip. AEg. page 320. SEE ALOE.

## Liguori, Alfonzo Maria De[[@Headword:Liguori, Alfonzo Maria De]]

             a Roman Catholic bishop, and founder of the Order of Redemptorists, was born September 27, 1696, at Naples. He was descended from a noble family, and the son of a royal officer; from his mother, who was a fervid Catholic, he imbibed in early childhood a glowing devotedness to the Church of Rome. Educated in an institution of the priests of the Oratory, he made such rapid progress that he obtained in the sixteenth year of his life the degree of LL.D. In accordance with the wish of his parents he became a lawyer, but the loss of an important lawsuit so mortified him that he resolved to enter the priesthood. He overcame the violent opposition of his father, and took orders in 1725. Soon after he entered the Congregation of the Propaganda at Naples, and began to labor with great zeal for the religious awakening of the lowest classes in Naples and the neighboring provinces. In order to enlarge the sphere of his labors he concluded to establish a new religious congregation. The first house of the, new congregation was established with the assistance of twelve companions at Scala; the chief task of the members was declared to be "to devote themselves to the service of the poorest and most abandoned souls."

Three years later the second house was established at Cionani, in the diocese of Salerno. The rule of the new congregation, which Liguori had drawn up with the assistance of several prominent men, was confirmed by a brief of pope Benedict XIV, dated February 22, 1749, and Liguori was elected superior general for his lifetime. The archbishopric of Palermo, which king Charles III of Naples offered to him, Liguori declined, but in 1762 he had, at the request of pope Clement XIII, to accept the bishopric of Sta. Agata de' Goti. A general chapter of the congregation unanimously declared that no new superior general should be elected in place of Liguori,. but that the latter should appoint a vicar general top reside over the congregation in his place. 'The feeble state of his health repeatedly induced him to ask the pope to accept his resignation, but his wish was not granted until 1775. He retired to the house of his congregation at Nocera de' Pagani, where he spent the remainder of his life in composing theological and, in particular, ascetical worls. In consequence of the intrigues of several prominent members of his order, and the government of Naples, which, against his  will, caused the rules of his order to be changed, he was compelled to resign its supreme management. He died August 1, 1787.

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

## Liguorians[[@Headword:Liguorians]]

             SEE REDEMPTORISTS.

## Ligure[[@Headword:Ligure]]

             (לֶשֶׁם, le'shenm, supposed to be from an old root preserved in the Arab., and signifying to taste) occurs but twice (Exo 28:19; Exo 39:12) as the name of the first stone in the third row on the high-priest's breastplate, where the Sept. renders λιγύριον (apparently alluding to the above derivation), and is followed by the Vulg. ligyurius, as well as the A.V. So also Josephus (War, 5:5,7). " The word ligulre is unknown in modern mineralogy. Phillips (Mineraslogy, page 87) mentions ligurite, the fragments of which are uneven and transparent, with a vitreous luster. It occurs in a sort of talcose rock in the banks of a river in the Apennines" (Smith). The classical ligure (or λυγκούριον) was thought to be a species of amber (see Moore, Anc. Min. page 106), although ancient authors speak uncertainly respecting it (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 37:11, 13; Theophrastus, De lalpid. c. 50), and assign a false derivation to the name (see Gesenius, Thesaur. Heb. page 763). The Hebrew word has been thought to designate the same stone as the JACINTH (Braunius, De vestitu sacerd. 2:14), although others adhere to the opal as corresponding better with the ancient figure (Rosenmüller, Sch. in Lexod. 28:19). "Dr. Woodward and some old commentators have supposed that it was some kind of belemnite, because, as these fossils contain bituminous particles, they have thought that they have been able to detect, upon heating or rubbing pieces of them the absurd origin which Theophrastus (Frag. 2:28, 31; 15:2, edit. Schneider) and Pliny (H.N. 37:3) ascribe to the lyncyrium. As to the belief that amber is denoted by this word, Theophrastus, in the passage cited above, has given a detailed description of the stone, and clearly distinguishes it from electron, or amber. Amber, moreover, is too soft for engraving upon, while the lynncyrium was a hard stone, out of which seals were made." SEE GEM.

Beckmann (Hist. Invent. 1:87, Bohn) believes, with Braun, Epiphanius, and J. de Laet, that the description of the lyncyrium agrees well with the hyacinth-stone of modern mineralogists, especially that species which is described as being of an orange-yellow color, passing on into a reddish-brown (see Rosenmüller, Bibl. Alterth. IV, 1:28). The hyacinth is a variety of crystallized zircon, containing also iron, which usually gives it a reddish or brown color. It generally occurs in four-sided prisms, terminated by four rhombic planes. It is diaphanous, glossy, and hard. It occurs in the beds of rivers, the best being brought from the West Indies, but is now little esteemed as a gem, although the ancients used it for engraving. "With this supposition (that the lyncyrium is identical with the  jacinth or hyacinth) Hill (Notes on Theophrastus on Stones, § 50, page 166) and Rosenmüller (Mineral. of Bible, page 36; Bib. Cab.) agree. It must be confessed, however, that this opinion is far from satisfactory; for Theophrastus, speaking of the properties of the lyncyrium, says that it attracts not only light particles of wood, but fragments of iron and brass. Now there is no peculiar attractive power in the hyacinth; nor is Beckmann's explanation of this point sufficient.

He says: 'If we consider its (the lyncyrium's) attracting of small bodies in the same light which our hyacinth has in common with all stones of the glassy species. I cannot see anything to controvert this opinion, and to induce us to believe the lyncyrium and the tourmaline to be the same.' But surely the lyncyrium, whatever it be, had in a marked manner magnetic properties; indeed, the term was applied to the stone on this very account, for the Greek name ligurion appears to be derived from λείχειν, 'to lick,' 'to attract,' and doubtless was selected by the Sept. for this reason to express the Hebrew word, which has a similar derivation. Hence Dr. Watson (Philos. Tirans. 51:394) identifies the Greek hyncyrium with the tournmaline, or, more definitely, with the red variety known as rubellite, which is a hard stone, and used as a gem, and sometimes sold for red sapphire. Tourmaline becomes, as is well known, electrically polar when heated. Beckmann's objection, that had Theophrastus been acquainted with the tourmaline, he would have remarked that it did not acquire its attractive power till it was heated,' is answered by his own admission on the passage, quoted from the Hist. de l'Academie for 1717, page 7 (see Bechmann, 1:91). Tourmaline is a mineral found in many parts of the world. The duke de Noya purchased two of these stones in Holland, which are there called aschentrikker. Linnaus, in his preface to the Flora Zeylandica, mentions the stone under the name of lapis electricus from Ceylon. The natives call it tournamal (Philippians Trans. 1.c.). Many of the precious stones which were in the possession of the Israelites during their wanderings were no doubt obtained from the Egyptians, who might have procured from the Tyrian merchants specimens from even India and Ceylon, etc. The fine specimen of rubellite now in the British Museum belonged formerly to the king of Ava."

## Likhi[[@Headword:Likhi]]

             (Heb. Likchi', לַקְחַי, learned, otherwise captivator; Sept. Λακειά v.r. Λακίμ, Vulg. Leci), the third named of the four sons of Shemidah or Shemida, son of Manasseh (1Ch 7:19; comp. Jos 17:2).  He does not appear to have had a numerous if any progeny, as his name does not occur in the account of the Manassite families (Num 26:32). B.C. post 1856.

## Liknon[[@Headword:Liknon]]

             (λίκνον), a long basket, in which the image of Dionysus was carried in the Dionysia. The Liknon was the winnowing fan into which the corn was received after threshing, and was, very naturally, used in the rites of both Bacchus and Ceres. It was also employed to carry the instruments of sacrifice, and firstfruits or other offerings. SEE BACCHUIS.

## Lilburne, John[[@Headword:Lilburne, John]]

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

## Lilienthal, Max[[@Headword:Lilienthal, Max]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born at Munich in 1815. He studied at his native place, and graduated in 1837 as doctor of philosophy. In 1839 he received a call as director of the Hebrew school at Riga, Russia. In 1845 he resigned his position and went to New York city, where he was elected rabbi of three congregations, an office which he, however, resigned to open a Jewish boarding-school. In 1855 he accepted a call to the congregation at  Cincinnati, and died April 1, 1882. Besides sermons and addresses, he published, Ueber den Ursprung der judisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie (Munich, 1839): — Bibliographische Notizen uber die hebraischen Manuscripte der konigl. Bibliothek zu Munchen (printed in the Beilage der allgemeinen Zeitung des Judenthums, 1848). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:249 sq. (B.P.)

## Lilienthal, Michael[[@Headword:Lilienthal, Michael]]

             a German theologian, was born at Liebstadt, in Prussia, September 8, 1686. He studied theology at Kuieigsberg and Jena, and became professor in the University of Rostock. He afterwards visited Holland, where he studied philology and archaeology, and after his return was for some years professor at Konigsberg. In 1714 he became assistant librarian of that university, and in 1719 was appointed dteacon oif one of the churches at Heidelberg. He was made member of the Academy of Berlin ill 1711, and of that of Strasburg in 1733. He died at Kidnigsberg January 23, 1750. His principal works are Biblisch-exegetische Bibliothek (Kinigsb. 1740-1744, 3 volumes, 8vo): — Biblischer Archivarius d. Heiligen Schrift (Konsigsb.  1745-1746, 2 volumes, 4to: it contains a list of Biblical commentators, arranged in the order of the difficult passages): — Theologisch-homelit. Archivarius (Konigsberg, 1749, 4to). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:413; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 31:225. (J.N.P.)

## Lilienthal, Theodor Christopher[[@Headword:Lilienthal, Theodor Christopher]]

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

## Lilith[[@Headword:Lilith]]

             SEE SCREECH-OWL.

## Lilith (2)[[@Headword:Lilith (2)]]

             the name of the first wife of Adam, according to rabbinical tradition. She was made of the earth as was Adam himself, and would not submit to be ruled over by her husband. Seeing no possibility of an agreement between herself and him, she fled away to the sea, where she became the mother of a race of daemons, and, as a punishment for refusing to return to Adam, one hundred of her children were to die every day. Lilith became noted in Jewish legend as a destroyer of infants, and for this reason they adopted the custom of writing the names of three protecting angels on slips of paper or parchment, and binding them upon the infant, to prevent the evil influence of Lilith. Among modern Jews, when a woman approaches the period of her confinement, the husband inscribes on each of the walls or partitions around the bed, along with the names of Adam and Eve, the words "Begone, Lilith." On the inside of the doors also he writes the names of three angels, which it is believed will defend the child from the injuries which it might otherwise receive from Lilith.

## Lillie, Adam, D.D[[@Headword:Lillie, Adam, D.D]]

             a Scotch Congregational minister, was born in Glasgow in 1803. He embraced religion very early in life, studied at the university, and becoming animated by a strong missionary desire, offered his services to the London Missionary Society, studied three years at Gosport, and in 1826 sailed to India. His health failing caused his return to Glasgow in the following year. He then settled as teacher, soon after became itinerant minister, in 1833 was chosen copastor at Musselburgh and in 1834 accepted an invitation to the pastorate at Brantford, Ontario, where he continued during life. In 1840 Dr. Lillie added to his pastorate the tutorship of the Canadian. Institute for the training of a local ministry. He died October 19, 1869. Dr. Lillie was an eminent Christian and scholar, and a prodigious worker. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-Book, 1870, page 305.

## Lillie, John, D.D[[@Headword:Lillie, John, D.D]]

             a minister originally of the Refoirmed (Dutch), but afterwards of the Presbyterian Chiurch, was born in Kelso, Scotland, December 16, 1812; graduated with the highest honors at the University of Edinburgh at the age  of twenty-one years, prosecuted his theological studies for two years at Eidinburgh, then came to America, and completed his course at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, New Brunswick, N.J. In 1835 he was installed pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Kingston, N.Y. In 1841 he took charge of the grammar-school of the New York University, and in 1843 of a congregation which had gathered about him in the University Chapel, and afterwards (1846) occupied their new church in Stanton Street. From 1844 until 1848 he was the editor of the Jewish Chronicle. He was employed by the American (Baptist) Bible Union as one of its translators from 1851 to 1857. In 1855 he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh. In 1858 he accepted the call offered to him by the Presbyterian Church, Kingston, N.Y., and he there labored until his death, February 23, 1867. Dr. Lilie's published productions is are not numerous, but highly creditable. His revisions and translation of the epistles to the Thessalonions, the Second Epistle of Peter, those of John and Jude, and the Revelation, for the Anglo-American edition of "Lange's Commentary," have won the highest encomiums. He was also the author of a small work on The Perpetuity of the Earth, in which he developed his premillennial views. Dr. Lillie was an earnest Christian, a ripe scholar, and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Aima. 1868, page 117; Kingston Arus and Journal, February 1867; Mem. Sermnon, by Reverend W. Irvin; British and Foreign Evangelical Review, 59:619.

## Lily[[@Headword:Lily]]

             (שׁוּשִׁן, shushan', from its whiteness, 1Ki 7:19; also שׁוֹשָׁן, shoshan', 1Ki 7:22; 1Ki 7:26; Son 2:16; Son 4:5; Son 5:13; Son 6:2-3; Son 7:2; and

שׁוֹשִׁנָּה, shoshannah', 2Ch 4:5; Son 2:1-2; Hos 14:5 SEE SHUSHAN; SEE SHOSHANNIM; Sept. and N.T. κρίνον, Mat 6:28 : Luk 12:27). There are, no doubt, several plants indigenous in Syria which might come under the denomination of lily, when that name is used in a general sense, as it often is by travelers and others. The term shoshan or sosuns seems also to have been employed in this sense. It was known to the Greeks (σοῦσον), for Dioscorides (3:116) describes the mode of preparing an ointment called susinon, which others, he savs, call κρινινόν, that is, lilinum. So Atheneus (12:513)  identities the Persian susona with the Greek krinon. The Arabic authors also use the word in a general sense, several varieties being described under the head sosun. The name is applied even to kinds of Iris, of which several species, with various colored flowers, are distinguished. But it appears to us that none but a plant which was well known and highly esteemed would be found occurring in so many different passages. Thus, in 1Ki 7:19-26, and 2Ch 4:5, it is mentioned as forming the ornamental work of the pillars and of the brazen sea, made of molten brass, for the house of Solomon, by Hiram of Tyre. In Canticles the word is frequently mentioned; and it is curious that in five passages, Son 2:2; Son 2:16; Son 4:5; Son 6:2-3, there is a reference to feeding among lilies, which appears unaccountable when we consider that the allusion is made simply to an ornamental or sweet-smelling plant; and this the shushans appears to have been from the other passages in which it is mentioned. Thus, in Son 2:1, 'I am the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valleys;' Son 2:2, 'as the lily among thorns, so is my love among the daughters;' Son 2:13, 'his lips like lilies, dropping sweetsmelling myrrh;' Son 7:2, 'thy belly is like an heap of wheat set about with lilies.' If we consider that the book of Canticles is supposed to have been written on the occasion of the marriage of Solomon with a princess of Egypt, it is natural to suppose that some of the imagery may have been derived from her native country, and that the above lily may be a plant of Egypt rather than of Palestine. Especially does the water-lily, or lotus of the Nile, seem suitable to most of the above passages. Thus Herodotus (2:92) says. 'When the waters have risen to their extremest height, and all the fields are overflowed, there appears above the surface an immense quantity of plants of the lily species, which the Egyptians call the lotus; having cut down these, they dry them in the sun. The seed of the flowers, which resembles that of the poppy, they bake, and make into a kind of bread: they also eat the root of this plant, which is round, of an agreeable flavor, and about the size of an apple.

There is a second species of the lotus, which grows in the Nile, and which is not unlike a rose. The fruit, which grows from the bottom of the root, resembles a wasp's nest: it is found to contain a number of kernels of the size of an olive-stone, which are very grateful either fresh or dried.' All this exists even to the present day. Both the roots and the stalks form articles of diet in Eastern countries, and the large farinaceous seeds of both the nymphaea and nelumbium are roasted and eaten. Hence possibly the reference to feeding among lilies in the above-quoted passages" This flower (the Nymhaea Lotus. of Linnaeus, and the beshnin,  of the modern Arabs) grows plentifully in Lower Egypt, flowering during the period of the aninual inundation. There can be little doubt the "lilywork" spoken of in 1Ki 7:19; 1Ki 7:22, was an ornament in the form of the Egyptian lotus. There wre eformerly three descriptions of water-lily in Egypt, but one (the red-flowered lotus) has disappeared. "The flower," says Burckhardt, speaking of the white variety, or Nymphaea lotus, "generally stands on the stalk from one to two feet above the surface of the water. When the flowers open completely, the leaves form a horizontal disk, with the isolated seed-vessel in the midst, which bends down the stall by its weight, and swims upon the surface of the water for several days until it is engulfed. This plant grows at Cairo, in a tank called Birket el- Rotoli, near one of the northern suburbs where I happen to reside. It is not found in Upper Egypt, I believe, but abounds in the Delta, and attains maturity at the time when the Nile reaches its full height. I saw it in great abundance and in full flower. covering the whole inundated plain, on October 12, 1815, near the ruins of Tiney, about twelve miles south-east from Mansoura, on the Damietta branch. It dies when the water retires."

Among the ancient Egyptians the lotus was introduced into all subjects as an ornament, and as the favorite flower of the country, but not with the holy character usually attributed to it, though adopted as an emblem of the god Nophre-Atmi (Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, 1:57, 256). As the Hebrew architecture was of the Phoenico-Egyptian style, nothing was more natural than the introduction of this ornament by Solomon into the Temple. It was in like manner borrowed by the Assyrians in their later structures (Layard's Nineveh, 2:356). Mr. Bardwell, the architect, in his work entitled Temples, Ancient and Modern (1837), says, "The two great columns of the pronaos in Solomon's Temple were of the usual proportions of Egyptian columns, being five and a half diameters high; and as these gave the great characteristic feature to the building, Solomon sent an embassy to fetch the architect from Tyre to superintend the molding and casting of these columns, which were intended to be of brass. Observe how conspicuous is the idea of the vase (the 'bowl' of our translation), rising from a cylinder ornamented with lotus-flowers; the bottom of the vase was partly hidden by the flowers, the belly of it was overlaid with net-work, ornamented by seven wreaths, the Hebrew number of happiness, and beneath the lip of the vase were two rows of pomegranates, one hundred in each row. These superb pillars were eight feet in diameter and forty-four feet high, supporting a noble entablature fourteen feet high." SEE JACHIN AND BOAZ.

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

On the other hand, some of the passages in which shoshanz occurs evidently refer to a field variety, as Son 2:1-2, and the tubular shape of the trumpet is sufficient to explain the transfer of the word to that musical instrument. SEE SHOSHANNIM. "The Hebrew word is rendered 'rose' in the Chaldce Targum, and by Maimonides and other Babbinical writers, with the exception of Kimchi and Ben-Melech, who in 1Ki 7:19 translated it by 'violet.' In the Judaeo-Spanish version of the Canticles shoishan and shôshannâh are always translated by rosa, but in Hos 14:5 the latter is rendered lirio. But κρίνον, or 'lily,' is the uniform rendering of the Sept., and is, in all probability, the true one, as it is supported by the analogy of the Arabic and Persian susan, which has the same meaning to this day, and by the existence of the same word in Syriac and Coptic. The Spanish azucena, 'a white lily,' is merely a modification of the Arabic; but, although there is little doubt that the word denotes some plant of the lily species, it is by no means certain what individual of this class it especially designates. Father Souciet (Recueil de diss. Crit. 1715) labored to prove that the lily of Scripture is the 'crown imperial,' the Persian tusai, the κρίνον βασιλικόν of the Greeks, and the lFritillaria imperialis of Linnums. So common was this plant in Persia that it is supposed to have given its name to Susa, the capital (Athen. 12:1; Bochart, Phaleg. 2:14); but there is no proof that it was at any time common in Palestine, and 'the lily' par excellence of Persia would not of necessity be 'the lily' of the Holy Land. Dioscorides (1:62) bears witness to the beauty of the lilies of Syria and Pisidia, from which the best perfume was made. He says (3:106 [116]) of the κρίνον βασιλικόν that the Syrians call it σασᾶ (=shushcan), and the Africans ἀβίβλαβον, which Bochart renders in Hebrew characters אביב לבןwhite shoot.' Kühn, in his note on the passage, identifies the plant in question with the Liliumz candidumn of Linnaeus. It is probably the same as that called in the Mishna ‘king's lily' (Kilaimi, 5:8).

Pliny (21:5) defines κρίνον as 'rubens lilium;' and Dioscorides, in another passage, mentions the fact that there are lilies with purple flowers, but whether by this he intended the Lilium martagon or Chalcedonicunm, Kühn leaves undecided. Now in the passage of Athenaus above quoted it is said, Σοῦσον γὰρ ειναι τῇ ῾Ελλήνων φωνῇ τὸ κρίνον. But in the Etymologicum Mazgnums (s.v. Σοῦσα) we find τὰ γὰρ λείρια ὑπὸ τῶν Φοινίκων σοῦσαλέγρεται. As the shushans is thus identified both with κρίνον, the red or purple lily, and with λείριον,  the white lily, it is evidently impossible, from the word itself, to ascertain exactly the kind of lily which is referred to. If the shushan or shoshlannah of the O.T. and the κρίνον of the Sermon on the Mount be identical, which there seems no reason to doubt, the plant designated by these terms must have been a conspicuous object on the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret (Mat 6:28; Luk 12:27); it must have flourished in the deep, broad valleys of Palestine (Son 2:1), among the thorny shrubs (Son 2:2) and pastures of the desert (Son 2:16; Son 4:5; Son 6:3), and must have been remarkable for its rapid and luxuriant growth (Hos 14:5; Sir 39:14). The purple flowers of the khob, or wild artichoke, which abounds in the plain north of Tabor and in the valley of Esdraelon, have been thought by some to be the 'lilies of the field' alluded to in Mat 6:28 (Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 2:110). A recent traveler mentions a plant, with lilac flowers like the hyacinth, and called by the Arabs usweih, which he considered to be of the species denominated lily in Scripture (Bonar, Desert of Sinai, page 329)." Tristram strongly inclines to identify the scarlet, anemone (Anemone coronaria with the Scripture "lily" (Nat. Hist. of Bible, page 464).

In the N. Test. the word "lily" occurs in the well-known and beautiful passage (Mat 6:28), 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet I say unto you that even Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these;' so also in Luk 12:27. Here it is evident that the plant alluded to must have been indigenous or grow in wild in the vicinity of the Sea of Galilee, must have been of an ornamental character, and, from the Greek term κρίνον being applied to it, of a liliaceous nature. The name κρίνον occurs in all the old Greek writers (see Dioscor. 3:116; compare Claudian. Epithal. seren. 126; Martial, 5:37, 6 sq.; Calpurn. 6:33; Athen. 15:677, 680; Virgil, Ecl. 10:25; Pliny, 15:7; 21:11).

Theophrastus first uses it, and is supposed by Sprengel to apply it to species of Varscissus and to Lilium candidumn. Dioscorides indicates two species, but very imperfectly: one of them is supposed to be the Lilium candidum, and the other, with a reddish flower, may be L. martagon or L. Chalcedonicum. He alludes more particularly to the lilies of Syria and of Pamphylia being well suited for making the ointment of lily. Pliny enumerates three kinds, a white, a red, and a purple-colored lily. Travelers in Palestine mention that in the month of January the fields and groves everywhere abound in various species of lily, tulip, and narcissus.  Benard noticed, near Acre, on Jan. 18th, and about Jaffa on the 23d, tulips, white, red, blue, etc. Gumpenberg saw the meadows of Galilee covered with the same flowers on the 31st. Tulips figure conspicuously among the flowers of Palestine, varieties probably of Tulijpas Gesneriana (Kitto's Palestine, page 215). So Pococke says, 'I saw many tulips growing wild in the fields (in March), and any one who considers how beautiful those flowers are to the eye would be apt to conjecture that these are the lilies to which Solomon in all his glory was not to be compared.' This is much more likely to be the plant intended than some others which have been adduced, as, for instance, the scarlet amaryllis, having white flowers with bright purple streaks, found by Salt at Adowa. Others have preferred the Crown imperial, which is a native of Persia and Cashmere. Most authors have united in considering the white lily, Lilium candidume, to be the plant to which our Savior referred; but it is doubtful whether it has ever been found in a wild state in Palestine. Some, indeed, have thought it to be a native of the New World. Dr. Lindley, however, in the Gardeners' Chronicle (2:744), says, 'This notion cannot be sustained, because the white lily occurs in all engraving of the annunciation, executed somewhere about 1480 by Martin Schongauer; and the first voyage of Columbus did not take place till 1492. In this very rare print the lily is represented as growing in an ornamental vase, as if it were cultivated as a curious object.' This opinion is confirmed by a correspondent at Aleppo (Gardeners' Chronicle, 3:429), who has resided long in Syria, but is acquainted only with the botany of Aleppo and Antioch: 'I never saw the white lily in a wild state, nor have I heard of its being so in Syria. It is cultivated here on the roofs of the houses in pots as an exotic bulb, like the daffodil.' In consequence of this difficulty, the late Sir J.E. Smith was of opinion that the plant alluded to under the name of lily was the Amaryllis lutea (now Oporasnthus lutteus), 'whose golden liliaceous flowers in autumn afford one of the most brilliant and gorgeous objects in nature, as the fields of the Levant are overrun with them; to them the expression of Solomon, in all his glory, not being arrayed like one of them, is peculiarly appropriate.'

Dr. Lindley conceives it to be much more probable that the plant intended by our Savior was the Ixiolirion montanum, a plant allied to the amaryllis, of very great beauty, with a slender stem, and clusters of the most delicate violet flowers, abounding in Palestine, where colonel Chesney found it in the most brilliant profusion (l.c. page 744). In reply to this, a correspondent furnishes an extract of a letter from Dr. Bowring, which throws a new light upon the subject: 'I cannot describe to you with botanical accuracy the lily  of Palestine. I heard it called by the title of Lilia Syriaca, and I imagine under this title its botanical characteristics may be hunted out. Its color is a brilliant red; its size about half that of the common tiger lily. The white lily I do not remember to have seen in any part of Syria. It was in April and May that I observed my flower, and it was most abundant in the district of Galilee, where it and the Rhododendron (which grew in rich abundance round the paths) most strongly excited my attention.' On this Dr. Lindley observes, 'It is clear that neither the white lily, nor the Oporanthus luteus, nor Ixiolirion, will answer to Dr. Bowring's description, which seems to point to the Chalcedonian or scarlet martagon lily, formerly called the lily of Byzantium, found from the Adriatic to the Levant, and which, with its scarlet turban-like flowers, is indeed a most stately and striking object' (Gardeners' Chronicle, 2:854)" (Kitto). As this lily (the Lilium Chalcedonicum of botanists) is in flower at the season of the year when the Sermon on the Mount is supposed to have been spoken (May; but it is probable that our Savior's discourse on Providence, contaning the allusion to the lily, occurred on a different occasion, apparently about October; see Strong's Harmony of the Gospels, § 52), is indigenous in the very locality, and is conspicuous, even in the garden, for its remarkable showy flowers, there can now be little doubt that it is the plant alluded to by our Savior. "Strand (Flor. Palest.) mentions it as growing near Joppa, and Kitto (Phys. Hist. of Palest. page 219) makes especial mention of the L. candidum growing in Palestine; and, in connection with the habitat given by Strand, it is worth observing that the lily is mentioned (Son 2:1) with the rose of Sharon."

By some the lily is supposed to be meant by the term חֲבִצֶּלֶת(chabatstse'leth, "rose"), in Isa 35:1; Son 2:1. For further details, consult Oken, Lehrb. d. Naturgesch. II, 1:757; Rosenmüller, Bibl. Alterth. 4:138; Celsius, Hierobot. 1:383 sq.; Billerbeck, Flosta Class. page 90 sq.; Gesenius, Thes. Heb. page 1385; Penny Cyclopaedia, s.v. Lotus.

## Limbo Or Limbus[[@Headword:Limbo Or Limbus]]

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

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

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

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

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

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

From the authorities of the Church, we find that the admission of the belief in a purgatory had in the West great influence on the ideas concerning the future. The scholastics, in the course of time, erected these views into a system. Besides the above-named three places of abode for departed spirits deprived of heavenly felicity recognized in the Roman Catholic Catechism, they asserted the existence of a fourth, intended for children who died previous to baptism. Bellarmine (Purg. 2:7) considers it a very difficult question to decide whether there may not be a fifth, in which the purified souls remain until their final admittance into the kingdom of heaven, and which must consequently be situated somewhere between purgatory and heaven (Beda, Hist. 5:13; Dionysius Carthusianus, Dial. de jud. particul. 31; Ludi Blosius, Monil. Spirit. 13). The necessity of ascribing to each of these loca paenalia its special position accounts sufficiently for the fact that the word limbus is made to answer both for the place where the saints who lived before Christ remain, and for the abode of children who died without baptism. It appears to have been first set forth by Thomas Aquinas, and to have been at once adopted by the Church. Hell is considered as situated in the center of the earth; next comes purgatory, which surrounds hell; then the Limbus infantum, or puerorum; and finally, as the central point between hell and heaven, the Limbus Patrum, or Sinus Abrahae. Of course each different place has its own special punishments: in hell it is paena aeterna damni et sensus; in purgatory, paena temporalis damni et  sensus; in the Limbus infantum, paena damni aeterna; and in the Limbus patrum, poena damni temporalis (Thom. Aq. 3, d. 22, q. 2, a. 1, q. 2, 4; d. 21, q. 1, a. 1, q. 2; d. 45, q. 1, a. 1, q. 2, 3, 3, q. 52, 2, 4, 4; d. 45, q. 1, a. q. 2, etc., Eleucidar. 64; Dante, Inf. 4; comp. 31 sq.; Durand, De S. Port. Sentt. 3, d. 22, q. 4; Sonnius, Demonstr. rel. Chr. 2:3, 15, and 2:4, 1; Bellarmine, Purg. 2:6; Andradius, Defins. Trid. Synod. 2:299).

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

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

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

Now, although the essential nature of the poena damni consists in the deprivation of the happiness of seeing God, there exists a difference in the manner of applying the idea to children and their inheritance of original sin. In the fifth session of the Council of Trent the Dominicans advocated the stricter view, making of the limbus infantum a dark, underground prison, while the Franciscans placed it above in a region of light. Others made the condition of these children still better: they supposed them occupied with studying nature, philosophizing on it, and receiving occasional visits from angels and saints. As the council thought it best not to decide this point, theologians have since been free to embrace either view. Bellarmine (De amiss. grat. 6:6) considers their state, like Lombard, as one of sorrow, On the contrary, cardinal Sfondrani (Nodus praedest. dissol. 1:1, 23, and 1:2, 16) and Peter Godoy (compare Thomas, Quaest. 5 de nalo, a. 2) consider them as enjoying all the natural happiness of which they are capable. They do not even know that supernatural happiness consists in the visio clara Dei, and can feel no pain from this, to them unknown, exclusion. Finally, Perrone (5:275), who takes Concil. Tr. sess. 5, c. 4, as including in de fide only the want of the supernaturalis beatitudo, says: " 'Si spectetur relative ad supernaturalem beatitudinem habet talis status rationem poenae et damnationis; si vero spectetur idem status in se sive absolute, cum per  peccatum de naturalibuis nihil amiserint, talis erit ipsorum conditio, qualis fuisset, si Adam neque peccasset neque elevatus ad supernaturalem statum fuisset, i.e., in conditione purae nature." This attempt at conciliation agrees so well with the Roman Catholic view of original sin, that on this account it has been admitted (Conc. Tr. sess. 5:2, 3, 5, and sess. 6; Bellarmine, grat. prim. horn. 5). Moreover, it is well known that Roman Catholic principles are of great elasticity in their application, so that there is alwavs some way for the Church of getting out of difficulties. Thus, while the Catechism (2:2, 28) continues to assert that, aside from baptism, there is "nulla alia salutis comparande ratio," we learn from the theologians, from Duns Scotus down to Klee (Dogm. 3:119), that the mere desiderium baptismi can be considered as valid for the children while set in the mothers' womb, and is equivalent to the actual performance of the rite of baptism on the child. What becomes of the children who, though baptized, die soon after baptism, and who thus lose the meritum e congruo necessary for justification, cannot here be taken into consideration.

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

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

## Limborch, Philip Van[[@Headword:Limborch, Philip Van]]

             an eminent Dutch theologian, was born at Amsterdam June 19, 1633. He first studied ethics, history, and philosophy at his native place, and then applied himself to divinity under the Remonstrants. From Amsterdam he went to Utrecht, and attended the lectures of Voetius, and other divines of the Reformed religion. In 1657 he became pastor of the Remonstrants at Gonda, and remained there until 1667, when he removed to Amsterdam as pastor. The following year he was called to the chair of divinity in the Remonstrant college at the latter place, which position he held until his death, April 30, 1712. Limborch was on intimate terms with Locke, and corresponded with him regularly for several years on the nature of human liberty (see Locke's Ietters, Lond. 1727, 3 volumes, fol.). Limborch was gentle in his disposition, tolerant of the views of others, learned, methodical, of a retentive memory, and, above all, had a love for truth, and engaged in the search of it by reading the Scriptures with the best commentators. Next to Arminius himself, and Simon Episcopius, Limborch was one of the most distinguished of the Arminian theologians, "who exerted a beneficial reaction upon Protestantism by their thorough scientific attainments, no less than by the mildness of their sentiments" (Hatgenbach's History of Doctrines, 2:214). In 1660, having found among the papers of Episcopius, his maternal uncle, several letters relating to  ecclesiastical affairs, he arranged a collection with Hartsocker, Epistolae praestantium et eruditorum Virorums (8vo). Limborch was specially noted for his doctrinal works. His principal work is Theologia Christiana (1686; 4th ed. Amst. 1715, 4to), translated, with improvements from Wilkins, Tillotson, Scott, and others, by William Jones, under the title, A complete System or Body of Divinity, both speculative mind practical, founded on Scripture and Reason (Lond. 1702, 2 volumes, 8vo). This was the first and most complete exposition of the Arminian doctrine, displaying great originality of arrangement, and admirable perspicuity and judicious selection of material. The preparation of the work was undertaken at the request of the Remonstrants (q.v.). His other works are, De veritate religionis Christianae (1687), the result of a conference with the learned Jew, Dr. Orobius: — Historia Inquisitionis (1692, fol.; translated by Samuel Chandler, under the title The History of the Inquisition, to which is prefixed a large introduction concerning the rise and progress of persecution, and the real and pretended causes of it, London, 1731, 2 volumes, 4to). He is also the author of an exegetical work, Commentarius in Acta Apos. et in Epistolas ad Romanos et ad Hebreos (Rotterdam, 1711, fol.). "This commentary, though written in the interest of the author's theological views, is deserving of attention for the good sense, clear thought, and acute reasoning by which it is pervaded" (Kitto). In addition, he edited many of the works of the principal Arminian theologians. See Niceron, Hist. des Honlares illustres, 11:39-53; Abrah. des Armorie van der Hoeven, De Jo. Clerico et Philippo a Limrborch. (Amstelod. 1845, 8vo); Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Genzerale, 31, s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8, s.v.; Farrar, Crit. History of Free Thought, page 386, 392; Methodist Quarterly Review, July 1864, page 513.

## Limbus[[@Headword:Limbus]]

             SEE LIMBO.

## Lime[[@Headword:Lime]]

             (שַׂיד, sid, perh. from its boiling or effervescing when slaked; Isa 33:12; Amo 2:1; rendered "plaster" in Deu 2:2; Deu 2:4; the same word is used for lime in Arab. and Syr.), a well-known mineral substance, which is a very prevalent ingredient in rocks, and, combined with carbonic acid, forms marble, chalk, and limestone, of various degrees of hardness and every variety of color. Limestone is the prevailing  constituent of the mountains of Syria; it occurs under various modifications of texture, color, form, and intermixture in different parts of the country. The purest carbonate of lime is found in calcareous spar, whose crystals assume a variety of forms, all, however, resulting from a primary rhomboid. Under the action of fire, carbonate of lime loses its carbonic acid and becomes caustic lime, which has a hot, pungent taste. SEE CHALK.

If lime be subjected to an intense heat, it fuses into transparent glass. When heated under great pressure, it melts, but retains its carbonic acid. The modern mode of manufacturing common or "quick" lime was known in ancient times. Lime is obtained by calcining or burning marble, limestone, chalk, shells, bones, and other substances to drive off the carbonic acid. From Isa 32:12 it appears that lime was made in a kiln lighted with thorn-bushes. Dr. Thomson remarks, "It is a curious fidelity to real life that, when the thorns are merely to be destroyed, they are never cut up, but are set on fire where they grow. They are only cut up for the lime-kiln" (Land and Book, 1:81). SEE FURNACE.

In Amo 2:1 it is said that the king of Moab "burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime." The interpretation of the Targum and some of the rabbins is that the burnt bones were made into lime and used by the conqueror for plastering his palace. The same Hebrew word occurs in Deu 27:2-4 : "Thou shalt set thee up great stones, and plaister them with plaister; and thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law." It is probable that the same mode of perpetuating inscriptions was followed as we know was customary in Egypt. In that country we find paintings and hieroglyphic writing upon plaster, which is frequently laid upon the natural rock, and, after the lapse of perhaps more than three thousand years, we find the plaster still firm, and the colors of the figures painted on it still remarkably fresh. The process of covering the rock with plaster is thus described: " 'The ground was covered with a thick laver of fine plaster, consisting of lime and gypsum, which was carefully smoothed and polished. Upon this a thin coat of lime white-wash was laid, and on it the colors were painted, which were bound fast either with animal glue or occasionally with wax" (Egyptian Antiq., in Lib. of Entertaining Knowl.). SEE PLASTER.

If it be insisted that the words of the law were actually cut in the rock, it would seem best to understand that the Hebrew word sid does not here mean a "plaister," but indicates that the stones, after they had been engraved, were covered with a coat of tenacious lime white-wash, employed for similar purposes by the Egyptians, who, when the face of a rock had been sculptured in relievo, covered the whole with a coat of this wash, and then  painted their sculptured figures (Kitto's Pict. Bible, note ad loc.). SEE MORTAR.

## Limina Martyrum[[@Headword:Limina Martyrum]]

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

## Limiter[[@Headword:Limiter]]

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

## Limus[[@Headword:Limus]]

             an article of dress worn around the loins by the ancient-Roman papa, or officiating priest, at the sacrifices.

## Lincoln, Ensign[[@Headword:Lincoln, Ensign]]

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

## Lincoln, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Lincoln, Richard, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was promoted to the see of Dublin in 1757. He encouraged his people to a continuance of peaceful and Christian dispositions, and forcibly appealed to those of another communion as to Catholic loyalty and love. He died in 1762. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 469.

## Lincoln, Thomas Oliver, D.D[[@Headword:Lincoln, Thomas Oliver, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Boston, Massachusetts, May 4, 1809. He graduated from Yale College in 1829, and from Newton Theological Institution in 1834; was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church in Kennebunkport, Maine, December 10, 1834, and afterwards served the Free Street Church in Portland; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Mount Holly, N.J.; Manchester, N.H.; Utica and Elmira, N.Y.; Williamsport, Pennsylvania; and Roadstown, N.J. He died at Bridgeton, January 20, 1877. (J.C.S.)

## Linda Or Lindanus, William Damiasus Van[[@Headword:Linda Or Lindanus, William Damiasus Van]]

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

## Lindblom, Jacob Axel[[@Headword:Lindblom, Jacob Axel]]

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

## Linde, Christoph Ludwig[[@Headword:Linde, Christoph Ludwig]]

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

## Linde, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Linde, Johann Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 24, 1760, at Thorn, and died February 16, 1840, at Dantzic, superintendent and member of consistory. He is the author of, Sententiae Jesu Siracidae (Dantzic, 1795): — Des Sohnes Sirach Sittenlehre (Leipsic, 1782, 1795): — Reinhard und Ammon, oder Predigten-Parallele; als Beitrag zur Homiletik (Konigsberg, 1800). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:233; 2:48, 64; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:250. (B.P.)

## Lindemann, Joachim[[@Headword:Lindemann, Joachim]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born April 7, 1662, at Rostock. He studied at different universities, was in 1684 magister in his native city, in 1688 archdeacon, in 1692 professor, and died December 14, 1698, a doctor of theology. He wrote, De Obligatione Conscientiae: — De Praejudiciis Philosophicis: — De Sanctorum cum Christo Redivivorum Resurrectione, ex Mat 27:52-53 : — De Proto-Canonicis et  Deutero-Canonicis S. Scripturce Libris: — De Iis quae Theologia Naturalis Ignorat. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lindesay, David[[@Headword:Lindesay, David]]

             a Scotch prelate, was preferred to the see of Ross in 1600, and still continued his ministry at Leith until his death, which occurred about 1613. In 1604 he was one of the commissioners for uniting the two kingdoms. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 201.

## Lindesay, Patrick[[@Headword:Lindesay, Patrick]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first minister at St.Vigian's in Angus. In October 1613, he was preferred to the episcopal see of Ross, and consecrated December 15 of the same year. From this he was translated to the see of Glasgow, April 16, 1633. He died at Newcastle in 1641. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, pages 202, 264.

## Lindet, Robert Thomas[[@Headword:Lindet, Robert Thomas]]

             a French prelate and politician, was born at Bernay (Eure) in 1743. He was pastor of the parish of St. Croix in that town, when he was elected deputy of the clergy of the bailiwick of Evreux to the States-General of 1789. In 1791 he was elected constitutional bishop of Eure. In November 1792, he married publicly. In 1793 he resigned his episcopate, and all his offices in 1798, and lived thereafter in obscurity until finally, by the law of amnesty of 1816, he was obliged to leave France. After staying some time in Switzerland and Italy, he was permitted to come home to his native country, where he died in August 1823. He wrote, Lettre Circulaire au Clerge de son Diocese: — Lettres aux Religieuses des Monasteres de son Diocese. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lindewood, Lindwood, Or Lyndewood, William[[@Headword:Lindewood, Lindwood, Or Lyndewood, William]]

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

## Lindgerus (Ludgerus), St.[[@Headword:Lindgerus (Ludgerus), St.]]

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

## Lindley, Daniel, D.D[[@Headword:Lindley, Daniel, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian missionary, was born in America in 1800. After receiving his theological education, he was ordained, and went with five others to South Africa in 1834. In 1836 he established a mission on the Allovo river, Port Natal, and commenced his lifelong work of laboring to convert the Zulus to Christ. On account of the numerous wars in that country, his mission was broken up, and for a considerable length of time he was prevented from carrying out his great design. He lived, however, to see a great moral and civil revolution among the inhabitants of that country, and his zeal and  perseverance in the great cause in which he was engaged were crowned with success. After toiling for thirty-seven years, he was obliged, on account of his wife's illness, to return to the United States. He travelled extensively throughout the country advocating the cause of missions, until 1877, when he was stricken with paralysis, from which he never recovered. Dr. Lindley died in New York in August 1880. (W.P.S.)

## Lindley, Jacob, D.D[[@Headword:Lindley, Jacob, D.D]]

             a Cumberland Presbyterian minister, was born June 13, 1774, in western Pennsylvania, and was the fifth in descent from Francis Lindley, one of the passengers in the Mayflower. Jacob's father erected a block-house between the Monongahela river and Wheeling, as a defence against prowling Indians, in the winter of 1774 and 1775; and it was long known as Fort Lindley. Young Jacob became a communicant about 1786. For a time he was a student at an academy near his home, and at the age of eighteen entered the institution afterwards known as Jefferson College, at Cannonsburg, Pennsylvania. In 1798 he entered Princeton College, from which he graduated in 1800. Having studied theology for a time, he was licensed to preach by the Washington Presbytery, and in 1803 removed to Beverly, Ohio. The first board of trustees of Ohio University selected him to organize and conduct that institution, for which purpose he went to Athens in 1808. For several years he had charge of the infant college, and was the prime mover in securing the erection of the college buildings, and in founding the Presbyterian Church in Athens. During a part of his twenty years' labor there he was the only Presbyterian minister, in that section of Ohio. About 1828 he was partially relieved by the appointment to the presidency of Reverend Dr. Wilson, of Chillicothe; although he remained about a year longer in the college as professor of moral philosophy and. mathematics. Subsequently he spent one year at Walnut Hills,' Cincinnati; then a year or two at the Flats of Grace creek; after which he accepted a call from the Upper Ten Mile congregation, within whose bounds was his birthplace. While here, in western Pennsylvania, he received a mandate from his presbytery forbidding ministerial intercourse with the Cumberland Presbyterians. Refusing obedience to the mandate, charges were brought against him, which he showed to be groundless, and then he demanded from his presbytery a letter of dismission. This was granted, and in this way his connection with the Presbyterian Church was severed. He became a Cumberland Presbyterian, but continued his pastoral relation with the Upper Ten Mile congregation for two or three years. Subsequently he took  charge of a Cumberland Presbyterian congregation at Beverly (then Waterford), Ohio. In 1837 he removed to Alabama, still preaching and teaching as opportunity offered. From 1848 Dr. Lindley spent his winters in the South, and his summers in the North. He died at Connellsville, Pennsylvania, January 29, 1857. In 1846 he published a small volume, entitled Infant Philosophy. See Beard, Biographical Sketches, 2d series, page 45.

## Lindner, Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Lindner, Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1779 at Weida. He commenced his academical career at Leipsic in 1806, was in 1825 professor of catechetics, retired in 1860, and died November 1, 1865. He published, Die wichtigsten Thatsachen und Urtheile fur und gegen Missions- und Bibelgesellschaften (Leipsic, 1825): — Die Lehre vom Abendmachle (1831). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:800; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:454, 587. (B.P.)

## Lindner, Wilhelm Bruno[[@Headword:Lindner, Wilhelm Bruno]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Leipsic in 1876, doctor and professor of theology, is the author of, De Joviniano et Vigilantio (Leipsic, 1839): — Lehrbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte (1848- 54, 3 volumes): — Bibliotheca Patrum Ecclesiasticorum Selectissima (1857): — Sermons, delivered in the University Church (1844): — Christological Sermons (1855). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:800 sq. (B.P.)

## Lindo, Elia H[[@Headword:Lindo, Elia H]]

             a Jewish writer, who died in London, July 11, 1865, is the author of History of the Jews of Spain and Portugal (London, 1849). From the Hebrew he translated a work of Menasseh ben-Israel: The Conciliator, a Reconcilement of the Apparent Contradictions in Holy Scripture (1842, 2 volumes). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:251. (B.P.)

## Lindsay (properly Alexander William Crawford), Lord[[@Headword:Lindsay (properly Alexander William Crawford), Lord]]

             (known after the death of his father as Count of Crawford and Balcarres), an English writer, was born October 16, 1812. He was educated at Eton, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, and graduated in 1833 as master of arts. He then travelled extensively, and published in 1838 his Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land, in two volumes. In 1844 he published A  Letter to a Friend on the Evidence and Theory of Christianity, and in 1846 Progression by Antagonism. In 1861 he issued his Scepticism, in 1870 (Ecumenicity in Relation to the Church of England, and in 1872 Etruscan Inscriptions. He died at Florence, December 13, 1880. A large work on comparative history of the religions of antiquity, which he intended to publish under the title of The Religion of Noah, was left incomplete. (B.P.)

## Lindsay, Alexander[[@Headword:Lindsay, Alexander]]

             a Scotch prelate, was preacher at St. Madoes, and bishop. of Dunkeld, where he continued until 1638, when he renounced his office, abjured episcopacy, submitted to Presbyterian parity, and accepted from the. then rulers his former church of St. Madoes. He acquired the barony of Evelick, in the case of Gowrie. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, p. 98.

## Lindsay, David[[@Headword:Lindsay, David]]

             a Scotch prelate, was minister at Dundee, made bishop of Brechin, and consecrated at St. Andrews, November 23, 1619. He was translated to the see of Edinburgh, September 17, 1634. He was deposed and excommunicated for reading the liturgy in the High Church of Edinburgh, July 23, 1637. He went to England, and died soon after. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 61.

## Lindsay, Ingeram[[@Headword:Lindsay, Ingeram]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Aberdeen in 1442, and also in 1448, 1452, and 1458, when he probably died. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 114.

## Lindsay, James, D.D[[@Headword:Lindsay, James, D.D]]

             an English Presbyterian clergyman, was born-and educated in Scotland, where he began to preach. He came to London, and was ordained pastor at Monkwell Street in May 1783. In 1787 he was appointed afternoon preacher to the Presbyterians at Stoke-Newington, where he fixed his residence, and opened an academy. In 1803 he removed to Old Ford, and received his diploma from Aberdeen University. He published two funeral sermons, and was minister at Monkwell Street in 1811. See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 3:215.

## Lindsay, John[[@Headword:Lindsay, John]]

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

## Lindsay, John (2)[[@Headword:Lindsay, John (2)]]

             (2), a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Lynn, Massachusetts, July 18, 1788; was converted in 1807; entered the New England Conference in 1809; was agent for the Wesleyan University in 1835-6; in 1837 was  transferred to the New York Conference, and made presiding elder on New Haven District; next he filled two stations in New York City; in 1842 he was agent for the American Bible Society; was transferred in 1845 to the Troy Conference; was appointed to the Albany District in 1846; and died at Schenectady February 10, 1850. Mr. Lindsay was an impressive and successful preacher, and a man of noble benevolence. He was very active in the founding of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, and the Wesleyan University. — Minutes of Conf. 4:460; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, volume 2, chapter 41. (G.L.T.)

## Lindsay, John (3)[[@Headword:Lindsay, John (3)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was promoted to the see of Glasgow about 1325. This prelate was killed in 1335 while returning from Flanders to Scotland. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 244.

## Lindsay, William[[@Headword:Lindsay, William]]

             a Scotch prelate, was minister at Perth, and consecrated bishop of the see of Dunkeld, May 7, 1677. He died in 1679. See Keith, Scottish Bishops. page 99.

## Lindsey, Theophilus[[@Headword:Lindsey, Theophilus]]

             an eminent English Unitarian minister, was born at Middlewich, in Cheshire, June 20, 1723 (O.S.). He entered St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1741, and, after taking his degrees, was elected fellow in 1747. About this time he commenced his clerical duties at an Episcopal chapel in Spital Square, London. Later he became domestic chaplain to Algernon, duke of Somerset, after whose death he traveled two years on the Continent with Algernon's son. On his return, about 1753, he was presented to the living of Kirkby Wiske, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, and in 1756 he removed to that of Piddletown, in Dorsetshire.

In 1760 he married a step- daughter of his intimate friend archdeacon Blackburne, and in 1763, chiefly for the sake of enjoying his society, took the living of Catterick. Lindsey, who had felt some scruples respecting subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles even while at Cambridge, began now to entertain serious doubts concerning the Trinitarian doctrines, and by 1769 his association with the Reverend William Turner, a Presbyterian minister at Wakefield, and Dr. Priestley, then a Unitarian minister at Leeds, gave a more decided coloring to his Antitrinitarian views, and he actually began to contemplate the duty of resigning his living. He was induced to defer that step by an attempt which was made in 1771, by several clergymen and gentlemen of the learned professions, to obtain relief from Parliament in the matter of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and in which he joined heartily, traveling upwards of 2000 miles in the winter of that year to obtain signatures to the petition which was prepared. The petition was presented on the 6th of February 1772, with nearly 250 signatures, but, after a spirited debate, its reception was negatived by 217 to 71. It being intended to renew the application to Parliament at the next session, Lindsey still deferred his resignation, but when the intention was abandoned he began to prepare for that important step.

He drew up, in July 1773, a copious and  learned "Apology," and, notwithstanding the attempts of his diocesan and others to dissuade him from the step, he formally resigned his connection with the Established Church, and, selling the greatest part of his library to meet his pecuniary exigencies, he proceeded to London, and on the 17th of April 1774, began to officiate in a room in Essex Street, Strand, which, by the help of friends, he had been enabled to convert into a temporary chapel. His desire being to deviate as little as possible from the mode of worship adopted in the Church of England, he used a liturgy very slightly altered from that modification of the national church-service which had been previously published by Dr. Samuel Clarke.

This modified liturgy, as well as his opening sermon, Lindsey published. His efforts to raise a Unitarian congregation proving successful, lie commenced shortly afterwards the erection of a more permanent chapel in Essex Street, which was opened in 1778. His published "Apology" having been attacked in print by Mr. Burgh, an Irish M.P., by Mr. Bingham, and by Dr. Randolph, Lindsey published a "Sequel" to it in 1776, in which he answered those writers. In 1781 he published The Catechist, or an Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Scriptures concerning the only True God and Object of Religious Worship; in 1783, A Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship Reform the Reformation to our own Times, an elaborate work, which had been several years in preparation; and in 1785, anonymously, An Exanination of Mr. Robinson of Cambridge's Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, by a late Member of the University. In 1788 he published Vindicise Priestleicane, a defense of his friend Dr. Priestley, in the form of an address to the students of Oxford and Cambridge; and this was followed, in 1790, by a Second Address to the Students of Oxford and Cambridge relating to Jesus Christ and the Origin of the great Errors concerning him. In 1782 he invited Dr. Disney, who then left the Established Church for the same reasons as himself, to become his colleague in the ministry at Essex Street; and in 1793, on account of age and growing infirmities, he resigned the pastorate entirely into his hands, publishing on the occasion a farewell discourse (which he felt himself unable to preach) and a revised edition, being the fourth, of his liturgy. In 1795 he reprinted, with an original preface, the Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever which Dr. Priestley had recently published in America in reply to Paine's Age of Reason; and in 1800 he republished in like manner another of Priestley's works, on the knowledge which the Hebrews had of a future state. Lindsey's last work was published in 1802, entitled Conversations on the Divine Government, showing that everything  is from God and for good to all. He died on the 3d of November 1808. Besides copious biographical notices of Lindsey, which were published in the Monthly Repository and Monthly Magazine of December 1808, the Reverend Thomas Belsham published, in 1812, a thick octavo volume of Memoirs, in which he gives a full analysis of Lindsey's works and extracts from his correspondence, together with a complete list of his publications. Two volumes of his sermons were printed shortly after his death. Sec Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Robert Hall, in his Works (11th ed. 1853). 4:188 sq.; London Quarterly Review, 8:422 sq.

## Lindsley, James Harvey[[@Headword:Lindsley, James Harvey]]

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

## Lindsley, Philip[[@Headword:Lindsley, Philip]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Morristown, N.J., December 21, 1786, and graduated in the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1804. After teaching for some time, and completing his theological course, he was licensed in 1810. and went to Newtown, Long Island, where he preached as a stated supply. In 1812 he became senior tutor in Princeton College, and in 1813 was appointed to the professorship of languages, and chosen secretary of the board of trustees. To these offices were added those of librarian and inspector of the college, and in 1817, when he was  ordained, that of vice-president. In 1824 he agreed to go to Nashville, solely induced thereto by the new and wide field of exertion which lay before him there. He continued more than a quarter of a century at Nashville, and his reputation as a teacher was so high in the South and West' that it was said that every university in those regions had solicited him to accept its headship. He was twice invited to preside over Dickinson College, in Pennsylvania, and was actually elected provost of the University of Pennsylvania in 1834. From this period he was successively moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, member of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries at Copenhagen, professor of ecclesiastical polity and Biblical archeology in the New Albany Seminary (Indiana), 1850. He removed from New Albany in April, 1853, and returned to Nashville, where he died May 23, 1856. Dr. Lindsley's works have been published entire, with an introductory notice of his life and labors by Leroy J. Halsey (Philadel. 1865, 3 volumes, 8vo). Their contents are as follows: volume 1, Educational Discourses; volume 2, Sermons and Religious Discourses; volume 3, Miscellaneous Discourses and Essays. — Sprague, Annals, 4:465.

## Lindwood[[@Headword:Lindwood]]

             SEE LINDEWOOD.

## Line[[@Headword:Line]]

             (represented by the following terms in the original: חֶבֶל, che'bel, a measuring-line, 2Sa 8:2; Amo 7:17; hence a portion as divided out by a line, Psa 16:6; elsewhere “cord," "portion," etc. קָוּ or קִו, kav, a measuring-line, Isa 34:17; Eze 47:3; either for construction, Job 38:5; Isa 44:13; Jer 31:39; Zec 1:16, or for destruction, 2Ki 21:13; Lam 2:8; Isa 34:11; metaph., a rule or norm, Isa 28:17; Isa 28:10; Isa 28:13; like the Gr. κανών, 2Co 10:13; 2Co 10:15-16; Gal 6:16; Php 3:16; also the rim, e.g. of a laver, 1Ki 7:23; 2Ch 4:2; or string of a musical instrument, put for sound, q.d. accord, Psa 19:4; where Sept. ὁ φθόγγος, and so Rom 10:18, Vulg. sonus; once, strength, Isa 18:2, where "a nation meted out" should be rendered a most mighty nation: in three of the above passages, 1Ki 7:23; Jer 31:39; Zec 1:16, the text reads קֶוֶה, ke'veh, of the same import; and in Jos 2:18; Jos 2:21, occurs תַּקְוָה,  tikvah', a cord, from the same root. Other terms less proper are: חוּט, chut, a thread, for measuring a circumference, 1Ki 7:15; "fillets," Jer 52:21; elsewhere generally a "thread." פָּתַיל, pathil', a cord, for measuring length, Eze 40:3; elsewhere a "thread," "lace," etc., especially the string for suspending the signet-ring in the bosom, rendered "bracelets" in Gen 38:18; Gen 38:25. שֶׂרֶד, se'red, the awl or stylus with which an artist graves the sketch of a figure in outline, to be afterwards sculptured in full, Isa 44:13). There can be little doubt that the Hebrews acquired the art of measuring land from the ancient Egyptians, with whom it was early prevalent (Wilkinson's Anc. Egypt. 2:256). In Jos 18:9 we read, "And the men went out and passed through the land, and described it by cities into seven parts in a book, and came again to Joshua to the host at Shiloh." These circumstances clearly indicate that a survey of the whole country was made, and the results entered carefully in a book (see Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.). This appears to be the earliest example of a topographical survey on record, and it proves that there must have been some knowledge of mensuration among the Hebrews, as is moreover evinced by the other topographical details in the book of Joshua.

## Lineage[[@Headword:Lineage]]

             (πατριά, paternal descent, "kindred," Act 3:25; "family," Eph 3:15), a family or race (Luk 2:4). SEE GENEALOGY.

## Linegar, John, D.D[[@Headword:Linegar, John, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was appointed to the see of Dublin in 1734, and held the office until 1739, without being molested in any way. The act of king William, "for disarming the, Papists," was enforced, and this caused some disturbance. He died in 1756. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 466.

## Linen[[@Headword:Linen]]

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

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

1. PISHTEH´ (פַּשְׁתֶּה, or, rather, according to Gesenius, פֶּשֶׁת, pe'sheth, from פָּשִׁשׁ, to card) is rendered "linen" in Lev 13:47-48; Lev 13:52; Lev 13:59; Deu 22:11; Jer 13:1; Eze 44:17-18; and "flax" in Jos 2:6; Jdg 15:14; Pro 31:13; Isa 19:9; Eze 40:3, Hos 2:5; Hos 2:9. It signifies

(1.) flax. i.e., the material of linen, Isa 19:9; Deu 22:11; Pro 31:13, where its manufacture is spoken of; also a line or rope made of it, Eze 40:3; Jdg 14:4; so "stalks of flax," i.e., woody flax, Jos 2:6 (where the Sept. has λινοκαλάμη, Vulg. stipulae lini. but the Arabic Vers. stalks of cotton); and

(2.) wrought flax. i.e., linen cloth, as made into garments. e.g. generally, Lev 13:47-48; Lev 13:52; Lev 13:59; Deu 22:11; Eze 44:17; a girdle, Jer 13:1. a mitre a pair of drawers worn by the priests, Eze 44:18. A cognate term is פַּשְׁתָּה, pistah', the plant "flax" as  growing, Exo 9:31; spec. a wick, made of linen, i.e., of "flax," Isa 42:3, or "tow," Isa 43:17. To this exactly corresponds the Greek λίνον (whence English linen), which, indeed, stands for pishteh or pishtah in the Sept. (at Exo 9:31; Isa 19:9; Isa 43:3). It signifies properly the flax-plant (Xenophon, Ath. 2:11, 12), but in the N.T. is only used of linen raiment (Rev 15:6; comp. Homer, Il. 9:661; Od. 13:73), also the wick of a lamp, as being composed of a strip or ravelings of linen (Mat 12:20), where the half-expiring flame is made the symbol of an almost despairing heart, which will be cheered instead of having its religious hopes extinguished by the Redeemer. In Joh 13:4-5 occurs the Latin term linteum, in its Greek form λέντιον, literally a linen cloth, hence a "towel" or apron (comp. Galen, Comp. Med. 9; Suetonius, Calig. 26).

This well-known plant was early cultivated in Egypt (Exo 9:31; Isa 19:9; comp. Pliny, 19:2; Herod. 2:105; Iasselquist, Trav. page 500), namely, in the Delta around Pelusium ("linum Pelusiacum," Sil. Ital. 3:25, 375; "linteum Pelusium," Phaedr. 2:6, 12); but also in Palestine (Jos 2:6, Hos 2:7; compare Pococke. East, 1:260), the stalk attaining a height of several feet (see Jos 2:6; compare Hartmann, Hebr. 1:116). Linen or tow was employed by the Hebrews, especially as a branch of female domestic manufacture (Pro 31:13), for garments (2Sa 6:14; Eze 44:17; Lev 13:47; Rev 15:6; comp. Philo, 2:225), girdles (Jer 31:1), thread and ropes (Eze 40:3; Jdg 15:13), napkins (Luk 24:12; Joh 19:40), turbans (Eze 44:18), and lamp-wick (Isa 40:3; Isa 43:17; Mat 12:20). For clothing they used the "fine linen" (בִּד, ὀθόνη, 1Ch 15:27, where the Sept. has βύσσινος: see Hartmann, 3:38; compare Lev 16:4; Lev 16:23; Eze 44:17), perhaps the Pelusiac linen of Egypt (see Mishna, Joma, 3:7), of remarkable whiteness (comp. Dan 12:6; Rev 15:6; see Plutarch, Isis, c. 4), with which the fine Babylon linen manufactured at Borsippa doubtless corresponded (Strabo, 16:739), being the material of the splendid robes of the Persian monarchs (Strabo, 14:719; Curt. 8:9), doubtless the karpas, כִּרְפִּס, of Est 1:6 (see Gesenius, Thesaur. Heb. page 715). Very poor persons wore garments of unbleached flax (ὠμόλινον, linum crudum, i.q. tow-cloth, Sir 40:4). The refuse of flax or tow is called in Heb. נַעֹרֵת, nesoreth (Jdg 16:9; Isaiah 31). (See, generally, Celsius, Hierobot. 2:28 sq. See FLAX.

2. BUTS (בּוּוֹ, from a root signifying whiteness) occurs in 1Ch 4:21; 1Ch 15:27; 2Ch 2:14; 2Ch 3:14; 2Ch 5:12; Est 1:6; Est 8:15; Eze 27:16, in all which passages the A.V. renders it "fine linen," except in 2Ch 5:12, where it translates "white linen." The word is of Aramean origin, being found in substantially the same form in all the cognate dialects. It is spoken of the finest and most precious stuffs, as worn by kings (1Ch 15:27), by priests (2Ch 5:12), and by other persons of high rank or honor (Est 1:6; Est 1:8; Est 1:15). It is used of the Syrian byssus (Eze 27:16), which seems there to be distinguished from the Egyptian byssus or שֵׁשׁ, shesh (Eze 27:7). Elsewhere it seems not to differ from this last, and is often put for it in late Hebrew (e.g. 1Ch 4:21; 2Ch 3:14; comp. Exo 26:31; so the Syr. and Chald. equivalents of buts occur in the O. and N.T. for the Heb. שֵׁשׁand Gr. βύσσος). That the Heb. garments made of this material were white may not only be certainly concluded from the etymology (which that of שֵׁשׁconfirms), but from the express language of Rev 19:4, where the white and shining raiment of the saints is emblematical of their purity. Yet we should not rashly reject the testimony of Pausanias (5:5), who states that the Hebrew byssus was yellow, for cotton of this color is found as well in Guinea and India (Gossypium religiosum) as in Greece at this day (comp. Vossius, ad. Virg. Geo. 2:220), although white was doubtless the prevailing color, as of linen with us. J.E. Faber (in Harmar, Observ. 2:382 sq.) suspects that the buts was a cotton-plant common in Syria, and different from the shesh or tree-cotton. It has long been disputed whether the cloths of byssus were of linen or cotton (see Celsius, Hierobot. 2:167 sq.; Forster, De bysso antiquor. London, 1776), and recent microscopic experiments upon the mummy-cloths brought to London from Egypt have been claimed as determining the controversy by discovering that the threads of these are linen (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 3:115).

But this is not decisive, as there may have existed religious reasons for employing linen for this particular purpose, and the cloths used for bandaging the bodies are not clearly stated to have been of byssus. On the contrary, the characteristics ascribed to this latter are such as much better agree with the qualities of cotton (see Forster, De bysqo, ut sup.). "The corresponding Greek word βύσσος occurs in Luk 16:19, where the rich man is described as being clothed in purple and fine linen, and also in Rev 18:12; Rev 18:16; Rev 19:8; Rev 19:14, among the merchandise the loss of which would be mourned for by the merchants trading with the mystical  Babylon. But it is by many authors still considered uncertain whether this byssus was of fax or cotton; for, as Rosenmüller says, 'The Heb. word shesh, which occurs thirty times in the two first books of the Pentateuch (see Celsius, 2:259), is in these places, as well as in Pro 31:22, by the Greek Alexandrian translators interpreted byssus, which denotes Egyptian cotton, and also the cotton cloth made from it. In the later writings of the O.T., as, for example, in the Chronicles, the book of Esther, and Ezekiel, buts is commonly used instead of shesh as an expression for cotton cloth.' This, however, seems to be inferred rather than proved, and it is just as likely that improved civilization may have introduced a substance, such as cotton, which was unknown at the times when shesh was spoken of and employed, in the same manner as we know that in Europe woolen, hempen, linen, and cotton clothes have at one period of society been more extensively worn than at another."

Cotton is the product of a plant apparently cultivated in the earliest ages not only in India, Cyprus, and other well-known localities, but also in Egypt (Pliny, 19:2; comp. Descript. de l'Egypte, 17:104 sq.), and even in Syria (Eze 27:16) and Palestine (1Ch 4:21; Pausan. 5:5, 2; Pococke, East, 2:88; Arvieux, 1:306). Two kinds of cotton are usually distinguished, the plant (Gossypium herbaceum) and the tree (Gossyp. arboreum), although the latest investigations appear to make them essentially one. The former, which in Western Asia is found growing in fields (Olearius, Travels, page 297; Korte, Reis. page 437), is an annual shrub two or three feet high, but when cultivated (Olivier, Trav. 2:461) it becomes a bush from three to five feet in height. The stalks are reddish at the bottom, the branches short, furry, and speckled with black spots; the leaves are dark green, large, five-lobed, and weak. The flowers spring from the junction of the leaves with the stem; they are bell-shaped, pale yellow, but purplish beneath. They are succeeded by oval capsules of the size of a hazel-nut, which swell to the size of a walnut, and (in October) burst spontaneously. They contain a little ball of white filaments, which in warm situations attains the size of an apple. Imbedded in this are seven little egg- shaped, woolly seeds, of a brown or black-gray color, which contain an oily kernel. The Gossypium arboreunr (δένδρον ἐπιοφόριον of Theophrastus) was anciently (see Theoph. Plant. 4:9, page 144, ed. Schneider), and still is indigenous in Asia (i.e., India), and attains a height of about twelve feet, but differs very little as to the leaves, blossoms, or fruit from the herbaceous cotton. See generally Belon, in Paulus's Samml.  1:214 sq.; Kurrer, in the Hall. Encykl. 8:209 sq., Oken, Lehrb. d. Neaturgesch. II, 2:1262 sq.; Ainslie, Mater. Ind. page 282 sq.; Ritter, Erdk. 7:1058 sq.

## Linfield, WILLIAM F. M., D.D[[@Headword:Linfield, WILLIAM F. M., D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born at Charleston, S.C., August 25. 1824. He was converted in 1849, in 1851 entered the Alabama Conference, in which and adjoining conferences he labored, with but one year's intermission, until his death, March 16, 1882. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1882, page 115.

## Linga[[@Headword:Linga]]

             (a Sanscrit word which literally means a sign or symbol) denotes, in the sectarian worship of the Hindus, the phallus, as an emblem of the male or generative power of nature. The Linga-worship prevails with the Saivas, or adorers of Siva. SEE HINUISMI.

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

## Lingam[[@Headword:Lingam]]

             SEE LINGA.

## Lingard, John, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Lingard, John, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Roman Catholic priest, and one of the most eminent. of modern historians, was born at Winchester, England, February 5, 1771. He studied at the Roman Catholic College of Douai, France, and remained there until obliged by the horrors of the French Revolution to return to England. The college was finally settled at Ushaw, near the city of Durham. and Mr. Lingard there performed the duties of some of its offices. He revisited  France for a short time during the dangerous period of the Revolution, and on one occasion barely escaped being mobbed as a priest. In 1805 he wrote for the Newcastle Courant a series of letters, which were collected and published under the title of Catholic Loyalty vindicated (12mo). He afterwards wrote several controversial pamphlets, which in 1813 were published in a volume having the title of Tracts on several Subjects connected with the Civil and Religious Principles of the Catholics (reprinted by F. Lucas, Jr., at Baltimore, 1823, 12mo, and often). Dr. Lingard's great work, however, is hi is History of England from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of William and Mary in 1688 (Londaon, 181925, 6 volumes, 4to; 2d edit. 1823-31, 14 volumes, 8vo; 4th edit. 1837, 13 volumes, 12mo; 5th ed. 1849-50, 10 volumes, 8vo; 6th ed. 1854-55, 10 volumes, 8vo; American editions, published by Dunigan, N.Y., 13 volumes, 12mo; by Sampson & Co., of Boston, 1853-54, 13 volumes, 12mo, of which the last is the best).

It is a work of great research, founded on ancient writers and original documents, displaying much erudition and acuteness, and opening fields of inquiry previously unexplored. The narrative is clear, the dates are accurately given, and the authorities referred to distinctly. The style is perspicuous, terse, and unostentatious. The work, perhaps, exhibits too exclusively the great facts and circumstances, military, civil, and ecclesiastical, and enters less than might be desirable into the manners, customs, arts, and condition of the people. In all matters connected with the Romish Church the work is, as might have been expected, colored by the very decided religious opinions of the author, but these are not offensively set forth. Dr. Lingard, after the completion of his "History of England," paid a visit to Rome, where pope Leo XII offered to make him cardinal, but he refused the dignity, partly because he did not feel qualified for the office, and partly because it would have interfered with his favorite studies. He spent the last forty years of his life in the small preferment belonging to the Roman Catholic church at the village of Hornby, near Lancaster, enjoying the esteem and friendship of all, both Protestants and Roman Catholics. He died July 13, 1851, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Cuthbert's College, at Ushaw, to which institution he bequeathed his library. Lingard was also the author of Catechetical Instructions on the Doctrines and Worship of the Catholic Church (2d edit. Lond. 1840, 12mo; 3d edit. 1844, 18mo): — A Review of certain Anti-Catholic Publications (Lond. 1813, 8vo): — Examination of certain Opinions advanced by Bishop Burgess (anon.) (Manchester, 1813, 8vo): — Scriptures on Dr. Marsh's Comparative View of the Churches of  England and Rome (Lond. 1815, 8vo): — Observations on the Laws and Ordinances which exist in Foreign States relative to the Religious Concerns of their Roman Catholic Subjects (anon.) (Lond. 1817. 8vo): — Documents to ascertain the Sentinments of British Catholics in former Ages respecting the Power of the Popes (Lond. 1819, 8vo): — The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church (Lond. 1806; 1845, 2 volumes, 8vo; Philippians 1841, 12mo). In 1836 he published anonymously an English translation of the N.T., which is said to be accurate and faithful in several passages where the Douai translation is faulty. See Engl. Cycl. . 5; the London Times (July 25, 1851); Gentleman's Magazine (September 1851, page 323 sq.); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. volume 8, s.v.; Lowndes, Brit. Lib. page 1096 sq.; Brit. and For. Rev. 1844, page 374 sq.; and the excellent article in Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1102-1105. (J.H.W.)

## Lingayets[[@Headword:Lingayets]]

             SEE JANGAMAS.

## Lingendes, Claude de[[@Headword:Lingendes, Claude de]]

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

## Lingendes, Jean de[[@Headword:Lingendes, Jean de]]

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

## Link, Johann Wolfgang Conrad[[@Headword:Link, Johann Wolfgang Conrad]]

             a German theologian, was born at Pirmasens April 23, 1753. In 1771 he entered the University of Giessen, and in 1774 was graduated A.M. In 1775 he obtained the chair of philosophy at that university as professor extraordinary, and in 1778 he became pastor at Bischofsheim, near Darmstadt. He died suddenly December 23, 1788. In addition to his theological researches, his extensive knowledge of modern languages enabled him to translate English works into German and German productions into English, the latter for the "Universal English Library." Of his own compositions we mention Ueber das hebrische Sprachstudieum  (Giess. 1777, 8vo): — Diss. de Schilo a Jacobo predicto Genes. 49, 10 (ibid, 1774, 4to). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl. volume 2, s.v.

## Link, Wenceslaus[[@Headword:Link, Wenceslaus]]

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

## Linn, James, D.D[[@Headword:Linn, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Sherman's Valley (now Perry County), Pennsylvania, September 4, 1783. He graduated at Dickinson College in 1805, and studied theology with Dr. Williams. He was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Carlisle, September 27, 1809, visited the congregations of Spruce Creek and Sinking Valley, and was ordained pastor in 1810. He was called to take charge of the churches of Bellefonte and Lick Run, but in 1839 was released from the latter, that lhe might give his whole time to the former. In 1861 Reverend J.H. Barnard was appointed co-pastor. Dr. Linn died at Bellefonte, February 23, 1868. See Presbyterian, March 14, 1868. (W.P.S.)

## Linn, John Blair[[@Headword:Linn, John Blair]]

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

## Linn, William[[@Headword:Linn, William]]

             D.D., a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born near Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, February 27, 1752. He graduated from Princeton College in 1772 with honor, studied divinity with Reverend Dr. Robert Cooper, of  Middle Spring, Pennsylvania, and in 1775 was licensed to preach by Donegal Presbytery. Fired with the patriotism of the Revolution, he became a chaplain in Genesis Thompson's regiment, and was ordained to the ministry at this period. His regiment being soon ordered to Canada, for domestic reasons he resigned his chaplaincy. After a brief settlement at Big Spring, he taught an academy in Somerset County, Maryland, with success, until in 1786 he became pastor of a Presbyterian church at Elizabethtown, N.J., from whence he removed to New York in the same year as one of the pastors of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church. He was full of genius and power. His sermons were written, and committed to memory. His delivery was graceful, natural, animated, and accompanied by that electric power which thrills and sways an audience. His imagination was vivid, his language choice and classical, and his pictorial ability remarkable. He was celebrated for his missionary and charitable discourses. "Earnest, pathetic, persuasive, and alarming in his addresses, he peculiarly excelled in awakening sinners and urging them to the refuge of the Gospel. On special occasions he shone with conspicuous luster, ad rose above himself." In consequence of the failure of his health, he retired from the active ministry in 1805, and died at Albany January 8, 1808. Among his published addresses are some of his celebrated missionary and charity sermons, historical discourses, controversial sermons, a eulogy on Washington, delivered before the New York State Society of the Cincinnati, and a sermon preached in 1776 to a regiment of soldiers who were about to join the army. — Sprague, Annals, volume 9; Dr. De Witt's Historical Discourse; Dr. Bradford's Funeral Sermon, etc. (W.J.R.T.)

## Linsley, Joel H., D.D[[@Headword:Linsley, Joel H., D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Cornwall, Vermont. July 16, 1790. Under private tuition, and afterwards at the Addison County Grammar- school, he acquired his preliminary training, and graduated from Middlebury College in 1811. For a year he taught school in Windsor, and in 1812 began the study of law. In 1813 he was appointed tutor in Middlebury College, holding that position for more than two years, still prosecuting his legal studies. He was admitted to the bar in December, 1815, went into a law partnership, and continued in-practice until 1822. Previously, in 1812, he was licensed to preach, and for a time studied at Andover Theological Seminary. After eight months of missionary labor in South Carolina he returned to New England, was ordained, in 1824, pastor of the South Congregational Church in Hartford, Connecticut, and remained until 1832, in which year he was installed pastor of the Park Street Church, Boston. He resigned to assume the presidency of Marietta College in 1835, and held that position for about ten years. Then for two years he was in the service of the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West. In December 1847, he became pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Greenwich; Connecticut, and died there March 22, 1868. He published a volume of lectures on the Relations and Duties of the Middle Aged, besides orations, addresses, reviews, and sermons. See Cong. Quarterly, 1868, page 380.

## Lintel[[@Headword:Lintel]]

             (prop. מִשְׁקוֹŠ, mashkoph', lit. a projecting cover; Exo 12:22; Exo 12:33; "upper door-post," Exo 12:7; also כִּפְתֹּר, kaphtor', a chaplet, i.e., capital of a column, Amo 9:1; Zep 2:14; elsewhere a "knop" of the candelabrum; and אִיַל, a'yil, a "ram," as often; hence a pilaster or pillar in a wall, 1Ki 6:31, elsewhere "post"), the head-piece of a door, or the horizontal beam covering the side-posts or jambs. SEE POST. This the Israelites were commanded to mark with the blood of the paschal lamb on the memorable occasion when the Passover was instituted. SEE PASSOVER.

## Lintner, George A., D.D[[@Headword:Lintner, George A., D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born at Minden, Montgomery County, N.Y., February 15, 1796. At an early age he was admitted to Union College. After graduation he studied theology, and was licensed to preach in September 1818. The following year he accepted a call to the pastorate of Schoharie and Cobleskill. He was one of the recognized leaders of his synod in opposition to what he called the "Quitman Dynasty of Rationalism." After a time he and others became dissatisfied with the old synod, and at a convention, in 1830, at Schoharie, the Hartwick Synod was organized, of which he was chosen the first president. In 1837 certain members of this synod withdrew, and formed the Franckean Synod, on the widest latitudinarian basis. The movement was revolutionary, and led to controversy and contests in the courts. le was pastor of the Church in Schoharie until 1849, a period of thirty years. From 1827 to 1831 he was editor of the Lutheran Magazine. In 1841 and 1843 he was president of  the General Synod of the United States. The liturgy of the Lutheran Church of America, published by order of the General Synod of 1832, was prepared by him. During his ministry he organized three new churches as the result of his work — one at Breakabeen, one at Middleburg, and another at Central Bridge. From 1837 until the close of his life he was president of the Schoharie County Bible Society. The last years of his life he visited the Lutheran churches in New York and New Jersey in behalf of the Foreign Missionary Society. He died December 21, 1871. See Five Years in the Lutheran Ministry, 1878, page 206.

## Lintrup, Severin[[@Headword:Lintrup, Severin]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Denmark, who died March 13, 1731, at Copenhagen, was bishop of Wiburg, in Jutland, in 1720, and in 1725 courtpreacher and professor of theology. He wrote, Specimen Calunniae- Papeo-Calviniance in Avgust. Confess. Invariatamn: — De θηριομαχίᾷ Paulina 1Co 15:32 : — De Polymathia Scriptorun Sacrorum, Speciatim Pauli Apostoli: — AeMeletemata Critica iv ad Selectiora N.T. Loca, etc. See Moller, Cimbria Litterara; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Linus[[@Headword:Linus]]

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

According to the Roman Breviary, Linus was born at Volterra, but an old papal catalogue represents him as an Etrurian. According to tradition, he went to Rome when 22 years of age, made there the acquaintance of Peter, and was sent by him to Besanqon, in France, to preach the Gospel. After his return to Rome Peter appointed him his coadjutor; but, according to the Breviary, he was the one who prinus post Petrum gubernavit ecclesiam. He is said to have enacted, on his accession to the bishopric, that, in  accordance with 1Co 11:5, women should never enter the church with their heads uncovered.

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

"The statement of Ruffinus, that Linus and Cletus were bishops in Rome while St. Peter was alive, has been quoted in support of a theory which sprang up in the 17th century, received the sanction even of Hammond in his controversy with Blondel (Works, ed. 1684, 4:825; Episcopatus Jura, 5:1, § 11), was held with some slight modification by Baraterius, and has recently been revived. It is supposed that Linus was bishop in Rome only of the Christians of Gentile origin, while at the same time another bishop exercised the same authority over the Jewish Christians there. 'Tertullian's assertion (De Prescr. Haeret. § 32) that Clement [the third bishop] of Rome was consecrated by St. Peter has been quoted also as corroborating this theory, but it does not follow from the words of Tertullian that Clement's consecration took place immediately before he became bishop of Rome; and the statement of Ruffinns, so far as it lends any support to the above-named theory, is shown to be without foundation by Pearson (2:3, 4). Tilemont's observations (page 590) in reply to Pearson only show that the establishment of two contemporary bishops in one city was contemplated in ancient times as a possible provisional arrangement to meet certain temporary difficulties. The actual limitation of the authority of Linus to a section of the Church in Rome remains to be proved. Ruffinus's statement ought, doubtless, to be interpreted in accordance with that of his contemporary Epiphanius (Adv. Haer. 27:6, page 107), to the effect that Linus and Cletus were bishops of Rome in succession, not contemporaneously. The facts were, however, differently viewed, (1) by an interpolator of the Gesta Pontificum Damasi, quoted by J. Voss in his second epistle to A. Rivet (App. to Pearson's Vindiciae Ignatiane); (2) by  Bede (Vita S. Benedlicti, § 7, page 146, edit. Stevenson), when he was seeking a precedent for two colltemporaneous abbots presiding in one monastery and (3) by Rabanus Malrtns (De Chorepiscopis, in Opp. ed. Migne, 4:1197), who ingeniously claims primitive authority for the institution of chorepiscopi on the suppossition that Linus and Cietus were never bishops with full powers, but were contemporaneous chorepiscopi employed by St. Peter in his absence from Rome, and at his request, to ordain clergymen for the Church at Rome."

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

## Linz Or Lintz, The Peace Of[[@Headword:Linz Or Lintz, The Peace Of]]

             so named after the place where it was concluded, December 13, 1645, between Rakoczy, prince of Transylvania, and the emperor Ferdinand III, as king of Hungary, was an event of great importance for the legal existence of the Evangelical Church in Hungary. Rakoczy, who aimed at the crown of that country, and relied on the Protestant party for support, had concluded in April 1643, with Sweden and France, a defensive and offensive alliance against Ferdinand. In an address to the Hungarians, in which he enumerated their various grievances, he laid great stress on the oppression of the evangelical party. He succeeded in assembling an army, and in obtaining John Kemenyi, an experienced general, to command it. Sweden sent him soldiers under the renowned Dugloss, and France furnished him with large amounts of money. His troops obtained some unimportant advantages over those of Frederick, and the Swedish soldiers succeeded in driving the Imperialists out of several towns.

This, however, did not continue, and in October 1, 1644, Rakoczy began negotiations for  peace with Ferdinand. The advantages he asked, namely, the absolute religious liberty of Hungary, etc., were approved at Vienna August 8, 1645, and the peace finally signed as above. The most important feature of the treaty is the grant of religious liberty to the Hungarians. It gave permission to all to attend whatever Church they might choose; ministers and preachers of all the different confessions were to be left undisturbed, and such as had previously been persecuted and driven away on account of their religious principles were allowed to return, or to be recalled by their congregations. The churches and Church property taken from the evangelical party were restored to their previous owners. The eighth article of the sixth decree of king Wladislaus VI was re-enacted against those who infringed these regulations, and made them subject to a trial and punishment at the next session of the Diet. These regulations, however, so favorable to the Protestants met with great opposition at the Diet of Presburg in 1647, and were most violently opposed by the Jesuits. The Roman Catholics refused to surrender to the Protestants the churches they had taken from them, and the evangelical party finally agreed to accept, instead of some 400 churches which had been taken from it, the small number of 90, which had been assured to it by a royal edict, under date of February 10, 1647. See Steph. Katona, Historia critica regum Hungaricorum, 22:332 sq.; Dumont, Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens, 6:1 sq.; J.A. Fessler, Die Gesch. d. Ungarn, etc., 9:25 sq.; Johann Mailath, D. Religionswirren in Ungarn (Regensb. 1845), part 1, page 30 sq.; Gesch. d. Evangelischen Kirche in Ungarn (Berlin, 1854), page 199 sq.; History of the Protestant Church in Hungary, transl. by J. Craig (Boston and New York, 1856, 12mo). SEE HUNGARY.

## Lion[[@Headword:Lion]]

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

1. גּוֹר, gor, or גּוּר, gur (a suckling), a lion's "whelp," a very young lion (Gen 49:9; Deu 33:20; Jer 51:38; Eze 19:2-3; Eze 19:5; Nah 2:11-12).

2. כְּפַיר, kephir' (the shaggy), a " young lion," when first leaving the protection of the old pair to hunt independently (Eze 19:2-3; Eze 19:5-6; Eze 41:19; Psa 91:13; Pro 19:12; Pro 20:2; Pro 28:1; Isa 31:4; Jeremiah 41:38; Hos 5:14; Nah 2:11; Zec 11:3), old enough to roar (Jdg 14:5; Psa 104:21; Pro 19:12; Jer 2:15; Amo 3:4); beginning to seek prey for itself (Job 4:10; Job 38:39; Isa 5:29; Jer 25:38; Eze 19:3; Mic 5:8); and ferocious and blood-thirsty in his youthful strength (Psa 17:12; Psa 91:13; Isa 11:6). This term is also used tropically for cruel and blood-thirsty enemies (Psa 34:10; Psa 35:17; Psa 58:6; Jer 2:15); Pharaoh, king of Egypt, is called a "young lion of the nations," i.e., an enemy prowling among them (Eze 32:2); it is also used of the young princes or warriors of a state (Eze 38:13; Nah 2:13).

3. אֲרַי, cari' (the pulleer in pieces, plur. masc. in 1Ki 10:20, elsewhere fem.), or אִרְיֵה, aryueh' (the same with הparagogic, also Chald.), an adult and vigorous lion, a lion having paired, vigilant and enterprising in search of prey (Nah 2:12; 2Sa 17:10; Num 23:24, etc.). This is the common name of the animal.

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

5. לִיַשׁ, la'yish (the strong), a fierce lion, one in a state of fury, or rather, perhaps, a poetical term for a lion that has reached the utmost growth and effectiveness (Job 4:11; Pro 30:30; Isa 30:6).

6. לְבַיא, lebia', or לְבַי, lebi' (lowcin/g, roaring), hence a lion, lioness (Num 24:9, Hos 13:8; Joe 1:6; Deu 33:20; Psa 57:4; Isa 5:29). Bochart (Hieroz. 1:719) supposes this word not to denote the male lion, but the lioness; and Gesenius (Thes. page 738) says this rests on good grounds, as it is coupled with other nouns denoting a lion, where it can hardly be a mere synonyme (Gen 49:9; Num 24:9; Isa 30:6; Nah 2:11); and the passages in Job 4:11; Job 38:39; Eze 19:2, accord much better with a lioness than with a lion.

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

As "king of beasts," "the lion is the largest and most formidably armed of all carnassier animals, the Indian tiger alone claiming to be his equal. One full grown, of Asiatic race, weighs above 450 pounds, and those of Africa often above 500 pounds. The fall of a fore-paw in striking has been estimated to be equal to twenty-five pounds' weight. and this, with the grasp of the claws, cutting four inches in depth, is sufficiently powerful to break the vertebra of an ox. The huge laniary teeth and jagged molars, worked by powerful jaws, and the tongue entirely covered with horny papilla, hard as a rasp, so as to crush the frame of the victim and clean its bones of the flesh, are all subservient to an otherwise immensely strong, muscular structure, capable of prodigious exertion, and minister to the self- confidence which these means of attack inspire. In Asia the lion rarely  measures more than nine feet and a half from the nose to the end of the tail, though a tiger-skin has been known of the dimensions but a trifle less than thirteen feet. In Africa they are considerably larger, and supplied with a much greater quantity of mane. Both lion and tiger are furnished with a small horny apex to the tail-a fact noted by the ancients, but only verified of late years (see the Proceedings of the Council of the Zoological Society of London, 1832, page 146), because this object lies concealed in the hair of the tip, and is very liable to drop off." Yet this singular circumstance has not escaped the attention of the Assyrians, and it is foiund represented on the ruined inscriptions of Nineveh (Bonomi's Nineveh, pages 245, 246).

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

"Lions are monogamous, the male living constantly with the lioness, both hunting together, or for each other when there is a litter of whelps, and the mutual affection and care for their offspring which they display are remarkable in animals doomed by nature to live by blood and slaughter. It is while seeking prey for their young that they are most dangerous; at other times they bear abstinence, and when pressed by hunger will sometimes feed on carcasses found dead. They live to more than fifty years; consequently, having annual litters of from three to five cubs, they multiply rapidly when not seriously opposed. Zoologists consider Africa the primitive abode of lions, their progress towards the north and west having at one time extended to the forests of Macedonia and Greece, but in Asia never to the south of the Nerbundda nor east of the Lower Ganfges. Since the invention of gunpowder, and even since the havoc which the ostentatious barbarism of Roman grandees made among them, they have diminished in number exceedingly, although at the present day individuals are not unfrequently seen in Barbary, within a short distance of Ceuta" (Kitto). "At present lions do not exist in Palestine, though they are said to be found in the desert on the road to Egypt (Schwarz, Desc. of Pal.; see Isa 30:6). They abound on the banks of the Euphrates, between Bussorah and Bagdad (Rassell, Aleppo, page 61), and in the marshes and jungles near the rivers of Babylonia (Layard,Nineveh and Babylon, p. 566). This species, according to Layard, is without the dark and shaggy mane of the African lion (ibid. 487), though he adds in a note that he had seen lions on the River Karûn with a long black mane. But, though lions have now disappeared from Palestine, they must in ancient times have been numerous. The names Lebaoth (Jos 15:32), Beth-Lebaoth (Jos 19:6), Arieh (2Ki 15:25), and Laish (Jdg 18:7; 1Sa 25:44) were probably derived from the presence of, or connection with lions, and point to the fact that they were at one time common. They had their lairs in the forests which have vanished with them (Jer 5:6; Jer 12:8; Amo 3:4), in the tangled brushwood (Jer 4:7; Jer 25:38; Job 38:40), and in the caves of the mountains (Son 4:8 Eze 19:9; Nah 2:12). The canebrake on the banks of the Jordan, the 'pride' of the river, was their favorite haunt (Jer 49:19; Jeremiah 1, 44; Zec 11:3), and in this reedy covert (Lam 3:10) they were to be found at a comparatively recent period, as we learn from a passage of Johannes  Phocas, who traveled in Palestine towards the end of the 12th century (Reland, Pal. 1:274). They abounded in the jungles which skirt the rivers of Mesopotamia (Ammian. Marc. 18:7, 5), and in the time of Xenophon (De Venat. 11) were found in Nysa."

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

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

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

"The terrible roar of the lion is expressed in Hebrew by four different words, between which the following distinction appears to be maintained: שָׁאִג, shâag' (Jdg 14:5; Psa 22:13; Psa 104:21; Amo 3:4), also used of the thunder (Job 37:4), denotes the roar of the lion while seeking his prey; נָהִם, nâham' (Isa 5:29), expresses the cry which he utters when he seizes his victim; הָגָּה, hâgâh,' (Isa 31:4), the growl with which he defies any attempt to snatch the prey from his teeth; while נָעִר, nâ'ar' (Jer 51:38), which in Syriac is applied to the braying of the ass and camel, is descriptive of the cry of the young lions. If this distinction be correct, the meaning attached to nâham will give force to Pro 19:12. The terms which describe the movements of the animal are equally distinct: רָבִוֹ, râbats' (Gen 49:9; Eze 19:2), is applied to the crouching of the lion, as well as of any wild beast, in his lair; שָׁחָה, shâchâh', יָשִׁב, yâshab' (Job 38:40), and אָרִב, arab' (Psa 10:9), to his lying in wait in his den, the two former denoting the position of the animal, and the latter the secrecy of the act; רָמִשׂ, râmas' (Psa 104:20), is used of the stealthy creeping of the lion after his prey; and זַנֵּק zinnêk' (Deu 33:22), of the leap with which he hurls himself  upon it" (Smith). "The Scriptures present many striking pictures of lions, touched with wonderful force and fidelity; even where the animal is a direct instrument of the Almighty, while true to his mission, he still remains so to his nature.

Thus nothing can be more graphic than the record of the man of God (1Ki 13:28), disobedient to his charge, struck down from his ass, and lying dead, while the lion stands by him, without touching the lifeless body or attacking the living animal, usually a favorite prey. (See also Gen 49:9; Job 4:10-11; Nah 2:11-12.) Samson's adventure also with the young lion (Jdg 14:5-6), and the picture of the young lion coming up from the underwood cover on the banks of the Jordan, all attest a perfect knowledge of the animal and its habits. Finally, the lions in the den with Daniel, miraculously leaving him unmolested, still retain, in all other respects, the real characteristics of their nature."

"The strength (Jdg 14:18, Pro 30:30; 2Sa 1:23), courage (2Sa 17:10; Pro 28:1; Isa 31:4; Nah 2:11), and ferocity (Gen 49:9; Num 24:9) of the lion were proverbial. The 'lion-faced' warriors of Gad were among David's most valiant troops (1Ch 12:8) and the hero Judas Maccabaeus is described as 'like a lion, and like a lion's whelp roaring for his prey' (1Ma 3:4)." Hence the lion, as an emblem of power, was symbolical of the tribe of Judah (Gen 49:9). Grotius thinks the passage in Eze 19:2-3, alludes to this fact that Judaea was among the nations like a lioness among the beasts of the forest; she had strength and sovereignty. The same type of sovereignty recurs in the prophetical visions, and the figure of this animal was among the few which the Hebrews admitted in sculpture or in cast metal, as exemplified in the throne of Solomon (1Ki 10:19-20) and the brazen sea (1Ki 7:29; 1Ki 7:36). The heathen assumed the lion as an emblem of the sun, of the god of war, of Ares, Ariel, Arioth, Re, the Indian Siva, of dominion in general, of valor, etc.; and it occurs in the names and standards of many nations. This illustrated Dan 7:4, "The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings." The Chaldaean or Babylonian empire is here represented (see Jer 4:7). Its progress to what was then deemed universal empire was rapid, and therefore it has the wings of an eagle (see Jer 48:40, and Eze 17:3). It is said by Megasthenes and Strabo that this power advanced as far as Spain. When its wings were plucked or torn out, that is, when it was checked in its progress by frequent defeats, it became more peaceable and humane, agreeably to that idea of Psa 9:20. A remarkable coincidence between  the symbolical figure of Daniel's vision and the creations of ancient Assyrian art has lately been brought to light by the researches of Lavard and Botta on the sites of Babylon and Nineveh. SEE CHERUB.

In Isa 29:1, "Woe to the lion of God, the city where David dwelt," Jerusalem is denoted, and the terms used appear to signify the strength of the place, by which it was enabled to resist and overcome all its enemies. SEE ARIEL.

The apostle Paul says (2Ti 4:17), "I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." The general opinion is that Nero is here meant, or, rather, his prefect AElius Cesarianus, to whom Nero committed the government of the city of Rome during his absence, with power to put to death whomsoever he pleased. SEE PAUL.

So, when Tiberius died, Marsyas said to Agrippa, "The lion is dead." So likewise speaks Esther of Artaxerxes, in the apocryphal chapters of that book (ch. 14:13), "Put a word into my mouth before the lion." There are some commentators who regard the apostle's expression as a proverbial one for a deliverance from any great or imminent danger, but others conclude that he had been actually delivered from a lion let loose against him in the amphitheater. That the same symbol should sometimes be applied to opposite characters is not at all surprising or inconsistent, since different qualities may reside in the symbol, of which the good may be referred to the one, the bad to another. Thus in the lion reside courage and victory over antagonists. In these respects it may be and is employed as a symbol of Christ, called the Lion of the tribe of Judah (Rev 5:5), as being the illustrious descendant of that tribe, whose emblem was the lion. In the lion also reside fierceness and rapacity. In this point of view it is used as a fit emblem of Satan: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (1Pe 5:8). On the subject generally, see Bochart, Hieroz. 2:1 sq.; Rosenmüller, Alterlft. IV, 2:111 sq.; Wemyss, Clavis Symbolica, s.v.; Penny Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Wood, Bible Animals, page 18 sq.; Tristram, Natural History of the Bible, page 115 sq.

## Lion-Worship[[@Headword:Lion-Worship]]

             was particularly prevalent in the city of Leontopolis, Egypt. The lion was the symbol of strength, and therefore typical of the Egyptian Hercules. The lion was also sacred to the Egyptian Minerva. In southern Ethiopia, in the vicinity of the modern town of Shendy, the lion-headed deity seems to have been the chief object of worship. He holds a conspicuous place in the great temple of wady Owateb, and on the sculptured remains at wady Benat, at the former of which he is the first in a procession of deities, consisting of Re, Neph, and Ptah, to whom a monarch is making offerings. According to Plutarch, "the lion was worshipped by the Egyptians, who ornamented the doors of their temples with the gaping mouth of that animal, because the Nile began to rise when the sun was in the constellation Leo." Mithras, which is a solar god, was represented with a lion's head. In his mysteries the second degree was that of the lion. Adad, the god of the Syrians, was seated on the back of a lion, which represents his solar nature. In South America the first discoverers found at Tabasco an image of an lion, to which the natives offered human sacrifices. Dr. Livingstone, in his Travels in Africa, mentions a tribe vwho believe that the souls of their chiefs enter  into lions, and therefore they never attempt to kill them; they even believe that a chief may metamorphose himself into a lion, kill any one he chooses, and then return to the human form; therefore when they see one they commence clapping their hands, which is their usual mode of salutation. SEE LION.

## Lioness[[@Headword:Lioness]]

             SEE LION.

## Lip[[@Headword:Lip]]

             (שָׂפָה, saphah', usually in the dual; Gr. χεῖλος), besides its literal sense (e.g. Isa 37:29; Son 4:3; Son 4:11; Son 5:13; Pro 24:28), and (in the original) metaphorically for an edge or border, as of a cup (1Ki 7:26), of a garment (Exodus 27:32), of a curtain (Exo 26:4; Exo 36:11), of the sea (Gen 22:17; Exo 2:3; Heb 11:12), of the Jordan (2Ki 2:13; Jdg 7:22), is often put as an organ of speech, e.g. to "open the lips," 1. to begin to speak (Job 11:5; Job 32:20), also to "open the lips" of another, i.e. ecause him to speak (Psa 51:17), and to "refrain the lips," i.e. to keep silence (Psa 40:10; Pro 10:19). So speech or discourse is said to be "upon the lips" (Pro 16:10; Psa 16:4), once "under the lips" (Psa 140:4; Rom 3:13; comp. Eze 36:3), and likewise "sinning with lips" (Job 2:10; Job 12:20; Psa 45:3), and "uncircumcised of lips," i.e., not of ready speech (Exo 6:12), also "fruit of the lips," i.e., praise (Heb 13:15; 1Pe 3:5), and, by a bolder figure, "the calves of the lips," i.e., thank-offering (Hos 14:2); finally, the motion of the lips in speaking (Mat 15:8; Mar 7:6; from Isa 29:13). By metonomy, "lip" stands in Scripture for a manner of speech, e.g. in nations, a dialect (Gen 11:1; Gen 11:6-7; Gen 11:9; Isa 19:18; Eze 3:5-6; 1Co 14:21, alluding to Isa 28:11), or, in individuals, the moral quality of language, as "lying lips," etc., i.e., falsehood (Pro 10:18; comp. 17:4, 7) or wickedness (Psa 120:2), truth (Pro 12:19); "burning lips," i.e., ardent professions (Pro 26:23); "sweetness of lips," i.e., pleasant discourse (Pro 16:22; so Zep 3:9; Isa 6:5; Psa 12:3-4). To "shoot out the lip" at any one, i.q. to make mouths, has always been an expression of the utmost scorn and defiance (Psa 22:8). In like manner, "unclean lips" are put as a represelntation of unfitness to impart or receive the divine communications (Isa 6:5; Isa 6:7). Also the "word of one's lips," i.e. communication, e.g. Jehovah's precepts (Psa 17:4; comp. Pro 23:16 : spoken of as something before unknown, Psa 81:6); elsewhere in a bad sense, i.q. lip-talk, i.e., vain and empty words (Isa 36:5; Pro 14:23), and so of the person uttering them, e.g. a man of talk, i.e., an idle talker (Job 11:2), a prating fool (Pro 10:8; comp. Lev 5:4; Psa 106:33). SEE TONGUE.

The "upper lip" (שָׂפָם, saphats', a derivative of the above), which the leper was required to cover (Lev 13:45), refers to the lip-beard or mustachios, as the Venet. Greek (μύσταξ) there and the Sept. in 2Sa 19:24, render it, being the beard (in the latter passage), which  Mephibosheth neglected to trim during David's absence in token of grief. The same practice of "covering the lip" with a corner of one's garment, as if polluted( (comp. "unclean lips"), as a sign of mourning, is allluded to in Eze 24:17; Eze 24:22; Mic 3:7, where the Sept. has στόμα, χείλη. SEE MOUTH

## Lipmann, Jomtob[[@Headword:Lipmann, Jomtob]]

             (of Mühlhausen), also called Tab-Jomi ( טביומי= יום טוב), a Jewish writer and rabbi of the Middle Ages, was born, according to some, at Cracow, Poland, but most authorities are now agreed that he flourished at Prague about the middle of the 14th century. While a resident of the Bohemian capital he brought forward his Nitsachon (נצחון, Victory), an important polemical work. It consists of seven parts, divided, he tells us himself in his preface, "according to the seven days of the week," and of 354 sections, "'according to the number of days in the lunar year, which is the Jewish mode of calculation to indicate that every Israelite is bound to study his religion every day of his life, and to remove every obstruction from the boundaries of his faith." In his treatment of the subject, the denial of the authenticity of the Christian religion, Lipmann does not adopt any systematic plan, but discusses and explains every passage of the Hebrew Bible which is either adduced by Christians as a Messianic prophecy referring to Christ, or is used by skeptics and blasphemers to support their skepticism and contempt for revelations, or is appealed to by rationalistic Jews to corroborate their rejection of the doctrine of creation out of nothing, the resurrection of the body, etc., beginning with Genesis and ending with Chronicles, according to the order of the books in the Hebrew Bible, so that any passage in dispute might easily be found. The work, which, as we have seen from its divisions, partook both of the character of a Jewish polemic and an O.-T. apologetic, was, until near the middle of the 16th century, entirely controlled by Jews.

They largely transcribed and circulated it in MS. form among their people throughout the world; and in the numerous attacks which they had to sustain both from Christians and rationalists during the time of the Reformation, this book constituted their chief arsenal, supplying them with weapons to defend themselves. About 1642 the learned Hascapan, then professor in the Bavarian University at Altdorf, was engaged in a controversy on the questions at issue between Judaism and Christianity with a neighboring rabbi residing in Schneitach, who in his dissertations frequently referred to this Nitsachon (a MS. copy  made in 1589), which Hascapan asked the privilege to examine. Refused again and again, he at last called with three of his students on the rabbi, when he pressed him in such a manner to produce the MS. that he could not refuse. He pretended to examine it, and when the students had fairly surrounded the rabbi, the professor made his way to the door, got into a conveyance which was waiting for him, had the MS. speedily transcribed, and only returned it to the rabbi after much earnest solicitation. The professor enriched it by valuable notes and an index and then presented the work procured in such a dastardly manner to the Christian world (Altdorf, 1644). It was rapidly reprinted, translated into Latin, corrected and refuted by Blendinger, Lipmanni Nizzacahon in Christianos, etc., Latine conversum? (Altdorf, 1645); Wagenseil, Tela ignea Saltane (Altdorf, 1681) ; Sofa, Liber Mischnicus de Uxore Adulterii Suspecta (Altdorf. 1674), Appendix, and others (see Wolf, Bibl. Jud. 1:347 sq.). Lipmann's personal history is to our day very obscure. Jewish historians represent him as having been among the prisoners arrested at Prague (August 3, 1399) for irreverent mention, etc., of the name of Jesus. What punishment he suffered is not known; certain it is that he was not one of the seventy-seven Jews who were executed on the day of the dethronement of kingWenceslaus (August 22, 1400), for he mentions the fact himself in the Nitsachon. See Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, 8:76 sq.; Fürst, Biblioth. Judaica, 2:403 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana, col. 1410-1414; Geiger, Proben Jüd. Velrtheidigung gegen Christliche Angriffe im Mittelalter in Liebermanzn's Deutscher VolksKalender (Brieg, 1854), page 9 sq., 47 sq.; Kitto, Cycl. Bibl. Lit. volume 2, s.v.

## Lipovniczky, Stephan Von[[@Headword:Lipovniczky, Stephan Von]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, who died August 12, 1885, bishop of Gross- Wardein, Hungary, took an active part in the political events of 1849. After the suppression of the Hungarian revolution he was condemned to death. Being pardoned by the emperor of Austria, Lipovniczky resumed clerical duties, and finally became the incumbent of one of the most important episcopal sees of Hungary. (B.P.)

## Lippe[[@Headword:Lippe]]

             sometimes also (but less properly) LIPPEDETMOLD, a small principality of Northern Germany, surrounded on the W. and S. by Westphalia, and on the E. and N. by Hanover, Brunswick, Waldeck, and a detached portion of Hesse-Cassel, extends over an area of 438 square miles, and has a population (1885) of 123,250, mainly belonging to the Reformed Church. The earliest inhabitants were the Cherusci; subsequently it was a part of the country of the Saxons. The first establishment of Christianity in that province dates back to Charlemagne. In the very beginning of his war against the Saxons, in 772, he took the castrum AEresburgum (probably Radtberg, on the Diemel, near the southern frontier of the principality), and there destroyed the statue of the idol Irmansaul. In 776 he went to Lippspringe, and the following year to Padrabrun (Paderborn), both on the  southern frontier of the province, obliging whole tribes of the conquered Saxons to receive baptism. In 783 Charlemagne again vanquished the Saxons in the great battle of Theotmelli (Detmold), in the very heart of the present principality. The Saxon army was entirely destroyed, and Charlemagne, in commemoration of this event, erected a church which is still in existence. The next Christmas he spent at Skidroburg-supra- Ambram, now Schieder, on the Emmer, where it is said he also erected a church. But his most important measure for Christianizing the country was his establishment of the bishopric of Paderborn, embracing the district of Lippe within its diocese, for which the house of the princes of Lippe furnished many a bishop.

The Reformation early found strong supporters in Lippe. The first city of the province to adopt it was Lemgo, moved to such a course by Luther's theses against indulgences. By 1524 the Reformation was further advanced in this part of Germany by the adherents it had gained in the town of Herford, adjoining Lemgo, where the works of Luther and Melancthon had been circulated freely. Foremost among Luther's supporters there were his colleagues the Augustine monks. One of them, Dr. John Drever, a native of Lemgo and a personal friend of Luther, distinguished for his learning and eloquence, was the first to preach the Gospel in Herford. In spite of the priests, the people introduced the singing of the German hymns of Luther into their churches, and all attempts to put an end to this by violence gave way before the unanimous will of the people. The first to take the decided step of separation was Moriz Piderit, a priest, and formerly one of the most determined adversaries of the evangelical doctrines, and by his influence the city was carried for Luther's doctrines. Lippstadt embraced them nearly at the same time. The monks of the Augustine convent in that city, who had sent two of their number to Wittemberg to be instructed by Luther, on their return preached the Gospel with great success to the people of Lippe and of neighboring places; and they so quickly advanced the cause of the Reformers, that when an inquisitor was sent to Lippe from Cologne in 1526 to stay the heresy, he found the evangelical party so strong that he gave up all attempts to control it, and returned to his home. In 1533 the town was besieged by the dukes of Cleves and Juliers, and the count of Lippe forced to surrender. The evangelical ministers were of course driven away, but it was not long before permission was granted for the preaching by Lutheran ministers again. After the death of the zealous Roman Catholic count Simon V, in 1536, the Reformation made more rapid progress in the  province. The landgrave Philip of Hessia and count Jobst von Hoya, two determined partisans of the Reformation, became guardians of the children of the deceased count, and caused them to be diligently instructed in the Protestant doctrines; and when, in 1538, both the nobility and the people loudly demanded a reform in the Church of the count de Hoya, John Timann, surnamed Amstelrodamus, and Adrian Buxschoten, both of Bremen, were called and sent to Lippe to frame a plan of evangelical church organization, which was submitted to the States and to Luther, and, upon approval (1538), it was promulgated throughout the principality, and Protestant ministers were everywhere appointed. Under John von Eyter, of Wittemberg, then general superintendent of Lippe, a new church organization was drawn up and printed in 1571, with the authorization of the authorities, and it is still in our day in force among the Lutheran communities of the country.

In 1600, during the reign of count Simon VI (ruled 1583-1613), who had imbibed Calvinistic views at the court of Cassel, Calvinism found an entrance in Lippe. It commenced by the appointment of a Calvinistic minister to preach at Horn in 1602. This preacher at once forbade the use of the Lutheran Catechism in the schools, administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in strict Calvinistic form, and established the Reformed mode of worship in spite of the local authorities and of the pope. In 1605 the same step was taken at Detmold, and was supported by the government, notwithstanding the opposition of the people and city authorities. In this manner Calvinism was established throughout the country, the nobility alone and the city of Lemgo remaining Lutheran. It was not, however, until 1684 that Calvinism was sanctioned as the state religion. In that year count Simon Henrich promulgated the Reformed ecclesiastical organization, which recognizes as its formula of confession the Catechism of Heidelberg, and is in force in our day. The city of Lemgo resisted these measures, and succeeded in obtaining in 1717 an edict assuring its inhabitants the fullest religious liberty, the right of appointing their own ministers, etc. But as Rationalism had obtained full control of the Reformed Church of Lippe in the 18th century, upon reaction towards the middle of the 19th century the whole country, including Lemgo, was subjected to the Reformed consistory, which, however, by the admission of one Lutheran member, became a mixed consistory. As an outline of doctrine, the Heidelberg Catechism was introduced.  In 1885 the principality numbered about 2700 Roman Catholics, 6500 Lutherans, 1150 Israelites; the remainder belonged to the Reformed Church. The latter is divided into three classes, at the head of each of which is a superintendent; at the head of the whole clergy is a superintendent general at Detmold. The supreme ecclesiastical board for both Reformed and Lutherans is the consistory at Detmold. The principality has 43 Reformed, 5 Lutheran, and 6 Catholic parishes; the Catholics belong to the diocese of Paderborn, in Westlphalia. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 8:423; Falkmann und Preuss, Lippesche Regesten (Lemgo, 1860-63, 2 volumes, 8vo); Falkmann, Beitrage zur Gesch. der Furstenth. (ibid. 1847-56); and his Graf Simon VI zur Lippe (Detm. 1869, volume 1). (A.J.S.)

## Lippincott, Caleb Atmore[[@Headword:Lippincott, Caleb Atmore]]

             a veteran Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Pemberton township, N.J., July 26, 1803. His parents were of Quaker descent, and he was brought up a moral youth, but was full of animal spirits, and fond of all the follies of the age. He was converted among the Methodists in 1825, commenced circuit work in 1829, and in 1830 entered the Philadelphia Conference, wherein he served Tuckerton Circuit, Warren Circuit, Newton, Frankford, Germantown, Philadelphia, and Asbury (West Philadelphia). He then, in 1842, was transferred to the New Jersey Conference, and was sent in turn to Birmingham Mission, Columbus Circuit, Northampton, Flemington, Bordenitown, Morristown, Flanders, Rahway District, Stanhope, Hackettstown, Cross Street, Paterson, and Union Street, Newark; then served as tract agent; was then sent to Hurdtown, Hope, Berkshire, Hurdtown and Longwood, and Chester and Denville, at which latter place he died, June 17, 1871. Mr. Lippincott was a man of remarkable powers of mind. He was a natural orator, possessed marvellous powers of description, overflowed with wit and good humor, and was pre-eminently a revivalist. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1872, page 34.

## Lippomani, Aloysius[[@Headword:Lippomani, Aloysius]]

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

## Lipscomb, Philip D.[[@Headword:Lipscomb, Philip D.]]

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

## Lipsius[[@Headword:Lipsius]]

             in his work Zur Quellenkritik der Epiphanios (Vienna, 1865), has shown that the work of Hippolytus against thirty-two sects, the conclusion of which is still extant under the title of a homily against the heresy of Noetus, is the basis of the Philosophoumena, and can, to, a large extent, be reconstructed from it. See also Schaff, Church History, vol. 1, § 125; Hare, Contest with Rome, p. 214; Neander, History of Dogmas, 1, 51; Milman, Lat. Christ. 1, 66 sq.; Lardner, Works, 2, 409 sq.; Herzog, Real Encyklop. 6:131 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 24, 777 sq.; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, 5, 376; and, for the Roman Catholic side, Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen Lexikonv 5, 210 sq.; Allgem. Real-Encyklop. d. Kathol. Deutschland, 5, 374. Early monographs on Hippolytus were written by Frommann, Intempret. New Test. ex Hippol. (Coblentz, 1765, 4to); C. G. Hianell, De Hippol. (Götting. 1838, 8vo); Heumann, Ubi et qualis episcop fuerit Hippolytus (Götting. 1737, 4to); Woog, Fragment. Hippolyti Martyris (Lips. 1762, 4to). On the earlier writings of Hippolytus, see Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature, 1, 158; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 6, 20-23; Lardner, Credibility of the Gospel History, 2, 35; Tillemont, Memoires, etc., 3, 104; Neander, Ch. Hist, cent. 3 pt. 2, ch. 2, § 7.

## Lipsius (2)[[@Headword:Lipsius (2)]]

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

## Liptines Or Lestines, Synod Of[[@Headword:Liptines Or Lestines, Synod Of]]

             (Conciliumi Liptinense). This synod was held at Liptina or Lestines, near the convent of Laubes, in Henegau, in 743, by order of Carloman, Bonifacits presiding. Four canons were published. The bishops, earls, and governors promised in this council to observe the decrees of the Council of Germany (A.D. 742). All the clergy, moreover, promised obedience to the  ancient canons; the abbots and monks received the order of St. Benedict, and a part of the revenue of the Church was assigned for a time to the prince, to enable him to carry on the wars then raging. (J.N.P.)

## Liquor[[@Headword:Liquor]]

             (דֶּמִע, de'ma, a tear, fig. of the juice of olives and grapes, Exo 22:29; מֶזג, me'zeg, mixed, i.e., highly flavored wine, Son 7:3; מַשְׁרָה, mishrah', maceration, i.e., drink prepared by steeping grapes, Num 6:3). SEE WINE.

## Lis (or Lys), Jan Van Der[[@Headword:Lis (or Lys), Jan Van Der]]

             an eminent Dutch artist, was born at Oldenburg, Germany, in 1570, but studied at Haarlem, under Henry Goltz, and afterwards went to Italy, where he studied the works of Paul Veronese and Domenico Pieti. His  subjects are principally taken from sacred history. The chief of them are a picture of Adam and Eve Mourning over the Body of Abel, and in San Nicolo, at Venice, is a celebrated painting by him, representing St. Jerome in the Desert. He died at Venice in 1629. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Lisco, Friedrich Gustav[[@Headword:Lisco, Friedrich Gustav]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born February 12, 1791, at Brandenburg. He entered upon his ministerial duties at Berlin in 1814, and died there, July 5, 1866, doctor of theology. Lisco was a prolific writer, and published, Predigten uber die Gleichnisse Jesu ( Berlin, 1828): — Die O febarungen Gottes in Geschichte und Lehre (2d ed. Hamburg, 1835): — Die Parabeln Jesu exegetisch-honiletisch bearbeitet (5th ed. Berlin, 1861): — Die Bibel mit Erklarungen, etc. (1852, 2 volumes): — Das christliche Kirchenjahr (4th ed. eod. 2 volumes): — Biblische Betrachtungen uber Johannes den Taufer (1836): — Die Wunder Jesu, exegetisch-homiletisch bearbeitet (2d ed. 1844): — Das christlich- apostolische Glaubenbekenntniss (4th ed. 1851): — Die Scheidelehren der protestantischen und romischen Kirche (1845): — Dies Irae, Hymnus auf das Weltgericht (1840): — Stabat Mater, Hymnus auf die Schmerzen der Maria (1843), etc. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:802-804; Winer, Handbuch der Theol. Lit. 2:87, 119, 123, 201, 306, 310, 357, 359. (B.P.)

## Lismanini, Francis[[@Headword:Lismanini, Francis]]

             a Socinian theologian, was born at Corfu in the beginning of the 16th century. He studied in Italy, joined the Franciscans, and a few years after became doctor of theology; removed to Poland, and was appointed by queen Bona, wife of Sigismund I, her preacher and confessor. He became also superior of the Franciscans of Poland, director of all the convents of the nuns of St. Clara, etc. The society of Andrew Fricesio and the reading of Ochin's works led him to question the authority of the Roman Church, yet he was not displaced on account of it, but continued in favor with the queen, and was sent by her to Rome, in 1549, to congratulate Julius III on his election as pope. On his return to Poland in 1551, Lismanini became acquainted with Socinius, and it is this association that no doubt gave rise to the mission with which he was entrusted by the king of Poland, ostensibly for the purpose of collecting works for the royal library, but in reality to study the position of the Reformation, and to report concerning it. Lismanini accordingly visited Padua, Milan, and Switzerland, where he finally left his order, embraced the Helvetic confession, and married. The king, fearing to be compromised by this overt act, broke all connection with him, ceased to supply him with funds, and Calvin, Bullinger, and Gesner in vain sought to obtain for Lismanini leave to return to Poland. It was not until 1556 that he was permitted to return, but the king's favor he never regained, notwithstanding the efforts of a large number of the Polish nobility in his behalf. His Socinian views on the doctrine of the Trinity served still more to bring him into discredit. As he attempted to make converts he was exiled from Poland. He retired to Konigsberg, where he became counselor of duke Albrecht. About 1563 he became distracted on account of family difficulties, and committed suicide by drowning. His chief production is Brevis Explicatio doctrinae de sanctissima Trinitate, quam  Stancaro et aliis quibusdam opposuit (1565, 8vo). See Bibl. antitrinitariorum, page 34; Bayle, Hist. Dict.; Friese, Beiträge z. Ref.- Gesch. in Polen, 2:1, page 247 sq.; Fock, Der Socinianismus, 1:145; Herzoog, Real-Encyklopädie, 10:426; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 31:356. (J.H.W.)

## List, Carl Benjamin[[@Headword:List, Carl Benjamin]]

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

## Litany[[@Headword:Litany]]

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

The term litany for a supplicatory form of worship among the pagans was early adopted by Christian writers. In the fourth century we find such occasions as litanies connected with processions, the clergy and people in solemn procession using certain forms of supplication and making special entreaty for deliverance. Whether anything of this kind would have been ventured before Christianity became a "religio licia" (A.D. 270) may be  doubted. The predominance of a Christian population, however, in certain localities, and the intervals of repose between persecutions, admit of their possibility at an earlier period. In these earliest developments, moreover, of the processional litany, whether before or during the fourth century, they rested, doubtless, upon an earlier Christian habit and custom — that of special seasons of prayer and supplication. These, in some cases, would be by the assembled body of believers in their houses or places of assembling; in others, for purposes of safety from the fury of their enemies, in their individual homes and places of abode. Certainly the Church was not wanting in such occasions during the first centuries of her existence, when the course pursued by the disciples at Jerusalem (Act 12:5), and for similar reasons would need to be repeated. Occasions of this particular kind would of course pass away with the passing away of persecution. But others of a different character would take their place. As early, indeed, as the times of Tertullian and Cyprian we find allusions to Christian prayers, and fastings, and supplications for the removal of drought, the repelling of enemies, the moderation of calamities; and later, in the fourth and fifth centuries, we find the same thing, on a larger scale and in a more formal manner. Theodosius, preliminary to a battle, spent the whole night in fasting and prayer, and in sackcloth went with the priests and people to make supplication in all the churches. So, again, in the reign of one of his successors, a solemn litany or supplication on account of a great earthquake was made at Constantinople. In these last cases, the element, to which allusion has been made, that of the procession, was undoubtedly present, and so continued until the time of the Reformation; the name litany, indeed, being sometimes used simply to describe this part of it. as where seven litanies are directed by Gregory the Great to proceed from seven different churches (see below). The processions of the Arians in the times of Chrysostom, and the counter movement, on his part, by more splendid and imposing ones, to detract from any popularity which the Arians may have attained in this way, are described by Socrates. It is not at all improbable that in somewhat the same manner the hymns of Arius became circulated in Alexandria in the early part of the fourth century, and found lodgment in the minds of the populace.

The prevalence of litanies in the Western Church may be recognized after the beginning of the fifth century; and during the time of Charlemagne we find allusion to large numbers of them, to be attended to as a matter of special appointment. The Council of Orleans, A.D. 511, expressly  recognizes litanies as peculiarly solemn supplications, and enjoins their use preparatory to the celebration of a high festival. In the Spanish Church, in like manner, they were observed in the week after Pentecost. Other councils subsequently appointed them at a variety of other seasons, till, in the seventeenth Council of Toledo, A.D. 694, it was decreed that they should be used once in each month. By degrees they were extended to two days in each week, and Wednesday and Friday, being the ancient stationary days, were set apart for the purpose. Gregory the Great instituted a service at Rome for the 25th of April, which was named Litacia Septiformis, because a procession was formed in it of seven different classes. This service is distinguished as Litania Major, from its extraordinary solemnity. The Litaniae Minores, on the other hand, are supposed by Bingham to consist only of a repetition of Κύριε ἐλέησον, the customary response in the larger supplications. "It was a short form of supplication, used one way or other in all churches, and that as a part of all their daily offices, whence it borrowed the name of the Lesser Litany, in opposition to the greater litanies, which were distinct, complete, and solemn services, adapted to particular times or extraordinary occasions. I must note, further, that the greater litanies are sometimes termed 'exomologeses' — confessions — because fasting, and weeping, and mourning, and confession of sins were usually enjoined with supplication, to avert God's wrath, and reconcile him to a sinful people." Du Cange cites a passage from the acts of the Colc. Cloveshoviense, A.D. 747, confirming the identity of litania and royatio, but showing that originally there was a distinction between litania and exomologesis. Johannes de Janua terms litany, properly, a service for the dead. But Du Cange, by the authorities he cites for the early litanies, hazards the assertion that they differ but little from those in modern usage. In the Western litanies two features are to be found not prevalent in the Eastern — the invocation of saints, and the appointment of stated annual seasons for their use, as the rogation days of the Romish, and the tri- weekly usage of the English Church. There is, indeed, mention made of an annual litany in commemoration of the great earthquake in the reign of Justinian. But the general and present habit of the patriarchate of Constantinople has been and is to confine such services to their original purpose-extraordinary occasions.

Freeman (Principles of Divine Service, 2:325) insists that in its origin the litany is distinctly a "eucharistic feature," a series of intercessions closely associated with the eucharistic sacrifice. So we find in the East, and so it  was originally in the West also, one most notable feature being the pleading of the work of Christ in behalf of his Church. In a Syriac form given by Renaudot, the priest, taking the paten and cup in his right and left hand, commemorates

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

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

As to the peculiar structure of litanies, which are prayers, certain features may be mentioned that distinguish them from other prayers (the collects and the so-called common prayers), for in the litany the priest or minister does not pray alone, the people responding after each separate petition. It is even not absolutely necessary that the minister should lead, as the whole may be divided between two choirs; for we must also notice that the litany, occupying a medium position between prayer and singing, may be sung or spoken, according to the custom of the place where it is used. Some compositors even — Mozart, for instance — sometimes treated it in the same manner as the usual Church chants (the Stabat Mater, Requiemn, etc.); but in this case, by losing the distinction between petitions and responses, the litany entirely changed its character. In the next place, it must be noticed that in all litanies preceding the Reformation there is great uniformity. They all begin alike — Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, and end alike — Agnus Dei, qui tollis, etc. In this respect they resemble the mass. A form of supplication somewhat resembling a litany exists in the Apostolical Constitutions; as the deacon named the subjects of petition, the people answered to each, Lord, have mercy. That of the Church of England begins with an invocation of the persons of the Trinity, but uses  the old invocations in its progress and close. In their original purpose litanies were connected with fasting and humiliation, and were therefore inappropriate to the festal character of the Sunday service. In this respect their usage has been changed, and they are now part of divine service not only on Sundays, but on the most joyous seasons of Christian commemoration, such as Easter and Christmas day. One of the last efforts, indeed, in this kind of composition is the litany of Zinzendorf for Easter morning. The ordinary arrangement of litany material may be described as, first, the invocations, where we find the greatest difference between Romish and Protestant litanies; these are followed by the deprecations, from which this kind of service originally took its predominant character; next come intercessions for various classes and conditions of men, the whole closing with supplications for divine audience, and blessing upon the worshippers. The litany of the Church of Rome is that of Gregory, with subsequent additions, especially in the material of invocation to the body of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and all the saints. There was an earlier form, bearing the name of Ambrose, agreeing in many respects with the Lutheran and English (see below). There was another, put in shape by Mamertius, bishop of Vienna, about the year 460, which was used by Sidonius of Arranque soon after, in connection with an invasion of the Goths, the annual usage of which the Council of Orleans enjoined. That of Gregory, however, composed during the next century, became the prevailing one, or rather the typical form of others in subsequent use.

The three different forms now in use in the Romish churches are called the "litany of the saints" (which is the most ancient), the "litany of the name of Jesus," and the " litany of Our Lady of Loretto." Of these the first alone has a place in the public service-books of the Church, on the rogation days, in the ordination service, the service for the consecration of churches, the consecration of cemeteries, and many other offices. The one called by the name of litany of the saints bears its name from the prayers it contains to the saints for their help and intercession in behalf of the worshippers. Almost every saint in the calendar of the Romish Church has his particular form in the litany. The people's response in the prayer is Orca pro nobis, "Pray for us." The litany of Jesus consists of a number of addresses to Christ under his various relations to men, in connection with the several details of his passion, and of a djurations of him through the memory of what he has done and suffered for the salvation of mankind. The date of this form of prayer is uncertain, but it is referred, with much probability, to  the time of St. Bernardino of Siena, in the 15th century. The litany of Loretto SEE LORETTO resembles both the above-named litanies in its opening addresses to the Holy Trinity and in its closing petitions to the "Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world;" but the main body of the petitions are addressed to the Virgin Mary under various titles, some taken from the Scriptures, some from the language of the fathers, some from the mystical writers of the mediaeval Church. Neither this litany nor that of Jesus has ever formed part of any of the ritual or liturgical offices of the Catholic Church, but there can be no doubt that both have in various ways received the sanction of the highest authorities of the Romish Church. Those of the Lutheran and English churches, which are very much alike, are derived from the same source, being shorter in that these invocations are expunged.

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

The litany of the German and Danish Lutherans closely resembles that of the Church of England and that of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, and needs, therefore, no special mention here.  The processional feature is still retained in the Greek and Roman litanies on special occasions, but is not their special accompaniment. Efforts towards its restoration in the English and American Episcopal Church have for the past ten years been in progress. Judging from the prevalent sentiment of the episcopate in both countries, and the tone of the last General Convention in this, the prospects of success are not very favorable. See Procter, Book of Common Prrayer, page 246 sq.; Palmer, Origines Liturgices, 1:264 sq.; Wheatly, Common Prayer, page 163 sq.; Dean Stanley in Good Words for 1868 (June); Coleman, Manual of Prelacy and Ritualism, page 392 sq.; Christian Antiq. page 661; Blunt, Dict. Doct. and Hist. Theol. s.v.; Eacdie, Ecclesiastical Dictionary, s.v.; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, page 353. SEE LITURGY.

## Litaolane[[@Headword:Litaolane]]

             There is a curious tradition among the Bechuanas in South Africa, to the effect that a monster of immense size, at a remote period of time, swallowed up all mankind except a single woman, who conceived miraculously and brought forth a son, to whom she gave the name of Litaolane. This son of the woman attacked the monster and was swallowed up alive, but being armed with a knife he cut open an outlet for himself from the belly of the monster, and thus he obtained deliverance, and all the nations of the earth in him. Thus saved, men sought, without success, to destroy their rescuer.

## Lite[[@Headword:Lite]]

             (λιτή), in the Greek Church, a procession accompanied with prayer, made on various occasions of public calamity and intercession. Forms of service on such occasions are given in the Greek euchology.

## Literae Clericae[[@Headword:Literae Clericae]]

             (clerical letters), a name given by Cyprian to letters written by a bishop in ancient times to a foreign Church, and which were sent by the hands of one of the clergy, usually a sub-deacon.

## Literae Encyclicae[[@Headword:Literae Encyclicae]]

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

## Literae Formatae[[@Headword:Literae Formatae]]

             or simply FORMATAE, are the epistles of bishops and churches to others of like character, and are so called because they are framed after certain prescribed canonical rules. There have been needless discussions over the fitness of the expression formata, and some would have it to be formalis (Suetonius, Domitian, 13); others will derive it forma, τύπος, seal (hence formata, τετυπωμένη, equivalent to sigillata), etc. Originally they were termed τετυπωμμένη, canonicae, but afterwards formatae. The adoption of a particular form was early necessary, in order to prevent the alteration of and tampering with letters, of which Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (t c.a. 167), complained, according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. lib. 4, cap. 23), as also Cyprian (Epist. 3). From the earliest times the brotherly union of the churches was cultivated by means of a regular correspondence, of which Optatus of Mileve says in the middle of the fourth century: "Totus orbis  commercio formatarum in una communionis societate concordat." The holy Scriptures themselves, namely, the epistles of the apostles, served as the first models. Letters of introduction and recommendation of brethren to the different churches were in the infancy of the Church the chief subject of this correspondence; these were called by the apostles συστατικαὶ ἐπιστολαί (2Co 3:1), literae commendatitiae.

They are mentioned by Tertullian (Adversus haereses, cap. 20), Gregory of Nazianzum (Oratio, 3), and Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. lib. 5, cap. 16), etc. The demand for such letters of recommendation became so numerous that it was necessary to frame regulations determining who was and who was not entitled to them, and in what form they should be written. The Council of Elvira, a. 305 (? 310), c. 25, that of Aries, a. 314, c. 9, etc., decided that bishops alone should be authorized to write them. Every traveler, whether laic or clerical, was to provide himself with one. It is said, cap. 32 (al. 34): "Nullus episcopus peregrinorum aut presbyterorum aut diaconorum sine commendatitiis recipiatur epistolis; et cum scripta detulerint, discutiantur attentius, et ita suscipiantur, si praedicatores pietatis extiterint; sin minus, haec quae sunt necessaria subministrantur eis, et ad communionem nullatenus admittantur, quia per subreptionem multa proveniunt" (see Conc. Antioch. a. 341 [? 332], c. 7, in c. 9, dist. 71; African. 1, a. 506, 100:2 [100:21, dist. 1], 100:5). The defense of the right of these members of the clergy to officiate was often withdrawn, as by the Conc. Chalcedon. a. 451, c. 13, in c. 7, dist. 71, etc. The form of the writings was taken from the apostolic models. Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, stated in the Council of Chalcedon, 451, that there was a formula established by the Council of Niceca, 325: "Nicaes.... constitutum, ut epistola formatae hanc calculationis sen supputationis habeant rationem, id est, ut assumantur in supputationem prima Graeca elementa Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, hoc est π. υ. α. quae elementa octogenarium, et quadringentesimum, et primum significant numerum.

Petri quoque apostoli prima litera, id est π... : ejus quoque, qui scribit, episcopi prima litera; cui scribitur secunda litera; accipientis tertia litera; civitatis quoque, de qua scribitur, quarta: et indictionis, quecunque est illius temporis, numerus assumatur. Atque ita his omnibus Graecis literis.... in unum ductis, unam, quaecunque fuerit collecta, summam epistola teneat, hanc qui suscipit omni cum cautela requirat expresse. Addat praeterea separatim in epistola etiam nonagenarium et nonunm numerum, qui secundum Graeca elementa significat ἀμήν." From these letters of recommendation must be distinguished the εἰρηνικαὶ ἐπιστολαί, literae pacificae, a kind of  letters of dismission (hence also called ἀπολυτικαί), stating that the giver was privy to the bearer's intention of traveling (c. 7, 8, Conc. Antioch. a. 382, c. 11; Conc. Chaelced. 451; Conc. Trullan. a. 672, c. 17, etc.). Formatae also contained the communications of one community to another, such as the information concerning the election of bishops, etc. (γράμματα ἐνθρονιστικά. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. lib. 7, cap. 30; Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. lib. 4, cap. 4); notices of festivals, particularly Easter, etc. (γράμματαἐορταστικά, πασχάλια, epistolae festales, paschales, etc.; Conc. Arelat. 1, a. 314, c. 1; Carthag. 5, a. 401, c. 7; Bracar. 2, a. 572, c. 7; Gratista. c. 24-26. dist. 3, "de consecr."). The publication of ordinations was also made by formate as circulars, ἐγκύκλια, ἐπιστολαί, circulares, tractorice. See.Du Fresne, Glossar. Lat.; Suicer, Thesaur. eccl. s.v. εἰρηνικός; F.B. Ferrarii, De antiquo epistolarum ecclesiasticarum genere (Meliol. 1613; and edit. (Th. Meier, Helmstadt, 1678, 4to); Philippians Priorii, De literiis canonicis diss. cum appendiae de tractoriis et synodicis (Paris, 1675); J.R. Kiesling, De stabli primitivae ecclesiae ope literarum communicatoriarum connubio (Lipsiae. 1745, 4to); Gonzalez Tellez, Kommentar z. d. Decretalen (lib. 2, tit. 22, "De clericis peregrinis," cap. 3); Rheinwald, Kirchliche Archäologie (Berlin, 1830). — Herzog, Real- Encykolop. s.v.

## Lith, Johann Wilhelm Von[[@Headword:Lith, Johann Wilhelm Von]]

             a German theologian, was born at Anspach, in Bavaria, February 4, 1678. In 1693 he entered the University of Jena, and became in 1694 A.M. In the following year he went to the University of Altdorf to continue his studies; in 1697 he studied at the University of Halle, and in 1698 he was admitted to the philosophical faculty of that university. His health failing, he was obliged to leave for his native city. In 1707 he became dean at Wassertrüdingen. In 1710 he accepted a call to his native city as preacher of a foundation and counsellor of the Consistory; in addition to this, he became in 1714 city pastor. He died March 13, 1743. Von Lith repeatedly declined calls to far higher dignities abroad. His polemics against Catholicism prove him to have been a man of wide knowledge and great acuteness; and his repeatedly reprinted sermons, and his valuable contributions to the history of the Reformation, give evidence of his success as a great preacher and historian. We mention Erläuterung der Reformationshistorie von 1524-28 (Schwabach, 1733, 8vo; 2d edit. ibid. 1739, 8vo): — Disquisitio de adoratione puntris consecrati, etc.  (Suabmzi. 1754, 8vo). See Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, volume 2, s.v.

## Lithomancy[[@Headword:Lithomancy]]

             (from λίθος, a stone, and μαντεία, divination), divination performed by means of stones. The stone used for this purpose was washed in spring water by candle-light, and the person engaged in divining, having purified himself, covered his face, repeated a form of prayer, and placed certain characters in a certain order. Then the stone was said to move of itself, and in a soft, gentle murmur to give the answer. SEE DIVINATION.

## Lithuania[[@Headword:Lithuania]]

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

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

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

## Lithuanian Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Lithuanian Version Of The Scriptures]]

             SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

## Litta, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Litta, Lorenzo]]

             a learned Italian prelate, was born at Milan, February 23, 1756. After studying at the Clementine College; in Rome, he was appointed apostolical prothonotary in 1782, in 1793 became archbishop in partibus of Thebes, and the year following departed for Poland as nuncio. In 1797 he went in the same capacity to Russia. He died May 1, 1820, leaving Lettres Diverses, etc. (Paris, 1809). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Litter[[@Headword:Litter]]

             occurs in the Auth. Vers. as a translation of צִב(tsab, from צָבִב, to move slowly), in Isa 66:20, (Sept. λαμπήνη), where a sedan or palanquin for the conveyance of a princely personage, borne by hand or upon the shoulders, or perhaps on the backs of animals, is evidently referred to. The original term occurs elsewhere only in Num 6:3, in the phrase צִב עֶגְלֹת(egloth' tsab, carts of the litter kind, A.V. "covered wagons"), where it is used of the large and commodious vehicles employed for the transportation of the materials and furniture of the tabernacle, being drawn by oxen. The term therefore signifies properly a hand-litter, and secondarily a wain or wheel-carriage. Litters or palanquins were, as we know, in use among the ancient Egyptians. They were borne upon the shoulders of men, and appear to have been used for carrying persons of consideration short distances on visits, like the sedan chairs of a former day in England (see Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1:73). In Son 3:9, we find the word אִפַּרְיוֹן, appiryon' (perhaps a foreign [Egyptian] word), Sept. φορεῖον, Vulg. ferculum, which occurs nowhere else in Scripture, and is applied to a vehicle used by king Solomon. In the immediate context it is described as consisting of a framework of cedar-wood, in which were set silver stanchions supporting a gold railing. with a purple-covered seat, and an embroidered rug, the last a present from the Jewish ladies.

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

## Little Christians[[@Headword:Little Christians]]

             is the name of a new sect, composed of members lately (1868) seceded from the Russo-Greek Church at Atkarsk, in the province of Saratof, and diocese of the bishop of Tsaritzin. The seceders from the orthodox Church, or founders of this new sect, were only sixteen persons in number. "They set up a new religion, and began to preach a gospel of their own devising." They condemned saints and altarpieces as idolatrous, and abandoned the use of bread and wine in the sacrament. Before they founded the new Church, which, they claim, Christ commanded them to do, they were immersed, and also fasted and changed their names. "They have no priests, and hardly any form of prayer. They keep no images, use no wafers, and make no sacred oil. Instead of the consecrated bread, they bake a cake, which they afterwards worship, as a special gift from God. This cake is like a penny bun in shape and size, but in the minds of these Little Christians it  possesses a potent virtue and a mystic charm" (Dixon, Free Russia, page 143, 144). The name they bear they gave themselves. Persecuted by the government, they have increased and are daily increasing in numbers. SEE RUSSIA. (J.H.W.)

## Little Horn[[@Headword:Little Horn]]

             SEE ANTICHRIST; SEE DANIEL.

## Little, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Little, Henry, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Boscawen, N.H., March 30, 1800. He was converted at six years of age, graduated at Dartmouth College in 1826, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1829. The same year he was ordained as a missionary under the auspices of the American Education Society, for labor in the West. In 1831 he became pastor at Oxford, Ohio, and two years later Western agent of the American Missionary Society; in 1838 pastor at Madison, Indiana, a position which he occupied for ten years. The rest of his life was devoted to home missionary work in the Presbyterian Church. He died at Madison, February 25, 1882. He was remarkably successful in pastoral labor, and in organizing missions and raising funds for their support.

## Little, Jacob, D.D[[@Headword:Little, Jacob, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Hampshire, May 1, 1795. He graduated from, Dartmouth College in 1822, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1825, preached at Hoosick, N.Y., and at Belpre, Ohio, in 1827 became Congregational pastor in Granville, in 1867 stated supply of the Presbyterian Church in Warsaw, Indiana, in 1874 removed top Wabash, and died there, December 17, 1876. See Nevin, Praesb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Littlejohn, John[[@Headword:Littlejohn, John]]

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

## Littleton, Adam[[@Headword:Littleton, Adam]]

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

## Littleton, Edward[[@Headword:Littleton, Edward]]

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

## Littre, Maximilien Paul Emile[[@Headword:Littre, Maximilien Paul Emile]]

             the leader of positivistm in France, was born in Paris, February 1, 1801. He at first chose medicine as his profession, and, though he did not practice, much of his varied intellectual activity was directed to the scientific and historical side of the subject; indeed, his first work of great importance was his edition and translation of Hippocrates, the first volume of which appeared in 1839, while the last came out on the eve of the appearance of his famous Dictionnaire de la Langue Francaise. In the same year, when his Hippocrates appeared, he was elected a member of the Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and in 1844 he took Fauriel's place in the company charged by the Academy with the continuation of the Histoire Litteraire, in which he did much good work. A great part of his time and energy was also taken up by his connection with Comte and positivism (q.v.). He himself was, by temperament, inclined not to polemics against religion, but to a kind of ignoring of it in favor of science; and he had translated Strauss's Leben Jesu within four years of its publication. He adopted positivism, as it at first presented itself, with vigorous partisanship, and produced in 1845 an excellent analysis of the Philosophie Positive. His subsequent refusal to follow Comte (q.v.) in his later excursions gave rise to the acrimonious polemic between the party of which he was the real chief, and the thorough-going disciples of the Politique, the Synthese, the Catechisme, and the rest. A very few years before his death, Littrd, in his "testament," expressed his attitude towards Christianity, in words from which it is evident that he had no hostility, nor even indifference, towards Christianity. He simply could not believe in it. It was an extreme inability, which his intellect could not overcome, as may be learned from his own words:

Some pious souls have troubled themselves about my conscience. It has seemed to them that, not being an absolute contemner of Christianity, and heartily acknowledging that it possessed grandeur and conferred blessings, there were chords in my heart that it might touch. It was a beginning of faith, they thought, to entertain neither hostility nor contempt for a faith which has reigned for many centuries over men's consciences, and which even now is the consolation of so many faithful souls. As I never experienced nor expressed repulsion or uneasiness in finding myself the subject of the feelings that I have just sketched, and as age and illness warned me of my approaching end as they have never abandoned the hope that I might experience the sovereign effect of divine grace, nor ceased to  appeal from the mature man, too proud of his strength, to the old man, henceforth accessible to the promptings of his weakness — I reply to these solicitations, without wishing to wound their feelings, by saying that I neither share their faith nor experience any misery at being unable to believe. I have questioned myself in vain. It is impossible for me to accept the conception of the world which Catholicism imposes upon its true believers; but I feel no regret at being outside these creeds. and I can feel within me no desire to enter within their pale."

And yet he died, June 2, 1881, within the pale of the Catholic Church, having shortly before his death been baptized. Besides the works already mentioned, Littre also published, Conservation, Revolution et Positivisme (Paris, 1852): — Auguste Comte et la Philosophie Positive (ibid. 1863): — Semites en Competition avrec les Ayens pour l'Hegemoncie du Monde (Leipsic, 1880). Compare Caro, Littre et le Positivisme (Paris, 1883). (B.P.)

## Liturgy[[@Headword:Liturgy]]

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

I. Jewish Liturgies. — This subject has, of course, its connection with the question of a similar state of things under the Jewish dispensation. Were there liturgical forms among the Jews, and, if so, to what extent? We find among the Greeks and Romans certain set forms in connection with their sacrifices, passing, it would seem, from mouth to mouth of successive priestly generations, and a usual form of prayer for the civil magistrate (Döllinger's Heathenism and Judaisnm, 1:221-225); among the sacred books of India, hymns and prayers to be used on stated occasions (Müller's  Chips from a German Workshop, 1:297); and in the Roman and in the Mohammedan worship, formula of a similar character (Lane's Mod. Egypt. 1:120 sq.). How was it in this matter with the Jews?

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

During, this period, however,  between the captivity and the times of the New Testament, there comes to view another ecclesiastical development of Judaism which has its connection with this subject — that of the worship of the synagogue. This, which in all probability originated during the captivity, and in the effort to supply the want occasioned by the loss of the worship of the Temple, would in many respects be like that Temple worship; in others, and from the necessity of the case, it would be very different. The greatest of these diversities would be in the fact of the necessary presence of the sacrificial and priestly element in the service of the Temple, their absence in that of the synagogue. In the Temple the Levites sang psalms of praise before the altar, and the priests blessed the people. In the synagogue there were prayers connected with the reading of certain specific passages of Scripture, of which are distinctly discernible two "chief groups, around which, as time wore on, an enormous mass of liturgical poetry clustered- the one, the Shelma ('Hear, Israel,' etc.), being a collection of the three Biblical pieces (Deu 6:4-9; Deu 11:13-21; Num 15:37-41), expressive of the unity of God and the memory of his government over Israel, strung together without any extraneous addition; the second, the Tephilla, or Prayer, by way of eminence (adopted in the Koran as Salavat, Sur. 2:40; comp. 5:15), consisting of a certain number of supplications, with a hymnal introduction and conclusion, and followed by the priestly blessing. The single portions of this prayer gradually increased to eighteen, and the prayer itself received the name Shemeonezah Esreh (eighteen; afterwards, however, increased to nineteen: the additional one is now twelfth in the prayer, and is against apostates [to Christianity] and heretics [all who refused the Talmud], including consequently the Karaites). The first addition to the Sheest formed the introductory thanksgiving for the renewed (lay (in accordance with the ordinance that every supplication must be preceded by a prayer of thanks) called lozer (Creator of Light, etc.), to which were joined the three Holies (Ophan), and the supplication for spiritual enlightening in the divine law (Ahabah). Between the Shema and the Tephillah was inserted the Geulahl (Liberation), or praise for the miraculous deliverance from Egypt and the constant watchings of providence. A Kaddish (Sanctification or Benediction) and certain psalms seem to have concluded the service of that period. This was the order of the Shaharith, or morning prayer, and very similar to this was the Maarsib, or evening prayer; while in the Minchalh, or afternoon prayer, the Shema was omitted.

On new moons, Sabbath and feast days, the general order was the same as on week days; but since the festive joy was to overrule all  individual sorrow and supplication, the intermediate portion of the Tephillah was changed according to the special significance and the memories of the day of the solemnity, and additional prayers were introduced for these extraordinary occasions, corresponding to the additional sacrifice in the Temple, and varying according to the special solemnity of the day (lMusssah, Neilath, etc.)" (Chambers). Compare Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literatures, page 367 sq.; Prideaux, 2:160-170. It is likewise to be noted that in the Temple worship there were occasions and opportunities in which the individual worshipper might confess the plague of his own heart, make individual supplication, or offer individual thanksgiving. Thus it was at the time of the coming of Christ. The Jewish liturgies since then, under the influence of Rabbinism, and in view of the fact that the synagogue, so far as possible, supplies the absence of the Temple, have been very much enlarged, and extend to numberless particularities. It may, in fact, be said that the whole life of the modern Jew is regulated by Rabbinic forms, that there is a rubric for every moment and movement of social as of individual existence. "The first compilation of a liturgy is recorded of Amram Gaon (A.D. 870-880); the first that has survived is that of Saadja Gaon (d. A.D. 942). These early collections of prayers generally contained also compositions from the hand of the compiler, and minor additions, such as ethical tracts, almanacs, etc., and were called Silddurimn (Orders, Rituals), embracing the whole calendar year, week-days and new moons, fasts and festivals. Later, the term was restricted to the week-day ritual, that for the festivals being called Machzor (Cycle). Besides these, we find the Selichoth, or Penitential Prayers; Kinoth, or Elegies; Hoshanahs, or Hosannahs (for the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles); and Bakashoth, or Special Supplications, chiefly for private devotion. The Karaites (q.v.), being harshly treated in these liturgies, especially by Saadja, have distinct compilations. The first of these was made by David ben-Hassan about A.D. 960 (compare Rule, Karaites, page 88, 104 sq., 118, 135 sq., 173 note).

The public prayers were for a long time only said by the public reader (Chasan, Sheliach Zibbur ), the people joining in silent responses and amens. These readers by degrees — chiefly from the 10th century — introduced occasional prayers (Piutim) of their own, over and above those used of yore. The materials were taken from the Halachah as well as the Haggadah (q.v.); religious doctrine, history, saga, angelology, and mysticism, interspersed with Biblical verses, are thus found put together like a mosaic of the most original and fantastic, often grand and brilliant, and often obscure and feeble kind; and the pure  Hebrew in manyy eases made room for a corrupt Chaldee. We can only point out here the two chief groups of religious poetry viz. the Arabic on the one hand, and the French-German school on the other. The most eminent representative of the Pajtanic age (ending c. 1100) is Eleazar Biribi Kalir. Among the most celebrated poets in his manner are Meshulam b.- Kalonymos of Lucca, Solomon b.-Jehuda of Babylon, R. Gerson, Elia b.- Menahem of Mans, Benjamin b.-Serach, Jacob Zom Elem, Eliezer b.- Samuel, Kalonymos b.-Moses, Solomon Isaaki. Of exclusively Spanish poets of this period, the most brilliant are Jehuda Halevi Solomon b.- Gabirol, Josef ibn-Abitur, Isaac ibn-Giat, Abraham Abn-Esra, Moses ben- Nachman, etc. When, however, in the beginning of the 13th century, secret doctrine and philosophy, casuistry and dialectics, became the paramount study, the cultivation of the Pint became neglected, and but few, and for the most part insignificant, are the writers of liturgical pieces from this time downwards" (Chambers). Comp. Zunz, Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters, page 59 sq. These liturgies, adopted by the Jews in different countries, were naturally subject to great variation, not only in their order, but also in their contents. Even in our day there exists the greatest variety imaginable in the synagogues of even one and the same country, due, in a measure, also to the influence of the reformatory movements. SEE JUDAISM.

Particularly worthy of note are the rituals of Germany (Poland), of France, Spain, and Portugal (Sefardim), Italy (Rome), the Levant (Romagna), and even of some special towns, like Avignon, Carpentras, Montpellier. The rituals of Barbary (Algiers, Tripoli, Oran, Morocco, etc.) are of Spanish origin. The Judaeo-Chinese liturgy, it may be observed by the way, consists only of pieces from the Bible. Yet, in the main body of their principal prayers, all these liturgies agree. As illustrative of these unessential diversities, we give the prayer of the Shemonah Esreh, which has been added to the number since the destruction of the second Temple, but which now stands as the twelfth, and shows its manifest reference to the followers of the Nazarene: "Let there be no hope to those who apostatize from the true religion; and let heretics, how many soever they be, all perish as in a moment; and let the kingdom of pride be speedily rooted out and broken in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who destroyest the wicked, and bringest down the proud" (Prideaux). "Let slanderers have no hope, and all presumptuous apostates perish as in a moment; and may thine enemies, and those who hate thee, be suddenly cut off; and all those who act wickedly be suddenly broken, consumed, and rooted out; and humble thou them speedily in our days. Blessed art thou, O  Lord, who destroyest the enemies and humblest the proud" (Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Prayer-book). That in the German and Polish Jews' Prayer-book is more brief, and less pointed in its application to apostates, i.e. Jews converted to Christianity. There are translations and commentaries on them in most of the modern languages. In the orthodox congregations, these forms of prayer, whether for the worship of the synagogue or for domestic and private use, are all appointed to be said in Hebrew. One of the best moves in this direction is the effort within the last century to remedy this evil by parallel translations. In this country the service-books in the synagogues are usually of this kind: either the Hebrew on one page and the English on the other, or both in parallel columns on the same page.

II. Early Christian Litiurgies. —

1. Their Origin. — So far as regards the primitive or apostolic age, the only trace of anything of that kind is the Lord's Prayer, and the Amen alluded to in 1Co 14:16; this latter an undoubted importation from the synagogue. As, moreover, we find the Master, with the twelve, singing a hymn, one of the psalms probably, on the night of the last supper, it is not improbable that such portions of Old-Testament Scripture, with which the early believers had been already familiar in the synagogue, should have still found favor in the Church. Even in free prayer fragments and sentences of old devotional forms, almost spontaneous through earlier use and sacred association, would naturally find utterance. This, however, would be the exception. Christian prayer, for its own full and peculiar utterance, must find its own peculiar modes of expression; and it would baptize into a new life and meaning and of those familiar expressions, the fragments of an earlier devotion. That men, however, who had been accustomed to liturgical worship under the old system should gradually go into it under the new, is not at all surprising; and to this special inducements before very long were presented. The demand for some form of profession of faith, of a definition of the faith, as dissensions and heresies arose, would be one of these occasions. The form of prayer given by the Master, in its present usage, would become the nucleus of others. The fact, again, that the most solemn act of Christian communion, the Lord's Supper, involved in the distribution of the elements a form of action, and that this action, in its original institution, had been accompanied by words, would have a like influence. That every thing in this respect, if not purely extemporaneous, was exceedingly simple in the time of Justin  Martyr, is very manifest from his own writings. The same remark is applicable to the statement of Pliny (Ep. ad Treaj. in Ep. 10:97).

2. Primitive Type. — The earliest form in which liturgical arrangement, to any extent, is found, is that which presents itself in the Apostolical Constitutions. The following is the order of daily service, as given in these Constitutions: After the morning psalm (the sixty-third of our enumeration), prayers were offered for the several classes of catechumens, of persons possessed by evil spirits, and candidates for baptism, for penitents, and for the faithful or communicants, for the peace of the world, and for the whole state of Christ's Church. This was followed by a short bidding prayer for preservation in the ensuing day, and by the bishop's commendation or thanksgiving, and by his imposition of hands or benediction. The morning service was much frequented by people of all sorts. The evening service was much the same with that of the morning, except that Psalms 140 (Psalms 141 of the present enumeration) introduced the service, and that a special collect seems to have been used sometimes at the setting up of the lights. SEE SERVICE.

This work, a fabrication by an unknown author, and taking its present form about the close of the third century contains internal evidence (see Schaff, Church History, 1:441) that much of its material belongs to an earlier date. It may be regarded as affording a type of the liturgical worship in use during the latter part of the anteNicene period. Bunsen (Christianity and Mankind, volume 2) has attempted to construct, out of fragments of this and other liturgies, the probable form of worship then prevailing. Krabbe, in his prize essay on this subject, regards the eighth book as of later date than the others. Kurtz, agreeing with Bunsen, substantially finds in this work the earliest extant form of liturgical arrangement, and the type of those of a later period. While, therefore, apocryphal as to its name and claims, yet in the character of its material, in its peculiarity of structure, in the estimation which it enjoyed, and in its influence upon later forms of devotion, it is of great historical significance. Taking it as it comes to our day, the eighth book contains an order of prayer, praise, reading, and sermon, followed by the dismissal successively of the catechumens, the penitents, and the possessed. After this comes the order of the Lord's Supper for the faithful, beginning with intercessory prayer, this followed by collects and responses, the fraternal kiss, warnings against unworthy reception of communion, with suitable hymns, prayers, and doxologies. Much of this material, as already hinted, is probably of a much earlier date than that of its unknown last  compiler. The hymn Gloria in Exselsis may have been the same of which Justin and Pliny speak, or an enlargement of it. This liturgy is remarkable, as contrasted with subsequent liturgies, in that it wants the Lord's Prayer. The general spirit and tone pervading all its forms afford grateful indication of the interior Christian life of that period.

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

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

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

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

(3.) The third and last of these liturgies is that of Caesarea or Byzantium, composed probably by Basil of Caesarea, and held to have been recast and enlarged by Chrysostom; but more properly, perhaps, both these are to be regarded as elaborations of that of St. James. They, moreover, have historical and moral significance in the fact that, through the Byzantine Church, they have been received into that of Russia, and are used in its patriarchates, each for special occasions, at the present time. Such additions, of course, have been made as have been rendered necessary through peculiarities of Greek worship, and accumulation of ritualistic minutiae coming into use since these liturgies in their original forms were introduced. They now contain expressions not to be found in the writings of Chrysostom: e.g. the appellation of in other of God, given to the Virgin Mary, which was not heard of until after the third General Council at Ephesus [A.D.431] — the body which condemned the doctrines of Nestorius — held 24 years after the death of Chrysostom.  From these Oriental liturgies have sprung others, variously modified to meet doctrinal and other exigencies. The largest number is from that of Jerusalem, the next from that of Basil. The most important is that of the Armenians, Monophysite, those of the Nestorians, and that of Malabar. For discussion as to the special origin of these subordinate forms, and the principles of classification, see Palmer's Origines Liturgicae, volume 1; Neale's Primitive Liturgies; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, book 4, chapter 1, sec. 6.

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

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

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

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

(4.) One other liturgical composition of some interest, dating from the close of the 4th century, is that of the Cathari, published by E. Kunitz  (Jena, 1852). It is of interest as giving a more favorable view of the community for which it was composed than had been previously entertained. It is to be remembered in connection with all these liturgies of the West, as already remarked of those of the East, that they are the names of many subordinate offshoots in use and prevalence in different portions of the Church. The discretionary power of the bishops, both at this and at earlier periods, to modify and adapt prevalent liturgies to peculiar exigencies of time and place, naturally produced after a time this kind of diversity. The ecclesiastical confusion of mediaeval times, and clerical ignorance and carelessness, would of course increase it. The traces, however, of the parent stock in any such case would not be difficult of recognition.

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

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

(1) the reading of holy Scripture, and

(2) the recitation of the Creed. In the Anaphora they are four, viz.:

(1) the Triumphal Hymn, or TRISAGION;

(2) the formula of Consecration;

(3) the Lord's Prayer; and

(4) the Communion.

These four great acts of praise, benediction, intercession, and communion gather around our Lord's words of institution and his pattern prayer, which form, in reality, the integral germ of the Christian liturgies. They are also  associated with other prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings, by which each is expanded and developed, the whole blending into a comprehensive service, by means of which the worship of the Church ascends on the wings of the eucharistic service, and her strength descends in eucharistic grace. The order in which these different portions of the liturgy are combined in the four ancient parent forms is shown by the following table:

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

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

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

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

1. The liturgy of St. John the Evangelist.

2. That of the three hundred and eighteen fathers present at the Council of Nice.

3. That of Epiphanius.

4. That of St. James of Sarug or Syrug.

5. That of St. John Chrysostom.

6. That of Jesus Christ.

7. That of the Apostles.

8. That of St. Cyriac.

9. That of St. Gregory.

10. That of their patriarch Dioscurus.

11. That of St. Basil.

12. That of St. Cyril.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

V. Continental Reformed or Protestant Liturgies. — At the time of the Reformation there were, of necessity, great changes in the matter of public worship. The liturgies in use at its commencement included the prevalent doctrinal system, especially as connected with the Lord's Supper; and very soon changes were made having in view the repudiation of Romish error, and the adaptation of reformed worship to the restored system of scriptural doctrine. The old forms, moreover, had there been no objection to them  doctrinally, were liable to the practical objection that they were locked up from popular use in a dead language. The Reformation, to a very great degree, had opened the ears of the people to the intelligent hearing and reception of Christian doctrine. Its task now was to open their mouths to the intelligent utterance of supplication — in other words, to provide forms of worship in the vernacular. This was done very largely by selection and translation from old forms, and, as was necessary, by the preparation of new material. With the English and Lutheran Reformers, the object seems to have been to make as few changes in existing forms as possible. Doubtful expressions, which admitted of a Protestant interpretation, but which, for their own merits, would never have been selected, were thus retained. It is to be said for the Reformers that they seem to have acted in view of the existing circumstances of the communities by which they were surrounded, and from one of them, the most eminent of all, Luther, we have the distinct disavowal of all wish and expectation that his work, in this respect, should be imposed upon other churches or continued in his own any longer than it was found for edification.

a. Lutheran Liturgies. — As first among the Reformers we notice these liturgical works of Luther. Different offices were prepared by him, as needed by the churches under his influence, the earliest in 1523, the latest in 1534. These were afterwards collected in a volume, and became a model for others. In his "Order of Service" provision is made for daily worship in a service for morning and evening, and a third might be held if desirable. These services consist of reading the Scriptures, preaching or expounding, with psalms and responsoria, with the addition, for Sundays, of mass or communion. He dwells earnestly, however, upon the idea, already mentioned, that these forms are not to be considered binding otherwise than in their appropriate times and localities. These views and this action of Luther were responded to by similar action on the part of the churches which through him had received the doctrines of the Reformation. These drew up liturgies for themselves, some of them bearing a close resemblance to that of Wittemberg, others differing from it widely; the differences, in one direction, being conditioned by the Zwinglian or Calvinistic element. in the opposite by the Romish. These, in particular localities, have been changed at different times as circumstances seemed to require.

No one Lutheran form has ever been accepted as obligatory upon all Lutheran churches, as is the case with the liturgy of the Church of England in all its dependencies; although it is claimed that there is essential unity — an  essential unity of life and spirit in all these unessential diversities as to outward form of particular states and churches. The tendency of the Rationalism of the last century was to neglect, to depreciate, and to mutilate the old liturgies, and then to procure changes which would substitute others in their stead. From this, and in connection with another movement, has followed a healthful reaction. This reaction may be seen in its effects upon the two great classes into which Lutheran Germany is now divided. It has controlled to a very great degree the efforts of the Unionists, has given form to the Union liturgy, and it is leading those who are opposed to this movement to a more careful study and diligent use of the older liturgies. The object of this new liturgy, that of the king of Prussia, first published in 1822, revised once or twice since then, is to unite the worship of the members of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in the Prussian dominions. The excitement connected with this movement, in the way of attack and defense, has given a deeper and wider interest to all liturgical questions — an interest deeply felt by the Lutheran churches of this country. Here, where the use of such forms is optional, the number of congregations returning to such use is on the increase. SEE LUTHERANISM.

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

b. Moravian Liturgy. — The liturgy of the Moravians, as recipients, through their great leader, of the Augsburg Confession, is not without its interest in this connection. It was first published in 1632. That which has been adopted by the renewed Moravian Church is mainly the work of count Zinzendorf who compiled it chiefly from the services of the Greek and Latin churches, but who also availed himself of the valuable labors of Luther and of the English Reformers. The United Brethren at present make use of a Church litany, introduced into the morning service of every Sunday; a litany for the morning of Easter-day, containing a short but comprehensive confession of faith; two offices for the baptism of adults, and two for the baptism of children: two litanies at burials; and offices for  confirmation, the holy communion, and for ordination; the Te Deum, and doxologies adapted to various occasions. All these liturgical forms in use in England are comprised in the new and revised edition of the Liturgy and Hymns for the Use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren (London, 1849). Other services peculiar to this Church, which are called "liturgies," consist mainly of a choral, with musical responsoria as a litany. This litany is for Sundays. There is a short prayer of betrothal, a baptismal office, also a form on Easter, used in the church-yards, of expressing their confidence in regard to the brethren departed of the year preceding. The daily service, which is in the evening, is a simple prayer-meeting. In this, as in the Sunday service, the prayers and exhortations are extemporaneous.

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

The present liturgy of Geneva is a development of that of Calvin, with certain modifications. It has no responses. Several additional prayers have been added. A distinct service for each day in the week is provided, also for the principal festivals, and for certain special occasions. So also as to the churches in sympathy with the system of Calvin. They have liturgies similar to that of Geneva, although not identical. Such is the case with the churches of Holland and Neufchatel, and the Reformed churches of France. A new edition of the old French Liturgy of 1562 was published in 1826, with additional forms for special occasions. The liturgy of the Church of  Scotland is in some respects different. It was drawn up at Frankfort by Knox and others, after the model of Calvin's, and was first used by Knox in a congregation of English exiles at Geneva. It was afterwards introduced by him into Scotland; its use enjoined in 1564, and such usage was continued until after his death. An edition of this liturgy was published in 1841 by Dr. Cumming. It differs from that of Calvin in that it more clearly leaves to the minister officiating to decide whether he shall use any form of prayer given or one of his own compositions extemporaneously or otherwise. It begins with the confession, as in Calvin's, and with the same form. This is followed by a psalm, by prayer, the sermon, prayer, psalm, and benediction. The book contains various offices and alternate forms; among other things, an order of excommunication. and a treatise on fasting, with a form of prayer for private houses, and grace before and after meals. The new book of Scotland of 1644 may be regarded as a modification of those of Knox and Calvin. In the Directory of the Westminster Assembly the discretionary power is greatly enlarged. Scriptural lessons are to be read in regular course, the quantity at the discretion of the minister, with liberty, if he see fit, of expounding. Heads of prayer in that before the sermon are prescribed, and rules for the arrangement of the sermon. The Lord's Prayer is recommended as the most perfect form of devotion. Private and lay baptism are forbidden. The arrangement of the Lord's table is to be such that communicants may sit about it, and the dead are to be buried without prayer or religious ceremony.

d. Intermediate between these two great families of liturgies, the Lutheran and Calvinistic, are those of the other Reformed churches on the Continent. It may be said, in general, that the German-speaking portion of these churches approach and partake of the Lutheran spirit and forms, and the Swiss of the Calvinistic, though there are individual exceptions. In 1523, the same year with Luther's work already mentioned, Zwingle and Leo Judah published at Zurich offices for baptism, the Lord's Supper, marriage, common prayer, and burial. This was followed by a more complete work in 1525, and subsequently by others. Similar works were published at Berne, Schaffhausen, and Basle at a later period. The peculiarity of these, according to Ebrard, quoted in Herzog, "is the liturgical character in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in which they compare favorably with the Calvinistic liturgies; also the custom of announcing the dead, and the special prayers for the festivals." The  liturgical issues which during this century have agitated the Lutheran Church have extended to those of the Reformed, not, however, to the same extent, nor with results of such decided character.

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

The first attempt in England to introduce e the vernacular was made in 1536, when, in pursuance of Henry VIII's injunctions, the Bible, Paternoster, Creed, and Decalogue were set forth and placed in churches. to be read in English. In 1545 the King's Primer was published, containing a form of morning and evening prayer in English, besides the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments, the Seven Penitential Psalms, Litany, and other devotions, and in 1547, on the accession of Edward VI, archbishop Cranmer, bishop Ridley, and eleven other eminent divines, martyrs, and confessors, were commissioned to draw up a liturgy in the English language "free from those unfounded doctrines and superstitious ceremonies which had disgraced the Latin liturgies;" and this was ratified by act of Parliament in 1548, and published in 1549. This liturgy is commonly known and cited as the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. In the great body of their work Cranmer and his associates derived their materials from the earlier services which had been in use in England; " but in the  occasional offices they were indebted to the labors of Melancthon and Bucer, and through them to the older liturgy of Nuremberg, which those reformers were instructed to follow" (Dr. Cardwell's Two Books of Common Prayer, set forth... in the reign of King Edward the Sixth, compared, page 14, Oxford, 1838). In consequence, however, of exceptions being taken at some things in this book, which were thought to savor too much of superstition, it underwent another revision, and was further altered in 1551, when it was again confirmed by Parliament. This edition is usually cited as the Second Prayer-book of Edward VI. it is very nearly the same with that which is at present in use. The two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552, with other Documents, set forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI, were very carefully edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. Joseph Ketley, M.A., at the Cambridge University Press, in 1844, in octavo. The two acts of Parliament (2 and 3 Edwiard VI, c. 1, and 5 and 6 Edward VI, c. 1) which had been passed for establishing uniformity of divine service were repealed in the first year of Queen Mary, who restored the Latin liturgies according to the popish forms of worship. On the accession of Elizabeth, however, the Prayer-book was restored, and has been in use ever since. For the later history of the subject, including liturgical books in England, Scotland, and America, SEE COMMON PRAYER.

Among the curiosities of the subject we notice the following:

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

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

VII. Literature. — Of bibliographical treatises on the literature of liturgy we may name Zaccaria, Bibliotheca Ritualis (Rome, 1776-8, 4 volumes, 4to); Guranegera , Institutions Liturgiiues (Paris, 1840-51); Ksecher, Bibliotheca Liturgica, etc., pages 699-866; Liturgies and other Documents of the Ante-Nicene Period (Ante-Nicene Library, Edinb. 1872, 8vo). Special works of note on the subject of liturgy are: J. Goar, Εὐχολόγιον, sive Rituacle Grecorum, etc., Gr. and Lat. (Par. 1647; Venice, 1740); Jos. Aloys. Assemani (R.C.), Codex Litur sicus ecclesiae universae.... in quo continentur libri rituales, missales, pontificales, officia, dypticha, etc., ecclesiarum Occidentis et Orientis (published under the auspices of pope Boniface XIV, Rome, 1749-66, 13 volumes); Euseb. Renaudot (R.C.), Liturgiarum Orientalium collectio (Paris, 1716; reprinted in 1847, 2 volumes); L.A. Muratori (R.C.), Liturgia Romana vetus (Venet. 1748, 2 volumes), contains the three Roman sacramentaires of Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory I, also the Missale Gothicum, and a learned introductory dissertation De rebus liturgicis; W. Palmer (Anglican), Origines Liturgicae (Lond. 1832 and 1845, 2 volumes, 8vo) [with special reference to the Anglican liturgy]; Thos. Brett, Collection of the Principal Liturgies used in the Christian Church in the celebration of the Eucharist, particularly the anccient (translated into English), with a Dissertation upon them (London, 1838); W. Trollope (Anglican), The Greek Liturgy of St. James (Edinb. 1848); Daniel (Lutheran, the most learned German liturgist), Codex Liturgicus ecclesiae universae in epitomem redactus (Lips. 1847 sq., 4 volumes; volume 1 contains the Roman, volume 4 the  Oriental liturgies); Fr. J. Mone (I.C.), Lateinische u. Griechische Messen aus dem 2ten bis 6ten Jahrhundert (Frankf. a. M. 1850), contains valuable treatises on the Gallican, African, and Roman Mass; J.M. Neale (Anglican, the most learned English ritualist and liturgist), Tetralogia liturgica; sive St. Chrysostom, St. Jacobi, St. Marci divina missae: quibus accedit ordo Mozarabicus (Lond. 1849); the same, The Liturgies of St. Mark, St. James, St. Clement, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, or according to the Use of the Churches of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Constantinople (Lond. 1859, folio, in the Greek original; and the same liturgies in an English translation, with an introduction and appendices, also at London, 1859); the same, Hist. of the Holy Eastern Ch. (Lond. 1850-72, 5 volumes, 8vo; Gen.Introd. volume 2); the same, Essays on Liturgioloqgy and Ch. History (Lond. 1863) [this work, dedicated to the metropolitan Philaret of Moscow, is a collection of various learned treatises of the author from the Christian Remembracer, on the Roman and Gallican Breviary, the Church Collects, the Mozarabic and Ambrosian liturgies, liturgical quotations, etc.]; Binterim, Denkwurdigkeiten d. Christ.-Kathol. Kirche, Freeman, Principles of Divine Service (Oxf. 1855, 8vo, enlarged in 1863); Mabillon, De Liturgia Gallicana, etc. (1865), Etheridge, Syrian Ch. Page 188 sq.; Coleman, Ancient Christianity Exemplified, page 284 sq.; and his Manual of Prelacy and Ritualismn (Phila. 1869, 12mo), page 275 sq.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, page 396 sq., 602 sq.; Siegel, Handb. d. Christl. Kirchl. Alterthümer, 3:202 sq., Augusti, Handb. d. Christl. Archaeol. 1:191 sq.; 2:537 sq.; 3:704 sq., 714 sq.; Blunt, Dict. of Hist. and Doctr. Theol. s.v., and Eadie, Eccles. Diet. s.v.; Bunsen, Christianity and Mankind (Lond. 1854), volume 7, which contains Reliquiae Liturgicae (the Irvingite work); Readings upon the Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Clurch (London, 1848-54); Hofling, Liturgisches Urkundenbuch (Leipz. 1854); Hefele (C. Jos.), Beitr. zu Kirchengesch. Archaeol. u. Litursgi (Tub. 1864), volume 2; Dollinger, Heathenism and Judaism; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2, § 100; Edinb. Review, 1852 (April): The Round Table, 1867 (August 10); New Englander, 1861 (July), art. 6; Mercersburg Review, 1871 (January). art. 5; Brit. and For. Miss. Rev. 1857 (July). (C.W.)

## Liutprand[[@Headword:Liutprand]]

             SEE LUITPRAND.

## Lively, Edward, D.D[[@Headword:Lively, Edward, D.D]]

             an English divine of the 16th century, was professor of Hebrew and divinity in the University of Cambridge, a learned Orientalist, and one of the translators of the Authorized Version of the Bible. He died in 1605. He published annotations on several of the Minor Prophets (1587): — and Chronology of the Persian Monarchy (1597). See McClure, Translators Revived.

## Liver[[@Headword:Liver]]

             (כָּבֵד, akbesd', so called as being the heaviest of the viscera) occurs in Exo 29:13; Exo 29:22; Lev 3:4; Lev 3:10; Lev 3:15; Lev 4:9; Lev 7:4; Lev 8:16; Lev 8:25; Lev 9:10; Lev 9:19; Pro 7:23; Lam 2:11; Eze 21:21. In the Pentateuch it forms part of the phrase translated in the Authorized Version "the caul that is above the liver," but which Gesenius (Thesaur. Heb. pages 645, 646), reasoning from the root, understands to be the great lobe of the liver itself rather than the caul over it, which latter, he observes, is inconsiderable in size, and has but little fat. Jahn thinks the smaller lobe to be meant. The phrase is also rendered in the Sept. "the lobe or lower pendent of the liver," the chief object of attention in the art of hepatoscopy, or divination by the liver, among the ancients. (Jerome gives "the net of the liver," "the suet," and "the fat;" see Bochart. Hieroz. 1:498.) SEE CAUL.

It appears from the same passages that it was burnt upon the altar, and not eaten as sacrificial food (Jahn, Bibl. Archaeol. § 378, n. 7). The liver was supposed by the ancient Greeks and Romans to be the seat of the passions pride, love, etc. (see Anacreon, Ode 3, fin.; Theocritus, Idyll. 11:16; Horace, Carri. 1:13, 4; 25, 15; 4:1, 12; and the Notes of the Delphin edition. Comp. also Persius, Sat. v. 129; Juvenal, Sat. 5:647). Some have argued that the same symbol prevailed among the Jews (rendering כְּבֹדַי, in Gen 49:6, "my liver," instead of "my honor," Sept. τὰ ἣπατακ; compare the Hebrew of Psa 16:9; Psa 57:9; Psa 108:2), but Gesenius (Hebr. Lex. s.v. כָּבוֹד) denies this signification in those passages. Wounds in the liver were supposed to be mortal; thus the expression in Pro 7:23, "a dart through his liver," and Lam 2:11, "my liver is poured out upon the earth," are each of them a periphrasis for death itself. tEschylus uses a similar phrase to describe a mortal wound (Agamemnon, 1:442). SEE HEART.

The passage in Eze 21:21 contains an interesting reference to the most ancient of all modes of divination, by the inspection of the viscera of animals, and even of mankind, sacrificially slaughtered for the purpose. It is there said that the king of Babylon, among other modes of divination referred to in the same verse, "looked upon the liver." The liver was always considered the most important organ in the ancient art of Extispicium, or divination by the entrails. Philostratus felicitously describes it as "the prophesying tripod of all divination" (Life of Apollonius, 8:7, 5). The rules by which the Greeks and Romans judged of it are amply detailed in  Adams's Romuan Antiquities, page 261 sq. (Lond. 1834), and in Potter's Archaologia Graeca, 1:316 (Lond. 1775). Vitruvius suggests a plausible theory of the first rise of hepatoscopy. He says the ancients inspected the livers of those animals which frequented the places where they wished to settle, and if they found the liver, to which they chiefly ascribed the process of sangnification, was injured, they concluded that the water and nourishment collected in such localities were unwholesome (1:4). But divination is coeval and coextensive with a belief in the divinity. Cicero ascribes divination by this and other means to what he calls "the heroic ages," by which term we know he means a period antecedent to all historical documents (De Dirinationze). Prometheus, in the play of that title (1:474 sq.), lays claim to having taught mankind the different kinds of divination, and that of extispicy among the rest; and Prometheus, according to Servius (ad Virg. Ecl. 6:42), instructed the Assyrians; and we know from sacred record that Assyria was one, of the countries first peopled. It is further important to remark that the first recorded instance of divination is that of the teraphim of Laban, a native of Padan-Aram, a district bordering on that country (1Sa 19:13; 1Sa 19:16), but by which teraphim both the Sept. and Josephus understood "the liver of goats" (Ant. 6:11, 4). SEE TERAPEISM. See generally Whiston's Josephus, page 169, note (Edinb. 1828); Bochart, 1:41, De Caprarum Nominibus; Encyclopaedia Metropolitanal , s.v. Divination; Rosenmüller's Scholia on the several passages referred to; Perizonius, ad AElian. 2:31; Peucer, De Praecipuis Divinationum Generibus, etc. (Wittemberg, 1560). SEE DIVINATION.

## Liverance, Galfrid[[@Headword:Liverance, Galfrid]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Dunkeld in 1236, 1239, 1247, and in 1249. He died at Tippermuir, November 22 of the last-named year. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 79.

## Liverpool Liturgy[[@Headword:Liverpool Liturgy]]

             SEE LITURGY.

## Livese Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Livese Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Livese is a dialect spoken by a remnant of the Finnish people in the peninsula of north-west Courlalnd, known by the name of Livs, inhabiting Livonia, a name given to the largest of the Baltic provinces of Russia. The Livs number about five thousand souls. The gospel of Matthew was transcribed for them into the Lettish character by the academician Widemann, at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and carried through the press in 1879. (B.P.)

## Living[[@Headword:Living]]

             a term often used in England to denote a benefice (q.v.).

## Living (2)[[@Headword:Living (2)]]

             an English prelate, is first met with as bishop of Wells, to which see he was consecrated in 999. In 1013 he was translated to the see of Canterbury. He continued for seven years, but in that time did very little more than to repair the roof of the cathedral. He did not receive the pallium. He died in 1020. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1:472 sq.

## Living Buddha[[@Headword:Living Buddha]]

             SEE BUDDHA, LIVING.

## Living Creatures[[@Headword:Living Creatures]]

             These, as presented in Ezekiel 1-10, and Revelation 4 sq., are identical with the cherubim. Besides the general resemblance in form, position, and service, we have, Eze 10:20 : "I knew that they were the cherubim." Ezekiel, being a priest, was familiar with these symbolical forms. The living ones present some variations from the cherubim, but not greater than appear in the cherubim themselves. The discussion of their forms and probable uses has already been given, and is not here resumed. SEE CHERUB.

They are taken up here to give a more careful attention to their symbolical utility. The importance of these symbols is manifest, 1, in the  very minute description of them; 2, in the fact that they do in some way pervade the entire period of grace, from the expulsion of Adam till, in the apocalyptic vision, we arrive at the gates of the city, having a right to the tree of life in the midst of the paradise of God — such a right as man in innocence never attained. They were placed first at the front of the garden of Eden; renewed in the tabernacle; extended in the Temple; resumed in the visions of Ezekiel; incorporated in the book of Psalms; and in the prospective history of Revelation they are left with us till the end of the world. The seraphim of Isaiah (ch. 6) appear in all respects to be the same; though differing in name and in position, they perform the same service. Even the idolatrous images, the teraphim, were probably an unwarranted and superstitious imitation of the figures at the east of Eden. True, there are periods when they are under a cloud, e.g. from the Deluge till the erecting of the tabernacle; still, we dare not say they were extinct, for before the tabernacle was built in the wilderness we read of another, called the tabernacle of the congregation (Exo 33:7-11). There is much mystery about them, and many mistakes occur among expositors in relation to them.

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

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

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

(c) The living ones are distinguished from angels in Rev 15:7.

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

(e) Angels take but a small part in the direct administration of grace; they rather point the inquirer, and furnish assistance to the administrator (Act 10:3; Rev 1:1; 1Ch 21:18; Act 12:7).

2. Nothing vindictive or judicial belongs to them.

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

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

(c) They warn of danger from divine justice (Isa 6:3-5).

(d) They call attention to justice (Rev 6:1; Rev 6:3; Rev 6:5; Rev 6:7).

(e) They deliver the commission to those who execute it (Eze 10:2; Eze 10:7; Rev 15:7).

(f) They join in celebrating the triumph over the victims of judgment (Rev 19:4). Very different is their function in the administration of grace; there they make application of the remedy to the very spot (Isa 6:6-7).

3. They are not devoid of human sympathy.

(a) They have the face of a man.

(b) They have the hands of a man under their wings (Eze 1:8).

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

(d) The throne which they bear has a man above upon it (Eze 1:26).

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

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

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

1. They are distinct from the sword, as already shown. If, in Eze 1:6, they seem to be evolved out of the fire, this is no more than we have  already in the first promise, where the death of death is our life; and in Psa 135:10 sq.

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

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

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

5. The like figures were made on the washstands of the Temple, interspersed with lions and oxen (1Ki 7:29; "lions and palm-trees," 1Ki 7:36; comp. Eph 5:26; Tit 3:5).

6. The firmament over their heads, with its throne and man upon it (Eze 1:26-27, combines Exo 24:10 with Rev 1:15).

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

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

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

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

## Livingston, Gilbert Robert[[@Headword:Livingston, Gilbert Robert]]

             D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, a descendant of the celebrated Rev. John Livingston (q.v.), was born at Stamford, Connecticut, October 8, 1786, and graduated at Union College in 1805. He studied theology under Reverend Dr. Perkins, of Great Hartford, Connecticut, and Reverend Dr. John Henry Livingston (q.v.). In 1811 he became pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Coxsackie, N.Y., where about six hundred persons were the fruits of his ministry of fifteen years. In 1826 he removed to Philadelphia as pastor of the First (Dutch) Reformed (or Crown Street) Church. Here again his ministry was greatly blessed, three hundred and twenty persons being added to the Church, and over one hundred in a single year. He died March 9, 1834. He was a man of large physical frame, benevolent countenance, and amiable temper. His preaching was practical, and addressed more to the understanding and conscience of the people than to their feelings. His pastoral labors were incessant and successful. At one period of his life lie embraced what were generally known as "New Measures," but he lived to abandon them in his later ministry. A single sermon and a tract are all that he is known to have published. — Sprague,  Annals; Corwin's Manual Ref. Church; Funeral Sermon by C.C. Cuvler, D.D.; Historical Discourse by W.J.R. Taylor, D.D. (W.J.R.T.)

## Livingston, Henry Gilbert[[@Headword:Livingston, Henry Gilbert]]

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

## Livingston, John[[@Headword:Livingston, John]]

             a noted Scottish Presbyterian divine, was born in 1603, and was educated at Glasgow, where he took the degree of A.M. in 1621. He entered the ministry, and soon distinguished himself as an able preacher. A zealous Covenanter, he opposed the episcopal government of the Church after the Restoration, and on this account suffered many inconveneniences. Very remarkable in his life was the result which followed his preaching on a special fast-day appointed by the "Kirk of Shotts," June 21, 1630. He was at this time domestic chaplain to the countess of Wigton. Later he became minister at Aneram. He was twice suspended from his pastoral office, but, his opposition to the government continuing, he was banished the kingdom in 1663. He retired to Holland, and became minister of a Scottish church at Rotterdam. There he died in 1672. He wrote his Autobiography (Glasgow, 1754, 12mo); also Lives of Eminent Scottish Divines (1754, 8vo). See  Chambers, Biog. Dict. of eminent Scotsmen, s.v.; A. Gunsn, Memoirs of John Lisvingston (N.Y. 1829); Gorton, Biog. Dict. volume 2, s.v.

## Livingston, John Henry[[@Headword:Livingston, John Henry]]

             D.D., S.T.P., the "father of the Reformed Dutch Church in this country," and in many respects its most celebrated representative, was born at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., May 30, 1746, son of Henry Livingston, and a lineal descendant in the fourth generation from the Reverend John Livingston, of Scotland. He graduated at Yale College in 1762, and then studied law for two years, when his health gave way under his close application, and he was obliged to discontinue it. About this time he was converted, and then directed his attention to the Christian ministry. By advice of Dr. Laidlie, of New York, he went to Europe to complete his theological studies at the University of Utrecht, in Holland, where he remained four years, and was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Classis of Amsterdam. Having received a call to become pastor and second preacher in English of the Church of New York, he passed examination at the university for the degree of doctor of divinity, returned to New York September 3, 1770, and at once began his labors as pastor of the Church. Here he soon established his great reputation as a pulpit orator and as a learned theologian; but his grand ecclesiastical achievement was the settlement of the old and bitter controversy between the "Coetus" and "Conferentie" parties of the Reformed Dutch Church, and the consummation in about two years of the union, which has never since been broken. His pastoral relation to the Church in New York continued forty years 1770 to 1810 — although during the Revolutionary War he was obliged to leave the city, and upon his return in 1783 he found himself the sole pastor, and so remained for three years.

The next year he was appointed professor of theology, and retained this office, with his pastorate, until 1810, when he removed to New Brunswick, N.J., at the request of the synod, and opened the theological seminary in that city, occupying, in connection with it, the presidency of Queens, now Rutgers College. These two offices he held until his death in 1825. It is difficult, in this brief notice, even to sum up the services and character of this eminent man. More than four hundred souls were received into the Church on profession of their faith during the three years of his sole pastorate after the war. Nearly two hundred young men were trained by him for the ministry of the Church. To him, more than to any other man, is due the credit of the separate organization of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in this country. He principally shaped its  Constitution; he prepared its first psalm and hymn book. His theological lectures still form the basis of didactic and polemic instruction in the theological seminary of which he was the founder and father.

The whole denomination is reaping today the fruits of the sacrifices which he made for it. His influence in the Church was like that of Washington in the nation. his grand and eloquent sermon, preached before the New York Missionary Society in 1804, from Rev 14:6-7, was one of the leading influences in that revival of the missionary spirit which gave Samuel J. Mills and his young friends to the work, and which resulted in the subsequent organization of the "American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions" in 1813. Several of Dr. Livingston's occasional productions were published by himself, and a posthumous volume, containing a syllabus of his theological lectures, was issued by the Reverend Jesse Fonda, one of his pupils. His death, at his residence in New Brunswick, January 19, 1825, was like a translation, without pain or complaint, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." His wife, Sarah Livingston, whom he married in October 1775, was the daughter of Philip Livingston, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Like him, Dr. Livingston was an ardent and fearless patriot, and during all of the Revolutionary struggle he earnestly sustained the cause of freedom. In person Dr. Livingston was tall, commanding, dignified, and imposing. His features were regular and handsome. His manners were refined and studiously polite. He was the model of the Christian gentleman. In his later years his appearance was truly patriarchal. His piety was all-pervading. As a preacher, he possessed eminent abilities. His oratory was peculiar to himself, and very effective. It was full of action, variety, and power.

As a theological teacher, he was clear, concise, learned, systematic, and practical. His influence over his students was wonderful. His great aim was to make them experimental ministers of Christ, and they loved and reverenced him almost as an apostle. Whatever faults he had were more than covered, to the eyes of his friends, by his majestic bearing, his admirable character, his pious life, and fruitful ministry, and by his services to the Church of Christ. See Dr. (Gunn's Life, etc., abridged by Dr. T.W. Chambers; also Sprague, Annals. volume 9, an admirable portraiture; also several funeral discourses, etc. (W.J.R.T.)

## Livingstone, David, LL.D[[@Headword:Livingstone, David, LL.D]]

             etc., an eminent African traveller and missionary, was born March 19, 1813, at Blantyre, in Lanarkshire, Scotland. At the age of ten he became a "piecer" in a cotton factory, and for many years was engaged in hard work as an operative. An evening-school furnished him with the opportunity of acquiring some knowledge of Greek and Latin, and finally, after attending a course of medicine at Glasgow University, and the theological lectures of the late Dr. Wardlaw, professor of theology to the Scotch Independents, he offered himself to the London Missionary Society, by whom he was ordained as a medical missionary in 1840. In the summer of that year he landed at Port Natal, in South Africa. Circumstances made him acquainted with the Reverend Robert Moffatt, himself a distinguished missionary, whose daughter he subsequently married. For sixteen years Livingstone proved himself a faithful and zealous servant of the London Missionary Society. The two most important results achieved by him in this period were the discovery of Lake Ngami (August 1, 1849), and his crossing the continent of South Africa, from the Zambezi (or Leeambye) to the Congo, and thence to Loando, the capital of Angola, which took him about eighteen months (from January 1853, to June 1854). In September of the same year he left Loando on his return across the Continent, reached Linzanti (in lat. 18° 17' south, and long. 23° 50' east), the capital of the great Makololo tribe, and from thence proceeded along the banks of the Leeambve to Quilimane, on the Indian Ocean, which he reached May 20, 1856. He then took ship for England, where he arrived December 12 of the  same year.

The reception accorded him by his countrymen was most enthusiastic. Probably no traveller was ever more affectionately honored. This was owing not merely to the importance of his discoveries, though it would be difficult to overestimate them, but to the thoroughly frank, ingenuous, simple, and manly character of the traveller. In 1857 Livingstone published his Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa, a work of great interest and value. "In all his various journeys," said Sir Roderick Murchison, at a meeting of the Royal Geographical Society, held shortly after Livingstone's return, "he had travelled over no less than eleven thousand miles of African territory.... By his astronomical observations he had determined the sites of numerous places, hills, rivers, and lakes, nearly all of which had been hitherto unknown, while he had seized upon every opportunity of describing the physical features, climatology, and geological structure of the countries which he had explored, and had pointed Out many new sources of commerce as yet unknown to the scope and the enterprise of the British merchant." In 1858 the British government appointed him consul at Quilimane, whither he returned in the course of the year; it also furnished him with a small steamer, that he might pursue his explorations of the Zambezi River and its tributaries.

Livingstone started up this river in January 1859, but after ascending it for over two hundred miles his farther progress was impeded by the magnificent cataracts of the Murchison. In March, following, he started for a second journey up the Shive, a branch of the Zambezi, and on the 18th of April discovered Lake Shirwa. Then followed the discovery. of Lake Nyassa on September 16. In 1864 he was ordered by the British government to abandon the expedition, and, returning to England, he published his second book of travels, entitled A Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambezi and its Tributaries. In August 1865, Mr. Livingstone left England on his third journey to Africa; discovered Lake Liemba in April 1867, south of Tanganyika, and going westward thence found Lake Maero on the 8th of September. But after eight years of lonely wandering in a previously unknown region, and after achieving discoveries which will permanently benefit mankind, the heroic traveller was overtaken by death. Having made repeated attempts to find the sources of the Nile, and being thwarted every time, in the last instance by severe illness, he requested his followers to take him to Zanzibar, as he was going home. After suffering intensely for several days, he died, May 1, 1873. His body was brought to England and interred in Westminster Abbey. See (Lond.) Christian  Observer, January 1875, page 14; Life, by Blaikie (Lond. 1874); Waller, Last Journals (ibid. eod.).

## Livington, James[[@Headword:Livington, James]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first rector of Forteviot and Weems, then dean of Dunkeld, and afterwards, in 1476, bishop of Dunkeld. He was constituted lord chancellor, February 18, 1483, and died at Edinburgh in the same year. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 90.

## Livinus, Saint[[@Headword:Livinus, Saint]]

             called the apostle of Brabant, was born in Ireland, it is said of noble parents, and received his education there. He was bishop of Dublin in 656. Being actuated by religious zeal, he intrusted his diocese in Ireland to the management of its archdeacon, and went to Ghent with three of his disciples, and, for a month, offered up mass at the tomb of St. Bavo every day, and afterwards went to Esca and preached the gospel, and converted numbers. He was murdered by some of the pagan inhabitants, November 12, 656. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 16.

## Livonia[[@Headword:Livonia]]

             the largest of the Baltic provinces of Russia; area 18,158 sq. m.; pop. in 1882,1,173,951. The Germans, who chiefly live in the towns, number  about 64,000 inhabitants; the remainder are mostly either Letts (a branch of the Slavi. kindred to the Lithuanians) or Esthonians, who are of Finnish descent. Christianity was first introduced at Riga about 1180 by merchants from Bremen. The great missionary was the Augustinian monk Meinhard, who in 1186 established the first church at Wexkiill, on the Duna, and in 1191 was consecrated bishop of Livonia. His successor, abbot Berthold, of Loccum, endeavored to accelerate the conversion of the Livonians by force of arms, and in 1198 fell in a victorious battle of the Crusaders. Bishop Albert, of Apeldern, in 1202 founded the Order of the Knights of the Sword, and gradually overcame the persistent opposition of the Livonians to the enforcement of Christianity. After his death (in 1229) the see of Riga was separated from the ecclesiastical province of Bremen, and in 1246 made an independent archbishopric.

The union of the Order of the Sword with the Teutonic Knight secured the subjection and Christianization of Livonia, but involved the bishops in long-protracted conflicts with the order, which hastened the decay of the Church. The army-master, Walter of Plettenberg (1494-1531), adopted the doctrines of the Reformation, and converted Livonia into a secular duchy under Polish sovereignty. The center of the reformatory movement was in Riga, where the Hussite Nicolaus Russ, of Rostock, had, from 1511 to 1516, prepared the way for a religious reformation. Among the first promoters of the Lutheran Reformation were Andreas Knipken, a Lutheran schoolteacher from Treptow, in Pomerania, who arrived in Riga in 1521, and Sylvester Tagetmeier, from Hamburg, who arrived in the following year.

Both were appointed preachers by the town council, in spite of the remonstrances of the archbishop. In Wolmar and Dorpat, Melchior Hoffminnn labored so violently in behalf of the Reformation that he created dissatisfaction even among the friends of the movement. and had to leave Livonia. Luther's epistle of congratulation and exhortation (1523) to the congregatons of Riga, Revel, and Dorpat shows that at that time the Reformation had made considerable progress. In 1524, the archbishop, Caspar Linde, of Riga, died, deeply mortified at the utter failure of his zealous efforts for saving the Catholic Church. His successor, John VII Blankenfeld, previously bishop of Dorpat and Revel, was no longer recognized by the town council of liga as sovereign, and in 1525 he was even made a prisoner. Under the archbishop Wilhelm, margrave of Brandenburg, who in 1539 succeeded Thomas Schonnig, the Reformation spread throughout Livonia; the archbishop himself became favorable to the new doctrine, and at the time of his death the Catholic Church in Livonia had almost ceased to exist.  Johann Briesmann (1527-31), who was called from Knoigsberg to Riga, drew up in 1530 the first agenda. The liturgy for Revel appeared in 1561, but had in 1572 to yield to that of Courland.

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

The latter therefore began, in 1843, to engage in a vigorous contest with the Moravians, invoking the stipulations of the peace of Nystadt (1721), in which Sweden had ceded Livonia to Russia, while the latter confirmed the privileges of the Lutheran Church. The Russian government supported the Lutherans against the Moravians, but, on the other hand, began (1841) to make great efforts to prevail upon the Lettish peasants to join the Greek Church. Several thousands of Letts and Livonians succumbed to the pressure brought upon them by the government, and, after having once joined the orthodox Greek Church, they were forbidden (as many soon desired) to return to the Lutheran Church. All the children born of mixed marriages (Lutheran and Greek) must be educated in the Greek religion. In 1863, the Lutheran bishop Walter, who vigorously stood up for the defense of the rights of his Church, had to yield to an intrigue, and not until 1868 was the rigor of the Russian government against the Lutheran Church somewhat relaxed. These conflicts have awakened a general interest in the religious community, to which the re-establishment of the University of Dorpat (1802) has been greatly instrumental. The number of Roman  Catholics is about 5000, that of Greek Catholics is estimated at 143,000; the remainder are Lutherans. (A.J.S.)

## Livonian Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Livonian Version Of The Scriptures]]

             See Lettish in the art. SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

## Lizard[[@Headword:Lizard]]

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

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

(2.) LETAAH´ (לְטָאָה, perh. so called from its hiding; Lev 11:30; Sept. χαλαβώτης, Vulg. stellio, Auth. Vers. "lizard"), perhaps the species called in Egypt Shechalit, described by Forskal (Descr. page 13) as a delicate little animal, about a span in length and of the thickness of the thumb, found in the neighborhood of houses. Bochart (Hieroz. 2:497 sq.) maintains that it is the wagrat of the Arabs, a kind of lizard that clings close to the ground (hence his derivation from an Arabic root, signifying to stick to the earth), to which also the Sept. alludes (comp. Oken, Naturgesch. III, 2:203). Geddes regards it as identical with the Lacerta gecko.  (3.) CHO´MET (חֹמֶט, so called from lying close to the ground; Lev 11:30; Sept. σαύρα, Auth.Vers. "snail") has been supposed by Bochart (2:500 sq.) to mean the Galkan, a species of lizard that burrows in the sand (on the precarious interpretation of the Talmud). The interpretation snail rests on no better foundation. Both the Arabic interpreters understand the chameleon. The I species intended is uncertain. (See Fuller, Miscell. 6:9.)

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

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

(6.) TINSHE´METH (תַּנְשֶׁמֶת, the hard breather; Sept., Vulgate, and Auth. Vers. mole; Lev 11:30; being the same Heb. word used in Lev 11:18; Deu 14:16, to describe a bird, rendered "swan") is (according to Saadias) a species of lizard, probably the Gecko (Hasselquist, Trav. page 356 sq.), a kind described as having a round tail of moderate length, and tufted feet, lamellated lengthwise on the bottom, said to be peculiar for exuding poison from the divisions of its toes, eagerly seeking spots imbued with salt, which it leaves infected with a virus that engenders leprosy (see also Forskal, page 13). Bochart (2:503 sq.) understands the chameleon, deriving the etymology from the ancient belief  that this creature lived upon the air (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 8:33, 51), a notion probably derived from its long endurance of hunger. (See Hasselquist, Trav. page 348 sq.; Sonnini, Trav. 1:87; Oken, Naturgesch. III, 2:306 sq.; Russel, Aleppo, 2:128 sq.) SEE CHAMELEON.

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

(8.) TANNIN' (תִּנַּין) or TANNIM' (תִּנַּים), otherwise TAN (תָּן), seems occasionally to signify a huge land serpent or saurian. SEE DRAGON.

(9.) LIVYATHAN' (לַיְיָתָן) sometimes stands for the largest of the lizard tribe, the crocodile. SEE LEIVIATHAN.

Under the denomination of lizard the modern zoologist places all the cold- blooded animals that have the conformation of serpents with the addition of four feet. Thus viewed as one great family, they constitute the Saurians, Lacertinae, and Lacertinae and Lacertidae of authors, embracing numerous generical divisions, which commence with the largest, that is, the crocodile group, and pass through sundry others, a variety of species, formidable, disgusting, or pleasing in appearance — some equally frequenting the land and water, others absolutely confined to the earth and to the most and deserts; and, though in general harmless, there are a few with disputed properties, some being held to poison or corrode by means of the exudation of an ichor, and others extolled as aphrodisiacs, or of medical use in pharmacy; but these properties in most, if not in all, are undetermined or illusory. One of the best known of these is the common chameleon (Chamaeleo vulgaris). SEE CHAMELEON.

When it is considered that the regions of Syria, Arabia, and Egypt are overrun with animals of this family, there is every reason to expect allusion to more than one genus in the Scriptures, where so many observations and similes are derived from the natural objects which were familiar to the various writers. Among the names enumerated above, Bochart refers צָב, tsub (Lev 11:29), to one of the group of Monitors or Varanus, the Nilotic lizard, Lacerta Nilotica, Varanus Niloticus, or Waran of the Arabs.  Like the others of this form, it is possessed of a tail double the length of the body, but is not so well known in Palestine, where there is only one real river (Jordan), and that not tenanted by this species. It appears that the true crocodile frequented the shores and marshes of the coast down to a comparatively late period, and therefore it may well have had a more specific name than leviathan — a word apparently best suited to the dignified and lofty diction of the prophets, and clearly of more general signification than the more colloquial designation. Jerome was of this opinion; and it is thus likely that tsab was applied to both, as Waran is now considered only a variety of, or a young, crocodile. There is a second of the same group, Lacerta scincus of Merrem (Vatranus arenarius), Waran el-hard, also reaching to six feet in length; and a third, not as yet clearly described, which appears to be larger than either, growing to nine feet, and covered with bright cupreous scales. This last prefers rocky and stony situations. One of the last mentioned pursues its prey on land with a rapid bounding action, feeds on the larger insects, and is said to attack game in a body, sometimes destroying even sheep. The Arabs, in agreement with the ancients, assert that this species will do fierce and victorious battle with serpents. Considerations like these induce us to assign the Hebrew name כֹּח, koach (a designation of strength) to the species of the desert; and if the Nilotic watranz be the tsab, then the Arabian dhab, as Bruce asserts, will be Varanus arenarius, or watran el-hard of the present familiar language, and chardaun the larger copper-colored species above noticed. But it is evident from the Arabic authorities quoted by Bochart, and from his own conclusions, that there is not only confusion among the species of lizard, but that the ichneumon of Egypt (Horpestes Pharaonis) is mixed up with the history of these saurians.

We come next to the group of lizards more properly so called, which Hebrew commentators take to be the לְטָאָה, letaah, a name having some allusion to poison and adhesiveness. The word occurs only once (Lev 11:30), where saurians alone appear to be indicated. If the Heb. root were to guide the decision, letaah would be another name for the gecko or anakah, for there is but one species which can be deemed venomous; and with regard to the quality of adhesiveness, though the geckos possess it most, numerous common lizards run up and down perpendicular walls with great facility. We therefore take חוֹמֶט, chomet, or the sand lizard of Bochart, to be the true lizard, several (probably many) species existing in myriads on the rocks in sandy places, and in ruins in  every part of Palestine and the adjacent countries. There is one species particularly abundant and small, well known in Arabia by the name of Sarabandi. We now come to the Stelliones, which have been confounded with the noxious geckos and others from the time of Aldrovandus, and thence have been a source of inextricable trouble to commentators. They are best known by the bundles of starlike spines on the body. Among these Lacerta stellio, Stellio Orientalis, the κροκόδειλος of the Greeks, and hardun of the Arabs, is abundant in the East, and a great frequenter of ruinous walls. The genus Uromastix offers Stellio spinipes of Daudin or Urspinipes, two or three feet long, of a fine green, and is the species which is believed to strike with the tail; hence formerly denominated Caudae verbera. It is frequent in the deserts around Egypt, and is probably the Guamril of the Arabs. Another subgenus, named Trapelus by Cuvier, is exemplified in the Tr. AEgyptiacus of Geoff., with a spinous swelled body, but remarkable for the faculty of changing color more rapidly than the chameleon. Next we place the Geckotians, among which comes אֲנָקָה, anakath, in our versions denominated ferret, but which is with more propriety transferred to the noisy and venomous abu-burs of the Arabs. There is no reason for admitting the verb אָנִק, anak, to groan, to cry out, as radical for the name of the ferret, an animal totally unconnected with the preceding and succeeding species in Lev 11:29-30, and originally found, so far as we know, only in Western Africa, and thence conveyed to Spain, prowling noiselessly, and beaten to death without a groan, though capable of a feeble, short scream when at play, or when suddenly wounded. Taking the interpretation “to cry out," so little applicable to ferrets, in conjunction with the whole verse, we find the gecko, like all the species of this group of lizards, remarkable for the loud grating noise which it is apt to utter in the roofs and walls of houses all the night through; one, indeed, is sufficient to dispel the sleep of a whole family. The particular species most probably meant is the Lacerta gecko of Hasselquist, the Gecko lobatus of Geoffroy, distinguished by having the soles of the feet dilated and striated like open fans, from which a poisonous ichor is said to exude, inflaming the human skin, and infecting food that may have been trod upon by the animal. SEE FERRET.

Hence the Arabic name of abusbirs, or "father of leprosy," at Cairo. The species extends northwards in Syria, but it may be doubted whether the Gecko fascicularuis, or tarentola of South- eastern Europe, be not also an inhabitant of Palestine; and in that case the שְׂמָמַית, semamith of Bochart, would find an appropriate location. To  these we add the Chameleons proper; and then follows the Scincus (in antiquity the name of Varanus arenarius), among which Lacerta scincus, Linn., or Scincus officinalis, is the El-adda of the Arabs, figured by Bruce, and well known in the old pharmacy of Europe. S. Cyprius, or Lacerta Cyprius scincoides, a large greenish species, marked with a pale line on each flank, occurs also; and a third, Scincus variegatus or ocillatus, often noticed on account of its round black spots, each marked with a pale streak, and commonly having likewise a stripe on each flank, of a pale color. Of the species of Seps, that is, viviparous serpent-lizards, having the body of snakes, with four weak limbs, a species with only three toes on each foot, the Lacerta chalcides of Linn, appears to extend to Syria. See further details in the Penny Cyclopaedia, s.v. Varanidae; Wood, Bible Animals, page 534 sq.

From this examination, it appears probable that the generic name for the lizard among the Hebrews (being the only one thus rendered in the Auth. Version) is the לְטָאָה, letaah, which, although an unclean animal, does not usually designate a poisonous species. Among the various kinds with which the East abounds, the Lacerta stellio, or starry lizard, may be selected as probably affording the best type of the scriptural terms, or at least of letaah in general, as it is the most common in Egypt and Palestine. It is covered with tubercles, and is of a gray color. It lives in the holes of walls, and under stones, and covers itself with dirt. Belon states that it sometimes attains the size of a weasel. This is said to be the lizard which infests the Pyramids, and in other countries where it is found, harbors in the crevices and between the stones of old walls, feeding on flies and other winged insects. This may be the species intended by Bruce when he says, "The number I saw one day, in the great court of the Temple of the Sun at Baalbek, amounted to many thousands; the ground, the walls, the stones of the ruined buildings, were covered with them; and the various colors of which they consisted made a very extraordinary appearance, glittering under the sun, sin which they lay sleeping and basking." Lord Lindsay also describes the ruins at Jerash (the ancient Gerasa) as "absolutely alive with lizards." Near Suez, he speaks of "a species of gray lizard;" and on the ascent towards Mount Sinai, "hundreds of little lizards of the color of the sand, and called by the natives sarabandi, were darting about." In the Syrian desert, Major Skinner says, "The ground is teeming with lizards; the  sun seems to draw them from the earth, for sometimes, when I have fixed my eye upon one spot, I have fancied that the sands were getting into life, so many of these creatures at once crept from their holes." Wilkinson says, “In Egypt, of the lizard tribe, none but the crocodile seems to have been sacred. Those which occur in the hieroglyphics are not emblematical of the gods, nor connected with religion." SEE SNAIL.

## Lizel, Georg[[@Headword:Lizel, Georg]]

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

## Ljada[[@Headword:Ljada]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was a god of war among the Poles, to whom, before and after battle, human sacrifices were offered.

## Llewelyn (or Llywelyn), Thomas, LL.D[[@Headword:Llewelyn (or Llywelyn), Thomas, LL.D]]

             a Welsh dissenting minister, was born at Penalltan-isaf, Glamorganshire, about 1724, and having secured a liberal education, became the principal of an academical institution in London. He died in 1783. Although never the pastor of any church, he preached frequently, and was recognized as a minister of the gospel. He was a ripe scholar and a judicious writer. His works are, Historical Account of the British or Welsh Versions and Editions of the Bible (Lond. 1768, 8vo): — Historical and Critical Remarks on the British Tongue, etc. (1769, 8vo). See The (Lond.) Theological and Biblical Magazine, November 1806, page 467; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Llorente, Don Juan Antonio[[@Headword:Llorente, Don Juan Antonio]]

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

After the downfall of the grand inquisitor he attached himself to the Liberal minister Jovellanos, who contemplated a religious and political  regeneration of Spain. The minister fell, and Llorente was involved in his fall, the more surely as he openly expressed his sympathy for him. Suspected by his superiors, he was closely watched. He was subjected to innumerable petty annoyances, his letters were opened, and, without any reason being given for the measure, was deposed from his situation, and imprisoned in a convent for one month. In 1805 he was again received into favor as the reward of a literary service of a very questionable character which he rendered to the minister Godoy. The latter purposed abolishing the ancient privileges of the Basque Provinces, and carrying out in Spain a thorough system of centralization; to accomplish this, he deemed it advantageous to prepare the way by means of a historical essay, disproving the ancient liberties of those provinces. The mission was given to Llorente, who wrote Noticias historicas sobre has tres provincias Bascongadas (Madrid, 1806-8, 3 volumes, 8vo), a work not in any way remarkable for historical truthfulnessp Llorente was now again favored with several high offices. His tendency towards the French ideas, centralization among others, led him perhaps to accept offers which he would otherwise have rejected. Upon the intrusion of the French (1807), Llorente found himself placed between the national government which opposed all progress, and that of a foreign sovereign which offered both political and religious liberty.

Unable to serve at once the cause of the hereditary monarch and that of progress, Llorente and the Josephinos chose the latter; but the accusation preferred against them of having sold themselves to France (Hefele, in Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:557 sq.) is unsupported by proof, and unlikely; they simply chose a foreign master rather than religious and political slavery. In 1809 the Spanish Inquisition was abolished in Spain, and Llorente was commissioned to search its records for the purpose of writing a history of that tribunal. He had already, as early as 1789, began to collect materials for this purpose, yet two more years were spent, with the aid of several assistants, in compiling the voluminous records. When the convents were abolished he was given the direction of the proceedings, and the charge of the sequestered goods, as also the administration of the national properties, an ungrateful and not very creditable task, for these properties were the result of sequestration; yet he claimed afterwards to have introduced many favorable changes in the administration, such, for instance, as that of leaving the management of the property belonging to parties put under the ban to the members of their family, and the many distinguished persons of Spain to whom he appealed in corroboration of his assertion have never denied its truth.

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

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

## Lloyd, Charles Hooker[[@Headword:Lloyd, Charles Hooker]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Haven, Connecticut, February 21, 1833. His early life was spent in mercantile pursuits in New York City. In 1856, however, purposing to become a missionary to the heathen, he entered New York University; later he studied divinity in the theological seminary at Princeton, N.J., and graduated in 1862. He was licensed and ordained as an evangelist by the New York Presbytery April 29, 1862, and appointed (June 21, 1862) by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to South Africa. He did not, however, do much effective mission work, as he died February 10, 1865. Mr. Lloyd, as a preacher, was eminently wise to win souls. He was gifted with a strong passion for music,  and wrote and arranged many chants and hymns for the African converts. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, page 169.

## Lloyd, Humphrey, D.D[[@Headword:Lloyd, Humphrey, D.D]]

             etc., an eminent English divine and scientist, was born in Dublin in 1800. He entered Trinity College in 1815, was elected scholar in 1818, and graduated in 1820. In 1824 he was made fellow and tutor of Trinity College, and was soon ordained a minister of the United Church of England and Ireland. In 1831 he resigned the office of tutor, and was elected to the chair of natural philosophy, and afterwards gave his attention almost wholly to scientific investigations. He died January 17, 1881. Dr. Lloyd was a fellow of the royal societies of London and Edinburgh, and honorary member of the philosophical societies of Cambridge and Manchester, and other scientific societies of Europe and America. In 1846 he was elected president of the Royal Irish Academy; in 1856 he received the degree of D.C.L. from the University of Oxford; and in 1857 was chosen president of the British Association. His works are chiefly scientific. See Men of the Time, s.v.

## Lloyd, Thomas[[@Headword:Lloyd, Thomas]]

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

## Lloyd, William[[@Headword:Lloyd, William]]

             a noted English prelate, was born in Berkshire in 1627, and was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. In 1640 he removed to Jesus College, where he became fellow in 1646. He took deacon's orders from Dr. Skinner at the time of Charles's execution. In 1656 he was ordained priest, and acted as tutor of John Backhouse, son of Sir Wm. Backhouse, at Wadham College, Oxford. In 1660 he became master of arts at Cambridge, and was also made a prebendary of Ripon, in Yorkshire. In 1666 he was appointed king's chaplain, and in 1667 was collated to a prebend of Salisbury, and proceeded doctor of divinity at Oxford. In 1668 he was presented to the vicarage of St. Mary's, in Reading, and also installed archdeacon of Merioneth, in the church of Bangor, of which he became deacon in 1672, besides being made prebend in St. Paul's Church, London. In 1674 he was made residentiary of Salisbury, and in 1676 promoted to the see of Exeter, the vicarage of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Westminster.

In 1680 he was appointed bishop of St. Asaph, was translated to Lichfield in 1692, and to Worcester in 1699-1700. He took an active part in the troubles between the Romanists and Protestants in 1678. He preached the funeral sermon of Sir Edmondbury Godfrey, believed to have been murdered in carrying out what is known as the popish plot for overthrowing Protestantism in England. In 1688, with six other bishops, he signed, and, as spokesman,  presented to the king, a memorial against the publication of his declaration of indulgence to Romanists and Dissenters. He was one of the six bishops who, together with archbishop Sancroft, composing the illustrious seven bishops, for their refusal to publish the king's declaration, were shortly after imprisoned by James II in the Tower, and, after trial, acquitted, to the great joy of all England. He became almoner to William III, and later also to queen Anne. He died at Hartlebury Castle August 30, 1717. Lloyd furnished valuable materials to Burnet's History of his Own Times, and wrote Considerations touching the true Way to supress Popery in this Kingdom, etc. (Lond. 1684, 8vo, 2d edit.) [a work which was attacked by MacKenzie (Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland, etc.), and was defended by bishop Stillingfleet (Origines Brit.), who reprinted it, with Notes by T.P. Panton (Oxford, 1842, 2 volumes, 8vo)]: — History of the Government of the Church of Great Britain: — A Dissertation on Daniel's Seventy Weeks: — A Systenm of Chronology (1712): — Harmony of the Gospels, etc., etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, volume 2, s.v.; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. (Restoration), 1:500; 2:5, 28, 141 sq., 146; Strickland, Lives of the Seven Bishops.

## Lloyd, William Freeman[[@Headword:Lloyd, William Freeman]]

             an English poet, was born at Uley, Gloucestershire, December 22, 1791. He was for many years secretary of the Religious Tract Society of London, and died April 22, 1853. He wrote several hymns, of which some are found in most modern hymnals.

## Lo-ammi[[@Headword:Lo-ammi]]

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

## Lo-debar[[@Headword:Lo-debar]]

             (Heb. Lo-Debar, לאֹ דְבָר, no pasture, 2Sa 17:27, Sept. Λωδαβάρ; written לוֹ דְבָרin 2Sa 9:4-5, Septuag. Λωδαβάρ), a town apparently in Gilead, not far from Mahanaim, the residence of Ammiel, whose son Machir entertained Mephibosheth. and aftervards sent refreshments to David (2Sa 9:4-5; 2Sa 17:27). It is probably the same with the place (see Reland, Palest. page 875) called DEBIR (or rather  Lidbir', לַדְכַר, Jos 13:26; Sept. Λεβίρ, Vulg. Dabir; for thelis not a prefix, but a part of the name [see Keil's Comment. ad loc.], which should probably be pointed לֹדְבָרLod-ebar'), on the (north-eastern) border of Gad, but in which direction from Mahanaim is uncertain, perhaps north- west (in which general direction the associated names appear to proceed), and not far from et-Taryibell.

## Lo-debar (2)[[@Headword:Lo-debar (2)]]

             Tristram remarks (Bible Places, page 329), "may be Dibbin, near Jerash, where I found a fine ancient fountain and other remains."

## Lo-ruhamah[[@Headword:Lo-ruhamah]]

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

## Loaf[[@Headword:Loaf]]

             (properly כַּכָּר, kikkar', a circle, in the phrase כַּכָּר לֶחֶם, a round of bread, i.e., circular cake, being the form of Oriental bread, or rather biscuit, Exo 29:23, Jdg 8:5, 1Sa 10:3; 1Ch 16:3; rendered "piece" or "morsel" of bread in Pro 6:26; Jer 37:21, 1Sa 2:26; sometimes simply לֶחֶם, le'chem, bread, Lev 23:17; 1Sa 17:17; 1Sa 25:18; 1Ki 14:3; 2Ki 4:42; and so likewise the Greek ἄρτος, bread, espec. in the plural, Mat 14:17; Mat 14:19; Mat 15:34; Mat 15:36; Mat 16:9-10; Mar 6:38; Mar 6:41; Mar 6:44; Mar 6:52; Mar 8:5-6; Mar 8:14; Mar 8:19; Luk 9:13; Luk 9:16; Luk 11:5; Joh 6:9; Joh 6:11; Joh 6:13; Joh 6:26), a round cake, the usual form of bread among the ancients. SEE SHEW- BREAD.

The bread of the Jews was either in small loaves, or else in broad and thick cakes, as is the present custom in the East. Bread was always broken into such portions as were required, and distributed by the master of the family. SEE BREAD.

The word חִלָּה, challah', "cake" (2Sa 6:19), often refers to a cake of oblation (Exo 29:23; Lev 8:26; Num 6:15; etc.), from the root חָלִל, chalal, to pierce through, because they were pricked, as among the Arabians and Jews of the present day. We also find, on the paintings in the monuments of Egypt, representations of offerings of cakes pricked. SEE CAKE.

The two wave loaves mentioned in Lev 23:17 are called in Hebrew לֶחֶם תְּנוּפָה, le'chem temphah', signifying the act of waving or moving to and fro before Jehovah, a ceremony observed in the consecration of offerings; hence applied as a name to anything consecrated in this manner. SEE OFFERING.

## Loan[[@Headword:Loan]]

             (שְׁאֵלָה, sheelah'; 1Sa 2:20, a petition or request, as elsewhere rendered). The law of Moses did not contemplate any raising of loans for the purpose of obtaining capital, a condition perhaps alluded to in the arables of the "pearl" and "hidden treasure" (Mat 13:44-45; Michaelis, Comm. on Laws of Moses, art. 147, 2:297, edit. Smith). SEE COMMERCE. Such persons as bankers and sureties, in the commercial sense (Pro 22:26; Neh 5:3), were unknown to the earlier ages of the Hebrew commonwealth. The Mosaic laws which relate to the subject of borrowing, lending, and repaying are in substance as follows: If an Israelite became poor, what he desired to borrow was to be freely lent to him, and no interest, either of money or produce, could be exacted from him; interest might be taken of a foreigner, but not of an Israelite by another Israelite (Exo 22:20; Deu 23:19-20; Lev 25:35-38). At the end of every seven years a remission of  debts was ordained; every creditor was to remit what he had lent: of a foreigner the loan might be exacted, but not of a brother. If an Israelite wished to borrow, he was not to be refused because the year of remission was at hand (Deu 15:1-11). Pledges might be taken, but not as such the mill or the upper millstone, for that would be to take a man's life in pledge. If the pledge was raiment, it was to be given back before sunset, as being needful for a covering at night.

The widow's garment could not be taken in pledge (Exo 22:26-27; Deu 24:6; Deu 24:17). The law thus strictly forbade any interest to be taken for a loan to any poor person, either in the shape of money or of produce, and at first, as it seems, even in the case of a foreigner; but this prohibition was afterwards limited to Hebrews only, from whom, of whatever rank. not only was no usury on any pretense to be exacted, but relief to the poor by way of loan was enjoined, and excuses for evading this duty were forbidden (Exo 22:25; Lev 25:35; Lev 25:37 Deu 15:3; Deu 15:7-10; Deu 23:19-20). The instances of extorio onu metioate conduct mentioned with disapprobation in the book of Job probably represent a state of things previous to the law, and such as the law was intended to remedy (Job 22:6; Job 24:3; Job 24:7). As commerce increased, the practice of usury, and so also of suretyship, grew up; but the exaction of it from a Hebrew appears to have been regarded to a late period as discreditable (Pro 6:1; Pro 6:4; Pro 11:15; Pro 17:18; Pro 20:16; Pro 22:26; Psa 15:5; Psa 27:13; Jer 15:10; Eze 18:13; Eze 22:12). Systematic breach of the law in this respect was corrected by Nehemiah after the return from captivity (Neh 5:13; see Michaelis, ibid. arts. 148, 151). In later times the practice of borrowing money appears to have prevailed without limitation of race, and to have been carried on upon systematic principles, though the original spirit of the law was approved by our Lord (Mat 5:42; Mat 25:27; Luk 6:35; Luk 19:23). The money-changers' (κερματισταί and κολλυβισταί), who had seats and tables in the Temple, were traders whose profits arose chiefly from the exchange of money with those who came to pay their annual half shekel (Pollux, 3:84; 7:170; Schleusner, LexL. N.T. s.v.; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. at Mat 21:12). The documents relating to loans of money appear to have been deposited in public offices in Jerusalem (Josephus, War, 2:17, 6).

In making loans no prohibition is pronounced in the law against taking a pledge of the borrower, but certain limitations are prescribed in favor of the poor.  1. The outer garment, which formed the poor man's principal covering by night as well as by day, if taken in pledge, was to be returned before sunset. A bedstead, however, might be taken (Exo 22:26-27, Deu 24:12-13; comp. Job 22:6; Pro 22:27; Shaw, Trav. page 224; Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1:47, 231; Niebuhr, Descr. Deuteronomy 1'Ar. page 56; Lane, Mod. Eg. 1:57, 58; Gesen. Thessaur. page 403; Michaelis, Laws of Moses, arts. 143 and 150).

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

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

4. The original Roman law of debt permitted the debtor to be enslaved by his creditor until the debt was discharged (Livy, 2:23; Appian, Ital. page 40); and he might even be put to death by him, though this extremity does not appear to have been ever practiced (Gell. 20:1, 45, 52; Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Bonorum Cessio, Nexum). In Athens also the creditor had a claim to the person of the debtor (Plutarch, Vit. Sol. 15). The Jewish law, as it did not forbid temporary bondage in the case of debtors, yet forbade a Hebrew debtor to be detained as a bondsman longer than the seventh year, or at furthest the year of jubilee (Exo 21:2; Lev 25:39; Lev 25:42; Deu 15:9). If a Hebrew was sold in this way to a foreign sojourner, he might be redeemed at a valuation at any time previous to the jubilee year, and in that year was, under any circumstances, to be released. Foreign sojourners, however, were not entitled to release at that time (Lev 25:44; Lev 25:46-47; Lev 25:54; 2Ki 4:2; Isa 1:1; Isa 52:3). Land sold on account of debt was redeemable either by the seller himself, or by a kinsman in case of his inability to repurchase. Houses in walled towns, except such as belonged to Levites, if not redeemed within one year after sale, were alienated forever. Michaelis doubts whether all debt was extinguished by the jubilee; but Josephus's account is very precise (Ant. 3:12, 3; comp. Lev 25:23; Lev 25:34; Rth 4:4; Rth 4:10; see Michaelis, § 158, 2:360). In later times the sabbatical or jubilee release was superseded by a law, probably introduced by the  Romans, by which the debtor was liable to be detained in prison until the full discharge of his debt (Mat 5:26). Michaelis thinks this doubtful. The case imagined in the parable of the unmerciful servant belongs rather to despotic Oriental than Jewish manners (Mat 18:34, Michaelis, ibids. art. 149; Trench, Parables, page 141). Subsequent Jewish opinions on loans and usury may be seen in the Mishna, Buabal Meziah. c. 3:10. SEE JUBILEE.

These laws relating to loans may wear a strange and somewhat unreasonable aspect to the mere modern reader, and cannot be understood, either in their bearing or their sanctions, unless considered from the Biblical point of view. The land of Canaan (as the entire world) belonged to its Creator, but was given of God to the descendants of Abraham under certain conditions, of which this liberality to the needy was one. The power of getting loans, therefore, was a part of the poor man's inheritance. It was a lien on the land (the source of all property with agricultural people), which was as valid as the tenure of any given portion by the tribe or family to whose lot it had fallen. This is the light in which the Mosaic polity represents the matter, and in this light, so long as that polity retained its force, would it, as a matter of course, be regarded by the owners of property. Thus the execution of this particular law was secured by the entire force with which the constitution itself was recommended and sustained. But as human selfishness might in time endanger this particular set of laws, so Moses applied special support to the possibly weak part. Hence the emphasis with which he enjoins the duty of lending to the needy.

Of this emphasis the real essence is the sanction supplied by that special providence which lay at the very basis of the Mosaic commonwealth, so that lending to the destitute came to be enforced with all the power derivable from the express will of God. Nor are there wanting arguments sufficient to vindicate these enactments in the light of sound political economy, at least in the case of the Jewish people. Had the Hebrews enjoyed a free intercourse with other nations, the permission to take usury of foreigners might have had the effect of impoverishing Palestine by affording a strong inducement for employing capital abroad; but, under the actual restrictions of the Mosaic law, this evil was impossible. Some not inconsiderable advantages must have ensued from the observance of these laws. The entire alienation and loss of the lent property were prevented by that peculiar institution which restored to every man his property at the great year of release. In the interval between the jubilees the system under  consideration would tend to prevent those inequalities of social condition which always arise rapidly, and which have not seldom brought disaster and ruin on states. He affluently were required to part with a portion of their affluence to supply the wants of the needy, without exacting that recompense which would only make the rich more wealthy and the poor more needy, thus superinducing a state of things scarcely more injurious to the one than to the other of these two parties. There was also in this system a strongly conservative influence. Agriculture was the foundation of the constitution. Had money-lending been a trade, money-making would also have been eagerly pursued. Capital would be withdrawn from the land; the agriculturist would pass into the usurer; huge inequalities would arise, commerce would assume predominance, and the entire commonwealth be overturned — changes and evils which were prevented, or, if not so, certainly retarded and abated by the code of laws regarding loans. As it was, the gradually increasing wealth of the country was in the main laid out on the soil, so as to augment its productiveness and distribute its bounties. The same regulations, moreover, prevented those undue expansions of credit and those sudden fluctuations in the relative value of money and staple comnmodities which have so often brought on financial collapses and prostration in modern communities.

While, however, the benign tendency of the laws in question is admitted, and special objects may be adduced as attainable by them, may it not be questioned whether they were strictly just? Such a doubt could arise only in a mind which viewed the subject from the position of our actual society. A modern might plead that he had a right to do what he pleased with his own; that his property of every kind —land, food, money — was his own; and that he was justified to turn all and each part to account for his own benefit. Apart from religious considerations, this position is impregnable. But such a view of property finds no support in the Mosaic institutions. In them property has a divine origin and its use is entrusted to man on certain conditions, which conditions are as valid as is the tenure of property itself. In one sense, indeed, the entire land — all property — was a great loan, a loan lent of God to the people of Israel, who might well, therefore, acquiesce in any arrangement which required a portion — a small portion — of this loan to be under certain circumstances accessible to the destitute. This view receives confirmation from the fact that interest might be taken of persons who were not Hebrews, and therefore lay beyond the sphere embraced by this special arrangement. It would open too wide a field did we proceed to consider how far the Mosaic system might be applicable in the world at  large; but this is very clear to our mind, that the theory of property on which it rests — that is, making property to be divine in its origin, and therefore tenable only on the fulfillment of such conditions as the great laws of religion and morality enforce — is more true and more philosophical (except in a college of atheists) than the narrow and baneful ideas which ordinarily prevail.

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

1. Due inquiry should be instituted, so as to satisfy the lender of the moral worthiness of the creditor, lest the loan, instead of being a benefaction, should really be but a stimulus to vice, or, at least, an encouragement to idleness.  2. The wants of one's own family and nearer dependents must not be sacrificed by ill-judged and untimely generosity.

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

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

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

## Loanz, Elias Ben-Moses (surnamed Baal Shem)[[@Headword:Loanz, Elias Ben-Moses (surnamed Baal Shem)]]

             who died at Worms in 1636, rabbi, is the author of a cabalistic commentary on the Song of Solomon, entitled רנת דודי(Basle, 1599), and on Koheleth or Ecclesiastes, entitled מכלול יפי. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:253; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, page 360; Ginsburg, Commentary on Koheleth, page 74. (B.P.)

## Loaysa, Gracia De[[@Headword:Loaysa, Gracia De]]

             an eloquent Dominican preacher and Spanish cardinal, was born in 1479 at Talavera, Castile; entered the Dominican Order at St. Paul de Pennefiel in 1495, and was made successively professor of philosophy, next of theology, director of studies, rector at St. Gregory, prior of the convent of Avila and of Vallad(olid. provincial of Spain (1518), and finally general of his order. In 1532 he was chosen confessor to Charles V, of whom he had previously been a teacher. In the following year Charles V made him bishop of Osma. He admitted him into his private council, and very soon made him president of the Royal Council of the Indies, and president of the Crusade. Loavsa strongly opposed the release, without ransom or condition, of Francis I, king of France, made prisoner by Charles at Pavia. Succeeding events proved his counsel good. In 1530 Charles V obtained a cardinalship for him from pope Clement VII, and also the title St, Suzanne. In the same year he named him bishop of Siguenza, and also archbishop of Seville. Loaysa finally became grand inquisitor of Spain. He was frequently ambassador for Charles V, and kept up a private correspondence with him, some of the letters of which (from 1530 to 1532), embracing Charles's stay in Germany, the most important period in the history of the Reformation, are published by G. Heine from the archives of Simancas. These letters prove Loaysa very bitter against the "heretics." Loaysa (died April 21, 1546, at Madrid. See Antonio, Biblioth. Hispana Nova, 3:514; Richard, Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum, 2:39; Le P. Touron, Hommes illustres  de l'Ordre de Saint-Dominique, 4:93; Table du Journ. des Savans, volume 6; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, volume 31, s.v.; Vehse, Memoirs of the Court of Austria, 1:158 sq.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Lobbes[[@Headword:Lobbes]]

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

## Lober, Christian[[@Headword:Lober, Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 2, 1683, at Orlamtinde, in Thuringia. He studied at Jena, was in 1705 adjunct of the philosophical faculty, in 1711 superintendent at Ronneburg, in 1717 doctor of theology, in 1731 general superintendent at Altenburg, and died December 26, 1747. He wrote, Diss. Super 2Ti 3:16 : — De Statu Animarum Credentium Post Mortem: — An Judas Proditor Interfuerit Sacrac Caenae: — De Potestate Ligandi et Secandi ad Mat 15:19; Mat 18:16 : — De Natura Humnana a Filio Dei Demun in Tempore Assumta: — De Origine Mali, etc. See Moser, Lexikon etzlebender Gottesgelehrten; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.(B.P.)

## Lober, Gottiilf Friedemann[[@Headword:Lober, Gottiilf Friedemann]]

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

## Lobethan, Johann Konrad[[@Headword:Lobethan, Johann Konrad]]

             a German theologian, was born at Hebel, near Homburg, September 29, 1688. In 1705 he entered the University of Marburg; later, he spent three  years in Cassel, and in 1711 went to Bremen to continue his studies. In 1714 he accepted a call to Weimar as court preacher of the duchess dowager Charlotte Dorothea Sophie; in 1720, to Chthen, as chief minister and superintendent, with the dignity of a councilor of the Consistory. Subsequently he was, for several years, the first minister and councilor of the Consistory of the German Reformed Church at Magdeburg. The latter portion of his life he spent at Cothen, where he died November 29, 1735. Lobethan was noted as an eminent preacher; the earnest and warm mode of his delivery always captivated the attention of his audience. Of his productions, mostly of an ascetical character, we mention Dissert. de magisterio gratiae sub Novo Testam. (Bremae, 1711, 4to). — Doring, Gelehrte Th. Deutschl. s.v.

## Lobo, Jeronimo[[@Headword:Lobo, Jeronimo]]

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

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

## Lobstein, Johan Michael[[@Headword:Lobstein, Johan Michael]]

             a German theologian, was born at Lampertheim, near Strasburg, May 1740. In 1755 he entered the university of his native place, went to Paris in 1767, and at the expiration of nearly two years returned to Strasburg, and became pastor of the French Nicolai Church. In addition to this he became, after a few years, preacher of the German Peter's Church, and assistant at the Gymnasium. In 1764 he obtained a position as assistant of the philosophical faculty of the university of the same place. In 1775 he accepted a call to the University of Giessen as prof. ord. of divinity and assessor of the Consistory; in 1777 he received the degree of doctor of divinity, and was appointed inspector and first preacher at Butzbach. In 1790 he again returned to Strasburg as professor and preacher, and there died, June 29, 1794. Lobstein's above-mentioned stay in Paris not only offered him the opportunity of hearing some of the best Orientalists of the day (a fact which chiefly contributed to his extensive and accurate knowledge of the Oriental languages), but also made him acquainted with many great men of that city. Of his scholarly productions was only mention Diss. de divina animi pace, sanctae comite (Argentorati. 1766, 4to): —  Conmmentatio historico-philologica de montibus Ebal et Garizim (ibid. 1770, 4to): — Observationes criticae in loca Pentateuchi illustria (Gissae et Francof. 1787, 8vo). He published also the Samaritan Codex, after the MSS. of the Royal Library at Paris. — Döring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutsch. s.v.

## Lobwasser, Ambrosius[[@Headword:Lobwasser, Ambrosius]]

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

## Local Preachers[[@Headword:Local Preachers]]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Within a few years past a spirited effort has been made among the local preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church for mutual improvement, and the general increase of the intellectual and spiritual power of the body. A National Local Preachers' Association has been formed, which has held public sessions in various parts of the United States. "At these annual gatherings representatives from all parts of the world come together for counsel, and for the comparison of personal experience, and observations, and methods of labor; also to discuss questions bearing upon their work generally." This association also encourages the organization of branch associations in different sections of the country. The National Association  referred to memorialized the General Conference of 1872, requesting the following legislation, viz.:

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

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

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

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

## Locales[[@Headword:Locales]]

             a name anciently given to ecclesiastics who were ordained to a ministerial charge in some fixed place. At the Council ofValentia, in Spain, a decree was passed that no priest should be ordained unless he would give a promise that he would be a localis. Indeed, ordination at large was not considered valid.

## Locherer. Johann Nepomuk[[@Headword:Locherer. Johann Nepomuk]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Freiburg, August 21, 1773, and died at Giessen, February 26, 1837, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche (Ravensberg, 1824-34, 9 volumes): — Lehrbuch der christlichen Archiologie (Frankfort, 1832): — Lehrbuch der Patrologie (Mayence, 1837). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:14, 543, 608, 854; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:806. (B.P.)

## Lochman, John George, D.D[[@Headword:Lochman, John George, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, widely and favorably known, was born in Philadelphia December 2, 1773. After the proper preparation, he entered the University of Pennsylvania, at which he was graduated in 1789, and from which institution he subsequently received the doctorate. He studied theology under the direction of Dr. Helmuth, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1794. Soon after, he accepted a call to Lebanon, Penn., where he remained twenty-one years, laboring with great fidelity and the most satisfactory results. In 1815 he was elected pastor of the Lutheran Church at Harrisburg, Penn. His successful labors here were terminated by death  July 10, 1826. Dr. Lochman was an able and popular preacher. He was held in high estimation by the Church, and exercised an unbounded influence. See Sprague, Annals Am. Pulpit, 9:110 sq. (M.L.S.)

## Loci Communes Theologici[[@Headword:Loci Communes Theologici]]

             is the name given to expositions of evangelical dogmatics in the early times of the Reformation. It originated with Melancthon, and was retained by many as late as the 17th century. Melancthon was led to adopt it in consequence of its classical signification, the word loci being then used to denote the fundamental principles of any system or science, and he considered it desirable that the loci of theology should also be regularly established and defined: "Equibus rerum summa pendeat, ut quorsum dirigenda sint studia intelligatur" (Loci communes s. hypotyposes theologiae, 1521); "Prodest in doctrina Christ ordine colligere praecipuos locos ut intelligi possit; quid in summa profiteatur doctrina Christiana, quid ad eam portineat, quid non pertineat" (Loci communes, 1533, init.). But, as the very first principle of the Reformation was the Bible as a source of saving truth, it is evident the Loci communes theologici could be nothing else than the Scriptures themselves. In the first edition of his Loci Melancthon confined himself almost exclusively to the Epistle to the Romans, in the exposition of which he collected the Communissimi rerum theologicarum loci; in his second work (1533) he extended his field, following the historical order, and this plan has been generally adopted since. The most striking progress accomplished by this method, compared with the former scholastic treatment of dogmatics, is, as Melancthon himself pointed out, a return to the Bible on all points, instead of to the sentences of Peter Lombard, "Qui ita recitat dogmata ut nec muniat lectorem Scripturae testimoniis nec de summit Scripturae disputet."

As the Reformation restored the Bible to the people, it was natural that the Loci theol. also should be less scientific and learned works than such as could help the people to a clearer understanding of the Scriptures. Hence they were published in German by Spalatin (1521). afterwards by J. Jonas (1536), and finally by Melancthon himself (1542), and designated by them as the chief articles and principal point of Scripture (Hauptartikel u. fürnehmste Punkte d. ganzen heil. Schrift), or of Christian doctrine (Hauptartikel christlicher Lehre). Melancthon, however, in the third part of his Loci (1543-59), gradually withdrew from this position, and adopted a manner of treating the subject more akin to scholasticism. This was subsequently the case with the Loci theologici of Abdias Praetorius  (Schulze) (Wittemberg, 1569) and Strigel (ed. Pezel, Neust. 1581), who held the same views, as well as with those of Martin Chemnitz (ed. P. Lyser, Francf. a. M. 1591) and Hafenreffer (Tüb. 1600), who differed from him; also of Leonard Hutter (Wittemb. 1619), who went on an entirely different principle, which John Gerhard tried to soften down in his renowned Loci theol. (Jena, 1610), while A. Calov, in his Systema locor. theol. (Wittemb. 1655), carried it to its full extreme. After this time the expression Loci theologici ceased to be used in Lutheran dogmatics. In the Reformed Church it was used by Hyperius (Basle, 1566), W. Musculus (Berne, 1561), Peter Martyr (Basle, 1580), J. Maccov (Franeker, 1639), and D. Chamier (Geneva, 1653). See Gass, Gesch. d. prot. Dogmatik (1854, volume 1); Heppe, Dogmatik des deutsch. Protestantismus, etc. (1857, volume 1); C. Schwarz, Studien u. Kritiken (1855, 1, and 1857, 2). — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 8:449. (J.N.P.)

## Lock[[@Headword:Lock]]

             (נָעִל, naal', to bar up a door, Jdg 3:23-24; rendered "bolt," 2Sa 13:17-18, "inclose," "shut up," in Son 4:12; hence מִנְעוּל, manul', the bolt or fastening of a door, Neh 3:3; Neh 3:6; Neh 3:13-15, Son 5:5). The doors of the ancient Hebrews were secured by bars of wood or iron, though the latter were almost entirely appropriated to the entrance of fortresses, prisons, and towns (comp. Isa 45:2). Thus we find it mentioned in 1Ki 4:13 as something remarkable concerning Bashan that "there were threescore great cities, having walls and brazen bars." These were almost the only locks known in early times, and they were furnished with a large and clumsy key, which was applied to the bar through an orifice on the outside, by means of which the bolt or bar was slipped forward as in modern locks (Jdg 3:24). There were smaller contrivances for inner doors, and probably projecting pieces by which to shove the bolt with the hand (Son 5:5). SEE KEY.

Lane thus describes a modern Egyptian lock: "Every door is furnished with a wooden lock, called dabbeh, the mechanism of which is shown by a sketch here inserted. No. 1 is a front view of the lock, with the bolt drawn back, Nos. 2, 3, and 4 are back views of the separate parts and the key. A number of small iron pins (four, five, or more) drop into corresponding holes in the sliding bolt as soon as the latter is pushed into the hole or staple of the door-post. The key also has  small pins, made to correspond with the holes, into which they are introduced to open the lock, the former pins being thus pushed up, the bolt may be drawn back. The wooden lock of a street door commonly has a sliding bolt about fourteen inches long; those of the doors of apartments, cupboards, etc., are about seven, eight, or nine inches. The locks of the gates of quarters, public buildings, etc., are of the same kind, and mostly two feet in length, or more. It is not difficult to pick this kind of lock" (Mod. Egyptians, 1:25). Hence they were sometimes, as an additional security, covered with clay (q.v.), and on this a seal (q.v.) impressed (comp. Job 28:14). (See Rauwollff, Trav. in Ray, 2:17; Russell, Aleppo, 1:22; Volney, Trav. 2:438; Chardin, Voy. 4:123; Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt., abridgment, 1:15, 16.) SEE DOOR.

The other terms rendered "lock" in the Auth. Vers. refer to the hair of the head, etc.; they are the following: מִחְלָפוֹת, machlaphoth', braids or plaits, e.g. of the long hair of Samson (Jdg 16:13; Jdg 16:19); צַיצַית, tsitsith', the forelock of the head (Eze 8:3; also a "fringe" or tassel, Num 15:38-39; comp. Mat 23:5); פֶּרִע, pe'rla, the locks of hair, as being shorn (Num 6:5; Eze 44:20; and קְוצֻּוֹת, kevutstsoth', the forelocks or sidelocks of a man's or woman's hair (Son 5:2; Son 5:12; comp. Schultens, Op. min. page 246); but צִמָּה, tsammah', is a veil or female covering for the head and face, usual in the East (Son 4:1; Son 4:3; Son 6:7; Isa 47:2). SEE HAIR.

## Locke, George[[@Headword:Locke, George]]

             a Methodist preacher, was born in Cannonstown, Pennsylvania, June 8, 1797, and reared in Kentucky. His early educational advantages were few, but he improved all opportunities to secure knowledge. His parents were Presbyterians, but George was made a Methodist through the preaching of Edward Talbot when a saddler's apprentice. In 1817 he was licensed to exhort, and soon began to preach. In 1819 he entered Tennessee Conference, and was successively appointed to Little River Circuit, to Powell's Valley, and to Bowling Green Circuit, Kentucky. In 1822 he located in Shelbyville, and engaged in secular business. His conscience forced him to re-enter the ministry, and he successively preached on Jefferson Circuit and Hartford Circuit (Kentucky Conference). In 1826 he was transferred to Corydon Circuit, Illinois Conference. In 1828 he labored on Charleston Circuit, and was the means of one of the greatest revivals  that Southern Indiana ever witnessed. The same year he was appointed presiding elder of Wabash District, which embraced an area of territory in Indiana and Illinois of at least 100 miles from east to west, by 200 miles from north to south, on either side of the Wabash River. While on this district he contracted the consumption, and was obliged to become supernumerary. He died in New Albany, Indiana, in July, 1834. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 7:608.

## Locke, John[[@Headword:Locke, John]]

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

Life. — John Locke was born August 29, 1632, at Wrington, Somersetshire, and was educated first at Westminster School, and later at Christ Church College, Oxford. Here he prosecuted the prescribed studies with diligence and success, but deviated from the beaten path by devoting himself to the discountenanced writings of Des Cartes, who had died a few years before. He obtained the baccalaureate in 1655, and the master's degree in 1658, and then applied himself to the study of medicine, rather for the sake of knowledge and of his sickly frame than with the purpose of practicing his profession.  In 1664 Locke accompanied the embassy to the elector of Brandenburg as secretary of legation, but he returned to Oxford within the year, and applied himself to experimental philosophy, then rising into favor. An accident now decided his course of life, and occasioned his acquaintance with lord Ashley — the celebrated earl of Shaftesbury — with whom he was persuaded to take up his abode the next year. By his skill and good luck he relieved his patron of an abcess which endangered his life, and was induced to confine his medical practice to a small circle of the lord's friends, and to give his chief attention to political speculation and questions of state. He thus became a man of the world before he became a philosopher. In 1668 Locke accompanied the earl and countess of Northumberland to France. The earl proceeded towards Rome, and died on the way. Locke returned with the countess to England, and again found a home with Ashley-chancellor of the exchequer after Clarendon's fall. The future sage was employed to superintend the education of Ashley's heir, a feeble boy of sixteen. He was afterwards commissioned to select a wife for him, and did so satisfactorily. In due course of time he took charge of the education of the eldest son of this marriage, the author of "the Characteristics." "To such strange uses may we come at last!"

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

On Shaftesbury's restoration to office as lord president of the council, 1679, he sent for Locke, but the minister was dismissed in October of the  same year. In two years more he was brought to trial for treason, but the grand jury ignored the indictment. Shaftesbury, however, was compelled to escape secretly to Holland, where he died, June 21, 1683. Locke had followed him, and wrote an affectionate tribute to his memory.

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

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

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

In 1693 Locke withdrew from the dull, heavy atmosphere of London, and accepted a pleasant retreat for his increasing asthma and advancing age at  Oates. in Essex, the seat of Sir Francis Masham, who had married the accomplished daughter of Dr. Cudworth. It had been the fortune of Locke through life to live "quadris alienis." His last quarters were at Oates. This was his home till he found a quieter home in the grave, where he waited in cold abstraction's apathy for a miracle to reanimate his spirit, according to the dogma of The Reasonableness of Christianity (produced in 1695). This work sought the union of all Christian believers by advancing the doctrine that the only necessary article of Christian belief is comprised in the acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah, making all the requirements beyond this to consist of practical duties, of repentance for sin, and obedience to the moral precepts of the Gospel. It will be remembered that king William III, of England, entertained the design of uniting Conformists and Dissenters on some common ground, and to further this scheme Locke wrote The Reasonableness of Christianity (comp. Quarterly Review, Lond. 1864, July). About the time of his retirement from the city Locke published his third Letter on Toleration, and in the first year of his seclusion wrote his little tract on the Education of Children. The same year which brought out his exceedingly heterodox essay on Christianity was marked by his philosophical controversy with Dr. Stillingfleet, bishop of Worcester.

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

Locke's health was always exceedingly feeble, and his existence was prolonged only by constant vigilance and care. This doubtless contributed to his abstinence from any energetic vocation, and probably influenced his theories as well as his character and conduct. It rendered his existence a career of tranquil and learned leisure, except so far as it was interrupted by the suspicions and malice which civil discord directs against every man of note. The self-regarding habits of a valetudinarian may have impelled the  thoughts of the philosopher to that continual introspection and that exaggeration of personal impressions which so strongly mark his philosophy. His love of ease and security showed itself in his general demeanor. He was cautious and retiring, affable and genial in his intercourse, kindly and affectionate in his nature, free from personal animosities, notwithstanding his transitory difference with Newton and his controversy with bishop Stillingfleet. He avoided the incumbrances of matrimony; and the deficient experiences of an old bachelor — the want of that most suggestive knowledge, the dawn of intelligence in infancy — may be noted in his whole psychology. His life was, however, worthy of his eminence, and was such as to make him a suitable compeer of those fortunate nimium — those happy philosophic dispositions which are represented by Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Berkeley, and Hume.

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

An examination of the analysis usually prefixed to the "Essay" will show how small a portion of the work really belongs to the regular exposition of a metaphysical system; how much is occupied with the anticipation of objections, or the simplification of apprehended difficulties. The treatise is divided into four books. The first repudiates the Cartesian doctrine of innate ideas, and is therefore controversial and negative. It does not seem to have been very highly regarded by Locke himself. The second is an inquiry into the origin and limits of human knowledge, and is the characteristic portion of Locke's philosophy. The third is given to the consideration of words, and is in many respects the most valuable part of the book, affording useful suggestions for guarding against the  multitudinous seductions of the Idola Fori. It is dialectical rather than philosophical, though it affords frequent opportunities of confirming or expounding his cardinal tenet, and many of exhibiting its inadequacy. The fourth book is on the nature of knowledge in general, and does little more than apply the conclusion already reached to the determination of the degree, extent, and quality of human knowledge, which is reduced by him not merely to relativity, but to a beggarly and unsatisfactory relativity.

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

Locke's point of departure was that of all the philosophers of the latter part of the 17th and the first quarter of the 18th century — Cartesianism. The influence of the suspected doctrine was manifested at the outset of his labors by his proposition to substitute the phrase determinate ideas for clear and distinct ideas — though a mere change of name, and such a change, could effect little in producing a complete reform of system. It is a startling commentary on the insufficiency of this substitution that no writer has been more capricious and vacillating in his employment of terms than Locke himself, and that the very term idea, which he elaborately defines, is used by him without determinate meaning, and in almost every possible  sense except its true one. He, however, furnished neither the first nor the solitary example of the abuse of this fine Platonic invention. Locke's popularity may be due to the ease, and vigor, the vivacity, and homeliness of his style; but the style is rugged, ambiguous, conversational, and as far removed from philosophical propriety as it is from literary elegance.

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

Having got rid of innate ideas — tenues sine corpore vitae — the English philosopher proceeded to investigate the origin of human knowledge — the avowed object of his main inquiry. There was an inversion of logical order, as Morell has observed, in seeking the ratio essendi of the phenomena before ascertaining the phenomena themselves; but the accidental connection between the first and second pairs of the Essay is very intimate. If knowledge be not deduced ab infra, it might naturally  appear to be derived ab extra. Hence Locke concluded that all knowledge is obtained from sensation and reflection. This is his principle, and his principle is his philosophy — the curtain is the picture. The distinction between the sensation and its intellectual appreciation was unsuspected by him; nor did he observe that if sensation and reflection upon sensation are the exclusive sources of knowledge, the knowledge of reflection is derivative from and dependent upon sensation, and all knowledge springs from sensation alone. This oversight occasioned his very inadequate explanations of space, time, power, cause, good and evil, and God; it furnished Hume with his cardinal positions in regard to impressions and ideas; it rendered Locke a suitable patron for the French encyclopaedists and the materialists, and created the belief that he espoused the tenet "Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu."

This tenet was held by neither Aristotle nor Locke, but Locke's development of his own principle often seems to assert and to rest upon that tenet, and both provoked and justified the celebrated response and refutation offered by Leibnitz in the proposed addition to the maxim of the words "nisi infellectus ipse." Locke might have accepted that addition, but it was not declared by his language, nor clearly indicated by his teachings; and its frank acceptance would have been fatal to his philosophical expositions; for, if reflection be considered as a source of knowledge distinct from sensation, it must be different from sensation, and must be a contribution of the mind itself to the intellectual product. Locke's original attitude was that of a polemic engaged in the refutation of Des Cartes; this attitude he never altogether abandoned; it determined his habits of speculation, and continually misled him. Locke was still further misled by the looseness, awkwardness, obscurity, and prolixity of his style, by its colloquial negligence of phrase, by that wavering of expression and impalpability of figurative illustration which have been noted by Sir William Hamilton, Maurice, and nearly every other student of his works. The equivocation of the terms employed by him escaped his recognition, while it perplexes his readers, and produced much the same effect upon his reasoning as was produced upon Hume's by a similar agency. With Locke there might be delusion; there was no sophistry; there was an open, manly spirit, a candor and honesty of investigation which often slighted or ignored consistency in the determined apprehension of what was felt instinctively to be right. His book accordingly exercises a most wholesome influence even when the developments of his doctrine are most aberrant, and its perversions most perilous. The practical character of his own disposition, the predilection for  the studies of observation, and the innocence and simplicity of his own nature, guarded him from the effects as well as from the perception of his errors, but at the same time rendered those errors less apparent and more seductive to others. They preserved his own piety, while his system became a templum impietatis.

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

Literature. — The literature illustrative of Locke's philosophy is endless. It includes the greater part of the metaphysical treatises written since the close of the 17th century. It must suffice, therefore, to mention here only the works of most direct importance, and most readily accessible. Of such is the following list composed. Locke, Works (London, 1824, 9 volumes, 8vo) ; Locke, Philosophical Works, by J.A. St. John (London, 1854, 2 volumes, 12mo); Leibnitz, Nouveaux Esssais sur l'Entendement Humain; Joannes Clericus, Lockii Vita; "Life of John Locke," in the Biographica Britannica; Lord King, The Life of John Locke, etc. (Lond. 1830, 2 volumes, 8vo); Forster, Original Letters of John Locke, etc. (London, 1847); Browne, "Life of John Locke," in the Encyclop. Britannica; Dugald Stewart, Supplement to the Encyclop. Britannica; Sir James Mackintosh,  On the philosophical Genius of Bacon and Locke; Henry Rogers, Miscellanies (Lond. 1855, 3 vols. 8vo); Ritter, Gesch. d. Christl. Philos. 7:449 sq.; V. Cousin, Hist. de la Philosophie; Lewes, Biogrsaph. Hist. of Philosophy (Lond. 1857, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:237 sq.; Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought, page 124 sq.; Blakey, Hist. Philosophy of Mind (London, 1850, 4 volumes, 8vo); Morell, Crit. History of Modern Philosophly (Lond. 1847, 2 volumes, 8vo); Brit. Quar. Rev. 1847 (May); North Brit. Rev. 1864 (July), page 37 sq.; Edincb. Rev. 1864 (April), 1854; Lond. Quar. Review, 1864 (July), page 41 sq. (G.F.H.)

## Locke, John (2)[[@Headword:Locke, John (2)]]

             an English Wesleyan minister, was born at Lyme, Dorset, in 1814, entered the Wesleyan, ministry in 1841, and died January 2, 1890. He was a diligent student, and published a System of Theology in 1862, which had a large circulation in England, America, and Australia. See Minutes of the British Conference, 1890, page 24.

## Locke, Nathaniel Clark[[@Headword:Locke, Nathaniel Clark]]

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

## Locke, Samuel[[@Headword:Locke, Samuel]]

             D.D., a noted American divine and educator, was born at Woburn, Mass., Nov. 23, 1732, and was educated at Harvard University (class of 1755). He was ordained minister of the Gospel at Sherburne, Massachusetts, November 7, 1759, and remained in the ministry until 1769, when he was called to preside over his alma mater, and was inducted to the office March 21, 1770. Three years later he was honored by the college authorities with the doctorate of divinity, but some troubles must have arisen shortly after, for in December of this self-same year Locke resigned his position at Harvard, and spent the remainder of his life in retirement. He died at Sherburne, Massachusetts, January 15, 1788. An estimate of the man we find in two letters written by Dr. Andrew Eliot, of Boston, to Mr. Hollis,  of London, the distinguished benefactor of the college, about the time of Locke's election to the presidency of Harvard University, in which he is represented as "a clergyman of a small parish about twenty miles from Cambridge; of fine talents — a close thinker, having when at college the character of a first-rate scholar — of an excellent spirit, and generous, catholic sentiments — a friend to liberty — his greatest defect a want of knowledge of the world, having lived in retirement, and perhaps not a general acquaintance with books." The only production of Dr. Locke's that exists in print is the Convention Sermon preached in 1772. "His manner in the pulpit is said to have been marked by great dignity and impressiveness." See The N.Y. Observer, March 1865.

## Locke, William E[[@Headword:Locke, William E]]

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

## Lockwood, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Lockwood, Samuel, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Norwalk, Connecticut, November 30, 1721. After graduating from Yale College in 1745, he studied theology under the direction of his brother, Reverend James Lockwood, of Wethersfield. A society having been formed in Andover, in 1747, embracing Coventry, Lebanon, and Hebron, he was called to preach, as a candidate, in the beginning of the following year. Of this parish he was ordained pastor, February 25, 1749. He died in New Lebanon, N.Y., June 18, 1791. His manner in the pulpit was marked by gravity rather than vivacity; but he was very popular with his people. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:465.

## Lockyer, Nicholas[[@Headword:Lockyer, Nicholas]]

             a Presbyterian divine and pious Nonconformist, was born in 1612. He studied at New Inn Hall, Oxford, and became provost of Eton College in 1658, but was ejected at the Restoration. He died in 1684. His writings show him to have been very zealous and affectionate, earnestly bent on the conversion of souls. Some of his most important works are the following:  Baulme for bleeding England and Ireland, or seasonable Instructions for persecuted Christians, delivered in several sermons [on Col 1:11-12] (London, 1644): — Christ's Communion with his Church militant [on Joh 14:18] (5th ed. London, 1672, 12mo): — England faithfully watcht with her Wounds, or Christ as a Father sitting up with his Children in their swooning State; which is the summe of several Lectures painfully preached upon Colossians 1 (Lond. 1646, 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. s.v.

## Loctilus[[@Headword:Loctilus]]

             a name given to a place for a coffin among the ancient Romans.

## Locust[[@Headword:Locust]]

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

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

(1.) ARBEH' (אִרְבֶּה, occurs in Exo 10:4; Sept. ἀκρίδα πολλήν, a vast flight of locusts, or perhaps indicating that several species were employed, Vulg. locustam; and in Exo 10:12-14; Exo 10:19, ἀκρις and locusta, Eng. "locusts;" Lev 11:22, βροῦχον, bruchus, "locust;" Deu 28:38, ἀκρίς, locustae, "locust;" Jdg 6:5; Jdg 7:12; ἀκρίς, locustarum, "grasshoppers;" 1Ki 8:37, βροῦχος, locssta, "locust;" 2Ch 6:28, ἀκρίς, locusta, "locusts;" Job 39:20, ἀκρίδες, locustas, "grasshopper;" Psa 78:46, ἀκρίδι, Symm. σκώληκι, locustae, "locust;" Psa 105:34, ἀκρίς, locusta, "locusts;"  Psa 109:23, ἀκρίδες, locustae, "locust;" Pro 30:27, ἀκρίς, locusta, "locusts;" Jer 46:23, ἀκρίδα, locusta, "grasshoppers;" Joe 1:4; Joe 2:25, ἀκρίς, locustar, "locust;" Nah 3:15, βροῦχος, bruchus, "locusts;" Nah 3:17, ἀττέλαβος, locusts, "locusts"). In almost every passage where arbeh occurs, reference is made to its terribly destructive powers.

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

It is one of the flying creeping creatures that were allowed as food by the law of Moses (Lev 11:21). In this passage it is clearly the representative of some species of winged saltatorial orthoptera, which must have possessed indications of form sufficient to distinguish the insect from the three other names which belong to the same division of orthoptera, and are mentioned in the same context. The opinion of Michaelis (Suppl. 667, 910), that the four words mentioned in Lev 11:22 denote the same insect in four different ages or stages of its growth, is quite untenable, for, whatever particular species are intended by these  words, it is quite clear from Lev 11:21 that they must all be winged ortholptera. The Septulagint word βροῦχος there clearly shows that the translator uses it for a winged species of locust, contrary to the Latin fathers (as Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, etc.), who all define the bruchus to be the untledged young or larva of the locust, and who call it attelabus when its wings are partially developed, and locusta when able to fly; although both Sept. and Vulg. ascribe flight to the bruchus here, and in Nah 3:17. The Greek fathers, on the other hand, uniformly ascribe to the βροῦχος both wings and flight, and therein agree with the descriptions of the ancient Greek naturalists. Thus Theophrastus, the pupil of Aristotle, who, with his preceptor, was probably contemporaneous with the Septuagint translators of the Pentateuch, plainly speaks of it as a distinct species, and not a mere state: "The ἀκρίδες (the best ascertained general Greek word for the locust) are injurious, the ἀττέλαβοι still more so, and those most of all which they call βροῦχοις (De Aniin).

The Sept. seems to recognize the peculiar destructiveness of the βροῦχος in 1Ki 8:37 (but has merged it in the parallel passage, 2 Chronicles), and in Nah 3:15, by adopting it for arbeh. In these passages the Sept. translators may have understood the G. migratorius or greguarius (Linn.), which is usually considered to be the most destructive species (from βρώσκω, I devour). Yet, in Joe 1:4; Joe 2:2, they have applied it to the yelek, which, however, appears there as engaged in the work of destruction. Hesychius, in the 3d century, explains the βροῦχος as "a species of locust," though, he observes, applied in his time by different nations to different species of locusts, and by some to the ἀττελαβος. May not his testimony to this effect illustrate the various uses of the word by the Sept. in the minor prophets? Our translators have wrongly adopted the word "grasshopper" in Judges and Jer 46:23, where "locusts" would certainly have better illustrated the idea of "innumerable multitudes;" and here, as elsewhere, have departed from their professed rule "not to vary from the sense of that which they had translated before, if the word signified the same in both places" (translators to the reader, ad finern).

The Hebrew word in question is usually derived from, רבה, "to multiply," or "be numerous," because the locust is remarkably prolific; which, as a general name, is certainly not inapplicable; and it is thence also inferred that it denotes the G. migratorius, because that species often appears in large numbers. However, the largest flight of locusts upon record, calculated to have extended over five hundred miles, and which darkened the air like an  eclipse, and was supposed to come from Arabia, did not consist of the G. nigratorius, but of a red species (Kirby and Spence, Introd. to Entomology, 1:210); and, according to Forskal, the species which now chiefly infests Arabia, and which he names G. gregarius, is distinct from the G. migratorius of Linn. (Encyc. Brit. art. Entomology, page 193). Others derive the word from אָרִב, "to lie hid" or "in ambush," because the newly-hatched locust emerges from the ground, or because the locust besieges vegetables. Rosenmüller justly remarks upon such etymologies, and the inferences made from them (Scholia in Joe 1:4), "How precarious truly the reasoning is, derived in this manner from the e mere etymology of the word, everybody may understand for himself. Nor is the principle otherwise in regard to the rest of the species."

He also remarks that the references to the destructiveness of locusts, which are often derived from the roots, simply concur in this, that locusts consume and do mischief. Illustrations of the propriety of his remarks will abound as we proceed. Still, it by no means follows from a coincidence of the Hebrew roots, in this, or any other meaning, that the learned among the ancient Jews did not recognize different species in the different names of locusts. The English word fly, from the Saxon fleon, the Heb. עוֹŠ, and its representative "fowl," in the English version (Gen 1:20, etc.), all express both a general and specific idea. Even a modern entomologist might speak of "the flies" in a room, while aware that from fifty to one hundred different species annually visit our apartments. The Scriptures use popular language; hence "the multitude," "the devourer," or "the darkener," may have been the familiar appellations for certain species of locusts. The common Greek words for locusts and grasshoppers, etc., are of themselves equally indefinite, yet they also served for the names of species, as ἀκρίς, the locust generally, from the tops of vegetables, on which the locust feeds; but it is also used as the proper name of a particular species, as the grasshopper: τετραπτερυλλίς, "four-winged," is applied sometimes to the grasshopper; τρωξαλλίς, from τρώγω, "to chew," sometimes to the caterpillar. Yet the Greeks had also distinct names restricted to particular species, as ὄνος, μολουρίς, κερκώτη, etc. The Hebrew names may also have served similar purposes.

(2.) GEB (גֵּב, Isa 33:4; Sept. ἀκρίδες, Vulgate omits, Engl. "locusts"), or GoB (גּוֹב, Amo 7:1, ἐπιγονὴ ἀκρίδων; Aquila, βοράδον [voratrices], locustae, "grasshoppers;" Nah 3:17, ἀττέλαβος, locusts, "grasshoppers"). Here the lexicographers, finding no  Hebrew root, resort to the Arabic, גָּבָא, "to creep out" (of the ground), as the locusts do in spring. But this applies to the young of all species of locusts, and Bochart's quotations from Aristotle and Pliny occur unfortunately in general descriptions of the locust. Castell gives another Arabic root, גָּאִב, "to cut" or "tear," but this is open to a similar objection. Parkhurst proposes גִּב, anything gibbous, curved, or arched, and gravely adds, "The locust in the caterpillar state, so called from its shape in general, or from its continually hunching out its back in moving." The Sept. word in Nahum, ἀττέλαβος, has already been shown to mean a perfect insect and species. Accordingly, Aristotle speaks of its parturition and eggs (Hist. Amim 5:29; so also Plutarch, De Isid. et Osir.). It seems, however, not unlikely that it means a wingless species of locust, genus Podisma of Latreille. Grasshoppers, which are of this kind, he includes under the genus Tettix. Hesychius defines the ἀττέλαβος as "a small locust," and Pliny mentions it as “the smallest of locusts, without wings" (Histor. Nat. 29:5). Accordingly, the Sept. ascribes only leaping to it. In Nahum we have the construction גּוֹב גּוֹבִי, locust of the locusts, which the lexicons explain as a vast multitude of locusts. Archbishop Newcome suggests that "the phrase is either a double reading where the scribes had a doubt which was the true reading, or a mistaken repetition not expunged."

He adds, that we may suppose גּוֹבִיthe contracted plural for גּוֹבַים(Improved Version of the Minor Prophets, Pontefr. 1809, page 188). Henderson understands the reduplication to express "the largest and most formidable of that kind of insect" (Comment. on the Minor Prophets, ad loc.). Some writers, led by this passage, have believed that the gob represents the larva state of some of the large locusts; the habit of halting at night, however, and encamping under the hedges, as described by the prophet, in all probability belongs to the winged locust as well as to the larvae; see Exo 10:13 : "The Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day and all that night; and when it was morning, the east wind brought the locusts." Mr. Barrow (1:257-8), speaking of some species of South African locusts, says that when the larvae, which are still more voracious than the parent insect, are on the march, it is impossible to make them turn out of the way, which is usually that of the wind. At sunset the troop halts and divides into separate groups, each occupying in bee-like clusters the neighboring eminences for the night. It is quite possible that the gôb may represent the larva or nymnpha state of the insect; nor is the passage from Nahum, "When the sun ariseth they flee away," any objection  to this supposition, for the last stages of the larva differ but slightly from the nympha, both which states may therefore be comprehended under one name; the gob of Nah 3:17 may easily have been the nymphae (which in all the Ametabola continue to feed as in their larva condition) encamping at night under the hedges, and, obtaining their wings as the sun arose, are then represented as flying away (so too Kitto, Pict. Bible, note on Nah 3:17). It certainly is improbable that the Jews should have had no name for the locust in its larva or nymphs state, for they must have been quite familiar with the sight of such devourers of every green thing, the larvae being even more destructive than the imago; perhaps some of the other nine names, all of which Bochart considers to be the names of so many species, denote the insect in one or other of these conditions. SEE GRASSHOPPER.

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

(4.) CHAGAB' (חָגָב, Lev 11:22; Num 13:33; Isa 40:22; Ecc 12:5, and 2Ch 7:13, in all which the Sept. reads ἀκρίς, Vulg. locusta, and Engl. "grasshopper," except the last, where the Engl. has "locusts." The manifest impropriety of translating this word "grasshoppers" in Lev 11:22, according to the English acceptation of the word, appears from its description there as being winged and edible; in all the other instances it most probably denotes a species of locust. Our translators have, indeed, properly rendered it "locust" in 2 Chronicles; but in all the other places "grasshopper," probably with a view to heighten the contrast described in those passages, but with no real advantage. Oedman (Vern. Samml. 2:90) infers, from its being so often used for this purpose, that it denotes the smallest species of locust; but in the passage in Chronicles voracity seems its chief characteristic. An Arabic root, חָגִב, signifying "to hide," is usually adduced, because it is said that locusts fly in such crowds as to hide the sun; but others say, from their hiding the ground when they alight. Even Parkhurst demurs that "to veil the sun and darken the air is not peculiar to any kind of locust;" and with no better success proposes to understand the cucullated, or hoode, or veiled species of locust. Tychsen (Conmment. de Locust. page 76) supposes that chadab denotes the Gryllus coronatus, Linn.; but this is the Acanthodis coronatus of Aud. Serv., a South American species, and probably colnfined to that continent. Michaelis (Supplem. 668), who derives the word from an Arabic root signifying "to veil," conceives that chagab represents either a locust at the fourth stage of its growth, "ante quartas exuvias quod adhuc velata est," or else at the last stage of its growth, "post quartas exuvias, quod jam volans solem coelumque obvelat."

To the first theory the passage in Leviticus 11 is opposed. The second theory is more reasonable, but châgâb is probably derived not from the Arabic, but the Hebrew. From what has been stated above, it will appear better to own our complete inability to say what species of locust châgâb denotes, than to hazard conjectures which must be grounded on no solid foundation. In the Talmud châgâb is a collective name for many of the locust tribe, no less than eight hundred kinds of châgâbim being supposed by the Talmud to exist! (Lewysohn, Zoolog. des Talm. § 384). Some kinds of locusts are beautifully marked, and were sought after by young Jewish children as playthings, just as butterflies and cockchafers are nowadays. M. Lewysohn says (§ 384) that a regular traffic used to be carried on with the chagâbim, which were caught in great numbers, and sold after wine had  been sprinkled over them; he adds that the Israelites were only allowed to buy them before the dealer had thus prepared them. SEE GRASSHOPPER.

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

(6.) CHASIL' (חָסַיל. 1Ki 8:37; 2Ch 6:28; Psa 78:46; Isa 23:4; Joe 1:4; Joe 2:25; Septuag. ἀκρίς, but in 2 Chronicles βροῦχος; Vulg. rubigqo, bruchus, cerugo; Engl. always "caterpillar"). Gesenius derives it from the root חָסִל, to eat off; Deu 32:38. It thus points to the same generic idea of destructiveness prominent in all this genus. SEE CATERPILLAR.

(7.) CHARGOL' (חִרְגֹּל, only in Lev 11:22; Septuag. ὀφιομάχης,Vulg. ophionsmachus, Auth. Vers. "beetle"), derived by Gesenius from the Arabic quadriliteral root חִרְגִּל, to gallop, as a horse, and applied by the Arabs to a flight of wingless locusts, but thought by him to indicate in Leviticus a winged and edible locust. Beckmann has arrived at the conclusion that some insect of the sphex or ichneumon kind was meant (apud Bochaxt, a Rosenmüller, 3:264). The genus of locusts called Truxalis, said to live upon insects, has been thought to answer the description. But is it a fact that the genus Truxalis is an exception to the rest of the Acridites, and is pre-eminently insectivorous? Serville (Orthopt.  p. 579) believes that in their manner of living the Truxalides resemble the rest of the Acridites, but seems to allow that further investigation is necessary. Fischer (Orthop. Europ. page 292) says that the nutriment of this family is plants of various kinds. It is some excuse for the English rendering "beetle" in this place, that Pliny classes one species of grylhsis, the house-cricket, G. domesticus, under the scarabaei (Hist. Nat. 11:8). The Jews interpret chargôl to mean a species of grasshopper, German heuschrecke, which M. Lewysohn identities with Locusta viridissima, adopting the etymology of Bochart and Gesenius. The Jewish women used to carry the eggs of the chargol in their ears to preserve them from the earache (Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. et Rabbin. s.v. Chargol). SEE BEETLE.

(8.) YE'LEK (יֶלֶק, Psa 105:34, βροῦχος, bruchus, "caterpillars;" Jer 51:14; Jer 51:27, ἀκρίς, bruchus, "caterpillars;" and in the latter passage the Vulgate reads bruchus aculeatus, and some copies horripilantes; Joe 1:4; Joe 2:25, βροῦχος, bruchus, "canker-worm;" Nah 3:15-16, ἀκρίς and βροῦχος, "canker-worm"). Assuming that the Psalmist means to say that the yelek was really another species employed in the plague on Egypt, the English word caterpillar in the common acceptation cannot be correct, for we can hardly imagine that the larvae of the Papilionidae tribe of insects could be carried by "winds." Canker-worm means any worm that preys on fruit. Βροῦχοςcould hardly be understood by the Sept. translators of the minor prophets as an unfledged locust, for in Nah 3:16 they give the βροῦχος away. As to the etymology, the Arabic יָלִק, to be white, is offered; hence the white locust or the chafer-worm, which is white (Michaelis, Recueil de Quest. page 64; Supp. ad Lex. Heb. 1080). Others give לָקִק, to lick off; as Gesenius, who refers to Num 22:4, where this root is applied to the ox "licking" up his pasturage, and which, as descriptive of celerity in eating, is supposed to apply to the yelek. Others suggest the Arabic וָלִק, to hasten, alluding to the quick motions of locusts. The passage in Jer 51:27 is the only instance where an epithet is applied to the locust, and there we find סָמָר יֶלֶק, "rough caterpillars." As the noun derived from this descriptive term (מִסְמֵר) means "nails," "sharp-pointed spikes," Michaelis refers it to the rough, sharp-pointed feet of some species of chafer (ut supra). Oedman takes it for the G. cristatus of Linn. Tychsen, with more probability, refers it to some rough or bristly species of locust, as the G. haematopus of Linn., whose thighs are ciliated with hairs. Many  grylli are furnished with spines and bristles; the whole species Acheta, also the pupa species of Linn., called by Degeer Locusta pupa spinosa, which is thus described: Thorax ciliated with spines, abdomen tuberculous and spinous, posterior thighs armed beneath with four spines or teeth; inhabits Ethiopia. The allusion in Jeremiah is to the ancient accoutrement of war- horses, bristling with sheaves of arrows. SEE CANKER-WORM.

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

(10.) TSELATSAL' (צְלָצִל, as the name of an insect only in Deu 28:42, ἐρυσίβη, rubigo, "locust"). The root commonly assigned is צָלִל, to sound (whence its use for a whizzing of wings, Isa 18:1; for cymbals, 2Sa 6:5; Psa 150:5; or any ringing instrument, as a harpoon, Job 41:7); hence, says Gesenius, a species of locust that makes a shrill noise. Dr. Lee says a tree-cricket that does so. Tychsen suggests the G. stridulus of Linn. The song of the gryllo- talpa is sweet and loud. On similar principles we might conjecture, although with perhaps somewhat less certainty, a derivation from the Chald. צְלָא, to pray, and thence infer the Mantis religiosa, or Prier Iieu, so called from its singular attitude, and which is found in Palestine (Kitto's Physical History, page 419). The words in the Septuag. and Vulgo properly mean the mildew on corn, etc., and are there applied metaphorically to the ravages of locusts. This mildew was anciently believed by the heathens to be a divine chastisement; hence their religious ceremony called Rubigalia (Pliny, Hist. Na. 18:29). The word is evidently onomatopoietic, and is here perhaps a synonyme for some one of the other names for locust. Michaelis (Supplem. 2094) believes the word is identical  with chasil, which he says denotes perhaps the molecricket, Gryllus talpiformis, from the stridulous sound it produces. Tychsen (pages 79, 80) identifies it with the Gryllus stridulus, Linneus ( — Edipoda stridula, Aud. Serv.). The notion conveyed by the Hebrew word will, however, apply to almost any kind of locust, and, indeed, to many kinds of insects; a similar word, tsalsalza, was applied by the Ethiopians to a fly which the Arabs called zimb, apparently identical with the tsetse fly of Dr. Livingstone and other African travelers. In the passage in Deuteronomy, if an insect be meant at all, it may be assigned to some destructive species of grasshopper or locust.

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

II. Locusts belong to that order of insects known by the term Orthoptera (or straight-winged). This order is divided into two large groups or divisions, viz. Cursoria and Saltatoria. The first, as the name imports, includes only those families of Orthoptera which have legs formed for creeping, and which are considered unclean by the Jewish law. Under the second are comprised those whose two posterior legs, by their peculiar structure, enable them to move on the ground by leaps. This group contains, according to Serville's arrangement, three families, the Gryllides, Locustariae, and the Acridites, distinguished one from the other by some peculiar modifications of structure. The common housecricket (Gryllus domesticus, Oliv.) may be taken as an illustration of the Gryllides; the green grasshopper (Locusta viridissima, Fabr.), which the French call Sauterelie verte, will represent the family Locustariae; and the Acridites may be typified by the common migratory locust (OEldipoda migratoria, Aud. Serv.), which is an occasional visitor to Europe (see the Gentleman's Magazine July, 1748, pages 331-414; also The Times, October 4, 1845). Of the Gryllides, G. cerisyi has been found in Egypt, and G. domesticus,  on the authority of Dr. Kitto, in Palestine; but doubtless other species also occur in these countries. Of the Locustariae, Phaneroptera falcata, Serv. (G. falc. Scopoli), has also, according to Kitto, been found in Palestine, Bradyporus dasypus in Asia Minor, Turkey, etc., Saga Natoliae near Smyrna. Of the locusts proper, or Acridites, four species of the genus Truxalis are recorded as having been seen in Egypt, Syria, or Arabia, viz. T. nasuta, T. variabilis, T. procera, and T. miniata. The following kinds also occur: Opsomala pisciformis, in Egypt, and the oasis of Harrat; Paekiloceros hieroglyphicus, P. bufonius, P. punctiventris, P. vulcanus, in the deserts of Cairo; Dericorys albidula in Egypt and Mount Lebanon. Of the genus Acridium, A. maestum, the most formidable perhaps of all the Acridites, A. lineola (= G. AEgypt. Linn.), which is a species commonly sold for food in the markets of Bagdad (Serv. Orthop. 607), A. semifasciatum, A. peregrinum, one of the most destructive of the species, and A. morbosum, occur either in Egypt or Arabia. Calliptamus serapis and Chrotogonus lugubris are found in Egypt, and in the cultivated lands about Cairo; Eremobia carinata, in the rocky places about Sinai. E. cisti, E. pulchripennis, (Edipoda octofasciata, and OEd. migratoria (=G. migrat. Linn.), complete the list of the Saltatorial Orthoptera of the Bible lands.

Of one species M. Olivier (Voyage dans l'Empire Othoman, 2:424) thus writes: "With the burning south winds (of Syria) there come from the interior of Arabia and from the most southern parts of Persia clouds of locusts (Acridium peregrinum), whose ravages to these countries are as grievous and nearly as sudden as those of the heaviest hail in Europe. We witnessed them twice. It is difficult to express the effect produced on us by the sight of the whole atmosphere filled on all sides and to a great height by an innumerable quantity of these insects, whose flight was slow and uniform, and whose noise resembled that of rain: the sky was darkened, and the light of the sun considerably weakened. In a moment the terraces of the houses, the streets, and all the fields were covered by these insects, and in two days they had nearly devoured all the leaves of the plants. Happily they lived but a short time, and seemed to have migrated only to reproduce themselves and die; in fact, nearly all those we saw the next day had paired, and the day following the fields were covered with their (lead bodies." This species is found in Arabia, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia. The ordinary Syrian locust greatly resembles the common grasshopper, but is larger and more destructive. It is usually about two inches and a half in length, and is chiefly of a green color, with dark spots. It is provided with a pair of antennae or "feelers" about an inch in length, projecting from the  head. The mandibles or jaws are black, and the wingcoverts are of a bright brown, spotted with black. It has an elevated ridge or crest upon the thorax, or that portion of the body to which the legs and wings are attached. The legs and thighs of these insects are so powerful that they can leap to a height of two hundred times the length of their bodies; when so raised they spread their wings, and fly so close together as to appear like one compact moving mass.

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

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

Birds also eagerly devour them (Russell, Natural History of Aleppo, page 127; Volney, Travels, 1:237; Kitto's Physical History of Pal. page 410). The locust-bird referred to by travelers, and which the Arabs call smurmur, is no doubt, from Dr. Kitto's description, the "rose-colored starling," Pastor roseus. The Reverend H.B. Tristram saw one specimen in the orange-groves at Jaffa in the spring of 1858, but makes no allusion to its devouring locusts. Dr. Kitto in one place (page 410) says the locust-bird is about the size of a starling; in another place (page 420) he compares it in size to a swallow. The bird is about eight inches and a half in length. Yarrell (British Birds, 2:51, 2d ed.) says "it is held sacred at Aleppo because it feeds on the locust;" and Colossians Sykes bears testimony to  the immense flocks in which they fly. He says (Catalogue of the Birds of Dakhan) "they darken the air by their numbers... forty or fifty have been killed at a shot." But he says "they prove a calamity to the husbandman, as they are as destructive as locusts, and not much less numerous."

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

III. The general references to locusts in the Scriptures are well collected by Jahn (Bibl. Archaeol. § 23), while Wemyss gives many of the symbolical applications of this creature (Clavis Symbolica, s.v.). It is well known that locusts live in a republic like ants. Agur, the son of Jakeh, correctly says, "The locusts have no king." But Mr. Horne gives them one (Introduction, etc., 1839, 3:76), and Dr. Harris speaks of their having "a leader whose  motions they invariably observe" (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, London, 1825). See this notion refuted by Kirby and Spence (2:16), and even by Mouffet (Theat. Insect. page 122, Lond. 1634). It is also worthy of remark that no Hebrew root has ever been offered favoring this idea. Our translation (Nah 3:17) represents locusts, "great grasshoppers," as "camping in the hedges in the cold day, but when the sun ariseth as fleeing away." Here the locust, gob, is undoubtedly spoken of as a perfect insect, able to fly, and as it is well known that at evening the locusts descend from their flights and form camps for the night, may not the cold day mean the cold portion of the day, i.e., the night, so remarkable for its coldness in the East, the word יוֹם being used here, as it often is, in a comprehensive sense, like the Gr. ἡμέρα and Lat. dies? Gesenius suggests that גְּדֹרוֹת, "hedges," should here be understood like the Gr. αἱμασιά, shrubs, brushwood, etc. (See above, 1, 2.) With regard to the description in Joel (chapter 2), it is considered by many learned writers as a figurative representation of the ravages of an invading "army" of human beings, as in Rev 9:2-12, rather than a literal account, since such a devastation would hardly, they think, have escaped notice in the books of Kings and Chronicles. Some have abandoned all attempt at a literal interpretation of Lev 11:22, and understand by the four species of locusts there mentioned, Shalmaneser, Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus, and the Romans. Theodoret explains them as the four Assyrian kings, Tiglathpileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar; and Abarbanel, of the four kingdoms inimical to the Jews, viz. the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans (Pococke's Works, 1:214, etc., Lond. 1740; Rosenmüller, Scholia in Joel. c. 1).

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

1. Locusts occur in great numbers, and sometimes obscure the sun (Exo 10:15; Jer 46:23; Jdg 6:5; Jdg 7:12; Joe 2:10; Nah 3:15; compare Livy, 42:2: AElian, N.A. 3:12; Pliny, N.H.  11:29; Shaw, Travels, page 187 [fol. 2d ed.] ; Ludolf, Hist. AEthiop. 1:13, and De Locustis, 1:4; Volney, Travels in Syria, 1:236).

2. Their voracity is alluded to in Exo 10:12; Exo 10:15; Joe 1:4; Joe 1:7; Joe 1:12; Joe 2:3; Deu 28:38; Psa 78:46; Psa 105:34; Isa 33:4 (comp. Shaw, Travels, page 187, and travelers in the East, passim).

3. They are compared to horses (Joe 2:4; Rev 9:7. The Italians call the locust "Cavaletta;" and Ray says, "Caput oblongum, equi instar prona spectans." Compare also the Arab's description to Niebuhr, Descr. die l'Arabie).

4. They make a fearful noise in their flight (Joe 2:5; Rev 9:9; comp. Forskal, Descr. page 81: "Transeuntes grylli super verticem nostrum sono magnae cataractae fervebant;" Volney, Trav. 1:235).

5. Their irresistible progress is referred to in Joe 2:8-9 (comp. Shaw, Trav. page 187).

6. They enter dwellings, and devour even the wood-work of houses (Exo 10:6; Joe 2:9-10; comp. Pliny, N.H. 11:29).

7. They do not fly in the night (Nah 3:17; comp. Niebuhr, Descr. de l'Arabie, page 173).

8. The sea destroys the greater number (Exo 10:19; Joe 2:20; compare Pliny, 11:35; Hasselquist, Trav. page 445 [Engl. transl. 1766]; also Iliad, 21:12).

9. Their dead bodies taint the air (Joe 2:20; comp. Hasselquist, Trav. page 445).

10. They are used as food (Lev 11:21-22; Mat 3:4; Mar 1:6; compare Pliny, N.H. 6:35; 11:35; Diod. Sic. 3:29; Aristoph. Achar. 1116; Ludolf, II. AEtiol). page 7 [Gent's transl.]; Jackson, Marocco, page 52; Niebuhr, Descr. (de l'Arabie, page 150; Sparman, Trav. 1:367, who savs the Hottentots are glad when the locusts come, for they fatten upon them; Hasselquist, Travels, pages 232, 419: Kirby and Spence, Entom. 1:305). There are people at this day who gravely assert that the locusts which formed part of the food of the Baptist were not the insect of that name, but the long, sweet pods of the locust-tree (Ceratonia siliqua), Johannis brodt, "St. John's bread," as the monks of Palestine call  it. For other equally erroneous explanations, or unauthorized alterations of ἀκρίδες, see Celsii Hierob. 1:74.

IV. The following are some of the works which treat of locusts: Ludolf, Dissertatio de Locustis (Francof. ad Moen. 1694) [this author believes that the quails which fed the Israelites in the wilderness were locusts (vid. his Diatriba qua sententia nova de Selavis sive Locustis de enditur, Francof. 1694), as do the Jewish Arabs to this day. So does Patrick, in his Comment. on Numbers. A more absurd opinion was that held by Norrelius, who maintained that the four names of Lev 11:22 were birds (see his Schediassma de Avibus sacris, Arbeh, Chagab, Solam, et Chargol, Upsal. 1746, and in the Bibl. Barem, 3:36)]; Faber, De Locustis Biblicis, et sigillatim de Avibus Quadrupedibus, ex Lev 11:20 (Wittenb. 1710-11); Asso, Abhlandlung von den Heuschrecken (Rostock, 1787; usually containing also Tychsen's Comment. de Locustis); Oedman, Vermischte Sammlung, volume 2, c. 7; Kirby and Spence, Introduction to Entomology, 1:305, etc.; Bochart, Hierozoicon, 3:251, etc., ed. Rosenmüller; Kitto, Phys. History of Palestine, pages 419, 420; Harris, Natural Hist. of the Bible, s.v. (1833); Harmer, Observations (Lond. 1797); Fabricius, Entomol. System. 2:46 sq.; Credner, Joel, page 261 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, 2:102 sq.; Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, page 306 sq.; Wood, Bible Aninmals, page 596 sq.; Hackett. Illustra. of Script. page 97; Serville, Aonograph in the Suites a Blufon; Fischer, Orthoptera Europcea; Suicer, Thesaurus, 1:169,179; Gutherr, De Victu Johannis (Franc. 1785); Rathleb, Akridotheologie (Hanover, 1748); Rawlinson, Five Ancient Monarchies, 2:299, 493; 3:144.

## Lod[[@Headword:Lod]]

             (1Ch 8:12; Ezr 2:32; Neh 7:37; Neh 11:35). SEE LYDDA.

## Lodenstein, Jodocus Von[[@Headword:Lodenstein, Jodocus Von]]

             a noted Dutch theologian, was born at Delft in 1620. He studied undel Voetius at Utrecht, and under Cocceius and Amesius at Franeker, and became preacher at Zoetemer in 1644; at Sluys, in Flanders, in 1650, and at Utrecht in 1652-in all of which places he used every exertion to revive the spirit of practical piety among his countrymen, whom great prosperity had rendered worldly-minded and indifferent. When, in 1672, the country was threatened by the invasion of the French under Louis XIV, he proclaimed it a judgment of the Lord, and called on them to repent. He found many followers. In 1665 he ceased to administer the Lord's Supper, from conscientious scruples. Laying great stress on purity of life and of heart, he feared lest he might administer it to some unworthy to receive this sacred ordinance. The number of his adherents gradually increased, and they spread over the whole Netherlands, but they never separated from the Reformed Church like the Labadists. The effect of Lodenstein's doctrines in Holland was like that following Spener's labors afterwards in Germany. He died pastor of Utrecht in 1677. He wrote [Verfallenes Christenthum (published after his delath by J. Hofmann), Reformationsspiesel (to be found also in Arnold's Kirchen u. Ketzerhistorie), a a number of hymns, etc. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 10:450. (J.N.P.)

## Lodge[[@Headword:Lodge]]

             (properly some form of the verb לוּן, lun, or לַין, lin, to stay over night, αὐλίζομαι, etc.). See INN. In Isa 1:8, the "lodge in a garden" (מְלוּנָה, meelunah', a lodging-place, rendered "cottage" in Isa 24:20) signifies a shed or lodge for the watchman in a garden; it also refers to a sort of hanging bed or hammock, which travelers in hot climates, or the watchmen of gardens or vineyards, hang on high trees to sleep in at night, probably from the fear of wild beasts (Isa 24:20). The lodge here referred to was a little temporary hut consisting of a low framework of poles, covered with boughs, straw, turf, or similar materials, for a  shelter from the heat by day and the cold and dews by night, for the watchmen that kept the garden, or vineyard, during the short season while the fruit was ripening (Job 27:18), and speedily removed when it had served that purpose. It is usually erected on a slight artificial mound of earth, with just space sufficient for one person, who, in this confined solitude, remains constantly watching the ripening crop, as the jackals during the vintage often destroy whole vineyards. and likewise commit great ravages in the gardens of cucumbers and melons. This protection is also necessary to prevent the depredations of thieves. To see one of these miserable sheds standing alone in the midst of a field or on the margin of it, occupied by its solitary watcher, often a decrepit or aged person, presents a striking image of dreariness and loneliness (Hackett's Illustra. of Scripture, page 162). SEE COTTAGE.

## Lodge, Nathan[[@Headword:Lodge, Nathan]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in London County, Virginia, August 20, 1788; was converted in 1804, entered the Conference at Baltimore in 1810, and died November 27, 1815. He was a very zealous and useful minister, and many souls were converted through his preaching. He was greatly lamented by his people, among whom he was suddenly cut down. — Minutes of Conferences, 1:278.

## Lodge, Robert[[@Headword:Lodge, Robert]]

             a member of the Society of Friends, was born at Masham, Yorkshire, about 1636. He was a religious youth, and became a Friend about 1660. He preached and suffered for the Quaker cause in Ireland. On July 15, 1690, he died, assuring his friends, Blessed be God, I have heavenly peace." See Janney, Hist. of Friends, 2:434.

## Lodrone, Paris[[@Headword:Lodrone, Paris]]

             a German prelate, was born about 1570 at the castle of Lodrone, in the Italian Tyrol. He was the youngest of a nobleman's family, and was destined for the ministry. In 1619 he became princearchbishop of Salzburg. In the midst of the excitement of the Thirty Year's War, he determined to preserve in that country a complete neutrality, and assured to the adherents of both creeds equal protection, which certainly was a singular example at that time. In 1623 he founded the University of Salzburg, which occupied a very distinguished place among all the older ones. After that he commenced the reconstruction of the cathedral, and founded several establishments for the public benefit. Lodrone died at Salzburg in March 1653. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lodur[[@Headword:Lodur]]

             one of the three Norse divinities (Odin and Haner), who, walking at the sea-shore, created the first pair of men. SEE LOKI.

## Loebenstein, Alois, D.D[[@Headword:Loebenstein, Alois, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, came to America in 1852, and located at Femme Osage, Missouri. He had studied theology at Vienna, and soon was employed as pastor in one of the Evangelical churches. The year succeeding he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was appointed successively to Belleville, Illinois; Newport, Kentucky; Buckeye Street, Cincinnati, Ohio; Indianapolis, Indiana; professor of theology at Wallace College, Berea, Ohio, which position, he held for eight years; Lafayette, Indiana; Toledo, Ohio;. Walnut Street, Detroit, Michigan; Beaubien Street, East Saginaw. He died at the last appointment in 1881. He was a member of the Central German Conference. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1881, page 312.

## Loffler, Friedrich Simon[[@Headword:Loffler, Friedrich Simon]]

             a German Protestant theologian, nephew of the celebrated philosopher Leibnitz, was born at Leipzic August 9, 1669, and was educated at the university of his native place. In 1689 he became magister of philosophy and bachelor of divinity. In 1695 he was appointed pastor at Probstheida,  and served his people until 1745, when, on account of age, he was mande emeritus preacher. He died in 1748. He wrote Specimen exeges. s. de operarsiis in vinea: — Diss. de litteris Bellerophonteis; etc.

## Loffler, Josias Friedrich Christian[[@Headword:Loffler, Josias Friedrich Christian]]

             a noted German Protestant theologian, was born at Saalfeld January 18, 1752. Having lost his father in 1763, he was educated in the orphan asylum and at the University of Halle. In 1774 he went to Berlin, where he made the acquaintance of Teller, and in 1777 became minister of one of the churches of that city. He now made himself known as a writer by translating Souverail's renowned work on the Platonism of the fathers. In 1778 he went to Silesia as chaplain of a Prussian regiment, but returned at the end of a year to Berlin, where he resumed his office, devoting also part of his time to educational pursuits. In 1783 he became professor of theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and minister of the principal church of that city. Here his rationalistic views made him many enemies. In 1787 he was appointed general superintendent at Gotha, but entered on this office only in the following year. The University of Copenhagen conferred on him the degree of D.D. in 1792. He died February 4, 1816. Loffler published a number of separate sermons, dissertations, and tracts, and was after 1803 the editor of the continuation of Teller's Magazia fur Predifer. See Doring, Die deutsch. Kanzelredner des 18 and 19 Jahrh. page 223; Herzog, Real- Encyklopädie, 8:451.

## Loft[[@Headword:Loft]]

             (עֲלַיָּה, aliy ah', ὑπερῷον), the upper chamber, e.g. of a private house (1Ki 17:19; Act 20:9). Such rooms were either over the gate (2Sa 19:1) or built on the flat roof (2Ki 23:12), and were especially used for prayer, conference, or public meetings. SEE CHAMBER; SEE HOUSE; SEE ROOF.

## Loftus, Adam, D.D[[@Headword:Loftus, Adam, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was born at Swinshead, in Yorkshire, and was educated at the University of Cambridge. In 1561 he was rector of Painstown, in the diocese of Meath. In 1562 he was appointed to the see of Armagh, and was consecrated by Hugh, archbishop of Dublin, at the close of that year. In 1564 he was elected dean of St. Patrick's. In August 1567, he was promoted to the see of Dublin. In 1568. this prelate consecrated Dr. Lancaster as his own successor in Armagh, at Christ Church. In 1573 he was. appointed chancellor. In 1582 Loftus was one of the lords justices of Ireland. In 1583 he was the unjust judge that illegally sentenced the Roman Catholic archbishop of Cashel, Dermot Hurley, to the cruelties, of death on Osmantown Green. In 1597 Loftus was again one of the lords justices of  Ireland, and also in 1599. At the close of that year he was named as one of the assistant councillors to the lord president of Munster, and in 1603 had pardon of intrusion and alienation in reference to the manors, etc. He died April 5, 1605. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 240.

## Loftus, Dudley Field[[@Headword:Loftus, Dudley Field]]

             an Irish lawyer, noted as a learned Orientalist, was born at Rathfarnham, near Dublin, in 1618. He rose to the position of master in Chancery and a judge of the Prerogative Court. He translated the Ethiopic New Testament into Latin for Walton's Polyglot; also published translations from the Syriac into Latin and English. He died in 1695. See Wood, Athen. Oxon.; Harris's edition of Ware's Ireland; Lodge's Peerage of Ireland.

## Loftus, William Kennett[[@Headword:Loftus, William Kennett]]

             an English archaeologist, was born at Rye in 1820. He was a zealous traveler and discoverer, and explored the sites of several ancient cities on the Euphrates and Tigris. In 1857 he published a work entitled Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susiana; also an account of Some Excavations at Warka, the Erech of Nimrod, and Shushan, the Palace of Esther, in 1849-52. He died in 1858. To the Biblical student Loftus's work is of special importance. See Thomas's Dict. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Log[[@Headword:Log]]

             (לֹג, log, prob. a deep cavity, basin; Sept. κοτύλη, Vulg. sextarius), the smallest liquid measure (e.g. of oil) among the Hebrews (Lev 14:10; Lev 14:12; Lev 14:15; Lev 14:21; Lev 14:24), containing, according to the rabbins (see Carpzov. Apparat. p. 685), the twelfth part of a "HIN," or six eggs, i.e., nearly a pint. SEE MEASURE.

## Logan, David Swift[[@Headword:Logan, David Swift]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1834. His literary education was commenced in the academy of Beaver, and was continued in Jefferson College (class of 1854). In 1857 he entered the Western Theological Seminary, and, after completing the regular theological course, was licensed by the Presbytery of Alleghany City, and afterwards ordained as an evangelist by the Presbytery of Steubenville, and for two years preached in the churches of New Philadelphia and Urichville, Ohio. He next labored in the Presbyterian Church of Tiffin, Ohio, until ill health obliged his return to his home in Bridgewater, Pennsylvania, where he died, Sept. 15, 1864. Mr. Logan was endowed with a well-balanced nature; no single faculty was cultivated at the expense of the rest. He had method, promptness, assiduity, thoughtfulness; he was an earnest preacher and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, Presbyterian Historical Almanac, 1865, page 97. (J.L.S.)

## Logan, John[[@Headword:Logan, John]]

             a noted Scottish divine, was born at Fala, in the county of Edinburgh, in 1748. Though the son of a farmer, he was early destined to the clerical profession, and was educated in the University of Edinburgh. Upon graduation he became tutor to Sir John Sinclair. In 1773 he was licensed as  a preacher in the Established Church of Scotland, and was shortly after appointed minister at Leith, where he remained until 1785, when he removed to London, retaining by agreement a part of his clerical income, for the purpose of devoting himself altogether to literary labors. He had established quite a reputation as a sacred poet. Logan, if not a learned divine or a very profound thinker, was a man. of much eloquence, and a highly popular preacher. But his poetical endowments, strongly lyrical in their tendency, were the highest he possessed; and, unfortunately, he was tempted to apply these in a path where he was ill calculated to shine, and the adoption of which proved fatal not only to his professional usefulness, but to his happiness. In 1783 he printed and caused to be acted in Edinburgh a tragedy called Runnamede, which had been rehearsed at Covent Garden, but refused a license by the lord chamberlain. This publication brought on him the anger of his Presbyterian associates; and these and other annoyances, aggravated by a hereditary tendency to hypochondria, drove him to intoxication for relief. He died in London December 28, 1788. His friends, Doctors Blair, Robertson, and Hardy, published a volume of his sermons in 1790, and a second in 1791. These sermons long enjoyed very great popularity, and have been several times reprinted. They are among the most eloquent that the Scottish Church has produced. A third edition of his poems, with an account of his life, appeared in 1805; and the poems are included in Dr. Anderson's collection. Some of his hymns are annexed to the psalmody of the Scottish Church.

## Logan, Robert William[[@Headword:Logan, Robert William]]

             a missionary, was born; at York, Ohio, May 4, 1843. He served as a soldier in, the Union army in 1862; studied at Oberlin College, and graduated from the Theological Seminary there in 1870. After supplying a congregation at Rio, Wisconsin, for a year, he sailed for Micronesia in June 1874, and was stationed at Ponape; in 1879 he volunteered to go to. the Mortlock islands to take charge of the work there in 1884 took up his residence within the Ruk archipelago, and died at Anapano, December 27, 1887.

## Logic[[@Headword:Logic]]

             This term, derived from the Greek λόγὶος, λογικη, has been the subject of numerous definitions. By different authors and schools it has been defined as the art of convincing, the art of thinking, the art of discovering truth, the right use of reason, the science and art of reasoning, the science of deductive thinking, the science of the laws of thought as thought, and the science of the laws of discursive thought. These specimen definitions indicate in some degree the diverse conceptions of the subject which have prevailed at different periods and in different circles. Aristotle, whom Sir William Hamilton extravagantly calls the author and finisher of the general science under consideration, had no single name for it. He treated of its principal parts as analytic, apodeictic, and topic. In the latter he included the dialectic of Plato and the sophistic of the Sophists. Notwithstanding the honor credited to Aristotle, he himself says that Zeno the Eleatic was the inventor of dialectics.  Thus we are taken back to the early Greek philosophers for the first formal discussions of what is now universally denominated Logic. They, in successive generations, developed with more or less clearness its principal elements. Socrates illustrated induction; Euclid, deduction. Plato treated of mental images as the results of sensation, of notions as the product of the understanding, and of ideas as the product of reason. Aristotle formulated syllogisms, and defined their principal laws. He taught analysis. He devised a system of categories. He enumerated the five predicables, genus, species, difference, property, and accident. In short, he reduced to a system the fragmentary discoveries in the philosophy of mind of those who had gone before him, and embodied them in works destined to exert a great influence upon after ages. Like many other great men, Aristotle was but indifferently appreciated by his contemporaries. Even after his death, his logical system produced but little influence upon his countrymen the Greeks. Several of the Christian fathers, however, give evidence of having profited by its study, and of desiring to use the knowledge they had thus acquired in propagating the truth of Christianity. Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Clement, and others, both used and defended such dialectics as they had learned in the Grecian schools. On the other hand, as the same style of dialectics had been closely identified with the pernicious vagaries of heathen philosophy, Tertullian, Irenaeus, Arnobius, and Lactantius considered its use as unfavorable to the interests of Christianity, and destructive of true science and wisdom. Augustine also wrote in the same spirit against the academicians.

Nevertheless, speculative studies held a relative prominence in the learning of Greece and Rome during the early Christian centuries; and when, owing to the barbarian irruptions, learning and civilization declined, dialectical science remained in more general cultivation than almost any other of the higher species of knowledge. Having its subject matter in the human mind, it was not dependent for perpetuity upon those external circumstances which influenced the conditions of general literature. Boethius, who has been called the last of the ancient philosophers, and the connecting link between the classical and the medieval age, made a translation of Aristotle's categories into Latin. His contemporaries of the 6th century, Cassiodorus, Capella, and Isidore of Seville, together with several Byzantine writers, e.g. George Pachymera, Theodorus Metachita, and Michael Psellus, formed meager compendiums of logic and rhetoric, without any clear distinction between the two. These manuals superseded  or rather substituted the use of the ancient authors on both these subjects, and, imperfect as they were, became the oracles of that long and dismal period in which the trivium (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) and quadrivium (music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy) were the chief topics of study and instruction. The ignorance consequent upon such a condition of things continued for the long period of five centuries without material variation.

In the latter part of the 11th century commenced a period of literary awakening known to history as the first aera of scholasticism. SEE SCHOLASTICISM.

This movement was characterized by attempts to construct systems of theology on the traditional basis with strict dialectical form and method. Paris was the chief seat of the movement. Anselm, an abbot at Bec in 1078, and late in life an archbishop of Canterbury, made the first vigorous attempt in harmony with logical forms, on the basis of credo ut intelligam. Abelard opposed him, on the principle that understanding should precede faith. Thisas the period of Nominalism and Realism, and also of the foundation of universities. Among the most prominent of the great names of this period is that of Roscelinus of Compeigne, who is celebrated as having been the first to revive the question of the reality of universal ideas, and William of Champeaux, who opened a school of logic in Paris in 1109. The fame of the latter was soon eclipsed by that of Peter Abelard, who was able to invest logical disputation with such fascinations as to make it the favorite occupation of the most intelligent minds for generations following.

The 13th century is counted as the second period of scholasticism, durinlg which the leading dialecticians were Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. During this period scholasticism reached its climax. The 14th century, as the third period of scholasticism, witnessed its sensible decline under the protracted but bitter wranglings of the Thomists (Realists) and Scotists (Nominalists).

Notwithstanding an attempt by the Medici of Florence to revive the Platonic philosophy in opposition to that of Aristotle, the latter prevailed in the chief universities of Europe, and the corruptions of it which had been countenanced by scholasticism began to pass away under the influence of more intelligent discussion. In the 16th century, after the invention of printing, the logical and philosophical works of the Stagirite were issued in  a purer text and more accurate versions, and largely engaged public criticism.

The authority of Aristotle had been so long supreme in the continental universities, and the union between what passed for his philosophy and the errors of the Church of Rome had been so long established, that it was only natural for Luther and Melancthon, at the beginning of the Reformation, to inveigh strongly against the Aristotelian logic and metaphysics. As time passed on, however, it became apparent that the work of the Reformers had largely to be done through the agency of that same Aristotelian logic. Melancthon was not slow to perceive this, and subsequently became an acknowledged follower of Aristotle as to dialectics, and even influenced Luther to retract some of his severer utterances. He introduced into the University of Wittenberg, to which Protestant Germany looked up, a scheme of dialectics and physics founded upon the Aristotelian theory. He also imitated the Stagirite philosopher by teaching logic with constant reference to rhetoric. The advocacy and influence of Melancthon secured the preponderance of the Aristotelian dialectics in the Protestant schools of Germany for more than a century.

About the middle of the 16th century a formidable opposition to the authority of Aristotle sprang up at the University of Paris, under the leadership of Peter Ramus, a scholar of great natural acuteness, and of an intrepid, though somewhat arrogant spirit. He published his Institutiones Dialecticae in 1543. His system, founded with much ingenuity on the writings of Plato, notwithstanding violent opposition, prevailed so far as to greatly weaken the influence of the Aristotelian philosophy. The heads of the university, alarmed at this innovation, made complaint against Ramus to Parliament. The king himself interfered, and appointed a public trial of the rival systems of logic. As might have been expected, a majority of the judges favored the established system. Ramus was consequently ordered to desist from teaching, and an order passed for the suppression of his book. That order was subsequently removed, and Ramus again became popular as a teacher. He treated logic as merely the art of arguing, and was very severe on the dry and tedious formalities of the schoolmen. His system embraced invention and proofs, and thus blended with rhetoric. In 1551, through the influence of the cardinal of Lorraine, Ramus became royal professor of rhetoric and philosophy, in which capacity he made many proselytes. Having adhered to the Huguenot party, he was killed in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. But he had already traveled and taught in  Germany, where his system found no little favor. In Italy it secured a few disciples. but many more in France, England, and Scotland. Andrew Melville introduced the logic of Ramus at Glasgosw, and it ultimately became popular in all the Scottish universities. The logical writings of the remainder of the 16th century, and somewhat later, were filled with the Ramist and anti-Ramist controversy, which, though of little permanent importance, doubtless prepared the way for a better comprehension of the true principles and processes of logic in later periods.

In the 17th century the writings of lord Bacon formed another epoch in the history of logic. SEE BACON.

Logic, according to lord Bacon, comprised the sciences of invention, judging, retaining, and delivering the conceptions of the mind. We invent or discover new arts and arguments. We judge by induction or syllogism, and we may improve memory by artificial modes. The first book of the Novuma Organum developed his celebrated and peculiar division of fallacies, viz. idola tribes, idola splecus, idola fori, and idola theatri. The second book sought to apply the principles of induction to the interpretation of nature. Although, from a defective knowledge of natural phenomena incident to his times, the author's illustrations were far from perfect, and although many logicians have disputed the correctness of his principles, it cannot be questioned that the Baconian logic and method of study exerted a powerful influence upon his own and after times in stimulating thought and discovery. The remaining authors of the 17th century whose writings influenced the study and methods of logic were Des Cartes, Arnauld, author of L'Art de Pense, and Locke, of England. Probably the most influential treatise on the direct subject was Arnauld's Art of Thinking, commonly called the Port-Royal Logic. It attacked the Aristotelian system, and, being written in a modern language, had the advantage over the heavy Latinity of previous books. In this respect it became an example to subsequent writers, who, from the beginning of the 18th century, were numerous if not influential. But, with all that was written respecting it, the study of logic failed to command general attention. It had few attractions for the popular mind, and its special devotees were seldom able to place it in successful competition with philosophy, natural science, and general literature. Although prescribed in every system of academic study, and at once the agency and topic of ceaseless wrangling among professed scholars, yet its influence upon human life and public opinion was infinitesimally small.  The limits of this article do not admit of a detailed notice of all the logicians and logical systems of modern times, but only of allusion to a few of the most influential. In Germany, more than in all other countries, the study of logic has within the last hundred years assumed new phases and developed new doctrines, more especially in connection with the various systems of idealistic philosophy. Of that philosophy Immanuel Kant, SEE KANT, may be considered the inaugurator, and his first philosophical production commenced with the study of logic. As early as 1762 he published a treatise on the "False Subtlety of the Four Syllogistic Figures," in which he maintained that only the first is pure, and the others ratiocinia hybrida. From this point he went on developing his system, till in 1781 he published his Kritik of Pure Reason, to which in 1790 he added his Kritik of the Judgment. Kant claimed to have subjected the human mind to a new analysis, from which he determined the three comprehensive functions of sense, understanding, and reason. His general scheme is summed up as follows:

I. Doctrine of the transcendental elements of knowledge.

A. Transcendental aesthetics.

B. Transcendental logic.

a. Transcendental analytics.

 b. Transcendental dialectics.

II. The transcendental mlethod.

Not to mention the numerous defenders and modifiers of the Kantian system, we pass to G.W.F. Hegel, SEE HEGEL, the publication of whose Wissenschaft der Logik in 1812 marks another epoch in German metaphysics. Hegel employed the term logic in a very extended sense. Not confining it to abstract forms of thought and the laws of ideas, he considered it the science of the self-sufficient and self-determining idea — the science of truth and reality. From his fundamental principle that thought and substance are identical, it followed that what is true of one is true also of the other, and that the laws of logic are ontological. His system claimed to develop the idea of the absolute by antagonisms through all its successive stadia. With him the primary element of logic consisted in the oneness of the subjective and objective. Instinctive knowledge only regards the object without considering itself. But consciousness, besides the former, contains a perception of itself, and embraces, as three stages of  progress, consciousness, self-consciousness, and reason. Pure logic, according to Hegel, is divided into,

1. The logic of being;

2. The logic of qualified nature;

3. The logic of the idea.

In 1825, Richard Whately, afterwards archbishop of Dublin, published an article in the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana, which, having been expanded and printed as his Elements of Logic, was soon after extensively adopted as a text-book both in England and America. This publication has justly been considered as constituting an Vera in the study of logic in English-speaking countries. The principles of Kant's Kritik of Pure Reason were not extensively introduced into Great Britain until after 1836, when Sir William Hamilton began his lectures in the University of Edinburgh. SEE HAMILTON. Although Hamilton took opposite ground to Whately in reference to the essential character of logic, yet both were admirers and exponents of the Analytic of Aristotle. Thus the reawakened taste for logical studies during the current century arose from a restoration, by different methods, of the old logic which had come down from the early ages, and survived all the opposition and ridicule of the modern centuries. It is worthy of especial note that none of the systems put forth by Ramus, Descartes, Locke, or Condillac, and their several modifiers, has been able to stand the test of time like that of the old philosophers and schoolmen. This fact may be accepted as proving that the syllogism indicates substantially the process which takes place in all minds in the act of reasoning. Notwithstanding this small demonstration, and a few other points of general concurrence, the science of logic, which has been the subject of human study for more than two thousand years, remains still incomplete. Many of its principles and processes are yet in continued and active dispute. Since Whately and Hamilton, Mr. John Stuart Mill has written an elaborate work in which he depreciates the syllogism and magnifies induction. But his theories in reference to both bear the stamp of Comte's empirical positivism.

The chief logical discussion of the present day revolves around the "New Analytic of Logical Forms," or the quantification of the predicate introduced by Sir William Hamilton. This new analytic, which is chiefly valuable for its enlargement of the hitherto narrow sphere of formal logical praxis, is an emanation from the metaphysics of Kant, being grounded  upon certain principles of the Kritik of Pure Reason. Its theory, although illustrated by an ingenious system of notation, was left in a somewhat crude state by Hamilton, but has been ably elaborated by Mansel and Thomson, of England, and Bowen and Mahan. of America. While these writers seem to think that they have attained the end of all logical perfection, Dr. M'Cosh, of Princeton, charges their whole system with fundamental error in presupposing "that there are forms in the mind which it imposes on objects as it contemplates them." To explode this error is the avowed object of M'Cosh's recent treatise, in which, while he falls back for confirmation upon the old logic, he claims to unfold laws which were not noticed by the old logicians. The characteristic of his work is a more elaborate treatment of the notion than has taken place since the publication of the Port-Royal Logic. Thus logic seems destined to pass down to coming centuries as it has descended from the past, a subject of endless debate, but one from which each successive generation derives its advantage in the very process of debate.

See Hallam's Literature of Europe; Blakey's Historical Sketch of Logic; Kant's Kritik; Hegel's Wissenschaft der Logik; Whately's Elements of Logic; Sir William Hamilton's Lectures on Logic; Mansel's Prolegomena Logica; Thomson's Laws of Thought; Eleements of Logic, by H.P. Tappan, by W.D. Wilson, by C.K. True, by H. Coppee, by J.R. Boyd, by H.N. Day, by A. Schuyler, by L.H. Atwater; System of Logic, by John Stuart Mill; Science of Logic, by Asa Mahan; Formal Logic, by James M'Cosh. (D.P.K.)

## Logos[[@Headword:Logos]]

             (Λόγος, a word, as usually rendered), a special term in Christology, in consequence of its use as such by the apostle John, especially in the opening verses of his Gospel. An excellent article on the subject may be found in the brief but lucid exposition given in Bengel's Gnomon (Amer. edit. by Profs. Lewis and Vincent, page 536 sq.). SEE WORD.

1. Rendering. — The general meaning of Logos in every such connection is THE WORD, said symbolically of the law-giving, creative, revealing activity of God. This is naturally suggested here by the obvious reference to Gen 1:1; Gen 1:3.

Many have seen in this term but a bold personification of the wisdom or reason of God. as in Pro 8:22. But this sense of Logos does not  occur in the New Test., and is excluded by the reference to the history of creation. Besides, the repeated "with God" (Pro 8:1-2) compels us to distinguish the Logos from God; the words " became flesh" (Pro 8:14) cannot be said of an attribute of God; and the Baptist's testimony, Pro 8:15, in direct connection with this introduction (compare also such sayings of Christ as in chapters 8:58; 17:5), show clearly that John attributes personal pre-existence to the Logos. Similarly, every attempt to explain away this profound sense of Logos is inadequate, and most are ungrammatical. SEE WISDOM PERSONIFIED.

Thus the fundamental thought of this introduction is, that the original, all- creating, all-quickening, and all-enlightening Logos, or personal divine word, became man in Jesus Christ. SEE INCARNATION.

2. Origin and History of the Idea. —

(1.) John uses the term Logos without explanation, assuming that his readers know it to bear this sense. Accordingly, we find this conception of it not new with him, but a chief element in the development of the Old- Testament theology. In the Mosaic account, God's revelation of himself in the creation was, in its nature, spirit (Gen 1:2), in contrast with matter, and in its form, a word (Gen 1:4), in contrast with every involuntary materialistic or pantheistic conception of the creative act. The real significance, under this representation, of the invisible God's revelation of himself by speech became the germ of the idea of the Logos. With this thought all Judaism was pervaded; that God does not manifest himself immediately, but mediately; not in his hidden, invisible essence, but through an appearance — an attribute, emanation, or being called the angel of the Lord (Exo 23:21, etc.), or the word of the Lord. Indeed, to the latter are ascribed, as his work, all divine light and life in nature and history; the law, the promises, the prophecies, the guidance of the nation (compare Psa 33:6; Psa 33:9; Psa 107:20; Psa 147:18; Psa 148:8; Isa 2:1; Isa 2:3; Jer 1:4; Jer 1:11; Jer 1:13, etc. Even such poetic personifications as Psa 147:15; Isaiah 4:11, contain the germ of the doctrinal personality of the Word). SEE ANGEL.

(2.) Another important element of Hebrew thought was the wisdom of God. The consideration of it became prominent only after the natural attributes of God — omnipotence, etc. — had long been acknowledged. The chief passages are Job 28:12 sq.; Proverbs 8, 9. Even the latter is a poetic personification: but this is based on the thought that Wisdom is  not shut up at rest in God, but active and manifest in the world. It is viewed as the one guide to salvation, comprehending all revelations of God, and as an attribute embracing and combining all his other attributes. This view deeply influenced the development of the Hebrew idea of God. At that stage of religious knowledge and life, Wisdom, revealing to pious faith the harmony and unity of purpose in the world, appeared to be his most attractive and important attribute-the essence of his being. One higher step remained; but the Jew could not yet see that God is love.

(3.) In the apocryphal books of Sirach (chapters 1 and 24) and Baruch (Sirach 3 and Sir 4:1-4), this view of Wisdom is developed yet more clearly and fully. The book of Wisdom (written at least B.C. 100) praises wisdom as the highest good, the essence of right knowledge and virtue, and as given by God to the pious who pray for it (chapters 7 and 8); see especially Wis 7:22 sq., where Wisdom has divine dignity and honors, as a holy spirit of light, proceeding from God, and penetrating all things. But this book seems rather to have viewed it as another name for the whole divine nature than as a person distinct from God. And nowhere does it connect this Wisdom with the idea of Messiah. It shows, however, the influence of both Greek and Oriental philosophy on Jewish theology, and marks a transition from the Old Test. view to that of Philo, etc. SEE WISDOM, BOOK OF.

(4.) In Egypt, from the time of Ptolemy I (B.C. 300), there were Jews in great numbers, their head-quarters being at Alexandria (Philo estimates them at a million in his time, A.D. 50), and there they gradually came under the influence of the Egyptian civilization of that age, a strange mixture of Greek and Oriental customs and doctrines. SEE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOLS. Aristobulus, about 150 B.C., seems to have endeavored to unite the ancient doctrines of Wisdom and the Word of God with a form of Greek philosophy. This effort, the leading feature of the Jewish- Alexandrian school, culminated in Philo, a contemporary of Christ, who strives to make Judaism, combined with and interpreted by the Platonic philosophy, do the work of the idea of Messiah, affording by the power of thought a complete substitute for it. This attempt to harmonize heathen and Jewish elements, while it led in him to a sort of anticipation of certain parts of Christian doctrine, explains how he himself vacillates between opposite and irreconcilable views. SEE PLATONISM.

(5.) Philo represents the absolute God as hidden and unknown, but surrounded by his powers as a king by his servants, and, through these, as  present and ruling in the world. (These powers, δυνάμεις, are, in Platonic language, ideas; in Jewish, angels.) These are different and innumerable; the original principles of things; the immaterial world, the type of which the material is an image. The two chief of these in dignity are the θείς, God, the creative power, and the Κύριος, Lord, or governing power of the Scriptures. But all these powers are essentially one, as God is one; and their unity, both as they exist in God and as they emanate from him, is called the Logos. Hence the Logos appears under two relations: as the reason of God, lying in him — the divine thought; and as the outspoken word, proceeding from him, and manifest in the world. The former is, in reality, one with God's hidden being; the latter comprehends all the workings and revelations of God in the world, affords from itself the ideas and energies by which the world was framed and is upheld, and, filling all things with divine light and life, rules them in wisdom, love, and righteousness. It is the beginning of creation; not unoriginated, like God, nor made, like the world, but the eldest son of the eternal Father (the world being the younger); God's image; the creator of the world; the mediator between God and it; the highest angel; the second God; the high-priest and reconciler.

(6.) Lücke concludes that, such being the development of the doctrine of the Logos when John wrote, although there is no evidence that he borrowed his views from Philo, yet it is impossible to doubt the direct historical connection of his doctrine with the Alexandrian. Meyer thinks that if we suppose John's doctrine entirely unconnected with the Jewish and Alexandrian philosophy, we destroy its historic meaning, and its intelligibleness for its readers. It must be admitted that the term Logos seems to be chosen as already associated in many minds with a class of ideas in some degree akin to the writer's, and as furnishing a common point of thought and interest with those speculative idealists who constantly used it while presenting them with new truth.

(7.) But any connection amounting to doctrinal dependence of John upon Philo is utterly contrary to the tenor of Philo's own teaching; for he even loses the crowning feature of Hebrew religion, the moral energy expressed in its view of Jehovah's holiness, and with it the moral necessity of a divine teacher and Savior. He becomes entangled in the physical lntions of the heathen, forgets the wide distinction between God and the world, and even denies the independent, absolute being of God, declaring that, were the universe to end, God would die of loneliness and inactivity. The very  universality of the conception, its immediate working on all things, would have excluded to Philo the belief that the whole Logos, not a mere part or effluence of his power, became incarnate in Christ. "Heaven and earth cannot contain me," cries his Logos, "how much less a human being." On the whole, it is extremely doubtful whether Philo ever meant formally to represent the Logos as a person distinct from God. All the titles he gives it may be explained by supposing it to mean the ideal world, on which the actual is modeled. At most, we can say that he goes beyond a mere poetic personification, and prepares the way for a distinction of persons in the Godhead. SEE PHILO.

(8.) John's connection with the doctrines of the later Jews, though less noticed, is at least as important as that with Philo. In the apocryphal books, as we have seen, the idea of the Logos was overshadowed by that of the divine Wisdom; but it reappears, prominently and definitely, in the Targums, especially that of Onkelos. These were written, indeed, after John's Gospel (Onkelos, the earliest, wrote not later than the 2d century A.D.), yet their distinguishing doctrines certainly rest upon ancient tradition. They represent the Word of God, the Memrah, ממרה, or Dibur, דבור, as the personal self-revealed God, and one with the Shekinah, שכינה, which was to be manifested in Messiah. But it would be absurd to claim that John borrowed his idea of Messiah from the Jews, who in him looked for, not a spiritual revelation of God in clearer light, to save men from sin by suffering and love, but a national deliverer, to gratify their worldly and carnal desires of power; not even for the divine Word become flesh, and dwelling among men, but for an appearance, a vision, a mere display, or, at most, an unreal, docetic humanity.

(9.) The contrast between John's Logos and Philo's appears in several further particulars. The Logos here is the real personal God, the Word; who did not begin to be when Christ came, but was originally, before the creation, "with God, and was God." He made all things (Pro 9:3). Philo held to the original independent existence of matter, the stuff, ὔλη, of the world, before it was framed. John's Logos is holy light, which shines in moral darkness, though rejected by it. Philo has no such height of mournful insight as this. This Logos became man in the person of Christ, the Son of God. Philo conceives of no incarnation. Thus John's lofty doctrine of the Messiah is not in any way derived from Jewish or Gnostic speculations, but rests partly on pure Old-Testament doctrine, and chiefly on what he  learned from Christ himself. His testimony to this forms the historical part of his Gospel. SEE MEMRA.

3. Theological Bearing of the Term. — The word "Logos" is therefore evidently "employed by the evangelist John to designate the mediatorial character of our Redeemer, with special reference to his revelation of the character and will of the Father. It appears to be used as an abstract for the concrete. just as we find the same writer employing light for enlightener. life for life-giver, etc.; so that it properly signifies the speaker or interpreter, than which nothing can more exactly accord with the statement made (Joh 1:18), 'No man hath seen God at any time: the only- begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, hath declared him,' i.e., communicated to us the true knowledge of his mind and character. That the term is merely expressive of a divine attribute, a position which has been long and variously maintained by Socinians, though abandoned as untenable by some of their best authorities, is in total repugnance to all the circumstances of the context, which distinctly and expressly require personal subsistence in the subject which it describes. He whom John styles the Logos has the creation of all things ascribed to him; is set forth as possessing the country and people of the Jews; as the only-begotten (Son) of the Father; as assuming the human nature, and displaying in it the attributes of grace and truth, etc. Such things could never, with the least degree of propriety, be said of any mere attribute or quality. Nor is the hypothesis of a personification to be reconciled with the universally admitted fact that the style of John is the most simply historical, and the furthest removed from that species of composition to which such a figure of speech properly belongs. To the Logos the apostle attributes eternal existence, distinct personality, and strict and proper Deity — characters which he also ascribes to him in his first epistle — besides the possession and exercise of perfections which absolutely exclude the idea of derived or created being." SEE CHRISTOLOGY.

4. Literature. — The following are the principal monographs on this subject: Sandius, De Λόγῳ (in his Interp. Paradox, Amsterd. 1670); Saubert, De voce Λόγος (Altdorf, 1687): Carpzov, De Λόγῳ, Philonis (Helmstadt, 1749); Bryant, Philo's Λόγος (1797); Upham, Letters on the Logos (Boston, 1828); Bucher, Johann. Lehre evon Logos (Schaffh. 1856). For others, see Danz, Worterbuch, s.v.; Darling, Cyclopaedia, col. 1059; Lange's Commentary (Am. ed., Introd. to John's Gospel). Comp. also the Meth. Quar. Review, July and October 1851; January 1858;  Christian Examiner, January 1863; Am. Presb. Review, January 1840; July, 1864; Stud. u. Krit. 1830, 3:672; 1833, 2:355; 1868, 2:299. SEE JOHN, GOSPEL OF.

## Logotheta[[@Headword:Logotheta]]

             (λογοθέτης, q.d. chancellor) is the title given in the Greek Church to the member of the ecclesiastical courts holding the imperial seal to be appended to their edicts. SEE GREEK CHURCH.

## Loguo[[@Headword:Loguo]]

             is, in the mythology of the Caribbeans, the name of the first man, who descended from his celestial abode to the soft, shapeless mass of which the earth was formed by his creative power. He first imparted to it shape and motion; the sun rendered it dry and hard. Loguo, after his death, reascended to heaven. See Vollmer, Mythol. Wörterb. s.v.

## Lohdius, Carl Friedrich[[@Headword:Lohdius, Carl Friedrich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Grünberg, near Waldheim, December 13, 1748, and was educated at the University of Leipsic, where, in 1774, he obtained the degree of A.M. and the privilege of lecturing on theology. He became soon after morning preacher at the university. In 1780 he accepted a call to Grimma as dean, and in 1782 to Dresden. He died there August 4, 1809. Of his scholarly productions we only mention Delineatur imago doctrinae de conditione animi post mortem eo, quo Christus et Apostoli vixerunt, saeculo, diss. 1 et 2 (Lipsiae, 1790, 4to). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Lohe, Johann Konrad Wilhelm[[@Headword:Lohe, Johann Konrad Wilhelm]]

             a German Lutheran minister, was born at Fürth, in Bavaria, February 17, 1808, and was educated at the University of Erlangen, which he entered in 1826. After serving at various places as minister of Lutheran churches, he settled in 1837 at Neuendettelsau as pastor of a flourishing Church. Zealously devoted to the cause of his Master, he studied the ways and means of promoting the Christian religion among the masses of the German people, and in 1849 founded to this end a society for Inner AIaissions (q.v.), and in 1854, following the example of the immortal Fliedner (q.v.), of Kaiserswerth, established a Deaconesses' Institute, SEE DEACONESS, which in our day is known in nearly all the civilized world. Lohe labored  here faithfully and successfully until his death, January 28, 1872. He wrote Der evangelische Geistliche (2d edition, Stuttg. 1866, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Lebenslauf der heilig. Magd Gottes aus dem Pfarrstande (3d ed. Nuremb. 1869, 8vo): — Geistlicher Tageslauf (3d ed. Nuremb. 1870, 8vo): — Aus der Geschichte d. Diakonissenanstalt Neuendettelsan (Nuremb. 1870, 8vo); etc. See Schem, Deutsch-Amerikan. Conv. Lexicon, 6:589.

## Lohengrin[[@Headword:Lohengrin]]

             in British fable, was the famous guard and protector of the sacred Graal. He saved Elsa, the princess of Brabant, from a magician, by coming to her as a swan. She married the valiant knight, but on condition that she would not inquire as to his ancestry. Finally she asked about this, and Lohengrin fled on his swan back to the sacred Graal.

## Lohesh[[@Headword:Lohesh]]

             SEE HAL-LOHESH.

## Lohmann, Bogislav Rudolf[[@Headword:Lohmann, Bogislav Rudolf]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born December 28, 1825. He studied at Gdttingen and Halle, was in 1853 pastor at Furstenwalde, in 1865 at Springe, and died December 15, 1879, at Gorbersdorf, Hanover. He published, Kurze Fragstucke zum kleinen Katechismus Luther's (Berlin, 1858): — Athanasius, der Vater der Rechtglaubigkeit (2d ed. 1860): Lutherische und unirte Kirche (1867). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:809. (B.P.)

## Loin[[@Headword:Loin]]

             (usually in the dual, חֲלָצִיַם, chalatsa'yim, as the seat of strength, spoken of as the place of the girdle, Job 38:3; Job 40:7; Isa 5:27 ["reins," 11:5]; Job 32:1; or as a part of the body generally, Job 31:20; Jer 30:6 [so the Chald. plur. חִרְצַין, Dan 5:6]; by euphemism for the generative power, Gen 35:11; 1Ki 8:19; 2Ch 6:9; also מָתְנִיַם, mothna'yin, as the seat of strength, Gr. ὀσφύς, which are the other terms properly so rendered, and refer to that part of the body simply; but כְּסָלַים, kesalim', Psa 38:7, means the flanks, as elsewhere rendered, prop. the internal muscles of the loins, near the kidneys, to which the fat adheres; while יְרֵכִיַם, put in (Gen 46:26; Exo 1:5; comp. Jdg 8:30, by euphemism for the seat of generation, properly signifies the thigh, as elsewhere rendered, being plainly distinguished from the true loin in Exo 28:42), the part of the back and side between the hip and the ribs, which, as being, as it were, the pivot of the body, is most sensibly affected by pain or terror (Deu 33:11; Job 40:16; Psa 38:7; Psa 69:23; Isa 21:3; Jer 30:6; Eze 21:6; Eze 29:7; Dan 5:6; Nah 2:10). This part of the body was especially girt with sackcloth, in token of mourning (Gen 37:34; 1Ki 20:31-32; Psa 66:11; Isa 20:2; Isa 32:11; Jer 48:37; Amo 8:10). The term is most frequently used with allusion to the girdle which encompassed this part of the body, i.q. the waist; especially in the phrase to "gird up the loins," i.e., prepare for vigorous effort, either literally (1Ki 18:46; 2Ki 4:29; 2Ki 9:1; Pro 31:17), or oftener as a metaphor borrowed from the loose and flowing dress of Orientals, which requires to be gathered closely at the waist, or even to have the skirts tucked up into the belt before engaging in any  exertion or enterprise (Job 38:3; Job 40:7; Jer 1:17; Luk 12:35; 1Pe 1:13). SEE GIRDLE.

## Lois[[@Headword:Lois]]

             (Λωϊvς, perh. agreeable), the grandmother of Timothy, not by the side of his father, who was a Greek, but by that of his mother. Hence the Syriac has “thy mother's mother." She is commended by the apostle Paul for her faith (2Ti 1:5); for, although she might not have known that the Christ had come, and that Jesus of Nazareth was he, she yet believed in the Messiah to come, and died in that faith. Ante A.D. 64. SEE TIMOTHY.

## Loki Or Loke[[@Headword:Loki Or Loke]]

             in Scandinavian mythology, is the principle of evil, an impious, mischievous wretch, author of all intrigue, vice, and crime; father of the most abominable monsters, of the wolf Fenris, the midgard snake, and Hela (blue Hel), the goddess of death; the "spirit of evil," as it were, mingling freely with, yet essentially opposed to the other inhabitants of the Norse heaven, very much like the Satan of the book of Job. He is called the son of the giant Farbante, and is married to the giantess Angerbode. Sometimes he is called Asa-Loki, to distinguish him from Utgarda-Loki, a king of the giants, whose kingdom lies on the uttermost bounds of the earth; but these two are occasionally confounded. It is quite natural, considering the character of Loki, that at a later period he should have become identified with the devil of Christianity, who is called in Norway to the present day Laake. See Vollmer, Mythol. Worterb. s.v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Weinhold, Die Sagen v. Loki in Haupt, Zeitschrift Jur deutsches Alterth. volume 7; Thorpe, North. Mythol. volume 1 (see Index); and the excellent article in Thomas, Biogr. and Alythol. Dict. (Phila. 1872), s.v.

## Lokman[[@Headword:Lokman]]

             is represented in the Koran and by later Arabian tradition as a celebrated philosopher, contemporary with David and Solomon, with whom he is said to have frequently conversed. He was, we are told, an Arabian of the ancient tribe of Ad, or, according to another account, the king or chief of that tribe; and, when his tribe perished by the Seil el-Arim, he was preserved on account of his wisdom and piety. Other accounts, drawn mostly from Persian authorities, state that Lokman was an Abyssinian slave, and noted for his personal deformity and ugliness, as for his wit and  a peculiar talent for composing moral fictions and short apologues. He was considered to be the author of the well-known collection of fables, in Arabic, which still exist under his name. There is some reason to suppose that Lokman and AEsop were the same individual, and this view is of late gaining ground. See the excellent articles in the English Cyclops. s.v.; Chambers, Cyclops. s.v.; and Hammer-Purgstall, Literaturgesch. der Araber, 1:31 sq.

## Loll (or Lull)[[@Headword:Loll (or Lull)]]

             in German mythology, was a frightful god of the Franks, who had a sacred grove containing a brazen image in the region of Schweinfurt.

## Lollards Or Lol(l)hards[[@Headword:Lollards Or Lol(l)hards]]

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

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

English Lollards. — Whatever be the derivation of the word Lollard, certain it is that by this name alone the followers of John Wickliffe (q.v.) were always designated, who, in the early stage of the reformatory movements of the bold English churchman (about A.D. 1360), consisted of the "Poor Priests" (q.v.), a class called together by Wickliffe to carry the glad tidings of the Gospel into the remotest hamlets, and to counteract the influence of the begging friars ( SEE BEGHARDS, who were then strolling over the country, preaching instead of the Word the legends of the saints and the history of the Trojan War (compare D'Aubigne, Hist. of the Reformation, 5:91 sq.). For some time. the mendicant orders, which had first entered England in the early part of the preceding century, had been the object of attack, both by the people and the clergy, for their rapacious and shameless conduct. Indeed, so much was the country disturbed by the violence and vices of swarms of these sanctimonious vagabonds that the ancient records often speak of their arrest. Wickliffe's opposition to such a class of persons could not but have secured him the general respect and commendation of the people. Not so, however, when, to counteract the influence of the mendicants, he instituted the "Poor Priests," who, not content with mere polemics, preached the great mystery of godliness, and became so greatly the favorites of the people that the clergy were threatened to be left without any attendants at their churches, preference being shown to the poor priests, preaching in the fields, in some church- yard, or in the market-places. It was not, however, until after Wickliffe's appointment to the University of Oxford that any of the doctrines which the Lollards as a sect afterwards maintained, and which caused his prosecution by the papists, were advocated and propagated. It is true, even as early as 1357, Wickliffe had published a work against the covetousness of Rome (The last Age of the Church), and in 1365 had vindicated Edward  III's resistance to the claim of Urban V of the arrears of the tribute granted to the papacy by king John, SEE URBAN V; SEE ENGLAND; but it was not until (in 1372) he had taken the degree of D.D., and entered upon his work at Oxford University by able and emphatic testimony against the abuses of the papacy, that he drew upon himself the enmity of the English prelates, and, in consequence, came to stand forth the advocate of reform and the leader of a movement for this purpose. Nor did the success of his course slacken in the least after his withdrawal from the university and his retirement to the small parish of Lutterworth. Everywhere those persons who had come sunder his influence or been converted by his writings were busily engaged in disseminating the doctrines which he taught. His followers were to be found among all classes of the population. Some, like the duke of Lancaster, lord Percy, and Clifford, may have been attached to Wickliffe's views mainly by their political sympathies, but the great mass of his adherents were such upon religious grounds. The examinations of those who, during the generation that followed his death (1384), were arrested or punished as heretics, indicate the common doctrinal position which they almost uniformly maintained. It was substantially identical with that taken by Wickliffe in his writings. The supreme authority of the Scriptures in religious matters. the rejection of transubstantiation, the futile nature of pilgrimages, auricular confession, etc., the impiety of image-worship, the identification of the papal hierarchy with Antichrist, the entire sufficiency of Christ as a Savior, without the need of priestly offices in the mass, or any elaborate ceremonial — such were the points upon which they were pronounced heretical, and, as such, persecuted and condemned.

Up to 1382, through the events of the time, the great schism of the papacy, the indignation excited in England by papal encroachments, the scandalous conduct of many among the prelates and clergy, Wickliffe, as well as his followers, had been left comparatively unmolested, and he himself even escaped altogether. Not so, however, his followers, who were, near the time of his death, rapidly augmenting all over England. The testimony of Knighton and Walsingham indicates the rapid spread of Wickliffe's opinions, though there may be some exaggeration in the remark of the former to the effect that "nearly every other man in England was a Lollard." In 1382, however, more decided action was taken on the part of the ecclesiastics, and resulted in the convening of a council by archbishop Courtney. By it ten of Wickliffe's articles were condemned as heretical, and twenty-four as erroneous. The archbishop issued his mandate, forbidding  any man, "of what estate or condition soever," to hold, teach, preach, or defend the aforesaid heresies and errors, or any of them, or even allow them to be preached or favored, publicly or privately. Each bishop and priest was exhorted to become an "inquisitor of heretical pravity," and the neglect of the mandate was threatened with the severest censures of excommunication. This measure took effect at Oxford, where the chancellor, Robert Rygge, was inclined to favor Wickliffe's opinions, and the proctors, John Huntman and Walter Dish, were in sympathy with him. A sermon by Philip Reppyngdon, which they had allowed, and in which Wickliffe's views were defended, subjected them to suspicion. They were summoned before the archbishop, and with some difficulty escaped on submission. The chancellor was required to put Wickliffe's adherents to a purgation or cause them to abjure, publishing before the university the condemnation of his conclusions. His reply was that he durst not do it for fear of death. "What!" exclaimed the archbishop, "is Oxford such a nestler and favorer of heresies that the catholic truth cannot be published?" At the same time, by the archbishop's authority, Nicholas Hereford, Philip Reppyngdon, John Ashton, and Lawrence Bedemen, whose names were associated with Wickliffe's, were denied the privilege of preaching before the university, and suspended from every scholastic act. The chancellor himself was addressed as "somewhat inclined and still inclining to the aforesaid conclusions so condemned," and, under pain of the greater excommunication, he was enjoined to permit no one in the university to teach or defend the obnoxious doctrines. The injunction of the archbishop was enforced by the command of the royal council.

In the early months of 1382 the king had favored the persecution of heretics. On the petition of the archbishop, he had allowed him and his suffragans "to arrest and imprison, either in their own prisons, or any other if they please, all and every such person and persons as shall either privily or openly preach or maintain" the condemned conclusions. The persons thus arrested might,, moreover, be detained "till such time as they shall repent them and amend them of such erroneous and heretical pravities." The officers and subjects of the king were also required to obey and humbly attend the archbishop and his suffragans in the execution of their process. But the king declined to interfere. Even this, however, did not satisfy the archbishop. The excommunicated Hereford had escaped from prison, and the prelate, disappointed of his victim, asked the king to issue letters for his apprehension. On Ashton's trial in London, the citizens broke  open the doors of the conclave, forcing the archbishop to complete his process elsewhere. But popular sympathy was weak to resist the organized efforts of a powerful hierarchy, largely occupying the most responsible posts of government, and bold enough (Hannay's Rep. Gov.) to forge or interpolate parliamentary records, of which they had the control. Some of the accused, like Reppyngdon and Hereford, recanted, and became the most virulent persecutors of their former sympathizers. Others, according to Walden, who mentions William Swinderby, Walter Brute, William Thorpe, and others, whose names figure in Fox's "Martyrs," fled the realm. If Swinderby was one of the refugees, he soon returned. It is doubtful whether he or his associates went farther than to Wales or Scotland. In 1389 he was arraigned before the bishop of Lincoln, and charged with heresy. Forced to recant, he withdrew to the diocese of Hereford. Here he was again arrested as a "truly execrable offender of the new sect vulgarly called Lollards." The issue, so far as episcopal authority was concerned, could not remain doubtful. Swinderby was found guilty, pronounced a heretic, and to be shunned by all. From this sentence lie appealed to the king and council.

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

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

The compact between the leading representatives of the ecclesiastical and civil power which marked the accession of Henry IV to the throne was soon sealed by parliamentary legislation. To prevent the spread of the Lollards, and to suppress their meetings, which were described as confederacies to stir up sedition and insurrection (Crabb's History of English Law, page 334), it was ordained that if persons, sententially convict, refused to abjure their opinions, such persons were to be left to the secular arm. In such cases evidence was to be given to the diocesan or his commissary, and the sheriff, mayor, and bailiff were, after sentence promulgated, to receive them, and in a high place, before the people, to cause them to be burnt. 'The law did not remain a dead letter. It was not long before a victim was found. The ecclesiastics were only too zealous for an example that might strike terror among the people, and especially the Londoners, who were "not right believers in God, nor in the traditions of their forefathers; sustainers of the Lollards, depravers of religious men, withholders of tythes," etc. The victim selected was "one William Sautre, a good man and a faithful priest, inflamed with zeal for true religion," who in the Parliament of 1401 required that he might be heard for the commodity of the whole realm. The suspicions of the bishops were excited, and he was summoned before the ecclesiastical court.

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

But all the precautions of the bishops and the severity of persecuting laws were ineffectual to suppress the hated opinions. Fox narrates the examination of William Thorpe (1407) and the burning of John Badby (1409). The latter event seems to have created sympathy for the Lollards on the part of the Commons. In the eleventh year of Henry IV (1410) they praved that persons arrested under the obnoxious statute might be bailed and make their purgation, and that they might be arrested by none but sheriffs and lay officers. This petition, however, did not secure the royal approval. The influence and support of the Church would doubtless have  been lost to the king if he had yielded to the wishes of the Commons. Other measures which they proposed, designed to set limits to ecclesiastical usurpation, while they gave unequivocal evidence of the unchanged spirit of the nation, met with little more success In 1413 Henry IV was succeeded by his son, Henry V. The change, however, did not open any brighter prospect to the persecuted Lollards. The beginning of this reign was signalized by a new triumph of the Church. The king surrendered his friend, Sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, to the machinations of his persecutors. He was arrested, imprisoned, arraigned before the archbishop and his assessors, pronounced a heretic, and excommunicated. His offense was regarded as of the most aggravated character.

He was not only himself heretically inclined, but he had employed his wealth and influence to support Lollard preachers, and transcribe and disperse heretical books. So powerful and bold was the organized conspiracy of the priesthood against him that the king did not venture to interfere in his behalf. He was abandoned to his fate, but by some means escaped from prison, and only some years later was arrested, and subjected to the tardy but sure vengeance of his persecutors. It was not only by his surrender of lord Cobham that the new monarch signalized his subservience to the interests of the hierarchy. In his first Parliament a law was enacted against the Lollards, who were considered as the principal disturbers of the peace not only of the Church, but of the whole kingdom, uniting, as the preamble of the act states. in confederacies to destroy the king and all other estates of the realm. Hence all magistrates, from the chancellor to the sheriffs of cities and towns, were required, on entering office, to take an oath that they would use their whole power and diligence to destroy all heresies and errors, commonly called lollardies, and assist the ordinaries and their commissaries as often as required by them. It was moreover enacted "that whatsoever they were that should read the Scriptures in the mother tongue (which was then called Wickliffe's learning) should forfeit land, cattle, body, life, and goods from their heirs forever, and so be condemned for heretics to God, enemies to the crown, and most arrant traitors to the land." No sanctuary or privileged ground within the realm, though permitted to thieves and murderers should shelter them. In case of relapse after pardon they should be hanged as traitors against the king, and then burned as heretics against God.

The terror inspired by such executions and enactments drove many into exile. They fled, says Fox, "into Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and  into the wilds of Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, working there many marvels against their false kingdom too long to write." It was, of course, the most distinguished members of the sect who had most to apprehend, and who were the first to flee. Those who remained behind belonged very largely to the middle or the lower class. From time to time we meet with the name of some more eminent offender, and, from the precautions taken by their persecutors, we may form some idea of the continued energy as well as existence of the Lollards. Lechler, in the Zeitschrift für Hist. Theol. (1853, volume 4), has traced the evidences of their presence and influence in England down to the date of the Lutheran Reformation. The precious legacy of the Lollard faith was transmitted, along with MS. translations of the Scriptures and Lollard books, from generation to generation; and among the English martyrs, just before as well as after the commencement of the Reformation, there were several who might most appropriately be denominated Lollards.

The prevalence of their views as late as the middle of the 15th century is attested by the elaborate effort which Reginald Peacock, successively bishop of St. Asaph and of Chichester. made to refute them. His earlier years had been spent in London, in the work of instruction, and here he had become familiar with the work of the Lollards, and the arguments by which they were maintained. With great ingenuity, and with a commendable patience, he undertook their refutation, giving to this method the decided preference over chains, prison, and the stake. Convicted at length himself of holding heretical opinions, and removed from the episcopal office, he spent the last three years of his life in prison, and by some, although unwarrantably, was regarded as a Lollard. On some points his views, indeed, approximated to those of the hated sect, but his writings derive their historical value from the exhibition which they make of the doctrines maintained by the Lollards, or "Bible-men," as he sometimes calls them, and the evidence which they afford of their extensive acceptance. Here we see that for nearly two lull generations the same doctrinal views which had been accepted by the immediate followers of Wickliffe were still retained by their successors, and during the two generations which followed they underwent no material change. Thus, when the English Reformation of the 16th century commenced, it derived a new impulse from the earlier Lollard movement which it was destined to absorb into itself. Nor is it a mere fancy which has led writers like Lechler to assert an important and vital connection between the Lollardism of the 15th and the Puritanism of the 16th century. (E.H.G.)  Scottish Lollards. — Lollardism was by no means confined to the southern portion of the British Islands. It penetrated also into Scotland, and in the real home of the Culdees (q.v.) — the land where a simple and primitive form of Christianity had been established, while among her southern neighbors Rome presented a vast accumulation of superstitions, and was arrayed in her well-known pomp — received the countenance of those whose position and influence were well calculated to aid in its dissemination among a people that had freely imbibed the spirit of religious reformation so prevalent among the English in the 14th century, especially in the reign of Richard II, at the time of the passage of the statute of praemunire (A.D. 1389).

More particularly rapid was the spread of the reformatory spirit in Scotland in the western districts, those of Kyle, Carrick, and Cunningham, and hence the surname for the Scotch Lollards, Lollards of Kyle, as they were oftentimes called. The clergy, aware of the danger that threatened their state of profligacy and ease, at last, in the beginning of the 15th century, made open war upon these silent antagonists. The first to suffer from the persecution which they inaugurated was a certain John Resby an English priest who had fled northward from persecution, and in the land of refuge also was fast making converts to his cause. The leading authority and influence in the land was at this time the see of St. Andrews (compare Dean Stanley's Lectures on the Eccles. History of Scotland, page 45), over which bishop Henry Wardlaw was now presiding. By his interference Resby was tried before Dr. Laurence de Lindoris, afterwards professor of common law at St. Andrews, and on his refusal to retract his views about the supremacy of the pope, auricular confession, transubstantiation, etc., was burnt at Perth in 1405 or 1407. According to Pinkerton, such a scene was unknown before in Scotland. The burning of Resby is given in the twentieth chapter of the fifteenth book of the Scotichronicon. Still these opinions continued to extend, especially in the south and west of Scotland. The regent, Robert, duke of Albany, was known to be opposed to the Lollards; and though king James I was by no means blind to prevailing abuses in the Church, an act of Parliament was passed during his reign, in 1425 by which bishops were required to make inquisition in their dioceses for heretics, in order that they might undergo condign punishment. This act was soon to be put in force. In 1433 another victim for the stake was secured in the person of Paul Craw or Crawar, a physician of Prague, who had sought refuge from persecution in Scotland. As he made no secret of his Lollard or Hussite opinions, he was arraigned  before Lindoris and condemned to the flames. After this time we hear but little of Lollardism for quite a long period.

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

Literature. — Much information concerning the Lollards may be derived from the lives of Wickliffe by Lewis, Le Bas, and especially Vaughan. Fox, in his Martyrology, often presents very disconnected documents exceedingly valuable. Walsingham (Chronica), Knighton, and Walden have contributed important evidence. although by no means favorable, which subsequent writers have used. The fuller histories of England, as Rapin, for instance, present some leading facts concerning the Lollards in connection with contemporary political movements. The most satisfactory account of  the later Lollards is found in articles by Lechler in the Histor. Zeitschrift for 1853 and 1854. IHe has given citations from works hitherto unpublished, which he examined in the libraries of the English universities. See also Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britannicae (London, 1737, 3); Turner, History of England during the Middle Ages; Weber, Gesch. d. Kirchen Ref. in Grossbritanien (1856), volume 1; Neander, Ch. History, 5:141 sq.; Milman, Hist. of Lat. Christianity, 7:404 sq.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 13th cent. page 323; 14th cent. pages 381, 392, etc.; 15th cent. Page 438 sq.; Shoberly, Persecutions of Popery, 1:135 sq.; Ullmann, Reform. before the Reformation, 2:11, 14; Ebrard, Kirchen und Dogmengesch. 2:360, 450, 462 sq.; Gillett, Life and Times of John Huss, 1:370 sq., 628, Index for Wickliffe; Punchard, Hist. of Congregationalism (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 12mo), 1:237 sq.; Butler (C.M.), Eccles. Hist. second series (Philadel. 1872, 8vo), page 365 sq., 378,381 sq., 388; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, page 379 sq.; Reichel, Hist. of the Roman See in the Middle Ages, page 571 sq.; Studien u. Kritiken, 1845, 3:594 sq.; 1848, 1:169 sq.; Chr. Rev. volume 8; Christ. Remem. 1853 (October), page 415; Ladies' Rewos. 1870 (September), page 189 sq.

## Lollards of Kyle[[@Headword:Lollards of Kyle]]

             SEE LOLLARDS.

## Lombard(us), Peter[[@Headword:Lombard(us), Peter]]

             a very noted scholastic theologian, derived his name from the province in which he was born, near Novara, in Lombardy, about the opening of the 12th century. He studied at Bologna, Rheims, and afterwards at Paris. Here he acquired a great reputation, was made first professor of theology in the university, and subsequently (in 1159) appointed bishop. He died in the French capital in 1164. Lombardus was considered one of the best scholars of his day, and a zealous priest. His principal work, Sententiarum libri quatuor, is a collection of passages from the fathers, of which he attempted to conciliate the apparent contradictions, somewhat in the manner in which Gratian attempted it in his Decret. He may be considered as the first author who collected theological doctrines into a complete system, and, whatever the faults of his work, it is the foundation of scholastic theology, and shows much care and system. It became the text- book in the schools of philosophy, obtained for him the title of "Master of Sentences" (Magister Sententiarum), and placed him at the head of the scholastic divines. The work was first published at Venice (1477, fol.) in four parts, each divided into different headings. After his death, one of the propositions contained in it ("Christus, secundum quod est homo, non est aliquid") was condemned by pope Alexander III. Thomas Aquinas and  others have written commentaries on the book. He also wrote Commentaire stur les Psaumes (Paris, 1541, fol.): — Commentaire sur les Epitres de St. Paul (1537, fol.). His complete works were published at Nuremberg in 1478, and at Basle in 1486. An able editor was found in Aleaume, who published Peter the Lombard's works at Louvain in 1546. The best edition of the Sentences is by Antoine Ghenart (Louvain, 1567, 4to). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Neander, Hist. of Chrtistian Dogmas (Bohn's edit.), volume 2 (see Index); Hefele, Conciliengesch. 5:545, 639, 785; Reuter, Alexander III, volume 3; Dupin, Nouv. Biblioth. des antiq. Ecclesiastiques, 16:45 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:583 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Lombards[[@Headword:Lombards]]

             SEE LONGOBARDI.

## Lombardy[[@Headword:Lombardy]]

             is the name given to that part of Northern Italy which formed the "nucleus" of the kingdom of the Longobardi (q.v.). Incorporated in 774 into the Carlovingian possessions, it became an independent kingdom again in 843, though it was not entirely severed from the Frankish monarchy until 888. It now consisted of the whole of Italy north of the Peninsula, with the exception of Savoy and Venice. In 961 it was annexed to the German empire, and its territory thereafter gradually lessened by the formation of several small but independent duchies and republics. Throughout the Middle Ages the Lombards were compelled to league together with their neighbors to retain their independence from the German emperors. The assumptions of Frederick Barbarossa they successfully defeated in 1176, and so also those of Frederick II. But by internal dissensions they were gradually weakened, and in 1540 Spain finally took possession of Lombardy, and held it until about 1706, when it fell to Austria, and was designated "Austrian Lombardy." In 1796 it became part of the Cisalpine republic, but in 1815 it was restored to Austria, and annexed politically to the newly-acquired Venetian territory under the name of the Lombardo- Venetian kingdom. This union was dissolved in 1859 by the Italian War, Lombardy, with the exception of the Venetian territory (finally also given to Italy in 1866), falling to the new kingdom of Italy. "Here is now no political division called Lombardy, the country having been parceled out into the provinces of Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Cremona, Milan, Pavia,  and Sondrio. Its total area was 9086 English square miles, with a population, in 1885, of 3,460,824 souls, mostly Roman Catholics. SEE ITALY.

## Lombroso, Jacob[[@Headword:Lombroso, Jacob]]

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

## Lomenie, De Brienne, Etienne Charles De[[@Headword:Lomenie, De Brienne, Etienne Charles De]]

             a very celebrated French prelate, was born at Paris in 1727. He renounced his primogeniture and the rigors of military glory for the easy honors of the Church, and became a great and powerful opponent of the Protestants. Promoted in 1763 to the archbishopric of Toulouse, he aspired, it would seem, to the part of a Mazarin or a Richelieu in the state, without possessing either the ability or the unscrupulous daring necessary to it. Upon the coronation of Louis XVI in 1775, he took particular pains to strike against the Protestants, but it was not until 1787 that he gained prominence in state affairs. In this year, after figuring in a commission for the reform of the clergy, and coquetting with the philosophy of D'Alembert and the encyclopaedists, he became a member of the Assembly of Notables, and, having headed the party by whom the administration of Calonne was overthrown, he succeeded that unfortunate as minister, adopted his plans, and proved himself just as incapable of executing them. An excited contest arose between the king and Parliament, and resulted in the dismissal of the latter by force of arms. In 1788 he was made prime minister, and was also promoted to the rich archbishopric of Sens. In 1791 he was offered a cardinal's hat, but, knowing the opposition of the people against the clergy, he declined this distinction. In July, 1788, he was compelled by the dissatisfaction of the people to proceed to the Convocation of the states general for the month of May following, and on the 24th of August he retired to private life. He resided for a time at Nice, but the cardinal's hat which Pius VI bestowed on him he now gratefully accepted. He was one of those who took the oath as a constitutional bishop, on account of which he was deprived of the cardinal's hat. He was nevertheless arrested February  15, 1794, and died of apoplexy the same night. See Heroes, Philosophers, and Courtiers of the Time of Louis XVI (London, 1863, 2 volumes, 12mo); Lacroix's Pressense, Religion and the Reign of Terrora, pages 43, 124; Droz, Hist. due regne de Louis XVI; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 31:532 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Lommatzsch, Karl Heinrich Eduard[[@Headword:Lommatzsch, Karl Heinrich Eduard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 22, 1802, at Grosschonau, near Zittau. He commenced his academical career at Berlin in 1829, was in 1832 professor at the theological seminary in Wittenberg, and died August 19, 1882, doctor of theology. Lommatzsch is especially known as the editor of De la Rue's edition of Orsigenis Opera Omnia (Berlin, 1831-48, 25 volumes). (B.P.)

## Lomus[[@Headword:Lomus]]

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

## Lon, Johanna Michael[[@Headword:Lon, Johanna Michael]]

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

## London Missionary Society[[@Headword:London Missionary Society]]

             SEE MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

## Long Brothers, The Four[[@Headword:Long Brothers, The Four]]

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

## Long, Clement, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Long, Clement, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in New Hampshire in 1807. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1828, studied theology for two years in Andover Theological Seminary as a member of the class of 1834, and was ordained. He was a tutor in Western Reserve College, and became professor of intellectual and moral philosophy in that institution in 1834; professor of theology in 1844; professor of theology in the theological seminary at Auburn, N.Y., in 1852; professor of intellectual philosophy and political economy in Dartmouth College in 1854. He died at Hanover, N.H., October 14, 1861. See Trien. Cat. of Andover Theol. Sem. 1870, page 112.

## Long, Jacques Le[[@Headword:Long, Jacques Le]]

             SEE LE LONG.

## Long, Roger[[@Headword:Long, Roger]]

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

## Long, Thomas[[@Headword:Long, Thomas]]

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

## Longevity[[@Headword:Longevity]]

             The Biblical narrative plainly ascribes to many individuals in the earlier history of the race lives far longer than what is held to be the present extreme limit, and we must therefore carefully consider the evidence upon which the general correctness of the numbers rests, and any independent evidence as to the length of life at this time. The statements in the Bible  regarding longevity may be separated into two classes those given in genealogical lists, and those interspersed with the relation of events.

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

Infidelity has not failed, in various ages, to attack revelation on the score of the supposed absurdity of assigning to any class of men this lengthened term of existence. In reference to this, Josephus (Ant. 1:3, 3) remarks: "Let no one, upon comparing the lives of the ancients with our lives, and with the few years which we now live, think that what we say of them is false, or make the shortness of our lives at present an argument that neither did they attain to so long a duration of life." When we consider the compensating process which is going on, the marvel is that the human frame should not last longer than it does. Some, however, have supposed that the years above named are lunar, consisting of about thirty days; but this supposition, with a view to reduce the lives of the antediluvians to our standard, is replete with difficulties. At this rate, the whole time from the creation of man to the flood would not be more than about 140 years; and Methuselah himself would not have attained to the age which many even now do, whilst many must have had children when mere infants! Moses must therefore have meant solar, not lunar years — averaging as long as ours, although the ancients generally reckoned twelve months, of thirty days each, to the year. "Nor is there," observes St. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, 15:12), "any care to be given unto those who think that one of our ordinary years would make ten of the years of these times, being so short; and therefore, say they, 900 years of theirs are 90 of ours — their 10 is our 1, and their 100 our 10. Thus think they that Adam was but 20 years old when he begat Seth, and he but 201 when he begat Enos, whom the Scriptures call (the Sept. ver.) 205 years. For, as these men hold, the Scripture divided one year into ten parts, calling each part a year; and each part had a sixfold quadrate, because in six days God made the world. Now 6 times 6 is 36, which, multiplied by 10, makes 360 — i.e., twelve lunar months." Abarbanel, in his Comment. on Genesis v, states that some, professing Christianity, had fallen into the same mistake, viz. that Moses meant lunar, and not solar years. Ecclesiastical history does not inform us of this fact, except it be to it that Lactantius refers (2:12) when he speaks  of one Varro: "The life of man, though temporary, was yet extended to 1000 years; of this Varro is so ignorant that, though known to all from the sacred writings, he would argue that the 1000 years of Moses were, according to the Egyptian mode of calculation, only 1000 months!"

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

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

1. Either that the age of puberty was later in proportion as the lives of the antediluvians were longer than ours, or,

2. That Moses does not record the first-born sons but as the order of the genealogy required, his object being to trace the succession from Adam, through Seth, to Abraham.

While the Jews have never questioned the longevity assigned by Moses to the patriarchs, they have yet disputed, in many instances, as to whether it was common to all men who lived up to the period when human life was contracted. Maimonides (More Nebochim, 2:47) takes this view. With this opinion Abarbanel, on Genesis v, agrees; Nachmanides, however, rejects it, and shows that the life of the descendants of Cain must have been quite as long as that of the Sethites, though not noticed by Moses; for only seven individuals of the former filled up the space which intervened between the death of Abel and the flood, whereas ten of the latter are enumerated. We have reason, then, to conclude that longevity was not confined to any peculiar tribe of the ante or post diluvian fathers, but was vouchsafed, in general, to all. Irenaeus (Adversvs Haeret. 5) informs us that some supposed that the fact of its being recorded that no one of the antediluvians named attained the age of 1000 years, was the fulfillment of the declaration (Genesis 3), "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" grounding the opinion, or rather conceit upon Psa 90:4, namely, that God's day is 1000 years.  As to the probable reasons why God so prolonged the life of man in the earlier ages of the world, and as to the subordinate means by which this might have been accomplished, Josephus says (Ant. 1.c.): "For those ancients were beloved of God, and lately made by God himself; and because their food was then fitter for the prolongation of life, they might well live so great a number of years; and because God afforded them a longer time of life on account of their virtue and the good use they made of it in astronomical and geometrical discoveries, which would not have afforded the time for foretelling the periods of the stars unless they had lived 600 years; for the great year is completed in that interval." To this he adds the testimony of many celebrated profane historians, who affirm that the ancients lived 1000 years. In the above passage Josephus enumerates four causes of the longevity of the earlier patriarchs.

1. As to the first, viz., their being dearer to God than other men, it is plain that it cannot be maintained; for the profligate descendants of Cain were equally longlived, as mentioned above, with others.

2. Neither can we agree in the second reason he assigns; because we find that Noah and others, though born so long subsequently to the creation of Adam, yet lived to as great an age, some of them to a greater age than he did.

3. If, again, it were right to attribute longevity to the superior quality of the food of the antediluvians, then the seasons, on which this depends, must, about Moses's time — for it was then that the term of human existence was reduced to its present standard — have assumed a fixed character. But no change at that time took place in the revolution of the heavenly bodies, by which the seasons of heat, cold, etc., are regulated: hence we must not assume that it was the nature of the fruits they ate which caused longevity.

4. How far the antediluvians had advanced in scientific research generally, and in astronomical discovery particularly, we are not informed; nor can we place any dependence upon what Josephus says about the two inscribed pillars which remained from the old world (see Ant. 1:2, 9). We are not, therefore, able to determine, with any confidence, that God permitted the earlier generations of man to live so long in order that they might arrive at a high degree of mental excellence. From the brief notices which the Scriptures afford of the character and habits of the antediluvians, we should rather infer that they had not advanced very far in discoveries in natural and experimental philosophy. SEE ANTEDILUVIANS.

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

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

That the common age of man has been the same in all times since the world was generally repeopled is manifest from profane as well as sacred history. Plato lived to the age of 81, and was accounted an old man; and those whom Pliny reckons up (7:48) as rare examples of long life may for the most part be equaled in modern times. It must be observed, however, that all the supposed famous modern instances of very great longevity, as those of Parr, Jackson, and the old countess of Desmond, have utterly broken down on examination, and that the registers of countries where records of such statistics have been kept prove no greater extreme than about 110 years. We may fortunately appeal to at least one contemporary instance. There is an Egyptian hieratic papyrus in the Bibliotheque at Paris bearing a moral discourse by one Ptah-hotp, apparently eldest son of Assa (B.C. cir. 1910-1860), the fifth king of the fifteenth dynasty, which was of shepherds. SEE EGYPT. At the conclusion, Ptah-hotp thus speaks of himself: "I have become an elder on the earth (or in the land); I have traversed a hundred and tell years of life by the gift of the king and the approval of the elders, fulfilling my duty towards the king in the place of favor (or blessing)" (Facsimile d'un Papyrus Egyptien, par E. Prisse d'Avennes, pl. 19, lines 7, 8). The natural inferences from this passage are, that Ptah-hotp wrote in the full possession of his mental faculties at the age of 110 years, and that  his father was still reigning at the time, and therefore had attained the age of about 130 years, or more. The reigns assigned by Mahetho to the shepherd-kings of this dynasty seem indicative of a greater age than that of the Egyptian sovereigns (Cory, Ancient Fragments, 2d ed., pages 114, 136). SEE CHRONOLOGY.

## Longinus, Dionysius Cassius[[@Headword:Longinus, Dionysius Cassius]]

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

## Longley, Charles Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Longley, Charles Thomas, D.D]]

             the last primate of all England, was born in Westmeathshire in 1794, and was educated at Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford, where he distinguished himself' as a first-class scholar in classics. After graduating, he remained for some time connected with the university as college tutor, censor, and public examiner. He became perpetual curate of Cowley in  1823, and rector of West Tytherley in 1827, and head master of Harrow School in 1829. In 1836 he was appointed bishop of Ripon, and in 1856 was translated to Durham, in 1860 to the archbishopric of York, and in 1862 to that of Canterbury. Over this see, by virtue of which he was primate of the Church of England, and first of all the Anglican bishops of the world, he presided until his death, October 27, 1868. "Archbishop Longley belonged ecclesiastically to the old school of 'moderate' Establishment divines, but in the last three years of his administration his amiable temper, cooperating with his instinctive hyper-conservatism, led him to temporize with the reckless and audacious policy of bishop Wilberforce and the High-Anglicans, and he became a most inadequate standard-bearer for the English Church in her supreme hour. Incapable of bold and persistent action, the latter portion of his primacy was marked by a series of disastrous vacillations and blunders. He first gave his countenance to the bishop of Capetown in his revolutionary action in South Africa, and then withdrew that countenance. In an interval of reason he encouraged lord Shaftesbury to introduce his anti-ritualistic resolutions, and then he shiveringly withdrew his approval when they came up for action." The most important event during his administration was the so- called "Pan-Anglican" Synod, a meeting of all the bishops of the Church of England and the churches in communion with her, convened in 1867, a measure instigated, it is said, by bishop Wilberforce (q.v.), to stop the tide of ritualism, and to bring about, if possible, a union with the Greek Church (see Appleton's Annuall Cyclop. 1867, page 42 sq.). In this synod the archbishop of Canterbury proved entirely untrustworthy. Himself inclining towards ritualism, he moderately rebuked the Ritualists in public, while privately he favored their promotion, and was instrumental in their appointment to colonial bishoprics. He was decidedly a High-Churchman, and, though in person amiable, devout, dignified, and courteous, he showed, in his disastrous primacy, how unfitted are mere moderation, and a desire simply for compromise and peace, to guide the Church in times when her foundations are assailed. We will only add that archbishop Longley died as he had lived, a man of profoundly pious feeling that fell a little too much into formula. He referred to words of Hooker's some three or four days before his death as containing the faith in which he "wished to die" — words expressive of his sense of guilt and his faith in Christ's blood to cleanse him from that guilt. See London Spectator, 1868, October 31, page 1272; NY. — Tribune, October 29, 1868. (J.H.W.)

## Longobardi[[@Headword:Longobardi]]

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

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

The first historical notices present them as a people small in number, having their original seat on the west side of the Lower Elbe, in a territory extending some sixty miles southward from Hamburg. They advanced into Moravia and Hungary, the abode of the Rugi, before 500, and conquered the Heruli, and were invited by Justinian to the neighborhood of the Danube in the year 526. They afterwards crossed into Pannonia, where, though at first in alliance with the Gepide, they subsequently (A.D. 566 or 567) subdued the people, yielding in turn to the Avars, and in 569 crossed the Alps into Italy under Alboin, having been invited thither by Narses, as it is said, out of revenge against the province and the emperor. This was fourteen years after the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom, and the exhausted state of the country left Northern Italy an easy prey. The Goths were Arians, and religious differences with both the Roman and Greek churches went far to prevent the acceptance of their rule, and the establishment at that time of a united government in Italy, for the want of which the country has so many centuries suffered. The Lombards succeeded no better in securing entire dominion. They, however, extended their power, establishing the duchies of Frioul, Spoleto, and Benevento, until only the districts of Rome and Naples, the southern extremity of the peninsula, Venice, and the east coast from the Po to Ancona, with Ravenna as the city of the exarchs, remained sunder the power of the Greek emperor. The conduct of the Lombards as conquerors has been severely characterized on the authority of early writers of the Romish Church. Gregory the Great, in his epistles and dialogues, draws a frightful picture of their oppressions, as does Paulus Diaconus of the unquestionably lawless sway of the thirty-five dukes, who were the only rulers in the interregnum after the death of Cleph, till, by the threatening approach of the Franks, they were compelled to elect a king in the person of Autharis. Now for the first time (584-590) an orderly constitution was established. Paulus Diaconus speaks with great praise of the new state of things. "Wonderful  was the state of the Lombard kingdom: violence and treachery were alike unknown; no one was oppressed, no one plundered another; thefts and robberies were unheard of; the traveler went wherever he would in perfect security" (Paul. Diac. 3:16).

A general idea of their political constitution may be found in the edict of king Rothari (636-652), a kind of Bill of Rights, which was promulgated November 22, 643, and is memorable as having become the foundation of constitutional law in the Germanic kingdoms of the Middle Ages. It was revised and extended by subsequent Lombard kings, but subsisted in force for several centuries after the Lombard kingdom had passed away. The edict recognises, as among all German nations, three classes — the free, the semi-free, and slave or vassal. Among the free were the nobiles. The army secured the national unity, civil officers being regarded as rendering military service. The king was elective, and among the dukes he represented the nation. He was commander of the army, head of all police power, chief judge, and general ward. There were courtiers of various ranks. The dukes were also called judges, or judices civitatis. Under each judex were many local, judicial, police, and military authorities. The cities chosen by the dukes severally as their residences were centers of the Lombard government. There would seem to be but little room for the old Roman municipal constitutions. Concerning the relation of the Lombard rule to the continuance of the Roman law and the rights of the conquered people there are differences of opinion. Under the Goths the former laws and customs remained largely unaffected; but it has been maintained (as by Leo) that under the Lombards the personal liberty, right of property, and municipal constitutions of the conquered people were abolished. The subject was much discussed by the Italians in the last century; and in this century the historians Savigny, Leo, Bandi di Vesme, Fossati, Troya, Bethmann-Hollwseg, etc., present conflicting or somewhat varied views. The Lombard laws themselves give but little precise information on this point. The Romans at least lost all united nationality. Roman law seems to have been first distinctively brought into use under Luitprand. The feeling of enmity which, for a long time at least, existed between the people and their conquerors, was increased by religious differences, and on this account the new power was specially obnoxious to the authorities of the Roman Church. A state of war generally prevailed between the two powers. The Church writers are constant and bitter in their complaints of Lombard impiety and oppressions — at least during the earlier period of  their dominion — in the wasting of churches and monasteries, and the treatment of ecclesiastics. The Lombard clergy themselves, however, do not seem to be charged as active participants in these deeds. Gregory the Great discerns in the times signs of the approaching judgment. "What is happening in other parts of the world," he says, "we know not; but in this the end of all things not merely announces itself as approaching, but shows itself as actually begun" (Dial. 3). Such representations of the spirit and course of the conquerors must be taken with considerable qualification. Still more untrustworthy are the accounts given, especially by Gregory, of numerous miraculous interferences in behalf of the true faith.

The Lombards were Arians. Unlike the Franks, who became by religious sympathy the natural defenders of the pope, they, with the Goths, Vandals, Burgundians, and Suevians, had been converted to Christianity, about the end of the 5th century, by Arian missionaries. Such was the case with the German tribes generally on the lower Danube. But there were among them many, some of whom entered Italy, who were still heathens, and worshipped their gods Odin and Freia south of the Alps. There were probably also some Catholic Pannonians and Noricans who, with their bishops, had joined the expedition. The first influence exerted by Rome for the conversion of the Lombards was through the wife of Alboin, a niece of Clovis, who was a good Roman Catholic, and had been enjoined by the bishop of Treves to convert her husband from his Arian heresy. Theodolinda of Bavaria also exerted a like influence upon her husband Autharis, and under his reign the Catholic faith made considerable progress. On the death of Autharis (590), Theodolinda married Agilulf, and under his government also she continued to labor for the advancement of the Catholic Church, hoping thereby to refine the manners of her own people. Theodolinda persuaded Agilulf to restore a portion of their property and dignities to the Catholic clergy, and to have his own son baptized according to the Catholic ritesan example which was followed by multitudes. Her brother Gundwald, duke of Asti, she influenced to build the magnificent Basilica of St. John the Baptist at Monza, near Milan, in which in subsequent times was kept the Lombard crown, called the Iron Crown; indeed, she improved any and every opportunity to advance the interests of the Catholics, and thus hastened the successful establishment of their religion among the Lombards. Gregory the Great (590-604), founder of the papacy, maintained frequent correspondence with the queen in a friendly relation, similar to that existing between Gregory VII and the  countess Matilda. On the occasion of the baptism of her children she received a present from Gregory. Earlier he had sent her four Books of Dialogues, "because he knew that she was true to the faith in Christ, and strong in good works” (Paul. Diac. 4:5).

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

The Church was subject to the state. Though its clergy and bishops obtained increasing power, it was not of a political character as in France. The bishops were subject to the king, and the inferior clergy to the subordinate judges. The bishops were chosen by the people. The cloisters were subject to magisterial power. But the prospect looming up before the popes of soon becoming themselves subject to the rule of the  barbaric Lombards, they now entered upon that Machiavelian policy which they long incessantly pursued, of laboring to prevent a union of all Italy under one government, in order to secure for themselves the greater power in the midst of contending parties. This, with the disputes which arose concerning the succession to the Lombard throne, led to the downfall of the Lombard kingdom within no long time after it had reached its utmost greatness. Gregory III, in his distress, fixed his gaze on the youthful greatness of a transalpine nation, the Franks, to afford him the necessary assistance in the struggle now ensuing. The movement against the Lombards was initiated at the election of Zachary, by discarding the customary form of obtaining the consent of the exarchate's authority, at this time vested in the Lombard king; and Stephen II made way for Pepin, after having anointed him to the patriciate, i.e., the governorship of Rome, to make war upon Aistulf, the successor of Luitprand. Naturally enough, Pepin's military successes were all turned to the advantage of the pope in securing to him the exarchate and Pentapolis. New causes of hostility between the Frank and Lombard monarchs arose when Charlemagne sent back to her father his wife, the daughter of the Lombard king Desiderius (754-774). In the autumn of 773 Charlemagne invaded Italy, and in May of the following year Pavia was conquered, and the Lombard kingdom was overthrown. In 803 a treaty between Charlemagne, the western, and Nicephorus, the eastern emperor, confirmed the right of the former to the Lombard territory, with Rome, the Exarchate, Ravenna, Istria, and part of Dalmatia; while the Eastern empire retained the islands of Venice and the maritime towns of Dalmatia, with Naples, Sicily, and part of Calabria. See Tiurk, Die Longobarden und ihr Volksrecht (Rost. 1835); Flegler, Das Konigreich der Longobarden in Italien (Leipz. 1851); Abel, Der Untergang d. Longobardenreichs in Italien (Gott. 1858); Leo, Gesch. d. itatl. Staaten (1829), vol. i; Hautleville, Hist. des Communes Lolmbardes depuis leur origine jusqu'a la fin du xiii Siscle (Paris, 1857), volume 1; Reichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, page 50 sq.; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 1:472; 2:39 sq. SEE LOMBARDY.

## Longobardi, Niccolo[[@Headword:Longobardi, Niccolo]]

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

## Longstreet, Augustus Baldwin, LL.D[[@Headword:Longstreet, Augustus Baldwin, LL.D]]

             a Methodist minister, was born at Augusta, Georgia, September 22, 1790. He studied in the Litchfield (Connecticut) Law School, and settled in his native state. In 1823 he represented Greene Count V in the state legislature, and the following year was made judge of the Superior Court of the state. During the Nullification excitement he established the Augusta Sentinel. In 1838 he entered the ministry, and from 1839 to 1848 was president of Emory College, in Oxford. He was then for a short time president of Centenary College, Jackson, Louisiana, and from 1849 to 1856 president of the University of Mississippi. Still later he was president of South Carolina College. He died September 9, 1870. He was a frequent contributor to Southern periodicals, and published many separate works, among the best known of which is his humorous collection of Georgia Scenes. See Obituary Record of Yale College, 1872.

## Longueil, Richard Oliver De[[@Headword:Longueil, Richard Oliver De]]

             a French prelate, was born about 1410, of an illustrious family of Normandy. He was archdeacon of Eu, and became, in 1453, bishop of Coutances. Having been designated among other commissaries, by the pope, in 1455, to revise the proceeding in the case of Joan d'Arc, he exhibited great zeal in rehabilitating the memory of that female hero. King Charles VII sent him as ambassador to the duke of Burgundy, and placed him at the head of his council. He also obtained for Longueil from the pope, Calixtus III, the cardinal's hat, in 1456. In his devotion to the Church that prelate ventured to oppose in the parliament the Pragmatic Sanction, for which he was fined not less than 10,000 livres. Pius II gave him the  bishoprics of Oporto and of St. Ruffina, also the legateship of Umbria, and made him archpriest of the basilica of St. Peter. He died at La P6rouse. August 15, 1470. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Longuerue, Louis Du Four[[@Headword:Longuerue, Louis Du Four]]

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

## Longueval, Jacques[[@Headword:Longueval, Jacques]]

             a learned French Jesuit, was born in the suburbs of Peronne March 18,1680. At the age of nineteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and afterwards taught rhetoric and theology in different colleges of his order. On account of a violent work published upon the religious quarrels of the  period, he was first exiled, but later received permission to reside at the house of professed Jesuits in Paris. He died January 11, 1735. Among his published works are Traite du Schisme (Brussels, 1718) [a Refutation of this work was published in the same year by Meganck]: — Dissertation sur les Miracles (Paris, 1730, 4to): — Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane (Paris, 1730-1749, 18 volumes, 8vo); Longueval wrote only the first eight volumes, reaching the year 1138; the others have been written by Fontenay, Brumoy, and Berthier. The work has been reprinted at Nimes (1782) and at Paris (1825). Longueval is also the author of the greater part of the Reflexions Morales, an appendix to the Nouveau Testament of P. Lallemant. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biogr. and Mythol s.v.; Fontenay, Eloge de Longueval, in Histoire Gallicane, volume 9.

## Lonsano, Menachem Di[[@Headword:Lonsano, Menachem Di]]

             a Jewish writer of the 17th century, is the author of איר תורה, or critical work on the text of the Pentateuch (Amsterdam, 1659 and often). He compared ten MSS., chiefly Spanish ones, with the text of Bomberg's quarto Bible, published in 1544, some of them being five or six hundred years old. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:255 sq.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 184 sq. (B.P.)

## Lonsdale, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Lonsdale, John, D.D.]]

             a distinguished English prelate, was born at Newmillerdam, near Wakefield, January 17, 1788, and was the son of the Reverend John Lensdale, vicar of D.rfield and incumbent of Chapelthorpe. Young Lonsdlale entered Eton College at the age of 11, and completed his studies finally at King's College, Cambridge, where he got nearly all the prizes, and took the B.A. in 1811. He then studied law for a time, but changing for theology, he was ordained priest in 1815. Shortly after he was made examining chaplain to archbishop Sutton and assistant preacher at the temple. In 1821 he was appointed to the office of Christian advocate to Cambridge University, and in the following year domestic chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. From 1831 to 1843 he was prebendary of St. Paul's; from 1839 to 1843, principal of King's College, London, and rector of Southfleet, Kent. He was also archdeacon of Middlesex during 1842 and 1843, and was for some time chaplain at Lincoln's Inn. In 1844, finally, he was appointed, by Sir Robert Peel, bishop of Lichfield. He died at Erdeshall Castle, Staffordshire, October 19,1867. Bishop Lonsdale was greatly celebrated in the English pulpit; while yet in the infancy of his ministry, two courses of his university sermons, as well as several occasional discourses, were asked for and received by the public (London, 1820,1821). In 1849 he published, with archbishop Hale, a volume of Annotations of the Gospels, SEE HALE.

He is spoken of as "a man of remarkable humility, averse to controversy, and never willing to enter into a public discussion of great questions in theology, from the belief that others were better qualified than he to handle them; but, withal, he was  unflinching in his adherence to what he believed to be right." He was greatly beloved, not only by his own Church, but by the Dissenters also. See Appleton's Ann. Cyclop. 1867. page 451; Am. Ch. Rev. 1868, page 675.

## Loochooan Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Loochooan Version Of The Scriptures]]

             SEE TUKUDH VERSION.

## Looking-glass[[@Headword:Looking-glass]]

             SEE MIRROR.

## Loomis, Augustus Ward, D.D[[@Headword:Loomis, Augustus Ward, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Andover, Connecticut, September 4, 1816. After graduating from Hamilton College in 1841; and Princeton Theological Seminary in 1844, he became missionary to China, 1844-50; missionary to the Creek Indians, 1852-53; in regular pastoral work, 1853- 59; and in 1859-91 missionary to the Chinese in San Francisco, where he died, July 26, 1891. He was the author of Learn to Say No (1856): — Scenes in Chusan (1857): — How to Die Happy (1858): — Scenes in the Indian Country (1859): — A Child a Hundred Years Old (ibid.): — Profits of Godliness (ibid.): — Confucius and the Chinese Classics (1867): — Chinese and English Lessons (1872).

## Loomis, Harmon, D.D[[@Headword:Loomis, Harmon, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Georgia, Vermont, October 26, 1805. He received his preparatory education at St. Albans' Academy, and at a high school in his native place; graduated from the University of Vermont in 1832, and in the same year entered Andover Theological Seminary, where he spent two years. He was licensed to preach by the Northwestern Congregational Association of Vermont, October 10, 1834. In 1835 he entered Princeton Seminary, but left in January, 1836, and became stated supply of the Union Presbyterian Church, New York city. He was ordained by a Congregational Council at Vergennes, Vermont, August 31, 1836. Soon after he accepted the position of chaplain for the American Seaman's-Friend Society of New York, and began preaching to seamen in New Orleans, January 8, 1837. This he did four years, spending his summers in the North and raising funds for the society. From 1841 to 1845 he preached as stated supply to the Presbyterian Church at Mount Joy, Pennsylvania. In the last-named year he entered upon the duties of corresponding secretary of the American Seaman's Friend Society, in New York, and continued in that office till 1871. He died in Brooklyn, January 19, 1880. Dr. Loomis published a number of volumes and pamphlets, and did much to promote the temperance cause. He was a man of sincere and earnest piety. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1880, page 25.

## Loop[[@Headword:Loop]]

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

## Loos (Callidius), Cornelius[[@Headword:Loos (Callidius), Cornelius]]

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

## Lope de Vega[[@Headword:Lope de Vega]]

             SEE VEGA.

## Lope de Vera, Y Alarcan[[@Headword:Lope de Vera, Y Alarcan]]

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

## Loqui, Martin[[@Headword:Loqui, Martin]]

             SEE TABORITES.

## Lorance, James Houston[[@Headword:Lorance, James Houston]]

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

## Lorck, Josiah[[@Headword:Lorck, Josiah]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Copenhagen, was born January 3, 1723, at Flensburg, and died February 8, 1785. He published, Die Bibelgeschichte in einigen Beitragen erldutert (Copenhagen, 1779): — Beitrage zu der neuesten Kirchengeschichte in den koniglichen ddnischen Reichen (1757- 62, 2 volumes). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:69, 832. (B.P.)

## Lord[[@Headword:Lord]]

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

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

2. אָדוֹן, adon', one of the early words (hence in the early Phoenico-Greek A donis) denoting the most absolute control, and therefore most fitly represented by the English word lord, as in the A.V. (Sept. κύριος, Vulg. domimus). It is not properly a divine title, although occasionally applied to God (Psa 114:7; properly with the art. in this sense, Exo 23:13), as the supreme proprietor (Jos 3:13); but appropriately denotes a master, as of slaves (Gen 24:4; Gen 24:27; Gen 39:2; Gen 39:7), or a king, as ruler of subjects (Gen 45:8; Isa 26:13), a husband, as lord of the wife (Gen 18:12). It is frequently a term of respect, like our Sir, but with a pronoun attached ("my lord"), and often occurs in the plural. SEE MASTER.

A modified form of this word is Adonay' (אֲדוֹנָי; Sept. Κύριος, lord, master), "the old plural form of the noun אָדוֹן, adon, similar to that with the suffix of the first person, used as the pluralis excellentiae, by way of dignity, for the name of JEHOVAH. The similar form with the suffix, is also used of men, as of Joseph's master (Gen 39:2-3 sq.), of Joseph himself (Gen 42:30; Gen 42:33; so also Isa 19:4). The Jews, out of superstitious reverence for the name JEHOVAH, always, in reading, pronounce Adonai where Jehovah is written, and hence the letters יהוהare usually written with the points belonging to Adonai, JEHOVAH. The view that the word exhibits a plural termination without the affix is that of Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v. דון), and seems just, though rather disapproved by professor Lee (Lex. in אדון). The latter adds that “our English Bibles generally translate יהוהby LORD, in capitals; when preceded by האדון, they translate it GOD; when צבאות, tzabaoth, follows, by LORD, as in Isa 3:1, ‘The Lord, the LORD of Hosts.' The copies now in use are not, however, consistent in this respect" (Kitto). "In some instances it is difficult, on account of the pause accent, to say whether Adonai is the title of the Deity, or merely one of respect addressed to men. These have been noticed by the Masorites, who distinguish the former in their notes as 'holy,' and the latter as 'profane.' (See Gen 18:3; Gen 19:2; Gen 19:18; and  compare the Masoretic notes on Gen 20:13; Isa 19:4)." SEE ADONAI.

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

4. בִּעִל, master in the sense of domination, applied to only heathen deities, or else to human relations, as husband, etc., and especially to a person skilled or chief in a trade or profession (like the vulgar boss). To this corresponds the Greek δεσπότης, whence our "despot." SEE BAAL.  The remaining and less important words in the original, thus rendered in the common Bible (usually without a capital initial), are: גְּבַיר, gebir', prop. denoting physical strength or martial prowess; שִׂר, sar, a title of nobility; שָׁלַישׁ, shalish', a military officer, SEE CAPTAIN; and סֶרֶן, se'ren, a Philistine term; also the Chald. מָרֵא, mare', an official title (hence the Syriac mar, or bishop); and רִב, rab, a general name = praefect, with its reduplicate רִבְרְבָן, rabreban', and its Greek equivalent ῥαββονί, "Rabboni."

## Lord, Benjamin[[@Headword:Lord, Benjamin]]

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

## Lord, Daniel Minor[[@Headword:Lord, Daniel Minor]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born April 9, 1800, at Lyme, Connecticut, and was educated at Amherst College and at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J., and in April 1834, was licensed by the Second Presbytery of Long Island, and subsequently ordained at Southampton. In 1835 the Presbytery dismissed him to the Suffolk South Association. Soon after he became pastor of the Boston Mariners' Church. In August 1848, he became  the first pastor of the Shelter Island Church, where he remained until his death, August 26, 1861. Mr. Lord published The History of Pitcairn's Island; also various articles on The moral Claims of Seamen stated and enforced, and for several years was editor and almost sole writer and publisher of a review, in which he ably, logically, and clearly discussed profound theological questions. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, page 305. (J.L.S.)

## Lord, Eleazer[[@Headword:Lord, Eleazer]]

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

## Lord, Isaiah[[@Headword:Lord, Isaiah]]

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

## Lord, James Cooper[[@Headword:Lord, James Cooper]]

             a philanthropic New York merchant and iron manufacturer of our day, deserves a place here for his great efforts to advance the interests of his fellow-men. He founded in 1860 "The First Ward Industrial School;" later,  a free reading-room, a library, and erected two churches for the benefit of his workingmen and their neighbors. He died February 9, 1869.

## Lord, Jeremiah S[[@Headword:Lord, Jeremiah S]]

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

## Lord, Jeremiah Skidmore, D.D[[@Headword:Lord, Jeremiah Skidmore, D.D]]

             a Reformed Dutch minister, was born at Jamaica, N.Y., May 10, 1812. He graduated from the University of the City of New York in 1836, and from the Union Theological Seminary in 1839; was ordained August 20 of the same year, becoming pastor at Montville, N.J.; went to Grigstown in 1843, to Harlem, New York city, in 1848, and died there, April 2, 1869. See Genesis Cat. of Union Theol. Sem. 1876, page 14; Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in America, page 356.

## Lord, John Chase, D.D[[@Headword:Lord, John Chase, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Washington, N.H., August 9, 1805. He studied at Plainfield Academy, and Madison and Hamilton colleges, from the last of which he graduated in 1825. After two years' editorial experience in Canada he went to Buffalo, N.Y., began the study of law, and was admitted to the bar in 1828. He united with the First Presbyterian Church of Buffalo in 1830, and soon after entered Auburn Theological Seminary, from which he graduated in 1833, and was called to the Church at Geneseo, where a wonderful revival occurred. In 1835 he became pastor of the Central Church at Buffalo, and remained until he gave up effective work in the ministry in 1873. He died there, January 21, 1877. Dr. Lord was the author of, Lectures to Young Men (1838): — Lectures on Civilization (1851), besides sermons and pamphlets. See (N.Y.) Evangelist, April 26, 1877; Genesis Cat. of Auburn Theol. Sem. 1883, page 263; Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v. (W.P.S.)

## Lord, John King[[@Headword:Lord, John King]]

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

## Lord, Nathan[[@Headword:Lord, Nathan]]

             D.D., LL.D., an eminent American divine and educator, was born at South Berwick, Maine, November 28, 1793; was educated at Bowdoin College (class of 1809), and studied theology at Andover Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1815. After quitting the college he acted as assistant in Phillips Exeter Academy. Now a theologian. He at once entered the active work of the ministry as pastor of the Congregationalists at Amherst, N.H., the only church he ever served. He remained with his people until  1828. when he was called to the responsible position of president of Dartmouth (College, where he remained until his death, September 9, 1870. Possessed of the highest attainments of scholarship, great executive ability, a winning address, equanimity of temper, remarkable "firmness of character and devotion to principle, and unwearied application to labor, Dr. Lord made Dartmouth College one of the most popular of our higher educational institutions: 1824 students were graduated from its halls during his presidency. As a theologian he was. like Edwards, Hopkins, and Bellamy, of the school advocating a strictly liberal interpretation of prophecy, but he has left us few remains in print. He occasionally contributed to our theological quarterlies, and published several sermons and essays. The following deserve notice: Letter to the Reverend David Dama, D.D., on Prof. Park's Theology of New England (New Engl. 1852); On the Millennium (1854); and Letters to Ministers of the Gospel of all Denomzinations on Slavery (1854-5), in which he defended the institution of slaveryas sanctioned by the Bible, thereby greatly provoking opposition and criticism from Northern divines. See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.; New Amer. Cyclops s.v.; also the Annual for 1870.

## Lord, Nathan L[[@Headword:Lord, Nathan L]]

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

## Lord, William Hayes, D.D[[@Headword:Lord, William Hayes, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of president Nathan Lord, was born in Amherst, N.H., March 11, 1824. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1843, and three years after from Andover Theological Seminary; was ordained pastor at Montpelier, Vermont, September 20, 1847, and died  there, March 18, 1877. He was a trustee of the Washington County Grammar School from 1853, and president from 1865. From 1847 to 1875 he was director of the Vermont Bible Society, and held the same relation to the Domestic Missionary Society from 1853 to 1877. After 1870 he was president of the Vermont Historical Society, of which he had been for some time previously a member. In 1876 he was appointed fish commissioner of Vermont. He was moderator of the General Convention of Vermont in 1861; was corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions from 1873; and the following year became editor of the Vermont Chronicle. See Cong. Quarterly, 1878, page 446.

## Lordly[[@Headword:Lordly]]

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

## Lords Day[[@Headword:Lords Day]]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Lord rose on the first day of the week (τῇ νυᾶ'/σαββάτων), and appeared, on the very day of his rising, to his followers on five distinct occasions — to Mary Magdalene, to the other women, to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, to St. Peter separately, to ten apostles collected together. After eight days (μεθ᾿ ἡμέρας ὀκτώ), that is, according to the ordinary reckoning, on the first day of the next week, he appeared to the eleven (Joh 20:26). He does not seem to have appeared in the interval —it may be to render that day especially noticeable by the apostles, or it may be for other reasons. But, however this question be settled, on the day of Pentecost, which in that year fell on the first day of the week (see Bramhall, Disc. of the Sabbath and Lord's Day, in Works, 5:51, Oxford edition), "they were all with one accord in one place," had spiritual gifts conferred on them, and in their turn began to communicate those gifts, as accompaniments of instruction, to others. At Troas (Act 20:7), many years after the occurrence at Pentecost, when Christianity had begun to assume something like a settled form, St. Luke records the following circumstances: St. Paul and his companions arrived there, and "abode seven days, and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." From the statement that "Paul continued his speech till midnight," it has been inferred by some that the assembly commenced after sunset on the Sabbath, at which hour the first day of the week had commenced, according to the Jewish reckoning (Jahn's Bibl. Antiq. § 398), which would hardly agree with the idea of a commemoration of the resurrection. But further, the words of this passage, Ε᾿νδὲ τῇ μιᾶ'/ τῶν σαββάτων, συνηγμένων τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ κλάσαι ἄρτον... . have been by some considered to imply that such a weekly observance was then the established custom; yet it is obvious that  the mode of expression would be just as applicable if they had been in the practice of assembling daily. Still the whole aim of the narrative favors the reference to what is now known as Sunday. In 1Co 16:1-2, St. Paul writes thus: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches in Galatia, even so do ye: Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him. that there be no gatherings when I come." This direction, it is true, is not connected with any mention of public worship or assemblies on that day. But this has naturally been inferred; and the regulation has been supposed to have a reference to the tenets of the Jewish converts, who considered it unlawful to touch money on the Sabbath (Vitringa, De Synagogâ, translat. by Bernard, pages 75-167). In consideration for them, therefore, the apostle directs the collection to be made on the following day, on which secular business was lawful; or, as Cocceius observes, they regarded the day "non ut festum, sed ut ἐργάσιμου" (not as a feast, but as a working day; Vitringa, page 77). Again, the phrase μία τῶνσαββάτων is generally understood to be, according to the Jewish mode of naming the days of the week, the common expression for the first day. Yet it has been differently construed by some, who render it " upon one of the days of the week" (Tracts for the Times, 2:1, 16). In Heb 10:25, the correspondents of the writer are desired "not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, as the manner of some is, but to exhort one another," an injunction which seems to imply that a regular day for such assembling existed, and was well known; for otherwise no rebuke would lie. Lastly, in the passage given above, St. John describes himself as being in the Spirit "on the Lord's day."

Taken separately, perhaps, and even all together, these passages seem scarcely adequate to prove that the dedication of the first day of the week to the purposes above mentioned was a matter of apostolic institution, or even of apostolic practice. But, it may be observed, that it is, as any rate, an extraordinary coincidence, that almost as soon as we emerge from Scripture we find the same day mentioned in a similar manner, and directly associated with the Lord's resurrection; and it is an extraordinary fact that we never find its dedication questioned or argued about, but accepted as something equally apostolic with confirmation, with infant baptism, with ordination, or at least spoken of in the same way. As to direct support from holy Scripture, it is noticeable that those other ordinances which are usually considered scriptural, and in support of which Scripture is usually  cited, are dependent, so far as mere quotation is concerned, upon fewer texts than the Lord's day is. Stating the case at the very lowest, the Lord's day has at least "probable insinuations in Scripture" (Bp. Sanderson), and so is superior to any other holy day, whether of hebdomadal celebration, as Friday in memory of the crucifixion, or of annual celebration, as Easter day in memory of the resurrection itself. These other days may be, and are, defensible on other grounds, but they do not possess anything like a scriptural authority for their observance. If we are inclined still to press for more pertinent scriptural proof, and more frequent mention of the institution, for such we suppose it to be, in the writings of the apostles, we must recollect how little is said of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and how vast a difference is naturally to be expected to exist between a sketch of the manners and habits of their age, which the authors of the holy Scriptures did not write, and hints as to life and conduct, and regulation of known practices, which they did write.

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

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

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

A pagan document now comes into view. It is the well-known letter of Pliny to Trajan, written (about A.D. 100) while he presided over Pontus and Bithynia. "The Christians (says he) affirm the whole of their guilt or error to be that they were accustomed to meet together on a stated day (stato die), before it was light, and to sing hymns to Christ as a god, and to bind themselves by a sacrnamentun, not for any wicked purpose, but never to commit fraud, theft, or adultery; never to break their word, or to refuse, when called upon, to deliver up any trust; after which it was their custom  to separate, and to assemble again to take a meal, but a general one, and without guilty purpose" (Epist. 10:97).

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

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

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

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

Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 194, comes next. One does not expect anything very definite from a writer of so mystical a tendency, but he has some things quite to our purpose. — In his Strom. (4:3) he speaks of τὴν ἀρχιγονον ἡμέραν, τὴν τῷ ὄντι ἀνάπαυσιν ημῶν, τὴν δὴκαὶ πρώτην τῷ ὄντι φωτὸς γένεσιν, κ. τ. λ.,words which bishop Kaye interprets as contrasting the seventh day of the Law with the eighth day of the Gospel. As the same learned prelate observes, "When Clement says that the Gnostic, or transcendental Christian, does not pray in any fixed place,  or on any stated days, but throughout his whole life, he gives us to understand that Christians in general did meet together in fixed places and at appointed times for prayer." But we are not left to mere inference on this important point, for Clement speaks of the Lord's day as a well-known and customary festival (Strom. 7), and in one place gives a mystical interpretation of the name (Strom. 5).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Imperator Constantinus Aug. Helpidio.  "Omnes judices urbanaeque plebes et cunctarutm artium officia venerabili Die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturae liberni licenterque inserviant, quonian frequenter evenit ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis aut vineae scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas coelesti provisione concessa." — Dat. Non. Mart. Crispo II et Constantino II Coss.

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

The three other statements concern themselves rather with what Constantine meant than with what he did. But with such considerations we have little or nothing to do. He may have purposely selected an ambiguous appellation. He may have bean only half a Christian, wavering between allegiance to Christ and allegiance to Mithras. He may have affected a religious syncretism. He may have wished his people to adopt such syncretism. He may have feared to offend the pagans. He may have hesitated to avow too openly his inward leanings to  Christianity. He may have considered that community of religious days might lead by-and-by to community of religious thought and feeling. He may have had in view the rectification of the calendar. But all this is nothing to the purpose. It is a fact, that in the year A.D. 321, in a public edict, which was to apply to Christians as well as to pagans, he put especial honor upon a day already honored by the former — judiciously calling it by a name which Christians had long employed without scruple, and to which, as it was in ordinary use, the pagans could scarcely object. What he did for it was to insist that worldly business, whether by the functionaries of the law or by private citizens, should be intermitted during its continuance. An exception, indeed, was made in favor of the rural districts, avowedly from the necessity of the case, covertly, perhaps, to prevent those districts where paganism (as the word pagus would intimate) still prevailed extensively from feeling aggrieved by a sudden and stringent change. It need only be added here that the readiness with which Christians acquiesced in the interdiction of business on the Lord's day affords no small presumption that they had long considered it to be a day of rest, and that, so far as circumstances admitted, they had made it so long before.

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

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

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

## Lords Prayer[[@Headword:Lords Prayer]]

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

The closing doxology is omitted by Luke, and is probably spurious in Matthew, as it is not found there in any of the early MSS. The prayer is doubtless based upon expressions and sentiments already familiar to the Jews; indeed, parallel phrases to nearly all its contents have been discovered in the Talmud (see Schöttgen and Lightfoot, s.v.). This, however, does not detract from its beauty or originality as a whole. The earliest reference found to it, as a liturgical formula in actual use, is in the so-called Apostolical Constitutions (q.v.), which give the form entire, and enjoin its stated use (7:44), but solely by baptized persons, a rule which was afterwards strictly observed. The Christian fathers, especially Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, are loud in its praise, and several of them wrote special expositions or treatises upon it. Cyril of Jerusalem is the first writer who expressly mentions the use of the Lord's Prayer at the administration of the holy Eucharist (Catech. Myst. 1). St. Augustine has also alluded to its use on this solemn occasion (Hom. 83). The Ordo Romanus prefixes a preface to the Lord's Prayer, the date of which is uncertain. It contains a brief exposition of the prayer. All the Roman breviaries insist upon beginning divine service with the Lord's Prayer; but it has been satisfactorily proved that this custom was introduced as late as the 13th century by the Cistercian monks, and that it passed from the monastery to the Church. The ancient homiletical writings do not afford any trace of the use of the Lord's Prayer before sermons (see Riddle, Manual of Christian Antiquities). Its absurd repetition as a Pater Noster (q.v.) by the Romanists has perhaps led to an undue avoidance of it by some Protestants. In all liturgies (q.v.) of course it occupies a prominent place, and it is usual in many denominations to recite it in public services  and elsewhere. That it was not designed, however, as a formula of Christian prayer in general is evident from two facts: 1. It contains no allusion to the atonement of Christ, nor to the offices of the Holy Spirit; 2. It was never so used or cited by the apostles themselves, so far as the evidence of Holy Writ goes, although Jerome (Adv. Pelag. 3:3) and Gregory (Epp. 7:63) affirm that it was used by apostolical example in the consecration of the Eucharist. The literature of the subject is very copious (see the Christ. Remembrancer, January 1862). Early monographs are cited by Vobeding, Index Programmatum, page 33 sq., 131. Among special recent comments on it we may mention those of Bocker (Lond. 1835), Anderson (ibid. 1840), Manton (ib. 1841), Rowsell (ibid. 1841), Duncan (ibid. 1845), Kennaway (ibid. 1845), Prichard (ibid. 1855), Edwards (ibid. 1860), and Denton (ib. 1864; N.Y. 1865). SEE PRAYER.

## Lords Supper[[@Headword:Lords Supper]]

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

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

II. Biblical Notices. —

1. Original Accounts. — The institution of this sacrament is recorded by Mat 26:26-29, Mar 14:22-25, Luk 22:19 sq., and by the apostle Paul (1Co 11:24-26), whose words differ very little from those of his companion, Luke; and the only difference between Matthew and Mark is, that the latter omits the words "for the remission of  sins." There is so general an agreement among them all that it will only be necessary to recite the words of one of them: "Now, when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve" to eat the Passover which had been prepared by his direction, "and as they were eating, Jesus tool bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Mat 26:20; Mat 26:26-28). Its institution "in remembrance" of Christ is recorded only by Luke and Paul. John does not mention the institution at all, but the discourse of Jesus in chapter Joh 6:51-59 is referred by many interpreters to the Lord's Supper. Paul warns the Corinthians (1Co 10:16-21) that they cannot partake of the Lord's table and at the same time eat of the pagan sacrifices, because (1Co 10:19) "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God;" and in another part of his first epistle (1Co 11:27-29), that "whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; but let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Other passages of the New Testament are referred by many exegetical writers to the Lord's Supper, but they establish no new point concerning the Biblical doctrine. They will be examined, however, in detail in this connection, leaving the ecclesiastical relations of the subject for the title COMMUNION SEE COMMUNION .

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

(1.) The members of the company that were joined for this purpose met in the evening and reclined on couches, this position being then as much a matter of rule as standing had been originally (comp. Mat 26:20,  ἀνέκειτο ; Luk 22:14; and Joh 13:23; Joh 13:25). The head of the household, or celebrant, began by a form of blessing "for the day and for the wine," pronounced over a cup, of which he and the others then drank. The wine was, according to rabbinic traditions, to be mixed with water; not for any mysterious reason, but because that was regarded as the best way of using the best wine (comp. 2Ma 15:39).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(9.) This was succeeded by a fourth cup, and the recital of Psalms 115-118, followed by a prayer, and this was accordingly known as the cup of the Hallel, or of the Song.  (10.) There might be, in conclusion, a fifth cup, provided that the "great Hallel" (possibly Psalms 120-137) was sung over it. SEE PASSOVER.

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

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

(b) that the meal of which he and his disciples partook was really the Passover itself, conducted according to the same rules, we are able to point, though not with absolute certainty, to the points of departure which the old practice presented for the institution of the new. To (1.) or (3.), or even to (8.), we may refer the first words and the first distribution of the cup (Luk 22:17-18); to (2.) or (7.), the dipping of the sop (ψωμίον) of Joh 13:26; to (7.), or to an interval during or after (8.), the distribution of the bread (Mat 26:26; Mar 14:22; Luk 22:19; 1Co 11:23-24); to (9.) or (10.) ("after supper," Luk 22:20), the thanksgiving, and distribution of the cup, and the hymn with which the whole was ended. It will be noticed that, according to this order of succession, the question whether Judas partook of what, in the language of a later age, would be called the consecrated elements, is most probably to be answered in the negative.

The narratives of the Gospels show how strongly the disciples were impressed with the words which had given a new meaning to the old familiar acts. They leave unnoticed all the ceremonies of the Passover, except those which had thus been transferred to the Christian Church and perpetuated in it. Old things were passing away, and all things becoming new. They had looked on the bread and the wine as memorials of the deliverance from Egypt. They were now told to partake of them "in remembrance" of their Master and Lord. The festival had been annual. No rule was given as to the time and frequency of the new feast that thus supervened on the old, but the command, “Do this as oft as ye drink it" (1Co 11:25), suggested the more continual recurrence of that which was to be their memorial of one whom they would wish never to forget.

The words, "This is my body," gave to the unleavened bread a new character. They had been prepared for language that would otherwise have been so startling by the teaching of John (Joh 6:32-58), and they were thus taught to see in the bread that was broken the witness of the closest possible union and incorporation with their Lord. The cup, which was "the  new testament' (διαθήκη) "in his blood," would remind them, in like manner, of the wonderful prophecy in which that new covenant had been foretold (Jer 31:31-34), of which the crowning glory was in the promise, "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." His blood shed, as he told them, "for them and for many," for that remission of sins which he had been proclaiming throughout his whole ministry, was to be to the new covenant what the blood of sprinkling had been to that of Moses (Exo 24:8). It is possible that there may have been yet another thought connected with these symbolic acts. The funeral customs of the Jews involved, at or after the burial, the administration to the mourners of bread (comp. Jer 16:7, "neither shall they break bread for them in mourning," in marginal reading of A.V.; Ewald and Hitzig, ad loc.; Eze 24:17; Hos 9:4; Tob 4:17), and of wine, known, when thus given, as "the cup of consolation." May not the bread and the wine of the Last Supper have had something of that character, preparing the minds of Christ's disciples for his departure by treating it as already accomplished? They were to think of his body as already anointed for the burial (Mat 26:12; Mar 14:8; Joh 12:7), of his body as already given up to death, of his blood as already shed. The passover meal was also, little as they might dream of it, a funeral feast. The bread and the wine were to be pledges of consolation for their sorrow, analogous to the verbal promises of Joh 14:1; Joh 14:27; Joh 16:20. The word διαθήκη might even have the twofold meaning which is connected with it in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

May we not conjecture, without leaving the region of history for that of controversy, that the thoughts, desires, emotions of that hour of divine sorrow and communion would be such as to lead the disciples to crave earnestly to renew them? Would it not be natural that they should seek that renewal in the way which their Master had pointed out to them? From this time, accordingly, the words "to break bread" appear to have had for the disciples a new significance. It may not have assumed, indeed, as yet, the character of a distinct liturgical act; but when they met to break bread, it was with new thoughts and hopes, and with the memories of that evening fresh on them. It would be natural that the Twelve should transmit the command to others who had not been present, and seek to lead them to the same obedience and the same blessings. The narrative of the two disciples to whom their Lord made himself known "in breaking of bread" at Emmaus  (Luk 24:30-35) would strengthen the belief that this was the way to an abiding fellowship with him.

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

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

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

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

The next traces that meet us are in 1 Corinthians, and the fact that we find them is in itself significant. The commemorative feast has not been confined to the personal disciples of Christ, or the Jewish converts whom they gathered round them at Jerusalem. It has been the law of the Church's expansion that this should form part of its life everywhere. Wherever the apostles or their delegates have gone, they have taken this with them. he  language of St. Paul, we must remember, is not that of a man who is setting forth a new truth, but of one who appeals to thoughts, words, phrases that are familiar to his readers, and we find accordingly evidence of a received liturgical terminology. The title of the "cup of blessing" (1Co 10:16), Hebrew in its origin and form (see above), has been imported into the Greek Church. The synonym of "the cup of the Lord" (1Co 10:21) distinguishes it from the other cups that belonged to the Agaps. The word "fellowship" (κοινωνία) is passing by degrees into the special signification of "communion." The apostle refers to his own office as breaking the bread and blessing the cup (1Co 10:16). The table on which the bread was placed was the Lord's table, and that title was to the Jew, not, as later controversies have made it, the antithesis of altar (θυσιαστήριον), but as nearly as possible a synonyme (Mal 1:7; Mal 1:12; Eze 41:22).

But the practice of the Agape, as well as the observance (of the commemorative feast, had been transferred to Corinth, and this called for a special notice. Evils had sprung up which had to be checked at once. The meeting of friends for a social meal, to which all contributed, was a sufficiently familiar practice in the common life of Greeks of this period, and these club-feasts were associated with plans of mutual relief or charity to the poor (comp. Smith's Dict. of Gr. and Romans Antiq. s.v. Eranoi). The Agape of the new society would seem to him to be such a feast, and hence came a disorder that altogether frustrated the object of the Church in instituting it. Richer members came, bringing their supper with them, or appropriating what belonged to the common stock, and sat down to consume it without waiting till others were assembled and the presiding elder had taken his place. The poor were put to shame and defrauded of their share in the feast. Each was thinking of his own supper, not of that to which we now find attached the distinguishing title of "the Lord's Supper." When the time for that came, one was hungry enough to be looking to it with physical, not spiritual craving; another so overpowered with wine as to be incapable of receiving it with any reverence. It is quite conceivable that a life of excess and excitement, of overwrought emotion and unrestrained indulgence, such as this epistle brings before us, may have proved destructive to the physical as well as the moral health of those who were affected by it, and so she sickness and the deaths of which Paul speaks (1Co 11:30), as the consequences of this disorder, may have been so, not by supernatural infliction, but by the working of those general laws of the divine government which make the punishment the traceable consequence of the sin. In any case, what the  Corinthians needed was to be taught to come to the Lord's table with greater reverence, to distinguish (διακρίνειν) the Lord's body from their common food. Unless they did so, they would bring upon themselves condemnation. What was to be the remedy for this terrible and growing evil he does not state explicitly. He reserves formal regulations for a later personal visit. In the mean time, he gives a rule which would make the union of the Agape and the Lord's Supper possible without the risk of profanation. They were not to come even to the former with the keen edge of appetite. They were to wait till all were met, instead of scrambling tumultuously to help themselves (1Co 11:33-34). In one point, however, the custom of the Church of Corinth differed apparently from that of Jerusalem: the meeting for the Lord's Supper was no longer daily (1Co 11:20; 1Co 11:33). The directions given in 1Co 16:2 suggest the constitution of a celebration on the first day of the week (compare Just. Mart. Apol. 1:67; Pliny, Ep. ad Trat.). The meeting at Troas was on the same day (Act 20:7).

The tendency of this language, and therefore, probably, of the order subsequently established, was to separate what had hitherto been united. We stand, as it were, at the dividing point of the history of the two institutions, and henceforth each takes its own course. The Agape, as belonging to a transient phase of the Christian life, and varying in its effects with changes in national character or forms of civilization, passes through many stages; becomes more and more a merely local custom, is found to be productive of evil rather than of good, is discouraged by bishops and forbidden by councils, and finally dies out. Traces of it linger in some of the traditional practices of the Western Church. There have been attempts to revive it among the Moravians and other religious communities, but in no considerable body does it survive in its original form. SEE LOVEFEAST.

On the other hand, the Lord's Supper also has its changes. The morning celebration takes the place of the evening. New names — Eucharist, Sacrifice, Altar, Mass, Holy Mysteries — gather round it. New epithets and new ceremonies express the growing reverence of the people. The mode of celebration at the high altar of a basilica in the 4th century differs so widely from the circumstances of the original institution that a careless eye would have found it hard to recognize their identity. Speculations, controversies, superstitions, crystallize round this as their nucleus. Great disruptions and changes threaten to destroy the life and unity of the Church. Still, through all the changes, the Supper of the Lord vindicates its  claim to universality, and bears a permanent testimony to the truths with which it was associated.

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

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

All the distinct references to the Lord's Supper which occur within the limits of the N.T. have, it is believed, been noticed. To find, as a recent writer has done (Christian Remembrancer, April 1860), quotations from  the Liturgy of the Eastern Church in the Pauline Epistles involves (ingeniously as the hypothesis is supported) assumptions too many and bold to justify our acceptance of it. Extending the inquiry, however, to the times as well as the writings of the N.T., we find reason to believe that we can trace in the later worship of the Church some fragments of that which belonged to it from the beginning. The agreement of the four great families of liturgies implies the substratum of a common order. To that order may well have belonged the Hebrew words Hallelujah, Amen, Hosanna, Lord of Sabaoth; the salutations "Peace to all," "Peace to thee;" the Sursum Corda (ἃνω σχῶμεν τάς καρδίας), the Trisagion, the Kyrie Eleison. We are justified in looking at these as having been portions of a liturgy that was really primitive; guarded from change with the tenacity with which the Christians of the 2d century clung to the traditions (the παραδόσεις of 2Th 2:15; 2Th 3:6) of the first, forming part of the great deposit (παρακαταθήκη) of faith and worship which they had received from the apostles and have transmitted to later ages (comp. Bingham, Eccles. Antiq. book 15, chapter 7; Augusti, Christl. Archaol. B. 8; Stanley on 1 Corinthians 10, 11).

III. Ecclesiastical Representations. — The Christian Church attached from the first great and mysterious importance to the Lord's Supper. In accordance with the original institution, all Christians used wine and bread, with the exception of the Hydroparastates (Aquarii), who used water instead of wine, and the Artotvrites, who are said to have used cheese along with bread. The wine was generally mixed with water (κρᾶμα), a anan allegorical signification was given to the mixture of these two elements. In the writings of the fathers of the first three centuries we meet with some passages which speak distinctly of symbols, and, at the same time, with others which indicate belief in a real participation of the body and blood of Christ. Ignatius, Justin, and Irenaeus laid great stress on the mysterious connection subsisting between the Logos and the elements. Tertullian and Cyprian are representatives of the symbolical aspect, though both occasionally call the Lord's Supper simply the body and blood of Christ. The symbolical interpretation prevails in particular among the Alexandrine school. Clement called it a mystic symbol which produces an effect only upon the mind, and Origen decidedly opposed those who took the external sign for the thing itself. The idea of a sacrifice, though not yet of a daily propitiatory sacrifice, appears in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus. Cyprian says that the sacrifice is made by the priest, who acts  instead of Christ, and imitates what Christ did. It is not quite certain, but probable, that the Ebionites celebrated the Lord's Supper as a commemorative feast; the mystical meals of some Gnostics, on the contrary, bear but little resemblance to the Lord's Supper. The development of liturgies in and after the third century, and the introduction of many mystical ceremonies, showed that the fathers generally regarded the Lord's Supper, with Chrysostom, as a "dreadful sacrifice." They clearly speak of a real union of the communicants with Christ; some, also, of a real change from the visible elements into the body and blood of Christ. though most of their expressions can be understood both of consubstantiality or of transubstantiation.

Theodoret drew a clear distinction between the sign and the thing signified, while Augustine sought to unite its more profound mystical significance with the symbolical. Gelasius, bishop of Rome, very decidedly denied "the ceasing of the substance and nature of bread and wine." The notion of a daily repeated sacrifice is distinctly set forth in the writings of Gregory the Great. A violent controversy concerning the Lord's Supper arose in the 9th century. Paschasius Radbertus. a monk of Corvey, clearly propounded the doctrine of transubstantiation in his Liber de corpore et saltngutie Domini, addressed to the emperor Charles the Bald, between 830 and 832. He was opposed by Ratramnus in his treatise De corpore et sanguine Domini, which was written at the request of the emperor, who drew a distinction between the sign and the thing represented by it, between the internal and the external. The most eminent theologians of the age, as Rabanus Maurus and Scotus Erigena, took an active part in the controversy. Gerbert (afterwards pope Sylvester II) endeavored to illustrate the doctrine of transubstantiation by the aid of geometrical diagrams. Toward the middle of the 11th century the doctrine of transubstantiation was rejected by Berengar, canon of Tours (q.v.), who principally condemned the doctrine of an entire chasgnge in such a manner as to make the bread to cease to be bread. Several synods in succession, between 1050 and 1079, condemned his views. At one of these synods cardinal Humbert imposed upon Berengar an oath that he believed "corpus et sanguinem Domini non solum sacramento sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri." Among the scholastics, Lanfranc developed the distinction between the subject and the accidents. The term transubstantiatio was first used by Hildebert of Tours, though similar phrases, as transitio, had previously been employed (by Hugo of St.Victor and others). Most of the earlier scholastics, and, in particular, the followers of Lanfranc, defended both the change of the  bread into the body of Christ and that of the "accidentia sine subjecto," both of which were inserted in the Decretum Gratiani (about 1150), and declared an article of faith by the fourth Council of Lateran. Later, the Scholastics discussed a great many subtle questions, such as, Do animals partake of the body of Christ when they happen to swallow a consecrated host? By the institution of the Corpus-Christi day by pope Urban IV (1264), the doctrine of transubstantiation received a liturgical expression. However, a considerable time before, it had become a custom in the Latin Church that the laity received the Lord's Supper only in the form of the host. Alexander Hales, Bonaventura, and Thomas Aquinas expressly demanded that only the priests should partake of the cup. The Hussites demanded the admission of the laity also to a partaking of the cup, and the refusal of this demand by the Council of Constance was one of the causes of the Hussite War. The doctrine that Christ existed wholly in either of the elements (for which doctrine the theologians used the expression concomitance) was expressly confirmed by the Council of Basle. The number of those who during the Middle Ages expressed their dissent from the doctrine of transubstantiation is limited.

The doctrine of impanation, or a coexistence of Christ's body with the bread, was first advanced by John of Paris, who was followed by William Ockham and Durandus de Sancto Porciano. Both transubstantiation and impanation were combated by Wickliffe, who, with Berengar of Tours, believed it a change from the inferior to the superior. His views were probably shared by Jerome of Prague, while Huss seems to have believed in transubstantiation. The Reformers of the 16th century agreed in rejecting transubstantiation as unscriptural, but they differed among themselves in several points. Carlstadt believed that the words of institution were to be understood δεικτικῶς, i.e., that Christ, while speaking to them, had pointed at his own body. Zuingle took the word "is" (ἐστί) in the sense of signifies, and viewed the Lord's Supper merely as an act of commemoration, and as a visible sign of the body and blood of Christ. (Ecolampadius differed from Zuingle only grammatically, retaining the literal meaning of "is," but taking the predicate, "my body" (τὸ σῶμα μοῦ), in a figurative sense. Luther believed it impossible to put any of these constructions on the letter of the Scripture, and adhered to the doctrine of the real-presence of Christ's body and blood in, with, and under the bread and wine (consubstantiation). Together with this view he professed a belief in the ubiquity of the body of Christ. Calvin rejected the doctrine of the real  presence; but, after the precedence of Bucer, Myronius, and others, spoke of a real, though spiritual participation of the body of Christ which exists in heaven. This participation, however, he restricted to the believer, while Luther agreed with the Roman Church in maintaining that also infidels partook of Christ's body, though to their own hurt. Attempts at mediating between the views of Luther and Calvin were early made, and there were crypto-Calvinists in the Lutheran, and crypto-Lutherans in the Calvinistic churches. But the Ltheran view received a dogmatic fixation in the Formula Concordiae, which shut out any further influence of Calvinism. The decline of Lutheran orthodoxy in general caused also the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper to grow into disuse, and the Protestant theologians generally adopted the views either of Calvin or of Zuinusgle.

The latter, at length, prevailed. (See the Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. October 1860; Muller, De Lutheri et Calvini sententiae de Sacra Coena, Hal. 1853.) It was in particular, adopted by the Arminian churches, as also by the Socinians. In the Church of England there was from the beginning a real-presence and a spiritual-presence party, and the controversy between them frequently became very hot. The real-presence party generally agreed with the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, but some of its writers advanced views more resembling those of the Roman Church. In the 19th century the High-Church parties of the German Lutheran Church, and of the Episcopal Church of England, Scotland, and America, revived and emphasized again the doctrine of the real presence. Under the influence of rationalistic theology and speculative theology a number of new interpretations sprang up like mushrooms, and disappeared again just as fast. The leading theologians of the United Evangelical Church of Germany in the 19th century fell back on the doctrine of Calvin, and emphasized the (real and objective communication of the whole God-man Christ to the believer, and the same views have become predominant in the German Reformed Church of America. Very different from the doctrine of all the larger Christian denominations were the views which some mystic writers of the ancient and mediaeval Church intimated, and which were fully developed in the 16th century by Paracelsus, and afterwards adopted by the Society of Friends. They regard communion as something essentially internal and mystical, and deny the Lord's Supper to be an ordinance which Christ desired to have perpetuated. — Lavater, Historia controversiae Sacramentariae (Tig. 1672); Hospinianus, Hist. Sacramentaria (Tig. 1602); Planck, Geschichte d. Entstehung, etc., des protest. Lehrbegriffs,  2:204 sq., 471 sq.; 3, (1.) 376 sq.; 4:6 sq.; 5, (1) 89 sq., 211 sq., (2) 7 sq.; 6:732 sq. SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

IV. Form of Celebration. —

1. The Elements. —

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

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

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

1. that the unfermented juice of the grape can hardly, with propriety, be called wine at all;

2. that fermented wine is of almost universal use in the East; and,

3. that it has invariably been employed for this purpose in the Church of all ages and countries.

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

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

2. Consecration and Distribution of the Elements. — To “consecrate" meant in the ancient Church only to set apart from common and devote to a sacred use. But, by degrees, a magical effect was attributed to consecration, as was already done by Augustine, and when the doctrine of transubstantatiation became prevalent in the Roman Church, it was supposed that the pronunciation of the words "This is my body" changed the elements into the body and blood of Christ. The formula which were used at the consecration were at first free, but afterwards fixed by written liturgies. All liturgies contain the words of institution and a prayer; the liturgy of the Greek Church, moreover, a prayer to the Holy Spirit to  change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. In the ancient Church both elements were distributed by the deacons, afterwards only the wine; at a later period of the Church, again, both elements. According to the Protestant theologians, the administration belongs properly to the ministers of the Church; but Luther, and many theologians with him, maintained that where no regular teachers can be obtained, this sacrament may be administered by other Christians to whom this duty is committed by the Church.

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

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

The apostles received the Lord's Supper reclining, according to Eastern custom. Since the 4th century the communicants used to stand, afterwards  to kneel, the men with uncovered head, the women covered with a long white cloth.

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

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

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

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

In the Reformed, Presbyterian, Congregational, Arminian, etc., churches, the service begins commonly with a formula containing the passage 1 Corinthians 11. The communicants step, in most places singly, to the communion table, and the broken bread and the cup are given into their own hands. In some places they remain sitting in the pews, where the elders carry to them bread and wine; in others, twelve at a time sit around a table. Private communion of the sick is an exception.  In the Episcopal Church of England the service of the Lord's Supper is immediately preceded by a general confession of sins, which is followed by a prayer of consecration and the words of institution. The clergymen first commune themselves, then the communicants who approach without observing any distinction, and kneel down at the communion table, receiving the bread (which is cut) and the cup into their hands. The same service takes place in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and substantially in the Methodist churches.

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

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

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

V. The Literature on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is very extensive. A history of the doctrine was given by Schulz (Rationalistic), Die christliche Lehre vom heiligen Abendmahle (2d ed. Leipsic, 1831); Ebrard (Evangelical), Das Dogma voms Abendmahl und seine Geschichte (Frankfort, 1845); Kahnis (High Lutheran), Die Lehre vom Abendmahle (Leipsic, 1851); L.J. Ruckert (Rationalistic), Das Abendmahl, sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten Kirche (Leipsic, 1856, 2 volumes). For many other foreign monographs, see Danz, Worterbuch, s.v. Abendmahl; Volbeding, Index, page 50; Hase, Leben Jesu, page 194; Malcom, Theol. Index, page 275. The following are the principal English works on the subject: Wilberforce (Puseyite), Doctrine of the Eucharist (Lond. 1853). and Sermons on the Holy Communion (ib. 1854); J. Taylor (in opposition to Wilberforce), True Doctrine of the Eucharist (London, 1855); Goode  (W.), Nature of Christ's Person in the Eucharist (1856); Pusey (E.B.), Real Presence (1853-7); Freeman, Principles of Divine Service; Turton (Bp.), Eucharist, and Wiseman's Reply (in ten Essays, 1854). More general are Dorner, Doctrine of the Person of Christ (Edinburgh, 1864, 5 volumes, 8vo), volume 2, div. 2, page 116; and his Protest. Theol. page 298; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, volume 1, § 73; Heppe, Dogmatik, page 455; Cunningham, Hist. Theol. 1:205; 2:142 sq.; Auberlen, Dis. Revel. page 210 sq.; Browne, Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, page 683 sq.; Forbes, Explan. of the XXXIX Articles, 2:496; Martensen, Christian Dogmatics, page 482 sq.; J. Pye Smith, Christian Theology, page 686 sq.; Baur, Dogmensgesch. 3:10, 247; Liddon, Our Lord's Divinity (see Index under Eucharist); Munscher, Dogmengesch. 2:673 sq. See also Ch. of Engl. Quart. 1855, January art. 1; Evangel. Rev. 1866, page 369 sq.; Method. Quart. Rev. 1860 (October), page 648 sq.; 1870 (April), page 301; Jatrb. deutsche Theol. 1867, 2:21 sq.; 1868, volume 1 and 2; 1870, volume 3 and 4; Stud. u. Krit. 1841, 3:715 sq.; 1839, 1:69, 123; 1840, 2:389; 1844, 2:409; 1866, 2:362; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschr. Wissensch. Theol. 1867, p. 84; Christian Monthly, 1844 (May), page 542; Christian Renmemb. 1853 (October), pages 93, 263; 1867, page 84; Kitto, Journ. Sac. Lit. 1854 (October), page 102; Bibl. Sacra, 1862, art. 6; 1863, page 3; Hercersb. Rev. 1858, page 103; Chr. Review, 1866, page 11 sq.; Christian Rev. 40, 191; Lit. and Theol. Rev. 1836 (September); Bapt. Quart. Review, 1870 (October), page 497; Contemp. Rev. 1868 (July and November); Edinb. Rev. 1867 (April), page 232; Brit. Quart. Rev. 1868, page 113; Princeton Rev. 1848; Brit. and For. Ev. Review, 1868, page 431; Westm. Rev. 1871, page 96 sq. An account of the mode of the celebration of the Lord's Supper by the various denominations is given by Scheibel, Feier des heiligen Abendmahls bei den verschiedenen Religionsparteien (Breslau, 1824). SEE SUPPER.

## Lore, Dallas Dayton, D.D[[@Headword:Lore, Dallas Dayton, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Mauricetown, N.J., in 1815. He was converted at the age of fifteen, and at twentyone entered the Philadelphia Conference, soon receiving the most important charges. In 1847 Mr. Lore sailed for South America as a missionary, and for seven years was the pastor of a large and intelligent congregation in Buenos Ayres, proving himself eminently successful both among the foreign and native population. Upon his return he was sent on a tour of exploration to New Mexico to inspect the condition of the mission field. In 1856 he was transferred to the Newark Conference, and after serving several prominent charges within its bounds, received a transfer to the Genesee Conference, and was appointed to Grace Church, Buffalo. In 1864 he was elected editor of the Northern Christian Advocate, in which office he continued till his death, at his residence near Auburn, January 20, 1875. As a theologian, Dr. Lore was diligent and comprehensive in his researches, and careful in his conclusions. As a preacher he was earnest, direct, and practical. As an editor he achieved success by his strong and forcible style, by the boldness and wisdom of his conclusions, and by his devotion to the truth. His zeal in the cause of Christian missions was truly marvellous, and highly exemplary. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, page 119; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Lorenz, Johann Michael[[@Headword:Lorenz, Johann Michael]]

             a German theologian, was born at Strasburg June 16, 1692, and was educated at the university of that city. In 1713 he obtained the degree of A.M.; in 1714 he was appointed preacher in his native place; in 1722, professor ordinary of divinity at his alma mater. In addition to this, he was appointed in 1724 visitor of Williams College; in 1728, morning preacher and prebendary of the foundation of St. Thomas; in 1734, pastor of the Thomas Church; in 1741, vice-president of the ecclesiastical conference. The doctorate in divinity he obtained in 1722. He died August 13, 1752.  By more than fifty Latin dissertations on dogmatical and exegetical theology Lorenz gained an honorable name in theological literature. We only mention Dissertatio de unctione Spiritali, ad 1Jn 2:27 (Argentorati. 1723, 4to). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, volume 2, s.v.

## Lorenzo Or Lorenzetto, Ambrogio And Pietro Di[[@Headword:Lorenzo Or Lorenzetto, Ambrogio And Pietro Di]]

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

## Loretto Properly Loreto[[@Headword:Loretto Properly Loreto]]

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

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

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

## Loretz, Andrew[[@Headword:Loretz, Andrew]]

             one of the early pioneer ministers of the German Reformed Church in America, a Swiss by birth, was educated in Europe, and emigrated to America towards the close of the last century. "About the year 1789 he  commenced preaching and ministering in a wide field, embracing a large part of both the Carolinas, from Orange County, in North Carolina, to beyond the river Saluda, in South Carolina, a distance of two hundred and fifty miles." He died in 1812. Mr. Loretz was a man of superior natural ability, extensive learning, great zeal and energy, and, in his day, "regarded as one of the best pulpit orators in the Carolinas." See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Germ. Ref. Church, 3:15. (D.Y.H.)

## Loria (Or Luria) Isaac[[@Headword:Loria (Or Luria) Isaac]]

             (by the Jews ארי [Lion], the initials of אשנזי רבי יצחק), a noted rabbi and great expounder of the Cabala (q.v.), was born at Jerusalem in 1534, of a German-Jewish family. His father having died when he was a child, he was cared for by a rich uncle, and was dedicated to the study of the Talmud at Cairo. When twenty-four years of age he was considered one of the greatest Talmudists of that place. Unfortunately, however, Loria became an ardent admirer of the mystical writings of the Jews, and especially enraptured with the Sohar (q.v.), one of the Cabalistic works. The hermit of Cairo was the first to bring the intricate and confused system of the Sohar into order, unity, and congruity; he also made many valuable adlitions. A most remarkable feature of his views are the numerous divisions of his psychology, with its two sexes. Still, all these theories were, with him, only premises to lead on to a more important and practical branch in the Cabala, which he called the "world of perfection" (Olam ha- T'ikkun).

He also held peculiar views on the fall of man. By reason of Adam's original sin, he held, the higher and the infernal souls, the good and the evil, came into confusion, and became intermixed with each other, a transmigration and separation of souls was thus a necessity. In addition to this he teaches the Superfaetatio. He pretended to have a full knowledge concerning the origin, relation, and ramification of souls; further, to possess the power and faculty to compel the spirits of the upper world to take their abode in the bodies of living men, in order to reveal to them what is going on in the upper world; further, to be able to read on every man's brow in which relation his soul stands to the higher worlds. In Cairo nobody interested himself in his mysticism, and he therefore emigrated in 1569 to Safet, the cabalistic Jerusalem, where the Cabala was esteemed as high as the Bible. His superior knowledge, faculties, and gifts gradually secured him the favor of the Cabalists, and Loria was soon surrounded by troops of young and old Cabalists, who came to listen to his new revelations. He subsequently formed a cabalistic community, who lived together apart from the non-Cabalists, and according to his prescriptions. After Loria's death (August, 1572), Vital Calabrese became his successor and gathered his productions, while another of his disciples, the Italian Israel Saruk, propagated his teachings in Europe. Indeed, it may be said that the influence of this Cabalist extended more or less over all the Jews of the globe, and many of them to this very day follow this great Jewish mystic in assigning to the Sohar equal value as to the Bible. It must be  confessed, however, that by his influence he also called forth a revival in the Jewish communities everywhere, and a reaction in the pharisaic, lifeless prayers, while even upon the Christian theosophy, mysticism, and exegetical studies his influence was considerable. See Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, 9:437 sq.; 10:125; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. 3:138,145; Fürst, Bibliotl. Jud. 2:257 sq.

## Loria, Salomo[[@Headword:Loria, Salomo]]

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

## Lorimer, Peter, D.D[[@Headword:Lorimer, Peter, D.D]]

             an eminent English Presbyterian divine, was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1812. He graduated from the university there, was ordained in 1836, and installed pastor of the River Terrace Church, London, which was then in connection with the Church of Scotland. He was at one with those who, in 1843, formed the Free Church of Scotland, and along with his congregation became a constituent part of the Synod of Berwick in 1844, which, until recently, was known as the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England. From that time forward the first desire of his life was the advancement of that Church to a position worthy of its name. He was connected with the London Theological College from the date of its establishment in 1845, when he was elected to the chair of Hebrew and Biblical criticism. He was made the first principal in 1878, and died suddenly, July 28, 1879. He was the author of several valuable works, among them, The Life of Patrick Hamilton: — The Life of the Scottish Reformer, John Knox: — and A History of the Presbyterian Church of England, a work on which he had spent years of diligent research, but which he was only able to complete in part.

## Lorin(us), Jean[[@Headword:Lorin(us), Jean]]

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

## Loriquet, Jean Nicolas[[@Headword:Loriquet, Jean Nicolas]]

             a French Jesuit, famous on account of his historical falsifications, was born August 5, 1760, at Epernay, Champagne. He was professor at the Seminary of Argentiere, which was closed by Napoleon in 1807. The events of 1814 made the Jesuits come forward in great numbers, and their colleges were multiplied. Loriquet was intrusted with the direction of the schools at Aix, Provence, and St. Acheul, Picardy, and the pupils who were under his charge were imbued with that spirit which has been detrimental to modern society. In 1830 the people of St. Acheul destroyed the school there, and the reverend fathers had to quit the place. Loriquet went to Switzerland, where he worked in behalf of his order. Under Louis  Philippe he returned to France, and died at Paris, April 9, 1845. Loriquet was a prolific writer. For a list of his works, see Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lorraine (or Gelee), Claude[[@Headword:Lorraine (or Gelee), Claude]]

             an illustrious French painter, was born in a small town of Champagne, in the diocese of Toul, Lorraine, in 1600, and went to Rome early for instruction, where he made great improvement in his studies, but met with many reverses, and often was almost penniless. Godfrey Waal admitted him into his academy, where he remained probably two years. Agostino Tassi became interested in Claude, took him into the bosom of his family, and made him his familiar companion. Claude, naturally of a religious disposition, feeling profound gratitude for the many benefits he had received, soon after leaving Tassi and quitting Rome, about 1625, performed a pilgrimage to the holy Virgin of Loretto, where he remained some days in devotional meditation. From thence he made a tour through Italy, traversing Romagna, Lombardy, and on to Venice, where he practiced his profession for some time. In 1627 he returned to Rome, and soon found abundant employment. One of his earliest patrons was cardinal Bentivoglio, for whom he painted two pictures which established his reputation. About this time he was employed by cardinal Crescenzi to decorate the rotunda of his palace; he was also similarly engaged in the Muti of the Holy Apostles, and of the Medici alla Trinita de' Monti. These were succeeded by commissions from the duke of Bracciano, the duke de Bouillon, and the prince de Leaucour, for each a picture. The fame of Claude now extended to every part of Europe, and he received commissions from the most distinguished persons. His works were not confined to Rome, Milan, Parma, Lombardy, and Venice, but extended also to Paris, Lyons, Montpellier, Avignon, Antwerp, Amsterdam, and Madrid. He died November 21, 1682. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Lorraine, Charles De Guise[[@Headword:Lorraine, Charles De Guise]]

             Cardinal of. SEE GUISE, CHARLES.

## Lorsbach, Georg Wilhelm[[@Headword:Lorsbach, Georg Wilhelm]]

             a German theologian, was born at Dillenburg, in the duchy of Nassau, February 29, 1752. In 1768 he entered the University of Herborn; in 1771 he removed to that of Göttingen, and became there an enthusiastic student of the Oriental languages under Michaelis. After having finished the academical course, he spent four years in private study in his father's house, preparing himself for the ministry. In 1778 he became rector at Siegen; in 1786, at the grammar-school of his native place, and obtained, at the same time, the dignity of professor; in 1791, rector at the grammar-school of Herborn, and, at the same time, professor of Oriental languages at the  academy there, and in the following year was appointed to lecture at the university of that place on history and exegesis. In 1793 he became the third professor ordinary of divinity; in 1794, the second professor and a counselor of the Consistory. Having become famous, by reason of his literary contributions, as an eminent Orientalist, he was, in 1812, called to the University of Jena as professor of Oriental literature. The theological faculty of Marburg bestowed on him the degree of doctor of divinity. He died March 30, 1816. He belongs to the few and rare scholars of the ancient languages who combined acuteness with extensive learning. De Sacy places him among the first German Orientalists. He published an Archiv d. morgenlandischen Literatur (Marburg, 1791-94, 2 bde. 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, volume 2, s.v.

## Lorsch, Convent Of[[@Headword:Lorsch, Convent Of]]

             (otherwise Lauresham, Lauresheim, monasterium Laureacense, Laurissense, Laurissa), situated four miles from Heidelberg, was established about A.D. 764 by countess Williswinda (widow of count Rupert, who, by order of Pepin, conducted pope Stephen back to Rome) and her son Cancor. Its first abbot is said to have been a near relative of the founders, Chrodegang of Metz. The first establishment was on an island of the Weschnitz, dedicated to St. Peter; a second was soon erected on a hill in the neighborhood. Charlemagne greatly interested himself in this monastery, and added to it as endowment Heppenheim (in January 773) and Oppenheim (in September 774), and personally attended the consecration. Louis the Pious, Lothaire, Louis the German, and Louis III all confirmed successively the donations of Charlemagne. But one of the greatest sources of prosperity for the convent was its having received from Rome the relics of St. Nazarius, which brought it numberless presents and donations, and soon made it one of the most prosperous convents at the time. Lorsch also enjoys great literary fame. Its monks especially distinguished themselves by their literary pursuits, to which the Annales Laureshmenses bear witness. The early part of these annals (703-768) is evidently derived from those of the convent of Murbach, which were very popular; but after that time they are clearly original, and continue down to 803. Aside from the less important Annales Laurissenses minores, we must mention the Annales Laurissenses, formerly called plebeji or Loiseliani, which are the most important annals of the time. Ranke has lately discovered in them the official work of a Carlovingian court historian, which was afterwards used by Einhard as the basis of the annals bearing his  name. Until the 11th century the convent enjoyed great prosperity. Then its reverses commenced, and, after various struggles, it fell in the 12th century, till "a planta pedis usque ad verticem non fuit in eo sanitas." The moral condition of the Lorsch monastery had greatly deteriorated ever since the 11th century, and it became necessary to inaugurate a reform. This task was entrusted to archbishop Sifried II of Mentz, A.D. 1229. His successor, Sifried III, however, was really the man who completed this task by subjecting the monks to the Cistercian rule, "ut ordo," says Gregory IX in his brief, "de nigro conversus in album purgetur vitiis et virtutibus augeatur." By him also were subsequently installed into Lorsch some Praemonstrant canons of the convent of All Saints (diocese of Strasburg), and the pope approved it as a new organization January 8, 1248. In the second half of the 16th century Lorsch was subjected to the rule of the electoral administration. Vainly did the Praemonstrants appeal to pope Alexander VII: the convent retained only the original foundation at Mentz and its dependencies. Not until after the completion of the treaty of Westphalia (1650) was a part of its other possessions restored to it. In 1651 the Palatinate renewed its claims to the lands of the convent, and questioned the propriety of the independence of Lorsch as a separate duchy, with representation in the Diet. The quarrel lasted nearly through the whole of the 18th century, but was finally settled in 1803, when the convent became the possession of the house of Hesse-Darmstadt. See Rettberg, K. Geschichte Deutschlands, 1:584 sq.; K. Dahl, Beschreib. d. Furstenthums Lorsch (Darmstadt, 1812, 4to); Codex principis olim Laureshamensis, etc., edit. Academ. elector. scient. Theodoro-Palatina, volume 3 (Mannh. 1768, 4to); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:490.

## Lort, Michael, D.D[[@Headword:Lort, Michael, D.D]]

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

## Losada, Christopher[[@Headword:Losada, Christopher]]

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

## Loscher, Johann Kaspar[[@Headword:Loscher, Johann Kaspar]]

             a German theologian, was born at Werden May 8, 1636, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg. He flourished successively as superintendent of the churches of Sondershausen (1668), pastor at Erfurt  (1676), superintendent at Zwickau (1679), and then as senior preacher in the west Prussian city of Dantzic. In 1687 he was made doctor and professor of theology at his alma mater, and he remained there until his death, July 11, 1718. He wrote many theological dissertations, of but little value in our day.

## Loscher, Valentin Ernst[[@Headword:Loscher, Valentin Ernst]]

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

## Losing, Herbert[[@Headword:Losing, Herbert]]

             an English prelate, was born probably at Hoxon, Suffolk, his father being an abbot, wives in that age not being absolutely forbidden the clergy, though his father might have become abbot in his old age. Herbert bought a better preferment for himself, however, giving £1900 to king William Rufus for the bishopric of Thetford. Simony was a fashionable sin at that'  time. He afterwards went to Rome, returned to England, removed his bishopric from Thetford to Norwich, built the fine cathedral there and five beautiful parish churches, and died July 22, 1119. See Fuller, Worthies of Egland (Nuttall), 3:13, 166.

## Loskiel, George Henry[[@Headword:Loskiel, George Henry]]

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

## Losner, Christopher Friedrich[[@Headword:Losner, Christopher Friedrich]]

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

## Loss[[@Headword:Loss]]

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

## Loss, Lewis Homri[[@Headword:Loss, Lewis Homri]]

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

## Lossius, Caspiar Friedirici[[@Headword:Lossius, Caspiar Friedirici]]

             a German theologian, was born at Erfurt Jan. 31, 1753, and was educated at the university of that place, which he entered in 1770. Dissatisfied with the innovations which Bahrdt undertook in theology, he removed in 1773 to the University of Jena; and again, not quite satisfied with the rationalistic innovations of the day, he was obliged to acquire the greater part of his learning by private study. In 1774 he became school-teacher at his native  place; in 1781 dean of Andreas Church, and in 1785 dean to the Prediger Church of the same place. He died March 26, 1817. Lossius was a man of great learning; the literature of the Reformation was almost his daily study. Having seen the danger which threatened his country, both religiously and morally, from the rationalistic innovations, and from the consequences of the French Revolution, he dedicated most of his time and talent as a popular author to the cause of the faith and principles of the fathers of the Reformation. Some of his productions passed through several editions in a short time. Some were even translated into French, and rescued thousands from moral degradation and spiritual destruction. A complete list of his works is given by Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl. volume 2, s.v.

## Lost Tribes[[@Headword:Lost Tribes]]

             SEE CAPTIVITY; SEE ISRAEL.

## Lot[[@Headword:Lot]]

             (properly גּוֹרָלor גֹּרָל, goral', κλῆρος, literally a pebble, used anciently for balloting; other terms occasionally thus rendered are חֵבֶלor חֶבֶל, che'bel, a portion, Deu 32:9; 1Ch 16:18; Psa 105:11, referring to an inheritance; and λαγχάνω, to obtain by lot, Luk 1:9; Joh 19:24), strictly a small stone, as used in casting lots (Lev 16:8; Num 33:54; Jos 19:1. Eze 24:6; Jon 1:7), hence also a method used to determine chances or preferences, or to decide a debate. The decision by lot was often resorted to among the Hebrews, but always with the strictest reference to the interposition of God. As to the precise manner of casting lots, we have no certain information; probably several modes were practiced. In Pro 16:33 we read that "the lot," i.e., pebble, "is cast into the lap," properly into the bosom of an urn or vase. It does not appear that the lap or bosom of a garment worn by a person was ever used to receive lots.

The use of lots among the ancients was very general (see Dale, Orac. ethn. c. 14; Potter, Greek Antiq. 1:730; Adams, Roman Ant. 1:540 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. s.v. Sors) and highly esteemed (Xenoph. Cyrop; 1:6, 46), as is natural in simple stages of society (Tacit. Germ. 10), " recommending itself as a sort of appeal to the Almighty secure from all influence of passion or bias, and a sort of divination employed even by the gods themselves (Homer, Iliad, 22:209; Cicero, De Div. 1:34; 2:41). The  word sors is thus used for an oracular response (Cicero, De Div., 2:56). So there was a mode of divination among heathens by means of arrows, two inscribed and one without mark, βελομαντεία (Hos 4:12; Eze 21:21; Mauritius, De Sortitione, c. 14, § 4; see also Est 3:7; Est 9:24-32 ; Mishna, Taanith, 2:10). SEE DIVINATLON. Among heathen instances the following additional may be cited:

1. Choice of a champion, or of priority in combat (Il. 3:316; 7:171; Herod. 3:108);

2. Decision of fate in battle (Il. 20:209);

3. Appointment of magistrates, jurymen, or other functionaries (Aristot. Pol. 4:16; Schol. On Aristoph. Plut. 277; Herod. 6:109; Xenoph. Cyrol). 4:5, 55: Demosth. c. Aristog. 1:778, 1; comp. Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Dicastes);

4. Priests (AEsch. in Tim. page 188, Bekk.);

5. A German practice of deciding by marks on twigs, mentioned by Tacitus (Germ. 10);

6. Division of conquered or colonized land (Thucydides, 3:50; Plutarch, Pericles, 84; Bockh, Public Econ. of Ath. 2:170)."

The Israelites sometimes had recourse to lots as a method of ascertaining the divine will (Pro 16:33), and generally in cases of doubt regarding serious enterprises (Est 3:7; compare Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 3:301), especially the following: (a.) In matters of partition or distribution. e.g. the location of the several tribes in Palestine (Num 26:55 sq.; Num 33:34; Num 34:13; Num 36:2; Jos 14:2; Jos 18:6 sq.; Jos 19:5), the assignment of the Levitical cities (Jos 21:4 sq.), and, after the return from the exile, the settlement in the homesteads at the capital (Neh 11:1; compare 1Ma 3:36). Prisoners of war were also disposed of by lot (Joe 3:3; Nah 3:10; Oba 1:11; compare Mat 27:35; Joh 19:24; compare Xenoph. Cyrop. 4:5, 55). (b.) In criminal investigations where doubt existed as to the real culprit (Jos 7:14; 1Sa 14:42). A notion prevailed among the Jewls that this detection was performed by observing the shining of the stones in the high-priest's breastplate (Mauritius, c. 21, § 4). The instance of the mariners casting lots to ascertain by the surrendering of what offender the sea could be appeased (Jon 1:7), is analogous; but it is not clear, from  Pro 18:18, that lots were resorted to for the determination of civil disputes. (c.) In the election to an important office or undertaking foir which several persons appeared to have claims (1Sa 10:19; Act 1:26; comp. Herod. 3:128; Justin. 13:4; Cicero, Verr. 2:2, 51; Aristot. Polit. 4:16), as well as in the assignment of official duties among associates having a common right (Neh 10:34), as of the priestly offices in the Temple service among the sixteen of the family of Eleazar and the eight of that of Ithamar (1Ch 24:3; 1Ch 24:5; 1Ch 24:19; Luk 1:9), also of the Levites for similar purposes (1Ch 23:28; 1Ch 24:20-31; 1Ch 25:8; 1Ch 26:13; Mishna, Tamid, 1:2; 3:1.; 5:2; Jonut, 2:2. 3, 4; Shabb. 23:2; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. in Luk 1:8-9, volume 2, page 489). (d.) In military enterprises (Jdg 20:10; compare Val. Max. 1:5, 3).

In the sacred ritual of the Hebrews we find the use of lots but once prescribed, namely, in the selection of the scape-goat (Lev 16:8 sq.). The two inscribed tablets of boxwood, afterwards of gold, were put into an urns which was shaken, and the lots drawn out (Joma, 3:9; 4:1). SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF. Eventually lots came into frequent usage (comp. the Mishna, Shabb. 23:2). In later times they even degenerated into a game of hazard, of which human life was the stakes (Josephus, War, 3:8, 7). Dice appear to have been usually employed for the lot (הַשְׁלַיךְ גּוֹרָל, to "throw the die," Jos 18:8; so הוֹרָה, to cast, Jos 18:6; δίδωμι, to give, Act 1:26; נָפָל, πίπτω, to fall, Jon 1:7; Eze 24:7; Act 1:26), and were sometimes drawn from a vessel (יָצָא הִגּוֹרָל," the lot came forth," Numbers 32:54, so עָלָה, to "come up," Lev 6:9; comp. the Mishna, Joma, 4:1). A different kind of lot is elsewhere indicated in the Mishna (Josna, 2:1; comp. Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. page 714). A sacred species of lot was by means of the SEE URIM AND THUMMIM (q.v.) of the high-priest (Num 27:21; 1Sa 28:6), which appears to have had some connection with the divination by means of the sacerdotal EPHOD (1Sa 23:6; 1Sa 23:9). Stones were occasionally employed in prophetical or emblematical lots (Num 17:6 sq.; Zec 11:10; Zec 11:14). SEE PURIM. Election by lot appears to have prevailed in the Christian Church as late as the 7th century (Bingham, Eccles. Antiq. 4:1, 1, volume 1, page 426; Bruns, Conc. 2:66). Here also we may notice the use of words heard, or passages chosen at random from Scripture. Sortes Biblicae, like the Sortes Vigilance, prevailed among Jews, as they have also among Christians, though denounced by several councils (Johnson, "Life of Cowley," Works, 9:8;  Bingham, Eccl. Antiq. 16:5, 3; id., 6:53 sq.; Bruns, Conc. 2:145-154, 166; Mauritius, c. 15; Hofmann, Lex. s.v. Sortes).

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

The term "lot" is also used for that which falls to one by lot, especially a portion or inheritance (Jos 15:1; Jdg 1:3; Psa 125:3; Isa 17:14; Isa 47:6; Act 8:21). Lot is also used metaphorically for portion, or destiny, as assigned to men from God (Psa 16:5): "And arise to thy lot in the end of days" in the Messiah's kingdom (Dan 12:13; comp. Rev 20:6). SEE HERITAGE.

## Lot (2)[[@Headword:Lot (2)]]

             SEE MYRRH.

Lot

(Heb. id., לוֹט, a covering, as in Isa 25:7; Sept. and N.T. Λώτ, Josephus Αῶτος; occurs Gen 11:27; Gen 11:31; Gen 12:4-5; Gen 13:1-14; Gen 14:12; Gen 14:16; Gen 19:1-15; Gen 19:18; Gen 19:23; Gen 19:29-30; Gen 19:36; Deu 2:9; Deu 2:19; Psa 83:8; Luk 17:28-29; Luk 17:32; 2Pe 2:7), the son of Haran and nephew of Abraham (Gen 11:27). His sisters were Milcah, the wife of Nahor, and Iscah, by some identified with Sarah. [In our treatment of the history, we freely avail ourselves of the articles in Kitto and Smith.] The following genealogy exhibits the family relations:

By the early death of his father (Gen 11:28), he was left in charge of his grandfather Terah, with whom he migrated to Haran, B.C. 2089 (Gen 11:31), and the latter dying there, he had already come into possession of his property when he accompanied Abraham into the land of Canaan, B.C. 2088 (Gen 12:5), and thence into Egypt, B.C. 2087  (Gen 12:10), and back again, by the way of the Philistines, B.C. 2086 (Gen 20:1), to the southern part of Canaan again, B.C. 2085 (Gen 13:1). Their united substance, consisting chiefly in cattle, was not then too large to prevent them from living together in one encampment. Eventually, however, their possessions were so greatly increased that they were obliged to separate, and Abraham, with rare generosity, conceded the choice of pasture-grounds to his nephew. Lot availed himself of this liberality of his uncle, as he deemed most for his own advantage, by fixing his abode at Sodom, that his flocks might pasture in and around that fertile and well-watered neighborhood (Gen 13:5-13). He had soon very great reason to regret this choice; for although his flocks fed well, his soul was starved in that vile place, the inhabitants of which were sinners before the Lord exceedingly. There "he vexed his righteous soul from day to day with the filthy conversation of the wicked" (2Pe 2:7).

Not many years after his separation from Abraham (B.C. 2080), Lot was carried away prisoner by Chedorlaomer, along with the other inhabitants of Sodom, and was rescued and brought back by Abraham (Genesis 14), as related under other heads. SEE ABRAHAM; SEE CHEDORLAOMER.

This exploit procured for Abraham much celebrity in Canaan; and it ought to have procured for Lot respect and gratitude from the people of Sodom, who had been delivered from hard slavery and restored to their homes on his account. But this does not appear to have been the result.

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

It is this hospitality which receives the commendation  of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in words that have passed into a familiar proverb, "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares" (Heb 13:2). On the other hand, it is his deliverance from the guilty and condemned city — the one just man in that mob of sensual, lawless wretches — which points the allusion of St. Peter, to "the godly delivered out of temptations, the unjust reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished, an ensample to those that after should live ungodly" (2Pe 2:6-9). The avenging angels, after having been entertained by Abraham, repaired to Sodom, where they were received and entertained by Lot who was sitting in the gate of the town when they arrived. While they were at supper the house was beset by a number of men, who demanded that the strangers should be given up to them, for the unnatural purposes which have given a name of infamy to Sodom in all generations. Lot resisted this demand, and was loaded with abuse by the vile fellows outside on that account. They had nearly forced the door, when the angels, thus awfully by their own experience convinced of the righteousness of the doom they came to execute, smote them with instant blindness, by which their attempts were rendered abortive, and they were constrained to disperse. Towards morning the angels apprised Lot of the doom which hung over the place, and urged him to hasten thence with his family. He was allowed to extend the benefit of this deliverance to the families of his daughters who had married in Sodom; but the warning was received by those families with incredulity and insult, and he therefore left Sodom accompanied only by his wife and two daughters.

As they went, being hastened by the angels, the wife, anxious for those who had been left behind, or reluctant to remove from the place which had long been her home, and where much valuable property was necessarily left behind, lingered behind the rest, and was suddenly involved in the destruction by which — smothered and stiffened as she stood by saline incrustations — she became "a pillar of salt" (Gen 19:1-26). This narrative has often been regarded as one of the "difficulties" of the Bible. But it surely need not be so. Even under the above extreme view of the suddenness of the event, the circumstances appear to be all sufficiently accounted for. In the sacred record the words are simply these: "His wife looked back from behitnd him, and became a pillar of salt;" words which neither in themselves nor in their position in the narrative afford any serious difficulty, even without the supposition of a miracle. It is true that, when taken with want has gone before, they seem to imply (Gen 19:22-23) that the work of destruction by fire (did not commence till after Lot had entered  Zoar. The storm, however, may have overtaken her in consequence of her delay. Later ages have not been satisfied to leave the matter, but have insisted on identifying the "Pillar" with some one of the fleeting forms which the perishable rock of the south end of the Dead Sea is constantly assuming in its process of decomposition and liquefaction (Anderson's Off. Narr. page 180). The first allusion of this kind is perhaps that in Wis 10:7, where "a standing pillar of salt, the monument (μνημεῖον) of an unbelieving soul," is mentioned with the "waste land that smoketh," and the "plants bearing fruit that never come to ripeness," as remaining to that day, a testimony to the wickedness of Sodom. This notion was regarded by the Roman Catholics as scriptural authority that might not be disputed. See the quotations from the fathers and others in Hofmann's Lexikon (s.v. Lot), and in Mislin, Lieux Saints (3:224). Josephus also (Ant. 1:11, 4) says that he had seen it, and that it was then remaining. So, too, do Clemens Romanus (Epist. 1:11) and Irenaeus (4:51, 64). So does Benjamin of Tudela, whose account is more than usually circumstantial (ed. Asher, 1:72).

Rabbi Petachia, on the other hand, looked for it, but "did not see it; it no longer exists" (ed. Benisch, page 61). The same statement is to be found in travelers of every age, certainly of our own times (see Maundrell, March 30). The origin of these traditions relative to this pillar has lately been satisfactorily explained by the discovery by the American party under Lieut. Lynch of an actual column still standing on the south-western shore of the Dead Sea, at, a place retaining the traces of the name of Sodom in the form of Usdum, of which he gives a pictorial sketch, describing it as a round pillar, about forty feet high, on a lofty pedestal, standing detached from the general mass of the mountain, of solid salt, slightly decreasing in size upwards, and capped with carbonate of lime; but, although himself a Catholic, he admits, with scientific candor, that it is merely the result of the action of the winter rains upon the rock-salt hills, which the cap of limestone has here protected, leaving the surrounding parts to wash aways till a columnn has thus gradually been carved out (Narrative of Expedition, pages 307,308). Prof. Palmer also visited this singular object, called by the Arabs Bint Sheik Lot, or "Lot's [daughter] wife." He describes and gives a view of it as "a tall isolated needle of rock, which really does bear a curious resemblance to an Arab woman with a child upon her shoulder. The Arab legend of Lot's wife differs from the Bible account only in the addition of a few frivolous details. They say that there were seven cities of the plain, and that they were all miraculously overwhelmed by the Dead Sea as a punishment for their crimes.

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

Lot and his daughters meanwhile had hastened on to Zoar (q.v.), the smallest of the five cities of the plain, which had been spared on purpose to afford him a refuge; but, being fearful, after what had passed, to remain among a people so corrupted, he soon retired to a cavern in the neighboring mountains. and there abode (Gen 19:30). After some stay in this place, the daughters of Lot became apprehensive lest the family of their father should be lost for want of descendants, than which no greater calamity was known or apprehended in those times; and in the belief that, after what had passed in Sodom, there was no hope of their obtaining suitable husbands, they, by a contrivance which has in it the taint of Sodom, in which they were brought up, made their father drunk with wine, and in that state seduced him into an act which, as they well knew,  would in soberness have been most abhorrent to him. They thus became the mothers, and he the father, of two sons, named Moab and Ammon, from whom sprung the Moabites and Ammonites, so often mentioned in the Hebrew history (Gen 19:31-38). With respect to Lot's daughters, Whiston and others are unable to see any wicked intention in them. He admits that the incest was a horrid crime, except under the unavoidable necessity which apparently rendered it the only means of preserving the human race; and this justifying necessity he holds to have existed in their minds, as they appear to have believed that all the inhabitants of the land had been destroyed except their father and themselves. But it is incredible that they could have entertained any such belief.

The city of Zoar had been spared, and they had been there. The wine also with which they made their father drunk must have been procured from men, as we cannot suppose they had brought it with them from Sodom. The fact would therefore seem to be that, after the fate of their sisters, who had married men of Sodom and perished with them, they became alive to the danger and impropriety of marrying with the natives of the lad, and of the importance of preserving the family connection. The force of this consideration was afterwards seen in Abraham's sending to the seat of his family in Mesopotamia for a wife to Isaac. But Lot's daughters could not go there to seek husbands; and the only branch of their own family within many hundred miles was that of Abraham, whose only son, Ishmael, was then a child. This, therefore, must have appeared to them the only practicable mode in which the house of their father could be preserved. Their making their father drunk, and their solicitous concealment of what they did from him, show that they despaired of persuading him to an act which, under any circumstances, and with every possible extenuation, must have been very distressing to so good a man. That he was a good man is evinced by his deliverance from among the guilty, and is affirmed by an apostle (2Pe 2:7); his preservation is alluded to by our Savior (Luk 17:18, etc.); and in Deu 2:9; Deu 2:19, and Psa 83:9, his name is honorably used to designate the Moabites and Ammonites, his descendants. This account of the origin of the nations of Moab and Ammon has often been treated as if it were a Hebrew legend which owed its origin to the bitter hatred existing from the earliest to the latest times between the "children of Lot" and the children of Israel.

The horrible nature of the transaction — not the result of impulse or passion, but a plan calculated and carried out, and that not once, but twice, would prompt the wish that the legendary theory were true. But even the  most destructive critics (as, for instance, Tuch) allow that the narrative is a continuation without a break of that which precedes it, while they fail to point out any marks of later date in the language of this portion; and it cannot be questioned that the writer records it as a historical fact. Even if the legendary theory were admissible, there is no doubt of the fact that Ammon and Moab sprang from Lot. It is affirmed in the statements of Deu 2:9; Deu 2:19, as well as in the later document of Psa 33:8, which Ewald ascribes to the time when Nehemiah and his newly- returned colony were suffering from the attacks and obstructions of ''Obiah the Ammonite and Sanballat the Horonite (Ewald, Dichter, Psalms 83).

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

## Lotan[[@Headword:Lotan]]

             (Heb. Lotan', לוֹטָן, coverer; Sept. Λωτάν), the first-named of the sons of Seir, the Horite, and a petty prince of Idumaea prior to the supremacy of the Esauites (Gen 36:20; Gen 36:29; 1Ch 1:38). His sons are mentioned as being Hori and Hemam or Honam, and his sister as being named Timna (Gen 36:22; 1Ch 1:39), by which latter he was allied to Esau's oldest son (Gen 36:12). B.C. cir. 1927.

## Lothaire I[[@Headword:Lothaire I]]

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

## Lothaire II[[@Headword:Lothaire II]]

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

## Lothaire Of Lorraine[[@Headword:Lothaire Of Lorraine]]

             SEE HINCMAR; SEE NICHOLAS I (pope).

## Lothasubus[[@Headword:Lothasubus]]

             (Λωθάσουβος, Vulg. Abusthas v.r. Sabuls), one of the supporters of Esdras as he read the law (1Es 9:44); evidently the HASHUM SEE HASHUM (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Neh 7:22).

## Lots Wife[[@Headword:Lots Wife]]

             SEE LOT.

## Lots, Feast of[[@Headword:Lots, Feast of]]

             SEE PURIM.

## Lotto, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Lotto, Lorenzo]]

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

## Lotto, Lorenzo (2)[[@Headword:Lotto, Lorenzo (2)]]

             an eminent Italian painter, was probably born at Bergamo in 1490, and apparently studied at Venice under Giovanni Bellini. His principal works are in the churches at Bergamo, Venice, and Recauati. His picture of the Virgin and Infant is considered one of his best performances. In the Church of Santo Spirito is another exquisite picture of the Virgin and Infant, with St. John Standing at the Foot of the Throne, Embracing a Lamb. Other masterpieces are to be seen at Bergamo in the churches and private collections, and place him almost upon a level with the first luminaries of art. He died in 1560. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lotus[[@Headword:Lotus]]

             SEE LILY.

## Lotze, Hermann Rudolf[[@Headword:Lotze, Hermann Rudolf]]

             a philosopher of Germany, was born May 21, 1817, at Bautzen, Saxony. He studied medicine and philosophy with such success that, five vears after his entrance to Leipsic University, he was able to qualify as a teacher in both faculties. In 1844 he was called to Gottingen as professor of philosophy. Before going there, however, he had published his metaphysics in 1844, and his logic in 1843. In 1881 he was called to Berlin, and died the same year. Lotze was a determined opponent of materialism in philosophy. "It is the glory of Hermann Lotze," says Joseph Cook, "to have broadened, by exact and not mystical methods, the philosophical outlook upon human nature, to have taken the emotions in all their ranges into view, as well as the intellectual faculties; and thus, gradually, through the strictest methods of modern research, to have risen to a philosophy of the soul and of the whole composite nature of man, in harmony with the truths of all the sciences — mental, moral, aesthetic, and physical." Others, however, see in the philosophical system of Lotze a decided tendency to that insidious form of idealistic pantheism which comes near to denying the objectivity of matter, or at least to resolving all phenomena into pure deity. SEE SCEPTICISM, RECENT PHASES OF. Lotze published, Metaphysik (Leipsic, 1841): — Allgemeine Pathologie und Therapie als mechanische Naturwissenschaften (1842; 2d ed. 1848): — System nder Philosophie (2  volumes; volume 1, Logik, 1843; new ed. 1874; volume 2, Metaphysik, 1878; 2d ed. 1884; Engl. transl. edited by B. Bosanquet, Oxford, 1883, 2 volumes): — Ueber den Begrsif der Schonheit (Gottingen, 1845): — Geschichte der Aesthetik in Deutschland (Munich, 1868): — Allgemeine Physiologie des kirperlichen Lebens (Leipsic, 1851): — Medizinische Psychologie (1852): — Mikrokosmus (1856-64, 3 volumes; 4th ed. 1884): — Grundzage der Psychologie (1881). See Caspari, Hermann Lotze, eine kritisch-historische Studie (Breslau, 1883); Pfleiderer, Lotze's philosophische Weltanschauung (Berlin, 1882; 2d ed. 1884); Cook, Spiritual Religion in Lotze's Philosophy (Boston Monday morning's lecture, published in the [N.Y.] Independent, March 20, 1884); Gardiner, Lotze's Theistic Philosophy (Presb. Review, October 1885). (B.P.)

## Loudun, Convent Of[[@Headword:Loudun, Convent Of]]

             SEE GRANDIER.

## Louis (Or Luis) Of Granada[[@Headword:Louis (Or Luis) Of Granada]]

             a Spanish ascetic, theologian, and writer, was born at (Granada in 1504. In 1524 he joined the Dominicans, in the convent of Santa Cruz of Granada. In 1529 he was, on account of his great reputation, transferred to the convent of St. Gregory at Valladolid, where he attracted much attention by his preaching. He was afterwards recalled to Granada, to reform the convent of Scala Coeli, in the Sierra de Cordova. In the solitude of this convent he composed a number of religious works. He next went to Cordova as preacher, and became acquainted with John of Avila (q.v.), who acquired great influence over him. After spending eight years in Cordova, Louis went to Badajoz, where he founded a convent, of which he was the first abbot. Cardinal Henry, infant of Spain and archbishop of Ebora, desiring to avail himself of Louis's talents, attached him to his diocese. The queen of Portugal vainly offered to make him bishop of Viseu, and afterwards metropolitan of Braga; he accepted no office whatever, except that of provincial of his order in Portugal, which h held for some years. He finally retired into the convent of Santa Domingo of Lisbon, and devoted the remainder of his life to pastoral duties and to writing religious works. He died December 31, 1588. His works, a large number of which were translated into French, Italian, and German, are very numerous; among them the most important are, Memorial de la vida Christiana (Salamanca, 1566, 2 volumes, 8vo; Barcelona, 1614, fol.): —  Simbolo de la Fe (Salamanca, 1582, fol.; often reprinted and translated): — Guida de Pecadores (Salamanca, 1570, 8vo): — Compendio de la dottrina Christiana (Lisbon, 1564; Madrid, 1595, 4to): — Institucion y regla de bien vivir para los que empiecan a servir a Dios (Barcelona, 1566, 8vo; Madrid, 1616): — Libro de la Oracion y Meditacion (Salamanca, 1567, 8vo): — Collectanea moralis Philosophiae (Lisbon, 1571, 3 volumes, 8vo; Paris, 1582; and under the title Loci communes Philosophiae moralis, Cologne, 1604): — Rhetorica ecclesiastica (Lisbon, 1576, 4to), etc.; and a number of sermons. See Louis Munos, La Vida y Virtudes de Luiz de Grenada (Madrid, 1639, 4to); N. Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispana, 4; Quetil and Echard, Scriptores ordines Praedicatorum, 2; Tournon, Hommes illustres de l'ordre de Saint-Dominique. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:516; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 31:1034 sq. (J.N.P.)

## Louis I[[@Headword:Louis I]]

             (German Ludwiq, Latin Ludovicus), called "Le Debonnaire," and also "the Pious," youngest son of Charlemagne, was born at Casseneuil A.D. 778. The great empire of the West had just been recreated by the heroic efforts of Charles, therefore honored with the title of "the Great;" but it was not absolutely the love of war and conquest, and the honor of his name, that had actuated Charles; he rather sought to accomplish what the great Ostrogoth Theodoric (q.v.) had contemplated, but failed to effect, viz., the unions of the Christian Germanic nations into one empire. Charlemagne, it must be remembered, was eminently "a champion of the Church," and, believing that the conversion of the Saxons and other Germanic tribes could be accomplished only by their subjection, he came to dream of a union of them all under one imperial head, and gratefully he accepted the result in his own coronation as "Charles Augustus" by pope Leo III, A.D. 800. SEE CHARLEMAGNE.

But Charlemagne still believed in the independence of the imperial crown from the papal chair, and manifestly evinced this by one of his latest acts. As early as 806 he had made provision for his successors by apportioning to his three sons different parts of his possessions. To Pepin he gave Italy, to Louis, Aquitaine, and to Charles the remainder, consisting chiefly of German countries; but when, by the decease of two of these, he saw that upon Louis only would center all the responsibility of an imperial crown, he called him to his side in 813, when feeling his own end approaching, and at Aix-la-Chapelle, on a Sunday, when in the cathedral together, caused Louis to place the golden crown upon his head, and, thus crowned, presented his son as the future  king of all the Franks, without first awaiting the anointment of the pope. Not so independent was our Louis, who, in the year following the event just recorded, by the death of Charlemagne, became sole emperor of the West and king of France. Thus far the race of the Carlovingians had produced consecutively four great men — a rare occurrence in history. With Louis I opened a new aera; for, though his personal appearance was by no means insignificant, being of a prepossessing countenance and of a strong frame, and so well practiced in archery and the wielding of the lance that none about him equaled him, "he was weak in mind and will, and his surname 'the Pious' implies not only that he was religious, but principally that he was so easy tempered that it required much to displease him." Or, as Milman puts it: "In his gentler and less resolute character religion wrought with an abasing and enfeebling rather than ennobling influence" (Latin Christianity, 2:514). A ruler of this description was not likely to hold in union the vast empire of Charlemagne. His first troubles arose with Bernard, son of Pepin, whom Charlemagne, on the decease of his eldest son, had made king of the Italian possessions. Bernard's ambition soared higher.

He was not content with Italy; he desired the mastery over the whole of the imperial lands, and ungratefully conspired against his uncle. He was unsuccessful, however; was seized by the imperial troops, and condemned to death. Louis was determined to mitigate the lot of Bernard, but state interests compelled him to inflict the severe punishment of depriving his nephew of eyesight, which was the cause shortly after, no doubt, of his death. This conspiracy, as well as sundry the occurrences, made Louis feel the necessity of provisions for the succession, and, finally deciding in favor of the principle of primogeniture, his son Lothaire was appointed successor. Besides Lothaire, Louis had two sons, Pepin and Louis. To the former of these two he gave Aquitania; to the latter Bavaria, Bohemia, and Carinthia. Unfortunately, however, for the peace of the family, Louis lost his faithful companion, the mother of these children, shortly after this partition of his possessions, and, marrying a second wife, became the father of a fourth son, Charles, whose mother, Judith, conspired in his behalf for a portion of the imperial crown. This resulted in 830 in a revolt of Lothaire against his father, on the plea of the bad conduct of the step-mother. At a diet, however, which was held at Aix-la- Chapelle, the father and son were reconciled. Not so happily ended a second revolt in 833, when Louis, forsaken by his followers, was obliged to give himself up to his son Lothaire, who took him as prisoner to Soissons, sent the empress Judith to Tortona, and confined her infant son  Charles, afterwards Charles the Bald, the object of the jealousy of his half- brothers, in a monastery. A meeting of bishops was held at Compiegne, at which the archbishop of Rheims presided, and the unfortunate Louis, being arraigned before it, was found guilty of the murder of his nephew Bernard, and of sundry other offenses. He was deposed, condemned to do public penance in sackcloth, and was kept in confinement.

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

Of a prince so feeble and dependent as Louis proved himself in the affairs of state, we cannot, of course, expect the same vigor and determination towards the papacy that characterized the reign of Charlemagne, and it may be safely said that with the death of the latter a new aera opens in the history of the Latin Church. Charlemagne had proved an earnest supporter of the Church and the papacy, but he had known how to oppose their pretensions. Not so Louis. His feebleness and incapacity to govern gave rise to many abuses, or gave new life to such as had before been  successfully repressed. The whole reign of Louis, indeed, abounded in political disorders. "Distraction and weakness," says Neander (Ch. Hist. 3:301), "gave many opportunities for the Church to interfere in the political strifes," and for it the Church had been anxiously but patiently in waiting. With the coronation of Charlemagne the pope of Rome had transferred his allegiance from the East to the West, and thus, by his action, had not only conferred a most doubtful title on Charlemagne, but secured at the same time a political ascendency of the papacy. Under Charlemagne, however, the thunders of the Church were controlled by the emperor; but in Louis "the Pious" was found a willing slave, and with rapid strides the Romish Church marched onward to establish its superiority over the empire. SEE PAPACY.

What Louis would do for the Church was clearly seen in his submissive acts — the master of Europe in 822 a penitent before the prelates assembled at the Council of Attigny. Here the triumphs of the spiritual power, under the auspices of a rapid progress towards domination, were plainly foreshadowed. The hierarchy failed not to discover the hour of Louis's weakness, and day by day new laws were proposed and enacted, the ecclesiastical fabric enlarged and strengthened, the power of the secular authority enfeebled and abrogated. Prominent among the ecclesiastics who influenced the king to favor the Church and her institutions was Wala, abbot of Corbie. What Wala (q.v.) advised was worthy of adoption, and he had no sooner made his proposals than they became law. Thus the granting of monasteries to laymen, and grants of Church property at pleasure to the vassals of the crown without consent of the bishops, were abrogated, virtually making the bishops co-legislators; and by 829 the ecclesiastic royal counselor hesitated not to declare that "everything depended on keeping the line of demarcation clearly drawn between the ecclesiastical and the civil province, the king and the bishops concerning themselves only about the affairs which belonged to their respective callings." Unfortunately, however, the concessions which the king was daily making to the clergy gave to the bishops much of the business strictly belonging to the secular authority, and "the scope and the danger of the authority thus successively conferred upon the Church were most impressively manifested when Louis was deposed by his sons (in 833),... and Lothaire determined to render impossible the restoration of his father to the throne... . The people had been invited by Louis himself, eleven years before, at Attigny, to see the bishops sit in judgment on their monarch; and the decretals (q.v.) of Siricius and Leo I, forbidding secular employment and the bearing of arms by any one who had undergone public  penance, were not so entirely forgotten but that they might be revived. Accordingly, when Lothaire returned to France, dragging his captive father in his train, he halted at Compiegne, and summoned a council of his prelates to accomplish the work from which his savage nobles shrunk. With unfaltering willingness they undertook the odious task, declaring their competency through the power to bind and to loose conferred upon their order as the vicars of Christ and the turnkeys of heaven. They held the wretched prisoner accountable for all the evils which the empire had suffered since the death of Charlemagne, and summoned him at least to save his soul by prompt confession and penitence, now that his earthly dignity was lost beyond redemption....

With that overflowing hypocritical unction which is the most disgusting exhibition of clerical craft, the bishops labored with him for his own salvation, until, overcome by their eloquent exhortations, he threw himself at their feet, begged the pardon of his sons, and implored their prayers in his behalf, and eagerly demanded the imposition of such penance as would merit absolution. The request was not denied. In the church of St. Mary, before the tombs of the holy St. Medard and St. Sebastian, the discrowned monarch was brought into the presence of his son and surrounded by a gaping crowd. There he threw himself upon a sackcloth, and four times confessed his sins with abundant tears, accusing himself of offending God, scandalizing the Church, and bringing destruction upon his people, for the expiation of which he demanded penance and absolution by the imposition of those holy hands to which had been confided the power to bind and to loose. Then, handing his written confession to the bishops, he took off sword and belt, and laid them at the foot of the altar, where his confession had already been placed. Throwing off his secular garments, he put on the white robe of the penitent, and accepted from his ghostly advisers a penance which should inhibit him during life from again bearing arms. The world, however, was not as yet quite prepared for this spectacle of priestly arrogance and royal degradation. The disgust which it excited hastened a counter-revolution; and when Louis was restored to the throne, Ebbo of Rheims and St. Agobard of Lyons, the leaders in the solemn pantomime, were promptly punished and degraded.

Yet the piety of Louis held that the very sentence for the imposition of which they incurred the penalty was valid until abrogated by equal authority, and accordingly he caused himself to be formally reconciled to the Church before the altar of St. Denis, and abstained from resuming his sword until it was again belted on him by the hand of a bishop" (Lea, Studies in Ch. Hist. page 319-321). "These  melancholy scenes," says Milman (Lat. Christianity, book 5, chapter 2), "concern Christian history no further than as displaying the growing power of the clergy, the religion of Louis gradually quailing into abject superstition, the strange fusion and incorporation of civil and ecclesiastical affairs." For six years more Louis the Pious swayed the scepter of the Carlovingian empire, but he did it without power — a tool in the hands of contending factions, which at his death took up arms in open warfare, and continued their contest until Lothaire had been defeated on the field of Fontenay, and peace restored by the division of the empire at Verdun. But what is most eventful about these transactions in the life and reign of Louis the Pious, and leads us to assign them such prominence here, is the part which the clergy played ill arranging, conducting, and accomplishing them, and thus bringing them under the sanction of religion. This circumstance alone is enough to show how the power of the Church was growing. But there was another and more important circumstance that still more clearly indicates it. Stephen IV had died, and a successor had been chosen who assumed the responsibility of the papal chair as Paschal I. Instead of waiting for his confirmation by Louis, he took immediate possession of the high dignity conferred upon him by the Church, and thus inaugurated the principle of independence of the pope from the emperor. It is true a deprecatory epistle was prudently dispatched from Rome, but the same liberty was taken by his successor Eugenius II, who contented himself with sending a legate to apprise the emperor of his accession, instead of awaiting the imperial sanction to the election; and though the Romans were afterwards obliged to bind themselves by oath never to consent to the installation of a pope elect until the sanction of the emperor had reached Rome, the effort was unavailing. Events were hurrying on destined to render all such measures futile, and to accomplish the revolution of European institutions, resulting in the power of the priesthood and the irresponsible autocracy of the pope (comp. Lea, Studies in Ch. Hist. pages 38-42).

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

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

## Louis IX[[@Headword:Louis IX]]

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

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

## Louis VI Of The Palatinate[[@Headword:Louis VI Of The Palatinate]]

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

## Louis VII Of France[[@Headword:Louis VII Of France]]

             called "Le Jeune," son of Louis le Gros, was born in 1119, and succeeded his father in 1137. By nature of a cruel disposition, he had been especially harsh towards disobedient subjects, and, under the pretense that he must aid the Church to atone for his great sins, he was advised by St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, to go on a crusade. Accordingly, the king set out, at the head of a large army, in 1147. Suger and Raoul, count of Vermandois, Louis's brother-in-law, were left regents of the kingdom. This second crusade proved unsuccessful: the Christians were defeated near Damascus,  and Louis, after several narrow escapes, returned to France in 1149. The repudiation of his first wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and his marriage with Constance of Castile, brought on a war with Henry II of England, who had taken Eleanor for his wife. The war was, however, unimportant in its consequences. In Henry's controversy with Thomas a Becket, Louis VII greatly furthered the cause of Becket (comp. Robertson, Becket [London, 1859, sm. 8vol, page 211 sq., 295). He died at Paris in September, 1180. See Reichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, page 327 sq.; Milman, History of Latin Christianity, book 8, chapter 6 and ch. 8. (J.H.W.)

## Louis XIV, Of France[[@Headword:Louis XIV, Of France]]

             grandson of Henry IV, and third of the Bourbons, was born in 1638. The regency of his mother, Anne of Austria, controlled by cardinal Mazarin (q.v.), continued during the minority of the sovereign. So far, indeed, as the policy of Mazarin was concerned, it prevailed until his death in 1661, when Louis first really assumed for himself the reins of government, and indicated the principles of his administration. During the minority of its youthful sovereign the country had been distracted by civil wars. those of the Fronde, partly through Spanish influences, partly through an unsatisfied and factious element of the French nobility. Perplexing difficulties, moreover, and even actual conflicts of the regent and her minister with the Parliament and States General, had more than once arisen, usually terminating, however, in the triumph of the former, Louis himself, in his eighteenth year, dismissing one of these bodies, and forbidding any future exercise of some of its most important functions. The internal difficulties, so far as due to the hostile policy of the Spanish court, were disposed of by  the marriage of Louis with the infanta Maria Theresa in 1660, through the skillful management of Mazarin. The effect of these troubles, however, was to shape, to some degree, the policy of Louis, and to enable him to carry it out successfully. That policy was to avoid all conflict of authority by centring all power in the person of the sovereign.

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

Louis's civil policy — the consolidation of all power in the hands of the sovereign, detaching the crown from its alliance with all the legislative, judicial, and municipal institutions — he himself has best interpreted for us. "The worst calamity which can befall any one of our rank," is his language to the dauphin, "is to be reduced to that subjection in which the monarch is obliged to receive the law from his people.... It is the will of God that every subject should yield to his sovereign implicit obedience... I am the state!" These assertions of supreme prerogative are put forth, indeed, in connection with a recognition of accountability to the divine Source from which such powers are derived; but below him there was no accountability, no limitation to the action of his royal vicegerent. Consistently with this theory was the operation of his internal administration. The first and most effective instrument for the carving out of such policy was a thorough military organization. This was perfected to a degree hitherto unknown, among its new features the most effective to the end proposed being the emanation of all commissions, promotions, and distinctions from the king; doing away altogether with ,the possibility of the existence of such a balance of power as had previously been maintained, and rendering impossible all limitation of prerogative. The States-General — the great central legislative representation of the clergy, nobles, and commons — ceased to exist. The provincial states, having a more limited function of the same nature, shared the same fate. The Parliaments, from registering, protecting, and partly legislative bodies, became simply judicial tribunals to execute, under the forms of law, the decrees of a royal master. That in the  thorough working out of this system Louis exhibited rare administrative ability cannot be denied. "That he possessed the peculiar capacity of selecting efficient subordinates is no less manifest. That, moreover, under his rule there was a great evolution of administrative, military, and literary capacity is equally undoubted. Not so salutary or favorable were the results, however. Louis's policy eventually broke down the resources of the country; and it set in operation certain tendencies, which only worked themselves out in the crash of the French Revolution.

But this concentration of all power in the person of the sovereign had in view the carrying out of an external as well as an internal policy. "Self- aggrandizement," to use his own words, "is at once the noblest and most agreeable occupation of kings," and this he did not always pursue under the real requirements of truth and right. "In dispensing with the strict observance of treaties, we do not," said he, "violate them; for the language of such instruments is not understood literally; it is conventional phraseology, just as we use complimentary expressions in society." These two sentences are the text, of which the internal policy of Louis may be regarded as constituting the commentary. His reign, counting from the death of Mazarin, was characterized by four great wars, occupying altogether forty-two years, or seven ninths of its continuance. The first of these was his attack upon Spanish Flanders, and this in violation of the treaty of the Pyrenees, made at his marriage, by which all claim of inheritance, in right of his wife, to Spanish territory was solemnly renounced. Out of this contest, at first opposed, but afterwards (1670) assisted by England, for a long time varying in successes, but, on the whole, to the advantage of France, Louis, by the treaty of Nimeguen, 1678, came forth with the possession of a large addition of territory, a part of which was the duchy of Lorraine, and to which he afterwards added Strasburg, then a free German citypossessions which remained a part of France until restored to Germany by the war of 1870. Next, to provoke a war of nine or ten years' duration was his claim for his sister, the duchess of Orleans, to a portion of the Palatinate, enforced by an invasion of the territory in question. To repel this movement the League of Augsburg was formed, consisting of the emperor of Germany, the kings of Spain, Denmark, and Sweden, the duke of Savoy, and eventually of the king of England. This war, characterized by the devastation of the Palatinate and the sack of Heidelberg, terminated with the Peace of Ryswick, 1697, leaving Louis without a navy, his finances embarrassed, his people  impoverished, and many of them suffering from actual starvation. But by far the greatest contest was provoked by Louis's claim for his family to the succession of the crown of Spain, for which there were three competitors — Louis, the emperor Leopold, and the elector of Bavaria. Through the influence of the pope and of the Spanish nobility, Louis had succeeded in procuring the succession for his grandson, the duke of Anjou. To this Holland, under threat of invasion, had been forced to accede; and William of England, unable to secure the cooperation of Parliament in the way of resistance, was obliged to pursue the same course. Leopold, however, began hostilities, and in a short time England, Holland, and Denmark united with him in the Second Alliance, and the conflict only ended in 1713 with the Peace of Utrecht, leaving the duke of Anjou upon the throne of Spain, but at the expense to France of the damage and humiliation of many defeats, and the loss of many colonies, besides a distinct provision against the union of France and Spain under the same monarch. During this last contest, moreover, with external enemies, there had been an internal war destroying the national resources, that of the Camisards in the Cevennes, infuriated and maddened by religious persecution into rebellion. SEE CAMISARDS.

Louis's religious and ecclesiastical policy is exhibited in connection with. his treatment of the national Church, and its central head, the papacy; his action with reference to a division of sentiment among different portions of this national Church; and, last of all, in his treatment of his Protestant subjects. As to the national Church, it may be said that he found the machinery of ecclesiastical despotism made to his hands, in the concordat of Leo X and Francis I, already mentioned. His peculiarity consisted in the skill with which such machinery was worked, the thoroughness and extent of its operation. The "liberties of the Gallican Church," which usually meant the liberty of the monarch to control all temporalities, and to fleece all classes of the beneficed clergy without dividing the wool with the pope, was energetically asserted during the reign of Louis. His effort was to free the national Church from the control of the papacy; through his appointments, to make it subservient to his general policy. His treatment of the pope, especially in connection with the question of the privilege of the French ambassador at Rome, was harsh and overbearing; and although compelled, in 1691, to yield in certain assertions of prerogative, it but slightly affected the exercise of his ecclesiastical supremacy. His bishops were, many of them, learned, able, and eloquent. There was a higher  standard, both of literary taste and of ecclesiastical propriety, than in reigns preceding. Their writings constitute this period, in some respects, one of the most brilliant in the history of the Church of France. But these writings contain no vigorous protest against the vices and cruelties of their royal master, and many of them are implicated in the support of his most flagrant cruelties and acts of oppression. It was perfectly understood that no other course would be tolerated. His own account to Massillon of the effect produced upon him by his court preachers will enable us to understand the character of their preaching. "I have heard a great many speakers in my chapel, and I have been very well pleased with them; when I hear you, I am displeased with myself." But the unfavorable testimony of this one faithful witness, and of at least one other not less faithful, Fenelon, could not counteract the flattery of so many others. The difficulty with the Jansenists constitutes, perhaps, one of the most striking illustrations of this despotic policy in ecclesiastical and religious matters. In this contest between Jesuitism and a purer form of Romanism, the pope, and, through the pope and the Jesuits, Louis, became a party. SEE JANSENIUS.

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

Louis, whose great doctrine was uniformity and submission in all things, therefore proposed for himself the task, not of violating this great compact with his Protestant subjects, but of doing away with the necessity of its existence by bringing them all within the national Church.  Urged forward in this attempt by his mistress, Madame de Maintenoln, wholly under the control of the Jesuits, and by the latter themselves, on the plea that by such a course he would merit the forgiveness of heaven for the many sins of his youth, especially his illicit connection with Madame de Montespan, two great agencies were immediately set in operation to the attainment of this result — those of bribery and intimidation. Conversions were sought by purchase, or by appeals to the interests or ambition of the Farties concerned: Special provision was made for the purchase of such conversions by a fund collected of one third of the profits of all ecclesiastical benefices, and placed in the hands of a Huguenot renegade, to be used for this purpose. The matter went so far that there was a regular scale of prices for converts of different grades, and large successes were published as the result of this mode of operation. To cut off the temptation of relapse, so as to insure the price of a second conversion, an edict was issued condemning all relapsed persons to banishment for life and confiscation of their property. With these efforts, moreover, which only reached the weak and worthless, was combined the other element of harassment and intimidation. Commissions of Romish clergy were instituted, sometimes upon their own motion, sometimes upon popular complaint. and with the well-understood approval of court officials, to investigate the legal titles of churches of the Huguenots, which for the purpose had been called in question. One infelicity in the position of the Protestants, even under the Edict of Nantes, was that which was connected with what may be called the Church territorial system. They were territorially in the dioceses of Romish bishops, in the parish limits of Romish priests, in some indefinite manner regarded as in their pastoral charge, and these annoying questions of Church property could thus be easily started. The result, in many cases where these titles were called in question, was a long, vexatious litigation, ending in the decision that it was imperfect, and that the church building should be shut up and demolished. The decisions of the sovereign were well known, and loyalty, ambition, and interest alike found their expression and exercise through these agencies in the rank of proselytism.

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

There was, however, another form of operation in this effort of exterminating Protestantism by conversion. Human wickedness, in this effort, found out the way to commit a new crime. This new crime, unique and preeminent in the achievements of malicious ingenuity, had to be described by a new name, and the world thus heard for the first time of the Dragonnade — the dragooning of people out of one religion into another. The process was that of quartering soldiers — Romanists, of course, the bigotry of the Romanist being combined with the brutality of the soldier — in the families and houses of Protestants. The commanders were instructed to quarter them on Protestant families, and to keep them there until the families were brought over to the Catholic faith, and then to transfer them to others of the same character and for the same object. As the army employed for this purpose was a large one, so whole districts at once were subjected to this intolerable annoyance and oppression.

Multitudes, of course, yielded; and where they subsequently recanted their act of weakness, they became subject to banishment and confiscation. The suffering involved may be more easily imagined than described. "The dragoons," says one who passed through it, "fixed their crosses to their musquetoons, so as the more readily to compel their hosts to kiss them; and if the kiss was not given, they drove the crosses against their stomachs and faces. They had as little mercy for the children as for the adults, beating them with these crosses or with the flats of their swords, so violently as not seldom to mains them. The wretches also subjected the women to their barbarities: they whipped them, they disfigured them, they dragged them by the hair through the mud or along the stones. Sometimes they would seize the laborers on the highway, or when following their carts, and drive them to the Romish churches, pricking them like oxen with their own goads to quicken their pace." If, in any case, these outrages were resisted, and there was anything like a Protestant gathering, the result was a massacre. The mere collection of such population, to indicate that they were not all carried over to the national Church, was thus treated. Upon the assumption, therefore, that these agencies, after having operated for four or five years, had accomplished their intended purpose; that Protestantism, to any calculable degrees had ceased to exist, in 1685 the Edict of Nantes, as no longer of any use or necessity, was abrogated. To proclaim the falsehood and cruelty of this pretense, and the proceedings  based upon it, they were followed by enactments against the non-existent Protestantism (see volume 4, page 396, Colossians 1). The only privilege left to the Protestants was the permission of enjoying their religion in private. The non-intent of this concession was best exhibited by the declaration of an ordinance of Louis himself thirty years later (1715), "that every man who had continued to reside in France after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 had given conclusive proof that he was a Catholic, because only as a Catholic he would have been allowed to dwell there, and, therefore, if any man persisted in Protestantism, he must be treated as a relapsed heretic. In other words, if such a one emigrated in 1685 as a Protestant, he was condemned to the galleys. If he did not, he was regarded as a Catholic, and at any subsequent period could be proceeded against for his Protestantism as a relapsed Catholic."

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

Louis dying September 1, 1715, was succeeded by his great-grandson, Louis XV. His son the dauphin and his eldest grandson died at an earlier period. Some of his children, the fruit of an adulterous connection with  Madame de Montespan, were legitimized during his lifetime, but the act was annulled after his death. In regard to other children from similar connections no such action was taken. After the death of his first wife he privately married Madame de Maintenon. The works of Louis are contained in six volumes. They are occupied with instructions for his sons, and with correspondence bearing upon the history of his times. His reign may be regarded as one of the most brilliant in the annals of French literature. In the department of theological and controversial literature this was peculiarly the case, while in that of pulpit eloquence there was an array of talent and genius beyond parallel.

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

## Louis, Saint[[@Headword:Louis, Saint]]

             bishop of Toulouse, was born in February 1274, at the castle of Brignoles, in Provence. He was the second son of Charles II, the hunchbacked king of Naples, and of Mary, the daughter of Stephen V, king of Hungary; was educated by the disciples of St. Francis, took the habit of their order, and was ordained priest in 1296 at Naples, notwithstanding the solicitations of his family, who wished to have him married to the sister of the king of Aragon. From his fourteenth to his twentieth year he served as hostage to his father, and was imprisoned at Barcelona, where he was treated very cruelly. Pope Boniface VIII appointed him to the see of Toulouse, December 27, 1295, although he was not yet of the required age, and charged him with administering the diocese of Parniers. Louis divided his time between the study, works of piety, and the pastoral duties, also making great efforts to destroy the Albigenses. In 1297 he went to Paris with his father. "A princess," says one of his biographers, "sought to test his virtue; in fact, she omitted nothing to seduce him, but the holy prelate disregarded her caresses and her threatenings." He went away from the court as soon as possible, and was invited to visit Aragon and Catalonia. He resolved, however, to go to Rome, in order to surrender into the hands of the pope the burden of the episcopacy; but on arriving at Brignoles he was attacked with fever, and died August 19, 1297. His body was at first taken to Marseilles, and afterwards to Aragon. Pope John XXII, who had been the preceptor of Louis, canonized him, April 7, 1317. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Loundres, Henry De[[@Headword:Loundres, Henry De]]

             an Irish prelate, previously archdeacon of Stafford, succeeded to the see of Dublin in 1213. In July of the same year he was appointed lord-justice of Ireland, where he continued until 1215. He was present, June 15 of that year, in England, when the king executed the Magna Charta at Runnymede. In 1216 king John conferred upon archbishop de Loundres and his successors the manor of Timothan, to which, in 1217 and 1225, various other grants were annexed. During the time this prelate presided over the see of Dublin, he erected the collegiate Church of St. Patrick into a cathedral. He constituted William Fitz-Guy the first dean, and appointed a precentor, chancellor, and treasurer, to whom he allotted lands and rectories. He died in July, 1228. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 79.

## Lounsbury, THOMAS, D.D[[@Headword:Lounsbury, THOMAS, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Florida, N.Y., October 4, 1789. He graduated with the highest honors from Union College in 1817; studied theology for more than a year at Princeton, N.J.; then became missionary in Sullivan County, N.Y., from 1821 to 1823; was ordained by the presbytery of Geneva, September 4 of the latter year; preached at Ovid from 1823 to 1849; was afterwards stated supply at Homer, Hector, and Romulus; then went again to Ovid, where he died, October 29, 1867. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 217; Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 27.

## Loup (Lat. Lupus), Saint[[@Headword:Loup (Lat. Lupus), Saint]]

             a French prelate, was born in the neighborhood of Bayeux. There is a legend, according to which St. Ruffinian, bishop of Bayeux, educated the young Loup, who soon became the most learned and most distinguished among all the clerks at Bayeux. Thus, at the death of Ruffinian, he was elected by the whole people his successor, and consecrated by Sylvester, archbishop of Rouen. Saint Loup died about the year 465. To him has often been attributed the Life of St. Raimbert, bishop of Bayeux. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Loup, Saint, Bishop Of Lyons[[@Headword:Loup, Saint, Bishop Of Lyons]]

             September 25, 542. He began as a monk in the monastery of the Isle of Sainte-Barbe, on the Saone, near Lyons. He became the superior of it, and Saint Virentiol, in the see of Lyons, in 523. He presided at the third council of Orleans, May 7, 538, at which there were passed thirty-three canons to restore discipline in the Church of France. He died September 25, 542, and is said to have been buried in the hermitage of the Isle of Sainte-Barbe. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Loup, Saint, Of Troyes[[@Headword:Loup, Saint, Of Troyes]]

             SEE LUPUS.

## Louse[[@Headword:Louse]]

             SEE LICE.

## Louvard, Francois[[@Headword:Louvard, Francois]]

             a French Jansenistic theologian of the Benedictine order, was born in Chamgeneteux in 1661, entered the convent of Saint Melaine, in Brittany, in 1679, and studied sacred and profane literature. In 1700 he was transferred to the convent of St. Denis, near Paris, to devote himself to the study of the text of St. Gregory Nazianzen. In 1713 pope Clement XI published the memorable bull "Unigenitus." The ecclesiastics of St. Maur all silently opposed it except Louvard, who openly denounced it, and was therefore greatly censured by P. le Tellier as one disobeying the apostolic decrees. He was exiled to Corbie, in the diocese of Amiens, but here also he frankly pronounced his opposition to the bull, and he was sent into  confinement in the monastery of Landevence, in Brittany. In 1715, on the death of Louis XIV, Louvard was restored to the monastery of St. Denis. In 1717, several bishops and two monks, one of them Louvard, called a meeting of the opponents of the bull, and became so troublesome even to the government that Louis XV exiled some of them, and published an edict that whosoever recommenced the controversy should be treated as a rebel to the public peace. Louvard protested. He had been the first of his order to oppose the bull; now, almost all the Benedictines were on his side; and, receiving no reply, he renewed his appeal with the four bishops in 1720. On complaint to the general of the order Louvard was specially interrogated, and, being found thoroughly bent on both present and future opposition, he was exiled to Tuffé. Here he wrote new polemics, preached, and taught the simple inhabitants that there was a difference between the holy religion of P. Quesnel and the manufactured heresies of the disciples of Loyola. In 1723 he was transferred to Cormori, diocese of Tours. Here he continued proselyting. The general of his order offered to forgive him all the past if he would cease. He refused, and had to be placed in the monastery of St. Laumer, at Blois; but, still continuing his opposition, he was removed to the monastery of St. Gildas de Bois, in Brittany. Louvard persisting in his attacks on the Jesuits, the latter brought charges against him as plotting against the state, and he was imprisoned in the castle of Nantes in 1728. Here he published a manifest against his accusers, and was therefore transferred to the Bastile in the same year. In 1734 a lettre de cachet, signed by the king, transferred him to the monastery of Rabais, diocese of Meaux. But Louvard, continuing in his former course, was to be rearrested. Apprised of this, he made his escape to the Carthusian monastery of Schonau, in Holland, where he died in April 1739. Among his numerous works the following are of special importance: Lettre contenant quelques Remarques sur les OEuvr'es de St. Gregoire de Nazianze, in the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, volume 33 (1704): — Prospectus novae editionis operum S. Gregorii (1708) : — OEuvres de St. Gregoire (1778-1840): — De la Necessite de l'Appel des eglises de France au futur Concile general (1717): — Lettre au Cardinal de Noailles, pour prouver a cette eminence que la constitution Unigenitus n'est recevable en aucune facon (1718): — Relation abregee de l'Imprisonnment de dom Louvarde (1728). See D. Tassin, Hist. Litter. de la Congregation de St. Maur; D. Clemencet, Preface de l'Edition des OEuvres du St. Gregoire de Nazianze; B. Hareau, Hist. Litter. du Maine, 2:175; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:28 sq.

## Love[[@Headword:Love]]

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

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

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

But, if this love is thus evinced towards the heathen, it is still more clearly manifested towards the chosen people, the fact of their choice being itself a manifestation of that love (Deu 7:6 sq.), which is further shown both in the blessings and punishments, the anger and the mercy, of which they were the objects. Holiness and mercy are the chief characteristics of the divine love as  manifested towards Israel; the one raising them above their weaknesess, their evils, and their sins; the other understanding these failings, and seeking to deliver and restore them. But in both also is manifested the constancy of that love, its faithfulness; and the exactitude with which it adheres to the covenant it had itself made evinces its righteousness by saving those who fear God and obey his commandments. Both holiness and mercy are, for the moral, religious consciousness, harmonized in the expiatory sacrifice, in a figurative, typical manner in the O.T., and in a real, absolute manner in the N.T. The divine right in regard to fallen humanity is maintained, the death penalty is paid, but in such a manner that the chief of all, the divine Son of man, who is also Son of God, suffers it for all, of his own free will, and out of love to man, in accordance with the wishes of his Father. Thus the curse of sin and death is removed from humanity, and the possibility of a new existence of righteousness and felicity restored.

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

We find the beginning and examples of this love under the old dispensation where mention is made of desire after God, joy in him, eagerness to serve  him, zeal in doing everything to please and honor him. The inclination towards those who belong to God, the holy communion of love in God, that characteristic feature of the N.T., is also foreshadowed in the O.T. by the people of God, who are regarded as one in respect to him, and whose close, absolute communion with God is represented by the image of marriage. This image is still repeated in the N.T., nevertheless in such a manner that the union is represented as not yet accomplished; for, though Christ is designated as the bridegroom and the Church as the bride, the wedding is made to coincide with the establishment of his kingdom. Thus considered, the love of God and the furtherance of the love of God are still a figurative expression. God wants the whole heart of his people: one love, one sacrifice, exclusively directed towards him, so that none other should exist beside it; and that all inclinations of love towards any creature should be comprised in it, derived from it, and return to it. On this account his love is called jealous, and he is said to be a jealous God. This jealousy of God, however, this decided requiring of an exclusive submission on the part of his people, is, on the other hand, the tenderest carefulness for their welfare, their honor, and their restoration.

The close connection, indeed the unity of both, is evident. The effect of this jealousy of God is to kindle zeal in those who serve him, and consequently opposition against all that opposes, or even does not conduce to his service. This is a manifestation of love towards God, which love is essentially a return of his own love, and consequently gratitude, accompanied by the highest appreciation, and an earnest desire for communion with him. It includes joy in all that serves God, absolute submission to him, and a desire to do everything for his glory. The love in God, i.e., the love of those who feel themselves bound together by that common bond, is essentially of the same character; but, from the fact of its being directed towards creatures who are afflicted with many failings and infirmities, must also include — as distinguished from the love towards God — a willingness to forgive, which makes away with all hinderances to full communion, a continual friendliness under all circumstances, consequently patience and gentleness, zeal for their improvement, and sympathy for their failings and misfortunes. But as the love of the creative, redemptive, and sanctifying God, extending further than merely those who have attained to that communion with him, embraces all, so should also the love of those who love God. Yet in the divine love itself there is a distinction made, inasmuch as God's love towards those who love him and keep his commandments is a strengthening, sustaining pleasure in them (Joh 14:21; Joh 14:23), while his  love towards the others is benevolence and pity, which, according to their conduct, the disposition of their hearts. and their receptivity, is either not felt at all by them, or only produces pain, fear o, or, again, hope, desire, etc., but not a feeling of complete, abiding joy. So in the love of the children of God towards the human race we find the distinction between brotherly and universal love (Rom 12:10; Heb 13:1; 1Pe 1:22; 2Pe 1:7). In both we find the characteristics of kindness and benevolence, sympathy, willingness to help, gentleness, and patience; but in the universal love there is wanting the feeling of delight, of an equal aim, a complete reciprocity, of conscious unity in the one highest good.

Love also derives a special determination from the personality, the spiritual and essential organization of the one who loves, and also his particular position. It manifests itself in friendship as a powerful attraction, a hearty sympathy of feelings, a strong desire for being together and enjoying a communion of thoughts and feelings. In sexual love it is a tender reciprocal attraction, a satisfaction in each other as the mutual complement of life, and a desire for absolute and lasting community of existence. Parental, filial, and brotherly love can be considered as a branch of this affection. Both friendship and love have the full sanction of Christian morals when based on the love of God. As wedded love is an image of the relation between the Lord and his people, or the Church (Eph 5:23 sq.), so paternal, filial, and brotherly love are respectively images of the love of God towards his children, of their love towards him, and of their love towards each other. All these relations may want this higher consecration, and yet be well regulated; they have then a moral character. But they may also be disorderly: friendship can be sensual, selfish, and even degenerate into unnatural sexual connection; sexual love may become selfish, having no other object but the gratification of lust; parental love may change to self-love, producing over-indulgence, and fostering the vices of the children; brotherly love can degenerate into flattery and spoiling. Thus this feeling, which in its principle and aim should be the highest and noblest, can become the most common, the worst, and the most unworthy.

Both kinds of love are mentioned in Scripture. The highest and purest tendency of the heart is in the Bible designated by the same name as the more natural, immoral, or disorderly tendency. The same was the case among the Greeks and Romans: ῎Ερως, Amor,, and Α᾿φροδίτη, Venus, had both significations, the noble and the common; but Christianity has in Christ and in his Church the perfect illustration and example of true love, whose  absolute type is in the triune life of God himself. This divine love, as it exists in God, and through the divine Spirit in the heart of man, together with the connection of both, is represented to us in Scripture as infinitely deep and pure. We find it thus represented in the Old Testament (see Deu 33:3; Isa 49:13 sq.; Isa 57:17 sq.; Isa 55:7 sq.; Jer 31:20; Jer 32:37 sq.; Eze 34:11 sq.; Hos 3:2 sq.; Mic 7:18 sq.). Then in the whole mission of Christ, and in what he stated of his own love and of the Father's, see Mat 11:28; Luke 15; Joh 4:10; Joh 4:14; Joh 6:37 sq.; Joh 7:37 sq.; Joh 9:4; Joh 10:12 sq.; Joh 12:35; Joh 13:1; Joh 15:12-13; John 17; and, for the testimony of the apostles, Rom 5:5 sq.; Rom 8:28 sq.; Rom 11:29 sq.; 1 Corinthians 13; Eph 1:3; Eph 1:17 sq.; Eph 5:1 sq.; 1Jn 3:4, etc. These statements are corroborated by the testimony of Christians in all ages, who have all been witness to this love, however much their views may have differed on other points. In later times, ethical essays on the subject have thrown great light on the nature and modes of manifestation of this love; see among them, Daub, Syst. d. christl. Moral, 2:1, page 310; Marheineke, Syst. d. theol. Moral, page 470; Rothe, Theol. Elthik, 2:350. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:388 sq. See Wesleyana, page 54.

## Love Family[[@Headword:Love Family]]

             SEE FAMILISTS.

## Love of[[@Headword:Love of]]

             a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church, established about 1585 by Bernardin Alvarez, a citizen of Mexico, for nursing the sick. It was sanctioned by the popes Sixtus V and Clement VIII, and received the same rights as the order of Brothers of Charity which had been established by St. Johannes a Deo, and with which it had statutes, aim, and dress in common. It only differs from it by the color of the monastic dress. The order was named after the patron saint of the city of Mexico, in commemoration of the fall of paganism, and the capture of the city of Mexico by the Christians on the day of St. Hippolytus (August 13). It never spread beyond Spanish America. (A. J. S.)

## Love, Christopher[[@Headword:Love, Christopher]]

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

## Love, John M[[@Headword:Love, John M]]

             D.D., an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Paisley, Scotland, in 1757. He was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society. He died in 1825. Dr. Love published in 1796 Addresses to the People of Otaheite, republished after his death; also 2 volumes of Sermons and Lectures in 1829; a vol. of Letters in 1838; 34 Sermons, preached 1784-5, in 1853. See  Chambers and Thomson, Biogr. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen, 1855, volume 5; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, volume 2, s.v.

## Love, Virgins of[[@Headword:Love, Virgins of]]

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

## Love-feast[[@Headword:Love-feast]]

             In the article AGAPE SEE AGAPE (q.v.) the subject has been treated so far as it relates to an institution in the early Church. It remains for us here only to speak of the love-feast as observed in some Protestant churches, especially the Methodist connection. In a strictly primitive form, the love- feast is observed by the Moravian Brethren. They celebrate it on various occasions, "generally in connection with a solemn festival or preparatory to the holy communion. Printed odes are often used, prepared expressly for the occasion. In the course of the service a simple meal of biscuit and coffee or tea is served, of which the congregation partake together. In some churches the love-feast concludes with an address by the minister" (E. de Schweinitz, Moravians Manual [Philad. 1859, 12mo], page 161). From the Moravians Wesley borrowed the practice for his own followers, assigning for its introduction into the Methodist economy the following reasons: "In order to increase in them Lpersonls in bands (q.v.)] a grateful sense of all his [God's] mercies, I desired that one evening in a quarter all the men in band, on a second all the women, would meet, and on a third both men and women together, that we might together 'eat bread,' as the ancient Christians did, 'with gladness and singleness of heart.' At these love-feasts (so we termed them, retaining the name as well as the thing, which was in use from the beginning) our food is only a little plain cake and water; but we seldom return from them without being fed not only with the 'meat which perisheth,' but with 'that which endureth to everlasting life' (Wesley, Works, 5:183). In the Wesleyan Church only members are attendants at love-feasts, and they are appointed by or with the consent of the superintendent (Minutes, 1806). Admission itself is gained only by a ticket; and as it frequently happened that members would lend their tickets to strangers, it was enacted in 1808 that "no person who is unwilling to join our society is allowed to attend a love-feast more than once, nor then without a note from the traveling preacher;".... and "that any person who is proved to have lent a society ticket to another who is not in society, for the purpose of deceiving the door-keepers, shall be suspended for three  months" (comp. Grindrod, Laws and Regulations of Wesl. Methodism [Lond. 1842], page 180). In the Methodist Episcopal Church the rule also exists that admission to love-feasts is to be had by tickets only (comp. Discipline, part 2, chapter 2, § 17 [2]), but the rule is rarely, if ever observed, and they are frequently attended by members of the congregation as well as by the members of the Church. By established usage, the presiding elder (and in his absence only the minister in charge) is entitled to preside over the love-feasts, and they are therefore held at the time of the Quarterly Conference. SEE CONFERENCE, METHODIST.

The manner in which they are now generally observed among Methodists is as follows: They are opened by the reading of the Scriptures, followed by the singing of a hymn, and then by prayer. During and after the dealing out of the bread and water, the different members of the congregation so disposed relate their Christian experience since the last meeting, etc. This is also the occasion for a report of the prosperity of the Church on the part of the pastor and by rule of Discipline (part 2, chapter 2, § 17); for the report of the names of those who have been received into the Church or excluded therefrom during the quarter; also the names of those who have been received or dismissed by certificate, and of those who have died or have withdrawn from the Church. Among the Baptists, in their missionary churches abroad, they seem to celebrate the real Agape. At Berlin, Prussia, they are held quarterly, and are made the occasion of a general social gathering, substituting coffee and cake for the Tread and water; but this practice is by no means general among the communicants of that Church. (J.H.W.)

## Lovejoy, Elijah Parish[[@Headword:Lovejoy, Elijah Parish]]

             a Presbyterian minister. noted for his and slavery activity, was the son of the Rev. Daniel Lovejoy, and was born at Albion, Maine, November 9, 1802; graduated at Waterville College, Maine, September 1826; and taught for a time in St. Louis, Missouri. In 1832 he was converted, and united  with the Presbyterian Church, and entered the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J. The following spring he obtained license to preach from the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, and began preaching in Newport, Rhode Island, and in New York City. In 1833 he established the St. Louis Observer, a weekly religious newspaper, in St. Louis, Missouri. In 1836, on account of a bitter dislike for the Observer's opposition to slavery and the prevailing principles on divorce, a mob destroyed Mr. Lovejoy's printing-office. The same year he removed to Alton, Illinois, where he established and maintained by solicited contributions "The Alton Observer." Continuing in his anti-slavery movements, resolutions were passed against him, and his press was twice destroyed by a pro-slavery mob. While defending a third press near his premises at Alton, he was mortally wounded, November 7, 1837.

## Lovejoy, Owen[[@Headword:Lovejoy, Owen]]

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

## Lovejoy, Theodore A[[@Headword:Lovejoy, Theodore A]]

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

## Loveys, John[[@Headword:Loveys, John]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Devon County, England, May 7, 1804; was confirmed in the Church of England in his youth; in 1825 was converted, and united with the Wesleyan Methodists; emigrated to America in 1829; spent one year at Cazenovia Seminary, N.Y., and in 1830 entered the Black River Conference. In 1834 he was stationed at Ogdensburg; in 1836 was made presiding elder on Potsdam District; then  preached at Oswego (1839), and various other appointments, until his death, August 30, 1849. He was a valuable preacher, clear, original, vigorous, and devout; an "excellent economist," a "diligent student," and a man of large spirit and liberal influence. Minutes of Conferences, 4:474; Black River Conference Memorial, page 249. Low Churchmen, a name for persons who, though attached to the system of government maintained in the Church of England, or in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, as "the Church," yet consider that the ministrations of other churches are not to be disregarded. SEE LATITUDINARIANS. The term was primarily applied to those who disapproved of the schism made by the Non-jurors, and who distinguished thernselves by their moderation towards Dissenters. SEE RITTUALISM.

## Low Sunday[[@Headword:Low Sunday]]

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

## Low, David[[@Headword:Low, David]]

             an Anglican bishop; was born in the neighborhood of Brechin, Scotland, in 1768. He received his education at the University of Aberdeen, then studied with bishop Gleig at Stirling, and was settled in charge of the congregation at Pittenweem in 1790, where for more than half a century he fulfilled the duties of the pastoral office without intermission. Dr. Low was consecrated bishop of the united diocese of Argyle, Ross, and Moray, in 1819. Some years subsequently he effected a separation between the diocese of Ross and Moray and that of Argyle, retaining the; superintendence of the former. He resigned the see in 1850, and died at Pettenween, January 26, 1855. He was especially intimate with Scottish traditions and historical lore, and was a captivating conversationalist. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1855, page 315.

## Low, Leopold[[@Headword:Low, Leopold]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born in 1811 in Moravia. He studied at Prague, and was in 1843 chief rabbi of Great Kanizca, Hungary. He took an active part in the revolution of 1848, and after its suppression was imprisoned and condemned to death. He was, however, pardoned, and in 1851 became chief rabbi at Szegedin, where he died, October 13, 1875. Low was a voluminous writer, his essays having been published in four volumes, under the title Gesammelte Schriften (Szegedin, 1876). Still valuable are his Beitrage zur judischen Alterthumskunde (Leipsic, 1870): — Allgemeine Einleitung und Geschichte der Schriftauslegung (Great Kanizca, 1855). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:266. (B.P.)

## Lowder, Charles Fuge[[@Headword:Lowder, Charles Fuge]]

             an Anglican clergyman, of some fame in the history of city missions and of English ritualism, was born at Bath, June 22, 1821, and graduated at King's College School, London, and Exeter College, Oxford. He served his apprenticeship to London church-work under Skinner, at St. Barnabas, Pimlico, from 1851 to 1856. It was a time of vehement anti-Catholic agitation. The ritualism of Skinner and Lowder consisted in (1) Procession of clergy and choristers from and to the vestry; (2) Obeisance towards the altar on entering and retiring from the sanctuary; (3) The eastward position; (4) Colored coverings varied for the season on the altar.

Bishop Blomfield allowed some of these, but disapproved of others. These troubles dragged on until the Lushington judgment disheartened the High- Church party, and the first decision of the privy council in December 1855, was welcomed as a deliverance by hearts which could not foresee the very different treatment which the Rubric oil ornaments was to receive from that same body in the Ridsdale judgment. Yet, at the beginning, the ritualism of St. Barnabas "roused such a storm and provoked such outrage that towards the end of 1850 the religious people of the district were so horrified by the blasphemous cries of the mob that they were fain to keep within their houses." In 1856 and 1857 Lowder took charge of mission congregations at Ratcliff Highway and Wellclose Square, where, amid many physical discomforts, and among the rough population of that wild East London district, he left "the record of a very noble life, full of unconscious greatness, to which the term heroic would not be misapplied." He was not a man of brilliant abilities or social attractiveness, by no means eloquent as a preacher, not always a good judge of character, his asceticism impaired his health and his working force, yet one could speak of his calm, unexcited courage, his splendid patience, his unsparing laboriousness, his habitual, far-reaching charity, his burning love of souls, his intense loyalty to Christ as a personal Savior. In 1858 Lowder welcomed a coadjutor, Alexander Heriot Mackonochie, since so conspicuous in the English Church. In 1859 six clergy were laboring in the parish, with a large staff of lay assistants, fifty-four services were held weekly, and six hundred children were under instruction in the six schools which had been set on foot. This outburst of missionary energy, with services so ritualistic, excited opposition.

In September 1859, Lowder came near being murdered by a mob lashed into fury, and in the beginning of 1860 "the whole service was interrupted by hissing, whistling, and  shouting; songs were roared out during the service and lesson; cushions and books were hurled at the altar . . . the clergy were spat upon, hustled, and kicked within the church, and only protected from greater outrages by sixty or eighty gentlemen who, unasked, came to the rescue." The mob gutted St. George's Church of everything savoring of the Roman service, and the bishop (Tait) for the most part gave way to the rioters. After the storm had passed, the patience and Christian spirit of Lowder and his associates began to make itself felt upon the rough zealots. Some of them became choristers in other churches, or assisted priests in mission work. New agencies for good sprang up, one of which was the Working Men's Institute, The Church of St. Peter's, London Docks, was consecrated June 31, 1866, Lowder being its first vicar.

Then came the visitation of cholera, which conquered the people and bowed their hearts once for all to the pastor who gave himself up with such absolute devotedness to the work of helping them. Lowder did not set up a system in place of a Person, or his own office as the substitute for an absent, instead of the witness for a present, Lord. The root idea of confession was the, heinousness of sin and the promise of pardon through the blood of Christ, and confession and absolution were freely offered to all those who needed it. He had rituals, because he thought it his duty to put before the eyes of the people the image of the worship of heaven, and the outward appointments of the Church gave an air of comfort and dignity — a lesson for the people to take back to their squalid homes. As the result, not only was open sin swept away from the streets of St. Peter's, where before streets were peopled by houses of ill-fame, but five hundred communicants of St. Peter's Were lifted above the suffering life into joy and peace. Lowder's health, undermined for a long time, broke down in 1874 or 1875. In August 1880, he went abroad, never to return. In the Tyrol, at Zell-am-See, at the age of sixty, among strangers, Sept. 9,1880, this great and heroic spirit passed away. See Charles Lowder, a biography, by the author of the Life of St. Teresa (2d ed. Lond. 1882; N.Y. eod.); Church of England Quar. Rev. April 1882, page 57 sq.; Twenty-one Years in St. George's Mission, by Reverend C.F. Lowder, M.A. (Lond. 8vo).

## Lowe, Joel, Ben-Jehudah Loeb[[@Headword:Lowe, Joel, Ben-Jehudah Loeb]]

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

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

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

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

(4) Commentary on the Psalms, with an extensive introduction (עם באור זמירות ישראל) containing an elaborate treatise on the musical instruments of the ancient Hebrews, as well as on Hebrew Poetry; published with Mendelssohn's German translation of this book (Berlin, 1785-91): —

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

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

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

## Lowe, ben-Bezalel[[@Headword:Lowe, ben-Bezalel]]

             a rabbi and Jewish teacher of note, was born probably in Posen about 1525. Of his early history but little is authenticated. We find him first occupying a position of influence and prominence at Prague, where he was best known as "the learned Rabbi Lowe," towards the close of the 16th century (1573). Previous to his coming to Prague he had been rabbi over a congregation in Moravia for some twenty years. In 1583 he was elected chief rabbi of the Jews in the Bohemian capital. In 1592 he became chief rabbi of Posen and Poland; he returned, however, in 1593 to Prague, and there died in 1609. He left nineteen different works, of which several are yet in manuscript in the library of the University of Oxford, England. Besides his great Talmudical knowledge, which made him one of the first authorities of his time, he also enjoyed a great reputation as mathematician and philosopher. He seems to have also possessed great knowledge of astronomy and astrology, the favorite studies of the age. He was befriended by the renowned Tycho Brahe, astronomer at the court of the emperor Rudolph II; and the latter also, it is said, honored the rabbi, and at one time admitted him to a prolonged audience; indeed, it is a well- established fact that his extended knowledge and unblemished character secured for himself and the Jews of his time happier days, and, like a sunbeam in the midst of dark clouds, appears the short period in which he officiated as rabbi in the sad history of the Jewish congregation of Prague. He was opposed to the unscientific manner in which the Talmud was studied, by hunting after imaginary contradictions and difficulties (Pilpul), and he called into existence new societies for a more scientific study of the same. In connection with his son-in-law, rabbi Chayim Wahle, he founded a  seminary for Talmudical studies. The rabbi's knowledge of natural philosophy caused him frequently to make experiments, which gave birth to many legends, as the ignorant saw in them the supernatural power of the Cabalist. A Christian Bohemian historian claims for the rabbi the honor of inventing the camera-obscura. See Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:496 sq.; Sekles, Some Jewish Rabbis (5), in the Jewish Messenger (N.Y. 1871); Fürst, Biblioth. Judaica, 2:266 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Lowell, Charles[[@Headword:Lowell, Charles]]

             D.D., a Unitarian Congregational minister of note, son of judge John Lowell, to whom Massachusetts is indebted for the clause in her Constitution which abolished slavery, was born in Boston August 15, 1782, and was educated first at Andover Academy, and later at Harvard College, class of 1800. After graduation he went abroad, and traveled extensively in the Old World. At Edinburgh he entered the divinity school of the university, and spent there three semesters. On his return home he studied theology with Reverend Dr. Zedekiah Sanger, of South Bridgewater, and Rev. David Tappan, professor of divinity at Cambridge, and was ordained pastor over the West Church, in Boston, January 1, 1806. In 1837 his feeble health demanded relief, and the Reverend Cyrus A. Bartol was ordained as his colleague. Dr. Lowell continued his pastoral connection until his death (at Cambridge, January 20, 1861), although he officiated but occasionally. He was remarkable for kindness, integrity, directness and simplicity of character, and was a most zealous and consistent opponent of slavery. As a preacher his popularity was eminent, and he was almost adored by his parishioners. Graceful as an orator, with a voice of uncommon sweetness, he preached with such an ardor and sincerity that he seemed to his hearers to be almost divinely inspired. He published some twenty different discourses, a volume of Occasionals Sermons (Bost. 1856, 12mo), and a volume of Practical Sermons (1856): — Meditations for the Afflicted, Sick, and Dying; and Devotional Exercisesfor Communicants. He also contributed largely to the periodical literature of his day. Among his surviving children are Prof. Lowell, the poet; the Reverend Robert Lowell, author of "The New Priest in Conception Bay," a novel of Newfoundland life; and Mrs. Putnam, the well-known writer on Hungarian history. See Christian Examiner, 1870,  page 389; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Drake, Dict. Am. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, s.v.

## Lowell, John[[@Headword:Lowell, John]]

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

## Lowenthal, Isidor[[@Headword:Lowenthal, Isidor]]

             a famous missionary and translator of the Bible, was a native,of Poland, and of Jewish parentage. At the age of twenty he had to flee his country, being suspected by the government of conspiracy. He came to America, and at Princeton, N.J., went about as a pedler, hawking jewelry and  stationery. In or near Princeton, living a life of retired though literary habits, was a much-respected clergyman, who had more than one conversation with the eloquent pedler. Perceiving in him talent of no common order, he offered to assist him in the prosecution of his studies. An appeal to some princely merchants of New York speedily procured the funds necessary to send the young man to Princeton College. At this time he was a bigoted Jew, but his course of studies, his intercourse with tutors, brought about his conversion, and he received baptism. Having completed his studies, he offered himself as a missionary to the American Presbyterian Board. To India he directed his steps, and fancying from what he had read that among the Afghans might be found traces of the lost tribes, he proposed that he should be sent to Peshawur, as a missionary to the Afghans. There, in 1856, he commenced his work. With rare ability and perseverance, he had so perfected himself in the difficult language of the Afghans as to prepare a translation of the entire New Test.; and although the execution of the work devolved wholly upon himself, it was marked by close adherence to the original texts, and by an idiomatic power of expression which earned the warmest commendation of the Pushtft linguists who were capable of pronouncing a critical opinion on the result of his labors. The question of translating the Old Test. had been discussed, and as the importance of giving the Afghans a complete Bible was deeply felt, Mr. Lowentbal had expressed his willingness to undertake this great and responsible task. But the Divine Master had otherwise appointed, and before he had fairly entered upon the duty, he was assassinated, April 27, 1864. SEE PUSHTU VERSION. (B.P.)

## Lower Parts Of The Earth[[@Headword:Lower Parts Of The Earth]]

             (תִּחְתּיּוֹת אֶרֶוֹ), properly valleys (Isa 44:23); hence, by extension, Sheol, or the under-world, as the place of departed spirits (Psa 63:9; Eph 4:9), and by meton any hidden place, as the womb (Psalm 131:15). In the original of Eze 26:20; Eze 32:18; Eze 32:24, the words are transposed, and used in the second sense.

## Lowisohn, Salomon[[@Headword:Lowisohn, Salomon]]

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

## Lowman, Abraham[[@Headword:Lowman, Abraham]]

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

## Lowman, Moses[[@Headword:Lowman, Moses]]

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

## Lowrie, John Marshall[[@Headword:Lowrie, John Marshall]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, July 16, 1817, and was educated for two years in Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., and afterwards at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. (class of 1840); and then at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J. (class of 1842). In April 1842, he was licensed by Newton Presbytery, and soon after, accepting a call to the churches of Blairstown and Knowton, in Warren County, N.J., he was ordained and installed by Newton Presbytery October 18, 1843. In 1846 he accepted a call to Wellsville, Ohio; subsequently he removed to Lancaster, Ohio, and thence to Fort Wayne, Ind., where he labored faithfully until his death, September 26, 1867. Dr. Lowrie  contributed largely to the press, and wrote many precious gems in poetry and prose; he was a man of more than ordinary gifts, a clear, vigorous intellect, and sound judgment; he excelled in systematic arrangement, clear statement, and forcible argument. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alto. 1868, page 115 sq.

## Lowrie, Reuben[[@Headword:Lowrie, Reuben]]

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

## Lowrie, Walter Macon[[@Headword:Lowrie, Walter Macon]]

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

## Lowth, Robert[[@Headword:Lowth, Robert]]

             D.D., a distinguished English prelate, and son of William Lowth (q.v.), was born at Buriton November 27, 1710. In 1737 he graduated master of arts at Oxford University, and in 1741 was elected professor of poetry in his alma mater. Entering the ecclesiastical order, he was presented with the rectory of Ovington, in Hampshire, in 1744. After a four year's residence on the Continent, he was, on his return in 1750, appointed by bishop Hoadley archdeacon of Winchester, and three years after to the rectory of East Woodhay in Hampshire. It was in this very year that Lowth published his valuable work De Sacra Poesi Hebrceorum, Praedectiones Academicae (Oxon. 1753, 4to; 2d edit. with annot. by Michaelis, Götting. 1758; Oxf. 1763; Gotting, 1768; Oxford, 1775, 1810; with notes by Rosenmüller, Leips. 1815; and last and best, Oxford, 1821, 8vo).

An English translation of the first 18 lectures was prepared by Dr. Dodd for the Christian Magazine (1766-67), and of all by Dr. Gregory (Lond. 1787,1816, 1835, 1839, 1847); a still more desirable English translation was prepared by Prof. Stowe (Andover, 1829, 8vo). "In these masterly and classical dissertations," says Ginsburg (in Kitto, Cycl. Of Bibl. Lit. 2, s.v.), "Lowth not only evinces a deep knowledge of the Hebrew language, but philosophically exhibits the true spirit and characteristics of that poetry in which the prophets of the O.T. clothed the lively oracles of God. It does not at all detract from Lowth's merits that both Abrabanel and Azariah de Rossi had pointed out two centuries before him the same features of Hebrew poetry [see Rossi] upon which he expatiates, inasmuch as the enlarged views and the invincible arguments displayed in his handling of the subject are peculiarly his own; and his work is therefore justly regarded as marking a new epoch in the treatment of the Hebrew poetry. The greatest testimony to the extraordinary merits of these lectures is the thorough analysis which the celebrated [Jewish] philosopher Mendelssohn, to whom the Hebrew was almost vernacular gives of them in the Bibliothek der schnszen Wissenschaften und derfreien Künste, volume 1:1756." In 1751 Lowth received the degree of doctor in divinity from the University of  Oxford by diploma.

In 1755 he went to Ireland as chaplain to the marquis of tlartington, then appointed lord lieutenant, who nominated him bishop of Limerick, a preferment which he exchanged for a prebend of Durham and the rectory of Sedgefield. In 1766 Dr. Lowth was appointed bishop of St. David's, whence a few months later he was translated to the see of Oxford, and thence, in 1777, he succeeded Dr. Terrick in the diocese of London. In 1778, only one year after his appointment at London, he gave to the public his last and greatest work, Isaiah: a new Translation, with a preliminary Dissertation, and Notes (13th edit. 1842, 8vo). This elegant and beautiful version of the evangelical prophet, of which learned men in every part of Europe have been unanimous in their eulogiums, and which is alone sufficient to transmit his name to posterity, aimed "not only to give an exact and faithful representation of the words and sense of the prophet by adhering closely to the letter of the text, and treading as nearly as may be in his footsteps, but, moreover, to imitate the air and manner of the author, to express the form and fashion of the composition, and to give the English reader some notion of the peculiar turn and cast of the original." In the elaborate and valuable Preliminary Dissertation where bishop Lowth states this, he enters more minutely than in his former production into the form and construction of the poetical compositions of the O.T., lays down principles of criticism for the improvement of all subsequent translations, and frankly alludes to De Rossi's view of Hebrew poetry, which is similar to his own. See Rossi. This masterly work soon obtained a European fame, and was not only rapidly reprinted in England, but was translated into German by professor Koppe, who added some valuable notes to it (Götting. 1779-81, 4 volumes, 8vo).

It must not, however, be presumed that the work did not meet also with opposition, so far as the views of the author could lead to difference in opinion; and we incline with Dr. G.B. Cheever to the belief that Lowth's "only fault as a sacred critic was a degree of what archbishop Seeker denominated the 'rabies emendandi,' or rage for textual and conjectural emendations. The prevalence of this spirit in his work on Isaiah was the only obstacle that prevented its attaining the name and rank, as classic in sacred literature, which has been accorded to the Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews" (North Amer. Rev. 31:376; comp. here Horne, Bibl. Bib. 1839, 287). On the death of archbishop Cornwallis, the primacy was offered to Dr. Lowth, a dignity which he declined on account of his advanced age and family afflictions. In 1768 he lost his eldest daughter, and in 1783 his second daughter suddenly expired while presiding at the tea-table; his eldest son was also suddenly  cut off in the prime of life. Bishop Lowth himself died November 3, 1787. The other and minor writings of bishop Lowth, consisting of (1) Tracts, belonging to his controversy with bishop Warburton (q.v.), to which a trifling difference of opinion on the book of Job gave rise: — (2) Life of William of Wyckham (1758): — (3) Short Introduction to English Grammar (1762). The Sermons and other Remains of Bishop Lowth were published with an Introductory Memoir by the Reverend Peter Hall, A.M. (London, 1834, 8vo). See Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the late Bp. Lowth (Lond. and Gotting. 1787, 8vo); Blackwood's Magazine, 29:765, 902; Gentl. Magazine, 57, 58, etc.; Kitto, Journal of Sac. Lit. 1:94, 295; 5:373; 17:138; Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Darling, Eccles. Biog. 2:1873; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.; and especially Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Auth. volume 2, s.v.

## Lowth, Simon[[@Headword:Lowth, Simon]]

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

## Lowth, William[[@Headword:Lowth, William]]

             D.D., a distinguished English divine, father of bishop Robert Lowth, was born in London September 11, 1661. He was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, whence he was elected to a scholarship at St. John's College, Oxford, in 1675, when not yet 14 years old; became M.A. in 1683, and B.D. in 1688. His Vindication of the Divine Authority of the Old and New Test. (Lond. 1692; 3d edit. with two sermons, 1821, 12mo), in answer to Le Clerc's attacks on the inspiration of Scripture, brought him prominently into notice; and the first to favor him was bishop Mew, of Winchester, who had been president of St. John's College, and well knew Lowth's great attainments. He made him his chaplain, and presented him with a prebendal stall in his cathedral at Winchester in 1696, and with the living of Buriton and Petersfield in 1699. Dr. Lowth died May 17, 1732. Though less celebrated as a writer than his son Robert, he is generally acknowledged to have been the profounder scholar, and might, and no doubt would, have attained to as great distinction in the Church as his son  had he lived as much in the public eye, and, instead of serving others in the preparation of their works, gone directly before the people himself. So great, indeed, was his modesty, that, in an estimate of his scholarship, w ca e can be just only after a careful inquiry of the amount and extent of the assistance he furnished to the works of his contemporaries, upon whom Dr. Lowth, having carefully read and annotated almost every Greek and Latin author, whether profane or ecclesiastical, especially the latter, dispensed his stores with a most liberal hand. The edition of Clemens Alexandrinus, by Dr. (afterwards archbishop) Potter; that of Josephus, by Hudson; the Ecclesiastical Historians, by Reading (Cambridge); the Bibliotheca Biblica, were all enriched with valuable notes from his pen. Bishop Chandler, of Durham, during the preparation of his Defense of Christianity from the prophecies of the Old Testament, against the discourse of the "Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion," and in his vindication of the "Defence" in answer to The Scheme of literal Prophecy considered, held a constant correspondence with him, and consulted him upon many difficulties that occurred in the course of that work. Many other English scholars were also indebted to Dr. William Lowth's labors for important aid. But the most valuable part of his character was that which least appeared in the eyes of the world. His piety, diligence, hospitality, and beneficence rendered his life highly exemplary, and greatly enforced his public exhortations. Besides the Vindication already mentioned above, Dr. Lowth wrote Directions for the profitable Reading of the Holy Scriptures, etc. (1708, 12mo; 7th edit. Lond. 1799, 12mo), an excellent little work, which has gone through many editions; and last, but chiefly, A Commentary on the prophetical Books of the Old Testament, originally published in separate portions (1714-1725), and afterwards collected in a folio volume as a continuation of bishop Patrick's commentary, and generally accompanying the commentary collected severally from Patrick, Whitby, Arnaid, and Lowman (best editions of the whole commentary, Lond. 1822, 6 volumes, royal 4to; Philad. 1860, 4 volumes, imp. 8vo). "Lowth," says Orme (Bibl. Bib.), "is one of the most judicious commentators on the prophets. He never prophesies himself, adheres strictly to the meaning of the inspired writer, and is yet generally evangelical in his interpretations. There is not much appearance of criticism; but the original text and other critical aids were doubtless closely studied by the respectable author. It is often quoted by Scott, and.... is pronounced by bishop Coutson the best commentary in the English language." See Life of Dr. William Lowth by his son, Biog. Brit.;  Churchman's Magazine, 1809 (March and April), 781 sq.; Jones, Christian Biog. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. 2:1875; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 7:75; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, volume 2, s.v.; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. volume 2, s.v.

## Loyola, Ignatius Of, St[[@Headword:Loyola, Ignatius Of, St]]

             or, with his full Spanish name, Don Inigo Lopez de Recalde, the founder of the Jesuits, was born in 1491, in the Castle of Loyola, which was situated not far from Azpeytia, in the Spanish province of Guipuscoa. He was the youngest of the eleven children of Don Bertand, Senor d'Aguez y de Loyola, and Martina Saez de Balde. His family prided itself on belonging to the ancient, pure nobility of the country, and was distinguished for chivalric sentiment. After receiving his first instruction in religion from his aunt, Dofia Maria de Guevara, a fervid Catholic, he became a page at the court of Ferdinand the Catholic. But Ignatius had too great a desire for glory to be satisfied with court life, and, following the example of his brothers, who served in the army, he resolved to become a soldier. During the first campaign in which he took part he distinguished himself at the siege of Najara, a small town situated on the frontier of Biscaya, the capture of which was partly attributed to his bravery. The town was given up to pillage, in which he took, however, no part. His life at this time, as one of his biographers says, was by no means regular; "being more occupied with gallantry and vanity than anything else, he generally followed in his actions the false principles of the world, and in this way he continued to live until his twenty-ninth year when God opened his eyes."

During the siege of Pampeluna, the capital of Novara, by the French, he was, on May 20, 1521, severely wounded by a cannon ball in both legs. The French, after taking the place, honored his courage, and had him transported on a litter to his native castle of Loyola, which is not far from Pampeluna. As the first operation had not been successful, the leg had to be broken again and to be reset anew. The extreme painfulness of this operation brought on a fever on the eve of the festival of the apostles Peter and Paul, which it was thought would prove fatal; but this fever suddenly ceased, and Ignatius ascribed his unexpected recovery to the miraculous aid of the prince of the apostles, who, as he states, appeared to him in a dream, touched him with his hand, and cured him from his fever. But, notwithstanding this belief in his miraculous recovery, Ignatius remained imbued with a worldly spirit. The recovery proved, however, not to be complete, and Ignatius, in order to get fully restored, had to submit to several other painful operations, in  spite of all of which his right leg remained considerably shorter than the other. While his recovery was slowly proceeding, he demanded novels for pastime; but as no books of this class were to be found in the castle, he received in their stead a Life of Jesus Christ and of the Saints. He read this at first without the least interest in the subject, and only because no other book could be found; but gradually his fiery imagination learned how to derive food from this reading, and a determination sprang up to imitate the spiritual combats which he found described in this book. and to excel the saints in heroic deeds. For a time the reviving thirst of glory, and a strong attachment to, a lady of the royal court, continued to prove formidable obstacles, but finally he fully overcame them, and began the new career upon which he had resolved to enter with a pilgrimage to the convent of Montserrat, famous for the immense concourse of pilgrims from all parts of the world to a miraculous picture of the Virgin Mary. To conceal his design, he pretended to make a visit to his old friend the duke of Najara, and immediately after making the visit dismissed his two servants, and took alone the road to Montserrat. There, during three successive days, he made a general confession of all the sins of his life, and took the vow of chastity.

Before the picture of the Virgin Mary he held a vigil, hung up his sword and dagger on the altar, and then repaired to Manresa, a small town situated about three leagues from Montserrat, and containing a convent of the Dominican order and a hospital chiefly for pilgrims. Here he desired to live unknown until the pestilence should cease at Barcelona, and the opening of the port should allow him to carry out his wish of visiting the Holy Land. He first entered the hospital, and there practiced the austerest asceticism, until it became known that he was a nobleman, when the number of persons who came to see him from curiosity induced him to hide himself in a neighboring cave which was known to few, and which no one had yet dared to enter. The horrors of this place, and the cruel, unnatural asceticism to which he gave himself up, produced a state of mind in which he believed himself alternately to be attended by temptations of the devil and to be gladdened by visions of the Savior and the holy Virgin. Gradually he began to be settled in his mind, and resolved to labor for the conversion and sanctification of souls. He began to speak in public on religion, and made the first draft of his famous book of the Spiritual Exercises (Exercitia Spiritualia), in the composition of which he claims to have had divine aid. This book has contributed more than any other to the erection of the new papal theocracy which has recently been completed by the promulgation of the doctrine of papal infallibility.

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

After passing ten months in Manresa, Ignatius, in January, 1523, embarked at Barcelona for the Holy Land. He spent a few days in Rome, then went to Venice, where he embarked for Jerusalem on July 14, and arrived there on September 4. It was his wish to remain here, in order to labor for the conversion of the people of the East; but the provincial of the Franciscan monks, who had been authorized by the popes either to retain the pilgrims or to send them home again, did not allow him to stay. Accordingly, he had to return to Europe, and arrived in Venice in January 1524. In March he was again on Spanish soil, and having become convinced during his voyage of the importance of a literary education for the accomplishment of his plans, he entered, although 33 years old, a grammar-school at Barcelona, where he studied, in particular, the elements of Latin. Two years later he  went, with three disciples whom he had gained at Barcelona, to the University of Alcala, which a short time before had been founded by cardinal Ximenes. Here he was, with his companions, imprisoned for six weeks, by order of the Inquisition, for giving religious instruction without special authorization. After being released, he went, at the advice of the archbishop of Toledo, to the University of Salamanca to continue his studies.

But, when there, he had new difficulties with the Inquisition; he resolved to leave Spain, and, not accompanied by any of his disciples, went to the University of Paris, where he studied from February 1528, to the end of March, 1535, and on March 14, 1533, obtained the title of master of arts. Here his plan was fully matured to establish a society of men who might aid him in carrying out his religious ideas. The first who was gained for the plan was Pierre Lefevre (Petrus Faber), who for some time had been his tutor in his philosophical studies. The second was Francis Xavier, a young nobleman of Novara. Soon after they were joined by the Spaniards Jacob Lainez, Alphonse Salmeron, and Nicholas Alphonse Bobadilla, and the Portuguese Simon Rodriguez d'Azendo. For the first time they were called together by Ignatius in July 1534. On August 15, on the festival of the assumption of the Virgin Mary, he took them to the church of the Abbey of Montmartre, near Paris, where, having received the communion from the hands of Lefivre, the only priest in their midst, they all, with a loud voice, took the solemn vow to make a voyage to Jerusalem, in order to labor for the conversion of the infidels of the Holy Land; to quit all they had in the world besides what they indispensably needed for the voyage; and in case they should find it impossible either to reach Palestine or remain there, to throw themselves at the feet of the pope, offer him their services, and go wherever he might send them. As several members of the company had not yet finished their theological studies, it was agreed that they should remain at the university until January 25, 1537.

Ignatius in the meanwhile undertook to labor against the further progress of the Reformation in France; his ascetic practices soon undermined again his health, and, at the advice of his physician, he had to return to his native land, where he soon recovered. On January 6, 137, he was met at Venice by all his companions, who, after his departure from Paris, had been joined by Claude le Jay, Jean Codure, and Pasquier Brouet. Two months later all the members of the society were sent by Ignatius to Rome, he himself remaining at Venice, as he believed the influential cardinal Caraffa (subsequently pope Paul IV) to be unfriendly to him. The pope, Paul III, received the companions of Ignatius favorably, and gave them permission  to be ordained priests by any bishop of the Catholic Church. As the war between Venice and the sultan made it impossible for Ignatius to go with his companions to Palestine, Ignatius, who had again united all the members of the society at Vicenza, resolved to go with Lefevre and Lainez to Rome, in order to place the services of his society at the disposal of the pope. Before separating, Ignatius instructed all his companions, in case they were asked who they were, and to what society they belonged, to reply that they belonged to the Society of Jesus, as they had united for a combat against heresy and vice under the banner of Jesus Christ. On his journey to Rome, Ignatius claimed to have had another vision in the lonely, decayed sanctuary of Storia, about six miles from Rome, and to have received a direct promise of divine aid and protection. At Rome Ignatius succeeded in gaining the entire confidence of the pope.

A charge of heresy and sorcery, which a personal enemy brought against him, was easily refuted, but it was found more difficult to overcome the opposition to his projected order from three cardinals, by whose advice the pope was chiefly guided. But, undaunted by this great obstacle, as Helvot (Histoire des Ordes es Monalstique, ed. Migne, 2:643) says, "he continued his urgent representations with the pope, and redoubled his prayers to God with all the greater confidence, as, not doubting the success of his enterprise, he promised to God three thousand masses in recognition, and thanksgiving for the favor which he hoped to obtain from his divine Majesty." The steady progress of the Reformation overcame, however, at last the reluctance of the cardinals, and, by the bull of September 27, 1540, Regimini militantis ecclesice, the pope gave to the new order the papal sanction and the name Society of Jesus. At the election of a general of the new order Ignatius received a unanimous vote. He at first declined to accept; but when, at a second election, he was again found to be the unanimous choice of his brethren and when his confessor, the Franciscan monk father Theodore, urged him not to resist the call of God, he was prevailed upon to accept. He soon drew up the constitution of his order, which, however, did not receive the final sanction until after his death. In November 1554, in consequence of his failing health, he appointed father Nadal his assistant. During the following spring he believed himself to have sufficiently recovered to do without this support, but during the summer of 1556 his health broke entirely down, and he died on July 31, 1556.

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

## Lozon[[@Headword:Lozon]]

             Δωζών,Vulg. Deldon), one of the sons of "Solomon's servants" who returned with Zorobabel (1Es 5:33); the DARKON SEE DARKON (q.v.) of the Heb. lists (Ezr 2:56; Neh 7:58).

## Lubbert(us), Librand(us)[[@Headword:Lubbert(us), Librand(us)]]

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

## Lubec, Reformation In[[@Headword:Lubec, Reformation In]]

             SEE HANSE Towns (in Supplement).

## Lubersac, Jean Baptiste Joseph De[[@Headword:Lubersac, Jean Baptiste Joseph De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Limoges, January 15, 1740. He became first grand-vicar of the archbishop of Aries, in 1768 almoner of the king, and in 1775 bishop of Treguier. In 1780 he was transferred to Chartres. Having been sent by the clergy to the States-General, he refused to recognise the constitution of the clergy, and March 15, 1791, was forced to emigrate. In 1801 he resigned his bishopric. After his return to France he was appointed canon of the chapter of St. Denis. He died August 30, 1822, leaving, Journal de l'Emigration du Clerge de France en Angleterre (Lond. 1802): — Apologie de la Religion et de la Monarechie Reunies (ibid. eod.). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lubienietski[[@Headword:Lubienietski]]

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

## Lubim[[@Headword:Lubim]]

             (Heb. Lubimz', לוּבַים, from the Arab., signifying inhabitants of a thirsty land, Nah 3:9; "Lubims," 2Ch 12:3; 2Ch 16:8; also Lubbin', לֻבַּיםLibyans," Dan 11:43; Sept. everywhere Λίβυες), the Libyans, always joined with the Egyptians and Ethiopians; being "mentioned as contributing, together with Cushites and Sukkiim, to Shishak's army (2Ch 12:3); and apparently as forming with Cushites the bulk of Zerah's army (2Ch 16:8); spoken of by Nahum (Nah 3:9) with Put or Phut, as helping No-Amon (Thebes), of which Cush and Egypt were the strength; and by Daniel (Dan 11:43) as paying court with the Cushites to a conqueror of Egypt or the Egyptians. These particulars  indicate an African nation under tribute to Egypt, if not under Egyptian rule, contributing, in the 10th century B.C., valuable aid in mercenaries or auxiliaries to the Egyptian armies, and down to Nahum's time, and a period prophesied of by Daniel, probably the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, SEE ANTIOCHUS IV, assisting, either politically or commercially, to sustain the Egyptian power, or, in the last case, dependent on it. These indications do not fix the geographical position of the Lubim, but they favor the supposition that their territory was near Egypt, either to the west or south. For more precise information we look to the Egyptian monuments, upon which we find representations of a people called REBU or LEBU (R and L having no distinction in hieroglyphics), who cannot be doubted to correspond to the Lubim. These Rebu were a warlike people, with whom Menptah (the son and successor of Rameses II) and Rameses III, who both ruled in the 13th century B.C., waged successful wars. The latter king routed them with much slaughter. The sculptures of the great temple he raised at Thebes, now called that of Medinet Abui, give us representations of the Rebu, showing that they were fair, and of what is called a Shemitic type, like the Berbers and Kabyles. They are distinguished as northern, that is, as parallel to, or north of, Lower Egypt. Of their being African there can be no reasonable doubt, and we may assign them to the coast of the Mediterranean, commencing not far to the westward of Egypt.

We do not find them to have been mercenaries of Egypt from the monuments, but we know that the kindred Mashashasha-u were so employed by the Bubastite family, to which Shishak and probably Zerah also belonged; and it is not unlikely that the latter are intended by the Lubim, used in a more generic sense than Rebu, in the Biblical mention of the armies of these kings (Brugsch, Geogr. Isschr. 2:79 sq.). We have already shown that the Lubim are probably the Mizraite LEHABIM: if so, their so-called Shemitic physical characteristics, as represented on the Egyptian monuments, afford evidence of great importance for the inquirer into primeval history. The mention in Manetho's Dynasties that, under Necherophes, or Necherochis, the first Memphite king, and head of the third dynasty (B.C. cir. 2600), the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians, but returned to their allegiance through fear, on a wonderful increase of the moon, may refer to the Lubim, but may as probably relate to some other African people, perhaps the Naphtuhim, or Phut (Put).

The historical indications of the Egyptian monuments thus lead us to place the seat of the Lubim, or primitive Libyans, on the African coast to the westward of Egypt, perhaps extending far beyond Cyrenaica. From the earliest ages of which we have any record,  a stream of colonization has flowed from the East along the coast of Africa, north of the Great Desert, as far as the Pillars of Hercules. The oldest of these colonists of this region were doubtless the Lubim and kindred tribes, particularly the Mashawasha-u and Tahen-nu of the Egyptian monuments, all of whom appear to have ultimately taken their common name of Libyans from the Lubim. They seem to have been first reduced by the Egyptians about B.C. 1250, and to have afterwards been driven inland by the Phoenician and Greek colonists. Now, they still remain on the northern confines of the Great Desert, and even within it, and in the mountains, while their later Shemitic rivals pasture their flocks in the rich plains. Many as are the Arab tribes of Africa, one great tribe, that of the Beni 'Ali, extends from Egypt to Morocco, illustrating the probable extent of the territory of the Lubim and their cognates. It is possible that in Eze 30:5, Lub, לוּב, should be read for Chub, כּוּב; but there is no other instance of the use of this form: as, however, לוּדand לוּדַיםare used for one people, apparently the Mizraite Ludim, most probably kindred to the Lubim, this objection is not conclusive. SEE CHUB; SEE LUDIM. In Jer 46:9, the A.V. renders Phut 'the Libyans;' and in Eze 38:5, Libya.'" SEE LIBYA.

## Lubin, Augustin[[@Headword:Lubin, Augustin]]

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

## Lubin, Eilhard[[@Headword:Lubin, Eilhard]]

             one of the most learned Protestants of his time, was born at Westersted, in Oldenburg, March 24,1556, of which place his father was minister. He was  educated first at Leipsic, where he prosecuted his studies with great success, and for further improvement went thence to Cologne. After this he visited the several universities of Helmstadt, Strasburg, Jena, Marpurg, and, last of all, Rostock, where he was made professor of poetry in 1595, and ten years later was advanced to the divinity chair in the same university. He died in June 1621. One of his works deserves special mention, Phosphorus de prima causa et natura mali, tractatus hypermetaphysicus, etc. (Rostock, 1596, and 8vo and 12mo in 1600), in which he established two coeternal principles (not matter and a vacuum, or void, as Epicurus did, but), God and the nihilum, or nothing. God, he supposed, is the good principle, and nothing the evil principle. He added that sin was nothing else but a tendency towards nothing, and that sin had been necessary in order to make known the nature of good; and the applied to this nothing all that Aristotle says of the first matter. He was answered by Grawer, but published a reply entitled Apologeticus quo Alb. Graw. calumnniis respond., etc. (Rostock, 1605). He likewise published the next year, Tractatus de causa peccati, ad theologos Augustinea confessionis in Gernmaniai. See Gen. Biog. Dict. s.v.; Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v.

## Luca, Antonio De[[@Headword:Luca, Antonio De]]

             cardinal-bishop of Palestrina and vice-chancellor of the Church of Rome, was born October 28, 1805, at Bronte, Sicily. In 1863 he was made cardinal, and died December 29, 1883. He was one of the most prominent members of the college of cardinals, chief of the apostolic chancery, and, with the cardinals Pitra and Hergenrither, had charge of the archives and the Vatican library. (B.P.)

## Luca, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Luca, Giovanni Battista]]

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

## Lucanus Or Lucianus[[@Headword:Lucanus Or Lucianus]]

             a disciple of Marcion and the Gnostics, flourished in the latter part of the second century. He denied the reality of the body of Christ, as well as the immateriality and immortality of the soul. He regarded the souls of animals as of the same kind with those of men, and allowed the resurrection of the  former. He is known to have been the author of numerous forgeries: among others, the History of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, the Protevangelion, or History of James, the Gospel of Nicodemus. He seems to have been the same heretic who is sometimes called Lucius, Leicius, Leucius, Lentitizs, Leontius, Lentius, Seleucus, Charinus, Nexocharides, and Leonides. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v. See Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:245. SEE LUCIAN, ST.

## Lucarinos, Reginaldo[[@Headword:Lucarinos, Reginaldo]]

             an Italian Dominican, who died October 10, 1671, is the author of, Episcopus Regularis: — Manuale Controversiarum Thomisticarum: — Hermes Biblicus: — Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ordinis Prcedicantiunz. See Echard, De Scriptoribus Ordinis Domninicanorum; Ughelli, Italia Sacra ; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lucarius, Cyrillus[[@Headword:Lucarius, Cyrillus]]

             SEE CYRIL, LUCAR.

## Lucas[[@Headword:Lucas]]

             (Δουκᾶς,Vulg. Lucas), a friend and companion of Paul during his imprisonment at Rome (Phm 1:24). A.D. 57. He is doubtless the same as Luke, the beloved physician, who is associated with Demas in Col 4:14, and who remained faithful to the apostle when others forsook him (2Ti 4:11), on his first examination before the emperor. For the grounds of his identification with the evangelist Luke, SEE LUKE.

## Lucas, De Tuy (Or Tudensis)[[@Headword:Lucas, De Tuy (Or Tudensis)]]

             a Spanish theologian and writer, was born at Leon, where he became canon of St. Isidore, and was afterwards appointed deacon of Tuy, in Gallicia. In 1227 he made a journey to Jerusalem, saw pope Gregory IX in Italy, and also the general of the Order of Franciscans. He was appointed bishop of Tuy in 1239, and died in 1250. He wrote a Chronicle of Spain, extending from 670 to 1236 (published by Schott in his Hisp. Ill., Francf. 1663, fol., volume 4), and a Vita et historia translationis S. Isidori, which is reproduced in the article on that saint in the Acta Sanctorum, April 4. The second part of this work, which does not at all relate to St. Isidore, is a passionate and superficial attack against the Cathari (q.v.); valuable, however, for its information concerning some customs of that sect in the south of France and in Spain. This part of Lucas's work was published separately by Mariana, under the inappropriate title of Libri tres de altera vita fideique controversiis contra Albigensium errores (Ingolst. 1613, 4to; reprinted in the Biblioth. Patrum Maximna, 25:188, and in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Cologne, 13:228). Lucas also rejected as heretical the view which afterwards obtained of the three persons of the Trinity being of  different ages, and asserted, contrarily to the then prevailing notion, that Christ ought not to be represented as crucified with the feet crossed, but with the two feet side by side, each pierced with a separate nail. — Herzog, Real-Encykl. 8:558. (J.N.P.)

## Lucas, Franciscus[[@Headword:Lucas, Franciscus]]

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

## Lucas, Richard[[@Headword:Lucas, Richard]]

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

## Lucatelli (or Locatelli), Pietro[[@Headword:Lucatelli (or Locatelli), Pietro]]

             a distinguished Roman painter, was born in 1660, and studied under Ciro Ferri. He was elected a member of the Academy of St. Luke in 1690, and executed some works for the public edifices at Rome. His paintings in the Church of San Agostino, and in the Collegio Fuccioli, are highly commended. He died in 1741. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Lucchi, Michael Angelo[[@Headword:Lucchi, Michael Angelo]]

             an Italian prelate, was born at Brescia, August 20, 1744. He made his profession at Monte Cassino, where he was appointed to teach philosophy and theology. He visited the principal libraries of Italy, and collected a number of ancient MSS., now in the Vatican. Pius VII called him to Rome, made him cardinal, February 23, 1801, and intrusted him with the censorship of books. He died at Subiaco, September 29, 1802, leaving several works on the Greek and Latin classics. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Luce, Abraham[[@Headword:Luce, Abraham]]

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

## Lucena, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Lucena, Lorenzo]]

             a Spanish Romadi Catholic theologian, was born in 1807. He was ordained deacon by the bishop of Cordova in 1830, and priest in 1831 by the suffragan bishop of Seville. For eight years he acted as professor of  theology at the College of St. Pelagius, in the University of Seville, and for three years held the office of provisional president there. In 1842 he was appointed honorary canon of Gibraltar Cathedral, and reader in the Spanish language and literature in the Taylorian Institution at Oxford, in 1861. He assisted in preparing the new edition of the Spanish Bible, generally known as that of Cipriano de Valera, and published by the British and Foreign Bible Society. He died at Oxford, August 24, 1881. (B.P.)

## Lucernarium[[@Headword:Lucernarium]]

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

## Luchan[[@Headword:Luchan]]

             in Mongolian mythology, is a mighty dragon, inhabiting the great sea, constantly growing, and destined finally to devour the universe.

## Lucia[[@Headword:Lucia]]

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

## Lucian[[@Headword:Lucian]]

             (Δουκιανός), a celebrated Greek rhetorician, the Voltaire of Grecian literature, was born at Samosata, a city on the west bank of the Euphrates, in the Syrian province of Commagene. We possess no particulars respecting his life on which any reliance can be placed except a few scattered notices in his own writings. From these it appears that he was born about the latter end of Trajan's reign (A.D. 53-117), that he lived under both the Antonines, and died about the end of the 2d century. His parents, who were in humble circumstances, placed him with his maternal uncle, a sculptor, in order to learn statuary; but he soon quitted this trade, and applied himself to the study of the law. He afterwards practiced at the bar in Syria and Greece; but. not meeting with much success in this profession, he resolved to settle in Gaul as a teacher of rhetoric, where he soon obtained great celebrity and numerous scholars. He appears to have remained in Gaul till he was about forty, when he gave up the profession of rhetoric, after having acquired considerable wealth. During the remainder  of his life we find him traveling about from place to place, and visiting successively Macedonia, Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and Bithynia. The greater part of his time, however, was passed in Athens, where he lived on terms of the greatest intimacy with Demonax, a philosopher of great celebrity, and where he probably wrote most of his works, which principally consist of attacks upon the religion and philosophy of his age. Towards the latter part of his life he held a lucrative public office in Egypt, which was bestowed upon him by the emperor Commodus. The account of his being torn to death by dogs for his attack on the Christian religion rests on no credible authority, and was probably invented by Suidas, who appears to have been the earliest to relate it.

The writings of Lucian, in the form of dialogue, are in a remarkably pure and elegant Greek style, free from the false ornaments and artificial rhetoric which characterize most of the writings of his contemporaries. Modern critics have usually given him his full need of praise for these excellences, and have also deservedly admired the keenness of his wit, his great talent as a writer, and the inimitable ease and flow of his dialogue; but they have seldom done him the justice he deserves. They have either represented him as merely a witty and amusing writer, but without any further merit, or else they have attacked him as an immoral and infidel author, whose only object was to corrupt the minds of his readers, and to throw ridicule upon all religion. But these opinions appear to us to have arisen from a mistaken and one-sided view of the character of Lucian and an intent to utterly ignore the peculiarities of the period in which he flourished. He seems to us to have endeavored to expose all kinds of delusion, fanaticism, and imposture; the quackery and imposition of the priests, the folly and absurdity of the superstitious, and especially the solemn nonsense, the prating insolence, and the immoral lives of the philosophical charlatans of his day (see his Alexander). Lucian may, in fact, be regarded as the Aristophanes of his age, and, like the great comic poet, he had recourse to raillery and satire to accomplish the great objects he had in view. His study was human character in all its varieties, and the times in which he lived furnished ample materials for his observation.

Many of his pictures, though drawn from the circumstances of his own days, are true for every age and country. As an instance of this, we mention the essay entitled On those who serve the Great for Hire. If he sometimes discloses the follies and vices of mankind too freely, and occasionally uses expressions which are revolting to our ideas of morality, it should. be recollected that every  author ought to be judged by his standard of religion and morality. The character of Lucian's mind was decidedly practical; he was not disposed to believe anything without sufficient evidence of its truth, and nothing that was ridiculous or absurd escaped his raillery and sarcasm. The tales of the poets respecting the attributes and exploits of the gods, which were still firmly believed by the common people of his age, were especially the objects of his satire and ridicule in his dialogues and in many other of his works. That he should have attacked the Christians in common with the false systems of the pagan religion will not appear surprising to any one who considers that Lucian probably never took the trouble to inquire into the doctrines of a religion which was almost universally despised in his time by the higher orders of society, who did, indeed, visit with ridicule all religious belief. Says Gibbon (Harpers' edit. 1:36), "We may be well assured that a writer conversant with the world would never have ventured to expose the gods of his country to public ridicule had they not already been the objects of secret contempt among the polished and enlightened orders of society." Volaterranus, indeed, affirmed, but without stating his authority, that Lucian apostatized from Christianity, and was accustomed to say he had gained nothing by it but the corruption of his name from Lucius to Lucianus. So also the scholiast on the Peregrius calls him παραβάτης, while the scholiasts on the Verae Historia and other pieces frequently apostrophize him in the bitterest terms, and make the most far- fetched and absurd charges against him of ridiculing the Scriptures. These accusations of blasphemy, however, could be made only against an apostate, and such, it is now well established, Lucian was not.

Born of pagan parents. he led the life of a pagan philosopher of the 2d century, when, as Gibbon tells us, "the ingenious youth who, from every part, resorted to Athens, and the other seats of learning in the Roman empire, were alike instructed in every school to reject and to despise the religion of the multitude" (1:36). Lucian is no more amenable to the charge of blasphemy than Tacitus or any other profane author, who, from ignorance of the Christian religion, has been led to vilify and misrepresent it. The charge might be urged with some color against Lucian if it could be shown that he was the author of the dialogue entitled Philopatris. A sneering tone pervades the whole piece, which betrays so intimate a knowledge of Christianity that it could hardly have been written but by one who had been at some time within the pale of the Church. Some eminent critics, and among them Fabricius (Biblioth. Graeca, 5:340 [ed. Harles]), have held Lucian accountable for this production, but it is now pretty generally  admitted not to be from his pen. (Compare Gesner, De AEtate et Auctore Philopatridis, in which it is shown that the piece could not have been Lucian's; and many considerations are brought forward which render it very probable that the work was composed in the reign of Julian the Apostate. Compare Neander, Church History, 2:89, note 5.)

The works of Lucian may be divided into,

I. RHETORICAL. — Περὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου, Somnium seu Vita Luciani: ῾Ηρόδοτος, Herodotus sive Aetion; Ζεύξις, Zeuxis sive Antiochus; Α῾ρμονίδης, Harmonides; Σκύθης ἤ Πρόξενος, Scytha; ῾Ιππίας ἢ Βαλανείον, Hippias seu Bableum; Προσλαλία ἢ Λιόνυσος, Bacchus; Προσλαλία ἤ ῾Η ρακλῆς, Hercules Gallicus; Περὶ τοῦ ἠλἐκτρου ἢ τῶν κύκνων, De Electro seu Cygnis; Περὶ τοῦ οἴκου De Domo; περὶ τῶν διψάδων, De Dipsadibus; τυρανυοκτόνος, Tyrannicida (perhaps spurious); Α᾿ποκηρυττόμενος, Abdicatus (attributed sometimes to Libanius); Φάλαρις πρῶτος καὶ δεύτερος, Phalaris prior et alter; Μυίας ἐγκῶμιον, Encomium Muscae; Πατρίδος ἐγκώμιον, Patriae Encomium.

II. CRITICAL WORKS. — Δίκηφωνηέτων, Judicium Vocalium; Λεξιφάνης, Lexiphanes (considered by some as directed against the Onomasticon of Pollux, by others against Athenseus); Πῶς δεῖἱστορίαν συγγάφειν, Quomodo Historia sit conscribenda, the best of Lucian's critical works; ῾Ρητόρων διδάσκαλος, Rhetorum Preceptor; Ψευδολογιστής, Pseudologista; Δημοσθένους ἐγκῶμιον, Demosthenis Encomium (rejected by some as spurious); Ψευδοσφιστής, Paseudosophista (also attacked, and on better grounds than the preceding).

III. BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS. — Α᾿λέξανδρος ἣ Ψευδόμαντις, Alexander seu Pseudomantis; Δημώνακτος βίος, Vita Demonactis; and Περὶ τῆς Περεγρίνου τελευτῆς, De Vorte Peregrini. This last work, containing an account of the life and voluntary auto-da-fe of Peregrinus Proteus, a fanatical cynic and apostate Christian, who publicly burnt himself from an impulse of vain-glory about A.D. 165, is really, for us, the most important work under consideration; for Lucian here discharges his satire upon Cynicism and Christianity. Peregrinus, a perfectly contemptible man, after having committed the commonest and grossest crimes — adultery, sodomy, and patricide — joins the credulous Christians in  Palestine, cunningly imposes on them, soon rises to the highest repute among them, and, becoming one of the confessors in prison, is loaded with presents by them, in fact, almost worshipped as a god, but is afterwards excommunicated for eating some forbidden food (probably meat of the idolatrous sacrifices), then casts himself into the arms of the Cynics, travels about everywhere in the filthiest style of that sect, and at last, about the year 165, in frantic thirst for fame, plunges into the flames of a funeral pile before the assembled populace of the town of Olympia for the triumph of philosophy. "Perhaps this fiction of the self-burning," says Dr. Schaff (Church History, 1:189), "was meant for a parody on the Christian martyrdom, possibly of Polycarp, who about that time suffered death by fire at Smyrna.... An Epicurean worldling and infidel, as Lucian was, could see in Christianity only one of the many vagaries and follies of mankind, in the miracles only jugglery, in the belief of immortality an empty dream, and in the contempt of death and the brotherly love of the Christians, to which he was constrained to testify, a silly enthusiasm."

We certainly find in Lucian a singular combination of impartiality and injustice. Wrongly interpreting rather than misrepresenting the Christian belief, he treats its advocates oftener with a compassionate smile than with hatred. He nowhere urges persecution. He never calls Christ an impostor, as Celsus does, but a "crucified sophist," a term which he uses as often in a good as in a bad sense. But then, in the end, both the Christian and the heathen religions amount, in his view, to imposture; and there is in all his writings, says Pressense (Early Years of Christianity, 2 [N.Y. 1871, 12mo], 454), "scarcely a page which is not an insult to religion in itself. That by which he is mainly distinguished is what may be called his universal impiety, his contempt of all greatness, goodness, or glory. He was the most accomplished disciple of the nil admirari school," and hence he has most aptly been termed the Voltaire of his day (compare Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. d. ersten sechs Jahrh. [Leipsic, 1869] page 161). It remains a question simply whether in these contemptuous exhibitions of all religion he aimed merely to satirize the failings of the advocates of religious belief, or whether he actually himself believed nothing. The latter must certainly be doubted when we consider his expose of Pyrrhonismn (q.v.); and we are inclined to accept as most just the treatment he has received at the hands of Thomas Dyer, in Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 2:814, Colossians 2, based on Lucian's own statement in his Α῾λιεύς (§ 20), and in his Alexander (§ 54), where he indignantly spurns the charge of immorality brought against him. Mr. Dyer concedes that Lucian was "a hater of pride,  falsehood, and vainglory, and an ardent admirer of truth, simplicity, and all that is naturally amiable." (Comp. however, the dissertations by Krebs, De Malitioso Luciani Consilio Religionem, Christianam scurrili dicacitate vanam et ridiculam reddendi [Opusc. Acad. page 308 sq.], and Eichstadt, Lucianus num scriptis suis adjuvare voluerit Religionem Christianam [Jena, 1822].)

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

V. DIALOGUES. — These dialogues, which form the great bulk of his works, are of very various degrees of merit, and are treated in the greatest possible variety of style, from seriousness down to the broadest humor and buffoonery. Their subjects and tendencies, too, vary considerably. Still we may divide them into three classes: first, those which are more exclusively directed against the heathen mythology; next, those which attack the ancient philosophy; and, lastly, those in which both the preceding objects are combined, or which, having no such tendency, are mere satires on the manners of the day, and the follies and vices natural to mankind. In the first class may be placed Προμηθεὺς ἣ Καύκασος, Prometheus seu Caucasus; Ε᾿νάλιοι Διάλογοι, Dei Marini; Ζεὺς Ε᾿λεγχόμενος, Jupiter Confutatus; Ζεὺς τργóδος, Jupiter Tragoedus, which strikes at the very existence of Jupiter and that of the other deities; Θεῶν ἐκκλησία, Deorun Concilium; Τὰ πρὸς Κρόνον, Saturnalia. To the second class belong Βίων πρᾶσις, Vitarum Auctio: in this humorous piece the heads of the different sects are put up to sale, Hermes being the auctioneer. The Α῾λιεὺς ἣ Α᾿ναβιῦντες, Piscator seu Reviviscentes, is a sort of apology for the preceding piece, and may be reckoned among Lucian's best dialogues; Ερμότιμος is chiefly an attack upon the Stoics, but its design is also to show the impossibility of becoming a true philosopher; Εὐνοῦχος, Eunuchus; Φιλοψευδής, on the  love of falsehood natural to some men purely for its own sake. Some commentators have thought that the Christian miracles were alluded to in § 13 and § 16, but this does not seem probable; the Δραπέται, Fugitivi, is directed against the Cynics, by whom Lucian seems to have been attacked for his life of Peregrinus; Ευμπόσιον ἣ Λαπίθαι, Convivium seu Lapithae, is one of Lucian's most humorous attacks on the philosophers. The third and more miscellaneous class, containing some of his best, includes Τίμων ἣ μισάνθρωπος, Timon, which may perhaps be regarded as Lucian's masterpiece. The Νεκρικοὶ Διάλογοι, Dialogi Mortuorum, are perhaps the best known of all Lucian's works. The subject affords great scope for moral reflection, and for satire on the vanity of human pursuits. Among modern writers, these dialogues have been imitated by Fontenelle and lord Lyttelton.

The Μένιππος ἣ Νεκυομαντεία, Vecyomanteia, bears some analogy to the Dialogues of the Dead: it wants, however, Lucian's pungency, and Du Saul thought that it was written by Menippus himself. The Ι᾿καρομένιππος ἣ ῾Υπερνέφελος, Icaro-Menippus, on the contrary, is in Lucian's best vein, and a masterpiece of Aristophanic humor. Χάρων ἣ ἐπισκοποῦντες, Contemplantes, is a very elegant dialogue, but of a graver turn than the preceding; it is a picture of the smallness of mankind when viewed from a philosophic as well as a physical height. The Κατάπλους ἣ Τω῏/ραννος, Kataplus sive Tyrannus is, in fact, a dialogue of the dead. ῎Ονειρος ἣ Α᾿λεκτρύων, Somnium seu Gallus, justly reckoned among the best of Lucian's. Δὶς κατηγορούμενος, Bis Accusatus, so called from Lucian's being arraigned by Rhetoric and Dialogue, is chiefly valuable for the information it contains of the author's life and literary pursuits. We may here also mention the Κρονοσόλων, Crono-Solon, and the Ε᾿πιστολαὶ Κρονικαί Epistolae Saturnales, which turn on the institution and customs of the Saturnalia. Among the dialogues which may be regarded as mere pictures of manners, without any polemical tendency, may be reckoned ῎Ερωτες; ῾Εταιρικοὶ Διάλογοι, Dialogi Meretricii; Πλοῖονἢ Εὐχαί, Navigium seu vota. Among the dialogues which cannot be placed in any of the above three classes are the Εἰκόνες, Imagines, which some suppose to have been addressed to a concubine of Verus, and which Wieland conjectures to have been intended for the wife of Marcus Antoninus; Υπὲρ τῶν Εἰκόνων, Pro Imaginibus, a defense of the preceding, with the flattery of which the lady who was the subject of it pretended to be displeased. Τόξαρις, Toxaris, on friendship; Α᾿νάχαρσις, Anacharsis, an attack upon the Greek gymnasia; Περὶ ἀρχήσεως, De Saltatione: this piece is hardly worthy of Lucian, but contains some curious  particulars of the art of dancing among the ancients. Διάλεξις πρὸς ῾Ησίοδον, Dissertatio cusm lesiodo, the genuineness of which is doubted.

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

Πρὸς ἀπαίδευτον, Adversus Indoctum,, is a bitter attack upon a rich man who thought to acquire a character for learning by collecting a large library. Περὶ τοῦμὴ ῥᾷδίως πιστεύειν διαβολῇ), Non temere credendum esse Delttioni.

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

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

Editions. — Lucian's works were first published (in Greek) at Florence in 1496, folio, from rather incorrect MSS.; a corrected edition was brought out at Venice by Antoni Francini in 1535 (2 volumes, 8vo), very good and  scarce. The first edition of the Greek text with a Latin version appeared at Basle in 1563 (4 volumes, 8vo), the result of the work of several savans: the parts of Erasmus, T. Morus, J. Micyllus, are deserving of praise; this is not the case with that of Vincent Obsopoeus. The notes by Samnbucus are considered of no account, but those of Gilbert Cousin are highly esteemed. In 1730 the distinguished philologist, Tib. Hemsterhuys, began to print his excellent edition; but dying in 1736, before a quarter of it had been finished, the editorship was assigned to J.F. Reitz, a much less capable man: it appeared at Utrecht in 1743 (4 volumes, 4to; republished by Schmidt, at Mittau, 1776-1780, 8 volumes, 8vo). This edition contains a large number of valuable notes; the last volume is a lexicon. A much esteemed edition is that of Deux-Ponts, 1789-93, 10 volumes, 8vo, which is a careful reprint of Hemsterhuys's edition, the lexicon being replaced by an index, and the 10th volume containing the various readings compiled by Belin de Ballu from the MSS. in the Royal Library of Paris. In 1800 Schmieder published at Halle a text without translation, with various readings compiled from the libraries of France and Germany. There were to appear commentaries in connection with it, which, however, were not published. This edition is much esteemed, although some of the various readings are thought to have been collected without sufficient care. The edition of Lehmann (Lpz. 1821-31, 9 volumes, 8vo), with a large number of notes, is of great use for the correct understanding of the text. A much esteemed edition is that of C. Jacobitz (Lpz. 183741, 4 volumes, 8vo); the text was established with the aid of the most valuable MSS. and with the greatest care. Dindorf published in 1840, at Paris, a Greek text of Lucian, with a Latin version, but no notes, which forms part of the Bibliotheca Graec, and stands deservedly high. Separate pieces of Lucian's have been often published.

Lucian has been translated into most of the European languages. In French the best editions are by Belin de Ballu in 1788 (6 volumes, 8vo), and by Eugene Talbot (Par. 1857, 2 volumes, 18mo). Among the English versions may be named one by several parties, including W. Moyle, Sir H. Shere, and Charles Blount (Lond. 1711). It was several years preparing, and Dryden wrote for it a life of Lucian, which is very incorrect. Carr's version (17731798, 4 volumes, 8vo) is a pretty correct translation, but the notes are valueless. The best English version is that of Dr. Franklin (Lond. 1780, 2 volumes, 4to, and 1781, 4 volumes, 8vo), but some of the pieces are omitted. Mr. Hooke's version (London, 1820, 2 volumes, 4to) is of little  value. In 1675 Charles Cotton published a burlesque imitation of some of the dialogues: it was reprinted in 1686 and 1751. The best German translation of Lucian has been furnished by Wieland (Leips. 1788, 6 volumes, 8vo). The notes accompanying it are also valuable; but the translator left out some pieces which he considered of minor interest. Another good translation is by Pauly (Stuttgardt, 1828-1831, 15 volumes, 12mo). See, besides the authorities already quoted, Jacob, Characteristic Lucian's v. Samosata (1832); Tiemann, Versuch u. Lucian und seine Philosophie (1804): Struve, Specimina ii de AEtate et vita Luciani (1829- 30); Passow, Lucian u. d. Gesch. (1854); Tzschirner, Fall des Heidenthums, 1:315 sq.; Baur, Die drei ersten Jahrhunderte, page 395 sq.; Donaldson, Greek Literature, chapter 54, § 3 and 4; Lardner, Works, 8, chapter 19; Farrar, Crit. Hist. Free Thought, page 48 sq.; Lond. Qu. Rev. 1828; Fraser's Magazine, 1839; Journal Sac. Lit. volumes 10 and 12; and especially Planck, in Studien u. Kritiken. 1851, and in an English version in the Biblioth. Sacra, 1853 (April and July) Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol. 3:812, and the excellent article by Theodor Keim, in Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie 6, 8:497-504.

## Lucian (2)[[@Headword:Lucian (2)]]

             ST., presbyter of Antioch, and a martyr, is said by some to have been born at Samosata, in the Syrian province of Commagene, about the middle of the 3d century. His parents died while he was yet a boy, and, left to depend upon his own resources, the twelve-year old lad removed to Edessa, where he was baptized, and became a pupil of Macarius, an eminent Biblical schelar. He entered the ministry as a presbyter at Antioch, and finally assumed the lead of a theological school, which he himself founded. He became greatly celebrated both as an ecclesiastic and as a Biblical scholar, and was an ornament of the Christian Church when suddenly cut down by martyrdom, which he suffered A.D. 312, by order of Maximin, during the reign of Diocletian. He was drowned, and was buried at Helenopolis, in Bithynia. Lucian is frequently mentioned by ecclesiastical writers not only as a man of great learning, but also as noted for his piety. Eusebius calls him a "person of unblemished character throughout his whole life" (Hist. Ecc 8:13); and Chrysostom, on the anniversary of Lucian's martyrdom, pronounced a panegyric upon him which is still extant. Jerome informs us, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers (c. 77), that "Lucian was so laborious in the study of the sacred writings that in his own time some copies of the Scriptures were known by the name of Lucian;" and we learn  from another part of his works (Praef. in Paralip. 1:1023) that Lucian's revision of the Septuagint version of the Old Test. was generally used in the churches, from Constantinople to Antioch. Lucian also made a revision of the New Testament, which Jerome considered inferior to his edition of the Septuagint. There were extant in Jerome's time some treatises of Lucian concerning faith, and also some short epistles; but none of these have come down to us, with the exception of a few fragments.

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

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

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

## Lucianists Or Lucanists[[@Headword:Lucianists Or Lucanists]]

             a sect so called from their founder. SEE LUCANUS.

## Lucidus[[@Headword:Lucidus]]

             a presbyter in the Gallic Church in the 5th century, was one of the most distinguished members of the ecclesiastical party which in that period defended the doctrines of St. Augustine against Semi-Pelagianism then greatly preponderating in the Church. The views of Lucidus are to be ascertained from the works resulting from the controversy between himself and Faustus of Rieg, who obliged him to recant. The latter wrote against Lucidus his Fausti Rejensis epistola ad Lucidum, and the recantation of Lucidus — probably posterior to the Synod of Aries, 475, as indicated by the expression, "Juxta praedicandi recentia statuta concilii damno vobiscum sensum ilium," etc. — is entitled Lucidi errorem emendantis libellus ad episcopos. In some respects Lucidus, indeed, had gone further than St. Augustine himself, especially in regard to predestination. allowing no free agency to man, and making all the workings of human conscience to be but the effects of the immediate and gratuitous influence of God. Such, at least, is the accusation which was brought against him at the Council of Aries. The text of his recantation is to be found in all the Bibl. Patr. and in the collections of councils. See Hist. Litt. de la France, 2:454; Mansi, 7:1008 sq.; Bibl. PP. edit. 2, volume 4, page 875; Wiggers, August. u. Pelag.  2:225, 329, 346; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 18:148 sq.; Gfrorer, Kirchengesch. volume 2, part 2. (J.N.P.)

## Lucifer[[@Headword:Lucifer]]

             (Heb. Heylel', הֵילֵל; Sept. ὁ ῾Εωσφόρος), a word that once occurs in the English Version in the lines,

"How art thou fallen from heaven,

O Lucifer, son of the morning!

How art thou cut down to the ground,

Which didst weaken the nations!"

(Isa 14:12). It is taken from the Vulgate, which understood the Hebrew word to be the name of the morning star, and therefore rendered it by the Latin name of that star, Lucifer, i.e., "light-bringing." The derivation has been supposed to be from הָלִל, halal', to shine. The same word here translated "Lucifer," however, occurs also in Eze 21:12 [17], as the imperative of יָלִל, yalal', " to howl," "to lament," and is there rendered "howl." Some take it in the same acceptation in the above passage, and would translate. "Howl, son of the morning!" But to this the structure of the verse is entirely opposed, for the parallelism requires the second line to refer entirely to the condition of the star before it had fallen, as the parallel member, the fourth line, does to the state of the tree before it was cut down. Hence the former derivation is to be preferred, namely, "brilliant," "splendid," "illustrious," or, as in the Septuagint, Vulgate, the rabbinical commentators, Luther, and others, "brilliant star;" and if Henylel, in this sense, was the proper name among the Hebrews of the morning star, then "Lucifer" is not only a correct but beautiful interpretation, both as regards the sense and the application. That it was such is probable from the fact that the proper name of the morning star is formed by a word or words expressive of brilliance, in the Arabic and Syriac, as well as in the Greek and Latin (see Gesenius, Commentar, ad loc.). Tertullian and Gregory the Great understood this passage of Isaiah in reference to the fall of Satan; in consequence of which the name Lucifer has since been applied to Satan, and this is how the usual acceptation of the word. But Dr. Henderson, who in his Isaiah renders the line "Illustrious son of the morning!" justly remarks in his annotation: "The application of this passage to Satan, and to the fall of the apostate angels, is one of those gross perversions of Sacred Writ which so extensively obtain, and which are to be traced to a proneness to  seek for more in any given passage than it really contains, a disposition to be influenced by sound rather than sense, and an implicit faith in received interpretations." The scope and connection show that none but the king of Babylon is meant. In the figurative language of the Hebrews, a star signifies an illustrious king or prince (Num 24:17; compare Rev 2:28; Rev 22:16). The monarch here referred to, laving surpassed all other kings in royal splendor, is compared to the harbinger of day, whose brilliancy surpasses that of the surrounding stars. Falling from heaven denotes a sudden political overthrow — a removal from the position of high and conspicuous dignity formerly occupied (comp. Rev 6:13; Rev 8:10). Delitzsch adopts the same view (Comment. ad loc.). "In another and far higher sense, however, the designation was applicable to him in whom promise and fulfillment entirely corresponded, and it is so applied by Jesus when he styles himself 'The bright and morning Star' (Rev 22:16). In a certain sense it is the emblem also of all those who are destined to live and reign with him (Rev 2:28)." SEE STAR.

## Lucifer, Bishop Of Cagliari[[@Headword:Lucifer, Bishop Of Cagliari]]

             in Sardinia, surnamed Calaritanus, a noted character in ecclesiastical history, the founder of an independent sect known as Luciferians, flourished about the middle of the 4th century. At the Council of Milan, held in 354, he appeared as joint legate with Eusebius of Vercelli from pope Liberius, and here he displayed great opposition to the Arian believers. He refused to hold any communion with the clergy who had, during the reign of Constantius, conformed to the Arian doctrines, although it had been determined in a synod at Alexandria, in 352, to receive again into the Church all the Arian clergy who openly acknowledged their errors, and was, in consequence, imprisoned for a time, and finally banished. He took up his residence in Syria, but here also became involved in disputes, and greatly increased the disorders which agitated the Church at Antioch by his ordination of Paulinus as bishop in opposition to Meletius. Disapproved and ignored by his former friends and associates, he retired in disgust to his native island, and there founded an independent sect, whose distinguishing tenet was that no Arian bishop, and no bishop who had in any measure yielded to the Arians, even although he repented and confessed his errors, could enter the bosom of the Church without forfeiting his ecclesiastical rank; and that all bishops and others who admitted the claims of such persons to a full restoration of their  privileges became themselves tainted and outcasts — a doctrine which, had it been acknowledged at this period in its full extent, would have had the effect of excommunicating nearly the whole Christian world. Lucifer died during the reign of Valentinian, about A.D. 370.

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

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

## Luciferians[[@Headword:Luciferians]]

             (I.) is the name of a sect founded by Lucifer of Cagliari (q.v.), which originated as follows: In 360 the Arians of Antioch had chosen Seletius of Sebaste, formerly a Eusebian, but afterwards an adherent of the Nicene Confession, their bishop. But his inaugural discourse convinced them of their mistake about his views, and they deposed him after the lapse of only a few days. Meletius was next chosen bishop of the Homoousian congregation at Antioch. The appointment of one who had been an Arian  was, however, resisted by a part of the people, headed by Paulinus, a presbyter. Athanasius and the Synodd of Alexandria. A.D. 362 used every influence to heal this schism. But Lucifel of Cagliari, whom the synod for this purpose reputed to Antioch, took the part of the opposition, and ordained Paulinus counter-bishop. What next followed has been narrated under LUCIFER. A comparison of this sect with the English Puritans is made by Punchard, Hist. of Congregationalisms 1, chapter 3.

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

## Lucifugae[[@Headword:Lucifugae]]

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

## Lucilla[[@Headword:Lucilla]]

             SEE DONATISTS.

## Lucius[[@Headword:Lucius]]

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

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

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

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

## Lucius (2)[[@Headword:Lucius (2)]]

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

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

It is commonly supposed that Lucius is the kinsman of Paul mentioned by that apostle as joining with him in his salutation to the Roman brethren (Rom 16:21). A.D. 55. There is, however, no sufficient reason for regarding him as identical with Luke the Evangelist, though this opinion was apparently held by Origen (ad loc.), and is supported by Calmet, as well as by Wetstein, who adduces in confirmation of it the fact reported by Herodotus (3:121), that the Cyrenians had throughout Greece a high reputation as physicians. But it must be observed that the names are clearly distinct. The missionary companion of Paul was not Lucius, but Lucas or Lucanus, "the beloved physician," who, though named in three different epistles (Col 4:14; 2Ti 4:11; Phm 1:24), is never referred to as a relation. Again, it is hardly probable that Luke, who suppresses his own name as the companion of Paul, would have mentioned himself as one among the more distinguished prophets and teachers at Antioch. Olshausen, indeed, asserts confidently that the notion of Luke and  Lucius being the same person has nothing whatever to support it (Clark's Theol. Lib. 4:513). SEE LUKE.

## Lucius (3)[[@Headword:Lucius (3)]]

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

## Lucius I[[@Headword:Lucius I]]

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

## Lucius II[[@Headword:Lucius II]]

             pope, of Bologna, properly GERHARD CACCIANAMICI, was a regular Augustinian chorister of St. John of Lateran. He was made cardinal priest of Santa Croce of Jerusalem by Honorius II, and vice-chancellor and librarian of the Church of Rome by Innocent II. He was finally elected pope after the death of Celestine II, March 12, 1144. Soon after his accession, the Romans, under the guidance of Arnold of Brescia, rose against the papal authority, determined, by an Arnoldian spirit, SEE  ARNOLD OF BRESCIA, to re-establish the old republic, and to this end appointed a patrician in the capitol to govern them, and chose Jordan, son of Peter Leo, as such, giving him all the revenues of the city, and restricting the pope to the tithes and voluntary offerings. "Caesar should have the things that are Caesar's, the priest the things that are the priest's, as Christ ordained when Peter paid the tribute-money" (compare Neander, Ch. History, 4:151). The pope attempted to oppose this revolution, and, at the head of a band of armed followers, went forth to attack the capitol, but was wounded by a stone, and died of this wound, February 25, 1145. See Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Rom. Empire, 6:426 sq.; Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages, page 226 sq.; Bower, History of the Popes, 6:52 sq. SEE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

## Lucius III[[@Headword:Lucius III]]

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

## Lucius Of Adrianople[[@Headword:Lucius Of Adrianople]]

             (or Hadrcianople), an Eastern prelate of note, flourished as bishop of Adrianople in the 4th century. Decidedly orthodox in his opinions, the predominant and powerful Arians deposed him from his see, and in 340 or  341 we meet him at Rome before pope Julius I pleading for his restoration. Although he went back with a demand from the Roman pontiff to reinstate the deposed orthodox bishop, the Oriental prelates refused to recognize the papal authority, and he did not recover his see until the emperor Constantius, constrained by the threats of his brother Constans, then emperor of the West, restored Lucius (about 347). Upon the death of Constans (350), Lucius was again deposed by the infuriated Arians, and banished. He died in exile. He is commemorated in the Romish Church February 11. See Athanasius, Apolog. de Fuga sua, c. 3; Arianor. ad Monach. c. 19; Socrates, Hist. Ecc 2:15; Ecc 2:23; Ecc 2:26; Bolland, Acta Sanct. Februarii, 2:519; Smith, Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog. and Myth. 2:825.

## Lucius Of Alexandria[[@Headword:Lucius Of Alexandria]]

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

## Lucius, Johann Gottlieb[[@Headword:Lucius, Johann Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 3, 1665, at Dresden. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1687 bachelor of theology, in 1698 licentiate, in 1708 doctor, and in 1712 superintendent at Pirna. Lucius died April 27, 1722. He wrote, De Lege Eterna: — Vindiciae Dissertationis Carpzovianae de Descensu Christi ad Inferos: — De AEternitate Dei: — De Convivificatione Fidelium cum Christo ex Hos 6:2 : — De Cohabitatione et Conglorificatione Fidelium cum Christo ex Joh 17:24. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lucius, Ludovicus[[@Headword:Lucius, Ludovicus]]

             a German Protestant theologian, was born at Basle, February 9, 1577. For some time professor of Hebrew, in the place of Buxtorf, he was called as deacon and rector to Baden, and died June 10, 1642. He wrote, Historia Jesuitica: — Notae in Apocalypsin Johannis: — Dissertatio Arnica cum Joa. Piscatore de Causa Meritoria Justificationis Nostrae Coram Deo: — Anti-Christi Occidentalis in Hungaria Persecutio: Synopsis Anti-  Sociniana: — De Fide et .Moribus Christianorum: — Dictionarium Novi Testamenti: — Compendium Theologie: — SemiPelagianismus Remonstrantium: — Historia Augustini ex Operibus Ejus Collecta. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:531; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lucius, Saint[[@Headword:Lucius, Saint]]

             of Britain, lived in the 2d century. Bede, in his Ecclesiastical History, says that in 154, under the Roman emperors, Marcus Aurelius and Verus, and during the pontificate of Eleutherus, a British king Lucius wrote to the pope, announcing that he wished to become a Christian. Eleutherus favorably received the communication, and sent priests to instruct the Britons in the Christian faith. A similar account may be found in a number of other traditions. See Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Lucius, Samuel[[@Headword:Lucius, Samuel]]

             SEE LUTZ.

## Luck, Johann Philipp[[@Headword:Luck, Johann Philipp]]

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

## Lucke, Gottfried Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Lucke, Gottfried Christian Friedrich]]

             an eminent German theologian, was born at Egeln, near Magdeburg, August 23, 1781. He studied theology at the universities of Halle and Göttingen. In 1813 he became lecturer in the latter university, and in 1816 went to Berlin University, and there lectured on the exegesis of the N.T. Here he became intimate with De Wette and Schleiermacher, whose views greatly influenced the remainder of his career as a theologian. In 1818 he was, at the same time as Giescler, appointed professor at the newly- established University of Bonn and in. 1827 became professor of theology at Göttingen. He died in that city February 14, 1855. He wrote Commentatio de Ecclesia Christianorum apostolica (Götting l813 4to): — Ueber den neutestam. Kanon des Eusebius von Caesarea (Berlin, 1816, 8vo): — Grundriss d. neutestam. Hermeneutik u. ihrer Gesch. (Gatting. 1817, 8ro): — Commentar. 2 d. Schrifien d. l'Evangelisten Johannes (Bonn, 1820-32, 4 volumes, 8vo; 3d edit. 1843-56: transl. into English under the title Commentary on the Epistles of St. Johns, Edinb. 1837,12mo): — Quaestiones ac vindiciae Didymianie (Göttingen, 1829, 4 parts, 4to). He also took part with De Wette and Schleiermacher in the publication of the Theologische Zeitschrift (Berlin, 1819-22, 3 parts, 8vo), and with Gieseler in that of the Zeitschrift für gebildete Christen (Elberfeld, 1823 and 1824, 4 parts, 8vo). He also contributed some valuable articles to the Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 32:165; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:569; Herzog, Real-Encyklops.  8:525 sq.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2:1879; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. 2:860.

## Luckenbach, Abraham[[@Headword:Luckenbach, Abraham]]

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

## Luckey, Samuel, D.D.[[@Headword:Luckey, Samuel, D.D.]]

             a noted minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Rensselaerville, Albany County, N.Y., April 4, 1791; entered the ministry in 1811, at Ottawa, Lower Canada; from 181216, inclusive, labored at Dutchecss, Montgomery, Saratoga, and Pittstown, and in 1817-18 in the city of Troy. In 1819 he was at Rhinebeck and in 1820-21 at Shenectadys, where he received from Union College the degrees of master of arts and of doctor of divinity. The next ten years of his life were spent at New Haven, Brooklyn, Albany, and as presiding elder on the New Haven District. In 1822 he became principal of the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary at Lima, N.Y., where he remained four years. At the General Conference of 1836 he was a delegate, and was elected editor of The Christian Advocate and Journal at New York. At that time the office involved the senior editorship of the Book Room. After an honorable service of four years he returned to the itinerancy, first for a time at Duane Street, New York, and in 1842 was again transferred to the Genesee Conference. From this time to the day of his death (October 11, 1869) he remained in Western New York, residing mostly in Rochester City, but filling the offices of presiding elder, pastor, and chaplain of the Monroe County Penitentiary, in which latter position he served for nine years, bestowing great labor on the reclamation of the fallen. Dr. Luckey had also the honor to be appointed in 1847 one of the regents of the State University. He wrote an excellent treatise on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, a work on the Trinity (a respectable 12mo volume, which gained for him a wide repute for theological acumen and  polemic tact), and a small volume of Ethic Hymns and Scriptural Lessons for Children. The hymns, which are original and not without merit, are rhythmical paraphrases of Scripture, mostly of the Psalms. "Dr. Luckey was a man of no ordinary power of intellect. For depth of penetration and soundness of judgment he had few superiors. His knowledge of the forms and principles of law, both civil and ecclesiastical, was quite extensive. He was a thorough Methodist, and with the genius and historic development of his Church he was as familiar as with the alphabet. He long stood among the magnates of his people, and his history is woven in the history of his Church." See Conf. Minutes, 1870, page 280 sq.

## Lucopetrians[[@Headword:Lucopetrians]]

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

## Lucretius, Titus Carus[[@Headword:Lucretius, Titus Carus]]

             a noted Roman poet, deserves a place here as the exponent of Epicurianism. He flourished some time towards the opening of the 1st century, but of his life we know almost nothing with certainty, as he is mentioned merely in a cursory manner in contemporary literature. St. Jerome, in his translation of the Chronicle of Eusebius, gives the date of his birth as B.C. 95 (according to others, 99), but he does not specify the source from which his statement is derived. It is alleged, further, that he died by his own hand, in the 44th year of his age, having been driven frantic by a love-potion which had been administered to him; that he composed his works in the intervals of his madness, and that these works were revised by Cicero; but all these statements rest on very insufficient authority, and must be received with extreme caution. His peculiar opinions rendered him specially obnoxious to the early Christians, and it is possible that the latter may have been too easily led to attribute to him a fate which, in its mysterious nature and melancholy termination, was deemed but a due  reward for the bold and impious character of his teachings. The great work on which his fame rests is De Rerum Natura, a philosophical didactic poem in six books (editio princeps, Brescia, about 1473; best editions by Wakefield [London, 1796, 3 volumes, 4to, and Glasgow, 1813s 4 volumes, 8vol, by Forbiger [Leips. 1828, 12mo], and by Lachmann [Berlin, 1850, 2 volumes]. English translations in verse by Creech [Lond. 1714, 2 volumes, 8vo], Good [Lond. 1805-7, 2 volumes, 4to]; in prose by the Reverend J.S. Watson. M.A. [London, Bohn's Classical Library, 1851, post 8vo]) — in large measure an exposition of the physical, moral, and religious tenets of Epicurus. SEE EPICURIAN PHILOSOPHY. "Regarded merely as a literary composition, the work of Lucretius stands unrivaled among didactic poems. The clearness and fullness with which the most minute facts of physical science, and the most subtle philosophical speculations are unfolded and explained; the life and interest which are thrown into discussions, in themselves repulsive to the bulk of mankind; the beauty, richness, and variety of the episodes which are interwoven with the subject-matter of the poem, combined with the majestic verse in which the whole is clothed, render the De Rerum Natura, as a work of art, one of the most perfect which antiquity has bequeathed to us" (Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.). See Smith, Dict. Class. Biog. s.v.

## Lud[[@Headword:Lud]]

             (Heb. id. לוּד, derivation unknown; Sept. Λούδ, but in Ezekiel Λυδοί; Auth.Vers. "Lydia," in Eze 30:5), the name apparently of two nations. SEE ETHOLOGY.

1. The fourth son of Shem (B.C. post 2513), and founder of a tribe near the Assyrians and Aramasans (Gen 10:22; 1Ch 1:17). According to Josephus (Ant. 1:6, 4), they were the Lydians; in which opinion agree Eustathius, Eusebius, Jerome, and Isidore, and among moderns Bochart (Phaleg. 2:12) and Gesenius. On the contrary, Michaelis (Spicileg. 2:11.4 sq.) reads הוד, and understands the Indians (see also his Supplement, No. 1416; comp. Vater, Comment. 1:130). Lud would thus be represented by the Lydus of the mythical period (Herod. 1:7). "The Shemitic character of the manners of the Ludim, and the strong Orientalism of the art of the Lydian kingdom during its latest period and after the Persian conquest, but before the predominance of Greek art in Asia Minor, favor this idea; but, on the other hand, the Egyptian monuments show us in the 13th, 14th. and 15th centuries B.C. a powerful people called RUTEN  or LUDEN, probably seated near Mesopotamia, and apparently north of Palestine. whom some, however, make the Assyrians. We may perhaps conjecture that the Lydians first established themselves near Palestine, and afterwards spread into Asia Minor; the occupiers of the old seat of the race being destroyed or rermoved by the Assyrians." With the latter supposition, compare the apocryphal statement in Jdt 2:23. SEE LYDIA.

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

## Luddimilia, Elisabeth Von Schwarzburg Rudolfstadt[[@Headword:Luddimilia, Elisabeth Von Schwarzburg Rudolfstadt]]

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

## Luderwald, Johann Balthasar, D.D.[[@Headword:Luderwald, Johann Balthasar, D.D.]]

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

## Ludgardis[[@Headword:Ludgardis]]

             (LUDGARIS, or LUTGARDIS), a celebrated thaumaturgist of the 12th century, was born about 1182. At the early age of twelve she entered the Benedictine convent of St. Trudo, and soon gave evidence of mystic tendencies. She claimed to have visions in which she held familiar converse with the Virgin Mary, the angels, John the Baptist and the apostles, St. Catharine, and a number of other saints. Once she stated she had seen St. John the evangelist in the form of a shining eagle, who, opening her mouth with his beak, filled her with divine wisdom. But Christ himself was generally the object of her ecstatic visions. After taking the veil in 1200, she was in 1205 appointed abbess of the convent. In 1206, by advice of John de Lirot and of St. Christine, she entered the convent of the  Cistercians of Aquiric, near Brussels. Here her visions became still more striking and numerous: in her meditations on the sufferings of Christ her body became covered with blood, etc. She was also said to have worked a great number of miracles. She died June 16, 1246. Her biography was written by the Dominican Thomas Cantipratanus. See Alban Stolz, Legenden (Freib. 1856), volumr 2:1. c. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:511.

## Ludger, Saint[[@Headword:Ludger, Saint]]

             a German prelate, was born in Friesland. In his early youth he studied under the discipline of St. Gregory, who governed the school as well as the Church of Utrecht. In 802 he is noticed at Rome, and next at Monte Cassino, where he stayed two years; finally returning to the barbarians, he preached the gospel to the Saxons and the Frieslanders, where, about the same period, he became chief of the Church of Munster. He died March 26, 809, leaving a single work, The Life of St. Gregory, Abbot of Utrecht (published in the Acta Sanctorum). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ludi Fun-bres[[@Headword:Ludi Fun-bres]]

             (funeral games) were celebrated at the funeral pyre of distinguished persons among the ancient Greeks and Romans. They were private entertainments, given by survivors in honor of their deceased friends, and were sometimes continued for two or three days.

## Ludi Martiales[[@Headword:Ludi Martiales]]

             (martial games) were celebrated every year among the ancient Romans in the circus, August 1, in honor of Mars.

## Ludicke, Johann August[[@Headword:Ludicke, Johann August]]

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

## Ludim[[@Headword:Ludim]]

             (Heb. Ludim', לוּדַים, Sept. Λωδιείμ; in 1 Chronicles לוּדיוֹם, Λωδίειμ in Jer. Λοῦδοι,, A.V. "Lydians"), a Mizraitish or Egyptian people or tribe (Gen 10:13; 1Ch 1:11; Jer 46:9), probably the same with LUD, No. 2. From their position at the head of the list of the Mizraites, it is probable that the Ludim were settled to the west of Egypt, perhaps further than any other race of the same stock. Isaiah mentions "Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow (משְׁכֵי קֶשֶׁת) Tubal, and Javan, the isles afar off" (66:19). Here the expression in the plural, "that draw the bow" (Vulg. (tendentes sagitam), may refer only to Lud, and therefore not connect it with one or both of the names preceding. A comparison with the other three passages, in all which Phut is mentioned immediately before or after Lud or the Ludim, goes to confirm the Sept. reading, Phut, Φούδ, for Pul, a word not occurring in any other passage, as the true one; and we also notice as coincident the extraordinary change from משְׁכֵי to Μοσόχ. SEE PUL; SEE MESECH.

Jeremiah, in speaking of Pharaoh Necho's army, makes mention of "Cush and Phut that handle the buckler, and the Ludim that handle [and] bend the bow" (Jer 46:9). Here the Ludim are associated with African nations as mercenaries or auxiliaries of the king of Egypt, and therefore it would seem probable, primd facie, that the Mizraitish Ludim are intended. Ezekiel, in the description of Tyre, speaks thus of Lud: "Persia, and Lud, and Phut were in thine army, thy men of war: buckler (מָגֵן) and helmet hung they up in thee; they set thine  adorning" (Jer 27:10). In this place Lud might seem to mean the Shemitic Lud, especially if the latter be connected with Lydia; but the association with Phut renders it as likely that the nation or country is that of the African Ludim. In the prophecy against Gog a similar passage occurs. "Persia, Cush, and Phut (A. Vers. "Libya") with them [the army of Gog]; all of them [with] buckler (מָגֵן) and helmet" (Jer 38:5). It seems from this that there were Persian mercenaries at this time, the prophet perhaps, if speaking of a remote future period, using their name and that of other well-known mercenaries in a general sense. The association of Persia and Lud in the former passage therefore loses somewhat of its weight. In one of the prophecies against Egypt Lud is thus mentioned among the supports of that country: "And the sword shall come upon Mizraim, and great pain shall be in Cush, at the falling of the slain in Mizraim, and they shall take away her multitude (שֲׁמוֹנָהּ), and her foundations shall be broken down. Cush, and Phut, and Lud, and all the mingled people (עֶרֶב), and Chub, and the children of the land of the covenant, shall fall by the sword with them" (Jer 30:4-5). Here Lud is associated with Cush and Phut, as though an African nation. The Ereb, whom we have called "mingled people" rather than "strangers," appear to havebeen an Arab population of the Sinaitic peninsula, perhaps including Arab or half-Arab tribes of the Egyptian; desert to the east of the Nile. Chub is a name nowhere, else occurring, which perhaps should be read Lub, for the country or nation of the Lubim. SEE CHUB; SEE LUBIM.

The "children of the land of the covenant" maybe some league of tribes, as probably were the Nine-Bows of the Egyptian inscriptions; or the expressions may mean nations or tribes allied with Egypt, as though a general designation for the rest of its supporters besides those specified. It is noticeable that in this passage, although Lud is placed among the close allies or supporters of Egypt, yet it follows African nations, and is followed by a nation or tribe at least partly inhabiting Asia, although possy possily also partly inhabiting Africa. SEE EGYPT.

There can be no doubt that but one nation is intended, in these passages, and it seems that thus far the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the Mizraitish Ludim. There are no indications in the Bible known to be positive of mercenary or allied troops in the Egyptian armies, except of Africans, and perhaps of tribes bordering: Egypt on the east. We have still to inquire how the evidence of the Egyptian monuments and of profane history may affect our supposition. From the former we learn that several foreign nations contributed allies. or mercenaries to the Egyptian armies.  Among them, we identify the Reicu with the Lubim, and the SHARYATANA with the Cherethim, who also served in David's army. The latter were probably from the coast of Palestine, although they may have been drawn in the case of the Egyptian army from an insular portion of the, same people.

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

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

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

## Ludke, Friedrich Germanus[[@Headword:Ludke, Friedrich Germanus]]

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

## Ludki[[@Headword:Ludki]]

             (Polish Ludschi) were conceived by the Wends to be earth-spirits. At night they have feasts; they come into houses by way of subterranean passages, do not allow themselves to be disturbed, and avenge every provocation by a knavish trick. German superstitions also admit of such ghost-like beings.

## Ludlow, Gabriel, D.D[[@Headword:Ludlow, Gabriel, D.D]]

             a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born at Acquackanonck, N.J., April 23, 1797. He graduated from Union College in 1817, from New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1820, and was licensed by the Classis of New Brunswick probably the same year. He was stated supply at Albany for six  months thereafter, and at Neshanic, Somerset County, N.J., from 1821 until his death, February 19, 1878. He was genial and sympathetic, strong in thought, as well as independent. He published several sermons. See Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in America, 3d ed. page 358.

## Ludlow, John[[@Headword:Ludlow, John]]

             D.D., LL.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Acquackanonck, now Passaic, N.J., December 13, 1793; graduated at Union College, 1814, and at the Theological Seminary, New Brunswicik, N.J., 1817. His first settlement was in the First Reformed (Dutch) Church of New Brunswick, 1817; in 1819 he was elected professor in the theological seminary at that place; in 1823 he became pastor of the First Reformed (Dutch) Church in Albany, where he sustained himself with great power as a preacher, pastor, and public man. In 1834 he was made provost of the University of Pennsylvania, and retained that position with distinguished ability until 1852, when he returned to New Brunswick as professor of ecclesiastical history and Church government in the theological seminary, and also as professor of mental philosophy in Rutgers College.

He died in 1857, in the full assurance of hope and of faith. In every respect Dr. Ludlow was "a mighty man," physically, mentally, spiritually; as a theologian, a preacher, and a leader of men. He was full of power. His intellect was like his bodily  frame, massive, compact, and vigorous. His will and his emotional nature were equally strong. His spirit and labors in the pulpit, in the professor's chair, at the head of the university, and in public bodies, were always direct, well ordered, and indomitable. "He adorned every relation that he sustained, and was one of the very finest specimens of intellectual and moral nobility." — Sprague, Annals; Memorial Sermons by Drs. George W. Bethune, Isaac Ferris, and W.J.R. Taylor; Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church; N.Y. Observer (1866); American College Presidents, 43. (W.J.R.T.)

## Ludlow, Peter[[@Headword:Ludlow, Peter]]

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

## Ludolf, Job[[@Headword:Ludolf, Job]]

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

## Ludolph, De Saxonia[[@Headword:Ludolph, De Saxonia]]

             was distinguished among the Dominican mystics of the 14th century. He entered the order about A.D. 1300, and in further pursuance of his pious devotion became a Carthusian at Strasburg. His Vita Jesu Christi has often  been edited and translated into various languages. He flourished in Saxony, but the date both of his birth and death are unknown.

## Ludovici, Christian[[@Headword:Ludovici, Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Landshut, Silesia, in 1663. He studied at Breslau and Leipsic, commenced his academical career in 1687, was professor of Oriental languages in 1699, doctor of theology in 1724, and died at Leipsic, January 15, 1732. He wrote, Isagoge in Accentuationem Hebraicam: — Hebraismus, Chaldaismus, TargumicoTalmudico-Rabbinicus et Syriasmus ad Harmoniam et Compendium Redacti: — Diss. V in Rabbi Levi ben Gerson Commentarium Rabbinicum in Hiobum: — Schediasma de Autoribus, qui de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis Egerunt: Historia Concili Niceni. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:531, 663; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. Ludowig, 2:274. (B.P.)

## Ludwig, Edmund A[[@Headword:Ludwig, Edmund A]]

             a German Reformed minister, was born in Switzerland. He received a liberal education, and obtained the degree of doctor of philosophy from a European university. After coming to America he became professor of languages in Washington College, Lexington, Virginia. Subsequently he went North, engaging as editor and teacher for some years. In 1868 he was licensed to preach, but failing to secure a call, spent the remainder of his life at Erie, Pennsylvania, in teaching and as organist. He died in 1880. He was a proficient scholar and devoted Christian. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Germ. Ref. Church, 5:381.

## Luers, John H[[@Headword:Luers, John H]]

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

## Luft, Friedrich Matthauus[[@Headword:Luft, Friedrich Matthauus]]

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

## Lugo, Juan De[[@Headword:Lugo, Juan De]]

             a learned Spanish Jesuit and cardinal, was born at Madrid, November 25, 1583, and for twenty years was theological professor at Rome; was made cardinal ill 1643, and died August 20, 1660. In his office as cardinal he was distinguished for his plain manner of life and his liberality to the poor. He wrote De Incarnatione dominica (Lyons, 1633, fol.): — De Sacramentis in genere (1635, fol.): — Responsorum Moralium lib. 6 (1651, fol.), etc. All his works were collected in seven large folios (Venice, 1751). Pallavicini boasted of having been his pupil. Liguori names him as a theologian next to Thomas Aquinas.  Lugo's brother FRANCISCO was also a Jesuit, and the author of several theological works. They are of minor value, however. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 32:212.

## Luhith[[@Headword:Luhith]]

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

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

## Luigi de Gonzaga[[@Headword:Luigi de Gonzaga]]

             an Italian saint, was born March 9, 1568, at Castiglione, being the son of Ferdinand of Gonzaga, marquis of Castiglione. After being educated at the court of Francis de Medicis, he went to Spain with his father, where Philip II gave him as a page to prince James. In 1585, leaving his worldly goods to his brother Rodolph, he entered upon the novitiate of the Jesuits at Rome. He died June 20, 1591, and was buried in the Church of the Annunciation, but some time later his body was transferred to a chapel which had been built under his invocation by the marquis Scipio Lancelloti.  He was beatified in 1621 by Gregory XV, and canonized in 1726 by Benedict XIII. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Luini[[@Headword:Luini]]

             (or Lovino), BERNARDINO, a celebrated painter of the Lombard school, born about 1460 at Luini, near the Lago Maggiore, was the ablest pupil of Leonardo da Vinci and of Stefano Scotto. He imitated the style and execution of his master Leonardo da Vinci so closely as to deceive experienced judges and yet his general manner has a delicacy and grace sufficiently original and distinct from that of Leonardo. Many of Luini's best and greatest works, in oil and in fresco, are still in a good state of preservation, namely, the Magdalen and St. John with the Lamb, in the  Ambrosian Library at Milan; the Enthroned Madonna, painted in 1521, the Drunkenness of Noah, and other works in the gallery of the Brera at Milan; the frescoes of the Monastero Maggiore, or San Maurizio, in the same city, from which. however, the ultramarine and gold have been scraped off; several at Saronno, among them his chef-d'oeuvre, Christ disputing with the Doctors; and other extensive and equally good works in the Franciscan convent Degli Angeli at Lugano, on the lake of that name. The date of his death is not exactly known, but he was alive in 1530.

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

## Luini (or Lovini), Bernardino[[@Headword:Luini (or Lovini), Bernardino]]

             an eminent Italian painter, was probably born at Luino, a small town in the Milanese province, on the Lago Maggiore, in 1480, and is generally considered to have been a pupil of Leonardo da Vinci. His two pictures of Mary Magdalene and St. John Embracing the Lamb, in the Ambrosian Gallery at Milan, are excellent works. He was no less distinguished for his frescos, of which the most celebrated is Christ Crowned with Thorns, in the same gallery. He died in 1530. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Luitprand Or Liudprand[[@Headword:Luitprand Or Liudprand]]

             king of Lombardy (A.D. 712-744), was born towards the close of the 7th century. In 702 his father, Ansprand, a powerful Lombard lord, and an adherent of king Luitbert, having been defeated by the usurper Aribert II, retired to the Bavarian court. He was joined there by Luitprand, but the other members of his family, having fallen into the hands of Aribert, were put to death. In 712 Luitprand and his father succeeded in overthrowing Aribert, and Ansprand dying shortly after, Luitprand succeeded to the throne. His first care was to restore peace to his kingdom, suffering from internal dissensions. He enacted a series of laws in the years 712, 717,720, 721, 723724, 2, which, with the Edict of Rotharis, form the principal basis of the Lombard law as it remained in force in Northern Italy until the 14th, and in the kingdom of Naples until the 16th century.

Peace and prosperity once restored to his people, Luitprand eagerly sought for an opportunity for the aggrandizement of his dominions. He had his eye especially on Rome and the exarchate, and when the quarrel broke out between the pope and the emperor of Constantinople concerning image worship, Luitprand suddenly announced himself and his Lombards devout worshippers of images, and, under pretense of taking the pope's part, he seized the exarchate of Ravenna and several cities. But pope Gregory II, alarmed at the growing power of Lombardy, and tie prospect that hereafter the papacy might be depleendt on the rule of a people looked upon as vile barbarians, SEE LOMBARDS, preferred to seek aid in other quarters not only for himself, but also for the exarchate, whose days seemed about to be numbered. He therefore enjoined upon the duke of Venetia to aid the exarch in retaking the provinces seized by Luitprand.

Gregory at the same time persuaded the inhabitants of the duchies of Spolcto and Benevento to  throw off the Lombard yoke. Luitprand, however, matched the pope in cunning, for he no sooner learned the position of the pontiff than he turned to the side of the exarch, and, after having aided him in subduing his insurgent provinces, marched himself against Rome, with the intention of taking his revenge on the pope. The latter, however, succeeded in pacifying Luitprand, and the Lombard returned into his kingdom. In 736, being dangerously ill, he surrendered for a while his power to his nephew Hildebrand, whom the Lombards had elected his successor, but when he recovered his health he found himself obliged to divide his authority with Hildebrand. In 739 Luitprand overcame a league formed against him by pope Gregory III, and the dukes of Spoleto and Benevento and the exarch of Bavenna, and, to punish the incumbent of the apostolic see, he appeared before the gates of Rome. The pope, in his distress. called upon Charles Martel for assistance. Gregory's appeal is truly touching: "His tears are falling night and day for the destitute state of the Church.

The Lombard king and his son are ravaging the last remains of the property of the Church, which no longer suffices for the daily service; they have invaded the territory of Rome, and seized all his farms. His only hope is in the timely succor of the Frankish king." Valuable presents accompanied this appeal-among them the mystic keys of the sepulcher of St. Peter, and filings of his chains, which no Christian could resist — also a proffer of the title of "Patrician and Consul of Rome" — yes, the deliverer of the Eternal City was to become even the patron of the Romish Church. Of course Martel answered favorably to such an invitation. Unfortunately, however, for the Romish cause, he died shortly after. But, even before Martel could have taken the field against Luitprand, the latter had been induced to withdraw his troops from Rome. A state of hostility, however, continued between the Lombards and the Romans until the death of Gregory III. The next pontiff (Zachary) finally succeeded, by a personal visit to Luitprand, in securing a treaty with the Lombards by which the latter restored to the Church all the possessions taken from it during the war. Luitprand thereafter seems to have been favorably inclined towards Zachary and the Church. He died in January 744. See Paul Diacre, Historia Longobardorum; Anastasius, Vitae Pontif.; Muratori, Annales Script. Ital.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. volume 32; Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages, page 54 sq.; Milman, Hist. Lat. Christ. 2:374 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Luitprand Or Liutprand[[@Headword:Luitprand Or Liutprand]]

             a distinguished Italian historian, is supposed to have been born at Pavia about A.D. 920, of a noble family very high in favor at the court of king Hughes. Luitprand received a very good education, and was at an early age appointed deacon of the cathedral of Pavia. He soon after became chancellor of king Berengar, by whom he was, about 946, sent on a mission to Byzantium. After his return in 950, he fell under the displeasure of the king and of queen Willa, and retired to the court of Otho I of Germany. He remained there eleven years, learned the language of the country, and became acquainted with all the most distinguished characters. In 958 he began, at the request of the bishop of Elvira, to write a history of his own age, and he continued this task until 962, when he returned to Otho in Italy. He was now at once appointed bishop of Cremona, and was in 963 sent by Otho to pope John XII, ostensibly for the purpose of assuring the latter of the emperor's good will, but in reality to incite the Roman aristocracy against the pope. Shortly after, when the pope was accused before the Synod of Rome, Luitprand spoke against him in the name of the emperor. Two years afterwards Otho sent him again to Rome, together with the bishop of Spiers, to direct the pontifical election, a duty which he performed to the emperor's entire satisfaction. In 968 Luitprand went to Constantinople to negotiate a marriage between princess Theophania and the son of Otho, but herein he failed. In 971 he was sent, with some others, to renew negotiations for the same object, Nicephorus being dead; but he died himself soon after, in the early part of 972.

His, works, which are of great value for the history of those times, are Antapodosis, begun at Frankfort-on-the-Maine in 958, concluded in Italy in 962, a historical work, in which he seeks to revenge himself for the wrongs he had suffered, especially from Berengar and Willa: — Liber de rebus gestis Ottonis Magni imperatoris, an account of events from 960 to 964, which is the more valuable from the fact that Luitprand was an eyewitness and often an actor in all the occurrences he relates: — Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana of 968, very important for the information it contains on events and customs, and the best written of Luitprand's works. The Antapodosis and Historia Ottonis, of which the original MS., partly in Luitprand's own handwriting, is preserved in the library of Munich, were published at Antwerp (1640, fol.), and in several historical works of the Middle Ages, as in those of Reuber and Du Chesne, and in the Scriptores of Muratori, volume 2. The best edition of Luitprand's works is contained  in Pertz, Monumenta, volume 3, who has also published them separately. A German translation of the Antapodosis was published by the baron of Osten-Sacken (Berlin, 1853), with an Introduction by Wattenbach. See Kopke, De Vitas et Scriptis Luitprandi (Berl. 1842, 8vo); Pertz, Afonum. 3:264; Wattenbach, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im lIittelalter (2d ed. Berl. 1866), page 209; Contzen, Geschichtschreiber d. sachsischen Kaiserzeit, etc. (Regensb. 1837); Giesebrecht, Kaiserzeit, 1:740, 742 sq.; Donniges, Otto I, page 199 sq.; Niebuhr, SS. Byz. volume 11; Martini, U. d. Geschichtschreiber Liudprand, in Denkschrift. d. Kon. Akad. d. Wissensch. of Munich, 1809, 1810; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:219; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:442; Baxmann, Politik der Papste, volume 2 (see Index).

## Lukaszewicz, Joseph Von[[@Headword:Lukaszewicz, Joseph Von]]

             a Polish historian, was born November 30, 1797, at Kromplewo, hear Posen, and died February 18, 1872. His works having been translated into German, we give the German titles: — Historische Nachricht uber die Dissidenten in der Stadt Posen ins 16. und 17. Jahrhundert (Posen, 1832; German by Dalitzki, Darmstadt, 1843): — Ueber die Kirchen der bohmischen Bruder im ehemaliqen Grosspolen (Posen, 1835; German by Fischer, Gratz, 1877): — Geschichte der Kirchen des helvetischen Bekenlntnisses in Litauen (1842, 2 volumes; German, Leipsic, 1850): — Geschichte des helvetischen Bekenntnisses in Kleinpolen (1853): — Geschichte aller katholischen Kirchen in der ehenaligen posen'schehi Diocese (1858-63, 3 volumes). (B.P.)

## Luke[[@Headword:Luke]]

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

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

II. Scripture History. — All that can be with certainty known of Luke must be gathered from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul. The result is but scanty. He was not born a Jew, for he is not reckoned among them " of the circumcision" by Paul (comp. Col 4:11 with Col 4:14). If this be not thought conclusive, nothing can be argued from the Greek idioms in his style, for he might be a Hellenistic Jew, nor from the Gentile tendency of his Gospel, for this it would share with the inspired writings of Paul, a Pharisee brought up at the feet of Gamaliel. The date of his conversion is uncertain. He was not, indeed, "an eyewitness and minister of the Word from the beginning" (Luk 1:2), or he would have rested his claim as an evangelist upon that ground. His name does not once occur in the Acts, and we can only infer his presence or absence from the sudden changes from the third to the first person, and vice versa, of which phenomenon, notwithstanding all that has of late been urged against it, this, which has been accepted since the time of Irenaeeus (Contr. Haer. 3:14), is the only satisfactory explanation. Rejecting the reading συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν, Act 11:28 (which only rests on D. and Augustine, De Serm. Dom. 2:17), which would bring Luke into connection with Paul at a much earlier period, as well as the identification of the evangelist with Lucius of Cyrene (Act 13:1 : Rom 16:21), which was current in Origen's time (ad Romans 16:39; see Lardner, Credibility, 6:124; Marsh, Michaelis, 4:234), and would make him a kinsman of Paul, we first find Luke in Paul's company at Troas, and sailing with him to Macedonia (Act 16:10-11). A.D. 48. Of his previous history, and the time and manner of his conversion, we know nothing, but Ewald's supposition (Gesch. d. v. Isr. 6:35, 448) is not at all improbable, that he was a physician residing in Troas, converted by Paul, and attaching himself to the apostle with all the ardor of a young convert. He may also, as Ewald thinks, have been one of the first uncircumcised Christians. His conversion had taken place before, since he silently assumes his place among the great apostle's followers without any hint that this was his first admission to the knowledge and ministry of Christ. He may have found his way to Troas to preach the Gospel, sent possibly by Paul himself. There are some who maintain that Luke had already joined Paul at Antioch (Act 11:27-30; see Journal of Sacred Literature, October 1861, page 170, and Conybeare and Howson's Life of Paul, chapter 5, new ed. Lond. 1861).

He accompanied Paul as far as Philippi, but did not share in the imprisonment of his master and his companion Silas, nor, as the third person is resumed (Act 17:1), did he, it would seem, take any further part in the apostle's  missionary journey. The first person appears again on Paul's third visit to Philippi, A.D. 54 (Act 20:5-6), from which it has been gathered that Luke had spent the whole intervening time — a period of seven or eight years — in Philippi or its neighborhood. If any credit is to be given to the ancient opinion that Luke is referred to in 2Co 8:18 as "the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches" (a view adopted by the Church of England in the collect for Luke's day), as well as the early tradition embodied in the subscription to that epistle, that it was sent from Philippi "by Titus and Lucas," we shall have evidence of the evangelist's missionary zeal during this long space of time. If this be so, we are to suppose that during the "three months" of Paul's sojourn at Philippi (Act 20:3) Luke was sent from that place to Corinth and this errand, the word "gospel" being, of course, to be understood, not, as Jerome and others erroneously interpret it, of Luke's written gospel, but of his publication of the glad tidings of Jesus Christ. The mistaken interpretation of the word "gospel" in this place has thus led some to assign the composition of the Gospel of Luke to this period, a view which derives some support from the Arabic version published by Erpenius. in which its writing is placed " in a city of Macedonia twenty-two years after the Ascension," A.D. 51. From their reunion at Philippi, Luke remained in constant attendance on Paul during his journey to Jerusalem (Act 20:6 to Act 21:18), and, disappearing from the narrative during the apostle's imprisonment at Jerusalem and Csesarea, reappears again when he sets out for Rome (Act 27:1). A.D. 56. He was shipwrecked with Paul (28:2), and traveled with him by Syracuse and Puteoli to Rome (Act 27:12-16), where he appears to have continued as his fellow-laborer (συνεργός, Phm 1:24; Col 4:4) till the close of his first imprisonment, A.D. 58. The Second Epistle to Timothy (4:11) gives us the latest glimpse of the "beloved physician," and our authentic information regarding him beautifully closes with a testimony from the apostle's pen to his faithfulness amidst general defection, A.D. 64.

III. Traditionary Notices. — The above sums up all we really know about Luke; but, as is often the case, in proportion to the scantiness of authentic information is the copiousness of tradition, increasing in definiteness, be it remarked, as it advances. His Gentile descent being taken for granted, his birthplace was appropriately enough fixed at Antioch, "the center of the Gentile Church, and the birthplace of the Christian name" (Eusebius, H.E. 3:4; comp. Jerome, De Vir. Illust. 7; In Matt. Praef.), though it is to be  observed that Chrysostom, when dwelling on the historical associations of the city, appears to know nothing of such a tradition. He was believed to have been a Jewish proselyte, ignorant of Hebrew (Jerome, Quaest. in Genesis c. 46), and probably because he alone mentions their mission, but in contradiction to his own words (Luk 1:23) — one of the seventy disciples who, having left our Lord in offense (Joh 6:60-66), was brought back to the faith by the ministry of Paul (Epiphan. Haer. 51:11); one of the Greeks who desired to "see Jesus" (Joh 12:20-21), and the companion of Cleopas on the journey to Emmaus (Theophyl. Proem in Luc.). An idle legend of Greek origin, which first appears in the late and credulous historian Nicephorus Callisus (died 1450), Hist. Eccl. 2:43. and was universally accepted in the Middle Ages, represents Luke as well acquainted with the art of painting (ἄκρως τὴν ζωγράθφου τέχνην ἐξεπιστάμενος), and assigns to his hand the first portraits of our Lord, his mother, and his chief apostles (see the monographs of Manni [Florent. 1764] and Schlichter [Hal. 1734]).

Nothing is known of the place or manner of his death, and the traditions are inconsistent with one another. Gregory Naz. reckons him among the martyrs, and the untrustworthy Nicephorus gives us full details of the time, place, and mode of his martyrdom, viz., that he was crucified to a live olive-tree in Greece, in his eightieth year. According to others, he died a natural death after preaching (according to Epiphanius, Contra Haer. 51:11) in Dalmatia, Gallia, Italy, and Macedonia; was buried in Bithynia, whence his bones were translated by Constantius to Constantinople (Isid. Hispal. c. 82; Philostorgius volume 3, chapter 29). See generally Koöhler, Dissert. de Luca Ev. (Lipsiae, 1695); Credner, Einleit. ins N.T. 1:124.

## Luke (2)[[@Headword:Luke (2)]]

             an Irish prelate, was dean of St. Martin le Grand, London, and treasurer of the king's wardrobe. He was elected to the see of Dublin, and obtained the royal confirmation, December 13, 1228. His election was set aside at Rome as not being canonical, and he was reelected, but not confirmed by the pope until 1230. About 1237 he improved the buildings of Christ's Church, and endowed that of St. John, without the New Gate, with two burgages and six acres of land in St. Kevin's parish. In 1240 he granted to the vicars serving mass at the altar of the Blessed Virgin, in St. Patrick's Cathedral, a certain portion of the revenues of the Church of Alderg. In 1247 archbishop Luke made an act for the purpose of enforcing the residence of the prebendaries of St. Patrick's Cathedral. In the following year he made  the Church of Larabrien a prebend of the same cathedral. He died in December 1255. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 90.

## Luke Of Prague[[@Headword:Luke Of Prague]]

             one of the most celebrated bishops and writers of the Unitas Fratrunm, or the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, was born about 1460, in Bohemia, and studied at the University of Prague, where he attained to the degree of A.B. A member of the Utraquist, or National Church, he quitted Prague in consequence of difficulties with the Roman Catholics, sought out the Brethren, whose simple faith and stanch confession of it attracted him, and joined their communion about 1480. At that time they were on the eve of serious dissensions, owing to the gradual separation of two parties among them, the one extreme, the other moderate in its views of the discipline. The former represented the illiterate, and the latter the educated portion of the membership. Luke, being a thoroughly learned man, gifted with great  executive ability, and distinguished for his unassuming piety, soon won a prominent position. He held to the moderate party, but enjoyed the confidence of many on the other side. In 1491 he was sent, with three associates, on a visit to the East, in order to find, if possible, a body of Christians free from the corruptions of the age, with whom the Unitas Fratrum might establish a fellowship. Returning from this journey without having accomplished its object, he devoted himself to literary labors, and wrote a number of works treating of the points in dispute among the Brethren.

These publications contributed in it a little to the ascendency of the moderate party, and to the final pacification of the Church in 1494, after the most violent of the extremists had seceded, and organized a sect of their own, called the Amosites, which soon degenerated into fanaticism. Three years later, Luke undertook a mission to the Waldenses of Italy and France, and on his return in 1500 was elected bishop. His sound judgment and unflinching courage sustained the Brethren in times of persecution; his sense of the dignity and proprieties of public worship served to develop their ritual; his enthusiastic conviction of the scriptural character of their faith opened the way for their rapid increase among the higher classes; and his wonderful diligence gave them a literature far superior to that of the Utraquists and of the Bohemian Roman Catholics. In 1505 he published a Catechism and a Hymn-book, the first evangelical works of this kind in the Middle Ages. Having, in 1518, become the senior bishop of the Church and president of its ecclesiastical council, he began to watch the progress of Luther's Reformation with close attention, and in 1522 sent a deputation to Wittenberg in order to present the good wishes of the Brethren. The result, however, was not satisfactory. Luke disagreed with Luther in regard to the doctrines both of the Lord's Supper and of justification by faith. On the one hand, he upheld the spiritual presence, and, on the other, he gave undue prominence to good works. Each published a defense of his own views.

Luther wrote with moderation, and in a friendly spirit; Luke was more severe in his strictures. His stand-point touching justification, however, was not, as Gindely asserts, a Romish one. He was led to extremes by his desire to prevent a misuse of the doctrine of free grace. This purpose induced him, in 1524, to renew his correspondence with Luther. A second deputation visited Wittenberg, and gave him a full account of the discipline of the Brethren, in the hope that he would introduce a similar system among his followers, and thus bring about a reform not merely of Christian doctrine, but also of Christian life. But again the negotiations failed. Indeed, they produced a personal estrangement between Luke and Luther,  and for a time all intercourse with Wittenberg was broken off. The real cause of this disagreement is not clear. In part it was owing to the grave offense which the deputies took at the loose morals of the Wittenberg students, and to the freedom with which they denounced their manner of life. Luther, on his side, attacked the rigorism of the Brethren in his Tischreden. In the following years the Brethren suffered a severe persecution in Bohemia. Luke himself was seized, loaded with chains, and imprisoned, and escaped execution only through the intervention of a powerful noble belonging to the Unitas Fratrum. After his liberation he was active for a few years longer, although suffering from a most painful disease, and died at Zungbunzlau December 11, 1528. His literary labors were astonishing. He was the author of more than eighty different works, written partly in Latin and partly in Bohemian, and consisting of doctrinal, exegetical, and polemical treatises. The most of them have been lost. For a further account of his life, see Gindely, Geschichte der Bohnz. Briider, volume 1, book 1, chapter 3, and book 2; Crozer, Geschichte d. alten Bruderkirche, 1:95-192; Czerwegka, Geschichte der Evang. Kirche in Böhmen, volume 2, chapters 3-7. (E. de S.)

## Luke, Gospel According To[[@Headword:Luke, Gospel According To]]

             the third in order of the canonical books of the New Testament,

I. Author — Genuineness. — The universal tradition of Christendom, reaching up at least to the latter part of the 2d century, has assigned the third member of our Gospel collection to Luke, Paul's trusted companion and fellow-laborer, συνεργός, who alone continued in attendance on his beloved master in his last imprisonment (Col 4:14; Phm 1:24; 2Ti 4:11). Its authorship has never been questioned until comparatively recent times, when the unsparing criticism of Germany — the main object of which appears to be the demolishing of every ancient  belief to set up some new hypothesis in its stead — has been brought to bear upon it, without, however, effectually disturbing the old traditionary statement.

The investigations of Semler, Hilgenfeld, Ritschl, Baur, Schleiermacher. Ewald, and others, have failed to overthrow the harmonious assertion of the early Church that the third Gospel, as we have it, is the genuine work of Luke. It is well known that, though the " Gospels" are referred to by Justin Martyr as a collection already used asnd accepted by the Church (Apol. 1:66; Dial. c. Tryph. c. 10). and his works supply a very considerable number of quotations, enabling us to identify, beyond all reasonable doubt, these εὐαγγἐλια with the first three Gospels, we do not find them mentioned by the names of their authors till the end of the 2d century. In the Muratorian fragment, which call hardly be placed later than A.D. 170, we read, "Tertium Evangelii librum secundum Lucam Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi cum eum Paulus quasi ut juris (τοῦ δικαίου) studiosum ['itineris socium,' Bunsen] secum adsumsisset nomine suo ex ordine 'opiinione,' Credner] conscripsit (Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne), et idem prout assequi potuit,ita et a nativitate Johannis incepit dicere" (Westcott, Hist. of Can., page 559). The testimony of Irenaeus, A.D. cir. 180, is equally definite, Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπ᾿ ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο (Contra Haer. 3:1, 1), while from his enumeration of the many particulars, pluria evangelii (ib. 3:14, 3), recorded by Luke alone, it is evident that the Gospel he had was the same we now possess. Tatian's Diatessaron is an unimpeachable evidence of the existence of four Gospels, and therefore of that by Luke, at a somewhat earlier period in the same century. The writings of Tertullian against Marcion, cir. 207, abound with references to our Gospel, which, with Irenaeus, he asserts to have been written under the immediate guidance of Paul (Ach. Marc. 4:2; 4:5).

In Eusebius we find both the Gospel and the Acts specified as θεόπνευστα βιβλία, while Luke's knowledge of the sacred narrative is ascribed to information received from Paul, aided by his intercourse with the other apostles (τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλωνὁμιλίας ὠφελημένος, H.E. 3:4 and 24). Eusebius, indeed, tells us that in his day the erroneous view which interpreted εὐαγγέλιον (Rom 2:16; comp. 2Co 8:18) of a written document was generally received, and that, in the words "according to my Gospel," Paul was supposed to refer to the work of the evangelist. This is also mentioned by Jerome (De Vir. Illust. 7), and accepted by Origen (Eusebius, H.E. 6:25) — one among many proofs of the want of the critical faculty among the fathers of that age.  Additional evidence of the early acceptance of Luke's Gospel may be derived from the guaestio vexata of its relation to the Gospel of Marcion. This is not the place to discuss this subject, which has led critics to the most opposite conclusions, for a full account of which the reader may be referred to De Wette, Einleit. in N.T. pages 119-137, as well as to the treatises of Ritschl, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Hahn, and Volckmar. It will be enough for our purpose to mention that the Gnostic teacher Marcion, in pursuit of his professed object of restoring the purity of the Gospel, which had been corrupted by Judaizing teachers, rejected all the books of the canon with the exception of ten epistles of Paul and a gospel, which he called simply a gospel of Christ. We have the express testimony of Irenaxus (Conr. lcaer. 1:27, 2; 3:12,12, etc.), Tertullian (Cont. Marc. 4:1, 2, 6), Origen (Colit. Cels. 2:27), and Epiphanius (Illusr. 42:11) that the basis of Marcion's Gospel was that of Iuke, abridged and altered by him to suit his peculiar tenets (for the alterations and omissions, the chief being its curtailment by the first two chapters, see De Wette, pages 123-132), though we cannot assert, as was done by his enemies among the orthodox, that all the variations are due to Marcion himself, many of them having no connection with his heretical views, and being, rather, various readings of great antiquity and high importance.

Of late years, however, the opposite view, which was first broached by Semler, Griesbach, and Eichhorn, has been vigorously maintained, among others, by Ritschl and Baur, who have endeavored to prove that the Gospel of Luke, as we have it, is interpolated, and that the portions Marcion is charged with having omitted were really unauthorized additions to the original document. See Bleek, Einl. in das N.T. § 52. Volckmar, in his exhaustive treatise Das Evansn. Marcions (Lips. 1852), has satisfactorily disposed of this theory, and has demonstrated that the Gospel of Luke, as we now have it, was the material on which Marcion worked, and, therefore, that before he began to teach, the date of which may be fixed about A.D. 139, it was already known to and accepted by the Church. Zeller and Ritschl have since abandoned their position (Theol. Jahrb. 1851, pages 337, 528), and Baur has greatly modified his (Isl-Markusevangel. 1851, pages 191). See also Hahn, Das Evangelium Marcions (Konigsb. 1823); Olshausen, Echtheit der vier Kanon. Ecanszyelien (Kinignsb. 1823); Ristschl, Das Evangeliunm Marcions (Tubing. 1846); Baur, Krit. Untersuchung über d. Kan. Evangelien (Stubing. 1847); Hilgenfeld, Krit. Untersuchunzenz (Halle, 1850); bishop Thirlwall's Introduction to Schleierunacher on St. Luke; De  Wette, Lehrbuch d. N.T. (Berl. 1848); Norton, Genuineness of the Gospels (Bost. 1844), 3, add. note C, page 49.

II. Sources. — The authorities from which Luke derived his Gospel are clearly indicated by him in the introduction (Luk 1:1-4). He does not claim to have been an eye-witness of our Lord's ministry, or to have any personal knowledge of the facts he records, but, as an honest compiler, to have gone to the best sources of information then accessible, and, having accurately traced the whole course of the apostolic tradition from the very first, in its every detail (παρηκολυθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς), to have written an orderly narrative of the facts (πραγμάτων) already fully believed (πεπληροφορημένων) in the Christian Church, and which Theophilus had already learned, not from books, but from oral teaching κατηχήθης; comp. Act 18:25; Gal 6:5).

These sources were partly the "oral tradition" (παρέδοσαν) of those "who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word," and partly the written records (to which Ewald, 6:40, on unexplained grounds, dogmatically assigns a non-Judaean origin) which even then "many" (πολλοί) had attempted to draw up, of which, though the evangelist's words do not necessarily bear that meaning, we may well suppose that he would avail himself. Though we thankfully believe that, as well in the selection of his materials as in the employment of them, Luke was acting under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, it will be remarked that he lays claim to no such supernatural guidance, but simply to the care and accuracy of an honest, painstaking, and well-informed editor, not so consciously under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit as to supersede the use of his own mental powers. His use of his authorities is not mechanical; though often incorporating, apparently with little alteration, large portions of the oral tradition, especially in the case of the words of our Lord, or those with whom he conversed, and adopting narratives already current (of which the first two chapters, with their harsh Hebraistic phraseology, immediately succeeding the comparatively pure Greek of the dedication, are an example), the free handling of his pen is everywhere to be recognized. The connecting links and the passages of transition evidence the hand of the author, which may again be recognized in the greater variety of his style, the more complex character of his sentences, and the care he bestows in smoothing away harshnesses, and imparting a more classical air to the synoptical portions.  Notwithstanding the almost unanimous consent of the fathers as to the Pauline origin of Luke's Gospel (Tertull. adv. Marc. 4:5, "Lucre digestum Paulo adscribere solent;" Irenaeus, Cont. Haer. 3:1; Origen apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 6:25; Euseb. Hist. Ecc 3:4; Jerome, De Vir. Illust. 7), there is little or nothing in the gospel itself to favor such a hypothesis, and very much to contradict it. It is true that the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, 1Co 11:23-25, displays an almost verbal identity with Luk 22:19-20; and, as Paul affirms that he received his "from the Lord," it is highly probable that the evangelist has in this instance incorporated a fragment of the direct teaching of his master. But this is a solitary example (Luk 24:34, comp. with 1Co 15:5, is too trifling to deserve mention), and it is impossible that the evangelist should have expressed himself as he has done in his preface if he had derived the facts of his narrative from one who was neither "an eye-witness" nor "a minister of the Word from the beginning." Nor again in the general tone and character of the gospel, when impartially viewed, is there much that can fairly be considered as bearing out the hypothesis of a Pauline origin.

Those who have sifted the gospel with this object have, it is true, gathered a number of passages which are supposed to have a Pauline tendency (see Hilgenfeld, Evang., and the ingenious essay prefixed to this gospel in Dr. Wordsworth's Greek Testament), e.g. Luk 4:25 sq.; Luk 9:52 sq.; Luk 10:30 sq.; Luk 17:16-18; and the parables of the prodigal son, the unprofitable servant, and the Pharisee and publican, which have been instanced by De Wette as bringing out the apostle's teaching on justification by faith alone; but, as dean Alford has ably shown (Greek Test. 1:44, note b), such a list may easily be collected from the other gospels, while the entire absence of any definite statement of the doctrinal truths which come forward with the greatest prominence in the apostle's writings, and, with very scanty exceptions, of his peculiar theological phraseology, is of itself sufficient to prove how undue has been the weight assigned to Pauline influence in the composition of the gospel. It is certainly true that, in the words of bishop Thirlwall (Schleiermacher On St. Luke, Introd. page 128), "Luke's Gospel contains numerous indications of that enlarged view of Christianity which gave to the gospel, as preached by Paul, a form and an extent very different from the original tradition of the Jews," but no more can be legitimately inferred than that Luke was Paul's disciple, instructed by the apostle of the Gentiles, and naturally sharing in his view of the gospel as a message of salvation for all nations; not that his gospel was in any sense derived from him, or rested on the apostolic basis of Paul.  The question naturally arises whether the gospels of Matthew and Mark were among the διηγήσεις to which Luke refers.

The answers to this have been various and contradictory, the same data leading critics to the most opposite conclusions. Meyer (Comment. 2:217) is of opinion that Luke availed himself both of Matthew and Mark, though chiefly of the latter, as the "primitive gospel;" while De Wette, on the other hand (Einleit. sec. 94, page 185), considers Mark's Gospel the latest of the three, and based upon them as authorities. In the face of these and other discordant theories, of which a list may be seen (De Wette, Einleit. § 88, pages 162-168), it will be wise not to attempt a categorical decision. A calm review of the evidence will, however, lead most unbiassed readers to the conclusion that all three wrote in perfect independence of one another; each, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, giving a distinct view of the great complex whole, the reflex of the writer's own individual impressions, and that least of all is Luke to be considered as a mere redaucleur of the prior writings of his brother synoptists-a theory, the improbabilities and absurdities of which have been well pointed out by dean Alford in the Prolegonem to his Greek Testament, 1:2-6, 41.

III. Relation to Matthew and Mark. — Believing that no one of the three synoptical gospels is dependent on the others, and that the true explanation of this striking correspondence, not only in the broad outline of our Lord's life and work, and the incidents with which this outline is filled up, but also, to a considerable extent, in the parables and addresses recorded, and even in the language and forms of expression, is to be sought in the same apostolical oral tradition having formed the original basis of each, we have presented a very interesting point of inquiry in tracing the correspondence and divergence of the several narratives. In particular, a comparison of Luke with the other synoptists furnishes many striking and important results. With the general identity of the body of the history, we at once notice that there are two large portions peculiar to this evangelist, containing events or discourses recorded by him alone. These are the first two chapters, narrating the conception, birth, infancy, and early development of our Lord and his forerunner, and the long section (Luk 9:51 to Luk 18:14) devoted to our Lord's final journey to Jerusalem, and comprising some of his most beautiful parables. We have also other smaller sections supplying incidents passed over by Matthew and Mark — the questions of the people and the Baptist's replies (Luk 3:10-14); Simon and the woman that was a sinner (Luk 7:36-50); the raising of the  widow's son (Luk 8:11-17); the story of Zacchaeus (Luk 19:1-10); our Lord's weeping over Jerusalem (Luk 19:39-44); the journey to Emmaus (Luk 24:13-35). In other parts he follows a tradition at once so much fuller and so widely at variance with that of the others as almost to suggest the idea that a different event is recorded (Luk 4:16-30; comp. Mat 13:54-58; Mar 6:1-6; Luk 5:1-11; comp. Mat 4:18-22; Mar 1:16-20). Even where the language employed so closely corresponds as to remove all question of the identity of the events, fresh details are given, often of the greatest interest, e.g. προσευχομένου (Luk 3:21); σωματικῷ εἴδει (Luk 3:22); πληρ. πνεύμ. ἁγ. (Luk 4:1); ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται, κ. τ. 50·( Luk 4:6); ἄρχι καιροῦ (Luk 4:13); δύναμις Κυρίου ην, κ. τ. 50· (Luk 5:17); καταλιτών ἃπαντα and δοχὴ μεγ. (Luk 5:28-29); the comparison of old and new wine (Luk 5:39); ἐπλήσθ. ἀνοίας (Luk 6:11); δύναμιςπαῤ αὐτοῦ ἐξήρξ. (Luk 6:19); the cures in the presence of John's disciples (Luk 7:21), and the incidental remarks (Luk 7:29-30); many additional touches in the narratives of the Gadarene demoniac (Luk 8:26-39), and the transfiguration, especially the fact of his "praying" (Luke records at least six instances of our Lord having prayed omitted by the other evangelists), and the subject of the conversation with Moses and Elijah (Luk 9:28-36); notices sipplied (Luk 20:19; Luk 21:37-38), all tending to convince us that we are in the presence not of a mere copyist, but of a trustworthy and independent witness. Luke's account of the passion and resurrection is to a great extent his own, adding much of the deepest significance to the synoptical narrative, particularly the warning to Simon in the name of the twelve (Luk 22:31-32); the bloody sweat (Luk 22:44); the sending to Herod (Luk 23:7-12); the words to the women (Luk 23:27-31); the prayer for forgiveness (Luk 23:34); the penitent thief (Luk 23:39-43); the walk to Emmaus (Luk 24:13-35); and the ascension (Luk 24:50-53).

It has been remarked that there is nothing in which Luke is more characteristically distinguished from both the evangelists than in his selection of our Lord's parables. There are no less than eleven quite peculiar to him:

(1.) The two debtors; (2.) Good Samaritan; (3.) Friend at midnight; (4.) Rich fool;  (5.) Barren fig tree; (6.) Lost silver; (7.) Prodigal son; (8.) Unjust steward; (9.) Rich man and Lazarus; (10.) Unjust judge; (11.) Pharisee and publican; and two others, the Great Supper, and the Pounds, which, with many points of similarity, differ considerably from those found in Matthew.

Of our Lord's miracles, six omitted by Matthew and Mark are recorded by Luke:

(1.) Miraculous draught; (2.) The son of the widow of Nain; (3.) The woman with a spirit of infirmity; (4.) The man with a dropsy; (5.) The ten lepers; (6.) The healing of Malchus's ear.

Of the seven not related by him. the most remarkable omission is that of the Syrophoenician woman, for which à priori reasoning would have claimed a special place in the so-called Gospel of the Gentiles. We miss also the walking onl the sea, the feeding of the four thousand, the cure of the blind men, and of the deaf and dumb, the stater in the fish's mouth, and the cursing of the fig-tree.

The chief omissions in narrative are the whole section, Mat 14:1 to Mat 16:12; Mar 6:45 to Mar 8:26; Mat 19:2-12; Mat 20:1-16; Mat 20:20-28; comp. Mar 10:35-45; the anointing, Mat 26:6-13; Mar 14:3-9.

With regard to coincidence of language, a most important remark was long since made by bishop Marsh (Michaelis, 5:317), that when Matthew and Luke agree verbally in the common synoptical sections, Mark always agrees with them also; and that there is not a single instance in these sections of verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke alone. A close scrutiny will discover that the verbal agreement between Luke and Marl is greater than that between Luke and Matthew, while the mutual dependence of the second and third evangelists on the same source is rendered still more probable by the observation of Reuss, that they agree both in excess and defect when compared with Matthew: that when Mark has elements  wanting in Matthew, Luke usually has them also; while, when Matthew supplies more than Mark, Luke follows the latter; and that where Mark fails altogether, Luke's narrative often represents a different παράδοσις, from that of Matthew.

IV. Character and general Purpose. — We must admit, but with great caution, on account of the abuses to which the notion has led, that there are traces in the gospel of a leaning towards Gentile rather than Jewish converts. The genealogy of Jesus is traced to Adam, not from Abraham, so as to connect him with the whole human race, and not merely with the Jews. Luke describes the mission of the Seventy, which number has usually been supposed to be typical of all nations; as twelve, the number of the apostles, represents the Jews and their twelve tribes.

On the supposed "doctrinal tendency" of the gospel, however, much has been written which it is painful to dwell on, but easy to refute. Some have endeavored to see in this divine book an attempt to ingraft the teaching of Paul on the Jewish representations of the Messiah, and to elevate the doctrine of universal salvation, of which Paul was the most prominent preacher, over the Judaizing tendencies, and to put Paul higher than the twelve apostles! (See Zeller, Apost.; Baur, Kanon. Evang.; and Hilgenfeld.) How two impartial historical narratives, the Gospel and the Acts, could have been taken for two tracts written for polemical and personal ends, is to an English mind hardly conceivable. Even its supporters found that the inspired author had carried out his purpose so badly that they were forced to assume that a second author or editor had altered the work with a view to work up together Jewish and Pauline elements into harmony (Baur, Kanon. Evang. page 502). Of this editing and re-editing there is no trace whatever; and the invention of the second editor is a gross device to cover the failure of the first hypothesis. By such a machinery it will be possible to prove in after ages that Gibbon's History was originally a plea for Christianity, or any similar paradox.

The passages which are supposed to bear out this "Pauline tendency" are brought together by Hilgenfeld with great care (Evangelien, page 220); but Reuss has shown, by passages from Matthew which have the same "tendency" against the Jews, how brittle such an argument is, and has left no room for doubt that the two evangelists wrote facts and not theories, and dealt with those facts with pure historical candor (Reuss, Histoire de la Thioloyie, volume 3, b. 6, chapter 6). Writing to a Gentile convert, and  through him addressing other Gentiles, Luke has adapted the form of his narrative to their needs, but not a trace of a subjective bias, not a vestige of a personal motive, has been suffered to sully the inspired page. Had the influence of Paul been the exclusive or principal source of this gospel, we should have found in it more resemblance to the Epistle to the Ephesians, which contains (so to speak) the Gospel of Paul.

The chief characteristic of Luke's Gospel which distinguishes it from those of the other synoptists, especially Matthew, is its universality. The message he delivers is not, as it has sometimes been mistakenly described, for the Gentiles as such, as distinguished from the Jews, but for men. As we read his record, we seem to see him anticipating the time when all nations should hear the Gospel message, when all distinctions of race or class should be done away, and all claims based on a fancied self-righteousness annulled, and the glad tidings should be heard and received by all who were united in the bonds of a common humanity, and felt their need of a common Savior, "the light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel." It is this character which has given it a right to the title of the Pauline Gospel, and enables us to understand why Marcion selected it as the only true exponent of Christ's Gospel. This universalism, however, is rather interwoven with the gospel than to be specified in definite instances; and yet we cannot but feel how completely it is in accordance with it that Luke records the enrollment of the Savior of the world as a citizen of the world-embracing Roman empire-that he traces his genealogy back to the head of the human race-that his first recorded sermon (Luk 4:16-27) gives proof of God's wide-reaching mercy, as displayed in the widow of Sarepta and Naaman — that in the mission of the twelve, the limitation to the "cities of Israel" should have no place, while he alone records the mission of the seventy (a number symbolical of the Gentile world) — that in the sermon on the mount all references to the law should be omitted, while all claims to superior holiness or national prerogative are cut away by his gracious dealings with, and kindly mention of, the despised Samaritans (9:52 sq.; 10:30 sq.; 17:11 sq.).

As with the race in general, so with its individual members. Luke delights to bear witness that none are shut out from God's mercy — nay, that the outcast and the lost are the special objects of his care and search. As proofs of this, we may refer to the narratives of the woman that was a sinner, the Samaritan leper, Zacchaeus, and the penitent thief; and the parables of the lost sheep and lost silver, the Pharisee and publican, the rich man and  Lazarus, and, above all, to that "which has probably exercised most influence on the mind of Christendom in all periods" (Maurice, Unity of the Gospel, page 274), the prodigal son.

Most naturally also in Luke we find the most frequent allusions to that which has been one of the most striking distinctions between the old and modern world the position of woman as a fellow-heir of the kingdom of heaven, sharing in the same responsibilities and hopes, and that woman comes forward most prominently (the Syrophcenician, as already noticed, is a single marked exception) as the object of our Lord's sympathy and love. Commencing with the Virgin Mary as a type of the purity and lowly obedience which is the true glory of womanhood, we meet in succession with Anna the prophetess, the pattern of holy widowhood (comp. 1Ti 5:5); the woman that was a sinner; the widow of Nain; the ministering women (Luk 8:2-3) Mary and Martha; the "daughter of Abraham" (Luk 13:11); and close the list with the words of exquisite tenderness and sympathy to the "daughters of Jerusalem" (Luk 23:28).

This universal character is one, the roots of which lie deep in Luke's conception of the nature and work of Christ. With him, more than in the other gospels, Jesus is "the second man, the Lord from heaven" (Lange); and if in his pages we see more of his divine nature, and have in the more detailed reports of his conception and ascension clearer proofs that he was indeed the Son of the Highest, it is here too, in " the life-giving sympathy and intercourse with the inner man, in the human fellowship grounded on not denying the divine condescension and compassion" (Maurice, u.s.), that we recognize the perfect ideal man.

Luke, it has been truly remarked, is the gospel of contrasts. Starting with the contrast between the doubt of Zacharias and the trustful obedience of Mary, we find in almost every page proofs of the twofold power of Christ's word and work foretold by Simeon (2:34). To select a few of the more striking examples: He alone presents to our view Simon and the sinful woman, Martha and Mary, the thankful and thankless lepers, the tears and hosannas on the brow of Olivet; he alone adds the "woes" to the "blessings" in the sermon on the mount, and carries on in the parables of the rich man and Lazarus, the Pharisee and publican, and the good Samaritan, that series of strong contrasts which finds so appropriate a close in the penitent and blaspheming malefactors.  Once more, Luke is the hymn-writer of the New Testament. “Taught by thee, the Church prolongs her hymns of high thanksgiving still" (Keble, Christian Year). But for his record the Magnificat, Benedictus, and Nunc Dimittis would have been lost to us; and it is he who has preserved to us the Ave Maria, identified with the religious life of so large a part of Christendom, and the Gloria in Excelsis, which forms the culminating point of its most solemn ritual.

To turn from the internal to the external characteristics of Luke's Gospel, these we shall find no less marked and distinct. His narrative is, as he promised it should be, an orderly one (καθεξῆς, 1:3); but the order is one rather of subject than of time. As to the other synoptists, though maintaining the principle of chronological succession in the main outline of his narrative, "he is ever ready to sacrifice mere chronology to that order of events which was the fittest to develop his purpose according to the object proposed by the inspiring Spirit, grouping his incidents according to another and deeper order than that of mere time" (Maurice, u.s.). It is true that he furnishes us with the three most precise dates in the whole Gospel narrative (Luk 2:2; Luk 3:1; Luk 3:23 — each one, be it remarked, the subject of vehement controversy), but, in spite of the attempts made by Wieseler and others to force a strict chronological character upon his gospel, an unprejudiced perusal will convince us that his narrative is loose and fragmentary, especially in the section Luk 9:49 to Luk 18:14, and his notes of time vague and destitute of precision, even where the other synoptists are more definite (Luk 5:12; comp. Mat 8:1; Luk 8:4; comp. Mat 13:1; Luk 8:22; comp. Mar 4:35, etc.).

"The accuracy with which Luke has drawn up his Gospel appears in many instances. Thus, he is particular in telling us the dates of his more important events. The birth of Christ is referred to the reign of Augustus, and the government of Syria by Cyrenius (2:1-3). The preaching of John the Baptist is pointed out as to its time with extreme circumstantiality (Luk 3:1-2). But it is in lesser matters that accuracy is chiefly shown. Thus the mountain storm on the Lake of Gennesaret is marked by him with a minute accuracy which is not seen in Mark or Matthew (comp. Luk 8:23 with parallel Gospels, and with Josephus, War, 3:10; Irby and Mangles, Travels, chapter 6). In Luk 21:1, we read of a gesture on Christ's part which marks a wonderful accuracy on the part of Luke. We read there that Christ "looked up," and saw the rich casting their gifts into the treasury. From Mar 12:41 we learn the reason of Luke's  expression, which he does not give himself, for there we read that Christ, after warning his disciples against the scribes, "sat down," and would therefore have to look up in order to see what was going on. This minute accuracy marks Luke's description of our Lord's coming to Jerusalem across the Mount of Olives (Luk 19:37-41). Travellers who are very accurate in topographical description speak of two distinct sights of Jerusalem on this route, an inequality of ground hiding it for a time after one has first caught sight of it (Clerical Journal, August 22, 1856, page 397). Luke distinctly refers to this nice topographical point; in Luk 19:37 he marks the first sight of Jerusalem, and in Luk 19:41 he marks the second sight of the city, now much nearer than before. The correctness of Luke's date in the matter of the government of Syria by Cyrenius has indeed been often questioned, but on insufficient grounds. The just way of dealing with very ancient documents which have given general proofs of trustworthiness, but which, in particular instances, make statements that do not appear to us to be correct, is to attribute this apparent want of correctness to our ignorance rather than to that of the writer. In the particular case before us recent research has shown that Cyrenius was in all probability twice governor of Syria, thus establishing, instead of overthrowing, the correctness of Luke" (Fairbairn). Compare Huschke, Ueber den zur Zeit der Geburt Christi gehaltenen Census (Breslau, 1840); Wieseler, Chronologische Synopse der vier Evanzgelien (Hamburg, 1843); Tholuck, Glaubwürdigkeit der evanzgelischen Geschichte. SEE CYRENIUS.

In his narrative we miss the graphic power of Mark, though in this he is superior to Matthew, e.g. chapter 7:1-10; comp. Mat 8:5-13 : chapter 8:41-56; comp. Mat 9:18-26. His object is rather to record the facts of our Lord's life than his discourses, while, as Olshausen remarks (1:19, Clark's ed.), "He has the peculiar power of exhibiting with great clearness and truth our Lord's conversations, with all the incidents that gave rise to them-the remarks of the bystanders, and their resuits."

We may also notice here the passing reflections, or, as bishop Ellicott terms them (Hist. Lect. page 28), "psychological comments," called up by the events or actors which appear in his Gospel, interpolated by him as obiter dicta in the body of the narrative. We may instance Luk 2:50-51; Luk 3:15; Luk 6:11; Luk 7:29-30; Luk 7:39; Luk 16:14; Luk 20:20; Luk 22:3; Luk 23:12.  V. Style and Language. — Luke's style is more finished than that of Matthew or Mark. There is more of composition in his sentences. His writing displays greater variety, and the structure is more complex. His diction is substantially the same, but purer, and, except in the first two chapters, less Hebraized, as remarked by Jerome (Comment. in AEs.; compare ad Damas. Ep. 20). It deserves special notice how, in the midst of close verbal similarity, especially in the report of the words of our Lord and others, slight alterations are made by him either by the substitution of another word or phrase (e.g. Luk 20:6; comp. Mat 21:26; Mar 11:32 : Luk 7:25; Mar 11:8 : Luk 9:14; Mar 6:39-40 : Luk 20:28-29; Mar 12:20; Mar 12:22 : Luk 8:25; Mar 8:27), the supply (Luk 20:45; Mar 12:38 : Luk 7:8; Mat 8:9), or the omission of a word (Luk 9:25; Mat 16:26; Mar 8:36), by which harsh constructions are removed, and a more classical air given to the whole composition.

The Hebraistic character is more perceptible in the hymns and speeches incorporated by him than in the narrative itself. The following are some of the chief Hebraisms that have been noticed:

(1.) the very frequent use of ἐγένετο in a new subject, especially ἐγένετο έν τῷ, with the accusative and infinitive, corresponding to וִיְהַי ב, twenty-three times, not once in Matt., only twice in Mark;

(2.) the same idiom, without ἐγένετο, e.g. Luk 9:34; Luk 9:36; Luk 10:35; Luk 11:37;

(3.) ἐγένετο ὡς, or ὡς alone of time, the Hebrew כּ, e.g. Luk 2:15; Luk 5:4, only once each in Matthew and Mark;

(4.) Υψιστος, used for God= עֶלְיוֹן, five times, once in Mark;

(5.) olscog, for family בֵּית;

(6.) ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν = מֵעִתָּה, four times, not once in the other gospels;

(7.) ἀδικία in the genitive as an epithet, e.g. οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας, κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας;

(8.) προσέθετο πέμψαι, Luk 20:11-12;

(9.) καρδία = לֵב.  On the other hand, we find certain classical words and phrases peculiar to Luke taking the place of others less familiar to his Gentile readers, e.g. ἐπιστάτης for ῥαββί, six times; νομικοί for γραμματεῖας, six times; ναί, ἀληθῶς, or ἐπ ἀληθείας for ἀμήν, which only occurs seven times to thirty in Matthew, and fourteen in Mark; ἃπτειν λύχνον for καίειν λ., four times; λίμνη of the Lake of Gennesareth for θάλασσα, five times; παραλελυμένος for παραλυτικός; κλίνιδιον for κράββατος; φόρος for κῆνσος.

The style of Luke has many peculiarities both in construction and in diction; indeed, it has been calculated that the number of words used only by him exceeds the aggregate of the other three gospels. Full particulars of these are given by Credner (Einleit.) (copied by Davidson, Introd. to the N.T.) and Reuss (Geschichte d. II. Schfri-.). The following are some of the most noteworthy. Of peculiar constructions we may remark,

(1.) the infinitive with the genitive of the article (Winer, Gr. Gr. 1:340), to indicate design or result, e.g. Luk 2:27; Luk 5:7; Luk 21:22; Luk 24:29; Luk 1:9; Luk 1:57; Luk 2:21.

(2.) The substantive verb with the participle instead of the finite verb. Luk 4:31; Luk 5:10; Luk 6:12; Luk 7:8; Luk 23:12 (Winer, § 6567). (3.) The neuter participle with the article for a substantive, Luk 4:16; Luk 8:34; Luk 22:22; Luk 24:14.

(4.) τό, to substantivise a sentence or a clause, especially in indirect questions, Luk 1:63; Luk 7:11; Luk 9:46, etc.

(5.) εἰπεῖνπρός, sixty-seven times; λέγειν πρός, ten times; λαλεῖν πρός, four times, the first being used once by Matthew, and the others not at all by him or Mark.

(6.) Participles are copiously used to give vividness to the narrative, ἀναστάς, seventeen times; στραφείς, seven times; πεσών, etc.

(7.) ἀνήρ used with a substantive, e.g. ἁμαρτωλός, Luk 5:8; Luk 19:7; and προφήτης, Luk 24:19.

Of the words peculiar to, or occurring much more frequently in Luke, some of the most remarkable are, the use of Κύριος in the narrative as a synonym for Ι᾿ησοῦη, which occurs fourteen times (e.g. Luk 7:13; Luk 10:1; Luk 13:15, etc.), and nowhere else in the synoptical gospels save in the  addition to Mar 16:19-20; σωτήρ σωτηρία, σωτήριον, not found in the other gospels, except the first two once each in John; χάρις, eight times in the Gospel, sixteen in the Acts and only thrice in John, χαρίζομαι, χαριτόω; εὐαγγελίζομαι, very frequent, while εὐαγγέλιον does not occur at all; ὑποστρέφω, twenty-one times in the Gospel, ten in the Acts, and only once in Mark; ἐφιστάναι, not used in the other three gospels; διέρχεσθαι. thirty-two times in Luke's Gospel and the Acts, and only twice each in Matthew, Mark, and John; παραχρῆμα, frequent in Luke, and only twice elsewhere, in Matthew; ὑπάρχω, seven times in Gospel, twenty-six in Acts, but nowhere in the other gospels, and τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, eight times in Gospel to three in Matthew alone; ἃπας, twenty times in Gospel, sixteen in Acts, to thrice in Matthew and four times in Mark; ῾Ιερουσαλήμ, instead of the ῾Ιεροσόλυμα of the other gospels; ἐνώπιον, twenty-two times in Gospela fourteen times in Acts, once besides in John; σύν, twenty-four times in Gospel, fifty-one in Acts, and only ten times in the other gospels; the particle το, which hardly appears in the other gospels, is very frequent in Luke's writings. The words ἀτενίζω, ἄτοπος, βουλή, βρεφος, δέομαι, δέησις, δοχή, δράχμη, θάμβος, θεμέλιον, ἴασις, καθότι, καθόλου, καθεξῆς, κακοῦβος, θκόραξ, λεῖος, λυτρόω, λύτρωσις, οἰκόνομος-ία-έω, παιδωύω, παύω, πλέω, πλῆθος, πλήθω, πλήν, πράσσω, σιγάω, σκιρτάω, τυρβάζομαι, χήρα, éσει, καθώς, are almost or quite peculiar to him; he is very partial to καί αὐτός and καὶ αὐτοί, εί, δέ, μή γε, and abounds in verbs compounded with prepositions, where the other evangelists use the simple verb.

Some omissions are to be noted: ἀληθής does not occur once, (ἀληθινός only once, εὐαγγελιον, διάκονος, δαιμονιζόμενος, not once; δαμονισθείς only once; and ὤστε, which is found fifteen times in Matthew, and thirteen in Mlark, occurs only thrice in the whole gospel.

A few Latin words are used by Luke — ἀσσάριον, Luk 12:6; δηνάριος, Luk 7:41; λεγέωνς, Luk 8:30; μόδιον, Luk 11:33; σουδάριον, Luk 19:20; Act 19:12, but no Hebrew or Syriac forms, except σίκερα, Luk 1:15.

On comparing the Gospel with the Acts, it is found that the style of the latter is more pure and free from Hebrew idioms, and the style of the later portion of the Acts is more pure than that of the former. Where Luke used the materials he derived from others, oral or written, or both, his style  reflects the Hebrew idioms of them; but when he comes to scenes of which he was an eye-witness, and describes entirely in his own words, these disappear.

VI. Quotations from the O.T. — It is a striking confirmation of the view propounded above of the character of Luke's Gospel, and the object of its composition, that the references to the O.T., the authority of which with any except the Jews would be but small, are so few — only twenty-four in the one against sixty-five in the other — when compared with their abundance in Matthew. Only eight out of the whole number are peculiar to our evangelist (marked with an asterisk in the annexed list), which occur in the portions where he appears to have followed more or less completely a παράδοσις of his own; the history of the birth and childhood of our Lord, the visit to Nazareth (chapter 4), and that of the passion. The rest are found in the common synoptical sections. We may also remark that, with the most trifling exceptions, Luke never quotes the O.T. himself, nor speaks on his own authority of events occurring in fulfillment of prophecy, and that his citations are only found in the sayings of our Lord and others. The following list is tolerably complete, exclusive of the hymns, which are little more than a cento of phrases from the O.T.

VII. Time and Place of Composition. — In the complete silence of Scripture, our only means for determining the above points are tradition and internal evidence. The statements of the former, though sufficiently definite, are inconsistent and untrustworthy. Jerome (Praef. in Matthew) asserts that it was composed "in Achaia and the regions of Boeotia," an opinion which appears to have been generally received in the 4th century (Gregory Nazianzen, Ε᾿ν Α᾿χαϊvαδι), and has been accepted by Lardner (Credibility), who fixes its date A.D. 63 or 64, after the release of Paul. An Arabic version, published by Erpenius, places its composition "in a city of Macedonia, twenty-two years after the ascension," A.D. 51; a view to which Hiilgenfeld and Wordsworth (Gr. Test. 1:170) give in their adherence. A still earlier date, thirteen years after the ascension, is assigned by the subscription in some ancient MSS. Other statements as to the place are Alexandria Troas, Alexandria in Egypt (the Peshito and Persian versions, Abulfeda, accepted by Mill, Grabe, and Wetstein), Rome (Ewald, 6:40; Olshausen), and Caesarea (Bertholdt, Schott, Thiersch, Alford, Abp. Thomson).  Amid this uncertainty, it will be well to see if there is any internal evidence which will help us in determining these points. We are here met at the outset by those who are determined to see in every clear prophecy a vaticinium post eventumn, and who find in the predictions of the overthrow of Jerusalem (Luk 13:34-35; Luk 19:43-44; Luk 21:20-24), and the persecutions of our Lord's followers (Luk 12:52-53; Luk 21:12), and the nearness of the παρουσία (Luk 21:25-33), a clear proof that the Gospel was composed after A.D. 70.

This has come to be regarded as a settled point by a certain school of criticism (Ewald, 5:134; De Wette, Einleit. page 298; Credner, Einleit.; Reuss, Gesch. de Heil. Schr. page 195; Meyer; Renan, Vie de Jesus, 16; Nicolas, Etudes, N.T., etc.), though there is no small diversity among its representatives as to the time and place of its publication of the Gospel and the sources from which it was derived. Those, on the other hand, who, brought up in a sounder and more reverent school, see no a priori impossibility in a future event being foretold by the Son of God, will be led by the same data to a very different conclusion, and will discover sufficient grounds for dating the Gospel not later than A.D. 58. It is certain that the Gospel was written before the Acts of the Apostles (Act 1:1). This latter could not have been composed before A.D. 58, when the writer leaves Paul “in his own hired house" at Rome; nor probably long after, since otherwise the issue of the apostle's imprisonment and appeal to Casar must naturally have been recorded by him. How long the composition of the Gospel preceded that of the Acts it is impossible to determine, but we may remark that the different tradition followed in the reports of the ascension in the two books renders it probable that the interval was not very small, or, at any rate, that the two were not contemporaneous. If we follow the old tradition given above, we may find reason for supposing that the interval between Luke's being left at Philippi (Act 16:12; Act 17:1) and his joining the apostle there again (20:5) was employed in writing and publishing his gospel. This view is accepted by Alford, Proleg. page 47, and is ably maintained by Dr. Wordsworth, Gr. Test. 1:168-170, though he weakens his argument by referring ευαγγέλιον (2Co 8:18) to a written gospel, a later sense never found in the New Test. Another and more plausible view, adopted by Thiersch, which has found very wide acceptance, is that the Gospel was written under the guidance and superintendence of Paul during his imprisonment at Caesarea, A.D. 55; but, as this imprisonment did not last for two years, as usually held, there is here no room for the composition. Olshausen, among others, places it a little later, during Paul's captivity at  Rome, where he may have mad he the acquaintance of Theophilus, if, as Ewald (6:40) maintains, the latter was a native of Rome. This view, which places the writing of the Gospel in the early part of Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, A.D. 56, is supported by Luke's leisure at the time, and the fact that the Acts followed not very long after as a sequel.

VIII. For whom written. — On this point we have certain evidence. Luke himself tells us that the object he had in view in compiling his gospel was that a certain Theophilus "might know the certainty of those things wherein he had been (orally) instructed." Nothing more is known of this Theophilus, and it is idle to repeat the vague conjectures in which critics have indulged, some even denying his personal existence altogether, and arguing, from the meaning of the name, that it stands merely as the representative of a class. SEE THEOPHILUS.

One or two inferences may, however, be made with tolerable certainty from Luke's words. He was doubtless a Christian, and, from his name and the character of the Gospel, a Gentile convert; while the epithet κράτστος, generally employed as 'a title of honor (Act 23:26; Act 24:3; Act 26:25), indicates that he was a person of official dignity. He was not an inhabitant of Palestine, for the evangelist minutely describes the position of places which to such a one would be well known. It is so with Capernaum (Act 4:31), Nazareth (Act 1:26), Arimathlea (23:51), the country of the Gadarenes (Act 8:26), the distance of Mount Olivet and Emmaus from Jerusalem (Act 1:12; Luk 24:13). By the same test he probably was not a Macedonian (Act 16:12), nor an Athenian (Act 17:21), nor a Cretan (Act 27:8; Act 27:12). But that he was a native of Italy, and perhaps an inhabitant of Rome, is probable from similar data. In tracing Paul's journey to Rome, places which an Italian might be supposed not to know are described minutely (Act 27:8; Act 27:12; Act 27:16); but when he comes to Sicily and Italy this is neglected. Syracuse and Rhegium, even the more obscure Putteoli, and Appii Forum and the Three Taverns, are mentioned as to one likely to know them. (For other theories, see Marsh's Michaelis, volume 3, part 1, page 236; and Kuinol's Praolegomena.) All that emerges from this argument is that the person for whom Luke wrote in the first instance was a Gentile reader. But, though the Gospel is inscribed to him, we must not consider that it was written for him alone, but that Theophilus stands rather as the representative of the whole Christian world; not, as we have already seen, of the Gentiles, as such, to the exclusion of the Jews, but the whole race of man, whom Luke had in his eye; and for whom, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the  work was adapted "as the Gospel of the nations (τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν πεποιηκότα, Origen, apud Euseb. 6:25), full of mercy and hope assured to the whole world by the love of a suffering Savior" (Westcott, Study of Gospel, page 218).

IX. Contents of the Gospel. — After the brief preface the value of which it is difficult to overestimate as throwing light on the history of the composition of the gospels in general, and the true theory of scriptural inspiration — the narrative of the Gospel may be divided into four portions:

1. The time preceding our Lord's public life, including the conception and birth of John the Baptist, and of Christ, his circumcision, presentation in the Temple, and the single incident recordled of his childhood (Luk 2:41-51), comprised in the first two chapters. The whole of this portion is in form, and to a considerable extent in substance, peculiar to our evangelist. See § X.

2. A large number of originally detached and independent narratives, comprising our Lord's baptism, temptation, and Galilaean ministry, almost the whole being common to Luke with the other synoptists.

3. A large section, sometimes, but improperly, termed the gsnomology, containing narratives of events and reports of discourses belonging to the period from the close of our Lord's direct Galilean ministry to his visit to Jericho a few days before his royal entrance into Jerusalem, and mostly occurring during the actual journey (Luk 9:50 to Luk 18:14). The whole of this, in its present form, is peculiar to Luke.

4. The last days of Christ: his entry into Jerusalem, discourses in the Temple, his sufferings and death, his resurrection and ascension, common to Luke and the other evangelists in substance, though there are considerable differences in detail in the narratives of the passion and resurrection (especially the journey to Emmaus), and that of the ascension is entirely Luke's own (Luk 18:15 to Luk 24:53).

X. Integrity of the Gospel — the first two Chapters. — The Gospel of Luke is quoted by Justin Martyr and by the author of the Clementine Homilies. The silence of the apostolic fathers only indicates that it was admitted into the canon somewhat late, which was probably the case. The evidence of the Marcionite controversy is, as we have seen, that our gospel was in use before A.D. 120. A special question, however, has been raised  about the first two chapters. The critical history of these is best drawn out perhaps in Meyer's note. The chief objection against them is founded on the garbled opening of Marcion's Gospel, who omits the first two chapters, and connects 3:1 immediately with 4:31. (So Tertullian, "Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiberiani proponit Deum descendisse in civitatem Galileaae Capharnaum," cont. Marc. 4:7.) But any objection founded on this would apply to the third chapter as well; and the history of our Lord's childhood seems to have been known to and quoted by Justin Martyr (see Apology, 1, § 33, and an allusion, Dial. cum Tryph. 100) about the time of Marcion. There is therefore no real ground for distinguishing between the first two chapters and the rest; and the arguments for the genuineness of Luke's Gospel apply to the whole inspired narrative as we now possess it (see Meyer's note; also Volckmar, page 130).

XI. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on Luke's Gospel: Origen, Fragmenta (in Opp. 3:979); also Scholia (in Bibl. Patr. Gallandii, 14); Athanasius, Fragmenta (in Opp. I, 2); also Commentaria (ib. 3:31); Ambrose, Expositio (in Opp. 1:1257); Augustine, Quaestiones (in Opp. 4:311); Jerome, Homiliae [from Origen] (in Opp. 7:245); also Expositio (in Opp. [Supposita] 10, 1:764); Cyril Alex., Additamentum (in Mai, Script. Vet. 9:741); Commentaria (ed. Smith, Lond. 1858, 4to; Commentary, tr. by same, ibid. 1859, 2 volumes, 8vo); Eusebius, Excepta (ibidem, 1:107); Titus Bostrensis, Commentarius (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 4:415); Apollinarius Laodicensis, Fragmenta (in Mai, Class. Auct. 10:495); Bede, In Lucam (in Opp. 5:217; Works, ed. Giles, 10 and 11); Photius, Specimen (in Mai, Script. Vet. I, 1:189); Nicetas Senon. Catena, (ib. 9:626); AElfridus Rivellensis, Homiliae (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 23:1); Bonaventura, Expositio (in Opp. 2:3); Albertus Magnus, Commantarii (in Opp. 10); Decorosus, Latudes (in Mai, Scriptt. Vet. 9:182); Zwingle, Annotationes (in Opps. 4:181); Brentius, Homiliae (in Opp. 5); Lambert, Commentarius (Norib. 1524, Argent. 1525, 8vo); Agricola, Commentarius (Aug. Vind. 1515, Norib. 1525, Hag. 1526, 8vo); Sarcer, Scholia (Basil. 1529, Francft. 1541, 8vo); Bullinger, Commentaria (Tigur. 1546, fol.); Hofmeister, Commentarius [includ. Matthew and Mark] (Lovan. 1562, fol.; Paris, 1563, Colon. 1572, 8vo); Logenhagen, Comnmentarius [from Augustine] (Antwerp, 1574, 8vo); Soar, Conmmentaria (Conimb. 1574, Par. 1578, fol.); Stella, Commentarius [Rom. Cath.] (Salmart. 1575, Complut. 1578, Lugdun. 1580, 1583, 1592, Rom. 1582, Antw. 1582, 1584, 1591, 1600, 1605, 1608, 1613, 1622,  1654, Mosgunt. 1680, fol.; Ven. 1583, Mayence, 1681, 4to); De Horosco, Commentarius (Complut. 1579, 4to); Gualther, Homiliae (Tigur. 1585, fol.); Piscator, Analysis (Sigen. 1596,1608, 8vo); De Melo, Commentaria (Vallis. 1597, fol.) Toletus, Commentarian [on chapter 1-13 (Rom. 1600, Par. 1600, Colon. 1612, fol.; Ven. 1600, 4to); Winckelmann, Commentarius (Francf. 1601, Giess. 1609, Lub. 1616 8vo); Del Pas, Commentaria (Romans 1625, 2 volumes, fol.); Corderius, Catena (Antw. 1628, fol.); Novarinus, Expensus (Lugd. 1642, fol.); Gomarus, Illustratio (in pop. theolog. 1:149); A Lapide, In lucam (Antwerp, 1660, fol.); Spielenberg, Commentarius (Jen. 1663, 4to); Hartsocker, Aantekingen [continued by Molinaeus] (Amst. 1687, 4to); Tolaar, Verklaring (Hamb. 1741, 3 volumes, 4to); Pope, Erlauterung (Bremen, 1777, 1781, 2 volumes, 8vo); Anon. Amerk. (Lps. 1792, 8vo); Morus, Praelectiones (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Schleiermacher, Versuch (volume 1:1817, 8vo; trans. Essay, Lond. 1825, 8vo); Major, Notes (Lond. 1826, 8vo); Bomermann, Scholiac (Lips. 1830, 8vo); Stein, Kommentar (Halle, 1830, 8vo); Wilson, Questions (Cambridge, 1830, 12mo); Sumner, Exposition (3d ed. 1833, 8vo); Watson, Exposition [chapter 1-13] (in Works, 13; also separately, N.Y. 8vo) ; Short, Lectures (London, 1837, 12mo); Sirr. Notes (part 1, London, 1843, 8vo); Trollope, Commentary (Lond. 1849, 12mo); Thomson, Lectures (Lond. 1849-51, 3 volumes, 8vo); Ford, Illustration (Lond. 1851, 8vo); Gumming, Readings (London, 1854, 8vo); Foote, Lectures (Glasg. 1857, 2 volumes, 8vo); Goodwin, Commentary (Lond.. 1865, 8vo); Stark, Commentary (London, 1866, 2 volumes, 12mo); Van Doren, Commentary (Lond. and N.Y. 1868, 2 volumes, 12mo); (Godet, Commentaire (Neufchatel, 1870, 8vo). SEE GOSPELS.

## Lukes, St., Day[[@Headword:Lukes, St., Day]]

             a festival observed in the Greek and Romish churches on the 18th of October.

## Lukewarm[[@Headword:Lukewarm]]

             (χλιαρός, tepid), moderately warm; spoken figuratively of Christians in a half-backslidden state (Rev 3:16), who are threatened with the divine excision, as we instinctively reject from the mouth water in this insipid state.

## Lullus Of Mayence[[@Headword:Lullus Of Mayence]]

             a noted German prelate of the Romish Church, flourished in the 8th century as successor of Boniface, in the archbishopric of Mayence. He was a native of England, and was educated in the cloister of Meldun, but went to Germany on invitation of Boniface, and was his ambassador to pope Zachary about 754. He attended the Council of Attigny in 763, and of Rome in 769. In 785 he baptized Witikind, leader of the Saxons. He founded the cloister of Hersfeld, and on his death in 786 was buried there. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:221.

## Lully, (Lull Or Lulle), Raymond[[@Headword:Lully, (Lull Or Lulle), Raymond]]

             surnamed the Doctori Illuminatus, an eminent Spanish philosopher and theologian, was born at Palma. on the island of Majorca, about 1234. In early life he followed his paternal profession of arms, and abandoned himself to all the license of a soldier's life. Even when married he continued to pursue pleasures inconsistent with conjugal fidelity, and the theme of his poetical compositions was sensual love. About the year 1266, sick and tired of debauchery, he retired to a desert to lead a life of solitude and rigorous asceticism. Here he pretended to have visions, and, among others, a manifestation of Christ on the cross, who called him to his service, and to the conversion of the Mohammedans. He therefore at once engaged in diligent study to prepare for the labors and duties of a missionary. Having mastered the Arabic, and thoroughly entered into the spirit of Arabian philosophical writings, he took to the use of his pen for the conversion of the Saracens, seeking to demonstrate the truth of Christianity in opposition to all the errors of infidels. His first work was his Ars major or generalis, which has so severely tested the sagacity of commentators. This work is the development of the method of teaching known subsequently as the "Lullian method," and afforded a kind of mechanical aid to the mind in the acquisition and retention of knowledge by a systematic arrangement of subjects and ideas. Like all such methods, however, it gave little more than a superficial knowledge of any subject, though it was of use in leading men to perceive the necessity for an investigation of truth, the means for which were not to be found in the scholastic dialectics, and it was published by Lully with the special aim of serving as the preparatory work to a strictly scientific demonstration of all the truths of Christianity.

The king of Majorca, hearing of his reputation, called Lully to Montpellier, where, in 1275, he wrote his Ars demonstrativa, and founded a convent for the preparation of Minorites as missionaries to the Saracens. This was the first linguistic school for missionary purposes. In 1287 he went to Paris, where he lectured on the Ars generalis to a large number of students, and before Bertauld de St. Denis, chancellor of the university. He next went to Rome to seek the countenance of the pope for his plan of establishing missionary schools, which he thought would prove more effective than the Crusades of which he said, "I see many knights going to the Holy Land in the expectation of conquering it by force of arms; but, instead of accomplishing their object, they are in the end all swept off themselves.

Therefore it is my belief that the conquest of the Holy Land should be  attempted in no other way than as thou (Christ) and thy apostles undertook to accomplish it — by love, by prayer, by tears, and the offering up of our own lives." Meeting, however, with but little success, he returned to Tunis in 1291, and commenced labors as a missionary by holding conferences with the most learned Mohammedan scholars and theologians. In proclaiming to them the truth of the Christian religion, he insisted especially on the necessary adaptation which a perfect Being could not fail to establish between the primary cause and its effect, and attempted to explain the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation by purely metaphysical arguments. He was, however, expelled by the king of Tunis, and owed his life only to the intercession of a learned and liberal Mohammedan. Lully now went back to Paris, resumed his teaching there, and wrote his Tabula generalis and Ars expositiva, which are a continuation of his former works, and present the same ideas under a different form. In 1298 he succeeded in establishing at Paris, under the protection of king Louis Philippe le Bel, a college where his method was taught. France was at that time in great ferment: Philippe le Bel was planning the destruction of the order of Knight Templars, and Boniface VIII, in revindicating the right previously claimed by Gregory VII, had aroused the greatest opposition in France. Lully himself, after having again in vain applied to Rome for help in carrying out his plans, withdrew to labor wherever an opportunity offered itself. He sought by arguments to convince the Saracens and Jews on the island of Majorca. In 1301 he went to Cyprus, and thence to Armenia, exerting himself to bring back the different schismatic parties of the Oriental Church to orthodoxy.

He then visited Hippone, Algiers, and other cities on the coasts of Africa, and finally Bugia, then the seat of the Mohammedan empire. Here he publicly lectured in Arabic, proclaiming "that Christianity is the only true religion; the doctrine of Mohammed, on the contrary, false; and this he was ready to prove to every one." He was again imprisoned, but made his escape by the aid of some Genoese merchants, enduring many hardships on his journey to Europe by shipwreck. He finally reached Paris, and there resumed his lectures with great success. In 1311 the Council of Vienne, mainly by his influence, no doubt, decided that, in order to facilitate the conversion of the heathen, professors of Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldee, two for each language, should be established at Rome, and in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca; those at Rome to be maintained and paid by the pope; those at Paris by the king of France, etc.; and excluded the doctrines of Averroes from the schools. But Lully could not long bear the  easy but monotonous life he was leading as a teacher and philosopher; so, on August 14, 1314, he once more crossed to Africa, where, after laboring at first secretly, then openly, he was at last stoned to death by order of the king, June 30, 1315. His body was recovered by some Genoese merchants and brought back to Europe. According to another account, he was still alive when rescued, but so seriously wounded that he died in sight of his native island.

Lully appears to have been in many points in advance of his contemporaries. Although at the time of his conversion he inclined to a life of asceticism, he afterwards declared himself strongly against the monastic spirit of his age. He deplored it as a great evil that pious monks retired into solitudes, instead of giving up their lives for their brethren, and preaching the Gospel among the infidels. Concerning pilgrimages, he contrasted the gorgeous processions of the pilgrims with the entry of Christ into Jerusalem; what he did to seek men, and what they do to seek him, and exclaimed, "We see the pilgrims travelling away into distant lands to seek thee, while thou art so near that every man. if he would, might find thee in his own house and chamber.... The pilgrims are so deceived by false men, whom they meet in taverns and churches, that many of them, when they return home, show themselves to be far worse than they were when they set out on their pilgrimage." As a theologian, Lully, as we have seen from his history, was a self-taught man, not having been trained in the school of any of the great teachers of his time. The speculative and the practical were intimately blended in his mind, and so they are also in his system. "His speculative turn entered even into his enthusiasm for the cause of missions, and his zeal as an apologist. His contests, growing out of this latter interest, with the school of Averroes, with the sect proceeding from that school which affirmed the irreconcilable opposition between faith and knowledge, would naturally lead him to make the relation subsisting between these two a matter of special investigation. It is true, the enthusiasm for truth which filled his mind, the union of a fervid imagination with logical formalism, led him to form extravagant hopes of a fancied absolute method adapted to all science — applicable, also, to the truths of Christianity, and by which these truths could be demonstrated in a convincing manner to every man. Yet his writings generally abound — far more than that formal system of science, his Ars magna — in deep apologetic ideas. The enthusiasm of a most fervent love to God, a zeal equally intense for the cause of faith and the interests of reason and  science, expressed themselves everywhere in his works" (Neander, Ch. Hist. 4:426).

One of his biographers states that the works of Lully numbered four thousand. Most of them are contained in an edition published at Mayvence (10 volumes, fol.), under title "Lulli Opera omnia, per Baccholium collecta, curante electore Palatino, et edita per Saltzingerum." They may be divided into four classes:

I. Works concerning the "Ars magna:" Ars generalis; Ars densonstrativa; Ars inventiva; Ars expositiva; Ars brevis; Tabula generalis; Ars magna generalis ultima (this latter was published separately, Majorca, 1647); Abor Scientiae (Barcelon. 1582); Liber Quaestionum super qualtuor libris sententiarum (Lyons, 1451); Quaestiones magistri Thomae Alubatensis solute secundum Artem (Lyons, 1451).

II. Religious works: De articulis fidei Christianae demonstrative probatis (Majorca, 1578); Controversia cum Homerio Sarraceno (Valencia, 1510); De Demonstratione Trinitatis per aequiparantiam (Valencia, 1510); Liber matalis pueri Jesu.

III. Against the Averroists: Libri duodecim Principiorum Philosophiae, contra Averrhoistas (Strasb. 1517); Philosophiae, in Averrhoistas, Expositio (Paris, 1516).

IV. The works in which he speaks of himself, as the Phantasticus (Paris, 1499), and a very curious biography of R. Lully preserved in MS. in the college of Sapientia, at Rome, and which appears to have been written by himself. To these must be added his numerous unpublished works, preserved in the Imperial Library, the libraries of the Arsenal and Ste. Genevieve, at Paris, and those of Angers, Amiens. the Esscurial, etc. We might also mention a number of works on alchemy generally attributed to him, but distinguished critics incline to the opinion that they are due to another person of the same name. Indeed, it appears certain that under the name of R. Lulle several distinct persons have been confounded together.

See Wadding, Vie de R. Lulle; Bouvelles, Epistol. in Vit. R. Lull. eremitae (Amiens, 1511); Pax, Elogium Luli (Alcala, 1519); Segni, Vie de R. Lulle (Majorca, 1605); Colletet, Vie de R. Lulle (Paris, 1646); Perroquet, Vie et Martyre du docteur illumine R. Lulle (Vendome, 1667); Vernon, Hist. de le saintete et de la doctrine de R. Lulle (Paris, 1668); Dissertacion  historica del rulto in memoril del beato R. Lulli (Majorca, 1700); Loev, De Vita R. Lulli specimen (Halle, 1800); Delecluze, Vie de R. Lulle, in the Revue des Deux Mondes, November 15, 1840; Haureau, Hist. de la Scholastique, 2; Renan, Averrhoes et l'Averrhoisme; Rousselot, Hist. philosophique dut Moyen-Age 3:76-141; Helffereich, Raymond Lull (Berl. 1858, 8vo); and especially Ritter, Gesch. d. Chrisil. Philos. 4:486 sq.; Maclear, Hist. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages, page 354 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Generale, 32:222; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:558. (J.H.W.)

## Luminum Dies[[@Headword:Luminum Dies]]

             (Day of Lights), another name for the Epiphany (q.v.), supposed to be the day of our Savior's baptism, and so named because baptism was frequently called lux, or lights

## Lump[[@Headword:Lump]]

             (דְּבֵלָה, debelah'), a round mass of any substance pressed together, specially of dried figs (2Ki 20:7; Isa 38:21; "cake," 1Sa 25:18; 1Sa 30:12; 1Ch 12:40). The Greeks adopted the Heb. term in a softened form, παλάθη, which the Sept. uses. This was the usual shape in which figs were preserved for sale or use among the ancients, and is still found in the modern package called a "drum of figs." (See Celsii Hierobot. 2:377-379; J.E. Faber on Harmar's Obs. 1:389 sq.) SEE FIG.

The term rendered "lump" in the New Test. is φύραμα, a kneaded mass, e.g. of potter's clay prepared for molding (Rom 9:21), or of dough (proverbially, 1Co 5:6; Gal 5:9; tropically, Rom 11:16; 1Co 5:7). SEE POTTERY.

## Lumper, Gottried[[@Headword:Lumper, Gottried]]

             a noted Benedictine, was born in 1747, and entered in his youth the Benedictine cloister of St. George at Villingen, in the Black Forest of Badlen. He remained there in various offices, and as theological teacher, till his death in 1801, and distinguished himself by his works on Church History, the chief of which is Historia theologico-critica de vita, scriptis atque doctrina SS. Patrum, aliorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum triun  primorum saeculorum (Augsburg, 1783-1799, 13 volumes, 8vo). See Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexicon, s.v.

## Lumpkin, John[[@Headword:Lumpkin, John]]

             a distinguished Baptist minister of Georgia, was born in Pittsylvania County, Virginia, November 4, 1785, but went, when a child, to Georgia, and was reared in Oglethorpe County, where he spent his whole life. Socially, his relations were of a high character. One of his brothers, Wilson Lumpkin, was governor of the state three years, and another brother, Joseph Henry, chief-justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia. His ordination took place in 1808, and his ministry was exercised in different parts of the county in which he lived. Three new churches were formed during his life, through his personal efforts. He died, greatly lamented, August 1, 1839. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 724. (J.C.S.)

## Lumsden, Wlliam O[[@Headword:Lumsden, Wlliam O]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Alexandria, Virginia, about 1805. He was converted in the fifteenth year of his age, was received into the Baltimore Annual Conference in 1824, and held the following appointments in the states of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia: 1824, Prince George's; 1825, Harford; 1826, Bedford Circuit; 1827, Phillipsburg; 1828, Gettysburg; 1829, Fairfax; 1830, Stafford; 1831, Prince George and St. Mary's; 1832-3, Montgomery; 1834, Severn; 1835, Springfield; 1836-7, Carlisle Circuit: 1838-9, Fairfax; 1840, Westmoreland; 1841-2,Winchester Circuit; 1843-4,Calvert; 1845-6, William Street, Baltimore; 1847, Whatcoat, Baltimore; 1848, Baltimore Circuit; 1849, Summerfield. In 1850 failing health obliged him to take a supernumerary relation. He died May 15, 1868. He was an active and efficient laborer in the vineyard of the Lord to the last. Though he was a supernumerary for eighteen years, he ceased not to preach of " the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." See Conf. Minutes, 1869, page 13.

## Luna, Pedro De[[@Headword:Luna, Pedro De]]

             SEE BENEDICT XIII (A).

## Lunatic[[@Headword:Lunatic]]

             (σεληνιάζομαι, to be moon-struck, as the Latin term lunaticus also signifies, a term the origin of which is to be found in the belief that diseases of a paroxysmal character were affected by the light, or by the changes of the moon), in Greek usage is i.q. epileptic, the symptoms of which disease were supposed to become more aggravated with the increasing moon (comp. Lucan. Tox. 24); in the N. Test. (and elsewhere) the same malady is ascribed to the influence of daemons or malignant spirits (Mat 4:24; Mat 17:15; comp. Lucan. Philops. 16; Isidor. Orig. 4:7; Manetho, 4:81, 216). In the enumeration of Mat 4:24, the "lunatics" are distinguished from the daemoniacs; in Mat 17:15, the name is applied to a boy who is expressly declared to have been possessed. It is evident, therefore, that the word itself refers to some disease affecting both the body and the mind, which might or might not be a sign of possession. Perhaps the distinction in the one case was that of periodicity or lucid  intervals, in contrast with the continual demency of the possessed. SEE DAEMONIAC.

Persons of this description are highly venerated in the East as saints, or individuals highly favored of heaven. In Egypt, according to Lane (Modern Egyptians, 1:345 sq.), "Lunatics who are dangerous to society are kept in confinement, but those who are harmless are generally regarded as saints. Most of the reputed saints of Egypt are either lunatics, or idiots, or impostors. Some of them go about perfectly naked, and are so highly venerated that even women do not shun them. Moen of this class are supported by alms, which they often receive without asking for them. An idiot or a fool is vulgarly regarded by them as a being whose mind is in heaven, while his grosser part mingles among ordinary mortals; consequently he is regarded as an especial favorite of heaven." This opinion entertained of lunatics by the Orientals serves to illustrate what is said of David when he lied to Achish, king of the Philistines, and feigned himself mad, and thus saved his life (1Sa 21:10-15). Also the words of the apostle are thought to be illustrated from the same superstitious custom: "For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise" (2Co 11:19). SEE MADNESS.

## Lund, Johann[[@Headword:Lund, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 11, 1638, at Flensburg. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1672 deacon at Tundern, Schleswig, and died September 13, 1686. He is the author of Beschreibung des Levitischen Gottesdienstes, which was published by his son under the title, Judische Heiligthumer. An edition, with notes, was published by Joh. Christ, Wolf (Hamburg, 1738). See Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:137. (B.P.)

## Lundy, Benjamin[[@Headword:Lundy, Benjamin]]

             an American philanthropist, of Quaker parentage, was born at Handwich, Sussex County, N.J., January 4, 1789. At the age of nineteen he went to learn the saddler's trade in Wheeling, Virginia, and there gained an insight into, and a lasting hatred of, negro slavery. He organized in 1815 an association called the "Union Humane Society," and soon after joined Charles Osborne. Esq., in publishing The Emancipator, at Mount Pleasant, O. In 1821 he successfully started a monthly entitled The Genius of Universal Emancipation, into which he afterwards merged The Emancipator. In 1824 he delivered his first antislavery address at Deep Creek, North Carolina, and lecturing and journeying about on foot from place to place, organized about fourteen abolition societies in that state, besides some in Virginia. In the same year he removed The Genius to Baltimore, and issued it weekly. In 1825 he visited Hayti, and made provisions there for emancipated slaves. In 1828 he visited the antislavery advocates of the East, and lectured in their principal cities. In 1828-9 he was assaulted for alleged libel, censured by the court, and compelled to remove his paper to Washington, and finally to Philadelphia, where he gave it the name of The National Inquirer, and finally it merged into The Pennsylvania Freeman. In 1838 his property was burnt up by the proslavery  mob which fired Pennsylvania Hall. Undaunted, he began anew by issuing The Genius at Lowell, La Salle County, Illinois, and there continued until his death, August 22, 1839. See Earle, Life, Travels, etc., of Benj. Lundy; Greeley, American Conflict, 1:111; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Lundy, Francis J., D.C.L[[@Headword:Lundy, Francis J., D.C.L]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman of the diocese of New York, became assistant minister of St. Paul's Church, Newburgh, in 1867, and died April 7, 1868, aged fifty-three years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1869, page 109.

## Lunsford, Lewis[[@Headword:Lunsford, Lewis]]

             a Baptist preacher, born in Stratford County, Virginia, in 1753, began to preach when seventeen at the Potomac (now Hartwood) Church. Later he traveled in Westmoreland, Northumberland, Lancaster, and all the counties of the northern Virginia Neck, and several churches sprang up as the fruit of his toil; among others, Nomini and Wicomico. On the establishment of Moratico Church in 1778, he became its pastor for life. His sect was much persecuted at the time he was preaching in Richmond Co., and Lunsford was arrested, and thereafter tried in vain to get license to preach. He never was ordained, because he thought a Church's call was sufficient. Faithful study in and out of his profession made up for a limited schooling. He died in Essex County,Virginia, October 26, 1793. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:125 sq.

## Lunt, William Parsons, D.D[[@Headword:Lunt, William Parsons, D.D]]

             an eloquent and popular Unitarian divine, born at Newburyport, Massachussetts, April 21, 1805, was ordained pastor of the Second Unitarian Church in New York, June 19, 1828; left here Nov. 19, 1833, and became pastor of the Unitarian Church in Quincy, Massachusetts. June 3, 1835, where he remained until his death, March 20, 1857. See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Lupercalia[[@Headword:Lupercalia]]

             a noted Roman festival, was celebrated annually on February 15, in honor of Lupercus, the god of fertility, or, as is alleged by many, in honor of Pan. Plutarch calls it the feast of wolves, and declares it to have been of a lustral or ceremonially purifying character. Whatever may have been its origin, it was in some way connected with the legend that Romulus and Remus were suckled by a she-wolf, and accordingly the rites of the Lupercalia were  observed in the Lupercal, the place where this nursing was supposed to have occurred. On the appointed day the Luperci (q.v.) assembled and offered sacrifices of goats and young dogs. A peculiar ceremony then followed. Two youths of high rank were led forward to the priests, who, having dipped a sword in the blood of one of the victims which had been sacrificed, touched their foreheads with it; after which some of the other priests came forward and wiped off the blood with a piece of woollen cloth which had been dipped in milk. The youths now burst into a fit of laughter, and forthwith the general merriment which characterized this festival began. The priests having feasted themselves, and indulged freely in wine, covered their bodies over with the skins of the goats which they had sacrificed. Thus fantastically dressed they ran up and down the streets, brandishing thongs of goat-skin leather, with which they struck all they met, particularly the women, who hailed the infliction of the sacred lash as a species of ceremonial lustration. This festival was long observed in commemoration of the founding of Rome, but having been neglected in the time of Julius Caesar, it was revived by Augustus, and continued to be celebrated until the reign of the emperor Anastasius.

## Luperci[[@Headword:Luperci]]

             the most ancient order of priests among the Romans. They were sacred to Pan, the god of the country, and particularly of shepherds, whose flocks he guarded. Plutarch derives the name from lupa, a shewolf, and traces their origin to the fabulous she-wolf which suckled Romulus and Remus. They formed originally a college, consisting of two classes: the Fabii, or Fabiani, and the Quinctilii, or Quinctiliani. Julius Caesar instituted a third class, under the name of Julii or Juliani. At first the Luperci were taken from the higher classes of society, but in course of time the whole order fell into disrepute.

## Lupetino, Fra Baldo[[@Headword:Lupetino, Fra Baldo]]

             one of the first martyrs to the Protestant cause in Italy in the 16th century, was born of ancient and noble parents in Albano, and actively propagated the reformed opinions in Venice. On becoming provincial within the Venetian territories of the Franciscan monks (to whose order he had been previously admitted) he urged the young men not to assume monastic orders. One of his contemporaries gives the following account of his further career. "After having long preached the Word of God in both the vulgar languages (the Italian and Sclavonian) in many cities, and defended it by public disputation in several places of celebrity with great applause, he was at last thrown into close prison at Venice by the inquisitor and papal  legate. In this condition he continued during nearly twenty years to bear an undaunted testimony to the Gospel of Christ, so that his bonds and doctrine were made known not only to that city, but to the whole of Italy, and even to Europe at large, by which means evangelical truth was more widely spread.... At last this pious man, whom neither threatenings nor promises could move, sealed his doctrine by an undaunted martyrdom, and exchanged the filth and protracted tortures of a prison for a watery grave." See M'Crie's History of the Reformation in Italy (Phila. 1842), pages 105, 221.

## Lupold Of Bebenburg (Or Eglofstein)[[@Headword:Lupold Of Bebenburg (Or Eglofstein)]]

             a learned German prelate, after having studied jurisprudence at Bologna, under the direction of John Andrew, became canon successively at Mayence, at Wirzburg, and at Bamberg, of which place he had been elected bishop in 1352. He died July 20, 1363, leaving, De Zelo Veterum Principum Germanorum in Religionem (Basle, 1497): — De Juribus et Translatio Inmperii (ibid. eod.). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Lupset, Thomas[[@Headword:Lupset, Thomas]]

             an English scholar and theologian, was born in London in 1498; was educated at English schools, but took the degree of B.A. in Paris. In 1518 he obtained the chair of rhetoric at Oxford University. Later he was secretary to the Italian ambassador. On his return he took charge of the education of the natural son of Wolsey in Paris. In 1530 he was appointed prebend of Salisbury. He died December 27, 1532. Among his works we notice Epistoles Variae, in the Epistolae saliquot emdit. Virorum (Belle, 1520): — Treatise teaching how to die well (1534): — An Exhortation to young Men (1540, 8vo): — Treatise of Charity (1546, 8vo): — Rules for a godly Life (London, 1660). See Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, volume 32, s.v.

## Lupus (originally Wolf), Christian[[@Headword:Lupus (originally Wolf), Christian]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born June 12, 1612, at Ypern. He joined the order of the Augustinians, was in 1653 doctor of theology and professor primarius at Louvain, and died July 10, 1681. He wrote, Diss. de Meletii et Arii Personis, Moribus Atque Erroribus: — De Symbolo Apostolico et Nicceo: — De Synodo Niccena: — De Concilio Sardicensi: — De Concilio Constantinopolitano:De Synodo Ephesina: — De Latrocinio Ephesino: — De Synodo Sexta: — De Synodo Trullana: — Scholia et Notce in Canones et Decreta Synodorum Generalium et Provincialium (5 volumes). After his death was published from his manuscript, Summum Romanae Apostolicae Sedis Privilegium Quod Evocationes et Appellationes (Venice, 1729). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:659, 664, 913, 920. (B.P.)

## Lupus, Christian[[@Headword:Lupus, Christian]]

             SEE WOLF.

## Lupus, Servatus, Or Loup, De Ferrieres[[@Headword:Lupus, Servatus, Or Loup, De Ferrieres]]

             a French ecclesiastical writer, was born in the neighborhood of Sens about the year 805; studied at the abbey of Ferrieres, and afterwards at Fulda. under the celebrated Rabanus Maurus. Eginhard instructed him in the classics. In 836 he returned to Sens, where he soon acquired a great reputation for learning. He was called to the court of the empress Judith, and became a favorite both with Louis le Debonnaire and his successor, Charles the Bald. In 841, the latter prince, having resolved to remove Odon, abbot of Ferrieres, appointed Lupus in his stead. This intervention of the royal power in the affairs of the Church displeased the ecclesiastical authorities, and Lupus failed to secure their sanction until he had obtained from king Charles a charter granting to the monks of Ferriires the right of appointing in future their own abbots. This charter is to be found in the Galliat Christisana, among the Instrumenta of volume 12, column 8. Lupus had great influence both with the king and with the clergy, and was present at all the councils held in France from 844 to 859, taking an active part in their proceedings. When the Normans landed in France in 861 he sought refuge in the diocese of Troyes. Still in the same year we find him present at the Council of Pistes, and in 862 at that of Soissons. There is no mention  made of him afterwards; whether he died then, or whether, as would appear from the chronicle of Robert of Auxerre, he was exiled from Ferriress, and his rival Guanelon appointed in his stead, does not appear. His works, so far as they were then extant, were collected by Etienne Baluze, and published first in 1644, then, with notes and corrections, in 1710, 1 volume 8vo. His treatise De tribus Quaestionibus discusses free- will, the twofold predestination, and the question whether Christ died for all men, or only for the elect. Gottschalk had mooted these three questions, strongly maintaining the necessity of grace; John Scotus Erigena, Rabanus Maurus, and Hincmar had more or less defended the doctrine of free-will. Lupus here attempts to conciliate these two opposite views, without, however, concealing his preference for that of Gottschalk. He thinks that, in the fallen human nature, free-will does indeed, to some extent, participate in our good impulses, yet is of no effect compared with grace. These impulses themselves originate in grace, and can only avail through grace; but, at the same time, grace enlightens the will, which becomes then a voluntary agent in continuing the work thus begun by grace alone. The Jansenists often quoted these views of Lupus. See Gallia Christ. volume 12, col. 159; Hist. Litt. de la France, 5:255; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 32:19; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:562; Neander, Ch. Hist. 3:459, 482.

## Lupus, St[[@Headword:Lupus, St]]

             The Roman Catholic Church commemorates three saints by this name. The most important of them was born at Toul about the beginning of the 5th century. He was of a good family, and received a good education. He was afterwards married to Pimeniola, sister of Hilarius, bishop of Aries. Seven years after he abandoned his wife and children, and joined the disciples of St. Honoratus, who were there laying the foundations of the afterwards renowned convent of Lerins. In 426 he returned to Macon, and was elected to the see of Troyes, and greatly distinguished himself by his learning, both classical and theological. In 429 a council of the bishops of Gaul sent him, together with Germain of Auxerre, to Brittany, to oppose the Pelagian heresy, which was making great progress in that country. In 451, when Attila conquered Troyes, we find the barbarian king in intimate association with the bishop, and in his retreat Attila was accompanied by Lupus as far as the shores of the Rhine. Lupus died, according to tradition, July 29, 479.  His most distinguished contemporaries called him "episcopus episcoporun," the Jacob of his age, and praised him particularly for his experience and his knowledge in all ecclesiastical matters. We possess only two works of his. One of them is an answer to some canonical questions propounded by Talassius, bishop of Angers, and to be found among the Instrumenta of the Gallia Christiana (volume 4, col. 39). It contains some interesting information concerning marriage among the clergy. There is, it says, no general rule on this point: in the churches of Autun and Troyes married deacons are ordained without difficulty; but those who were single when ordained are not permitted to marry, and a married priest, on losing his wife. cannot marry again. (Comp. Lea, History of Sacerdotal Celibacy, page 84.) His other work is a letter to Apollinarius, published in Achery, Spicilegiune, 5:579. See Hist. Litt. de la France, 1:486; Gallia Christ. 12, col. 485; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, 8:564; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 32:16. (J.N.P.)

## Luque, Hernando De[[@Headword:Luque, Hernando De]]

             the first Spanish bishop of Peru, was born in Darien, Isthmus of Panama, towards the close of the 15th century. After teaching a short time, he became priest and vicar of Panama. In 1525, as appears from subsequent events, he represented the licentiate Caspar de Espinosa, principal alcalde in Darien, in that famous written and consecrated contract between himself, Pizarro, and Almagro, by which he was to furnish the money for the outfit and expenses of an expedition for the conquest of Peru, the success of which depended mainly upon his exertions. His services were rewarded by the king of Spain with the bishopric, and he was, besides, declared Protector of the Indians of Peru. He died suddenly in 1532. See Oviedo y Valdes, Historia general y natural de las Indias, etc. (edit. de M. Amador de los Rios); Herrera, Historia general de los Viajes en has India occidentales; Prescott, Hist. of Peru; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, volume 32, s.v.

## Luria[[@Headword:Luria]]

             SEE LORIA.

## Luscinius, Othmar[[@Headword:Luscinius, Othmar]]

             SEE NACHTIGALL.

## Lush [[@Headword:Lush ]]

             SEE LAISH.

## Lusk H.K[[@Headword:Lusk H.K]]

             a Presbyterian minister, prosecuted his college studies at the Western University, in Monongahela City, and graduated with high honors. In 1842 he entered the theological seminary at Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, and in 1846 was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Chartiers. For a time he labored in many of the vacant places of the Church, but subsequently received a call from the congregation of Cambridge, N.Y. He afterwards accepted a call from the congregation of Hulton, where he spent the rest of his ministry. He died October 25, 1862. Mr. Lusk was gifted with a simplicity of manners which made him eminently social. Familiar with the government and discipline of the Church, he filled an important place in its courts. His convictions of truth and duty were such as to prompt a fearless and unswerving advocacy of what he deemed to be right and proper. See Wilson, Presbyt. Historical Almanac, 1863, page 358. (J.L.S.)

## Lust[[@Headword:Lust]]

             (usually תִּאֲוָה, ἐπιθυμία), in the ethical sense, is used to express sinful longings-sinful either in being directed towards absolutely forbidden objects, or in being so violent as to overcome self-control, and to engross the mind with earthly, carnal, and perishable things. Lust, therefore, is itself sinful, since it is an estrangement from God, destroys the true spiritual life, leads to take pleasure in what displeases God and violates his laws, brings the spirit into subjection to the flesh. and makes man a slave of sin and ungodliness. Lust, therefore, is the inward sin; it leads to the falling away from God; but the real ground of this falling away is in the will. It took place in the earliest days of mankind (Rom 1:21), and is natural to all in the unregenerated state; it can only be abolished by Christ. The nature of man is not changed, only his empirically moral mode and place of  existence. Lust, the origin of sin, has its place in the heart, not of a necessity, but because it is the center of all moral forces and impulses, and of spiritual activity. The law does not therefore destroy sin, nay, it rather increases it, yet not in an active manner, but by the sinner's own fault. The psychological reason of this is, that the law does not destroy the lust, even while accompanied by punishment; consequently the estrangement from God can only be canceled by regeneration. This takes place in the reconciliation with God through Christ, because, in giving his Son as a ransom for sinners, God has manifested his love in such a manner as to awaken man, and give him the strength to love God again. This love of God forms the substance of regeneration, and of the operations of the Holy Spirit, and destroys sinful lust by bringing man into union with God, or by the reception of the Spirit of Christ through faith.

According to Mat 5:28, "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." This forcible expression is correct, for he who is regenerated, and whose heart is filled with true love of God. and who is possessed of the Spirit of Christ, cannot have such worldly lusts. He, therefore, who looks on a woman to (πρός) lust after her, or, in other words, he in whom her sight will awaken the lust of carnal pleasure, has already committed adultery in his heart. In Mar 4:19 (Mat 13:22; Luk 8:14): "And the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful;" by lusts we are to understand the objects of desire, for lust does not enter the heart, but, on the contrary, proceeds from it, as appears from Mat 15:19 : "For out of the heart proceed [through lust] evil thoughts [sins], murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." In Rom 1:24 : "Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts;" and Rom 1:26, it is not God who awakened the lusts, but man, who had withdrawn from God, and made gods unto himself to worship. In view of its final object, this estrangement from God is a mystery, as it is an act of free volition.

So in Rom 6:12 : "Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof;" it call be understood how one could be good so far as intentions are concerned, while yet sin would reign in the lower ego — in the perishable body (compare with 7:19, Gal 5:17). But the apostle considers man, spiritually and bodily, as a whole. He who lives in God through Christ, and is dead unto sin (Rom 6:11), must not let lust govern his perishable body, or listen to his desire, but, on the contrary, these ought no longer to  exist in him; the body is to be made as subservient to righteousness as the spirit, for it is the temple of the spirit, and therefore is the instrument wherewith the human mind, animated by the Holy Spirit, is to act. Accordingly it is stated in Rom 7:5, "For when we were in the flesh [before being regenerated], the motions [acts] of sins, which were by the law [which were shown by the law as such], did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death." So in Rom 7:7-8 : "What shall we say, then? Is the law sin [the original source of sin]? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin [the fact of its existence within me] but by the law; for I had not known lust [that it was evil] except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But [my natural] sin [the principle of sin, or lust], taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence [sinful desires resulting from the general lusts of the flesh]. For without the law sin was dead [i.e. not absent, but partly in the sense of not being recognized as sin or lust, and partly because the knowledge of the restrictions imposed by the law served but to increase the desire for what it forbade]." Χωρίς γὰρ νόμου ἁματρτία νεκρά is a general and popularly expressed aphorism, which is not received in theory.

In Gal 5:16-17; Gal 5:24, we are directed, "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. For the flesi [sin] lusteth against [in contradiction with] the [Holy] Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the thing that ye [simply] would; but they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh (in the regeneration), with the affections and lusts." The effect of the strife between the flesh and the Spirit is to prevent the evil which man desires after the flesh. The Holy Spirit helps man to triumph over lust. The image of God is never entirely obliterated, but the lusts of the flesh can lead into enormous sins, and have done so. In like manner, in Rom 1:24, etc.; Eph 4:22 (Col 3:5 comp. with Eph 2:2; Tit 3:3): "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;" lust (estrangement from God), as an impulse of free volition, is the original source of error which obscures both the mind and the heart. Further, Rom 1:21-22; 1Ti 6:9 (" But they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition"); 2Ti 2:22 ("Flee also youthful lusts"); Tit 2:12 ("Teaching us that, denying ungodliness [ἀσίβειαν] and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world)."

Christians can and must be in the world, but not of the world, and must hold themselves aloof  from its contamination. So, again, Jam 1:27; 1Pe 2:11 ("Dearly beloved, I beseech you, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul"); 1Pe 4:1-3 ("He that has suffered in the flesh [ethically, is dead unto the flesh] hath ceased from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revelings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries"); compare 1Pe 1:4; 2Pe 2:10; 2Pe 2:18; 2Pe 3:3; Jud 1:16. Once more, 1Jn 2:15-17 : "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof." Finally, Jam 1:14-15 : "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death (or misery)." The N.T. teaches us that man should eagerly avail himself of the power of sanctification proffered through grace to overcome lust and the consequent sin. — Krehl, Neu-test. Worterbuch. SEE TEMPTATION.

## Lustration[[@Headword:Lustration]]

             a formal and public application of water in token of consecration or expiation. Such acts were prevalent not only among heathen nations, more especially those of the southern climates, such as the Indians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans (compare Wetstein. Nov. Test. Evang. Mat 3:6), but also among the Jews (see Häner, De lustratione Hebraeorum, Wittenb. 1733). With these latter they were preparations for divine services of a different nature, and even for private prayer (Judith 12). They formed a part of the offering-service, and more especially of the sin-offering (Leviticus xvi); and for that reason the prayer-houses (προσευχαί) were usually established in the vicinity of running waters (compare Kuinol, ad Act 16:13). Josephts (Ant. 18, 1:5) gives an account of the manifold lustrations of the Essenes. In the language of the prophets, cleansing with water is used as an emblem of the purification of the heart, which in the Messianic age is to glorify the soul in her innermost recesses, and embrace the whole of the theocratic nation (Eze 36:25 sq.; Zec 13:1). Such declarations gave rise to or nourished the expectation that the advent of the Messiah would manifest itself by a preparatory lustration, by  which Elijah or some other great prophet would pave the way for him. This supposition lies evidently at the bottom of the questions which the Jews put to John the Baptist (Joh 1:25; compare Matthew and Luk 3:7), whether he was the Messiah, or Elijah, or some other prophet? and if not, why he undertook to baptize? (compare Schneckenberger, Ueber das Alter der Judischen Proselytentaufe, § 41 sq.). Thus we can completely clear up the historical derivation of the rite, as used by John and Christ, from the general and natural symbol of baptism, from the Jewish custom in particular, and from the expectation of a Messianic consecration. SEE BAPTISM.

Among the ancient Greeks, and more particularly the Romans, lustrations were of most solemn import. Those of which we possess direct knowledge are always connected with sacrifices and other religious rites, and consisted in the sprinkling of water by means of a branch of laurel or olive, and at Rome sometimes by means of the aspergillum, and in the burning of certain materials, the smoke of which was thought to have a purifying effect. Whenever sacrifices were offered, it seems to have been customary to carry them around the person or thing to be purified. Lustrations were made in ancient Greece, and probably at Rome also, by private individuals when they had polluted themselves by any criminal action. Whole cities and states also sometimes underwent purifications to expiate the crime or crimes committed by a member of the community. The most celebrated purification of this kind was that of Athens, performed by Epimenides of Crete, after the Cylonian massacre. Purification also took place when a sacred spot had been unhallowed by profane use, as by burying dead bodies in it, as was the case with the island of Delos. SEE ABLUTION.

The Romans performed lustrations on many occasions on which the Greeks did not think of them, and the object of most Roman lustrations was not to atone for the commission of crime, but to obtain the blessing of the gods upon the persons or things which were lustrated. Thus fields were purified after the business of sowing was over, and before the sickle was put to the corn. Sheep were purified every year at the festival of the Palilia. All Roman armies before they took the field were lustrated, and, as the solemnity was probably always connected with a review of the troops, the word lustratio is always used in the sense of the modern review. The establishment of a new colony was always preceded by a lustratio with solemn sacrifices. The city of Rome itself, as well as other towns within its dominion, always underwent a lustratio after they had been visited by some  great calamity, such as civil bloodshed, awful prodigies, and the like. A regular and general lustratio of the whole Roman people took place after the completion of every lustrum, when the censor had finished his census, and before he laid down his office. This lustratio (also called lustrum) was conducted by one of the censors, and held with sacrifices called Suovetaurilia, because the sacrifices consisted of a pig (or ram), a sheep, and an ox. It took place in the Campus Martius, where the people assembled for the purpose. The sacrifices were carried three times around the assembled multitude. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiquities, s.v. Lustratio.

Something of the nature of lustration prevails in the use of "holy water" (q.v.) by the Roman Catholics.

## Lutei[[@Headword:Lutei]]

             earthy, one of the terms of reproach with which the first Christians were assailed by their persecutors.

## Luther, Martin[[@Headword:Luther, Martin]]

             the greatest of the Reformers of the Christian Church, whose name is the watchword of Protestantism, and marks a new aera in the history of Europe.

I. Youth. — He sprang from an old and widely-extended German family, of which there are documentary traces as early as 1137. He was born at Eisleben, a village of Lower Saxony, November 10, 1483 (see, however, an argument for a later date, 1484, Studien u. Kritiken, 1872) fifteen years before the martyrdom of Savonarola. As one of the heralding stars declined to its setting in blood, the Morning Star of the Reformation drew near the horizon of the new day. His father, Hans Luther, was a miner of the village of Moehra. His mother's name was Margaretha Lindemann. His parents subsequently removed to Mansfeld, and there his father became a man of property and town senator.

Luther grew up under pious but rigorous discipline. His father was characterized by severity, tempered with great honesty and clearness of judgment. Luther's mother was a woman of earnest piety, which, however, had also a tinge of harshness. Luther went to school at Magdeburg in 1497, in 1498 to Eisenach, and in 1501 he entered the University of Erfurt. Here he took the Bachelor's degree in 1503, and the degree of Master of  Arts, which entitled him to teach in the university, in 1505. He was designed for the profession of the law; but a prevailing discomfort and occasional anguish of mind, under a sense of sin and the dread of the wrath of God, heightened first by the sudden, violent death of a friend, and later by a stroke of lightning which fell near his feet, determined Luther quite otherwise. He vowed to St. Ann that he would become a monk. The evening before his entrance to the cloister of the Augustinians he spent in lively conversation and song with his university friends, and the first announcement to them of his purpose was made at the close of the festal hours. "To-day you see me; after this you will see me no more," said Luther. When night was passing into morning, July 17,1505, he presented himself for admission at the convent — soon to become the the birthplace of Lutheran Protestantism and of the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law.

II. Cloister Life (1505-1517). — He passed through his novitiate, and finally, in opposition to his father's wishes, to whom it seemed that his son had chosen "a life little differing from death," took the vows, and was consecrated to the priesthood May 2, 1507. Luther had entered the priesthood to find peace for his soul. He says, "I chose for myself twenty- one saints, read mass every day, calling on three of them each day, so as to complete the circuit every week; especially did I invoke the holy Virgin, as her womanly heart was more easily touched, that she might appease her Son. I verily thought that by invoking three saints daily, and by letting my body waste away with fastings and watchings, I should satisfy the law and shield my conscience against the goad; but it all availed me nothing: the further I went on in this way the more was I terrified, so that I should have given over in despair had not Christ graciously regarded me, and enlightened me with the light of the Gospel." From his deep depression of soul he was lifted by a brother in the cloister, who fixed his attention on the article in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the remission of sins." Staupitz, one of the noblest men of his time, dealt with Luther very faithfully. "Staupitz," says Luther, "once comforted me on this wise: 'You would be a painted sinner, and have a painted Christ as a Savior. You must make up your mind that you are a very sinner, and that Christ is a very Savior.' "I sought to make out the meaning of Paul in the term 'the righteousness of God,' and at last I came to apprehend it thus: Through the Gospel is revealed the righteousness which availeth with God — a righteousness by which God in his mercy and compassion justifieth us, as it is written, 'The  just shall live by faith.' The expression, 'the righteousness of God,' which I so much hated before, became now dear and precious, my darling and most comforting word and that passage of Paul was to me the true door of Paradise."

Luther now zealously devoted himself to the earnest study of theology. "The writings of Biel and D'Ailly he could repeat almost word for word; Occam he read long and carefully, and rated his acumen higher than that of Thomas and Scotus. He read Gerson with diligence, but the entire writings of Augustine he had read more frequently and fixed more thoroughly in his memory than any others" (Melancthon, Vit. Luth.). "Next after the holy Scriptures," says Luther, "no teacher in the Church is to be compared with Augustine; take the entire body of the fathers together, there is not to be found in them half that we find in Augustine alone" (Werke, 14:209). It was an unconscious presage when Luther, on entering the cloister, took the name of Augustine. Among the mediaeval writers, Bernard held the highest place in Luther's regard. "If ever there was a holy monk, Bernard was that monk. He is golden when he teaches and preaches — then he surpasses all the doctors in the Church" (Werke, 12:1696; 22:2050). Augustine and Bernard became increasingly precious to him as his continued studies of the holy Scriptures brought him to a profounder acquaintance with the truth. In 1508 his scholarship received acknowledgment by a call to the chair of philosophy in the newly-founded University of Wittenberg, the capital of the old electorate. The university was under the protection of the elector (Frederick) — not of an ecclesiastic — which was a happy circumstance for its part in the future. Its patron saints were Paul and Augustine. Luther went thither, and lectured on dialectics and physics according to Aristotle. In 1509 he became Baccalaureus ad Biblia; 1511, Sententiarius (Sentences of Lombard, first two books), Formatus (Sentences, last two books); October 4, 1512, Licentiatus (to teach theology in general); and October 19, 1512, Doctor of Theology, a degree which involved not a mere honor, but an office, in receiving which Luther swore "to teach purely and sincerely according to the Scriptures." He now transferred his labors from philosophy to theology. His favorite books, on which he delivered his earliest theological lectures, were the Psalms and the Epistle to the Romans. The lectures rested upon a study of the Vulgate and of the fathers. Philosophy he still prized, but most of all as a handmaid to true theology, which, he says, "searches for the kernel of the nut, the marrow of the fruit."  A journey to Rome was made by Luther in 1510, on foot. He went partly in the interests of his order, and yet more as a pilgrim. As the Eternal City rose before his eyes, he fell on his knees. and fervently exclaimed, "Hail, sacred Rome! thrice hallowed with the blood of martyrs!" St. Peter's was half finished. The man now looked upon it who was to make its completion the bankruptcy of Rome, though Rome held the world's coffers in her hands. New Rome stood on the heaped graves of the dead, old pagan city. Luther was not insensible to the historical and antiquarian interest which clustered around every site, but every other feeling was subordinate to the religious one. He was full of honest fervor, full of pious credulity. He went up the staircase of Pilate on his knees, yet with his heart protesting as he crept: Not thus do "the just live by faith." He looked upon the handkerchief of Veronica; he gazed on the heads of Paul and Peter, and his strong sight was too much for his strong credence — he pronounced the heads carvings in wood, and bad carvings. Luther saw the pomps and the corruptions of Rome, but his heart remained fixed still in its strong love to the "Roman Church, honored of God above all others" (1519).

The visitation of the cloisters of Misnia and Thuringia, conducted by Luther (1516), in the absence of the provincial Staupitz (who was then in the Netherlands), was the means of opening Luther's eyes to the corruptions among the people and the clergy, but did not shake his faith in the Church. "His first prejudices were enlisted in the service of the worst portion of the Roman Catholic Church; his opening reason was subjected to the most dangerous perversion; and a sure and early path was opened to his professional ambition. Such was not the discipline which could prepare the mind for any independent exertion; such were not the circumstances from which any ordinary mind could have emerged into the clear atmosphere of truth. In dignity a professor, in theology an Augustinian, in philosophy a Nominalist, by education a mendicant monk, Luther seemed destined to be a pillar of the Roman Catholic Church, and a patron of all its corruptions."

The first light of the Gospel as Luther sheds it, beams forth in his lectures on the Psalms and Romans. Among his earliest works are his series of sermons on the Ten Commandments, his exposition of the penitential psalms, printed in 1517, and his exposition of the Lord's Prayer, delivered during Lent in 1517, and printed in 1518. He had become a student of Tauler and of the "German theology." The influence of the pure and profound mysticism of these books shows itself in all of Luther's later life,  for true mysticism is the internal mirror of the truth of God. Luther's advance in Biblical study, and the influence of this loftier mysticism, brought him more and more out from the influence of Aristotle and of scholasticism. He was unconsciously preparing for the opening of that grand part which he was to play in the history of the Church and in the history of mankind.

The traffic in indulgences (q.v.) had been brought into the vicinity of Wittenberg, with the approval of the archbishop of Mayence, by Tetzel, a Dominican monk. The expressions with which Tetzel recommended his treasure appear to have been marked with peculiar impudence and indecency. But the act had in itself nothing novel or uncommon; the sale of indulgences had long been recognized as the practice of the Roman Catholic Church, and was sometimes censured by its more firm or more prudent members. But the crisis had at length arrived in which the iniquity could no longer be repeated with impunity. The cup was at length full, and the hand of Luther was destined to dash it to the ground. In the attitude which Luther took toward this traffic, his design was not to array himself against the Church, but to vindicate her against what he believed to be an abuse of her sacred name. At the confessional and in the pulpit he began to warn his people. He wrote earnest letters of remonstrance to the bishops of Brandenburg and Mayence, holding in regard to repentance that a distinction is to be made between the internal repentance, which is of the heart, and tie external thing of confession and satisfaction. Receiving unfavorable comments on his position from the prelates, he determined to make his opposition public.

III. First Movements as a Reformer (October 31, 1517-May 4, 1521). — On the 31st of October, 1517, at midday, Luther affixed to the castle church at Wittenberg ninety-five theses, which he proposed to defend at the university, completely denying the position on which Tetzel rested the merits of indulgences. He declared, in substance, that the command of Jesus to repent implies that the whole life is to be a repentance, not to be confounded with the confession and satisfaction made to a priest. Repentance, indeed, demands with that which is internal an external mortification of the flesh. The power of the papal indulgence can go no further than the penances imposed by the pope himself. The papal indulgence, consequently, can produce no reconciliation with God, nor, in fact, take away the guilt of the smallest daily sin. The pope can only announce and confirm the forgiveness imparted by God. This, indeed. is  not to be despised, yet it can be found without the pope's indulgence where there is true compunction and faith. The true treasure of the Church is not a treasure of indulgences entrusted to the pope, but is the Gospel of the grace of God. He distinctly held the obtaining of grace to be a thing of immediate relation between the sousl and God. In these theses Luther believed that he expressed throughout the mind of the pope, who he supposed was ignorant of the abuses that had been practiced in his name. It seems at first remarkable that Luther gives so little prominence to faith in the theses, and in the sermons on indulgence and grace which appeared simultaneously with the theses, and were meant for the people, November 1517. But a careful study will show that his conception of repentance is that larger Biblical one in which it embraces both penitence and faith. Repentance is sometimes used as synonymous with penitence, and we then speak of repenting and believing, repentance and faith. Sometimes repentance covers both, and then God is said to command men everywhere to repent. Thus, in the 12th art. of the Augsburg Confession, it is said: "Repentance properly consists of these two parts: The first is contrition, or the terrors of a conscience smitten with acknowledged sin. The other part is faith, which is conceived from the Gospel or absolution, and believes that for Christ's sake sins are remitted." "This first act of Luther's evangelical life," says Gieseler, "has been hastily ascribed by at least three eminent writers of very different character — Bossuet, Hume, and Voltaire — to the narrow monastic motive, the jealousy of a rival order. It is asserted that the Augustinian friars had usually been invested in Saxony with this profitable commission, and that it only became offensive to Luther when transferred to the Dominicans. There is no ground for this assertion. The Dominicans had been for nearly three centuries the peculiar favorites of the holy see, and objects of all its partialities; and it is particularly remarkable that, after the middle of the fifteenth century, during a period scandalously fruitful in the abuse in question, we very rarely meet with the name of any Augustinian as employed in that service. Moreover, it is almost equally important to add that none of the contemporary adversaries of Luther ever advanced this charge against him, even at the moment in which the controversy was carried on with the most unscrupulous wrath." The influence of the theses was instantly felt far and wide. "The theses," says Luther himself, "ran clear through all Germany in fourteen days, for all the world was complaining about the indulgences; and be cause all the bishops and doctors were silent, and nobody was willing to bell the cat, Luther became a renowned doctor, because at last somebody had come who took  hold of the thing." Luther, in his frank, artless confidence that the pope would be his most enthusiastic patron, was soon undeceived, but his higher trust was strengthened by the course of events. "If," said he, "the work be of God, who call overthrow it?" (Compare here the article SEE LEO X in this volume, especially page 363 sq. A careful reprint of the theses, after the original, is givesn in Ranke's Reformation's Geschichte.)

In 1518 the Augustinian Order held a convention at Heidelberg. All of Luther's friends counseled him against going thither, as his life was threatened. Luther, faithful to the vow to his order, went, on foot, to the convention. In Heidelberg he disputed on theses in theology and philosophy; on free-will and the fall; grace, faith, justification, and good works. He took ground against Aristotle. An immense audience, not only of students, but of citizens and courtiers, attended the disputation. Amongr the auditors were Bucer, Brentius, and others, destined to play a memlorable part in the scenes of the coming Reformation. Meanwhile the principles maintained in the ninety-five theses had provoked the assaults of a number of stanch adherents to the practice of the indulgence traffic; but Luther stoutly defended himself against all of them in his "Resolutiones," that is, solution of points in dispute concerning the virtue of indulgences; and, still hoping for redress from Rome, sent these to Leo X. His appeal was first of all to holy Scripture, and, next to this, to Augustine, as the profoundest expositor of Scripture among the fathers.

While the elector, in the interest of the university, protected Luther, Rome avoided coming to the last extremity. As early as February 1518, the pope had instructed the general of the Augustinian Order, Gabriel Venetus, to turn Luther from the path he was following. As this measure failed of success, Luther had been called forward for trial to Rome. By the intercession of the elector, in place of appearing at Rome to answer the citation, the appointment was made that cardinal Cajetan should give him a hearing at Augsburg. Urban, the orator of the marquis of Montferrat, tried his arts of persuasion previous to Luther's meeting Cajetan. To him Luther said, "If I call be convinced that I have said anything in conflict with the understanding of the holy Roman Church, I will at once condemn it, and retract it." Urban said, "Do you think the elector is going to hazard his land for you?" Luther replied, "I would in no wise have it so." "Where, then, will you abide?" Luther answered, "Under the cope of heaven." The Italian replied, "Had you the pope and the cardinals in your power, what would you do?" "I would," said Luther, "give them all due honor and reverence."  At this the messenger, after the Italian manner, biting his thumbs, went away (Fuller, Abel Redivivus [Nichols], 1867, 1:44).

The cardinal himself attempted, October 1518, to bring "little brother Martin" to submission, but without success. "I don't wish to talk more with this beast; he has a deep eye, and marvellous speculations in his head." The good offices of Staupitz, the head of the Augustinians, and a firm friend of Luther, were also called in to move Luther, but the service was not one after his heart. When Luther asked Staupitz for some other interpretation of the Scripture than that on which his faith rested, Staupitz acknowledged that he could not give it, and showed where his heart was when he said to Luther "Remember, dear brother, that thou hast begun in the name of Jesus." In order that Luther might not be hampered, Staupitz had absolved him from the vow of obedience to the order. Luther finally appealed from "our most holy master Leo X, illy informed, to Leo X, to be better informed." Having reason to fear violence, he made his escape in the night of October 20. Staupitz furnished him with a horse and an old guide. Luther, disguised in a long mantle, barefooted, and unarmed, rode until the evening of the day following, and when dismounted, could not stand, but lay helpless on the straw. At Grafenthal he was overtaken by count Albert of Mansfeld, who laughed heartily at Luther's style of horsemanship, and insisted on having him as his guest. Two days after Luther's departure the appeal was fastened to the door of the cathedral at Augsburg.

The papal bull of the month following condemned the attacks upon indulgences, and claimed for the pope the power of delivering sinners from all punishments due to every sort of transgression. Luther, now despairing of any reasonable accommodation with the pontiff, finding that nothing short of the six letters " r e v o c o" would answer, appealed on November 25, 1518, from the pope to a general council. Leo, however, by this time aware of the greatness of the schism likely to occur in the German Church, seeing around Luther fast gathering the great, and the strong, and the learned, hastily dispatched Miltitz, the papal chamberlain and legate, whose moderation and skill adapted him for the mission of conciliation. Though he utterly failed to procure any recantation, he yet succeeded in obtaining from Luther (1519) an expression of submissiveness, and induced him to write to the pope a letter full of courtesy and humility, promising silence if it were also imposed on his adversaries. SEE LEO X.

IV. Leipsic Disputation. — But the vanity and eagerness of his opponents were too great to allow the stipulation any practical force. They saw spurs to be won, and would not lift their lances from rest. Eck in the previous year (1518) had challenged Carlstadt to a disputation, but his whole course proved that Luther was to be the main object of his attack, and Luther hesitated not to appear in defense. The disputation took place at Leipsic, in the Pleissenberg Castle, from June 26 to July 16, 1519. Carlstadt was no match for Eck, who was incomparably the best debater on the side of Rome in the century. The discussion was so tedious at times that the hall was emptied. The debate itself, and the part Luther himself took during its progress, have already been spoken of in the article ECK SEE ECK ,

The breach with Rome was decided at these disputations by Luther's declaration that among the articles of Huss there were also some condemned by the Council of Constance completely Christian and evangelical, thus clearly denying, de facto, the authority of the Church to decide in matters of faith. In August 1520, appeared the reformatory writing, "To the Christian Nobles of the German Nation, of the bettering of the Christian State." In this work Luther unsparingly exposed what the pope had done to convert the Germans, a noble, loyal race, into treacherous perjurers, and showed with what forbearance Germany had borne these indignities. The German knighthood had offered to draw sword in Luther's defense, but he declined the aid of all earthly power, as out of keeping with the holy interests of the kingdom.

This great book showed to the knights that Luther's arms were mightier than theirs. In his book, " Of the Babylonish Captivity of the Church," October 6, 1520, Luther presented the doctrinal aspects of the Reformation, as in his book to the nobles he had looked at it in its political relations. He demanded the total abrogation of indulgences as "devilish institutions," the restoration of the cup to the laity, the limitation of the number of the sacraments: "If we wish to speak rigidly, there are in the Church two sacraments only." He declared transubstantiation to be no article of faith, and set forth the view that "true bread and true wine," not their mere accidents, remain in the Supper. He urges the cessation of external ecclesiastical satisfactions. Through the whole he argues the sufficiency of the faith by which alone man is justified. It might have seemed fixed that reconciliation with the Church of Rome was no longer possible; yet, as the result of a second conference with Miltitz at Lichtenberg, October 12, 1520, Luther expressed himself willing once more to test the question. If reconciliation  were to be had at all, the sermon "Of the Freedom of a Christian Man" (Wittenb. 1520) breathed the very spirit in which alone it was possible. It is "pleasant, without polemics, full of devoutness, and of the overwhelming might of love to God and love to man. In it the reformatory principle appears in its depth, its rich devotional spirit, its religious freshness. Its life- breath is the spirit of the higher peace; it contains a treasure of new impulses for the intellectual, and, indeed, the speculative life of the Christian soul. The evangelical principle, as it involves faith and love, has perhaps never been unfolded with such clearness, fullness, and depth. It is noble and full of significance that Luther appended this golden little book to his last letter to the pope (September 6, 1520), as if with a petition for a peaceful separation and a more kindly construction. But it is a happy thing besides to note the quiet self-possession, the profound repose, and clearness of soul with which Luther stood as the strife grew more threatening, and the bull of excommunication was impending. This undoubted mirror of a childlike heart, reflecting the peace of heaven, is in amazing contrast with the thunder-storm which gathered about it, and is a demonstration that the confessor of the justification which is by faith had what he confessed, and was what he taught" (Dorner, Gesch. der Prot. Theol. pages 101, 108).

Rome had meanwhile been getting ready to settle the whole matter by a coup de main. In September 1520, Eck appeared in Germany with the papal bull, dated June 15. It condemned as heresies forty-one propositions extracted from Luther's writings, ordered his works to be burned wherever they were found, and summoned him, on pain of excommunication, to confess and retract his errors within sixty days, and to throw himself upon the mercy of the pope. This bull brought Luther to a step decisive beyond recall. Susceptible to gentleness, he met violence and threatening with unshakable courage. Like a great general, promptly accepting the warfare forced upon him, he carried the war instantly into the heart of the enemy's territory. Before the gate which opens towards the river Elster, at Wittenberg, in the presence of a vast multitude of all ranks and orders, he burned the papal bull, and with it the decree, the decretals, the Clementines, the Extravagants, the entire code of Romish canon law, as the root of all the evil, December 10, 1520. Archdeacon Manning, whose testimony here will carry peculiar weight, says: 'The just causes of complaint which made Luther first address the bishops, his steady appeals through every gradation of ecclesiastical order to the award of a general council; and, on the other, the violent and corrupt administration of Leo X, ending in an excommunication against a man whose cause was still  unheard, seem effectually to clear both him and those who, for his sake, were driven from the unity of the Church from the guilt of schism" (Unity of the Church [London, 1842], pages 328, 329).

Thus Luther broke openly, as he had already broken virtually, with Rome, forever. This final rupture gave a character of sharpest decision to his appeal to a general council, with which he prefaced the burning of the bull, and to his writings Against the Bull of Antichrist, against Emser, and others. He still continued a faithful member of the Catholic Church of the West, holding its old faith, which knew nothing of a pope with unlimited despotic authority. He stood then in many respects in the same general position which is occupied by Dollinger now. The bull of excommunication promptly followed, January 6, 1521. In consequence of Luther's daring act, the papal legate, Alexander, demanded of the Diet sitting at Worms that he should be put under the ban of the empire. But it was the wish of the estates of the empire that, in advance of giving effect to the papal bull, Luther should be summoned to appear and have a hearing before the Diet. To this Diet, against the urgent advice of his friends, under a safeguard from Charles V, who had succeeded Maximilian in 1519, Luther went, saying, "Though there were as many devils in Worms as there are tiles on its roofs, still would I enter." In the memorable transaction at Worms, " the most splendid scene in history," as it has been styled, Luther stood in the presence of the emperor, the archduke Ferdinand, six electors, twenty-four dukes, eight margraves, thirty bishops, and other princes and prelates of the realm, April 17-18, 1521. It “was the most remarkable assembly ever convened on earth an empire against a man! Lucas Cranach's picture represents Luther as he stood there, so lone and strong, with his great full heart — a second Prometheus, confronting the Jove of the 16th century and the German Olympus." "His friends were yet few, and of no great influence; his enemies were numerous and powerful, and eager for his destruction: the cause of truth, the hope of religious regeneration, appeared to be placed at that moment in the discretion and constancy of one man. The faithful trembled." But Luther was victorious in his good confession. Having examined the books laid before him, April 17, he acknowledged them as his own.

After deep reflection, for which he had solicited time, he defended himself on the following day in an address of two hours in length. He upheld freedom of conscience, and denied the right of the priesthood to control by force the religious convictions of men. His manner was free from all vehemence, his expression was modest, gentle, and humble; "but in the matter of his public apology he declined in no one particular from the  fullness of his convictions. Of the numerous opinions which he had by this time adopted at variance with the injunctions of Rome, there was not one which in the hour of danger he consented to compromise." At the close of his speech, which was in German, he complied with the request to repeat it in Latin, for the sake of the emperor and of others. When urged with the direct question whether he would recant, he replied in Latin, “Unless I shall be convinced by the testimonies of the Scriptures or by evident reason (for I believe neither pope nor councils alone, since it is manifest they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am bound by the Scriptures I have quoted, and my conscience is held captive by the word of God; and as it is neither safe nor right to act against conscience, I cannot and will not retract anything." He added in German, "Here I stand; I cannot otherwise; God help me. Amen" (Acta Wormatiae habitae, in Opera [Jena], 2:414. The historical character of these last [German] words has been disputed [see Burckhardt, Stud. u. Krit. 1869], but without good grounds). Luther's enemies now made violent efforts to effect his ruin. They counseled the violation of the imperial safe-conduct. They appealed to the crime of Constance as a precedent. Charles replied that if honor were banished from every other home, it ought to find refuge in the heart of kings. The ban of the empire was published May 25, 1521. It made Luther an outlaw.

V. The Wartburg Exile and the Return (May 5, 1521-1522). — On Luther's return from Worms the imperial herald accompanied him to the border of Hesse. At this point Luther, with no companion but Amsdorf, turned his face towards Mohra, to visit his grandmother. At Altenstein, May 4, in the Thuringian Forest, he was seized by masked horsemen, and was taken for protection by his friend the elector to the Wartburg, the Patmos of the opening apocalypse of history (see "Leo and Luther," by Eugene Lawrence, in Harper's Monthly, 39:91-106). Here, in the apparel of a knight, he was known as Jungker George. His enemies accounted for his sudden disappearance by asserting that he had been carried off by the devil, a theory which, from their point of view, does not give to that august person the due generally conceded to his sagacity — if Rome was right, there was no one whom the devil had so much reason to wish to keep on earth as Luther. The leisure enjoyed by Luther at the Wartburg was employed by him in preparing the first draught of the translation of the New Testament. After an exile of ten months he was called back to Wittenberg, March 6, 1522, by the disorders which had broken out. The Augustinian monks had abrogated the mass; in the transactions which took  place between them, the university, and the elector, Carlstadt had intermeddled. Carlstadt had gone on at once to introduce what, in his judgment, were manifest consequences of Luther's principles. The communion was administered in both kinds, with the exclusion of the sacrificial elements and of the mass, and without confession. A great number of the usual ceremonies also were set aside, and the marriage of the priests, and of others under ecclesiastical vows, was introduced. The radical violence of the whole tendency and of its modes gave evidence that Carlstadt was availing himself of Luther's absence to attempt what he would not have dared to do when Luther was present.

The passionate violence of Carlstadt was fanned by the Zwickau Prophets, who at this time made their appearance at Wittenberg. The wild storm of iconoclasm was met by Luther with discussion for the scholar, with sermons for the people. The personal character and force of Luther, the solid truth of his position, and his irresistible popular eloquence gained a complete victory over Carlstadt (q.v.). The two men were in heart sundered from this hour, though they did not come into open controversy until 1525. Previous to the struggle with Carlstadt the life of Luther in every element and trait had made an ineffaceable impression of grandeur on the hearts of the whole German nation. Every independent heart, and all the nobler Roman Catholics, acknowledged him in the highest sense a man of the people, and, in a sense not less high, a man of God. He had "opened the sanctuary of a pure faith, and in heroic struggle had kept it open" (Dorner, Hist. of Prot. Theol., trans. by Robson and Sophia Taylor [Edinb. 1871], 1:97, 98). At this time took place his change from monasticism and asceticism to evangelical life: the former in 1524, when he dropped the monastic dress; the latter in 1525, when he married. Here also belong the part he took in 1529 at the colloquy in Marburg (q.v.), where an effort was made to harmonize the peculiar views of Luther and Zwingli on the Lord's Supper; and his work for the Augsburg Confession (q.v.).

VI. Last Efforts at Conciliation with Rome. — All the later efforts to bridge over the gulf between himself and the papacy Luther regarded as too weak, in their very conception, to justify any great solicitude either of hope or of despair on his part. At Coburg, in 1530, he warned the sanguine among his own adherents of the hopelessness of the effort to compromise with the pope without the sacrifice of the truth. “The colloquy in Wittenberg, November 1535, with Vergerius, the papal nuncio sent by Paul III, Luther considered a farce. The embassy filed into Wittenberg "with  twenty-one horses and one ass." Luther confided to his barber the chief preparation he felt it necessary to make for meeting the nuncio of the holy father, and, with a full sense of the humor of the position, put on the best clothes and the largest jewels he could command, and in the splendor of an open carriage, which would now be considered a cart, rode forth "pope of Germany, with cardinal Bugenhagen" at his side. The legate was treated with courtesy, but not with reverence. Luther declared himself willing to appear before a general council whenever it might be summoned, though he should know that it would end in his being burned. Vergerius: "The pope would not be unwilling to meet you here in Wittenberg." Luther: "Let him come; we shall be glad to see him." Vergerius: "Would you prefer his coming with an army, or without one?" Luther: "Just as he pleases; we are ready for him either way." When the legate had mounted, he said to Luther, "See to it that you are ready for the council." Luther replied, "I shall come, sir, if it costs me my head." His opinion of the proposed council was expressed in his work Of Councils and Churches (1539), and by his advice the evangelical (Lutheran) princes declined to participate in the council.

Melancthon in 1545 prepared the Wittenberg Reform, the sketch of a plan of union. To this Luther gave his subscription, but shortly afterwards published his book Against the Papacy at Rome, founded by the Devil, one of the very fiercest of his controversial works.

VII. Luther and the Bohemians. — On the other hand, Luther sought to perpetuate the fellowship formed with the Bohemians, who in 1536 had again sent their representatives to him. He wrote prefaces to their Apology of the Faith in 1533 and 1538. The dissatisfaction he had felt in 1541 with some things in their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which appeared to him suspicious, was dispelled in 1542.

VIII. Luther's last Days. — The Protestant princes had drawn the sword in the feud. Luther did all in his power to preserve the peace between the princes and the emperor; but the future looked threatening, and his soul was as full of solicitude as a soul could be whose trust in God was so implicit. The council and the congregation in Wittenberg gave Luther very serious trouble. The great renown and prosperity of Wittenberg, given to it by Luther and his coworkers, had brought the evils which naturally attend the inflowing of wealth and the attainment of position. Frivolity and fashion corrupted the people. Luther fought with all his energies against the evil. In  1530, after a powerful sermon of rebuke, he withdrew, disheartened, for a long time from the pulpit. He at length left Wittenberg, and advised his wife to sell her property there. The elector himself was obliged to interpose, to restore the old relations. From the time of his return Luther continued to preach, but discontinued his lectures.

Luther's last work was one of love and conciliation. Under the pressure of many cares, he started, in February 1546, on a journey to Eisleben, to attempt a conciliation between the counts of Mansfeldt, a work in which they had solicited his good offices. For fourteen years Luther had been a sufferer from severe and complicated diseases. He was not well when he reached the inn at Eisleben, and from the beginning of his sickness had a presentiment that he would die in the place where he was born. He was able, however, to preach once. The day before his death he expressed a strong assurance that we shall know our loved ones in heaven. February 17 he was too ill to leave his bed. When Aurifaber called, he found him so much worse that he summoned medical aid at once. Rubbing and bathing afforded him temporary relief, and about nine o'clock Luther lay down upon a couch, and after gathering a little strength by an hour's rest, proposed to his attendants that he should be helped to his bed. Jonas, and Martin, and Paul, Luther's sons, and two servants, watched by his side. His pains, however, became so great that he could not remain in his bed. Count Albert and the countess sent in haste for their own physicians. Luther used everything prescribed, but spoke of nothing but his death, which he felt sure was at hand. He poured forth his soul in fervent prayer, and, after commending his soul into the hands of God, lay silent and waiting. Among the stimulants used was shavings of the horn of the narwhal, or sea- unicorn, a remedy then greatly prized. None of the stimulants had any effect. A little before his last breath Jonas and Coelius asked him whether he died in firm assurance of the truth of the doctrine he had taught. With a distinct voice, he replied "Yes." He expired about four o'clock in the morning, February 18, 1546 (C.E. Stowe, Last Days and Death of Luther, in the Bibl. Repository, 1845, pages 195, 212).

His body was taken to Wittenberg, followed along the whole route by thousands of mourners, the tolling of the bells, and the dirges which gave expression to a universal sorrow. It was interred in front of the pulpit in the Castle Church. The funeral discourses were pronounced by Bugenhagen and Melancthon. Six weeks after Luther's death his wife wrote: "My dear husband was not the minister of a city, or of a land, but of the whole world.  To have lost a princedom, to have lost an empire, would not be such a loss as I deplore" (Briefe [De Wette, Leidemann], 6:650).

Luther's situation in reference to earthly possessions would have been that of very moderate competence (his greatest income was about three hundred gulden), had not his unbounded charity kept him perpetually poor. The large or older cloister of the Austin monks in Wittenberg was given to him by John the Constant. It was purchased from Luther's heirs for the academy at the price of 3700 gulden. Luther purchased the Little Cloister for 430 gulden: it was sold by his heirs for 300 thalers. He also owned an orchard and garden valued at 500 gulden, the manor of Wachsdorf, a malefief valued at 1500 gulden, and the Zeilsdorf property, which sold for 956 gulden. For his books, which enriched his publishers, he would take nothing.

IX. Domestic and Social Life. — In the midst of the warfare which conscience compelled him to carry on with Erasmus, Carlstadt, and others, who professed to take in whole or in part the general ground against Rome, Luther entered on that domestic life, the charm of which still wins the heart of men, whose sympathies have been lost to him as a reformer, or as a conservator in reformation. June 13, 1525 he married Catharine von Bora, who had fled from the Cistercian nunnery of Nimptsch. "This was the event of his life which gave most triumph to his enemies and perplexity to his friends. It was in perfect conformity with his masculine and daring mind, that, having satisfied himself of the nullity of his monastic vows, he should take the boldest method of displaying to the world how utterly he rejected them." Luther's intercourse with his wife and children, his letters to them, the touching story of the death of Margaret and of Madeleine, present him as the model of the head of a Christian family (Krauth, Conservative Reform. pages 33-43; Stork, Luther at Home [1872]).

Luther had six children: 1. John, born June 7, 1526, was a jurist in Konigsberg, and died there October 28, 1575. Some of his descendants were found in Bohemia in 1830 in a state of poverty. 2. Elizabeth, born December 10, 1527; died August 3, 1528. 3. Madeleine (Magdalene), born May 4, 1529; died October 20, 1542. 4. Martin, born November 7, 1531, studied theology, but had not the intellectual gifts necessary for the ministry; laid down his office, and died as a private citizen, March 3, 1565. 5. Paul, born January 28, 1533, was physician in ordinary at various courts, and died March 8, 1593. 6. Margaret, born in 1534, was married to George  von Kunheim, Prussian counselor, and died in 1570. See Nobbe, Stammbaum der Familie des Dr. Luther (Grimma, 1846); Hofman, Catharine von Bora, oder Luther als Gatte u. Vater (Leipzig, 1845); C. Becker, Luther's Familienleben (Königsb. 1858).

The direct line of male descent from Luther terminated with Martin Gottlob L., who was an advocate in Dresden, and died in 1759. The family of Luther's brother, and of Catharine von Bora, have living representatives.

The great coworkers with Luther were also his dearest personal friends. First among them were Melancthon, Amsdorf, Justus Jonas, and Bugenhagen. The Tischreden (Table-talk), which appeared twenty years after Luther's death. professes to be a record of his conversations, made immediately after them. It is not strictly authentic, and where it conflicts with well known and carefully avowed opinions of Luther, is of no value as testimony. It often presents the prosiest construction of the poetry of Luther's mind, and the dullest matter-of-fact perversion of his most brilliant thoughts. It confounds Luther himself with the character he dramatizes, in order to vivify his aversion to it, and the liveliest sallies of his wit and humor are given with the air of the most solid and painful judgments. Luther's annalist had the idolatry of a Boswell, but little of his skill. Nevertheless, the Table-talk is a record, though a clumsy one, of many of Luther's best sayings.

X. Luther and Erasmus. — In their negations Luther and Erasmus had many points of contact and sympathy. Luther admired the polished scholarship of Erasmus; Erasmus acknowledged the power of Luther, the purity of his motives, and the necessity for his earlier work. He wrote to Luther and of him as a friend (1519). When the diversity of their positions, the difference of their characters, and the pressure of circumstances made a conflict between them growingly probable, each dreaded the other as an antagonist as he dreaded no other man. (Compare here Luther's letter to Erasmus, cited in the article ERASMUS.) Erasmus was forced into the controversy. Had Erasmus had his own way, he would perhaps have never entered the lists against Luther, and he would never have written his Defence of freewill. The will of Erasmus was under bondage to the will of Henry VIII. Luther, with more solicitude than the presence of princes and prelates had ever given him, was obliged to take up the gage of battle. To the years 1524-1525 belongs this controversy. It began with an attack on the part of Erasmus in his book De libero Arbistrio. Luther wrote De  sesrvo Arbitrio. Erasmus wrote in reply his Hyperasptistes. Luther felt that Erasmus had made no new points, and that his own had been sufficiently put, and the controversy ceased. As regards the vital point in this discussion, the mass of earnest Christian thinkers from Luther's time to this have been a unit in their estimate. Erasmus simply made a development of a refined pagan naturalism (for Pelagianism is no more) under the phrases of Christianity. Luther's main point is the common ground of evangelical Christianity, though many of his particular phrases might not meet with universal approval. "Erasmus makes man at first richer than Luther does, but yet how far is Luther's conception of freedom ultimately superior to that of Erasmus, who views the highest and best element of freedom as reached in freedom of choice, and who accordingly must logically teach an everlasting possibility of falling, and make perfection eternally insecure! Luther's conception of freedom leads to godlike, real freedom by grace; fir this it could seem to be no advantage, but only a defect, to be involved in choice and hesitation" (Dorner, Hist. of Prot. Theol. transl.], 1:217). In justifying the classing of this controversy with Luther's war against Rome, Kostlin says: "Not only did Erasmus write under the pressure brought to bear on him by the papal opponents of Luther, but Luther, in his reply, shows that he recognizes the same interest as involved here, as that which had so far conditioned his whole struggle with Rome. He writes under the consciousness that in Erasmus he has again to do battle with the old principle of the Pelagianism of Rome" (2:36). (Comp. here a review of M. Durand du Laur's Erasme in The Academy, September 15, 1872.)

XI. The character of Luther lies so open in his life that it is hardly necessary to trace its lines. He was so ingenuous that if all the world had conspired to cover up his faults, his own hand would have uncovered them. His violence was that of a mighty nature, strong in conviction, waging the battle of truth against implacable foes. The expressions which jar upon the refined ear of the modern world were natural in a rough aera, and from the lips of one who was too pure to be prudish. The coarsenesses of the mendicant life can hardly fail to leave their traces on any man who has been subjected to them — the taint of a system in which filthiness is next to godliness, or, rather is a part of it. The inconsistencies charged upon Luther's thinking are those of a man of great intuitions, who grows perpetually, and who will not stop for the hopeless and useless task of harmonizing with the crudities of yesterday the ripeness of today. His widest diversities, after the sap of Reformation began to swell in his veins,  are like those of the tree which bends with the mellow fruit of autumn, careless of consistency with its first buddings in the cold rains of March. That Luther was unselfish, earnest, honest, inflexibly brave in danger, full of tenderness and humanity, the ideal of Germanic strength and of Germanic goodness; that he was one of the great creative spirits of the race, mighty in word and deed, matchless as a popular orator, one of the very people, yet a prince among princes, a child of faith, a child of God — this is admitted by all (see Krauth's Conservative Reformat. pages 45-87).

There is scarcely another instance in history in which an individual, without secular authority or military achievement, has so stamped himself upon a people, and made himself to so great an extent the leader, the representative, the voice of the nation. He has been to Germany what Horner was to Greece. "He was the only Protestant reformer," says Bayard Taylor, "whose heart was as large as his brain." (See "An Interview with Martin Luther," in Harper's Monthly, 22:231.) Luther was well-set, not tall, was handsome, with a "clear, brave countenance," and fresh complexion. His eyes were remarkable for their keenness, "dark and deep- set, shining and sparkling like a star, so that they could not well be looked upon," as old Kessler describes them. The fullness of face given him in his later pictures was the result, not of robustness, but of a dropsical tendency, resulting from his early austerities. His physical life was largely one of suffering. His habits were abstemious, and his enjoyments at the table were social, not Epicurean. His voice was not loud nor strong. Melancthon's happy phrase touching Luther's words is, that they were "fulmina," not "tonitrua" — it was their lightning, not their thunder, by which their mighty effects were produced. The papal system, the upas of the ages, which they struck, is not dead, but it is riven and blasted from its crown to its root.

XII. Luther as a Conservator. — The culmination of Luther's epic for the world at large is undoubtedly the defense at Worms. An obvious source of the diminution of interest in the later years of Luther's life is that the carrying through of what had been so grandly begun presents, in the nature of the case, less that brings before the mind, in all the magic of its unparalleled power, the personal character of Luther. When the warfare is ended, the life of the greatest soldier becomes as tame as that of the ordinary man. But, beyond this, a diminished interest and a divided sympathy are due to the fact that in the development of doctrine and of the constitution of the Church Luther took a position on which the Protestant world has divided. The occasion for the exhibition of Luther's conservatism  was given by his conflict with the Zwickau Prophets (1522) and Carlstadt, and by the dreadful excesses of the peasant insurrections. In these he encountered what claimed to be results of the German mystical thinking — a mysticism which he himself had cherished; he found that these wild fanatics put their own construction upon his views of Christian liberty and the rights of the congregation, and appealed to those views in self-defense. These results and this construction Luther looked upon with abhorrence. Luther brought to a fuller exhibition what was the real difference in principle between the position of these fanatics and his own. He saw that they consciously ignored and rejected a principle without which reformation would be transformed into a radical and violent revolution, foreign in its own nature to the whole genius and history of Christianity. This principle is that of the unbroken historical life and development of the Church. Not as a something isolated from the Church, but as a divine power within it, had the truth of God reached the soul of Luther. The power which opened to Luther the true nature of repentance, justification, and grace, had not simply lingered in the Church, but had ripened in it, and the Reformation could no more have been, nor Luther have been Luther, without the Church in history, than without the Word. Men are begotten of God through the Word, but the Church is the mother who bears them. The Word of God is the all-sufficient rule of faith, but it must be seen or heard in order to be applied; and the rule of faith does not write itself, print itself, circulate itself, or speak itself, and all the ordinary organs of its perpetuation, circulation, and application are within the Church. The divinity of the Word and the divinity of the Church are doctrines not only in harmony with each other, but necessary to each other's existence. The first without the second is fanaticism, sectarianism, and hopeless individualism; the second without the first is popery. The movement of Luther, from the hour of its riper self-perception, was so completely churchly and historical that the fanatics hated Luther more than they hated the pope. Among the evidences that Luther felt the need of building the sound, as well as of thinning down and removing the rotten, may be mentioned the Wittenberg Order of the Congregations, 1522; the Leisnig Order of the General Fund, 1523; letter to the landgrave of Hesse in regard to the Homberg Church-Order, 1527; the Visitation, 1527-1529; the part he took in the arrangement of the consistories and for the government of the Church.  Those who do not sympathize with his conservatism yet admit that Luther's personal religious character was deep and consistent, and that in the sphere of conscience, and where he stands on the verities of his own internal experience, he is the unshakable reformer. But it is said by these objectors that where his own immediate religious consciousness ceases he shows himself under the influence of his earlier views; that, unknown to himself, he stands forth with the "ineffaceable traces of the monk, the priest, and the scholastic theologian." By this supposition is solved the fact that, while he rejected the mass as it embodied the idea that the Lord's Supper is a proper sacrifice, and rejected transubstantiation, he yet found it impossible to abandon the thought that the Lord's Supper veils the mystery of redemption, and is "more than an act in which a congregation unites in a pious and believing memorial." This it was, they think, which led him "to a conception of the sacrament obscure and indeterminate, and to a doctrine which maintains on a scholastic basis the presence of Christ, and the ubiquity, the omnipresence of his body." From the same direction comes the charge that, "blinded by the halo which to the eyes of the people invests the head of the imperial majesty, he overlooked the fact that it is not only Christian for a great cause to go cheerfully to the scaffold, but that it is also Christian and manly for inalienable rights to resist imperial oppression with the sword." Luther's holding back, and Luther's scruples, are charged as the main cause that the Evangelical States made so little use of the favorable opportunities which were so often presented in the political relations of the times; opportunities which, rightly used, would have enabled them to seize and to maintain the pre-eminence.

To these objections it may be answered that all that is of real importance in the judgment of Luther's position as to the Lord's Supper hinges upon the question, Is his doctrine the Biblical one? If it be Biblical, the main objections vanish. They could at the worst fix no more than the charge of doing a right thing in a wrong way. If we were to concede for Luther in these controversies what he confessed for himself at Worms, that he had fallen into personal expressions which did not become his character as a Christian, nor as a minister of Christ, yet we could say for him, as he said for himself at the same great aera, the question is not concerning his person, but his doctrine. If the doctrine be unbiblical, the proof of that fact swallows up all minor questions. But those who prize the thing will at least forgive the mode. Loving him for the "re" in which he was "fortiter," they will absolve him for its sake for having carried the "fortiter" also into the  "modo." Here, as elsewhere, the estimate of Luther's character is properly made from the position of those who harmonize with his views, not of those who differ from him, for the practical difference between the construction of firmness and obstinacy usually is, that firmness stands fast to what we cherish, and obstinacy holds stiffly to what we reject, or care nothing about. To the Romanist Luther was obstinate at Worms, firm at Marburg; to the Zwingliau portion of Protestants he was obstinate at Marburg, firm at Worms.

As regards Luther's political position, it may be said that it saved the Reformation in its infancy; and when evil counsels of the friends of Protestantism harmonized with the efforts of the Romanists to drag the question of the aera into the arena of state-struggle, the Reformation was brought to the verge of ruin. Had Luther shared the political views of the Zwinglian side of the Reformation, the appeal to arms made in the Thirty Years' War might have come a century earlier, and might have ended in the overthrow of the Reformation. But once in his career did Luther yield to the pressure of political considerations (the bigamy of the landgrave of Hesse), and in that yielding the Reformation received its severest blow, and the name of Luther its solitary blot. His simple trust in God was the highest principle. It was, though Luther did not think of it as such, the highest policy.

A complete, comprehensive, and systematic statement of his doctrines was never given by Luther, not even in his confessional writings. Others have endeavored to arrange his views in systematic order: Kirchner, Thesaurus (in Latin, 1566; in German, 1566, 1570, 1578); Theodosius Fabricius, Loci Communes (Lond. 1593; 1651, Latin; and in German, 1597); Mains, M.L. Theologia Pura (1709; with a Supplement, 1710); Beste, N.L.'s Glaubenslehre (Halle, 1845). In this general class may also be mentioned And. Musculus, Schatz (1577), and Salzmann, Singularia Lutheri (1664, fol.). It was Luther's work to restore doctrine, he left to others the arrangement of it. He made history, others might write it. Luther's great aim constantly was to give prominence and strength to those doctrines which were denied, ignored, or corrupted. His plan of warfare was that of attack rather than of defense. He fought many battles, but underwent and conducted few sieges. "The wealth of his theological knowledge and teaching rests essentially upon his direct mighty grasp, intuition, and unifying view of truth. As the result of this, it is the peculiarity of his mind that there is a relative throwing into the background of that aspect and  endowment of intelligence which are directed to calm reflection upon the diverse individual elements and parts of the object, to notional formulating, to logical or dialectical systematizing" (Kostlin, The Theology of Luther [1863]). The grand impulse of his life was to testify to the truth; so to impart the knowledge in which his own soul had found healing and salvation that it might be to others health and life.

XIII. Polemics and Irenics. — Inflexible in his opposition to Rome, he yet showed himself solicitous to preserve peace while peace was possible. Very gradually and very cautiously he declared himself for the right of armed resistance, when, in the conscientious judgment of men learned in the law, the nature of the violation of rights is such as to demand war as the sole possible mode of self-defense.

1. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper grew to a subject of extended conflict, and of far-reaching doctrinal and practical power in Luther's life and in the Reformation. It became, indeed, a touchstone. The laws of interpretation which determined the doctrine of the Supper either way, conditioned more or less the entire distinctive characteristics of both tendencies in the Reformation. While he was engaged in the controversy with Carlstadt, he heard, November 12, 1524, that Zwingle, and January 13, 1525, that OEcolampadius held the same views — "the poison widely creeping." There were, indeed, three mutually contradictory processes of interpretation; each of the three overthrew the other two, and was overthrown by them; but as they concurred in the one result, the denial of the true presence, Luther regarded them from the beginning as essentially one view.

2. Luther's course in the sacramental controversies exercised an immense influence on the internal and external history of the Reformation, and on nothing in his history has Protestant sentiment been so completely and so passionately divided. In his sermon on the venerable sacrament (1519), in which he for the first time presented with comparative fullness the evangelical view of the Lord's Supper, he still retained the doctrine of transubstantiation. His own doctrine of the true presence of the body and blood of Christ without a change in the elements ("true bread and wine remains") he first brought clearly forth in his work on the adoration of the holy sacrament (1523), addressed to the Bohemian Brethren, who had directed their inquiries to him. They claimed that they held an objective gift of God in the sacrament; and, although their doctrine has been asserted by  some to be that of a purely spiritual presence, they gave it such an approximation to the doctrine maintained by Luther that he was entirely satisfied with their statement. He discussed the question further in a letter to the preacher at Strasburg (1525), and in a preface to the Suabian Syngramma (1526), with which he declared himself in harmony. He fought earnestly against the doctrine of the Lord's Supper proposed by Carlstadt and Zwingle, which had the common feature that it regarded the Lord's Supper not so much a divine institution as a movement of man towards God. Over against their views Luther designates the forgiveness of sins as the special, distinctive grace of this sacrament, as in that forgiveness Christ has laid the efficacy of his passion. That bread remains bread, and is yet, in the sacramental complex, the body of Christ, involves to faith no contradiction. He defended his views in the Sermon of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ (1526); that the Words "This is my Body" still standfast (1527); and in Confession touching the Supper (1529). The colloquy at Marburg (1529) only in part removed his suspicions of Zwingle: "You have another spirit than we." The Schwabach Articles gave renewed expression to the doctrine of the true presence, even stronger than that in the articles which were drawn up at Marburg to express the consent and dissent of the two parties. A more hopeful turn of mind was called forth by the visit of Bucer to Coburg in 1530. As a result of this visit, Luther, in letters to Albert of Prussia and to the people of Frankfort, expressed himself more gently towards Zwingle. The Wittenberg Concord of 1536 resulted from this new movement. This Concord led to a temporary friendly recognition of the Swiss, and a correspondence with them; but all the old distrust showed itself again in the Short Confession touching the Holy Sacrament (1544). Luther had set himself with unshakable decision against every league of the Evangelical (Lutheran) States with the Swiss. He had not been able, however, to deter the landgrave Philip from forming a league with them. In the conflict with Zwingle there had been a special development of Luther's Christological views, and an expansion and distinctiveness imparted to his entire theological thinking.

3. The controversies which most deeply distressed Luther were those which took place within the Evangelical Church itself. The Osiandrian controversy in Nuremberg, 1533, in regard to the general form of public absolution, to which Andrew Osiander (q.v.), who was constitutionally self-opinionated, objected on the ground that many were unprepared for  absolution, was decided by Luther with that thorough moderation which never failed him when he believed that principle was not compromised. He thought the form unobjectionable, but advised that if Osiander felt scruples he should be allowed to omit it, without censuring those who used it, or being censured by them. He quenched the Antinomistic controversy excited in Wittenberg in 1537 by John Agricola (q.v.), who had been one of his dearest friends. Agricola completely retracted his erroneous views, but the tenderness of the old confidence and love was never restored.

XIV. Literary Activity. — The activity of Luther in the period which followed his return to Wittenberg was largely directed to the internal shaping of the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church. Among its richest results may be mentioned,

1. his German hymns in the first German Hymn-book (1524), and the Wittenberg Hymnbook (1529). He stands forth in these as the father and founder of German hymnology and Church music. SEE HYMNOLOGY. He was the author of thirty-six hymns, and of several original melodies adapted to them.

2. His Order of Divine Service and of the Congregation (Wittenberg, 1523); his Formula Messae et Conmmunionis (1524); German Mass and Order of Divine Service (1526) (all of these are given in Sunday Services of the Churches of the Reformation, by C.P. Krauth), with which he connected his Ritual of Baptism and Marriage, and a form of Confession. The great visitation in the states of the elector of Saxony (1527-1529) led to Melancthon's writing the Book of Visitation. This was revised by Luther, and issued anew in 1538.

Among Luther's greatest labors are to be mentioned the two Catechisms (1529), and his Translation of the Bible. This he commenced with the New Testament in 1522; the Old was sent out in parts, commencing in 1525, and was issued complete in 1534. The final revision was made in 1541, and the latest edition of this final revision, which Luther himself helped to correct, typographically, appeared in 1545. The Bible of Luther is acknowledged masterpiece — one of the wonders of the intellectual world. "The modern German attained its full development and perfect finish in Luther's version. By means of that book it obtained a currency which nothing else could have given it. It became fixed; it became universal; it became the organ of a literature which, more than any other since the  Greek, has been a literature of ideas. It became the vehicle of modern philosophy, the cradle of those thoughts which at the moment act most intensely on the human mind" (Hedge). "He created the German language," says Heine.

XV. Activity in Church Constitution. — He took an active interest in the constitution of the Consistories: Bedenken — Considerations of the Theologians touching Consistories (1538). An important part was borne by Luther in the preparation of the confessional writings of the renewed Church. He was, in conjunction with other divines, the author of the Marburg Articles and Schwabach Articles (1529), which furnished the basis and, to a large extent, the material, both doctrinal and verbal, of the Augsburg Confession (1530), during the direct preparation and presentation of which Luther was at Coburg. As he was under the ban of the empire, to have appeared at Augsburg would have almost certainly cost him his life, and would have made all negotiation impossible, as it would have been regarded as an open act of aggression on the part of the Protestant princes. He was brought, therefore, to the nearest point at which he could be safe, and where he could be consulted. His influence at Augsburg was no less real and hardly less direct than if he had been there in person. The great hymn "Eine feste Burg" is generally supposed to have been written at this time, but there are strong grounds for believing that it appeared in 1529. In 1537 he prepared the Schmalcald Articles, to be laid before the council which had been summoned to convene at Mantua. In aiding in giving to the Church her proper external relations, Luther exercised his influence by letters, and by his writings in connection with the Diet of Nuremberg and of Ratisbon, the religious Peace of Nuremberg (1532), and the Interim of Ratisbon (1536). At the formation of the Torgau alliance (1526) and of the Schmalcald League (1530) he had sent his opinion and advice, and, with his counsel to his elector, the protestation was made at Spires (1529).

XVI. Memorials. —

1. A monumental bronze statue was erected to Luther's memory in the market-place of Wittenberg, 1817. Another monument, reared by the German nation at Worms, was inaugurated June 25, 1868.

2. The number of medals struck in honor of Luther and of his work is very great (Jincker's Life of Luther, illustrated by medals, in Latin, 1699, and German, 1707; Cyprian's Hilaria Evangelicae [1719, fol.]).

3. The third centennial anniversary of the death of Luther was observed February 18, 1846, throughout all Germany, with Wittenberg and Eisleben as its focal points. Nor was the celebration limited to Germany. Solemn memorial services were held in France, Holland, Sweden, Russia, and other countries. The anniversary was made the occasion of establishing a number of beneficent institutions. Among these were a Luther-school in Wittenberg for the poor, an evangelical Lutheran Orphanhouse in Warsawa, and the Luther-establishment in Leipzig, February 18, 1846, the object of which was to make provision for descendants of Luther, and to circulate Luther's writings, especially his translation of the Bible.

4. Poetry and Art have devoted many of their noblest efforts to Luther and his work. But neither Bechstein's epic ("Luther," Leipz. 1834), nor the dramas of Werner ("Martin Luther, or the Consecration of Power") and Koster, nor Trimpelmann's Luther u. Seine Zeit (Gotha, 1869), which is the latest attempt to dramatize Luther's life, have taken the place in the heart of the people which they would have filled had they been wholly worthy of their theme. The great war had its Achilles, but it waits for its Homer. The most ambitious effort in English in this line is Robert Montgomery's Luther, or the Spirit of the Reformation (3d edit. Lond. 1843).

5. Among the paintings of renown, the first place historically is due to Luther's portrait by Lucas Cranach. It is now in the possession of Winter, in Heidelberg. The copies and engravings of it have been multiplied by millions. Busts or portraits of Luther are found in many of the Protestant (Lutheran) churches on the Continent, and in some in America.

XVII. Literature. — Luther's separate works amount to about four hundred. In a collected shape his works have appeared in the following editions:

1. 1539-1559, 20 volumes folio (at Wittenberg), by order of the elector John Frederick. Seven of the volumes are in Latin (1545-1558), and one (Breslau, 1563) is the Index.

2. 1555-1558,12 volumes folio (Jena). Four are Latin. The Index (1573 and 1592) was completed by Aurifaber (Eisleben, 1564-1565, 2 volumes folio). Text more trustworthy than that of the Wittenberg.

3. 1661-1664, 10 volumes folio (Altenburg), by order of the duke Frederick William; edited by J. Ch. Sagitarus. German only. A supplement to these three editions was published in 1702, by J.G. Seidler (Halle, 1702).

4. 1729-1740, 23 volumes folio, German (Leipzig); best of the folio editions.

5. 17401753, 24 volumes 4to, German, J.G. Walch (Halle). Preferred to the others because of its fullness, and the incorporation of important documents; objected to because of inaccuracies, and liberties with the text.

6. a. 1826-1857. 67 volumes 12mo, German (Erlangen); edited by John G. Plochmann and John C. Irmischer. It is the most critical of all the editions.

b. The Latin series of the same edition is not yet completed.

Selections from Luther's works, or abridgments, have been edited by F.W. Lommler (Gotha, 1816-17, 3 volumes), by Vent (Hamb. 1826-27. 10 volumes), by Pfitzer (Frankf. 1837), by Otto von Gerlach (1840-1848, 24 volumes), and by Zimmermann (1846-1850, 4 volumes, 8vo). For the German Christian people, by Frobenius, Schellbach, and others (1847- 1855). Political writings, by Mundt (Berl. 1844). Kirchen-Postille, by Francke (Leipzig, 1844). Manual Concordance of Luther's writings, edited by Lomler and others (Darmstadt, 1827-1831, 9 volumes). See Bretschneider, Luther an Unsere Zeit (Erfurt, 1817).

Translations from Luther into English are catalogued in Lowndes's Bibliographer's Manual (Bohn, 1860), pages 1415-1417.

Luther's Letters have been edited, 1. by G. Th. Strobel (1780-83) and by De Wette (1825-28); supplement by Seidemann (1856). 2. Correspondence edited by Burckhardt (1866). See Veesenmayer, Literargeschichte ("Literary History of the Collections of Luther's Letters," Berlin, 1821).

The "Table-Talk" (Tischreden, Aurifaber, 1566; Stangwald, 1571, 1591) has been critically edited by Forstemann and Bindseil (1844-48). The most complete translation into English is by Capt. Henry Bell (Lond. 1652, folio; 2d edit. 1791; new edit. Burckhardt, 1840 [garbled]; transl. by Wm. Hazlitt, London, 1848; new edit., with additions, London [Bohn], 1857; Philad. 1868).  The writers on the life of Luther are numerous (Fabricii Centifolium [Hamburg, 1728,1730 2 volumes; Ukert, 1817]; E.G. Vogel, Biblioth. Biographica Luth. [Halle, 1851], give the literature), namely, Melancthon, Historia de vita et Actis Lutheri (Wittenberg, 1546; edited by Augusti, Breslau, 1817; with Preface by Neander, Berl. 1841; transl. by Zimmermann, Göttingen, 1816; in English, London, 1561, 1817); Cruciger (1553); Mathesius. Geschichte Luther's, in Seventeen Sermons (Nurnberg, 1565, and frequently since; edited, with observations by Rust, Berl. 1841; by Schubert, Stuttg. 1852); Selnecker (1575); Dresser (1598); Walch, in his edition of Luthers Werke, 24:1-875;. Keil (2d ed. Leipz. 1764, 4 volumes); Schrockh (Leipzig, 1778); Tischer (Leipz. 1793; new edit. 1803); Ukert (Gotha, 1817, 2 volumes [rich in notices of literature]); Spieker, Geschichte Luther's und der Reformation (Berlin, 1818, 1 volume); Stang, Leben u. Wirken (1835-37; after J. Mathesius, Nurnb. 1833); G. Pfizer (Stuttg. 1836); Ledderhose (1836); Meurer, Luther's Leben, aus den Quellen, erazahlt (Dresden, 1843-1846 [transl. N.Y. 1848], 1852; 3d edit. 1870; abridged, 1850, 1861, 1869); F.W. Genthe, Leben u. Werke (Eisleb. 1841-45); Jiurgens, First Divis. 3 volumes — reaches only to 1517 (Leipz. 1846-47); Weydmann (1850), H. Gelzer, Historical Sketches, with pictorial illustrations by G. Konig (Hamb. 1851; transl., with an Introduction and view of the Reformation in England by Croly, 1853, 1858; 3d ed. Bohn, 1860; reprinted, Philadelphia, with Introduction by T. Stork, 1854); J.A. Jander, Luther's Leben (Leipzig, 1853); K. Zimmermann (Darmstadt, 1855); G.A. Hoff, Vie de Luth. (Paris, 1860); H.W.J. Thiersch, Luther, Gustav Adolph, ud Maximilians I (Nordl. 1869); Jikel, Dr. M.L. Gesch. seines Lebens und seiner Zeit (1870); Schultz (E.S.F.), Luther's Leben u. Wirken (Berl. 1870); Lang, M.L. (1870). The biographical dictionaries and the encyclopaedias all have articles on Luther. Among the former may be mentioned Bayle, among the latter the Britannica (Bunsen) and Herzog (by Kostlin). Many of the most important works which treat of Luther's life, as, for example, Sleidan, Scultetus, Seckendorftenzel, Spalatine, Myconius, among the older writers, and Marheineke, Ranke, D'Aubigne, Waddington, among recent ones, present it in its connections with the history of the Reformation (q.v.).

The most noticeable lives of Luther from Roman Catholic hands are by Cochlaeus (1549; tr. into German by Hueber, 1582), Ulenberg (1622; trans. into German, Mainz, 1836), Michelet (1833-35, trans. by Lawson,  1836; by G.H. Smith and by Hazlitt, 1846), and Audin (Par. 1838, 1850; transl. Philad. 1841; by Trumbull, London, 1854).

The best known by English hands are by Bower (1813), Riddle (1837), and John Scott (London, 1832; New York, Harpers, 1833). The Schonberg-Cotta family (1864) is the best picture of Luther from an English pen; little more than the frame is fiction.

From the hands of American authors we have lives by Sears (1850),Weiser (1848,1866), Loy (tr. of Frick, 2d edit. 1869), J.G. Morris (Quaint Sayings and Doings concerning Luther, 1859), and A. Carlos Martyn (1866).

The third centennial of Luther's death, February 18, 1846, called forth an immense number of writings: Ortmann, Pasig, Kothe, Meurer, Petermann, Heyl, John, and Loschke. Petermann and others published histories of Luther's last days, and of his death and burial. There appeared at this time the account of Luther's last hours by two eye-witnesses, Justus Jonas and Coelius of Mansfeld; Luther's sermons, hitherto unprinted, edited by Holk (from the MSS. of the Wolfenbuttel Library); selections from Luther's German letters, by Doring; and Luther's hymns, by Kurtz, Wackernagel, and Crusius. Among the best books called forth is the prize work of Hopf — his critique (Wurdigung) of Luther's translation of the Bible, with reference to the older and the more recent translations (1847).

On Luther's theology, see Julius Kostlin, L.'s Theologie, "Luther's Theol- gy, in its historical unfolding and in its internal connection" (Stuttgart, 1863); L.'s Theologie, "Luther's Theology, with special reference to his doctrine of Atonement and Redemption" (Harnack, 1862-7); Dorner, Gesch. der Protest. Theolog. (Manchen, 1867; trans. by Robson and Sophia Taylor, Edinb. 1871, 2 volumes); Plitt, Einleitung in die Augustana (Erlangen, 1868); Chr. Weisse. Luther's Christologie (1855); Luther's Philosophie von Theophilos (1 Theil, die Logik, Hanover, 1870).

On Luther's German style, see Dietz, Wörterbuch zu Dr. M. L.'s Deutschen Schriften (Leipsic, 1868); Opitz, Die Sprache L. (Halle, 1869).

(On the character and merits of Luther, Ackermann L. Seinens Vollen Werth und Wesen nach, aus seinen Schriften dargestellt (I Heft, "Luther im Kampf," Jena, 1871). For other literature, SEE REFORMATION. (C.P.K.)

## Lutheran Church, Lutheranism, Lutherans[[@Headword:Lutheran Church, Lutheranism, Lutherans]]

             I. The name "Lutherans," as a designation of all those who were in sympathy with Luther's views, was, at the opening of the Reformation, first applied to them by Eck (q.v.) and pope Hadrian VI, and was meant as a term of depreciation, and at first and for a considerable time designated the entire body of those who opposed the corruptions of Rome. The official and proper titles of the particular churches on which the name Lutheran has finally been fixed are "Protestant" (q.v.), "Evangelical" (q.v.), and "Adherents of the Augsburg Confession." The Protestant Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession has not, as a whole, to this hour, by any official act, received or acknowledged the title "Lutheran," but has tolerated it because of the historical necessities of the usage. Like the name "Christian" itself, invented by enemies, it has been borne until it has become a name of honor. It became more and more the received term for the Protestant Evangelical Church in consequence of the struggles of that Church with the Zwinglian and Calvinistic-Reformed without, and the Philippists within. It marked Lutheranism in antithesis to Calvinism, and the thoroughgoing adherence to the faith of Luther, over against the changes furtively introduced and extended under the plea, true or false, of the authority of Melancthon (q.v.; also SEE PHILIPPISTS ).

The Lutheran Church is the ecclesiastical communion which adheres to the rule and articles of faith restored in the Reformation, of which Luther was the chief instrument. The acceptance of this rule (God's Word) and the confession of this faith are set forth in the Augsburg Confession of 1530, which is the common confession of the entire Lutheran Church. The major part of the Lutheran Church formally and in terms acknowledges, and the rest of it, almost without exception, virtually acknowledges the Apology of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, the Schmalcald Articles of 1537, the two Catechisms of Luther of 1529, and the Formula of Concord of 1579, as accordant with the rule of faith and with the Augsburg Confession. These confessions, together with the oecumenical creeds, form the Book of Concord of 1580, and are often styled the Symbolicol Bosoks of the Lutherans Church. The system of faith and life involved in the Church's Confession is Lutheranism, the Church which officially receives it is the Lutheran Church, and the members of that Church are Lutherans. The faith of the Lutheran Church is thus summarily presented by Dr. Chas. P. Krauth (Conservative Reformation, page 127): "We are justified by God, not  through any merits of our own, but by his tender mercy, through faith in his Son. The depravity of man is total in its extent, and his will has no positive ability in the work of salvation, but has the negative ability (under the ordinary means of grace) of ceasing its resistance. Jesus Christ offered a proper, vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice. Faith in Christ presupposes a true penitence. The renewed man co-works with the Spirit of God. Sanctification is progressive, and never reaches absolute perfection in this life. The Holy Spirit works through the word and sacraments, which only in the proper sense are means of grace. Both the Word and the Sacraments bring a positive grace, which is offered to all who receive them outwardly, and which is actually imparted to all who in faith embrace it." The chief peculiarities of Lutheran doctrine, which have to any considerable degree become subjects of controversy outside of the body itself, relate to (1.) Original Sin, (2.) the Person of Christ, (3) Baptism, and (4) the Lord's Supper. These will be found specially treated under those heads. Luther's own views on the last point will be detailed under the art. SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION. For a more complete view of the doctrines of Lutheranism, see Krauth, Conservative Reformation (Phila. 1871), and Prof. Jacobs in the Mercersburg Review, January 1872, page 77 sq.; Zöckler, Augsburische Confession (1870).

II. Origin and Extent. — The rupture with the dominant part of the Church of Rome, and the formation of the new communion, was made inevitable by the Diet at Spires in 1529, at which the solemn protestation of the evangelical princes was presented, in opposition to the imperial recess (decree) in its bearing on the great religious interests of the time. This event gave to the Lutheran Church the title PROTESTANT SEE PROTESTANT (q.v.), by which it is almost exclusively known in parts of Europe. The rupture was completed by the events connected with the presentation of the Augsburg Confession in 1530. The fundamental principle of the Lutheran Church prevented its formation into a new, concentrated, and united whole, like that which had grown to such enormous proportions and baleful power in the Church of the West. Nor was it Luther's object to form an independent Church. He hesitated as much in the establishment of an independent organization as do the leaders of the Old Catholic movement in our day (1872). Luther's single aim, like Dollinger's today, was the reformation and revival of Christianity, and the restoration of the whole Church, in its universal form, to primitive and scriptural purity. Denominationalism he knew not. His conception of the  Church comprehended Catholic Christianity. In spite of himself, however, his peculiar views, which for convenience sake we will now denominate "Lutheranism," spread rapidly, especially after the Diet of Worms (1521), and though as late as 1522 Luther himself wrote, I beseech you, above all things, not to use my name; not to call yourselves Lutherans, but Christians" (Works, 18:293, in the 6th Leips. ed.; comp. also Gelzer, Life of Luther, pages 288, 291), national churches sprang up in every country where his followers constituted the majority. These state churches were all independent of each other, and were based much upon the same fundamental principles of polity, allowing, however, of great variety in the forms of application. Instead of the bishop of Rome, the princes of the different countries now assumed the rights of bishops, and the direct rule of the Church was conducted by the Consistories (q.v.). John the Constant, elector of Saxony, followed in the steps of his brother and predecessor, Frederick the Wise, in devotion to the work of Luther. The landgrave Philip of Hesse also became an adherent. In Prussia the Lutheran doctrine was introduced in 1523 by George of Polentz, bishop of Samland. Thus, at the beginning of the year 1525, the three princes of Saxony, Hesse, and Prussia were its defenders. The Reformed doctrine found an especially ready entrance in the free imperial cities, where the voice of the people was a power. In Würtemberg it was introduced under duke Ulrich in 1534; in the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt in 1541; in Brunswick about 1545. The views which Luther had expressed at an early period in regard to a congregational constitution were thrown into the background by the disturbances of the Anabaptists and the insurrections of the peasants. The leagues of the evangelical princes were one of the earliest forms in which there was an expression of the unity of the different parts of the Lutheran Church. The conventions of the theologians for the adjustment of doctrinal controversies tended to the same end. In the political relations of the Church the unity found expression in the "Corpus Evangelicorum" (q.v.) at the Diets.

The rapid, and, for a time, resistless growth of the Lutheran Church received its first check in the "ecclesiastical reservations" of the religious peace of Augsburg. By the terms of this peace the transition of an ecclesiastical prince was attended by a loss of his secular power. The miscarriage of the attempt at reformation by Gebhard Truchsess in the archbishopric of Cologne in 1583 was a serious disaster to the Lutheran Church. The larger part of Germany was inclined to the Lutheran faith. The  apostasy of several of the princes, as, for example, Pfalz-Neuburg, on political grounds, and the influence of the counter reformation conducted by the Jesuits in Bavaria and Austria, preserved a part of Germany for the pope; but the peace of Westphalia finally fixed the bounds of the Lutheran Church in Europe, and they remain, very much as they then were, to the present day. The transition of the elector of Saxony, of the duke of Brunswick, and of other princes to the Church of Rome, exercised no very marked influence upon their people. A large part of the higher nobility, which in the earlier movements of the Reformation had manifested, almost without exception, a drawing towards it, gradually lapsed again into Romanism. (On these perversions, and other losses to the Lutheran Church, see Lobell's Hist. Briefe; Ranke, Deutsche Geschichte, volume 7 [1868].) At an earlier period than that of these changes, the Philippistic and Reformed churches of the Palatinate, and in Hesse, in Anhalt, and on the Lower Rhine, in East Friesland and Bremen, Lippe, Nassau, and Tecklenburg, had sundered themselves from the Lutheran Church. In the present century these churches have come together in the "Union." Beyond the bounds of Germany the Lutheran Church was firmly established in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and in the German Baltic provinces of Russia. In Poland it was suppressed (comp. Krasinski, Hist. of the Ref. in Poland). In the United States of America the Lutheran Church has won a new territory. SEE LUTHERANS IN AMERICA.

In Hungary and Transylvania the German (Saxon) nationality accepted the Lutheran confession. The Magyars became Reformed. In Sweden, Olaf and Lorenz Peterson, pupils of Luther, preached the purified faith. Gustavus Vasa, king of Sweden, greatly promoted the interests of the Lutheran Church; and at the Diet of Westeras, in 1544, the last remnants of the papal system were removed. In Denmark, as early as 1527, Christian II had favored the Reformation. Frederick I was also a decided Lutheran. Christian III called in Bugenhagen to prepare and introduce a Church discipline and ritual. Riga and Courland entered into the League of Schmalcald in 1538. Apart from the vast Lutheran element within the "Union" in Prussia, the Lutheran Church is the predominant Church in the minor German lands: Baden, Brunswick, Mecklenburg, Oldenburg, the principality of Reuss in Hesse, the Saxon lands, Schwarzburg, and Wtirtemburg; also in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; in Russia, in the departments of Livonia, Esthland, St. Petersburg, Finland, and Courland. Lutherans constitute a large body in Hungary, France, the British empire, and North America. They are, in fact,  found the world over. There are not less, probably, than forty millions of them altogether. (Comp. Krauth, pages 124, 125.)

III. Organization and Constitution. — The first fresh impulses of the evangelical life of faith was not allowed to shape a complete congregational life in entire accordance with the pure principles which had been restored. Although the early Lutheran princes were, as a body, men of devoted piety, yet the interests of the Church in the particular state territories were subjected to political policy. The tendencies of the Romish ideas, which in every department had struck their roots too deeply into European life to be easily eradicated, put forth new vigor in the reactionary after-time. The Lutheran Church was repressed in one part of her development, and stimulated to the highest degree by her liberty in another, and by the doctrinal necessities which taxed all her resources. The result was that she matured abnormally — the strength of her polity bore no proportion to the perfection of her doctrinal system. In the organization of the Church an important part was borne by the Church visitation in Saxony in 1529, and resulted in assigning the oversight of the churches and schools to superintendents (q.v.). A Saxon Church Order of Discipline and Worship was prepared, which became, to a very large extent, the model in the organization of the state churches throughout Germany.

The Lutheran Church held herself in principle remote from the two extremes of hierarchy, which absorbed the State into the Church, and Caesaropapacy, which absorbed the Church into the State. The princes and magistrates, in the time of the Church's need, took the position of provisional bishops. They were the supreme officers in the Church, its highest representatives. In the execution of the duties thus assumed they called to their aid Consistories (q.v.), an official board composed of clergymen and laymen. A condition of things which had been justified by the immediate necessity of the Church gradually became normal in the "Episcopal system." The provisional became legalized into the fixed, and the head of the State was in effect the chief bishop of the Church. Such a distinction as Rome had made between clergy and laity, and which ignored the great New-Testament doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, was no longer recognized. The ministry ceased to be a self-perpetuating, independent order, and was regarded as a divine office, with a divine vocation, given by Christ's command, through the Church. A hierarchical division of the clergy, as of divine right, was rejected as at war with the Christianity of the New Testament and of the early Church; but the propriety and usefulness of  grades in the ministry (bishops, superintendents, provosts), as of human right only, was acknowledged, and they are retained in some countries. Thus, in Denmark, in the very infancy of Lutheranism, evangelical bishops took the place of the deposed Roman Catholic prelates; while in Sweden the prelates embracing the Reformed doctrine were continued in office, and thus secured to that country "apostolical succession" in the High-Church sense. Very generally the rule of the Church is by consistories, but as these depend upon the instructions of the congregations, the ultimate power lies with the latter. SEE CONSISTORY; SEE SYNOD; SEE CHURCH.

IV. Progress. — The internal history of the Church became largely a process of the development of doctrine (see Hundeshagen, Beitr. z. Kirch.- politik); and in this progress, naturally enough, opposition was encountered, and gave rise to controversies with parties both from within and without. In the earliest period of the history of the Lutheran Church, her chief struggles were with Popery, the Anabaptists, and the Sacramentarians. These controversies drew the boundary-lines of her own territory, as biblical over against Rome, historical and conservative over against Anabaptism and the more radical type of Protestantism. To the fixing of the bounds of her territory succeeded a long series of efforts to bring that territory under complete and harmonious cultivation. To be consistent in general over against systems which, as systems, were indefensible, was not enough. The Lutheran system was to bring all its own parts into working harmony, and hence the various dissensions and difficulties when it was yet in its infancy. The most important of the internal controversies which arose during this effort are:

1. The Antinomistic, from 1537 to 1540, on the relation between the Gospel and the law, the use of the law, and its necessity. SEE AGRICOLA, JOHN.

2. The Osiandrian, from 1549 to 1567, on redemption, justification, and sanctification. SEE OSIANDER ANDREW.

3. The Majoristic, from 1551 to 1562: Are good works necessary to salvation? and in what sense? SEE MAJOR, GEORGE.

4. The Stancaristic, 1552: According to what nature was Christ's redemptory work wrought out — the divine, the human, or both?  5. The Synergistic, from 1555 to 1570, on the question whether there is an active cooperation on the part of man before and on his conversion.

6. The Flacian, 1561: Is original sin substantial or accidental? SEE FLCIUS ILLYRICUS. All these controversies had a common aim — they wished to define more perfectly the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith, to show what it presupposed and what it involved, to exhibit its objective and subjective aspects. All doctrines were viewed in these controversies in their relations to the central doctrine, and the great aim was to adjust them to it (see Dorner, Geschichte der Prof. Theologie (1867; in English dress, Edinb. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo). A deeper impression was made upon the life of the people by the controversies which grew out of the interim in 1548, involving the mode of worshipping God. It touched matters which appealed to the senses as well as to the convictions of the worshippers. Out of it arose the Adiaphoristic controversy (q.v.) (1550-1555): Whether the Church could permit certain usages, in themselves indifferent, to be imposed upon her by force or civil policy. The vehement opposition of the Flacians to the Philippists also had a great influence upon the shaping of the Lutheran Church. Unfortunately, however, these divisions among the Protestants gave the Romanists many advantages: they tended at the Diet of Augsburg (1566) to change the political situation greatly in favor of the Roman Catholics, and protracted the strife for years (Ranke, Deutsche Geschichte, 7:63). SEE INTERIM.

Against Calvinism, the controversy turned especially upon the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and the associated doctrine of the Person of Christ, and the doctrine of predestination. It involved the whole essential diversity between Lutheranism and Calvinism; also the Philippistic tendency, so far as it approximated to Calvinism in some features (Crypto-Calvinism). To compose these differences and close up these questions within the Church was the aim of the Formula of Concord, which after various ineffectual efforts in the same general direction at the Assembly of the Electors in Frankfort (1558), at the Assembly of the Princes in Naumburg (1561), and at the Altenburg Colloquy (1568), was finally carried to a successful completion at Cloister Bergen, near Magdeburg, in 1577. SEE CONCORD, FORMULA OF. The preparation of the Formula of Concord is the last act in the series of events which gave full confessional shape to the doctrines of the Lutheran Church.

During Luther's lifetime the Lutheran Church had taken a firm and final position over against the Roman Catholic. The Augsburg Confession was  the rallying point of the friends of the revised faith. The Apology defended the Confession in Melancthon's incomparable manner; the Schmalcald Articles gave forth Luther's trumpet note of a battle in which no quarter could now be given — a battle for victory or death. The people had their Manual in the Shorter Catechism, and the pastors, in using it, had the Larger Catechism, the best commentary on the lesser. Yet these immortal documents did not exhaust the development of the faith. Even in the individual peculiarities of Luther and Melancthon there were impulses to conflicting tendencies. After Luther's death the Lutheran Church was threatened with a schism, which might have been followed by the complete triumph of Rome over the whole reformatory work. On the one side was the gentler, unionistic tendency of Melancthon and his party (the Philippists), yearning for union, and temporizing sometimes with Calvinism, and yet more frequently with Romanism. On the other side stood the stricter party, headed by Amsdorf, Flacius, and Wigand. Over against the Church of Rome on the one side, and the Reformed Church on the other, the Lutheran Church insisted earnestly on the doctrines which distinguished and separated her from both.

She was unwilling that open questions should be perpetuated, and desired that the points of controversy should be adjusted and closed. Shall theology be simply a mode of thinking, or shall it be a system of faith? was the question involved. Shall it be a ball for the play of theologians, or a world for the firm footing of believers? The controversies which now arose took their root in questions which involved the relations of the two parties, on the one side to Romanism, on the other to Calvinism. Toward the Church of Rome the question in controversy had reference to the doctrines of redemption and justification. The intellectual centers of these struggles were the universities (q.v.). Wittenberg at this period was the home of the Melancthonian theology. Its great antagonist in the interests of the conservative Lutheranism was Jena, which for various causes — some of the subordinate ones, no doubt, being of a political character — had been founded in 1558 by the older Saxon line. It was the citadel of conservative Lutheranism until its exponents were driven from it for conscience sake. Their refuge proved to be Magdeburg. This period reaches its culmination in the preparation of the Formula Concordise, in which the Swabian tendency, whose great representatives were Brentius and Andreai, obtained official recognition (compare Schmid, Geschichte der Abendmahlslehre). The orthodoxy thus fixed was dominant from this time to the beginning of the 18th century. Its elaborate polemics were built up on almost  impregnable doctrinal authority.

The scholastic acuteness and dryness more and more supplanted the freer and more vital faith of the Reformation. The religion of the heart was too much absorbed into the elaborate system of theology. The temple was solid and grand, but the hearthstones of the people were too often cold. George Calixtus (1586-1656) revived in Helmstadt the humanism of Melancthon. His school became involved with orthodoxy in the Syncretistic controversy (q.v.). It sought, in the interests of Church peace, to soften the asperities of dogmatic disputes and the exclusiveness of the doctrinal systems. The plan on which it proposed to accomplish this result was to distinguish between fundamentals and non- fundamentals, and to return to the yet largely vague and general expressions of the first five centuries, which, while they regarded a pure faith as necessary to salvation, endured, without deciding the conflicting opinions on various points. The most unsparing and one of the ablest opponents of this tendency was Abraham Calovius (q.v.). Spener produced a revival of religious feeling by pietism. This active Christianity was needed in opposition to the one-sided scholasticism which had grown up in the Church. So far it revived the truer Lutheranism of the first aera. But it soon deviated into an outward form of religious life. The Biblical theology of its representatives degenerated into arbitrary interpretations and applications of Scripture. Pietism (q.v.), in various shades, made good its footing in the Church. It wrought in its better forms a more earnest spirit in theology. Next to Spener, as a representative of the best type of pietism, was Aug. Hermann Francke (q.v.). Its most distinguished opponents were Johann Benedict Carpzov (q.v.) and Valentine Ernest Lischer (q.v.).

The inflexible narrowness of the Church life was alleged as a ground of separation from the Church by the mystical fellowships which attached themselves to J. Bohme, Gichtel. and Dippel, and by the Church of the Brethren. By these movements, and by Bengel and the theosophy of Oetinger, the dominion of the mediaevalism of the seventeenth century was broken. Under the influence of rationalism, at the end of the eighteenth century, the points of distinction between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, both in Church life and in theology, lost more and more their significance. Efforts at union, which were vigorous without being in any high sense earnest, were made, especially in Westphalia and on the Rhine. These efforts resulted in very little until after the Wars of Liberation. From that great series of struggles went forth an intense religious feeling through all Germany. It was felt alike in both the Protestant churches. It stood in strong opposition to the shallow spirit of rationalism, but was, in the nature  of the case, more interested at the beginning in the great common principles of the religious life of the whole Protestant movement than with particular, and still more than with specific distinctive doctrines. Prussia now took steps for a "union" of all the Protestants. By the Lutheran conservatives this new movement was looked upon with distrust. The union, they held, depended for its moral power upon a depreciation in part of the confession. It had been made possible by rationalism; but its perplexity was that, if it remained true to what was in so large a part its original source, it lost its power on men in proportion as their convictions were heightened and intensified; if, on the other hand, it abandoned the mild laxity of rationalism, it at once helped to restore the way to a strict confessionalism. It is impossible for men to be intelligently earnest, either as Reformed or Lutheran, and regard the differences of the two churches as of little importance. Claus Harms, in his theses, treated the union as a rationalistic volatilization of the very substance of the faith. Among the people of conservative stamp also, the changes in the liturgy, the hymn- books, and in the Church usages of various kinds, were regarded with suspicion and dislike as an assault upon the religion of the fathers. Under these circumstances, the " Old Lutheran" movement, under the leadership of Scheibel, in Breslau, Huschke, the distinguished jurist, and Steffens, the natural philosopher, separated itself from connection with the State Church and formed an independent communion. SEE OLD LUTHERANISM.

The religious life of the Church continued to suffer from the evils which in the course of her history had been fixed upon German Lutheran Protestantism. Prominent among them were the hampering of the congregational life — a life which was demanded by the principles of Lutheranism — and the repression of public life which characterized the first half of the nineteenth century. The newly-awakened religious life withdrew itself, in consequence, very largely into the smaller religious circles, and derived from them more or less of a pietistic hue. SEE PIETISM.

These circles themselves drew more and more toward the ancient orthodoxy. To this they were impelled by the unionistic efforts, and the havoc created by infidelity and rationalism. The new theological tendencies were met by the system set forth in the Confessions. The feeling grew that without a restoration of the old relations of fealty on the part of ministers to the great Church standards there would be no internal harmony in the Church. This opposition to union first embodied itself in the Lutheran Conferences held at Leipzig in 1843, and subsequently. Rudelbach was the earliest leader of this movement. He was succeeded by Harless. It gained strength by the  civil commotions of 1848, so that at that time it demanded of the members of the conferences a subscription to the symbolical books. Under this tendency were formed the provincial associations, which united with the Lutheran Conventions at Wittenberg in 1849 and 1851. In these conventions, as well as in a great variety of publications, a strong opposition to the " union" was developed. It was evident that the conservatives were a unit on the two points — the dissolution of the state union and the complete re-establishment of the Lutheran Church. The prevailing political current in Prussia from 1852 favored this tendency. (See below, under Ritual and Worship.) In the different lands and provinces of Germany, the efforts in the one direction of emancipation and restoration bore the common character of earnestness and vigor, but in forms and modes shaped by circumstances. In Bavaria the leaders were Lohe, Thomasius, and Harless. In Mecklenburg its great representatives were Kliefoth and Krabbe. In Hanover its chief organs were the Conference at Stade, and Petri, Mtinchmeier (Dogma of the Invisible and Visible Church, 1854), and Uhlhorn; on the Rhine itself, and in Westphalia, Ravensberg. The "New Lutheranism" was not, indeed, a internal unit in all its views. Among its great theologians, Hoffmann and Kahnis completely alienated their early friends. In Bavaria, Löhe (died 1872), in carrying through his principles, came into conflict with the government in the Lutheran Church.

Efforts were made to annul the union and restore genuine Lutheranism. Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur, who will be considered above any suspicion of sympathy with the distinctive theology of Lutheranism, gives the history and characteristics of the two doctrinal tendencies, the unionistic mediating and the Lutheran, which come into conflict at this point: "The controversies arising from the question of the union have had this result in dogmatics, that no man can defend the Church doctrine without either taking position with the doctrines held in common — the consensus- dogmatik — or taking the strictly confessional position. As the chief opponents of the union are the Lutheran theologians, who, with all their strength, give force to their confessional interest, the main opposition to the dogmatik of the consensus is offered by the Lutheran dogmatik. On the side of the consensus the main representatives are theologians of the school of Schleiermacher, among whom are Nitzsch, Lücke, J. Müller, Dorner, and others. To relieve the union from the charge of lacking confessional character, they find it necessary to maintain a distinct dogmatical system.  But as it is essential to the idea of the union to set aside the particular distinctive doctrines which sunder the confessions. the system of the theologians of the union can only accept the ground common to both. In this spirit Nitzsch, in the Urkundenbuch d. Esvangelischen Union (1853), and J. Muller, The Evangelical Union, its Nature and divine Right (1854), have attempted to present, in the different articles, a formula exhibiting the agreement of the confessions. The consensus, however, can only be brought about by a limiting and tempering of the two doctrines to a medium in which the sharpness of the antithesis is lost. This method of union may be applicable to a certain set of doctrines, but it goes to pieces of necessity on the distinctive doctrines which can allow of no modification without loss of their essential character.

The principle on which the theology of the consensus rests is that that alone is essential in Protestantism in which the two confessions agree. Schleiermacher was the first to maintain this, but his object was by it to neutralize and render indifferent both systems, in order to set them aside as antiquated, and to substitute for them a point of view in consonance with modern culture. With all the care which Schleiermacher takes to give himself the appearance of complete harmony with the ancient system, it is easy to see that the new form of consciousness breaks through the old, and that the old is retained simply to introduce the new, and to smooth the way for it. In the case of these doctrinaries of the union, however, the dogmatics of the consensus is a mere illusion, which has no ground except in their lack of mental freedom. They find the particularism of the confessional systems too narrow for them; they are urged by something within them to sustain a freer relation to those systems; and there is no ignoring the fact that they take a position which has gone beyond them.

But they are not willing to confess this to themselves; instead of looking forward where their proper goal lies, they turn backwards. They are constantly recurring to the point on which the confessional differences originally rested. They desire to establish by the Church confessions what they hold to be the real substance of the evangelical faith. Yet they must themselves confess that they cannot be satisfied that they are throughout in harmony with either the Lutheran or the Reformed doctrine, and that on this ground they are wishing for what can be found in neither. The more the two systems are compared, the more do they show that the one excludes the other. This is the contradiction out of which there is no escape, the code in which there is a perpetual revolution between union and confession. The sympathy for the old system is lost, and yet there is lack of force and courage to rise to a new one. Men  know in their hearts that they are no longer at one with the Church, and yet they are afraid to break with it outwardly. They hold fast to the union, and yet cannot let go of the confessional. Is it a matter of wonder that all the dogmatic products of this school of theologians have an air of feebleness, superficiality, and lifelessness? From the dogmatic position it is impossible to deny that the opponents of the theology of the union are right; from it we must justify the Lutheran theologians, whose system, with all the offensiveness of its particularism, has at least the advantages of character, decision, and logical consistency" (Kirchengeschichte des Neunz. Jahrh. [Tübing. 1862], pages 409-411).

Mecklenburg isolated itself by its exclusive statechurchism. Even the Hanoverian Catechism, with which the earliest agitations in North Germany had been connected, did not secure the unmixed approval of the portion of the Church with whose views it was in sympathy. New Lutheranism has been accused of manifesting a tendency towards Romanizing, especially in the doctrine of the ministry, of the sacraments, and of the Church. To the ministerial office it is charged with imputing a hierarchical priestly character. It is charged with holding that ordination confers a divine authority for the ministration of the Word and sacraments, and for the discipline and government of the Church. With this tendency has been connected a desire to restore private confession, which its opponents say is almost equivalent to auricular confession. With it has arisen a strong opposition to the presbyterial constitution. It is said to maintain that the sacraments derive their operativeness from the "office of the means of grace." In connection with this view, an exalted importance is attached to the sacraments. The Lord's Supper is made the proper center of the public service. The whole artistic sense has been developed in this movement; a higher interest has been excited in the proper performance of the ritual, and, indeed, of the whole liturgical service of the Church. The intoning and the whole musical element in worship has been assigned its old place of esteem. This school has been charged with maintaining that, in order to preserve the pure doctrine, a view of tradition in affinity with that of Rome is to be held. Subjection to the authority of the Church is to be substituted for individual faith.

The most important literary organ of this tendency has been Hengstenberg's Ervangelische Kirchenzeitun, established in 1827, which maintains within the Prussian union, with immense force and success, the position of distinctive Lutheranism. This tendency separated itself from the orthodoxy which bore the tinge of pietism, and  from the mediating theology, especially in the work of inner missions (q.v.), with which it refused to cooperate, on the ground that it was not churchly. In the Prussian Church it opposed itself to the regulations of the congregations, and to the constitution of the State Church. In the department of missions to the heathen (the term foreign missions has ceased to answers since it has become the fashion for one set of Christians to establish missions for the conversion of another set), the revised New Lutheranism has pursued an independent course. Against this Dorner expressed himself, in a memorial of the Prussian High Consistory in 1866, which did not, however, prevent the newly-acquired state churches (such as Hanover, etc.) from being placed under the care of the minister of cultus. The Lutherans outside of Prussia, the Mecklenburgers, Bavarians, and others, at the conference at Hanover in 1868, with the Hanoverians, and others in Church fellowship with them, made use of the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession (of the Church and its true unity) to keep up the agitation against all union with the rest of the State Church of Prussia. See Neue Evassgel. Kirchenzeitung (1868); Ritschl, in Dorner's Zeitschrift fur das Kirchen-recht (1869); Matthes, Allgemeine Kirchliche Chronik (1871).

V. Ritual and Worship (cultus) of the Lutheran Church. — The foundation for these was laid by Luther in his Formula Missae (1523) and his German Mass (1525). In these he proceeded upon the principle, which he expressed and defended, that the Church service was not to be abrogated as a whole; that the vital parts of it had a noble origin; that the great thing was to purge off its excrescences and defilements, and to restore to its true place in it the Word of God, which had been more and more neglected. In conformity with Luther's fundamental principles, the ritual was purified, the neglected elements replaced, and the more necessary parts developed still further. It was brought back to the standard of the Bible, and of early pure Catholic antiquity. The Lord's Supper, restored to its true position, became the grand point of culmination in all the chief services. The office of the Word was renewed. Preaching became a great indispensable element of the chief public services. The congregation took a direct part in the service in response and singing. The services were held in the vernacular of the country, though a certain proportion of the familiar old Latin part of the services was in many cases continued, mainly, however, in order to retain the noble Church-music, until time had been given to fit it to a vernacular service complete in all its parts. Luther  insisted simply on an organization of worship which should preserve its rich treasures and resources. Services for the morning and evening, and for the days of the week, were retained or arranged. More than all, congregational singing was developed. In conformity with these views, there arose the service of the Lutheran type which we find in the agenda (q.v.) of the 16th and 17th centuries. In northern, eastern, and middle Germany the Wittenberg order was followed. and is maintained to this day. The service is of moderate length, and is rich liturgically.

The forms established in the aera of the Reformation were more or less broken through, or altered in a very wretched manner, in consequence of the theological revolution which marked the 18th century. With the religious life, whose reviving power was felt towards the close of the first quarter of the 19th century, came a strong desire for relief from these mischievous changes. To this desire, at least as one of its greatest motives, the Prussian agenda owes its origin; yet, alike in the mode of its introduction and in elements which pervaded it throughout, it involved a breach with the original Lutheran type, to which it claimed in large measure to conform. As this fact became more and more manifest, the effort was made to bring the forms of the agenda into harmony with the better elements which still survived in the congregations; yet, after all that could be done in this way, the result was imperfect and unsatisfactory. In consequence of this, in the most recent period, a still closer approximation has been made in Prussia to the original Lutheran ritual. One set of influential thinkers, as Hifling and Kliefoth, contended for an unconditional repristination of the worship of the Reformation time. Others held that various changes were necessary to adjust what was furnished by the history in Church worship with the well-grounded views of the present and the actual needs of the congregations.

The "agenda" became a source of special trouble in the controversy between the Unionists and the "Old Lutherans." The contest on the agenda raged particularly severe in Silesia. Among the most active participants in this struggle were the pastors Scheibel, Berger, Wehrhahn, and Kellner, at Hinigern. A pacific royal order of February 28, 1834, in regard to the continued force of the confessions, accomplished little. Nor was the conflict allayed by the rescript of the Consistory of Breslau, May 15, 1834, which demanded that the clergy who had not acceded to the Union should use the revised agenda of 1829, and forbade any public attacks upon the Union. In consequence of infraction of these orders the offending  clergymen were suspended (1834). In Honigern the military were called in to force open the Church for the introduction of the State-Union service (December 24, 1834). Similar disturbances arose in Halle in connection with Guericke, professor in the university, who was removed by the government in 1836. But this opposition element was not to be seduced by flattery nor terrified by force. In a synod held at Breslau in 1835 they had resolved to exhaust all legal measures to secure for themselves purity, independence, and integrity in doctrine, worship, and constitution. Missionary preachers traveled from place to place, administering baptism and the Lord's Supper. In Berlin and Erfurt new congregations were formed. In the Mark and in Silesia a special apostolical Church constitution was adopted. Among the decided Lutherans, however, there were two tendencies. The stricter tendency demanded a complete separation from the State Church. The relatively more moderate party, with which Guericke stood, desired to carry out their Lutheran convictions within the State Church as far as the legal concessions allowed them to do so. These troubles matured a purpose in thousands of the oppressed confessors of the faith to leave their native land for conscience sake. In spite of various concessions on the part of the government, a great emigration to Australia took place under the leadership of Kavel. To these "pilgrim fathers" of our day were added many from Saxony, led by Stephan, and from Wurtemberg and the Wupperthal. From 1838, and especially after the advent of Frederick William IV to the throne of Prussia (1840), the tone of the government towards the Lutherans became milder.

VI. "Separate Lutherans." — A royal general concession was issued July 23, 1845, for the relief of those Lutherans who held themselves aloof from the State "Evangelical" Church. They were granted the right to form congregations of their own, and to have them united under a common direction, which was not to be subject to the control of the State Church. The congregation, having obtained the consent of the state to its formation, could call pastors, whose vocation was to be confirmed by the Direction, and who were to be ordained by ordained ministers. The baptisms, confirmations, proclamation of the bans, and marriages of these clergymen were acknowledged in law, and their Church registers were to be received in evidence. Their obligation as regarded the taxes and burdens of the parochial connection was to be determined by the common law. Under these provisions the Lutherans constituted a High Consistory in 1841 under the presidency of professor Huschke. This official board is the supreme  ecclesiastical authority for the Lutherans in Prussia. It consists of four regular members; it is controlled by the Synod, and has charge of the purity of the Church in doctrine and life, of the reception of new congregations, the regulation of the parochial relations, and the appointments of clergymen; to it is committed the decision in complaints made by the officials of the churches and of the higher schools.

It has oversight of the ritual, of the decisions in ecclesiastical cases, and of censures, the calling of synods, and similar matters. The clergy are supported by a fixed salary, and by perquisites. The processes of Church discipline are monition, temporary exclusion from the communion, the making of apologies in various degrees, and final excommunication. The Church service is conducted according to the agenda which have been in use; the preaching on free texts requires the permission of the Board of the High Consistory; the Lord's Supper is an essential part of the chief service. The Lutherans are not obliged to send their children to the United schools. Thus the Lutheran Church in Prussia obtained a definite independent foundation. In 1847 the High Consistory had in its care twenty-one congregations recognized by the state, and numbering about nineteen thousand souls. Of these the largest proportion was in Silesia — ten congregations, with 8400 members. The smallest proportion was in Westphalia and in the Rhine Provinces. In addition to these Separate Lutherans there was an immense number of Lutherans who, in consequence of concessions guaranteed by the government, remained in the State Church. Outside of Prussia, a Lutheran movement was felt in Nassau in 1846, in which Brunn of Steeten, near Runkel, was leader. The government and the deputies declined to authorize the formation of a separate Lutheran commission. The connection between the Lutherans was strengthened by the press and by conventions. Their literary organs were the Zeitschrift für Lutlerische Theologie, edited by Budelbach and Guericke; the Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche, edited by Harless and others; and various popular periodicals, such as the Pilger aus Sachsen, the Sonntagsblatt, and others. Conventions were held at Berlin, Triglaff, and Gnadau. The Lutheran Conference in Leipsic held its first session in 1843.

With the great political movement of 1848 the interests of the Positive Lutherans entered on a new era. Of the urgent demands made at that time for the separation of Church and State, they took advantage especially in their struggle against the Union established by the State Church. Meanwhile the difference of conviction between the Lutherans within the Union and those separated from it was not completely removed. The Separate Lutherans urged the impossibility of a Lutheran  clergyman's remaining with good conscience in the Union. The Lutherans who did not withdraw from the government Church nevertheless began to come into closer association under the leadership of Goschel, Stahl, Heubner, and Schmieder. Their views and claims were supported by Hengstenberg's Kirchenzeitung, and by provincial associations in Saxony, Pomerania, Silesia, and Posen. They agreed, at a meeting in Wittenberg, in September 1849, on the following principles: "We stand upon the Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; our congregations have never justly ceased to be Lutheran congregations; we demand the recognition and adherence to the Lutheran Confession in worship, the order of the congregation, and Church government; first of all is to be insisted on the freeing of the altar service from everything that is dubious, and the giving of the stamp of the Confession to the entire service; furthermore, there should be in the government of the Church a management which would give security to confessional independence; finally, there should be a guarantee of Lutheran principles in the constitution of the congregations." These aims they did not, however, propose to secure by separation, but by contending within the State Church for the rights of the Lutheran Church in the districts belonging to it.

This decision rendered more bitter the feeling of alienation between the Lutherans who remained in the State Church and those who separated from it. In addition to these internal controversies, there arose also differences with the civil government of the Church, especially on the part of Lutherans within the State Church. These differences were caused partly by the establishment of the High Consistory in 1850, and partly by the proposed Evangelical Order of Congregations, which was opposed on the ground that the Confession was not sufficiently secured. The High Consistory attempted to meet the opposition, and to harmonize feelings by various concessions; but, with a growing consciousness of need and of right, the Lutherans constantly rose in their demands. They asked for the abolition of the mixed boards, the institution of exclusively Lutheran faculties, the return of the Church property, and for other changes looking in the same general direction. The result finally was the issue of a cabinet order of July 12, 1853, which showed that the king, Frederick William IV, was determined to make no further concessions.

The stricter Lutherans had shown themselves unwilling to cooperate in various movements of the time. Thus had they declined to cooperate in the plan of the Inner Missions (1849), and opposed the confederation of churches proposed at the Church Diet at Wittenberg in 1849. In other lands the struggles of the Lutheran  Church for truth and right continued. The University of Erlangen was the center of the struggle in Bavaria, and Harless, the president of the High Consistory, one of its great supports. But at the General Synod at Anspach, in consequence of opposition on the part, of the congregations, the stricter Lutheran views could not be carried out in regard to creed, Church government, changes in the liturgy, confession, and Church discipline. Here also arose the stricter party, with the pastors Löhe and Wacheren, which took ground against fellowship at the Lord's Supper with the reformed, and favored separation from the State Church. This party was resisted by the High Consistory. In Nassau, the two Hesses, Hanover, and the Saxon duchies, the stricter Lutheranism had adherents. As a rule the mission festivals were their centers of union. In Baden, under pastor Eichhorn as leader, the conflict with the government resulted in a legal separation from the State Church in 1856. In Saxony, especially about Schönburg, the stricter Lutheran clergy were numerous. The emigration of Stephan injured the cause very much in the general estimation. During these public movements various questions of profound interest in scientific theology were discussed by the great divines in the Lutheran Church. Among the most important of these discussions was, 1, that between Hoffmann in Erlansgen and Philippi in Rostock on the doctrine of the atonement; 2, the controversy in Mecklenburg, which resulted in the deposition of professor Baumgarten in 1858. A convention of clergymen and laymen at Rothenmoor in 1858 represented the strictest Lutheranism, of which Kliefoth had been the especial promoter. See F.J. Stahl, Die Lutherische Kirche u. die Union (Berl. 1859). (C.P.K.)

## Lutherans In America[[@Headword:Lutherans In America]]

             I. Early History. — The celebrated German divine, Dr. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg (q.v.), is generally and justly recognized as the founder of the Lutheran Church in America. He arrived in this country in 1742. Long previous to his coming, however, the Lutherans had gained a footing here. Adherents of the Church of the great German reformer first came to these shores of the West from Holland in 1621. In consequence of the severe measures adopted by the Synod of Dort (1618-19), the stay of non- Calvinists had been made uncomfortable in the mother country, and with the first Dutch settlers in the province of New Amsterdam (now New York) came several Lutheran immigrants, seeking here a home, and a place to worship God agreeably to the dictates of their conscience. They had  come, however, without a shepherd, and for years were dependent upon lay supervision and instruction. The first Lutheran communicants who brought thither one to minister unto them came from Sweden in 1638, and settled on the banks of Delaware Bay, where now stands the thriving city of Wilmington. For many years the Swedish Lutherans only were favored with ministerial care. The first to perform this duty was Reorus Torkillus (died in 1643), whose successor, John Campanius, "a man of enlightened zeal deeply interested in his work, and burning with a strong desire to promote the spiritual interests of the aborigines," was the first to publish in this country Luther's Smaller Catechism, and first to furnish it to the Red Man in his own vernacular — "perhaps the first work ever rendered into the Indian language, and the Swedes most probably were the first missionaries among the Indians in this country." Strangely enough, the Swedes were also the first to fall away from their mother Church and enter into communion with those of the Protestant Episcopal Church — a result due, no doubt, in a great measure, to the want of complete organization, as we shall see below.

Dr. Muhlenberg, as we have toted above, was of the German Church, and, though his labors were mainly confined to those of his own nationality, the influence of this man of God extended over all Lutherans in the states, and caused them to be "of one heart and one mind," and to keep "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The first German Lutherans preceded the doctor very nearly one hundred years. He himself, as we have seen, came hither in 1742; the first of his countrymen in the faith reached these shores in 1644. They came in company with the Dutch, and, like the latter, for a long time depended on lay instruction. By 1653 they had increased in strength sufficiently to seek the services of a preacher, but in vain they directed a petition to the Dutch Directory to secure permission for such a step. In 1664, finally, the much-coveted privilege came to them from the English authorities, who, immediately upon their acquisition of this territory, granted the Lutherans religious liberty. The first to preach to the German Lutherans in their own vernacular was Jacob Fabricius, who reached this country in 1669. The first house of worship, however, they enjoyed two years later (1671); but they were deprived of it by the Dutch in 1673. It was rebuilt in 1703 (on the south-west corner of Broadway and Rector Street).

The Lutherans enjoyed a decided accession in 1710, when four thousand Germans, the victims of civil oppression and religious persecution, who had fled for refuge to England under the patronage of  queen Anne, came to the provinces of New York, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. Quickly others followed, until in 1717 their large numbers began to excite the serious apprehension of the civil authorities. In Pennsylvania the government actually felt it its duty to direct the attention of the "Provincial Council" to the fact "that large numbers of foreigners from Germany, strangers to our language and constitution, had lately been imported into the province." All these people had come without their ministers, and so it happened that, by settling in Pennsylvania and South Carolina, they were deprived of the regular ministrations of the sanctuary, and dependent for religious instruction upon those of their own number best informed "in heavenly things." A colony of German Lutherans, refugees from civil oppression and Romish intolerance at Salsburg, was founded under better auspices in Georgia in 1734. Their pastors were John Martin Bolzius and Israel Christian Gronau. In the following year they received large accessions from the mother, another country, and by the time of Dr. Mühlenberg's arrival the Lutherans of Georgia formed quite a considerable Christian band (over 1200 of them). Indeed, it is said that these Lutherans exerted a very salutary influence on the piety of John and Charles Wesley.

As early as 1733, the German Lutherans of Philadelphia and other places had sent urgent petitions for ministerial help and pecuniary aid to the Lutherans of England and of the mother country. At Halle, where now flourished the pious Aug. Hermann Francke, their prayers were heard, and by the untiring exertions of the founder of the "Halle Orphan Asylum," the future founder and leader of American Lutheranism was induced to leave his native land, and "to relieve," among his brethren of the faith and fellow- countrymen who had sought a home in the wilds of America, "the spiritual destitution that prevailed, to gather together the lost sheep, and to preach to them the truths of the Gospel." With the year 1742, therefore, opens a new epoch in the history of the Lutheran Church in America — the epoch in which it assumed organic form. No man could have been more eminently fitted than was H.M. Mühlenberg for the mission to be accomplished. "He possessed piety, learning, experience, skill, industry, and perseverance." He was, moreover, "deeply interested in the work to which he had devoted himself, as is apparent from the manner in which he discharged his duties, and the condition in which he left the Church at the time of his decease."

When he came there was an absence of all organization. It is true the Swedish brethren gave assistance to their German brethren freely and  cheerfully, but this was by no means sufficient to advance the interests of Lutheranism. Mühlenberg saw this clearly, and he at once applied himself to the task of effecting an organic union of German Lutherans at least. The greatest obstacle he found in the want of preachers and of houses of worship; but he was not in the least discomfited by this jejuneness of his beloved Church. His influence at home was that of a pious and devoted servant of the Lord, and he soon drew a number of his former associates and friends to this side of the Atlantic, so that by 1748, only six years after his landing on these shores, he was enabled to call around him the strongest and ablest representatives of the Lutheran ministry in America, to counsel together and form a synod. The Swedes had contented themselves with the election of one of their own number as provost (q.v.), to preside over them and act as their representative before the country. Mühlenberg, however, desired stricter conformity to the rules and regulations of the mother Church, and, as the fate of the Swedish Lutheran Church afterwards showed, his course proved to be the only safe way towards a perpetuation of the Lutheran Church in America. The men who joined Mühlenberg in the convention at Philadelphia, August 14, 1748, for the purpose of organizing the first Lutheran synod in America, were Brunnholtz, Handschuh, and Hartwig, of the German, and Sandin and Naesman, of the Swedish Lutheran Church. It was by this body that the first German Lutheran was regularly set apart in this country to the work of the ministry. His name was John Nicholas Kurtz. He was not, however, the first Lutheran minister ordained here.

As early as 1701, Falkner, a student of divinity, was ordained by the Swedish ministers Rudman, Bjork, and Auren, to labor in the Swedish Lutheran Church; quite an eventful act, also, because it set aside forever the supposition that the Swedish Lutherans received the doctrine of the episcopacy in the sense in which it is taught in the Anglican Church. After 1748 the synod met regularly each year, and these meetings "were attended with the most beneficial results. They not only advanced the prosperity of the Church, but the hands of the brethren were strengthened, and their hearts encouraged. They promoted kind feeling, and formed a bond of union among the churches." In 1765 a private theological seminary was started, under the care of Drs. Helmuth and Schmidt, and in 1787 the Legislature of Pennsylvania established Franklin College, "for the special benefit of the Germans of the commonwealth, as an acknowledgment of services by them rendered to the state, and in consideration of their industry, economy, and public virtues." There were, in the year of Muhlenberg's arrival in this country, in  Pennsylvania alone 110,000 Germans, and of these about two thirds were of the Lutheran Church. One of the sons of Dr. H.M. Mühlenberg — Henry Ernest — at this time pastor of the Lutheran Church in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, was honored with the distinction of first president of this now widely celebrated institution of learning. In 1791 the Lutheran Church received further recognition for its services to education by the Pennsylvania Legislature in the gift of 5000 acres of land "to the free- schools of the Lutheran Church in Philadelphia," the center of Dr. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg's labors.

During the Revolutionary days the Lutherans acted the part of patriots and Christians; many of their number came forward in defense of the country of their adoption. Dr. Muhlenberg, among others, had two sons in the army; one of them exchanged the gown for the colonel's uniform. In consequence of this identification of the Lutherans with the cause of American liberty, the English came to dislike them greatly, and many were the sufferings and deprivations to which they were subjected; several of their churches were burned or desecrated, and all manner of oppression was visited upon them. The close of the War of Independence. however, left them, if anything, gainers in the struggle. Aside from the liberal donations which they received in Pennsylvania, as we have seen above, they received large accessions from the very ranks of their enemies. Many of the German soldiers who, by the ignominious treaty of the English with the Hessians, had been brought to this country to exterminate the love of freedom, at the close of hostilities concluded to remain this side the Atlantic, and became valuable members of the Lutheran Church in America. Out of 5723 soldiers that had come here from Brunswick, 1200, with seven officers and their chaplain, at one time entered the fold of American Lutheranism. Of the Hessians, also, some 7000 remained to swell the number of adherents to the Church of the great German reformer.

Not so auspicious was the outlook at the close of the eighteenth century. On October 7, 1787, the patriarch and founder of the Lutheran Church in America departed this life, and the Church was bereft of its great stronghold. There had been slowly growing, ever since the establishment of American independence, a decided preference for the introduction of the English language into the exercises of public worship. The older and more conservative portion of the Church contended for the use of the language which the great reformer had so much embellished and invigorated, and of which he was really the second father. Some of the Germans even believed  that their language might actually be made the language of the country, and thus the proposition of the younger and Americanized portion for the use of the English proved an occasion of discord and alienation, "resulted in serious injury to the Church, and almost caused its total ruin.... Thousands abandoned their parental communion, and sought a home among other denominations, because their children did not understand the German, while many who remained, because of their limited acquaintance with the language, lost all interest in the services, and became careless in their attendance on the ministrations of the sanctuary."

Dr. Mühlenberg had counseled due consideration of the wants of this young and growing element, and frequently himself preached in English; but his tongue once silent, the conservative element impolitically gloried in its wisdom (comp. here Dr. S.S. Schmucker's Am. Luth. Ch. [5th edit. Philad. 1852, 12mo], pages 27-29). The first Lutheran Church in which the English was exclusively used was not built until 1809, and it remained for many years the only one to represent the English-speaking element in the Lutheran Church. Efforts for more complete and effectual organization were made in New York State in 1785 by the establishment of the New York Synod; hitherto the Pennsylvania Synod was the only ministerium (q.v.) in existence. In 1803 a synod was organized in North Carolina; in 1819, in Ohio; in 1820, both in Maryland and Virginia. In 1816 the educational advantages of the Church also received new strength by the founding of a theological seminary at Hartwick, N.Y. — the first public training-school of the American Lutherans for young men prospecting the holy office of the ministry. An asylum for orphans the Lutheran Church had founded as early as 1749, in the midst of the thriving colonists at Ebenezer, in Georgia. It was widely known as the "Salzburger Waisenhaus," and is said to have received no little encouragement from Whitefield.

II. Organization of the General Synod of American Lutherans. — The need of a central bond of union for the different synods extending over a territory so vast as that of the United States gave rise in 1820 to the formation of a "general synod" — "a starting-place and a central radiating point of improvement in the Church." There were at this time 170 ministers connected with the Lutherans, and 35,000 communicants in the Lutheran connection. Of these, 135 preachers and 33,000 communicants were represented at the meeting which, October 22, 1820, formed the General Synod. The constantly increasing influx of European Lutherans frequently gave rise to the manifestation of the most diverse opinions on ecclesiastical  matters, and, in consequence, to many controversies, first of a milder, and gradually of a more decided character, until a schism became inevitable. Even previous to the outbreak of our civil war there had been frequent secessions of several of the synods from the general body, but the strife of 1861-65 gave a more decided influence in favor of the establishment of rival bodies by the side of the "General Synod." The first to establish themselves independently were the Southern Lutherans, who instituted a "Southern General Synod," later known as the "General Synod of North America," and now (1872) embracing 5 synods, 92 ministers, 175 churches, and 13,457 communicants.

A more serious division was, however, preparing, on doctrinal grounds, in the Northern synods. The constitution of the General Synod did not make membership dependent upon an adhesion to the letter of the "Augsburg Confession" of 1530, the great standard of faith of the early Lutheran Church. While heartily indorsing the Augsburg Confession as the most important historical document as regards the doctrines of the Church, the constitution aimed to secure to all Lutherans the liberty of rejecting some utterances of that confession which had early been discarded by a considerable number of the followers of Luther as unevangelical and semi- papal. This feature was obnoxious to the strict Lutheran party, which wished Lutheranism to remain for all time to come as defined by the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and which desired to bring back the whole Lutheran Church of the United States to this point.

III. Organization of the “General Council." — The party differences, after creating frequent disturbances at the meetings of the General Synod, led to an open rupture in 1864, when the Franckean Synod, a New York State body, which was regarded by the Confessional Lutherans as positively unchurchly and heretical, was admitted to the General Synod. In consequence of this act the oldest synod, that of Pennsylvania, withdrew from the Convention. At the next meeting of the General Synod, in 1866, the Pennsylvania Synod was consequently declared by the president and a majority of the delegates out of practical connection with the General Synod. In reply to this decision, the Pennsylvanians called on all Lutherans adhering to the letter of the Augsburg Confession of 1530 to organize upon this basis a new and genuine Lutheran Church. The call was responded to by a number of synods hitherto connected with the General Synod, and also by some independent synods, and a preliminary convention was held in December, 1866, at Reading, Pennsylvania. This meeting drew  up a constitution, and provided for the convention of the first "General Council" of the new organization as soon as the constitution should be adopted by ten synods. The preliminaries having been complied with, the "General Council" met at Fort Wayne November 20, 1867. Twelve synods, representing 140,006 communicants, a larger number than the combined membership of the two other organizations — the "General Synod" and the Southern "General Synod of North America" — together, were in attendance.

A resolution was passed inviting those only "who are in the unity of the faith with us, as set forth in the fundamental articles of this General Council," as "visiting brethren," making this body distinctively Confessional in the character of its Lutheranism. The last Convention of the "General Council," held at Rochester, New York, in November 1871, was presided over by Dr. Chas. P. Krauth, of Philadelphia. At this meeting there were only nine synods, representing 511 ministers, 971 congregations, and 141,875 communicants. Two other synods — the Danish-Norwegian Augustana Synod and the Indiana Synod — had, however, announced their intention to join the "Council". A meeting is now (November 1872) in progress at Akron, Ohio. Its proceedings will have to be given in the Appendix volume IV. Movement towards the Formation of a General Conference. — The tendency of a majority of the American churches towards ecclesiastical union has of late made an impression also on the Lutheran communicants, and there is now in progress a movement for the organization of a new body, to be called the "General Conference," with the avowed object of making it "the organization of a general Lutheran body, on the basis of the unqualified reception of all the symbolical books as a bond of union between all Lutheran synods in America." This movement was started several years ago, mainly by the independent synods (see for list, V. Statistics). At the meeting held at Fort Wayne, Indiana, November 14, 1871, about 60 members were present, representing most of the independent synods. The reports of the meeting for final organization, which was to be held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on the second Wednesday of July 1872, have not yet come to our notice. If all the six independent synods have adopted the Constitution and joined the "General Conference," this body is now the strongest in the Lutheran connection, its membership exceeding that of either the General Synod or of the General Council. (Comp. Schäffer, Early Hist. of the Lutheran Church in America; Schmucker, Amer. Luth. Church [5th edition, Phila. 1852]; and the excellent article in Schem, Deutsch-Amerikan Conv. Lexikon, 6:690-704; Annual to New Amer. Cyclop. 1871.)  V. Statistics. — We are enabled to present our readers with the latest statistics of the Lutheran Church in the United States of America. The almanacs for 1890 furnish a list of-theological seminaries, 26; colleges, 25; female seminaries, 11; academies 37; charitable institutions (orphan homes, infirmaries, hospitals, etc.), 56; Church boards and societies, 27. The General Synod embraces — synods, 23; ministers, 979; churches, 1437; communicants, 151, 404. The General Council embraces — synods, 8; ministers, 910; churches, 1552; communicants, 259,801. The Southern General Synod embraces — synods, 9; ministers, 201; churches, 385; communicants, 37,528. The grand total is — synods, 58; ministers, 4692; churches, 7948; communicants, 1,099,868. The periodicals are — English, 48; German, 51; Norwegian, 16; Swedish, 26.

For special local and national statistics of the Lutheran Church, SEE AMERICA; SEE ANHALT; SEE AUSTRIA; SEE BADEN; SEE BAVARIA; SEE BELGIUM; SEE BOHEMIA; SEE BRUNSWICK; SEE BREMEN; SEE CARINTHIA AND CARNIOLA; SEE DENMARK; SEE ENGLAND; SEE FRANCE; SEE HESSE; SEE HOLLAND; SEE HUNGARY; SEE ICELAND; SEE LIPPE; SEE LUBECK; SEE MECKLENBURG; SEE MORAVIA; SEE NORWAY; SEE OLDENBURG; SEE POLAND; SEE PRUSSIA; SEE RUSSIA; SEE SAXONY; SEE SILESIA; SEE STEIERMARK; SEE SWEDEN; SEE THURINGIA; SEE TRANSYLVANIA; SEE UNITED STATES; SEE WESTPHALIA; SEE WURTEMBERG. For missions of the Lutheran churches, SEE MISSIONS.

On the history of the Lutheran Church, compare Krauth, The Conservative Reformation and its Theology (Phila. 1871, 8vo), especially chapter 4; Gobel, Die religiosen Eigenthümlichkeiten d Luth. u. ref. Kirchen (1837); Augusti, Beitrage z. Geschichte u. Statistik der Evangel. Kirche (1838); Wiggers, Stattistik (1842, 2 volumes); Harnack, Die Luth. Kirche im Lichte d. Gesch. (1855); Kahnis, Germanz Protestantism (1856); Seiss, Ecclesia Lutherana, a brief Survey of the Evang. Luth. Church (1868); Dosmer, Gesch. der Protest. Theologie (1867); Müller (J.T.), Die symnbolischen Bucher der evangel. Luth. Kirche (Stuttg. 1860, 8vo); Plitt, Lutheranische Missionen (Erlangen, 1871, 8vo).

## Lutherans, Separate[[@Headword:Lutherans, Separate]]

             When, in 1817, the union between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches was established in Prussia, the protest of J.G. Scheibel, professor of theology at Breslau, found much sympathy among the Lutherans. For several years, however, the movement was confined within the boundaries of simple literary polemics, especially between Scheibel and David Schultz, also professor at Breslau. But when the breaking of the bread was introduced in the administration of the Lord's Supper by a cabinet order of 1830, Scheibel refused to obey, and asked permission to continue administering the Lord's Supper after the old Wittenberg agenda. The permission was not granted, and Scheibel was suspended. Soon he saw himself at the head of about two or three hundred families, who left the State Church and organized themselves into a new Church. They petitioned the minister of public worship to be acknowledged as a Church organization, but this he refused to do. The many vexations which Scheibel had to undergo induced him to leave the country. In the meantime the party had progressed very rapidly under the leadership of professor Huschke. A synod was convened at Breslau in the year 1834, and it was declared that nothing but complete separation from the State Church, and the formation of an independent organization could satisfy the Lutheran conscience. Persecutions then began. Several ministers were kept in prison for many years. A number of well-to-do laymen were reduced to poverty by money fines.

Not a few emigrated to America, among others, Grabau (q.v.) and Von Rohr, who formed the so-called Buffalo Synod. With the succession of Friedrich Wilhelm IV, in 1840, a change took place, and July 23,1845, the concession for the foundation of a free Church was given, and in 1850 the Church numbered fifty pastors and about fifty thousand members. Similar movements took place also outside of Prussia, in Saxony,  Hesse, and Baden. Perhaps no separation from the State Church made a deeper impression than that of Theodor Harms (q.v.) at Hermansburg, Hanover. The reason for his separation was neither dogmatical nor constitutional, but a few changes which were introduced by the government in the marriage formularies. Harms refused to accept these changes, and was suspended, January 22, 1878. He immediately formed an independent society, which soon absorbed the majority of the old congregation. Meanwhile the relation between the Separate Lutherans and the. State Church Lutherans was often very unpleasant, and bitter controversies arose. Finally, dissensions broke out among the Separate Lutherans themselves, and a party headed by pastor Dietrich, of Jabel, organized the so-called Immanuel Synod in opposition to the party headed ba Huschke of Breslau. This was in 1862. A similar split was caused in Saxony by the Missouri Synod. This synod was organized by a certain Stefan, who had emigrated in 1840 to America. Stefan, who was deposed of his office on account of gross immorality, was succeeded by the still living professor Walther of St. Louis, Missouri. Some of the Missourians had returned to Saxony, and formed at Dresden a Lutheranerverein, which soon occupied a prominent position, under the leadership of pastor Ruhland. The latter soon made war against the Immanuel Synod as being un-Lutheran, and so likewise against the Separate Lutherans of Breslau. The Lutheran churches of the State he condemned altogether, and finally a split was caused among the Missourians themselves. The Separate Lutherans of Germany are now against each other. See Plitt-Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Luthers (Two) Catechisms[[@Headword:Luthers (Two) Catechisms]]

             By way of supplement to the article Luther (q.v.), we add that both these catechisms, the larger one in the form of a continuous exposition, and the smaller one arranged in questions and answers, appeared in 1529, although the preparatory work dates back to the very beginning of Luther's reformatory activity. In 1518 Johann Schneider collected and published the various expositions of the Lord's Prayer which Luther had given in his sermons and lectures. This induced Luther to publish his exposition in an authentic form. In the same year he published a Latin exposition of the Ten Commandments, and in 1520 these sporadic efforts came to a preliminary consummation in his Eyn Kurcz form des zehnen Gepoth: — Eyn Kurcz form des Glaubens: — Eyn Kurcz form des Vatter Unsers. After 1524 Luther's attention was very strongly drawn to the school. His An die Radherrn aller Stedle deutsches Lands: dass sie christliche Schulen auffrichten und hallten sollen caused many evangelical schools to be founded, and the necessity arose for a trustworthy handbook in the elements of true Christianity. This necessity was the more felt by Luther himself, when, in his tour of visitation through Saxony in 1528, he saw how sorely both the ministers and congregations stood in need of such a book, and thus, in 1529, both the larger and smaller catechisms appeared. Luther's catechisms, however, are not the first attempts of the kind. There existed such works by Brenz, Althammer, and Lammer, but Luther's catechisms soon took the lead, and were immediately translated into Latin.  The smaller catechism, which soon became an almost symbolical book in the Lutheran churches, consists of, I. The Ten Commandments; II. The Creed; III. The Lord's Prayer; IV. The Sacrament of Baptism; V. The Sacrament of the Altar; to which is added, in the editions since 1564, a sixth part, Confession and Absolution, or the Power of the Keys. Considering the smaller catechism as a whole, it is indeed the ripe fruit of many exertions, the full expression after many trials. Wherever Lutherans are found, this catechism too is used. See Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Luthers Hymns[[@Headword:Luthers Hymns]]

             It was a saying among the Roman Catholics in the time of Luther, that "by his songs he has done more harm to the Romanists than by his sermons." And such is the fact. "For," says Mr. Coleridge, "Luther did as much for the Reformation by his hymns as by his translation of the Bible. In Germany the hymns are known by heart by every peasant; they advise, they argue, from the hymns, and every soul in the Church praises God, like a Christian, with words which are natural and yet sacred to his mind." Luther was intensely fond of both music and poetry, and his poetical talent we best perceive in his hymns. Altogether he wrote about thirty-six hymns, which may be divided as follows: (a) Translations of Latin hymns; (b) Amplifications of German hymns from the Latin; (c) Correction and revision of German hymns; (d) Hymns based upon Latin psalms; (e) Hymns based upon passages of the Bible; (f) Original hymns. Spangenberg, in his preface to the Cithara Lutheri, in 1545, speaks thus of Luther's hymns, "One must certainly let this be true and remain true, that, among all Meister-singers, from the days of the apostles until now, Luther is, and always will be, the best and most accomplished; in whose hymns and songs one does not find a vain or needless word. All flows and falls in the sweetest and neatest manner, full of spirit and doctrine, so that his every word gives outright a sermon of its own, or, at least, a singular reminiscence. There is nothing forced, nothing foisted in or patched up, nothing fragmentary.

The rhymes are easy and good, the words choice and proper, the meaning clear and intelligible, the melodies lovely and hearty, and in summa all is so rare and majestic, so full of pith and power, so cheering and comforting, that, in sooth, you will not find his equal, much less his master." The most famous of Luther's hymns is the Reformation hymn, Ein'feste Burg ist unser Gott, which has been translated into very many languages. A collection of the translations of this hymn in nineteen  languages has been published by B. Pick (Rochester, 1880); an enlarged edition, comprising twenty-one languages (28 English; 2 Dutch; 1 Danish; 1 Swedish; 5 Latin; 3 French; 1 Spanish; 1 Russian; 1 Polish; 1 Bohemian; 1 Wendish; 1 Lettish; 1 Lithuanian; 1 Finnish; 1 Esthonian; 1 Hebrew; 1 Accra; 1 Tshi; 1 Zulu; 1 Hungarian; 1 Italian), was published by the same author in 1883. But this is not the only hymn which has been translated into English. In fact, all his hymns are translated, as may be seen from Pick's Luther as a Hymnist (Philadelphia, 1875). An edition giving the German text, with the English translation and notes, was published by Scribner's Sons (New York, 1883). (B.P.)

## Lutkemann, Joachim[[@Headword:Lutkemann, Joachim]]

             a German theologian, was born at Demmin, in Pomerania, December 15, 1608; studied at Stettin, and afterwards at the universities of Greifswalde and Strasburg; then traveled through France and Italy; and was magister legente of the philosophical faculty of Rostock in 1638, and appointed professor of metaphysics in 1643. He published at this time several philosophical works, such as his Lineamenta cosporis physici (Rostock, 1647). He also preached at the same time, and soon acquired great reputation by his eloquence and Christian earnestness. He became involved, however, in a quarrel with the strict orthodox party of Mecklenburg, upheld by the duke, on the question of the humanity of Christ in his death. Littkemann defended his views in his Dissertatio physico-theologicac de vero honmine, maintaining that the human nature of Christ ended in his death. He was expelled for these views, but immediately called to Brunswick as general superintendent and court preacher. Here he prepared in 1651 a School Discipline, and in 1652 a Church Discipline, which were adopted in Brunswick. He died in 1655. His most important works were devotional, and in this line he may be ranked next to Arndt and Muller. The principal are: Vorschmack d. gottlichen Gute (Wolfenb. 1643): — Vom irdischen Paradies: — Harfe auf zehn saiten. See P. Rethmeyer, Schicksalen, Schriften u. Gaben Lutkemann's (Brunswick); Tholuck, Akad. Leben, part 2, page 109; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 8:536; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, volume 2, § 217.

## Lutkens, Franz Julius[[@Headword:Lutkens, Franz Julius]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 21, 1650. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1676 rector of Brandenburg, in 1679 deacon at Magdeburg, in 1684 pastor primarius and provost at Stargard, Pomerania, in 1704 court-preacher and professor of theology at Copenhagen, and died August 12, 1712. He wrote, Collegiumns Biblicum: — Commentarius in Epistolas ad Colossenses et Titun: — Dissertat. de Ideis in Mente Divina: — De Messia Davidis Filio: De Zohar Antiquo Judeworum Monumento, etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lutolf, Adolf[[@Headword:Lutolf, Adolf]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born in 1824. He studied under Hirscher and Dollinger, and after having spent some years at St. Gall, Lucerne, and Solothurn, as teacher and as priest, was called, in. 1868, to Lucerne as professor of Church history and canon of St. Leodegar. He died April 8, 1879, leaving Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz (Lucerne, 1871). (B.P.)

## Lutterbeck, Johann Anton Bernhard[[@Headword:Lutterbeck, Johann Anton Bernhard]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Munster. In 1842 he was professor of Catholic theology at Giessen, but after the determination of bishop Ketteler, in 1851, to ordain no candidate who had pursued his theological studies at Giessen, Lutterbeck became a member of the philosophical faculty. After the Vatican Council he joined the Old Catholics, and died December 30, 1882. He is the author of, Hermenien aus dem Gebiete der religiosen Spekulation (2d ed. Mayence, 1851): — Der neutestamentliche Lehrbegriff (1852, 2 volumes): — Die Clementinen und ihr Verhiltniss zum Utnfehlbarkeitsdogma (1872): — Leopold Schmid uber die religiose Aufgabe der Deutschen (1875). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:842 sq. (B.P.)

## Lutz (Or Lucius), Samuel[[@Headword:Lutz (Or Lucius), Samuel]]

             one of the most important representatives of early pietism in Switzerland, was born in 1674. His father, the pious and learned pastor of Biglen, was his first teacher. Lutz at first turned his attention especially to mathematics, the classics, and Hebrew, then to Church discipline, and finally left all these to devote himself exclusively to the study of Scripture, and the works of the fathers and reformers, especially Luther's. German pietism was then beginning to strike root in Switzerland, in spite of all the efforts of the orthodox party, headed by the theologians of Berne. To oppose it, a committee was appointed to take charge of all things pertaining to religion, and in 1699, by its influence, several prominent and influential preachers, tainted with pietism, were exiled or deprived of their office, a number of adherents of the pietist party fined or otherwise punished, and several stringent laws passed to secure the "uniformity of faith, doctrine, and worship." Finally both the citizens and clergy were obliged to take the so- called oath of association — a sort of Test Act. Lutz's first and rather insignificant appointment as pastor was at Yverden in 1703. Here he labored faithfully for twenty-three years, winning the respect and affection not only of the German, among whom he labored, but also of the French inhabitants. As he was accused of pietism, all attempts to secure more important appointments, with a view to increasing his sphere of usefulness, were defeated, in spite of his reputation for learning and eloquence, until about 1726, when he was appointed pastor of Amfoldingen. In 1738 he removed to Diessbach, where he died, May 28, 1750. His collected works were published under the title Wohlriechender Strauss v. schonen u. gesunden Himmelsblumens (Basle, 1736 and 1756, 2 volumes). See Leu, Schweiz. Lexikon, 12; Haller, Bibl. d. Schweizergesch. 2:290; Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1:191 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:621.

## Lutz, Johann Ludwig Samuel[[@Headword:Lutz, Johann Ludwig Samuel]]

             a distinguished German theologian, historian, and biographer, was born at Bern in 1785; studied first in his native city, then at the universities of Tübingen and Göttingen; was in 1812 appointed professor of the gymnasium, and rector of the literary school of Bern; in 1824 became pastor of Wynau, and afterwards of Bern; and was there in 1833 appointed professor of exegesis. He died September 21, 1844. Among his works the most noteworthy is Gesch. der Reformation in Basel (Basle, 1814, 8vo). His theological lectures were published by Riutschi and Ad. Lutz, under the title Biblische Dogmatik und Hermeneutik (1847 and 1849). See Hundeshagen, Lutz, ein theolog. Charakterbild, 1844; Neuer Nekrolog d. Deutschesn, volume 22; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 10:631; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 32:314. (J.N.P.)

## Lux Mentis[[@Headword:Lux Mentis]]

             (the light of the mind), another name for baptism, so called on account of the instruction in the Christian religion which was given to the candidates for baptism before they were admitted to the sacred ordinance. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.

## Luxembourg, Baudoin de[[@Headword:Luxembourg, Baudoin de]]

             a Franco-German prelate, brother of emperor Henry VII, was born in 1285. While quite young he lost his father, Henry IV, count of Luxembourg, and was educated with care by his mother, Beatrice of Avesnes, at the University of Paris, where he studied belles-lettres, philosophy, theology, and jurisprudence. He was consecrated archbishop of Treves in March, 1308, at Poictiers. In April, 1310, he assembled a provincial council at Treves. From this time Baudoin is no more noticed, except in military expeditions against rebellious chieftains. He died January 21, 1354. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Luxembourg, Louis de[[@Headword:Luxembourg, Louis de]]

             a French prelate, was proposed in 1414 for the bishopric of Therouanne. He declared himself for the English party, was made chancellor by Henry VI, in 1425, and attended in 1431 at the crowning of that prince as the king of France, at St. Denis. During several political excitements, and  particularly during the time of an insurrection against the English, in April, 1436, this prelate took great interest in the cause of the English in France, thus gathering upon himself the hatred and displeasure of the French. He finally had to take refuge in the Bastile, and on its surrender retreated to Rouen, where he was made archbishop, and would have received the cardinal's hat, but would only accept it on condition of beins nominated by the king of England. This prince gave him, some time afterwards, the bishopric of Ely, when he was obliged to take refuge in England. He died at Hartford, England, September 18, 1443. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Luxembourg, Philippe de[[@Headword:Luxembourg, Philippe de]]

             a French cardinal, was born in 1445. He was the son of Thibauld de Luxembourg, who, after having lost his wife, was received into orders, and became bishop of Mans. The first church which Philippe held in charge was that of Le Mans, which he obtained in 1477, after the death of his father. In 1483 he presided over Tours, and February 3, 1496, was nominated as bishop of Therouanne, but was not appointed till November 12, 1498. In 1516, after Philippe had occupied several more or less important positions in France, he became legate of the pope in that country. He was one of the richest prelates of the kingdom. He founded the College of Mans at Paris and accomplished also several very extensive missions by order of the king, for which he had no regular allocations. He died at Le Mans, June 2, 1519. See Hoefer, Nouv Biog. Genirale, s.v.

## Luxembourg, Pierre de[[@Headword:Luxembourg, Pierre de]]

             a French prelate, was born at the castle of Ligny-sur-Ornain, July 20, 1369. He began to study theology at Paris in 1377. While still a child, he was made canon of Paris in 1379, and of Cambray in 1382. At the age.of fourteen he was provided with the bishopric of Metz by Clement VII. At sixteen the same pontiff appointed him cardinal. deacon at Avignon. He died July 2, 1387, and was buried at the cemetery of St. Michael, at Avignon. There are a few books which have been erroneously attributed to him, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Luxury[[@Headword:Luxury]]

             a disposition of mind addicted to pleasure, riot, and superfluities. Luxury implies a giving one's self up to pleasure; voluptuousness, an indulgence in the same to excess. Luxury may be further considered as consisting in,

1. Vain and useless expenses;

2. In a parade beyond what people can afford;

3. In affecting to be above our own rank;

4. In living in a splendor that does not agree with the public good. In order to avoid it, we should consider that i is ridiculous, troublesome, sinful, and ruinous. See Robinson's Claude, 1:382; Ferguson, On Society, part 6, section 2; Buck, Theological Dictionary, s.v.

## Luynes, Paul Dalbert De[[@Headword:Luynes, Paul Dalbert De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Versailles, January 5, 1703. He had at first the name of count of Montfort, and was intended for the military career,  but, renouncing it, entered a seminary, was received into orders, appointed abbot of Cerisy in 1727, and bishop of Bayeux in 1729. He held several synods, and organized missions, preaching himself. He became archbishop of Sens, August 18, 1753. De Luynes assisted at the conclaves of 1758, 1769, and 1774. As an abbot of Corbie, he was appointed commander of the order of St. Esprit in 1759. He adhered to the acts of the assembly of the clergy of 1765. He died at Paris, January 21, 1788, leaving several episcopal letters. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Luz[[@Headword:Luz]]

             (Heb. id. לוּז, a nut-bearing tree, either the almond or hazel, as in Gen 30:37 [but according to Fürst, after Hiller, sinking, as of a valley]; Sept. Λουζά, but in Gen 28:19 unites with the preceding word Οὐλαμλούζ), the name of two places.

1. The ancient name of the Canaanitish city on or near the site of Bethel (Gen 28:19; Gen 35:6; Gen 48:3), on the border of Benjamin (Jos 18:13); taken and destroyed, with all its inhabitants (except one family that had acted as spies), by the descendants of Joseph (Jdg 1:23). The spot to which the name of Bethel was given appears, however, to have been at a little distance in the environs of Luz, and they are accordingly distinguished in Jos 16:2, although the Heb. name of Bethel eventually superseded the Canaanitish one Luz; or rather, perhaps, Luz was the name of a locality near which Bethel was afterwards built. The form of the name in the Sept., Eusebius, and the Vulg. seems to have been derived from Jos 18:13, where the words אֶלאּכֶּתֶ לוּזָהshould, according to ordinary usage, be rendered "to the shoulder of Luzah;" the ah, which is the particle of motion in Hebrew, not being required here, as it is in the former part of the same verse. Other names are found both with and without a similar termination, as Jotbah, Jotbathah; Timnath, Timnathah; Riblah, Riblathah, Laish and Laishah are probably distinct places. Van de Velde is confident that he has recovered the site of Luz in  the modern ruins called Khurbet el-Lozeh, one hour and a half west of Beth-el (Notes to the 2d ed. of his Map, page 16). SEE BETHEL.

2. A small place in the district of the Hittites, founded by an inhabitant of the former Luz, who was spared on the destruction of this place by the tribe of Benjamin (Jdg 1:26); and this seems to dispose of the identification with the ruins still found on Matthew Gerizim (Stanley, page 231 sq.), bearing the name of Luza (Seetzen, Reise, 1:174; Wilson, 2:69), about ten minutes beyond the trench of the Samaritan sacrifice (Van de Velde, Memoir, page 331). Schwarz thinks the site may be identified with that of wady Luzacn, in the interior of the desert of et-Tih, north-west of Jebel el-Aralf, (on the strength of the Talmudic statement that this place lay without the bounds of Palestine (Palest. page 213). This is doubtless the wady Lussan described by Dr. Robinson as a broad plain swept over by torrents from the mountains on the right, destitute of any fountain or water, and containing only a few remains of rude walls and foundations, which he regards as the traces of the Roman station Lysa along this route (Researches, 1:276, 277). Rosenmüller (Alterth. II, 2:129) refers the name to Luza, a city, according to Eusebius (Onomast. s.v.), lying three miles from Shlechem; but this could not have been Hittite territory. Studer (Buch d. Richter, page 45) adopts a suggestion of D. Kimchi, that a city of the Phoenicians (Kittim, so Eusebius, Κεττείμ, Onomast. s.v. 2) is meant. Probably it was some place near Hebron, in southern Palestine, where the Hittites were settled. SEE HITTITE.

## Luz (2)[[@Headword:Luz (2)]]

             SEE HAZEL.

## Luz (3)[[@Headword:Luz (3)]]

             (Jdg 1:26), Lieut. Conder suggests (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 1:95), may be the present Khurbet el-Lusweiziyeh, a ruined site four and a half miles north-west of Banias, and consisting of basaltic stones scattered and in rough walls" (ibid. page 120).

## Luzzatto, Mose Chayim, Ben-Jacob[[@Headword:Luzzatto, Mose Chayim, Ben-Jacob]]

             the great modern Jewish mystic of Italy, was born at Padua in 1707, and enjoyed the highest educational advantages the country of his birth could afford. WVhen a youth of only twenty, his extended studies in Hebrew literature, especially the cabalistic writings, secured for him a universal reputation. Had he known how to avoid mysticism, he might have proved one of the greatest ornaments of Judaism, but the Cabala (q.v.) led him astray, and he not only compiled a second Zohar (q.v.), but actually came to believe himself the predicted Messiah of his people. He was excommunicated, andi obliged to quit Italy. For a time he flourished in Amsterdam, and about 1744 he removed to the Holy Land. He died shortly  after, at Safet, in May 1747, and was buried at Tiberias. Of his multifarious works twenty-four are yet unedited; twenty-eight have been published, comprising treatises in theology, dogmatic and cabalistical, philosophy, morals, and rhetoric, and a body of poetry, devotional, lyrical, and dramatic. His most important writings are cited in Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrews Literature, page 393. See also Griltz, Geschischte d. Juden, 10:369-383; and his biography in Kerem Chemed (1838), 3:113 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Luzzatto, Philoxene[[@Headword:Luzzatto, Philoxene]]

             a Jewish Orientalist, was born at Trieste, July 10, 1829. At a very early age he mastered different languages, and in 1849 published Le Sanscritisme de la Langule Assyrienne. In 1850 he wrote, Etudes sur les Inscriptions Assyriennes de Persepolis, Hamadan, Van et Khorsabad: — Notice sur Abou-Jousouj Hasdai Ibn-Shaprout (1852). While on his travels he was taken sick, but at length arrived at Padua, and died January 25, 1854. The Memoire sur les Juifs d'Abyssinie ou Falaschas, was published after his death in the Archives Israelites of Paris. (B.P.)

## Luzzatto, Samuel David[[@Headword:Luzzatto, Samuel David]]

             one of the most noted Jewish writers of our day, the Jehudah ha-Levi (q.v.) of the 19th century, was born at Trieste (Italy) in 1800, the scion of one of the most eminent Italian families. He received a thorough academical training, and early displayed great ability as a writer. Greatly interested in the study of the history and literature of his people, he became one of the most prominent writers in this field. Says Graitz (Gesch. d. Juden, 11:502), "If Krochmal and Rapaport were the fathers of Jewish history, Luzzatto must be acknowledged as her mother." He brought to light the most beautiful pages of Jewish history of the Franco-Spanish epoch — the tragical fate of the Jews in the persecutions of the Middle Ages and the reformatory period — which had been given up as lost; and thereby prepared the way for the labors of Kayserling, Sachs, Zunz, and others. Luzzatto also labored creditably in the department of O.-T. exegesis, and when the collegio rabbinico was opened at Padua in 1829, he became one of its professors, continuing in this service until his death in 1865. He wrote Hebrew, Italian, French, and German. His diction is graceful and exceedingly pleasant. His essays and treatises in this field appeared first in the "Bikkure Ittim," and afterwards (1841, etc.) in the "Kerem Chemed," published in Vienna and then in Prague by a man of great learning in Jewish literature, Samuel L. Goldenberg, of Tarnapol. One of his best works is his Dialogues, etc., on the Casbala, the Zohar, the antiquity of the vowel- points and accents of the Bible (1852), which shows the folly of the Cabala, the origin of the Zohar in the 13th century, and the vowel-points in the 5th, and the accents probably in the 6th. Luzzatto also published on Hebrew grammar, Prolegomena ad una gram. Hebr.; and later a complete Hebrew grammar, Oheb Guer (אוהב גר) ; a work on the Aramaic version of Onkelos (Vienna, 1830); an Italian version of Job (Livorno, 1844); French Notes on Isaiah (in Rosenmüller's version, Leips. 1834); Heb.  Notes on the Pentateuch (Vienna, 1850); and finally Isaiah, an Italian translation with an extensive Hebrew commentary (Vienna, 1850). See Grintz, Gesch. d. Juden, 11:499 sq.; Jost, Geschichte d. Judenthaums, 3:345 sq.; Maggid, 1864-1865; The Israelite (Cincinnati. Ohio), January 19, 1872. (J.H.W.)

## Luzzatto, Simone[[@Headword:Luzzatto, Simone]]

             (Heb. Simcha), a noted rabbis who flourished at Venice about 1590, exerted no small influence on the Italian Jews of the 16th century. He was an associate of Leo da Modena (q.v.), and aided the latter greatly by his superior abilities. He died in 1663. He wrote Via della Fede, in which he teaches that the prophecies of Daniel refer rather to a by-gone age than to a future Messiah. This peculiar view has given rise to the belief that he accepted Jesus as the Messiah (see Wolf, Bibl. Jud. 3:1128). His most valuable work, however, is his Discorso circa il stato degli Hebrei (Venice, 1638), in which he ably defends Judaism and the Jews. The excesses of the Cabalists he deplored, and stoutly opposed all relation with them. See Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 10:162 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Lybon Or Libo[[@Headword:Lybon Or Libo]]

             a city mentioned in the Antonine Itinerary as being situated thirty-two Roman miles from Heliopolis (Baalbek), and the same distance from Laodicea. Its name has elsewhere been displaced in the same itinerary by that of Conna. The modern village of Lebweh is doubtless the same (Bibl. Sacr. 1848, page 699), although the distances have become corrupted (Porter, Damascus, 2:322 sq.). It is a poor village, in the middle of a basin, on a low tell among the streams on the eastern slope of Lebanon, with some remains of antiquity, and a considerable Arabian history (Robinson, Later Res. page 532 sq.).

## Lybrand, Joseph[[@Headword:Lybrand, Joseph]]

             an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Lutheran parentage in Philadclphia, October 3, 1793; was converted at about ten; entered the Philadelphia Conference in April 1811; was presiding elder on Philadelphia District in 1824-8; 1834-8 was on stations in Philadelphia; desisted from labor in 1843 at Harrisburg, and died April 24, 1845. Mr. Lybrand was a man of deep fidelity to God, and immovable fidelity to man. As an eloquent preacher he had few equals in the American pulpit. His style was elegant  and weighty, full of masterly argument and powerful exhortation, and many souls were added to the Church by his long and blessed ministry. So strong was his conviction in his duty to preach only that he refused to accept some of the most important offices in the gift of his denomination. Thus he declined in 1832 to assume the responsibilities of the publishing house taken from Dr. Emory, who had been elected bishop. — Minutes of Conferences, 3:598.

## Lycaonia[[@Headword:Lycaonia]]

             (Λυκαονία, either from the mythological name Lycaön, or from λύκος, a wof ), a province of Asia Minor, having Cappadocia on the east, Galatia on the north, Phrygia on the west, and Isauria and Cilicia on the south. These boundaries, however, are differently described by ancient authors (Ptolemy, 6:16; 5:6; Pliny, 5:25; Strabo, 14:663; Livy, 38:38). It extends in length about twenty geographical miles from east to west, and about thirteen in breadth. It was an undulating plain, involved among mountains, which were noted for the concourse of wild asses. The soil was so strongly impregnated with salt that few of the brooks supplied drinkable water, so that good water was sold for money; but sheep throve on the pasturage, and were reared with great advantage (Strabo, 12:568; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 8:69). Lycaonia first appears in history in connection with the expedition of Cyrus the younger (Xenophon, Anab. 1:2,19; 3:2, 23; Cyrop. 6:2, 20). The inhabitants were a hardy race, not subject to the Persians. and lived by plunder and foray (Dionysitus, Per. 857; Prisc. 806; Avien. 1020). With these descriptions modern authors agree (Leake's Journal, page 67 sq.; Rennel, Geog. of West. Asia, 2:99; Cramer, As. Min. 2:63; Mannert, Geog. VI, 2:190 sq.). It was a Roman province when visited by Pau. (Act 14:6), and its chief towns were Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, of which the first was the capital (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.). "The speech of Lycaonia" (Act 14:11) is supposed by some to have been the ancient Assyrian language, also spoken by the Cappadocians (Jablonsky, Disquis. de Lingua Lycaonica, Berlin, 1714; also in his Opusc. 3:3 sq.); but it is more usually conceived to have been a corrupt Greek, intermingled with many Syriac words (Guhling, Dissesrt. de Lingua Lycaonica, Viteb. 1726), since the people appear, from the account in the Acts, to have adopted the Grecian mythology as the basis of their religion (see Sommel, De Lingua Lyc. Lond. 1787). "It is deeply interesting to see these rude country people, when Paul and Barnabas worked miracles among them, rushing to the conclusion that the strangers were Mercury and Jupiter, whose visit to  this very neighborhood forms the subject of one of Ovid's, most charming stories (Ovid, Metam. 8:626). Nor can we fail to notice how admirably Paul's address on the occasion was adapted to a simple and imperfectly civilized race (Act 14:15-17). See Bomer, De Paulo in Lycaonia (Lips. 1708). SEE ASIA MINOR; SEE PAUL.

## Lycea[[@Headword:Lycea]]

             a festival among the Arcadians, celebrated in honor of Zeus Lycaeus. It is said to have been instituted by Lycaon, the son of Pelasgus, who sacrificed a child on the occasion, and sprinkled the altar with its blood. Plutarch says that the Lycea was celebrated in a manner similar to the Roman Lupercalia.

## Lych-gate[[@Headword:Lych-gate]]

             or LICH-GATE (Anglo-Sax. lie or lice, a body or corpse), i.e., corpse- gate, is a covered gate erected, especially in England, at the entrance of a churchyard, beneath which the persons bearing a corpse for interment were wont to pause, sometimes to read the burial-service under this sheltered place. It is also applied to the path by which a corpse is carried.

## Lychnoscope[[@Headword:Lychnoscope]]

             (an opening for watching the light), a name assigned by conjecture to an unglazed window or opening, which is frequently found near the west end of the chancel, and usually on the south side, below the range of the other windows, and near the ground. What purpose these low side windows served in churches is not now known.

## Lycia[[@Headword:Lycia]]

             (Λυκία, prob. from λύκος, a wolf; according to some, from its earliest king, Lycus; for a Shemitic origin of the name, see Simonis, Onomast. N.T. page 101; Sickler, Handb. page 568), a province in the south-west of Asia Minor, opposite the island of Rhodes, having Pamphylia on the east, Phrygia on the north, Caria on the west, and the Mediterranean on the south. The last eminences of the range of Taurus come down here in majestic masses to the sea, forming the heights of Cragus and Anticragus, with the river Xanthus winding between them, and ending in the long series of promontories called by modern sailors the "Seven Capes," among which are deep inlets favorable to seafaring and piracy. It forms part of the region now called Tekeh. It was fertile in corn and wine, and its cedars, firs, and other trees were celebrated (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 12:5). Its inhabitants were believed to be descendants of Cretans, who came thither under Sarpedon, brother of Minos. One of their kings was Bellerophon, celebrated in mythology. Lycia is often mentioned by Homer (Il. 6:171; 10:430; 12:312; Odys. 5:282, etc.), according to whom it was an ally of Troy. Herodotus assigns several ancient names to the country (1:173). The Lycians were a warlike people, powerful on the sea, and attached to their independence, which they successfully maintained against Craesus, king of Lydia, and were afterwards allowed by the Persians to retain their own kings as satraps, and their ships were conspicuous in the great war against the Greeks (Herod. 7:91, 92). After the death of Alexander the Great, Lycia was included in the Greek Seleucid kingdom, and was a part of the territory which the Romans forced Antiochus to cede (Livy, 37:55). It was made, in the first place, one of the continental possessions of Rhodes, SEE CARIA; but before long it was politically separated from that island, and allowed to be an independent state. This has been called the golden period of the history of Lycia (see further in Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.). It is at this time that it is named in 1Ma 15:23, as one of the countries to which the Roman senate sent its missive in favor of the Jews. The victory  of the Romans over Antiochus (B.C. 189) gave Lycia rank as a free state, which it retained till the time of Claudius, when it was made a province of the Roman empire (Sueton. Claud. 25; Vespas. 8). At first it was combined with Pamphylia, and the governor bore the title of "Proconsul Lycise et Pamphylia" (Gruter, Thes. page 458). Such seems to have been the condition of the district when Paul visited it (Act 21:1; Act 27:5). At a later period of the Roman empire it was a separate province, with Myra for its capital. Lycia contained many towns, two of which are mentioned in the New Testament: Patara (Act 21:1-2) and Myra (Act 27:5); and one. Phaselis, in the Apocrypha (1 Mace. 15:23). This region, abounding in ancient remains and inscriptions (the last copiously illustrated by Schmidt, Jena, 1868, fol.), was first visited in modern times by Sir Chas. Fellows. See his Journal (London, 1839, 1841); Forbes, Travels (London, 1847); Texier, L'A sie Mineure (Paris, 1838); Encycl. of Useful Knowledge, 14:210 sq.; Cramer's Asia Minor, 2:282 sq.; Mannert, Geogr. VI, 3:150 sq.; Cellarius, Notit. 2:93 sq.

## Lycus[[@Headword:Lycus]]

             (Wolf), a river of Palestine, mentioned by ancient geographers as situated between ancient Biblus and Berytus (Strabo, 16, page 755; Pliny, 5:20). This is evidently the modern Nahr el-Kelb (Dog River), at the mouth of which, about 2 ½ hours N.E. of Beirut, are found the remarkable rock-  tablets of ancient victorious kings (Wilson, 2:405; Robinson, Later Res. page 619 sq.).

## Lydda[[@Headword:Lydda]]

             (Λύδδα, Act 9:32; Act 9:35; Act 9:38; from the Heb. "Lod, לדֹ, strife; Sept. Λόδ v.r. Λώδ, 1Ch 8:12; Λυδδών v.r. Λοδαδί and Λοδαδίδ, by union with the following name, Ezr 2:33; Neh 7:37; Λύδδα, Neh 11:35; 1Ma 11:34; so also Josephus), a town within the limits of the tribe of Ephraim; according to Eusebius and Jerome, nine miles east of Joppa, on the road between that port and Jerusalem; according to the Antonine Itin., thirty-two miles from Jerusalem and ten from Antipatris. It bore in Hebrew the name of LOD, and appears to have been first built by the Benjamites, although it lay beyond the limits of their territory (1Ch 8:12); and we find it again inhabited by Benjamites after the exile (Ezr 2:33; Neh 11:35). In all these notices it is mentioned in connection with Ono. It likewise occurs in the Apocrypha (1Ma 11:34) as having been taken from Samaria and annexed to Judaea by Demetrius Nicator; and at a later date its inhabitants are named among those who were sold into slavery by Cassius when he inflicted the calamity of his presence upon Palestine after the death of Julius Caesar (Josephus, Ant. 14:11, 2; 12:6). In the New Testament the place is only noticed under the name of Lydda, as the scene of Peter's miracle in healing AEneas (Act 9:32; Act 9:35). Some years later the town was reduced to ashes by Cestius. Gallus, in his march against Jerusalem (Josephus, War, 2:19, 1); but it must soon have revived, for not long after we find it at the head of one of the toparchies of the later Judaea, and as such it surrendered to Vespasian, who introduced fresh inhabitants from Galilee (Josephus, War, 3:3, 5; 4:8).

At that time it is described by Josephus (Ant. 20:6, 2) as a village equal to a city; and the Rabbins have much to say of it as a seat of Jewish learning, of which it was the most eminent in Judaea after Jabneh and Bether (Lightfoot, Parergon, § 8; Horae Heb. page 35 sq.; Otho, Lex. Rabb. page 399 sq.). About the time of the siege it was presided over by rabbi Gamaliel, second of the name (Lightfoot, Chor. Cent. 16). Some curious anecdotes and short notices from the Talmuds concerning it are preserved by Lightfoot. One of these states that "queen Helena celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles there!" In the general change of names which took place under the Roman dominion, Lydda became Diospolis (Ptolemy, 5:16, 6; Pliny, 5:15; see Reland,  Palaest. page 877), and under this name it occurs in coins of Severus and Caracalla, and is often mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome. It was early the seat of a bishopric, and at the different councils the bishops are found to have subscribed their names variously, as of Lydda or Diospolis; but in the later ecclesiastical records the name of Lydda predominates.

Tradition reports that the first bishop was "Zenas the lawyer" (Tit 3:13), originally one of the seventy disciples (Dorotheus, in Reland, page 879); but the first historical mention of the see is the signature of "Atius Lyddensis" to the acts of the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325; Reland, page 878). The bishop of Lydda, originally subject to Caesarea, became at a later date suffragan to Jerusalem (see the two lists in Von Raumer, page 401); and this is still the case. In the latter end of 415 a council of fourteen bishops was held here, before which Pelagius appeared, and by whom, after much tumultuous debate, and in the absence of his two accusers, he was acquitted of heresy, and received as a Christian brother (Milner, Hist. of Ch. of Christ, cent. 5, chapter 3). The latest bishop distinctly mentioned is Apollonius, in A.D. 518. Lydda early became connected with the homage paid to the celebrated saint and martyr St. George, who was not less renowned in the East than afterwards in the West. He is said to have been born at Lydda, and to have suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia in the earliest persecution under Diocletian and Maximian, at the end of the 3d century. His remains were transferred to his native place, and a church erected in honor of him by the emperor Justinian. This church, which stood outside the town, had just been leveled to the ground by the Moslems when the Crusaders arrived at Lydda; but it was soon rebuilt by them, and they established a bishopric of Lydda and Ramneh. Great honors were paid by them to St. George, and they invested him with the dignity of their patron: from this time his renown spread more widely throughout Europe, and he became the patron saint of England and of several other states and kingdoms.

The church was destroyed by Saladin in 1191, and there is no evidence that it was ever rebuilt, although there was in later centuries an unfounded impression that the church, the ruins of which were then seen, and which still exist, had been built by the English king Richard. From that time there has been little notice of Lydda by travelers. It now exists, in a fruitful plain, one mile north of Rama, and three east of Jaffa, under its ancient name of Lud or Ludda (Lidd in Tobler, Dritte Wanderung, pages 69, 456). Within a circle of four miles still stand Ono (Kefr Auna), Hadid (el-Hadithehs , and Neballat (Beit-Neballah) associated with Lod in the ancient records. The water-course outside the  town is said still to bear the name of Abi-Butrus (Peter), in memory of the apostle (Tobler, page 471). The town is, for a Mohammedan place, busy and prosperous (see Van de Velde, Syr. and Palest. 1:244). Buried in palms, and with a large well close to the entrance, it looks from a distance inviting enough, but its interior is very repulsive on account of the extraordinary number of persons, old and young, whom one encounters at every step, either totally blind, or afflicted with loathsome diseases of the eyes. It is a considerable village of small houses, with nothing to distinguish it from ordinary Moslem villages save the ruins of the celebrated church of St. George, which are situated in the eastern part of the town. The building must have been very large. The walls of the eastern end are standing only in the parts near the altar, including the arch over the latter; but the western end remains more perfect, and has been built into a large mosque, the lofty minaret of which forms the landmark of Lud. As the city of St. George, who is one with the famous personage El-Khudr, Lydda is held in much honor by the Moslems. In their traditions the gate of the city will be the scene of the final combat between Christ and Antichrist (Sale's Koran, note to chapter 43; and Prel. Disc. 4, § 4; also Jalal ad-n, Temple of Jerusalem, page 434). See Raumer, Palastina, page 208; Robinson, Bib. Researches, 2:55; Sandys, Travailes; Cotovicus, Itiner. pages 137, 138; D'Arvieux, Memoires, 2:28; Pococke, Description, 2:58; Volney, Voyage, 1:278; Thomson, Land and Book, 2:291 sq.

## Lydda (2)[[@Headword:Lydda (2)]]

             Ludd, the modern representative of this place, is briefly described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:252), and its traditional Church of St. George in detail (ibid. page 267).

## Lydgate, John[[@Headword:Lydgate, John]]

             an ancient English theologian, celebrated particularly as a poet, one of the successors of Chaucer, was a monk of the Benedictine abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, in Suffolk. The dates of only a few of the events of his life have been ascertained. He was ordained a subdeacon in 1389, a deacon in 1393, and a priest in 1397, whence it has been conjectured that he was born about 1375. He seems to have arrived at his greatest eminence about 1430. After a short education at Oxford he traveled in France and Italy, and returned a complete master of the language and literature of both countries. He chiefly studied Dante, Boccaccio, and Alain Chartier, and became so distinguished a proficient in polite learning that he opened a school in his monastery for teaching the sons of the nobility versification and composition. Although philology was his subject, he was not unacquainted with the philosophy of the day: he was not only a poet and a rhetorician, but a geometrician, an astronomer, a theologist, and a  disputant. He died about 1461. — English. Cyclop. s.v.; Warton, Hist. Engl. Poetry; Chambers, Cyclop. Eng. Lit. 1:40 sq.

## Lydia[[@Headword:Lydia]]

             (Λυδία), the name of a country, and also of a woman in the New Testament.

1. The Hebrew LUD ("Lydia" in Eze 30:5; SEE LUDIM ), a province in the west of Asia Minor, supposed to have derived its name from Lud, the fourth son of Shem (Gen 10:22). Thus Josephus states "those who are now called Lydians (Λυδοί), but anciently Ludimn (Λούδοι), sprung from Lud" (Λούδα, Ant. 1:6, 4; compare Bochart, Opera, 1:83, and the authorities cited there). SEE ETHNOLOGY.

Lydia was bounded on the east by Greater Phrygia, on the north by AEolis or Mysia, on the west by Ionia and the AEgaean Sea, and or the south it was separated from Caria by the Meander (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Geogr. s.v.). The country is for the most part level (Schubert, Reisen, 1:369 sq.). Among the mountains, that of Tmolus was celebrated for its saffron and red wine (Xenoph. Cyrop. 6:2, 21). Lydia, however, lay on the west coast of Asia Minor, and thus was far removed from the other possessions of the Shemitic nations. Greek writers inform us that Lydia was originally peopled by a Pelasgic race called hicseonians (Homer, Iliad, 2:866; 10:431), who received their name from Maeon, an ancient king (Bochart, 1.c.). They also state that the name Lydians was derived from a king who ruled them at a later period (Herod. 1:7) About eight centuries B.C. a tribe of another race migrated from the east, and subdued the Maeonians. These were the Lydians. For some time after this conquest both nations are mentioned promiscuously, but the Lydians gradually obtained power, and gave their name to the country (Kalisch, On Genesis 10; Dionysius, 1:30; Pliny, 5:30; comp. Strabo, 12:572; 14:679). The best and most recent critics regard these Lydians as a Shemitic tribe, and consequently the descendants of Lud (Movers, Die Phonicier, 1:475). This view is strengthened by the description of the character and habits of the Lydians. They were warlike (Herod. 1:79), skilled in horsemanship (ib.), and accustomed to serve as mercenaries under foreign princes (7:71). Now, in Isa 66:19, a warlike people called Lud is mentioned in connection with Tarshish and Pul; and again in Eze 27:10, the prophet says of Tyre, "They of Persia, and of Lud, and of Phut, were in thine army, thy men of war." There can scarcely be a doubt that this is the Shemitic nation  mentioned in Genesis, and which migrated to Western Asia, and gave the province of Lydia its name.

The identity has recently been called in question by professor and Sir Henry Rawlinson, but their arguments do not seem sufficient to set aside the great mass of circumstantial evidence in its favor (Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:160, 659, 667; comp. Kalisch, ad loc. Gen.; Prichard, Physical History of Mankind, 4:562 sq.; Niebuhr, Lectures on Ancient History, 1:87; Gesenius, Thesaurus, page 745). In the palmy days of Lydia its kings ruled from the shores of the AEgean to the river Halys; and Craesus, who was its king in the time of Solon and of Cyrus, was reputed the richest monarch in the world (Strabo, 15:735). He was able to bring into the field an army of 420,000 foot and 60,000 horse against Cyrus, by whom, however, he was defeated, and his kingdom annexed to the Persian empire (Herod. 1:6). Lydia afterwards formed part of the kingdom of the Seleucidae; and it is related in 1Ma 8:8, that Antiochus the Great was compelled by the Romans to cede Lydia to king Eumenes (comp. Apian. Syr. 38). Some difficulty arises in the passage referred to from the names "India and Media" found in connection with it; but if we regard these as incorrectly given by the writer or by a copyist for "Ionia and Mysia," the agreement with Livy's account of the same transaction (37:56) will be sufficiently established, the notice of the maritime provinces alone in the book of Maccabees being explicable on the ground of their being best known to the inhabitants of Palestine. In the time of the travels of the apostles it was a province of the Roman empire (Ptolemy, 5:2, 16; Pliny, 5:30). Its chief towns were Sardis (the capital), Thyatira, and Philadelphia, all of which are mentioned in the New Testament, although the name of the province itself does not occur. Its connection with Judaea, under the Seleucidne, is referred to by Josephus (Ant. 12:3, 4). The manners of the Lydians were corrupt even to a proverb (Herod. 1:93). See Th. Menke, Lydiaea (Berlin, 1844); Cramer, Asia Minor, 1:413; Forbiger, Handb. der Alten Geogrs. 2:167; Clinton, Fasti Hellen. Appendix, page 361; Niebuhr, Lectures on Anc. Hist. 1:82; Cellarius, Notitiae, 1:108 sq.; Mannert, Geogr. VI, 3:345 sq.; Allgem. Welhistor. 4:623 sq.; Beck, Weltg. 1:308 sq.; Heeren, Ideen, I, 1:154 sq.

2. A woman of Thyatira, "a seller of purple," who dwelt in the city of Philippi, in Macedonia (Act 16:14-15). A.D. 47. The commentators are not agreed whether "Lydia" should be regarded as an appellative, or a derivative from the country to which the woman belonged, Thyatira, her native place, being in Lydia. There are examples of this latter sense; but the  preceding word ὀνόματι seems here to support the former, and the name was a common one. (See Biel and I. Hase in the Bibl. Brem. 2:411; 3:275; 5:670; 6:1041; Symb. Brem. II, 2:124; compare Ugolini Thesaur. 13:29.) Lydia was not by birth a Jewess, but a proselyte, as the phrase "who worshipped God" imports. It was at the Jewish Sabbath-worship by the side of a stream (Act 16:13) that the preaching of the Gospel by Paul reached her heart. She was converted, being the first person in Europe who embraced Christianity there, and after she and her household had been baptized she pressed the use of her house so earnestly upon the apostle and his associates that they were constrained to accept the invitation. As her native place was in the province of Asia (Act 16:14; Rev 2:18), it is interesting to notice that through her, indirectly, the Gospel may have come into that very district where Paul himself had recently been forbidden directly to preach it (Act 16:6). We infer that she was a person of considerable wealth partly from the fact that she gave a home to Paul and his companions, partly from the mention of the conversion of her "household," under which term, whether children are included or not, slaves are no doubt comprehended. Of Lydia's character we are led to form a high estimate from her candid reception of the Gospel, her urgent hospitality, and her continued friendship to Paul and Silas when they were persecuted. Whether she was one of "those women who labored with Paul in the Gospel" at Philippi, as mentioned afterwards in the epistle to that place (Php 4:3), it is impossible to say. The Lydians were famous for the art of dyeing purple vests (Pliny, 7:57; Max. Tyr. 40:2; Valer. Flacc. 4:368; Claud. Rapt. Proserp. 1:275; AElian, Anim. 4:46), and Lydia, as "a seller of purple," is supposed to have been a dealer in vests so dyed rather than in the dye itself (see Kuinol on Act 14:14).

## Lydian[[@Headword:Lydian]]

             (Jer 46:9). SEE LUD; SEE LUDIM; SEE LYDIA.

## Lydius, Balthasar[[@Headword:Lydius, Balthasar]]

             a Dutch theologian of German origin, was born at Umstadt, near Darmstadt, about 1577; studied at Leyden; became pastor at Streefkerk in 1602, and in 1608 at Dordrecht. He was present at the Synod of Dort. He died in 1629. Lydius was a violent opponent of the Remonstrants. Of his literary labors, one deserves special mention, Waldensisa (now very rare, Rotterdam, 1616-17; 2d ed. Amsterdam, 1623, 2 volumes, 8vo), in which  he seeks to show an intimate connection between the Moravians and Waldensians. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 20:63, 64.

## Lydius, Jacob[[@Headword:Lydius, Jacob]]

             a Dutch theologian, son of the preceding, flourished about the middle of the 17th century at Dordrecht, and took a prominent part in the synod held there. He died in 1688. Some of his works deserve special mention: Agonistica Sacra, sive Syntagma vocum et phrasium agonisticarum quae in Scriptura occurrunt (Rott. 1657, 12mo): — Florum Sparsio ad historium passionis Jesu Christi (ibid, 1672, 8vo). See Brandt, Hist. of the Reformation in the Low Countries; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 22:388.

## Lydius, Johannes[[@Headword:Lydius, Johannes]]

             (1), a German theologian, brother of Balthasar, was born at Frankfort about 1577, and became pastor at Oudewater (the birthplace of Arminius) in 1602. He died in 1643. Like his brother Balthasar, he is noted for his opposition to Arminianism. He was the editor of the works of Clemanges, Wessels, etc. See Herzog, Real-Enclcyklop. 20:64.

## Lydius, Johannes (2)[[@Headword:Lydius, Johannes (2)]]

             (2), one of the early Dutch ministers of the Reformed Church in America, was educated in Holland, and settled at Schenectady and Albany, N.Y., in 1702. Like his predecessors in the same Church, he labored successfully for the instruction and salvation of the Mohawk Indians. He ministered among the tribes of the "Five Nations," and received from the governor and council suitable compensation for his services. He died March 1, 1710. About thirty Indian communicants were in connection with his Church at his decease. He is represented by his contemporary, Reverend Thomas Barclay, of the Church of England, in a report to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, as "a good, pious man," who "lived in entire friendship" with him, " and sent his own children to be catechized." — Documentary Hist. of New York 3:897; Dr. Rogers's Hist. Discourse. (W.J.B.T.)

## Lydius, Martin[[@Headword:Lydius, Martin]]

             a noted Dutch theologian, father of Balthasar and Jacob, was born at Lubeck, Germany, in 1539 or 1540, of Dutch parentage. and was educated at the universities of Tübingen and Heidelberg, where in 1566 he was  employed at the Collegium Sapientice as teacher. On account of persecution in the Palatinate, he went to Holland, and became in 1579 pastor of a Church at Amsterdam. Upon the founding of the university at Franecker in 1585, he was called thither as professor. He died in 1601. He is noted for the part he took in the Arminian controversy. It is he who forwarded to Arminius the works of Koornhert and Arnold Cornelius for refutation, which resulted instead in the conversion of Arminius. See Herzog, Real-Encykl. 20:61 sq.; Bayle, Hist. Dict. 3:970, 971. SEE ARMINIANISM.

## Lye, Edward[[@Headword:Lye, Edward]]

             an English philologist and clergyman, was born at Totnes, Devonshire, and was educated at Hertford College, Oxford; took holy orders in 1719; was presented to the living of Haughton Parva, Northamptonshire; in 1750 became vicar of Yardley Hastings, and died in 1767. He acquired distinction by his researches in the Saxon language and literature. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, volume 2, s.v.

## Lye, Thomas[[@Headword:Lye, Thomas]]

             an English Nonconformist clergyman, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. While minister at All-Hallows, Lombard Street, London, he was called upon to take oath against the king; refusing, he was ejected in 1651; reinstated, he was once more expelled, because of his refusal to take the oath of uniformity, in 1662. He was very popular among Puritan families. His Sermons were published (Lond. 1660, 4to; 1662; 1681). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors, volume 2, s.v.; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of Engl. (Church Restoration), 1:278.

## Lyell, THOMAS, D.D[[@Headword:Lyell, THOMAS, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in Virginia in 1775. While quite a young man he became a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church; and during that time was one of the chaplains to Congress. In 1804 he was ordained deacon in the Protestant Episcopal Communion, and became rector of Christ Church, New York city, which position he occupied until his death, March 5, 1848. Dr. Lyell was elected secretary of the convention of the diocese of New York in 1811, which office he continued to hold annually until he declined re-election in 1816. Chosen a deputy to the General Convention in 1818, he was elected successively to the position during twenty-six years. He was a powerful extempore speaker, and a preacher of more than ordinary ability. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1848, page 302.

## Lyell, Thomas, D.D.[[@Headword:Lyell, Thomas, D.D.]]

             a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Richmond County, Virginia, May 13, 1775. Though educated in the Protestant Episcopal Church, he became in early life a Methodist, and officiated on the Frederick Circuit, Va., also in Providence, R.I., and was chaplain to Congress. In 1804, however, he became rector of Christ's Church, N.Y., and remained ever after in that connection. In 1803 he was made A.M. by Brown University, and in 1822 D.D. by Columbia College. Through a long ministry he held on the even tenor of his way, and was an active member of  almost every institution connected with the diocese of New York. He died March 4, 1848. — Sprague, Annals, 5:495.

## Lyford, William[[@Headword:Lyford, William]]

             an English theologian and zealous Calvinist, was born in 1598 at Perpmere (Berkshire); graduated at Oxford; became a fellow of Magdalen College; entered the Church; became vicar of Sherborne, Dorsetshire, and spent the remainder of his life there. He died in 1653. Among other sermons and treatises are published, Cases of Conscience propounded in the Timle of Rebellion (which preaches tolerance to all parties): — Principles of Faith and of a good Conscience (Lond. 1642; Oxford, 1652, 8vo): — An Apology for our public Ministry and Infant Baptisms (Lond. 1652, 1653, 4to): — The plain Man's Senses exercised to discern bota good and evil (ibid.. 1655, 4to). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, volume 32, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Lyle, John, A.M.[[@Headword:Lyle, John, A.M.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rockbridge County, Virginia, October 20, 1769, and graduated at Liberty Hall in 1794. Soon after he was employed in teaching, pursued his theological studies, and was licensed in 1797. He was ordained in 1799, and in 1800 took charge of the churches of Salem and Sugar Ridge, in Clark County. In 1805 he was appointed a missionary within the bounds of the Cumberland Presbytery, and subsequently a commissioner of the General Assembly. He removed to Paris, Bourbon County, Kentucky, in 1807, established an academy, and at the same time preached to the churches of Cave Ridge and Concord. He next supplied the church of Mount Pleasant, in Cynthiana, Harrison County, and passed the summer of 1814 in the counties of Bourbon, Harrison, Nicholas, and Fayette, preaching chiefly to the colored people. Having been instrumental, between 1815 and 1818, in the settlement of ministers on the field of his own labors, he devoted the rest of his life to missionary service, in which he was successfully engaged till his death in Paris, Kentucky, July 22, 1825. He published Contributions to Periodicals: — A New American English Grammar (1804): — A Sermon on the Qualifications and Duties of Gospel Ministers (1821). — Sprague, Annals, 4:178.

## Lyman, Chester Smith[[@Headword:Lyman, Chester Smith]]

             an American educator, was born at Manchester, Connecticut, January 13, 1814. Graduating from Yale College in 1837, and the Theological Seminary in 1842, he preached for two, years, but his health prevented his continuance in the ministry. In 1859 he became professor. of mechanics and physics in the Scientific School at New Haven; in 1871 of astronomy and physics; in 1884 of astronomy, in 1889 emeritus professor. He died January 29, 1890. See (Am.) Cong. Year-book, 1891.

## Lyman, Henry[[@Headword:Lyman, Henry]]

             an American missionary, was born at Northampton, Massachusetts, November 23, 1809, and graduated at Amherst College in 1829. He went as a missionary to Sumatra, and was killed there by the Battahs, with Mr. Minson, January 28, 1834. He published Condition of Females in Pagan Countries.

## Lyman, Joseph[[@Headword:Lyman, Joseph]]

             D.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 14, 1749, at Lebanon, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1767, was chosen tutor in 1770, in which position he remained two years, and was installed pastor in Hatfield, Mass., March 4, 1772, where he died March 27, 1828. He was elected president of the Hampshire Miss. Society in 1812, vice-president of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1819, and president in 1823. Dr. Lyman published several occasional Sermons (1787- 1821). — Sprague, Annals, 2:10.

## Lyman, William[[@Headword:Lyman, William]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born about 1763, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1784. He was pastor at Haddam, Conn., and China, N.Y., and died in 1833. The College of New Jersey honored him with the doctorate in divinity in 1808. Dr. Lyman published four Occasional Sermons (1806, 1807, 1810). See Drake, Hist. Amer. Biog. page 570; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2, s.v.

## Lynch, Patrick Niesen, D.D[[@Headword:Lynch, Patrick Niesen, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate and scholar, was born at Clones, County Monaghan, Ireland, March 10, 1817. In 1819 his parents came to America, and settled at Cheraw, S.C. At that time there was but one priest in the state, Dr. Gallagher, though Dr. England arrived next year to be the first bishop of Charleston, and opened St. John the Baptist's Seminary, at which Patrick Lynch was one of the earliest pupils. He was sent to the College of the Propaganda, Rome, where he was one of its most brilliant students, and was ordained priest and graduated doctor of divinity. In 1840 he returned to Charleston, and became assistant pastor of the cathedral, of St. Mary's Church, principal of the Collegiate Institute, and vicargeneral. On the death of bishop Reynolds, in 1855, Lynch became administrator, and on March 14, 1858, he was consecrated bishop of Charleston. The civil war soon came, and with it the destruction of his cathedral, house, and other Church property in Charleston and throughout the state. The rest of his life was a constant toil with debt, which was too much for his naturally robust constitution and vigorous mind, and brought him prematurely to his end. He died in Charleston, February 26, 1882. Bishop Lynch was noted for his quiet benevolence and literary activity. In 1848 he took charge of a hospital during the yellow fever, and in 1871, on another outbreak of the disease, was never absent from his post. He was a thorough scholar, and a devoted student of applied science. He was a contributor to magazines, author of letters to the Catholic World on the Vatican Council, articles on the Blood of St. Januarius, in the same, now published anonymously in book form,  contributed to the American Catholic Quarterly Review, and edited and revised Deharbe's Series of Catechisms. He was pleasant and affable in social intercourse, and a fine orator. See (N.Y.) Catholic Annual, 1883, page 57.

## Lynch, Thomas M.[[@Headword:Lynch, Thomas M.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Wilkerson County, Mississippi, August 1, 1826, was converted at Oxford, Ga., while a student at the university, at once joined the Church, and was licensed to preach in 1847, and shortly after was admitted to the Alabama Conference. His cultivated mind, his rare gifts in oratory, and his deep piety at once commended him to the love and confidence of the Conference. Enon Circuit was his first, and Marianna and Appalachicola his second appointment, when, in 1849, his health failed, and it became necessary for him to locate. By 1858 he had sufficiently recovered to re- enter upon his life-work, and he now consecutively served his church at Lowsndesboro, Pineville, Prattville, and the Socapatoy Circuit. In the last-  named place his health was again affected by the extent of the work and arduousness of its duties, and he retired from active work. He died in Coosa County, Alabama, April 18, 1867. "In all the relations of life he sustained the character of a gentleman of the highest type. Possessing a rich fund of knowledge, and gifted with conversational powers that statesmen and courtiers might envy, he ever drew around him, by the affability of his manners and sweetness of his spirit, a large circle of friends, and held them by an indissoluble cord." As a preacher his word had power and unction. See Minutes of Conferences of M.E. Church South, 3:128.

## Lynch, Thomas Toke[[@Headword:Lynch, Thomas Toke]]

             an English poet, was born at Dunmore, Essex, July 5, 1818, served as pastor in various chapels near London, and died May 9, 1871. Besides several prose works, he published a book in verse, called The Revealed (1855). See his Memoirs, by White (Lond. 1874).  M

## Lynd, Samuel W., D.D[[@Headword:Lynd, Samuel W., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 23, 1796. He was baptized by Reverend Dr. William Staughton in 1820; was well educated, and in 1824, was called to the pastorate of a church in Philadelphia, from which he was soon laid aside by severe illness. For a time, he, with his wife, conducted a female institution in Baltimore. In 1831 he began his labors as pastor of the Sixth Street Church, Cincinnati, Ohio, his ministry being eminently successful. He remained here until 1845, when he removed to St. Louis, Mo., and became pastor of the Second Church in that city. About 1848 he was elected president of the theological institute in Covington, Kentucky, and remained in this position until 1854, when he took up his residence on a farm near Chicago. His other pastorates were at Lockport, Illinois, the North Church, Chicago, and the Mt. Auburn Church, Cincinnati, Ohio. He died at Lockport, Illinois, June 17, 1876. See Minutes of Ill. Anniversaries, 1876, page 14. (J.C.S.)

## Lynde, Sir Humphrey[[@Headword:Lynde, Sir Humphrey]]

             an English writer of note, was born in 1579, and was educated first at Westminster School, and then at Christ Church, Oxford; was made bachelor of arts in 1600. He was a member of several Parliaments, and enjoyed other national honors, but he deserves a place here only on account of his works, among which are Via tuta (Lond. 1628, 8vo, and often) and Ancient Characters of the Visible Church, etc. He died June 14, 1636. See Gen. Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Lyng, Georg Wilhelm[[@Headword:Lyng, Georg Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Norway, was born in 1827. In 1869 he was professor at Christiania, and died May 19, 1884. Lyng is the author of Hedenskabets Leonetslob, i.e., a history of heathenism (1866). (B.P.)

## Lyngwe[[@Headword:Lyngwe]]

             in Norse mythology, is an island in the sea Amtswartner, where the wolf Fenris is held by the chain Gleipner.

## Lyon, Asa[[@Headword:Lyon, Asa]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Pomfret, Connecticut, December 31, 1763, and graduated at Dartmouth College in 1790. He was pastor of the Congregational Church at Sunderland, Mass., from October 4, 1792, to September 23, 1793; at South Hess, Vermont, from December 21, 1802, to March 15, 1840; and was a member of Congress from Vermont from 1815 to 1817. He was appointed chief judge of Grand Isle County in 1805, 1806, 1808, and 1813; and was during nine years a state representative. He was an able preacher. His published sermons and patriotic addresses show a high order of talent and scholarship.

## Lyon, George Armstrong, D.D[[@Headword:Lyon, George Armstrong, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Baltimore, Maryland, March 1, 1806. He graduated from Dickinson College, Pennsylvania, in 1824; spent one year in Princeton Theological Seminary, and was ordained by the Erie Presbytery, September 9, 1829, pastor of the First Church, Erie, Pennsylvania, which office he held until his death, at Avon, N.Y., March 24, 1871. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 54.

## Lyon, Hervey[[@Headword:Lyon, Hervey]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Walden, N.Y., January 18, 1800, and was educated at Union College, pursued a course of theology at Princeton, N.J., and soon after removed to Ohio. Here, in 1828, he was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Huron, and ordained pastor of the Church in Vermilion. In 1830 he removed to Brownhelm, Ohio, and engaged in the occupation of teaching at the academy in Richfield, Ohio. He died March 7, 1863. Mr. Lyon was a superior teacher, and much beloved by his pupils;  as a Christian, he enjoyed a spirit remarkable for its depth and intensity. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, page 309. (J.L.S.)

## Lyon, James Adair, D.D[[@Headword:Lyon, James Adair, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Jonesborough, Tennessee, April 19, 1814. He graduated from Washington College in 1832, and afterwards from Princeton Theological Seminary; was ordained as an evangelist by the Holston Presbytery, and after serving, for five years, as a stated supply, the churches of Rogersville and New Providence, became pastor of the Columbus Church, Miss., where he remained six years. He then spent a year in foreign travel, and after his return was installed pastor of the Westminster Church, St. Louis, Missouri. In 1850 he established a select high-school for young ladies there, which he taught three years, and returned to his old charge at Columbus. In 1870 he was elected professor of mental and moral science in the University of Mississippi, at Oxford, which position he held for ten years, when failing health compelled him to resign. As a writer, he contributed largely to the Southern Quarterly Review. He was moderator of the General Assembly, and repeatedly elected to important positions in connection with literary and theological institutions, among them to the presidency of Washington College, and the chair of didactic theology in Danville Seminary, Kentucky. He died at Holly Springs, Mississippi, May 15, 1882. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Ser. 1883, page 31. (W.P.S.)

## Lyon, John C[[@Headword:Lyon, John C]]

             a noted German minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Leonsberg, in the kingdom of Wurtemberg, Germany, February 11, 1802. His parents were of the Lutheran faith, and John received a Christian training. In 1817 he emigrated to this country, and some nine years later was brought nearer the cross, at once joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. and, after due preparation, entered the ministry, in which he continued for thirty-four years, preaching both to English and German congregations with great acceptance. He received consecutively the following appointments: 1828, Baltimore Conference, Huntington; 1829, Gettysburgh; 1830, Carlisle Circuit; 1831, Baltimore; 1832-33, Baltimore, Sharp Street, and Asbury; 1834, superannuated; 1835, Lexington; 1836, Lewisburgh Circuit; 1837-38, Rockingham; 1839-40, Augusta; 1841, York; 1842-45, New York Conference, Second Street German Church; 1846-48, Philadelphia; 184952, presiding elder of New York German District; 185354, East Baltimore; 1855-56, New York, Second Street; 1857, Fortieth Street; 1858-59, Philadelphia; 1860, Frederick City; 1861, East Baltimore. In 1862 he was superannuated, and died May 16,1868. "Brother Lyon was an earnest, faithful worker in the Gospel, never tiring, esteeming all labor light which served to advance his Master's glory.... He was a mighty man of God in the pulpit, a devout and holy man in life, a pleasant companion, a kind husband, a good father, a sweet singer in Zion, a useful laborer, turning many to righteousness." — Conf. Minutes, 1869, page 108.

## Lyon, Mary[[@Headword:Lyon, Mary]]

             a teacher and female philanthropist, born in Buckland, Massachusetts, February 28, 1797, is noted as the founder of the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary in South Hadley, over which she presided until her death, March 5, 1849. A feature of her plan (at first much opposed) was the performance of the institution's domestic labor by teachers and pupils, intending to give them independence of servants, self-denial, health, and interest in domestic duties. She set forth her views in Tendencies of the Principles embraced and the System adopted in the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary (1840),  and in the Missionary Offering (1843). See Hitchcock, Life and Labors of Mary Lyon (1851); Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biography, s.v.

## Lyons[[@Headword:Lyons]]

             a city of France, situated on the Rhone, 316 miles by railway south-south- east of Paris, is noted in ecclesiastical history for two oecumenical councils which were held there:

I. In 1245, consisting of 140 bishops, and convened for the purpose of promoting the Crusades, restoring ecclesiastical discipline, and dethroning Frederick II, emperor of Germany. It was also decreed at this council that cardinals should wear red hats.

II. In 1274. There were 500 bishops and about 1000 inferior clergy present. Its principal object was the reunion of the Greek and Latin churches. — Hook, Dictionary; Smith, Tables of Church History; Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v.

## Lyons, Israel[[@Headword:Lyons, Israel]]

             a noted English scholar of Jewish parentage, was born at Cambridge in 1709, and after the completion of his studies, mainly dependent upon his own efforts, he became instructor of Hebrew at the University in Cambridge. He died in 1770. Besides valuable contributions to mathematical science, he wrote The Scholar's Instructor, or Hebrew Grammar (1735, 8vo; 2d ed., greatly enlarged, 1757): — Observations and Inquiries relating to various Parts of Scripture History (1761). This last-named work is supposed by some to have been written, however, by his father. See General Biographical Dictionary, s.v.

## Lyons, James Gilbourne[[@Headword:Lyons, James Gilbourne]]

             D.D., LL.D., an episcopal clergyman and educator, a native of England, emigrated to America in 1844, and began his clerical labors at St. Mary's Church, Burlington, N.J. In 1846 he removed to Philadelphia, and established himself as a teacher of the classics. His educational success secured him the position of principal of Haverford Classical School, which he held until his death, February 3, 1868.

## Lyra[[@Headword:Lyra]]

             (also Lyrtanus), NICHOLAS DE, so called from Lyre, in Normandy, the place of his nativity, was born about 1270. He entered the Order of the Franciscans at Verneuil in 1291, and completed his studies in Paris. Here he studied successfully, was admitted to the degree of doctor, and became a distinguished lecturer on the Bible. Besides his studies at the university, he privately devoted himself to the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of Hebrew, and his association with converts of Jewish faith at this time has probably given rise to the opinion, even now held by some, that Nicholas de Lyra was born of Jewish parents, and was himself a convert to Christianity. His own writings, however, flatly contradict this report, as has been shown by Wolf (Bibliotheca, 1 and 3, s.v.); and Nicholas himself tells us, in one of his works (the polemical treatise), that he had but little association with Jews, and depended mainly upon the experience of other Christians for his delineation of Jewish character and customs (compare Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:513). His great learning, refined taste, and eminent worth, raised him to the principal offices of his order, and secured him the friendship of the most illustrious persons of his age. He died at Paris October 23, 1340. It is especially as a writer that Lyra is justly celebrated, and, as has been frequently asserted, he became, by his thorough expositions of the Scriptures, one of the greatest aids of the reformers of the 16th century. whence the couplet on Luther's exegetical labors by the enemies of the great German reformer:

"Si Lyra non lyrasset Lutherus non saltasset."

Nicholas de Lyra's chef d'oeuvre is his Postillae perpetuae in universa Biblia (Rome, 1471-72,5 volumes fol.; best edit. Antw. 1634, 6 volumes fol.), which brought him the title of "doctor planus et utilis" — or, better, which immortalized the name of Lyra. The great merit of this commentary consists in the embodiment of the sober-spirited and ingenious explanations of Rashi, whose mode of interpretation Lyra regarded as his model, as he frankly states, "Similiter intendo non solum dicta doctorum Catholicorum, sed etiam Hebraeorum maxime rabbi Salomonis, qui inter doctores Hebraeos locutus est rationalibus, ad declarationem sensus literalis inducere." De Lyra even adopts the well-known Jewish four modes of interpretation denominated פרדם= סוד, mystical; דרוש, allegorical;  דמו, spiritual; פשט, literal, which he thus expresses in verses in the same prologue (i.e., the first), from which the former quotation is made.

"Litera gesta docet,

quid credas allegoria,

Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia."

He gives, however, the preference to the literal sense.

"All of them, says he, in the second prologue, "presuppose the literal sense as the foundation. As a building declining from the foundation is likely to fall, so the mystic exposition which deviates from the literal sense must be reckoned unbecoming and unsuitable." Even in the interpretation of the N.T., where Rashi failed him, acquaintance with the Rabbinical writings and Jewish antiquities enabled him to illustrate largely by allusion to the manners and customs of the Hebrews. He also wrote a treatise in defense of Christianity, and against Judaism, entitled Tractatus fratris Nicolai de Lyra de Messia ejusque adventu, una cum responsione ad Judaeorum argumenta quatuordecim contra veritatem Evangeliorum, which he finished in 1309. It is generally appended to his commentary, and is also given in the polemical work entitled the Hebraeomastix of Hieronymus de Sancta-fide (Frankf. 1602, page 148 sq.). For the different editions of De Lyra's works and translations into French and German, see Grasse, Tresor des Livres rares et precieux, s.v.; see also Davidson, Sacred Hermeneutics (ed. 1843), page 175 sq.; Dr. Adam Clarke, Sacred Lit. s.v.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. 2, s.v.

## Lyre[[@Headword:Lyre]]

             SEE HARP.

## Lysanias[[@Headword:Lysanias]]

             (Λυσανίας, a common Greek name) is mentioned by Luke, in Luk 3:1, as tetrarch of Abilene, on the eastern slope of the anti-Lebanon, near Damascus, at the time when John the Baptist began his ministry, A.D. 25. SEE ABILA.

It happens, however, that Josephus speaks of a prince named Lysanias who ruled over a territory in the neighborhood of Lebanon in the time of Antony and Cleopatra, and that he also mentions Abilene as associated with the name of a tetrarch Lysanias, while recounting events of the reigns of Caligula and Claudius. These circumstances have given to Strauss and others an opportunity for accusing the evangelist of confusion  and error, but we shall see that this accusation rests on a groundless assumption.

(a.) What Josephus says of the Lysanias who was contemporary with Antony and Cleopatra (i.e., who lived sixty years before the time referred to by Luke) is, that he succeeded his father Ptolemy, the son of Mennleus, in the government of Chalcis, under Mt. Lebanon (War, 1:13,1; Ant. 14:7, 4), and that he was put to death at the instance of Cleopatra (Ant. 15:4,1), who seems to have received a good part of his territory. It is to be observed that Abila is not specified here at all, and that Lysanias is not called tetrarch.

(b.) What Josephus says of Abila and the tetrarchy in the reigns of Caligula and Claudius (i.e., about twenty years after the time mentioned in Luke's Gospel) is, that the former emperor promised the "tetrarchy of Lysanias" to Agrippa (Ant. 18:6,10), and that the latter actually gave to him "Abila of Lysanias" and the territory near Lebanon (Ant. 19:5, 1; comp. War, 2:12, 8).

Amid the obscurity which surrounds this name, several conjectures have been indulged in, which we will here notice.

1. According to Eusebius (whom others have followed, such as Bede and Adrichomius; see Corn. a Lapid. in Luk 3:1), Lysanias was a son of Herod the Great. This opinion (the untenableness of which is shown by Valesius, on Eusebius, Hist. Esccles. 1:9, and by Scaliger, Animadver. on Euseb. Chron. page 178) has no other foundation than the fact that the evangelist mentions Lysanias with Herod Antipas and Philip.

2. To the older commentators, such as Casaubon (On Baronius, Ann. 31, Numbers 4), Scaliger (loc. cit.), and others (see Corn. a Lap. and Grotius, ad loc.), this difference of dates presented no difficulty. Allowing historical credit to Luke (on which subject see Dr. Mill, Pantheistic Princip. part 2, page 16 sq.), no less than to Josephus, they at once concluded that two different princes of the same name, and possibly of the same family, were referred to by the two writers. (See also Kuinol, On Luk 3:1; Krebsius, Observ. page 110-113; and Robinson, Biblioth. Sacr. 5:81).

3. This reasonable solution, however, was unsatisfactory to the restless critics of Germany. Strauss and others (whose names are mentioned by Bleek, Synopt. Erkl. 1:156, and Meyer, Komment. 2:289) charge the  evangelist with "a gross chronological error;" a charge which they found on the assumption that the Lysanias of Chalcis mentioned by Josephus is, identical with the Lysanias of Abilene, whom Luke mentions. This assumption is supported by a hypothesis which is incapable of proof, namely, that Abilene, being contiguous to Chalcis, was united to the latter under the rule of Lysanias, the son of Ptolemy. It must. however, be borne in mind that Josephus nowhere speaks of Abilene in connection with this Lysanias; nor, indeed, does he mention it at all until many years after the notice by Luke. He calls Antony's victim simply ruler of Chalcis. Moreover, it is of importance to observe that the tetrarchical division of Palestine and neighboring districts was not made until after the death of Herod the Great; so that, in his haste to inculpate the evangelist, Strauss in effect, attributes to the historian, whom he invidiously opposes to Luke as a better authority, an amount of inaccurate statement which, if true, would destroy all reliance on his history; for we have already seen that Josephus more than once speaks of a "tetrarchy of Lysanias," whereas there were no "tetrarchies" until some thirty years after the death of Ptolemy's son Lysanias. It is, therefore, a juster criticism to conclude (against Strauss, and with the earlier commentators) that in such passages as we have quoted above, wherein the historian speaks of "Abila of Lysanias" and "the tetrarchy of Lysanias," that a later Lysanias is certainly meant: and that Josephus is not only accurate himself, but a voucher also for the veracity of Luke. But there is yet stronger evidence to be found in Josephus of the untenableness of Strauss's objection and theory. In his Jewish War (2:12, 8) the historian tells us that the emperor Claudius "removed Agrippa [the second] from Chalcis [the kingdom, be it remembered, of Strauss's Lysanias] to a greater kingdom, giving him in addition the kingdom of Lysanias" (ἐκ δὲ τῆς Χαλκίδος Α᾿γρίππαν εἰς μείζονα βασιλείαν μετατίθησι... προσέθηνκε δὲ τήν το Λυσανίου βασιλείαν).

Ebrard exposes the absurdity of Strauss's argument by drawing from these words of Josephus the following conclusion-inevitable, indeed, on the terms of Strauss — that Agrippa was deprived of Chalcis, receiving in exchange a larger kingdom, and also Chalcis! (See Ebrard's Gospel Hist. [Clark], pages 145, 146 ) The effect of this reductio ad absurdum is well put by Dr. Lee (Inspiration [lst ed.], page 394, note], "Hence, therefore, Josephus does make mention of a later Lysanias [on the denial of which Strauss has founded his assault on Luke], and, by doing so, fully corroborates the fact of the evangelist's intimate acquaintance with the tangled details of Jewish history in his day." Many eminent writers have expressly accepted Ebrard's  conclusion, including Meyer (loc. cit.) and Bleek (loc. cit.). Patritius concludes an elaborate examination of the entire case with the discovery that "the later Lysanias, whom Luke mentions, was known to Josephus also, and that, so far from any difficulty accruing out of Josephus to the evangelist's chronology,. as alleged by objectors to his veracity, the historian's statements rather confirm and strengthen it" (De Evangeliis, 3:42, 25). It is interesting, also, to remark that, if the sacred writer gains illustration from the Jewish historian in this matter, he also repays him the favor, by helping to clear up what would otherwise be unintelligible in his statements; for instance, when Josephus (Ant. 17:17, 4) mentions "Batanaea, with Trachonitis and Auranitis, and a certain part of what was called 'the house of Zenodorus, as paying a certain tribute to Philip" (σύν τινι μέρει οἴκου τοῦ Ζηνοδώρουλεγομένου); and when it is remembered that "the house of Zenodorus" included other territory besides Abilene (comp. Ant. 15:10, 3, with War, 1:20, 4), we cannot but admit the force of the opinion advanced by Grotius (as quoted by Dr. Hudson, On the Antiq. 17:11, 4), that "when Josephus says some part of the house or possession of Zenodorus was allotted to Philip, he thereby declares that the larger part of it belonged to another. This other was Lysanias, whom Luke mentions" (see also Krebsius, Observat. page 112).

4. It is not irrelevant to state that other writers besides Strauss and his party have held the identity of Luke's Lysanias with Josephus's son of Ptolemy, and have also believed that Josephus mentioned but one Lysanias. But (unlike Strauss) they resorted to a great shift rather than assail the veracity of the evangelist. Valesius (on Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 1:10), and, more recently, Paulus (Comment. ad loc.), suggested an alteration of Luke's text, either by an erasure of τετραρχαῦντος after Α᾿βιληνῆς, or retaining the participle and making it agree with Φιλίππου as its subject (getting rid of Λυσανίου as a leading word by reducing it to a mere genitive of designation by its transposition with τῆς — q.d. τῆς Δυσανίου Α᾿βιληνῆς τετραρχοῦντος), as if Philip had been called by the evangelist "tetrarch of Ituroea, Trachonitis, and the Abilene of Lysanias." This expedient, however, of saving Luke's veracity by the mutilation of his words is untenable, not having any support from MS. authority.

5. Still others think it probable that the Lysanias mentioned by Josephus in the second instance is actually the prince referred to by Luke. Thus, instead of a contradiction, we obtain from the Jewish historian a confirmation of the evangelist; and the argument becomes very decisive if, as some think,  Abilene is to be excluded from the territory mentioned in the story which has reference to Cleopatra.

In conclusion, it is worth adding, that in modern times a coin has been discovered bearing the inscription Λυσαᾷίου τετράρχου καί ἀρχιερέως, and Pococke also found an inscription on the remains of a Doric temple, called Nebi Abel, the ancient Abila, fifteen English miles from Damascus, which makes mention of Lysanias, tetrarch of Abileze. Both the coin and the inscription refer to a period subsequent to the death of Herod (Pococke's Description of the East, II, 1:115, 116; and Sestini, Lettere et Dissertationi numismatiche, 6:101, tab. 2, as quoted by Wieseler, Chronolog. Synops. page 183). Similarly, the geographer Ptolemy mentions an " Abila which bears the surname of Lysanias," ῎ Α῾βιλα έπικληθεῖσα Δυσαᾷίου (5:18). See Davidson's Introduct. to N.T. page 218. SEE ABILENE.

## Lysczynski, Casimir[[@Headword:Lysczynski, Casimir]]

             a martyr of philosophical atheism, descended from a noble family of Lithuania, was educated in the Jesuit college of Wilna, where he greatly distinguished himself by his talents, but from whence he was finally expelled on account of his singular religious views. He then commenced to study law, and in 1680 was appointed one of the judges of Brzeski, in Lithuania. He now turned his attention again to theology, and wrote, in the form of remarks on Alstedt's Natural Theology, a lengthy refutation of the proofs of the existence of God. He used in his arguments some incautious expressions, and on a journey to Warsaw he was arrested, October 31, 1688, on the plea that, by denying the existence of God, the author of all law, Lysczynski had become an outlaw. An ecclesiastical tribunal, presided over by the bishop of Livonia, was appointed to try his case. A former friend of Lysczynski appeared as his accuser, and, after the incriminating books had been examined, he was sent before the diet to be punished. The states went again over the whole case. Brszeska repeated his charges, maintaining, among other things, that in using in his works the expression "ita non athei credimus," Lysczynski had declared himself an atheist, and denied the existence of God by asserting that God did not create man, but that man invented God. Lysczynski answered that he had intended his works as an examination of the proofs of the existence of God, mentioning the fundamental objections of unbelievers only as a preliminary argument, and that he meant to live and die in the communion of the Church in which  he was brought up. His defense, however, was not deemed satisfactory, and the senate condemned him to suffer death at the stake. The royal verdict was that Lysczynski's MSS. should be publicly burned by the executioner along with himself, and that the house in which he wrote his works should be torn down. The sentence was afterwards altered, and he was beheaded before being burned, March 31, 1689. See C.F. Ammon, C. Lysczynski, ein Beitrag z. Gesch. d. idealen Atheismus (Gstting. 1802); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8:628. (J.N.P.)

## Lyser[[@Headword:Lyser]]

             (also LEISER or LEYSER), an eminent Lutheran theologian, was born at Winnenden, in Würtemberg, March 18, 1552, and was educated at the University of Tübingen. In 1573 he became pastor at Gellersdorf, in Austria, where he soon distinguished himself as a preacher. He often preached also in Vienna, and thus became acquainted with the emperor Maximilian II. He was made D.D. by the University of Tübingen July 16, 1576, being then under 25 years old. After remaining for two years at the court of the elector August of Saxony, he became pastor and professor at Wittenberg. After the adoption of the "Formula Concordiae," he and J. Andrea devised a new organization for the university; he was also commissioned to revise the text of the Lutheran translation of the Bible, etc. After the death of the elector August in 1586, Calvinism began to regain the ascendency in Saxony, and Lyser left Wittenberg, generally regretted by the university and the community, to accept a call to Brunswick as coadjutor or vice-superintendent. He, however, returned to Wittenberg in 1592, and shortly after became preacher at the court of Dresden. Here he continued in the faithful discharge of his arduous duties, honored not only by the prince, but also by the emperor Rudolph. He died February 22, 1610. His principal works are a continuation of Chemnitz's Harmonia IV Evangelistarum (which was completed by John Gerhard), Erlauterungen u. drei Fragen (1598), and a number of Predigten, particularly Vier Landtags-predigten (1605). See Polhyc. Leyser III, Officium pietalis, quod C.D. Polyc. Leysero debuit et persolvit pronepos (Lpz. 1706); Gleich, Annales ecclesiastici; Adami, Vit. theol.; Spizel, Templ. hon.; Erdmanns, Lebensbeschr. d. Wittenb. Theol. etc.; Herzog, Real-Encykl. 8:628 sq.

## Lyser (2)[[@Headword:Lyser (2)]]

             a name common to a number of eminent Lutheran theologians of Germany, of whom we mention:

1. CHRISTIAN, doctor of theology, pastor and superintendent at Sangerhausen, who died October 5, 1671, is the author of Dissensus Lutheranorum et Jansenistarum.

2. FRIEDRICH, who died in 1645, doctor of theology, is the author of Disp. Inauguralis de Dicto Apostolico Rom 4:22-23.

3. FRIEDRICH WILHELM, son of Polycarp III, was born at Leipsic, September 4, 1622. He studied at. different universities, was in 1650 Saturday-preacher at Leipsic, in 1651 deacon at Halle, in 1662 superintendent at Langensalza, in 1664 cathedral-preacher at Magdeburg, and died August 25, 1691.

4. JOHANNES, brother of Friedrich Wilhelm, was born September 30, 1631. In 1664 he was inspector and pastor at Pforte. Being an advocate of  polygamy, he was dismissed. He roamed about through Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Italy, and France. In the latter country he died, in 1684.

5. POLYCARP I (q.v.).

6. POLYCARP II, son of Polycarp I, was born November 20, 1586, at Wittenberg, where he was also promoted as doctor of theology. He wrote, Centuria Quaestionum Theologicarum de Articulis Christianae Concordiae: — An Syncretismus in Rebus Fidei cuin Calvinianis coli Possit, et in Politica Conversatione: — ( Comment. in Augustanam Confessionem: et Formulam Concordiae: — Analysis Scholastica et Theologica in Epistolam ad Galatas.: — Dissert. de Sacramentis. Lyser died January 15, 1633.

7. POLYCARP III, was born at Halle, July 1, 1656. He studied at Jena and Leipsic, and commenced his academical career at the latter place in 1682. In 1685 he was pastor at Magdeburg, in 1687 superintendent, in 1690 doctor of theology, in 1695 general superintendent, and' died Oct. 11,1725.

8. WILHELM, born at Dresden, October 26, 1592, studied at different universities, and died at Wittenberg, February 8, 1649, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, Trifolium Verae Religionis Veteris Testamenti Adamitiae, Abrahamitic et Israeliticae: — Summarium Locorum Theologicorum: — Systema Thetico-Exegeticumn: — Disquisitio de Praedestinatione: — Excitationes 21 in Evangelium. Joannis: — Diss. de Genealogia Christi ad Mat 1:1-16. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lysias[[@Headword:Lysias]]

             (Δυσίας, a common Greek name), the name of two men mentioned, one in the Apocrypha, and the other in the New Testament.

1. A Syrian "nobleman of the blood royal" whom Antiochus Epiphanes, when setting out for Persia, appointed guardian of his son, and regent of that part of his kingdom which extended from the Euphrates to the borders of Egypt (1Ma 3:32; 2Ma 10:11; compare Josephus, Ant. 12:7, 2; Appian, De rebus Syr. 46). Acting under the special orders of the king, Lysias collected a large force for the purpose of carrying on a war of extermination against the Jews. This army, under the command of the generals Ptolemy, Nicanor, and Gorgias, was surprised and put to flight by Judas Maccabaeus near Emmaus (1Ma 3:38 to 1Ma 4:18; Josephus, Ant. 12:7, 3, 4). In the following year, B.C. 165, Lysias himself invaded Judaea with a still larger army, and joined battle with Judas in the neighborhood of Bethsura. The Syrians were again defeated, and so decisively that Judas was able to accomplish his great purpose, the purification of the Temple, and the re-establishment of divine worship at Jerusalem (1Ma 4:28-61; Josephus, Ant. 12:7, 5-7). Lysias retired to Antioch. and, while preparing for a fresh campaign, the death of Epiphanes left him in virtual possession of the supreme power. Shortly afterwards (probably B.C. 163), with an army equal in number to the former two combined, with three hundred war-chariots and two-and-thirty elephants, and accompanied by the young king Antiochus Eupator, he again entered Judaea from the side of Idumaea. Having taken the fortified city of Bethsura, he advanced to Jerusalem and laid siege to the Temple. Meeting here with a stouter resistance than he had anticipated, and hearing that Philip, a rival claimant to the guardianship of the king, was returning from Persia, he hastily concluded a peace with the Jews, and set out for Antioch. On reaching this city he found it in the possession of his rival. In the engagement which followed Philip was defeated and slain. Another and more formidable opponent, however, soon appeared in the person of Demetrius Soter, first cousin of the king, who, escaping from Rome, landed at Tripolis, and laid claim to the throne. The people rose in his favor, and Antiochus and Lvsias were seized and put to death (1 Macc. 6-7. 2; 2Ma 13:1 to 2Ma 14:2; Joseph. Ant. 12:9, 10; Appian, De rebus Syr. 47).

In the second book of Maccabees an account is given at some length of an invasion of Judaea by Lysias, made befbre the final invasion, but after the  death of Epiphanes (2 Maccabees 11). It is scarcely possible to reconcile this with the more trustworthy narratives of the first book, and it is clear from 2 Mace. 9:28-10:10, that the writer is not following a strictly chronological order in this part of his history. Internal evidence seems to favor the opinion that this narrative has been compiled from separate and partial accounts of the two invasions referred to in 1 Maccabees 4-6, the writer too hastily inferring that they described the same event. — Kitto. "There is no sufficient ground for believing that the events recorded are different (Patritius, De Consensue Macc. § 27, 37), for the mistake of date in 2 Macc. is one which might easily arise (compare Wernsdorf, De fide Macc. § 66; Grimm, on 2Ma 11:1). The idea of Grotius that 2 Maccabees 11 and 2 Maccabees 13 are duplicate records of the same event, in spite of Ewald's support (Geschichte, 4:365, note), is scarcely tenable, and leaves half the difficulty unexplained."

2. CLAUDIUS LYSIAS, the chiliarch (χιλίαρχος, "chief captain") who commanded the Roman troops in Jerusalem during the latter part of the procuratorship of Felix, and by whom Paul was secured from the fury of the Jews, and sent under guard to the procurator Felix at Caesarea (Act 21:31-38; Act 22:24-30; Act 23:17-30; Act 24:7; Act 24:22). A.D. 55. Nothing more is known of him than what is stated in these passages. From his name, and from Act 22:28, it may be inferred that he was a Greek who had become a Roman citizen. His proper rank appears to have been that of military tribune, and his note to his superior officer is an interesting specimen of Roman military correspondence (comp. Wernsdorf. Cl. Lysiae Oratio. Helmst. 1743). SEE PAUL.

## Lysimachus[[@Headword:Lysimachus]]

             (Λυσίμαχος, a frequent Greek name), the name of two men mentioned in the Apocrypha.

1. "The son of Ptolemneus of Jerusalem," commonly supposed to be the translator into Greek of the Book of Esther (see the close of the Sept. version). The Apocryphal "rest of the Book of Esther," A.V., says, "In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemneus and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said he was a priest and Levite, and Ptolemus his son, brought this epistle of Phurim, which they said was the same, and that Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemeulls, that was at Jerusalem, had interpreted it" (11:1). There is, however, no reason to suppose that the translator was also the author of  the additions made to the Hebrew text. SEE ESTHER, APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO.

2. A brother of the Menelaus whom Antiochus appointed high-priest (B.C. cir. 171). Menelaus left him temporarily "in his stead in the priesthood," and encouraged him to commit many sacrileges. Thus he roused the indignation of the common people, who rose against him and killed him (2Ma 4:29; 2Ma 4:39). The Vulgate erroneously makes him the successor instead of the deputy of Menelaus.

## Lysius, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Lysius, Johann Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born June 29, 1704, at Konigsberg, Prussia. He studied at Halle, was in 1726 professor of Oriental languages at his native place, in 1730 doctor of theology, and died May 29, 1745. He wrote, Dissert. II de Historia et Usu Linguae Syriace: — De Silentio Sacrae Scripture: — De Commodo Christi Jugo ad Mat 11:30 : — De Christo Homine ἀναμαρτήτῳ ex 1Jn 3:5 : — De Angelo Nativitatis Christi Praecone. See Arnold, Historie der konigsbergischen Universitdt; Gotten, Jetztlebendes gelehrtes Europa; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Lysons, Daniel[[@Headword:Lysons, Daniel]]

             an English divine and writer, eldest son of the Reverend Samuel Lysons, rector of Rodmarton, in Gloucestershire (1804-33), was educated at Gloucester and at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, at which university he attained the degree of M.A. in 1785. Later he filled the curacy of Putney. He died January 3, 1834. He published a sermon or two, and a History of the Origin and Progress of the Meeting of the three Choirs of Gloucester, Worcester, and Hereford; but his fame rests entirely upon his topographical works, which are excellent for their laborious research, accuracy of description, and useful record of matters which most probably would otherwise have been irrecoverably lost. On this point consult the English Cyclopaedia, s.v., and Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, s.v.

## Lystra[[@Headword:Lystra]]

             (ἡ Λύστρα, Act 14:6; Act 14:21; Act 16:1; τἀ Λύστρα, Act 14:8; Act 16:2; 2Ti 3:11), a city in Asia Minor, of much interest in the history of Paul and Timothy.

We are told in the 14th chapter of the Acts that Paul and Barnabas, driven by persecution from Iconium (Act 14:2), proceeded to Lystra and its neighborhood, and there preached the Gospel. In the course of this service a remarkable miracle was worked in the healing of a lame man (Act 14:8). This occurrence produced such an effect on the minds of the ignorant and supersittious people of the place that they supposed that the two gods, Mercury and Jupiter, who were said by the poets to have formerly visited this district in human form, SEE LYCAONIA, had again bestowed on it the same favor, and consequently were proceeding to offer sacrifice to the strangers (Act 14:13). The apostles rejected this worship with horror (Act 14:14), and Paul addressed a speech to them, turning their minds to the true Source of all the blessings of nature. The distinct proclamation of Christian doctrine is not mentioned, but it is implied, inasmuch as a Church was founded at Lystra, which in post-apostolic times was so important as to send its bishops to the ecclesiastical councils (Hierocles, Synecd. page 675). The adoration of the Lystrians was rapidly followed by a change of feeling. The persecuting Jews arrived from Antioch in Pisidia and Iconium, and had such influence that Paul was stoned and left for dead (Act 14:19). On his recovery, he withdrew, with Barnabas, to Derbe (Act 14:20), but before long retraced his steps through Lystra (Act 14:21), encouraging the new disciples to be steadfast. It is not absolutely stated that Paul was ever in Lystra again, but, from the general description of the route of the third missionary journey (Act 18:23),it is almost certain that he was. SEE PAUL.

It is evident from 2Ti 3:10-11, that Timothy was one of those who witnessed Paul's sufferings and courage on the above occasion; and it can hardly be doubted that his conversion to Christianity resulted partly from these circumstances, combined with the teaching of his Jewish mother and grandmother, Eunice and Lois (2Ti 1:5). Thus, when the apostle, accompanied by Silas, came, on his second missionary journey, to this place again (and here we should notice how accurately Derbe and Lystra are here mentioned in the inverse order), Timothy was already a Christian (Act 16:1). Here he received circumcision, "because of the Jews in those parts" (Act 16:3); and from this point began his connection with Paul's travels. We are doubly reminded here of Jewish residents in and near Lystra. Their first settlement, and the ancestors of Timothy among them, may very probably be traced to the establishment of Babylonian Jews in Phrygia by Antiochus three centuries before (Josephus, Ant. 12:3, 4). Still it is evident that there was no influential Jewish population at Lystra: no mention is made of any synagogue, and the whole aspect of the scene described by Luke (Acts 14) is thoroughly heathen. As to its condition in heathen times, it is worth while to notice that the words in Act 14:13 (τοῦ Λιὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως) would lead us to conclude that it was under the tutelage of Jupiter. Walch, in his Spicilegium Antiquitatuem Lystrensium (Dissert. 1 in Acta Apostolorum, Jena, 1766, volume 3), thinks that in this passage a statue, not a temple, of the god is intended.

Pliny (5:42) places Lystra in Galatia, and Ptolemy (5:4, 12) in Isauria; but these statements are quite colnsistent with its being placed in Lycaonia by  Luke, as it is by Hierocles (Synecd. page 675). This city was south of Iconium, but its precise site is uncertain, as well as that of Derbe, which is mentioned along with it. Colossians Leake remarks that the sacred text appears to place it nearer to Derbe than to Iconium; for Paul, on leaving that city, proceeded first to Lystra, and thence to Derbe; and in like manner returned to Lystra, to Iconium, and to Antioch of Pisidia (see Walch, Diss. in Act. Apost. 3:173 sq.). He also observes that this seems to agree with the arrangement of Ptolemy (5:4, 12), who places Lystra in Isauria, and near Isaura, which seems evidently to have occupied some part of the valley of Sidy Shehr, or Bey Shehr. Under the Greek empire, Homonada, Isaura, and Lystra, as well as Derbe and Laranda, were all included in the consular province of Lycaonia, and were bishoprics of the metropolitan see of Iconium. Considering all the circumstances, Colossians Leake inclines to think that the vestiges of Lystra may be sought with the greatest probability of success at or near Wiranc Khatuiz, or Khatzun Serai, about thirty miles to the south of Iconium. "Nothing," says this able geographer, "can more strongly show the little progress that has hitherto been made in a knowledge of the ancient geography of Asia Minor than that of the cities which the journey of St. Paul has made so interesting to us, the site of one only (Iconium) is yet certainly knovwn" (Tour and Geogr. of Asia Minor, page 102). Mr. Arundell supposes that, should the ruins of Lystra not be found at the place indicated by Colossians Leake, they may possibly be found in the remains at Karahissar, near the lake Bey-shehr (Discoveries in Asia Minor.) Still more lately, Mr. Hamilton (Researches in Asia Minor, 2:319) identifies its site with the ruins called Bin-bir-Kilisseh (the "Thousand and one churches"), at the base of a conical mountain of volcanic structure named the Karadagh (generally thought to be those of Derbe, but which, according to his arguments, must be sought elsewhere, perhaps at Divle), as being more considerable (a bishop of Lystra sat in the Council of Chalcedon, according to Hierocles, Synecd. page 675), and on the direct road from Iconium to Derbe. Another traveler ascended the mountain, and says, "On looking down I perceived churches on all sides of the mountain, scattered about in various positions.... Including those in the plain, there are about two dozen in tolerable preservation, and the remains of perhaps forty may be traced altogether" (Falkner in Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 1:202). Comp. Mannert, Geogr. VI, 2:189 sq.; Forbiger, Handb. 2:322.

## Lytle, David[[@Headword:Lytle, David]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born, of Presbyterian parentage, at Salem, N.Y., October 31,1826, was converted in the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1847, joined the Church in 1848, was licensed to preach in 1854, and joined the Troy Conference. He successively preached at Granville, (1857) Argyle and North Greenwich, (1859) Whitehall, (1861) Mechanicsville, (1863) Third Street Church, Troy, (1865) Westport, (1867) North Chatham, and lastly at Rock City Falls, N.Y., where he died October 13, 1869. He "was possessed of a sound understanding, good judgment, and a kind and sympathizing nature. He was ardent and firm in his friendships, a kind husband and father, a faithful Christian, a good preacher, excelling as a pastor." During his second year at Argyle an epidemic broke out; but he continued at his post of duty, nursing the sick, and giving counsel and advice to the dying. See Conf. Minutes, 1870, page 140.

## Lyttleton, Charles[[@Headword:Lyttleton, Charles]]

             LL.D., an English divine, born at Hagley, Worcestershire, in 1714, was educated at Eton and at University College, Oxford; rector of Alvechurch, Worcester, in 1742; dean of Exeter in 1748; bishop of Carlisle in 1762, and president of the Society of Antiquaries in 1765. He died December 22, 1768. He published one sermon (Lond. 1765, 4to), and left various interesting scientific works. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, volume 2, s.v.

## Lyttleton, George, Sir[[@Headword:Lyttleton, George, Sir]]

             an English peer and celebrated politician, who was born in Worcestershire in 1708-9, and educated at Eton and Christchurch, Oxford; entered Parliament in 1730, held several high political offices, was raised to the peerage in 1759, and died in 1773, is noted also as the author of Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul (1747, 8vo, and often; last edit. 1854, 12mo), a work which elicited much praise for the able defense it furnishes for the truths of Christianity, or, as Leland (Deistical Writers, page 156 sq.) says, constitutes of itself "a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation." Another work of lord George Lyttleton of interest to us is his Dialogues of the Dead (1760). He had a son, Thomas, who died young, and who was as conspicuous for profligacy as his father for virtue. See Johnson, Lives of  the Poets, 3:391-400; Phillimore, Life of Lord Lyttleton, (1845); Lond. Quart. Rev. 1846 (June); Monthly Review, 1772 (April and May); 1774 (December); Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, 2:1150.