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ALSTON, G. CYPRIAN, O.S.B., Downside Abbey, Bath, England: Dissentis, Abbey of; Donnan, Saint; Drostan, Saint; Echternach, Abbey of; Einsiedeln, Abbey of; Eremurus, Abbey of; Saint; Engelberg, Abbey of; Estiennot de la Serre, Claude; Evesham Abbey.

ARENDZEN, J. P., Ph.D., S.T.D., M.A. (Cantab.), Professor of Holy Scripture, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Docteur; Dossiers; Druzes; Ebionites; Egyptian Church Ordinance; Encratites; Euchemisidas.


BANDELLIER, AD. F., Hispanic Society of America, New York: Ecuador, Republic of.

BARNES, ARTHUR STAPYLTON, M.A. (Oxon. and Cantab.), Cambridge, England: Discipline of the Secret; Dolphin; Dove; Elvira, Council of; Eulogia.


BENIGNI, U., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Pont. Collegio Urbano di Propaganda, Rome: Dominus Apostolus; Fabriano and Matelica, Diocese of; Faenza, Diocese of; Fano, Diocese of; Farnese, Alessandro.


BESSON, JULES, S.J., Professor of Canon Law, University of Toulouse, Director, "Nouvelle Revue Théologique" (Tournai), Toulouse, France: Dispensation.

BIHL, MICHAEL, O.F.M., Lector of Ecclesiastical History, Collegio San Bonaventura, Quaracchi, near Florence: Elizabeth of Hungary, Saint; Faber, Philip.

BOUDINHON, AUGUSTE-MARIE, D.D., D.C.L., Director, "Canonsite Contemporain", Professor of Canon Law, Institut Catholique, Paris: Discipline, Ecclesiastical; Domicile; Dower, Religious; Election; Excommunication; Faithful, The.


BRAUN, JOSEPH, S.J., Luxemburg: Embroidery, Ecclesiastical; Fanon.

BRÉHIER, LOUIS-REMY, Professor of Ancient and Medieval History, University of Clermont-Ferrand, Puy-de-Dôme, France: Doria, Andrea.

BROCK, HENRY M., S.J., Professor of Physics, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts: Dumont, Hubert-André; Elie de Beaumont, Jean-Baptiste; Epping, Joseph; Eusebius of Alexandria.

BURKE, EDMUND, A.B., Instructor in Latin, College of the City of New York: Faciolati, Jacopo.

BURTON, EDWIN, D.D., St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Dornan, Thomas; Drane, Augustus Theodosia; Durham, Ancient Catholic Diocese of; Easton, Adam; Egbert, King; Ellis, Phillip Michael; Ely, Ancient Diocese of; Englefield, Felix; Englengeld, Sir Henry Charles; Erdewicke, Sampson; Errington, William; Erskine, Charles; Ethelbert, Archbishop of York; Eustace, John Chetwode; Evangelical Alliance, The; Exeter, Ancient Diocese of; Eyre, Thomas; Eyster, Charles; Falkner, Thomas.

CAMM, BEDE, O.S.B., B.A. (Oxon.), Erdington Abbey, Birmingham, England: Drury, Robert, Venerable; Duckett, James, Venerable, and John, Venerable; Dymoke, Robert.

CAMPBELL, THOMAS J., S.J., St. Mary's College, Montreal: Dreichsel, Jeremia; Druillettes, Gabriel; Druzbieki, Gaspar.

CAPES, FLORENCE MARY, London: Elizabeth of Portugal, Saint.

CARR, EDWARD J., Fall River, Massachusetts: Fall River, Diocese of.


CATHRINE, VICTOR, S.J., Professor of Moral Philosophy, St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland: Duel; Ethies.


CHAPMAN, JOHN, O.S.B., B.A. (Oxon.), Prior of St. Thomas's Abbey, Erdington, Birmingham, England: Diodorus of Tarsus; Diodore, Epistle to; Dionysius, Saint, Bishop of Corinth; Dionysius of Alexandria; Dioecusius, Bishop of Alexandria; Doctors of the Church; Doctrine of Addai; Donatists; Eleusines; Epheusus, Council of; Epheusus, Robber Council of; Eusebius of Nicomedia; Eutyches; Eutychianism; Euvocius.

CLEARY, HENRY W., Editor, "New Zealand Tablet", Dunedin, New Zealand: Dunedin, Diocese of.
CONTRIBUTORS TO
THE FIFTH VOLUME

CLUGNET, JOSEPH-LÉON-TIBURCE, Litt.Lic.,
PARIS: Emanuella, Saint; Eucherius, Saint.

COGLIAN, DANIEL, D.D., PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH, DUBLIN: Dogma; Dogmatic Facts.

COLEMAN, AMBROSE, O.P., M.R.I., St. Saviour's Priory, Dublin: Dixon, Joseph; Dowdall, George.

COPPENS, CHARLES, S.J., PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, St. Louis University, Missouri: Direction, Spiritual; Examination of Conscience.

COPPIETERS, HONORÉ, S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND HOLY SCRIPTURE, COLLEGE DU PAPE, LOUVAIN: Evangelia (First Part).

CORBETT, JOHN, S.J., NEW YORK: Embroidery in Scripture.


CULLEN, JOHN BAPTIST, DUBLIN: Eimhin, Saint; Ethene, Saint; Eithe, Saint; Eustace, Saint; Eustace, Maurice.

D'ALTON, E. A., M.R.I.A., ATHENRY, IRELAND: Donlevy, Andrew; Down and Connor, Diocese of; Doyle, James Warren; Duffy, Sir Charles Gavan; Egan, Boeius.


DEBUCHY, PAUL, S.J., LITT.L., ENGHEN, BELGIUM: Discernment of Spirits.

DELMARRE, LOUIS N., PH.D., INSTRUCTOR IN FRENCH, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Dupin, Pierre-Charles-François; Estang, Jean-Baptiste, Comte d'.

DELANY, JOSEPH F., NEW YORK: Distraction; Error; Eutanasia.


DEVINE, ARTHUR, C.P., PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, ST. SAVIOUR'S RETREAT, BROADWAY, WORCESTERSHIRE, ENGLAND: Dominic of the Mother of God.

DOMANIG, KARL, PH.D., HONORARY IMPERIAL COUNCILLOR, CHIEF DIRECTOR OF THE IMPERIAL COLLECTION OF COINS, KLOSTERNEUBURG, AUSTRIA: Eckhel, Joseph Hilarion.

DONNELLY, NICHOLAS, TITULAR BISHOP OF CANEA, DUBLIN: Dublin, Archbishop of.

DONOHUE, JAMES, S.P.M., NEW YORK: Fathers of Mercy.

DONOVAN, STEPHEN M., O.F.M., FRANCISCAN MONASTERY, WASHINGTON: Discalced.

DRISCOLL, JAMES F., D.D., PRESIDENT OF ST. JOSEPH'S SEMINARY, DUNWOODIE, NEW YORK: Euthalium; Eve (In Scripture); Ezechias.


DUBRAY, C. A., S.T.B., PH. D., PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, MARIST COLLEGE, WASHINGTON: Duhamel, Jean-Baptiste; Duperton, Jacques-Davy; Dynamism; Emanationism; Encyclopedists; Epistemology; Espence, Claude d'; Faculties of the Soul.

DUFFY, DANIEL P., S.S., S.T.L., J.C.L., PROFESSOR OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, ST. MARY'S SEMINARY, BALTIMORE: Eleragr; Eloiseus; Erua.


DUNN, MGR. JAMES J., MEADVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA: Eiri, Diocese of.

DUNN, JOSEPH, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF CELTIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON: Druidism.

EDMONDS, COLUMBA, O.S.B., FORT AUGUSTUS, SCOTLAND: Edmund Rich, Saint; Ercenwald, Saint; Erna, Saints; Ewald, Saints.

ENGEHARDT, ZEPHYRIN, O.F.M., WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA: Dolores Mission; Dumetz, Francisco; Duran, Narcisco.

EWING, JOHN GILLESPIE, A.M., SAN JUAN, PORTO RICO: Ewing, Thomas.

FANNING, WILLIAM H. W., S.J., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY AND CANON LAW, ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, MISSOURI: Distributions.


FITZPATRICK, MALLICK J., NEW YORK: Drumgoole, John C.

FORTESQUE, ADRIAN, PH.D., D.D., LETCHWORTH, HERTS, ENGLAND: Doxology; Durandus, William; Durandus, William, the Younger; Durham Rite; Eastern Churches; Elias of Jerusalem; Eparchy; Epheus, The Seven Sleepers of; Euphrain of Antiocio; Epiklesis; Epiphanius of Constantinople; Etherianus, Hugh and Leo; Euchologion; Eudokia; Euphemius of Constantinople; Eusebius of Laodicea; Eustathius of Sebast ale; Eutychius I (Patriarch of Constantinople); Eutychius (Mechtih Patriarch of Alexandria); Ezech.


FUENTES, VENTURA, A.B., M.D., INSTRUCTOR, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Escina, Juan de la; Eneiso, Diego Ximenez de; Eneiso, Martin Fernandez de; Ercilla y Zúñiga, Alonso de; Espinel, Vicente; Espinosa, Alonso de.


GEUDENS, FRANCIS MARTIN, O.P.EM., ABBOT TITULAR OF BARLINGS, CORPUS CHRISTI PRIORY, MANCHESTER, ENGLAND: Druis, Jean.

GIETMANN, GERARD, S.J., TEACHER OF CLASSICAL LANGUAGES AND LÆSTETICS, ST. IGNATIUS COLLEGE, VALKENBURG, HOLLAND: Düster, Albrecht; Ecclesiastes, Book of; Erwin of Steinbach.
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GILOT, FRANCIS E., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF SACRED 
SCRIPTURE, ST. JOSEPH’S SEMINARY, DUNWOODIE, 
N.Y.: Ecclesiasticus, Book of.

GILLET, LOUIS, PARIS: Duccio di Buoninsegna; 
Eyck, Hubert and Jan van; Farinato, Paolo.

GODRZ, JOHN, S.T.D., PH.D., J.U.D., SHENAND 
DOAH, PENNSYLVANIA: Dlugosz, Jan.

GOYAU, GEORGES, ASSOCIATE EDITOR, “REVUE 
DES DEUX MONDES”, PARIS: Eveux, Diocese of; 
Falloux du Coudray, Vicomte de; Farfa, Abbey of.

GRAHAM, EDWARD P., A.M., SANDUSKY, OHIO: 
Divination; Emmerich, Anne Catherine; Esco- 
bar, Marina de, Venerable; Essenes.

GRATTAN-FLOOD, W. H., M.R.I.A., MUS.D., 
ROSEMOUNT, ENNISCORTHY, IRELAND: Disbod, 
Saint; Dowdall, James; Eoghan, Saints.

GUERECA, REGINALDO, DURANGO, MEXICO: 
Durango, Archdiocese of.

GUinan, JOSEPH, C.C., FERBANE, IRELAND: 
Edgeworth, Henry Essex.

Guiney, LOUISE IMOGEN, OXFORD, ENGLAND: 
Edmund Campion, Blessed.

GURDON, EDMUND, 0.CART., BARCELONA, SPAIN: 
Dissen, Heinrich von.

HANDLEY, M. L., NEW YORK: Donatello; Donner, 
Georg Raphael; Duquesnoy, Francois.

HARTIG, OTTO, ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN OF THE 
ROYAL LIBRARY, MUNICH: Europe.

HASSIETT, MAURICE M., S.T.D., HARRISBURG, 
PENNSYLVANIA: Encolpion; Eucharist, Early 
Symbols of the.

HAYES, MGR. PATRICK J., D.D., CHANCELLOR OF 
THE ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK, PRESIDENT, 
CATHERDAL COLLEGE, NEW YORK: Dubois, John.

HEALY, MOST REVEREND JOHN, D.D., LL.D., 
M.R.I.A., SENATOR OF THE ROYAL UNIVERSITY 
of IRELAND, ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM: Durtow, 
School of.

HEALY, PATRICK J., S.T.D., ASSISTANT PROFES- 
SOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY 
of AMERICA, WASHINGTON: Facundus of Her- 
miane.

HIND, GEORGE ELPHEGE, O.S.B., GLAMORGAN- 
SHIRE, WALES: Embald; Easterwine; Egbert, 
Archbishop of York; Ellwangen Abbey.

HOLLWECK, JOSEF, J.C.D., S.T.D., PROFESSOR 
of CANON LAW, SEMINARY, EICHSTATT, GERMANY: 
Eichstätt, Diocese of.

HOLLWECK, FREDERICK G., ST. LOUIS: Dispersion 
of the Apostles; Easter; Embolism; Espousals of the Blessed Virgin Mary; Eve of a 
Feast; Expectation of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

HORGAN, S. H., MORMINTOWN, NEW JERSEY: 
Egloffstein, Frederick W. von.

HOWARD, FRANCIS W., COLUMBUS, OHIO: Educa- 
tional Association, The Catholic.

HUDLESTON, GILBERT ROGER, O.S.B., DOWN- 
SIDE ABBEY, BATH, ENGLAND: Downside Abbey.

HUNT, LEIGH, PROFESSOR OF ART, COLLEGE OF 
THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Dolci, Carlo; Donemi- 
chino; Drevet Family, The; Edelmeck.

HUNTER-BLAIR, D. O., BART., O.S.B., M.A., OX- 
FORD, ENGLAND: Dorchester, Abbey of; Doug- 
las, Gavin; Dryburgh Abbey; Dunbar, William; 
Dundrennan, Abbey of; Dunfermline, Abbey of; 
Dunkeld, Diocese of; Edinburgh.

HYVERNAT, HENRY, D.D., CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY 
of AMERICA, WASHINGTON: Egypt; Elishé; Eznik.

JOYVE, ODORIC-M., O.F.M., CANDIAC, CANADA: 
Dolbeau, Jean.

KELLY, JAMES J., D.D., V.G., ATHLONE, IRELAND: 
Elphin, Diocese of.

KELLY, LEO A., PH.B., ROCHESTER, NEW YORK: 
Exuperius, Saint.

KENDAL, JAMES, S.J., BALAYAWO, RHODESIA, 
SOUTH AFRICA: Fate.

KENNEDY, THOMAS, B.A. (R.U.I.), LONDON: 
Epaet.

KETTENBURG, PHILIPP BARON, CHAPLAIN AT 
ST. ANGAR’S CHURCH, COPENHAGEN, DENMARK: 
Ekil.

KIRSCH, MGR. J. P., PROFESSOR OF PATHOLOGY 
AND CHRISTIAN ARCHEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF FRI- 
BOURG, SWITZERLAND: Dionysius, Saint, Pope; 
Donation of Constantine; Dympna, Saint; 
Ebenforer, Thomas; Eck (Eckius), Johann; Eg- 
bert, Archbishop of Trier; Ekkehard (monks); 
Eleutherius, Saint, Pope; Emerentiana, Saint; 
Euphrasia, Saint; Euphrosyne, Saint; Eusebius, 
Saint; Pope; Eutychianus, Pope; Evaristus, 
Saint, Pope; Eymeric, Nicolas; Fabiola, Saint; 
Farlati, Daniele.

KURTH, GODEFROID, DIRECTOR, BELGIAN HIST- 
ORICAL INSTITUTE, ROME: Egmont, Lamoral, 
Count of.

LABOURT, JÉRÔME, S.T.D., LL.T.D., MEMBER 
of the ASIATIC SOCIETY OF PARIS, PARIS: 
Ephraem, Saint.

LADEUZE, P., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF SACRED 
SCRIPTURE and of ANCIENT CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, 
UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN: PRESIDENT, COLLEGE DU 
SAINT ESPRIT, LOUVAIN: Ephesians, Epistle 
to the.

LALANDE, LOUIS, S.J., MONTREAL: Faber, Mat- 
thias.

† LE BARS, JEAN, B.A., LL.T.D., MEMBER of the 
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF PARIS: Epée, Charles-Michel de l’

LEBRUN, CHARLES, C.J.M., S.T.D., SUPERIOR, 
HOLY HEART SEMINARY, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA: 
Eudes, Jean, Venerable; Eustas.

LEHMKUHL, AUGUSTINUS, S.J., ST. IGNATIUS 
COLLEGE, VALENKUNGB, HOLLAND: Divorce (in 
Moral Theology).

† Deceased.
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LEJAY, PAUL, FELLOWS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FRANCE; PROFESSOR, INSTITUT CATHOLIQUE, PARIS; DRACONTIUS, BROSSEIUS, EMILUS; DUC, FRON- TON DU; DU CANGE, CHARLES DUFRESNE; DUPIN, LOUIS-ELIES; EMMODIUS, MAGNUS FELIX; EPIPHANIUS (SCHOLASTICUS); EVAGRIUS (SCHOLASTICUS).

LETELIER, A., S.S.N., SUPERIOR, FATHERS OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, NEW YORK: EYMARD, PIERRE- JULIEN, VENERABLE.

LILLY, WILLIAM SAMUEL, LL.M., HONORARY FELLOW OF PETERHOUSE, CAMBRIDGE, LONDON: England since the Reformation.

LIMBROCK, EBERHARD, S.V.D., PREFECT APOSTOLIC OF GERMAN NEW GUINEA: DIVINE WORD, SOCIETY OF THE.

LINDSAY, LIONEL ST. GEORGE, B.SC., PH.D., EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, "LA NOUVELLE FRANCE", QUEBEC: DOQUET, PIERRE-HERMAN; DUVERMAY, LUDGER; EGGIS, LOUIS-PHILIPPE MARCHEUX, D.; FALLOUX, EUGÈNE-MICHEL; FARINAUT, GEORGE-BARTHÉLEMY.

LIXSHE, LUCAS, R.H., INSTRUCTOR, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: FRANCOIS, FRANÇOIS.

LINS, JOSEPH, FREIBURG, GERMANY: DRESDEN.

LOUGHLIN, MGR. JAMES F., S.T.D., PHILADELPHIA: DISCIPLES OF CHRIST; DISCUSSIONS, RELIGIOUS; DRESEL, FRANCIS ANTHONY; EGAN, MICHAEL; EUGENE III, BLESSED, POPE; EUGENE IV, POPE; FAITH, PROTESTANT CONFESSIONS OF.

LOWTH, CATHERINE MARY, R.N.H., MISTRESS OF STUDIES, CONVENT OF THE SACRED HEART, MANHATTANVILLE, NEW YORK: DUCHESNE, PHILIPINE-ROSE.

LUCAS, HERBERT, S.J., STONYBROOK UNIVERSITY, BLACKBURNE, ENGLAND: ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE.

LUZIO, SALVATORE, D.D., PH.D., J.U.D., PROFESSOR OF CANON LAW, ST. PATRICK’S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH, DUBLIN: EXQUATUR.

MAAS, A.J., S.J., RECTO, WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MARYLAND: EDITIONS OF THE BIBLE; ELECT; ELICHIM; EMMANUEL; ENGADDI; EPHOD; EPITHESES (IN SCRIP TURE); ESCH, NICOLAUS VAN; EVAGRIUS (PONTICUS); EXEGESIS; FABRI, HONORÉ.

MCCARTHY, WALTER, D.D., PREFECT OF THE DUNBOYNE ESTATBISHMENT, MAYNOOTH COLLEGE, DUBLIN: ETERNITY.

MCMAHON, ARTHUR L. O.P., ST. DOMINIC’S PRIORY, SAN FRANCISCO: ECKHART, JOHANN, MEISTER; ESTHER; FABER, FELIX; FABER, JOHANN AUGUSTINUS.

MCNEAL, J. PRESTON, A.B., LL.B., BALTIMORE: Ezechiel, Samuel.

MCNEAL, MARK J., S.J., WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MARYLAND: EUGENIUS I AND II, ARCHBISHOPS OF TOLEDO; EUGENIUS OF CARThAGE, SAINT; EULOGIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, SAINT.

MWHICHERSON, EWAN, NEW YORK: DOMINICAN REPUBLIC; EATA, SAINT; EGWIN, SAINT; ETHELBERT, SAINT; ETHELBREDA, SAINT.

MAERLE, R.D.D., PROFESSOR OF CHRISTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN: DIPYCH; EVANGHELIA, ORNAMENTATION OF.

MAGNIER, JOHN, C.S.S.R., ROME: Donders, Peter.


MAXX, HORACE K., HEADMASTER, ST. CUTHBERT’S GRAMMAR SCHOOL, NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, ENGLAND: EUGENE I, SAINT, POPE; EUGENE II, POPE.

MARTINDALE, CYRIL C., S.J., B.A. (OXON.), PROFESSOR OF CLASSICS, MANRESA HOUSE, ROCHESTON, LONDON: EPHEPHY.

MAY CAMILLUS, SISTER, DIRECTOR OF STUDIES, ACADEMY OF NOTRE DAME OF PROVIDENCE, NEWPORT, KENTUCKY: DIVINE PROVIDENCE, SISTERS OF.

MARY PHILOMENA, SISTER, ST. JOSEPH’S CONVENT OF THE FAITHFUL COMPANIONS OF JESUS, ETTCHUBURG, MASSACHUSETTS: FAITHFUL COMPANIONS OF JESUS, SOCIETY OF THE.

MARY THERESE, MOTHER, PROVINCIAL SUPERIOR, SISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE, MT. IMMACULATE CONVENT, PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA: DIVINE PROVIDENCE, SISTERS OF.

MEEHAN, ANDREW B., PH.D., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF CANON LAW AND LITURGY, ST. BERNARD’S SEMINARY, ROCHESTER, NEW YORK: ENDOWMENT; EXAMINERS, APOSTOLIC; EXAMINERS, SYNDICAL; EXECUTOR, APOSTOLIC; EXHIBITORS, APOSTOLIC; FACULTIES, CANONICAL.

MEEHAN, THOMAS F., NEW YORK: DIRECTORIES, CATHOLIC (UNITED STATES); DONAHUE, PATRICK; DORNIN, BERNARD AND THOMAS ALOYSIUS; DUCOUDRAY, PHILIPPE-CHARLES; DULUTH, DIOCESE OF; ENVIRONMENT AID SOCIETIES; EUCHARISTIC CONGRESSES; FARO, DIOCESE OF.

MEIER, GABRIEL, O.S.B., ENSIBELDEN, SWITZERLAND: DOROTHEA, SAINT; ENGELBERT OF COLOGNE, SAINT; EUGENIUS OF Ratisbon, SAINT; EUGENIUS, SAINT; EUGENIUS, SAINT; EUGENIUS, SAINT; FABIAN, SAINT, POPE.

MERSHMAN, FRANCIS, O.S.B., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY, CANON LAW, AND LITURGY, ST. JOHN’S UNIVERSITY, COLLEGEVILLE, MINNESOTA: DORING, MATTHIAS; ELIZABETH OF REUTE, BLESSED; ELIZABETH OF Schönau, SAINT; EMBER DAYS; EUSEBIUS, SAINT (PRESBYTER AT ROME); EUSTACHIUS AND COMPANIONS, SAINTS; FALSTOOL.

MINGES, PARTHENIUS, O.F.M., ST.L., P.H.D., PREFECT, COLLEGIUM SAN BONAVENTURA, QUARAQCHE, NEAR FLORENCE, ITALY: DUNS SCOTUS, JOHN.

MOELLER, FERDINAND A., S.J., CHICAGO: EDUCATION OF THE DEAD AND DUMB.

MOONEY, JAMES, UNITED STATES ETHNOLOGIST, WASHINGTON: DOMENECH, EMANUEL-HENRI-DIEUDONNE; DUPONCEAU, PETER STEPHEN; ESKIMO; ESPEJO, ANTONIO.

MORICE, A.G., O.M.I., ST. BONIFACE, MANITObA: FABRE, JOSEPH; FARAUD, HENRI.
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SAUER, JOSEPH, S.T.D., Editor, "Rundschau", Professor of Theology, University of Freiberg, Germany: Encyclopaedia; Ensignen; Erasmus, Doctrinarius.


SCHAEFER, FRANCIS J., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of Church History, The St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota: Dobrmayer, Marian; Dunin, Martin von; Eckeberd; Eusebius Bruno; Eustathius (Archbishop of Thessalonica); Fari-bault, Jean-Baptiste.

SCHIEBD, N., S.J., Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria: Drach, David-Paul; Dreves, Lebrecht Blücher; Eichendorff, Freiherr von.

SCHETS, JOSEPH, Etten near Breda, Holland: Ezechiel.

SCHLAGER, HEINRICH PATRICKUS, O.F.M., Harreveld near Lichtenvoorde, Holland: Dudik, Breda Francisco; Eberhard, Matthias; Eberhard of Ratibion; Etcher von Mespelbrunn; Julius; Eckhart, Johann Georg von; Einhard; Eikkehard of Aura.

SCHROEDER, JOSEPH, O.P., Immaculate Conception College, Washington: Erbemar, Veit; Ernst of Hesse-Rheinfeld; Faber, Johann (of Hellbronn).

SCHUMACHER, MATTHEW, C.S.C., Ph.D., S.T.B., Director of Studies, University of Notre Dame, Indiana: Faber, Johann (of Lettkirch).

SCHWERTNER, THOMAS M., O.P., Immaculate Conception College, Washington: Dominici, Giovanni, Blessed; Doré, Pierre; Durandus, Saint-Pourqain; Ebner; Echard, Jacques; Emser, Hieronymus.


SIEGFRIED, FRANCIS PATRICK, Professor of Philosophy, St. Charles's Seminary, Overbrook, Pennsylvania: Empiricism; Extension.

SLOANE, CHARLES WILLIAM, New York: Donation (in Civil Jurisprudence); Dower.

SLOANE, THOMAS O'CONNOR, A.M., E.M., Ph.D., New York: Dumas, Jean-Baptiste; Elhuyar y de Suvias, Fausto de.


SOLLIER, JOSEPH FRANCIS, S.M., S.T.D., San Francisco: Donnet, Ferdinand-François-Auguste; Dubois, Guillaume; Duxplou, Félix-Antoine; Duprat, Antoine; Durandus of Tram; Duverger de Haaranne, Jean.

SOVAY, CHARLES L., C.M., LL.B., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of Holy Scripture and Hebrew, Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis: Disciple; Dreams, Interpretation of; Elias; Elizabeth; Eudras; Evangelist.

SILLANE, EDWARD P., S.J., Associate Editor, "America", New York: Dobrizhofer, Martin; Doutrelleau, Stephen; Dubois, Jean-Antoine; Duver, Francis Bennon; Eckart, Anselm.


STIGLMAYR, JOSEPH, S.J., Professor of Latin, Greek, and German, Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria: Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite.


STUART, J. C., St. Joseph's College, Dubuque, Iowa: Dubuque, Archdiocese of.

TAAFFE, THOMAS GAFENEY, Ph.D., Instructor in English Literature, College of the City of New York: Dolman, Charles.

THURSTON, HERBERT, S.J., London: Diplomatic, L'ap; Directories, Catholic (First Part); Domesday Book; Dominical Letter; Easter Controversy; Elevation, The; Encyclical; England Before the Reformation; Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

TOKE, LESLIE ALEXANDER ST. LAWRENCE, B.A., Stratton-on-the-Fosse, near Bath, England: Dubric, Saint; Dunedach, Saint; Dunstan, Saint.

TONER, PATRICK J., D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Dublin: Exegetology; Exorcism; Exorcist; Extreme Unction.

TURNER, WILLIAM, B.A., S.T.D., Professor of Logic and of the History of Philosophy, Catholic University of America, Washington: Donatus of Fiesole; Dungal; Erfugena, John Secc; Exul Hibernicus.
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The following tables and notes are intended to guide readers of The Catholic Encyclopedia in interpreting those abbreviations, signs, or technical phrases which, for economy of space, will be most frequently used in the work. For more general information see the article Abbreviations, Ecclesiastical.

I.—General Abbreviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad an.</td>
<td>at the year (Lat. ad annum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an., ann.</td>
<td>the year, the years (Lat. annum, anni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ap.</td>
<td>in (Lat. apud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art.</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assy.</td>
<td>Assyrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. V.</td>
<td>Authorized Version (i.e. tr. of the Bible authorized for use in the Anglican Church—the so-called “King James”, or “Protestant” Bible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk.</td>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bl.</td>
<td>Blessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, c.</td>
<td>about (Lat. circa); canon; chapter; compagnie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can.</td>
<td>canon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cap.</td>
<td>chapter (Lat. caput — used only in Latin context)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>compare (Lat. confer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod.</td>
<td>codex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col.</td>
<td>column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concl.</td>
<td>conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>const., constit.</td>
<td>.Lat. constitutio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curá</td>
<td>by the industry of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dcb.</td>
<td>dictionary (Fr. dictionnaire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disp.</td>
<td>Lat. disputatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diss.</td>
<td>Lat. aissertatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dist.</td>
<td>Lat. distinctio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. V.</td>
<td>Douay Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed., edit.</td>
<td>edited, edition, editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep., Epp.</td>
<td>letter, letters (Lat. epistola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>genus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. E., Hist. Eccl.</td>
<td>Ecclesiastical History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb., Hebr.</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ib., ibid.</td>
<td>in the same place (Lat. ibidem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Id.</td>
<td>the same person, or author (Lat. idem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.</td>
<td>below (Lat. infra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. c., loc. cit.</td>
<td>at the place quoted (Lat. loco citato)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat.</td>
<td>latitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lib.</td>
<td>book (Lat. liber)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long.</td>
<td>longitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon.</td>
<td>Lat. Monumenta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS., MSS.</td>
<td>manuscript, manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n., no.</td>
<td>number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. T.</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat.</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Fr., O. Fr.</td>
<td>Old French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op. cit.</td>
<td>in the work quoted (Lat. operc citato)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ord.</td>
<td>Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. T.</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p., pp.</td>
<td>page, pages, or (in Latin references) pars (part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>par.</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passim</td>
<td>in various places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt.</td>
<td>part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Quarterly (a periodical), e.g. “Church Quarterly”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q., QQ., quest.</td>
<td>question, questions (Lat. questio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. v.</td>
<td>which [title] see (Lat. quod vide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>Review (a periodical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. S.</td>
<td>Rolls Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. V.</td>
<td>Revised Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S., SS.</td>
<td>Lat. Sanctus, Sancti, “Saint”, “Saints”—used in this Encyclopedia only in Latin context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sess.</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skt.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sq., sqq.</td>
<td>following page, or pages (Lat. sequens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St., Sts.</td>
<td>Saint, Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup.</td>
<td>above (Lat. supra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. v.</td>
<td>under the corresponding title (Lat. sub voce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tom.</td>
<td>volume (Lat. tomus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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tr. translation or translated. By itself it means "English translation", or "translated into English by". Where a translation is into any other language, the language is stated.

tr., tract. tractate.
v. see (Lat. vide).
Ven. Venerable.

II.—ABBREVIATIONS OF TITLES.

Acta SS. Acta Sanctorum (Bollandists).
Ann. pont. cath. ... Battandier, Annuaire pontifical catholique.
Hast., Dict. of the Bible .... Hastings (ed.), A Dictionary of the Bible.
Kirchenlex. .... Wetzer and Welte, Kirchenlexicon.
P. C. .... Migne (ed.), Patres Graeci.
Vig., Dict. de la Bible. Vigouroux (ed.), Dictionnaire de la Bible.

Note I.—Large Roman numerals standing alone indicate volumes. Small Roman numerals standing alone indicate chapters. Arabic numerals standing alone indicate pages. In other cases the divisions are explicitly stated. Thus "Rashdall, Universities of Europe, I, ix" refers the reader to the ninth chapter of the first volume of that work; "I, p. ix" would indicate the ninth page of the preface of the same volume.

Note II.—Where St. Thomas (Aquinas) is cited without the name of any particular work the reference is always to "Summa Theologica" (not to "Summa Philosophiae"). The divisions of the "Summa Theol." are indicated by a system which may best be understood by the following example: "I-II, Q. vi, a. 7, ad 2um" refers the reader to the seventh article of the sixth question in the first part of the second part, in the response to the second objection.

Note III.—The abbreviations employed for the various books of the Bible are obvious. Ecclesiastes is indicated by Eccl., to distinguish it from Ecclesiastes (Eccles.). It should also be noted that I and II Kings in D. V. correspond to I and II Samuel in A. V.; and I and II Par. to I and II Chronicles. Where, in the spelling of a proper name, there is a marked difference between the D. V. and the A. V., the form found in the latter is added, in parentheses.
Full Page Illustrations in Volume V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Diptychs</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Madonna and Four Doctors of the Church—Moretto</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Communion of St. Jerome—Domenichino</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dominic—Titian</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George—Donatello</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Court Church, Dresden</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryburgh Abbey</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendalough, County Wicklow, Ireland</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Cathedral</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I in Armour—Van Dyck</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complutensian Polyglot</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natives Drawing Water on the Nile</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tables of Abydos</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Elizabeth of Hungary</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely Cathedral</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albans Abbey</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adoration of the Magi—Ghirlandajo</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus—Holbein</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Escorial</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter Cathedral</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Façades</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coloured Plates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Apostles—Albrecht Dürer</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page from Gutenberg's 42-Line (Mazarin) Bible (1455)</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Espousals of the Blessed Virgin—Raphael</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sees of the Oriental Rites</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Egypt</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastical Map of North Africa</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales—The Ecclesiastical Province of Westminster</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England from the 12th Century to the Schism of Henry VIII</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christendom A.D. 622</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Diocese (Lat. diœcesis), the territory or churches subject to the jurisdiction of a bishop (q.v.).

I. Origin of Term.—Originally the term diocese (Gr. διοικεσία) signified management of a household, thence administration or government in general. This term was soon used in Roman law to designate the territory dependent for its administration upon a city (civitas). What in Latin was called ager, or territorium, namely a district subject to a city, was commonly known in the Roman East as a diœcesis. But as the Christian bishop generally resided in a civitas, the territory administered by him, being usually conterminous with the juridical territory of the city, came to be known ecclesiastically by its usual civil term, diocese.

This name was also given to the administrative subdivision of some provinces ruled by legates (legati) under the authority of the governor of the province. Finally, Diocletian designated by this name the twelve great divisions which he established in the empire, and over each of which he placed a vicarius (Paulus-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart, 1903, V, 1, 716 sqq.). The original term for local groups of the faithful subject to a bishop was ἱστορία (church), and at a later date, παροικία, i.e. the neighbourhood (Lat. paroquia, parochia). The Apostolic Canons (xiv, xvi), and the Council of Nicaea in 325 (can. xvi) applied this latter term to the territory subject to a bishop. This term was retained in the East, where the Council of Constantinople (381) reserved the word diœcesis for the territory subject to a patriarch (can. ii). In the West also parochia was long used to designate an episcopal see. About 530 Leo IV, and about 1095 Urban II, still employed parochia to denote the territory subject to the jurisdiction of a bishop. Alexander III (1159–1181) designated under the name of parochiani the subjects of a bishop (c. 4, C. X. qu. 1; c. 10, C. IX, qu. 2; c. 9, X, De testibus, II. 29). On the other hand, the present meaning of the word diocese is met with in Africa at the end of the fourth century (c.e. 350, 51, C. X. vi, qu. 1), and afterwards in Spain, where the term parochiæ, occurring in the ninth canon of the Council of Antioch, held in 341, was translated by “diocese” (c. 2, C. IX, qu. 3). See also the ninth canon of the Synod of Toledo, in SS9 (Hefele, ad h. an. c. 6, C. X, qu. 3). This usage finally became general in the West, though diocese was sometimes used to indicate parishes in the present sense of the word (see Parish). In Gaul, the words terminus, territorium, civitas, pagus, are also met with.

II. Historical Origin.—It is impossible to determine what rules were followed at the origin of the Church in limiting the territory over which each bishop exercised his authority. Universality of ecclesiastical jurisdiction was a personal prerogative of the Apostles; their successors, the bishops, enjoyed only a jurisdiction limited to a certain territory: thus Ignatius was Bishop of Antioch, and Polycarp, of Smyrna. The first Christian communities, quite like the Jewish, were established in towns. The converts who lived in the neighbourhood naturally joined with the community of the town for the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries. Exact limitations of episcopal territory could not have engaged much attention at the beginning of Christianity; it would have been quite impracticable. As a matter of fact, the extent of the diocese was determined by the domain itself over which the bishop exercised his influence. It seems certain, on the other hand, that, in the East at any rate, by the middle of the third century each Christian community of any importance had become the residence of a bishop and constituted a diocese. There were bishops in the country districts as well as in the towns. The chiroepiscopi (τυχοεπισκόποι), or rural bishops, were bishops, it is generally thought, as well as those of the towns; though from about the second half of the third century their powers were little by little curtailed, and they were made dependent on the bishops of the towns. To this rule Egypt was an exception; Alexandria was for a long time the only see in Egypt. The number of Egyptian dioceses, however, multiplied rapidly during the third century, so that in 320 there were about a hundred bishops present at the Council of Alexandria. The number of dioceses was also quite large in some parts of the Western Church, i.e. in Southern Italy and in Africa. In other regions of Europe, either Christianity had as yet a small number of adherents, or the bishops reserved to themselves supreme authority over extensive districts. Thus, in this early period but few dioceses existed in Northern Italy, Gaul, Germany, Britain, and Spain. In the last, however, their number increased rapidly during the third century. The increase of the faithful in small towns and country districts soon made it necessary to determine exactly the limits of the territory of each church. The cities of the empire, with their clearly defined suburban districts, offered limits that were easily acceptable. From the fourth century on it was generally admitted that every city ought to have its bishop, and that his territory was bounded by that of the neighbouring city. This rule was stringently applied in the East. Although Innocent I declared in 415 that the Church was not bound to conform itself to all the civil divisions which the imperial government chose to introduce, the Council of Chalcedon ordered (451) that if a civitas were dismembered by imperial authority, the ecclesiastical organization ought also to be modified (can. xvii). In the West, the Council of Sardica (344) forbade in the sixth century the establishment of dioceses in towns not populous enough to render desirable their elevation to the dignity of episcopal residences. At the same time many Western sees included the territories of several civitates.

From the fourth century we have documentary evidence of the manner in which the dioceses were created. According to the Council of Sardica (can. vi),...
this belonged to the provincial synod; the Council of Carthage, in 407, demanded moreover the consent of the primate and of the bishop of the diocese to be divided (canons iv and v). The consent of the pope or the emperor was not called for. In 446, however, Pope Leo I ruled that dioceses should not be established except in large towns and populous centres (c. 4, Dist. Ixxii). In the same period the Apostolic See was active in the creation of dioceses in the Burgundian kingdom and in Italy. In the latter country many of the sees had no other metropolitan than the pope, and were therefore closely related to him. Even already is his role in the formation of the diocesan system in the northern countries newly converted to Christianity. After the first successes of St. Augustine in England, Gregory the Great provided for the establishment of two metropolitan sees, each of which included two dioceses. In Ireland, the diocesan system was introduced by St. Patrick, though the diocesan territory was usually coextensive with the tribal lands, and the system itself was soon peculiarly modified by the general extension of monachism (see IRELAND). In Scotland, however, the diocesan organization dates only from the twelfth century. The establishment of such dioceses was also due to the establishment of dioceses in that part of Germany which had been evangelized by St. Boniface. In the Frankish Empire the boundaries of the dioceses followed the older Gallo-Roman municipal system, though the Merovingian kings never hesitated to confirm the rights of provincial bishops. Thus, the creation of new dioceses was a matter of diocesan authority. The Gallo-Roman kings and their successors, the Western emperors, notably the Ottonian (936-1002), sought papal authority for the creation of new dioceses. Since the eleventh century it has been the rule that the Pope should ordinarily be consulted before a diocese be established as a matter of the Apostolic See. St. Peter Damian proclaimed (1059-60) this as a general principle (c. 1, Dist. xxii), and the same is affirmed in the well-known "Decretum" of Gregory VII (1073-1085). The papal decretals (see DIOCESAL CUSTOMS, PAPAL) consider the creation of a new diocese as one of the "causa majors," i.e., matters of special importance, reserved to the pope alone (c. X, De translatiis episcopi, I. 7; c. 1, X, De officio legis, I. 30) and of which he is the sole judge (c. 5, Extrav. communes, De significatione causa, 2). Ordinarily of a diocese is due here to the missionary or regional bishops, episcopi gentium, episcopi terreni episcopi in gentibus, still found in the eleventh century. They had no fixed territory or diocese, but were sent into a country or district for the purpose of evangelizing it. Each was a bishop in Germany, St. Augustine in England, and St. Wilibrord in the Netherlands. They were themselves the organizers of the diocese, after their apostolic labours had produced happy results. The bishops met with in some monasteries of Gaul in the earlier Middle Ages, probably in imitation of Irish conditions, had no administrative functions (see BELLUSHEIM, Gesch. d. kath. Kirche in Irland, I, 295-30, and LÖNING, below).

III. CREATION AND MODIFICATION OF DIOCESES.—We have noticed above that after the eleventh century the supreme pontiff reserved to himself the creation of dioceses. In the actual procedure, as already stated, all that touches the diocese is a causa major, i.e., one of those important matters in which the bishop possesses no authority whatever and which the pope reserves exclusively to himself. Since the episcopate is of Divine institution, the pope is obliged to consult in the Church, the Church, but the pope remains sole judge of the time and manner, and alone determines what flock shall be entrusted to each bishop. Generally speaking, the diocese is a territorial investment, but the bishop possesses authority only over certain classes of persons residing in the territory; this is principally the case in districts where both the Western and the Eastern Rite are followed. Whatever, therefore, pertains to the creation or suppression of dioceses, changes in their boundaries, and the like is within the pope's exclusive province. As a general rule, the task of consultation is done by the Congregation of the Consistory, by Propaganda when the question relates to territories subject to this congregation, and by the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs when the establishment of a diocese is governed by concordats (q. v.), or when the civil powers of the country have the right to intervene in the creation. We shall take up successively (1) the creation of new dioceses; (2) the various modifications to which they are subject, included by canonsists under the term Inmunatio. (1) Creation of Dioceses.—Strictly speaking, it is only in missionary countries that there can be question of the creation of a diocese, either because the country was never converted to Christianity or because its ancient hierarchy was suppressed, owing to conquest by infidels or the progress of heresy. Regularly, before becoming a diocese, the territory is successively a mission, a prefecture Apostolic, and finally a vicariate Apostolic. The Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith makes a preliminary study of the question and passes judgment on the opportuneness of the creation of the diocese in question. It considers principally whether the number of Catholics, priests, and religious establishments, i.e. churches, chapels, schools, is sufficiently extensive to justify the creation of the diocese. These matters form the subject of a report to Propaganda, to which must be added the number of towns or settlements included in the territory. If there is a city suitable for the episcopal see, the fact is stated, also the financial resources at the disposal of the see. There is added, finally, a sketch, if possible accompanied by a map, indicating the territory of the future diocese. As a general rule, a diocese should not include districts whose inhabitants speak different languages or are subject to disintegration powers (see Instructions of Propaganda, 1786, in Collectanea S. C. de P. F., Rome, 1907, no. 643). Moreover, the general conditions for the creation of a diocese are the same as those required for dividing or "dismembering" a diocese. Of this we shall speak below.

(2) Modification (Inmunatio) of Dioceses.—Under this head come the division (dismemberatio) of dioceses, their union, suppression, and changes of their respective limits.

(a) Division or Dismemberment of a Diocese.—This is reserved to the Holy See. Since the pope is the supreme power in the Church, he is not bound to act in conformity with the canonical enactments which regulate the dismemberment of ecclesiastical benefices. The following rules, however, are those which the observer has observed, though he is free to deviate from them. First, to divide a diocese, a sufficient reason must exist (causa probis). The necessity, or at least the utility, of the division must be demonstrated. There is sufficient reason for the subdivision of a diocese if it be too extensive, or the number of the faithful too great, or the means of communication too difficult, to permit the bishop to administer the diocese properly. The benefit which would result to religion (incrementum cultus divini) may also be brought forward as a reason for the change. In the main, these reasons are summed up in the one: the hope of forwarding the interests of Catholicism. Dissections between inhabitants of the same diocese, or a fact that they belong to different nations, may also be considered a sufficient reason. Furthermore, the mere fact that the endowment of a diocese was very large—a case somewhat rare at the present day—formed a legitimate reason for its division.

The second condition is suitability of place (locus congruus). There should exist in the diocese to be cre-
ated a city or town suitable for the episcopal residence; the ancient discipline which rules that sees should be established only in important localities is still observed.

Third, a proper endowment (dona congruo) is requisite; the bishop should have at his disposal the resources necessary for his own maintenance and that of the ecclesiastics engaged in the general administration of the diocese, and for the establishment of a cathedral church, the expenses of Divine worship, and the general administration of the diocese. Formerly it was necessary that in part, at least, such an endowment should consist in lands; at present this is not always possible. It suffices if there is a prospect that the new bishop will be able to meet the necessary expenses. In some cases, the civil government grants a subsidy to the bishop; in other cases, he must depend on the liberality of the faithful and on a contribution from the parishes of the diocese, known as the 'cathedraeum.'

Fourth, generally for the division of a diocese the consent of the actual incumbent of the benefice is requisite; but the pope is not bound to observe this condition. John XXII ruled that the pope had the right to appoint the new bishop to the diocese, even against the opposition of the bishop (c. 5, Extrav. commun., De prebendis, III, 2). As a matter of fact, the pope asks the advice of the archbishop and of all the bishops of the ecclesiastical province in which the diocese to be divided is situated. Often, indeed, the division takes place on the request of the bishop himself.

Fifth, theoretically the consent of the civil power is not required; this would be contrary to the principles of the distinction and mutual independence of the ecclesiastical and civil authority. In many countries, however, the consent of the civil authority is indispensable, because the Government has pledged itself to endow the occupants of the episcopal see, or because concordats have regulated this matter, or because a suspicious government would not permit a bishop to administer the new diocese if it were created without civil intervention (see Rits, Conventiones de rebus ecclesiasticis, Rome, 1869, pp. 19 seq.). At present, the creation or division of a diocese is done by a pontifical Brief, forwarded by the Secretary of Briefs. As an example, we may mention the Brief of 11 March, 1904, which divided the Diocese of Providence and established the new Diocese of Fall River. The motive proffered for the division was the diocese remained religiously divided, and the major bonus animorum; the Bishop of Providence himself requested the division, and this request was approved by the Archbishop of Boston and by all the bishops of that ecclesiastical province. The examination of the question was submitted to Propaganda and to the Apostolic Delegate at Washington. The pope then created, motu proprio, the new diocese, indicated its official title in Latin and in English, and determined its boundaries, which correspond to political divisions, and, finally, fixed the revenues of the bishop. In the case before us these consist in a moderate cathedraeum to be determined by the bishop (discretio arbitrio episcoporum). According to the practice of Propaganda, all the priests who at the time of the division exercised the ministry in the dismembered territory belong to the clergy of the new diocese from the day of its creation (13 April, 1904, in Collectanea S. C. de P. F., new ed., no. 1751).

(b) Union of Dioceses.—As in the case of the division of a diocese, the union of several dioceses ought to be justified by motives of public utility, e.g. the small number of the faithful, the loss of resources. As in the division, the pope obtains the advice of persons familiar with the situation; sometimes he asks the advice of the Government, etc. It is a generally recognized principle in the union of benefices, that such union takes effect only after the death of the actual occupant of the see which is to be united to another; at least when he has not given his consent to this union. Though the pope is not bound by this rule, in practice it must be taken into account. The union of dioceses takes place in several ways. There is, first, the unio aequi principalis or aequale when the two dioceses are entrusted for the purpose of administration to a single bishop, but not otherwise; in other respects distinct; each of them has its own cathedral chapter, revenues, rights, and privileges, but the bishop of one see becomes the bishop of the other by the mere fact of appointment to one of the two. He cannot resign one without ipso facto resigning the other. This situation differs from that in which a bishop administers for a time, or even perpetually, another diocese; in this case there is no union between the two sees. It is in reality a case of plurality of ecclesiastical benefices; the bishop holds two distinct sees, and his nomination must take place according to the rules established for each of the two dioceses. On the contrary, in the case of two or more united dioceses, the election or designation of the candidate must take place by the agreement of those persons in both dioceses who possess the right of election or of designation. Moreover, in the case of united dioceses, the union is diminished and the special rules for each of the dioceses which are a residence of the bishop, e.g. that he shall reside in each diocese for a part of the year. If the pope makes no decision in this matter, the bishop may reside in the more important diocese, or in that which seems more convenient for the purposes of administration, or even in the diocese which he prefers as a residence. If the bishop resides in one of his dioceses he is considered as present in each of them for those judicial acts which demand his presence. He may also convocate his two separate diocesan synods for each of the two dioceses or only one for both of them. In other respects the administration of each diocese remains distinct. There are two classes of unequal unions of dioceses (uniones inaequalis): the unio subjectiva or per accessorium, seldom put into practice, and the unio per confusionem. In the former case, the one diocese retains all its rights and the other loses its rights, obtains those of the principal diocese, and thus becomes a dependency. When a diocese is thus united to another there can be no question of right of election or designation, because such a dependent diocese is conferred by the very fact that the principal diocese possesses a titular. But the administration of each diocese remains distinct and the titular of the principal diocese must assume all the obligations of the united diocese. The second kind of union (per confusionem) suppresses the two pre-existing dioceses in order to create a new one; the former dioceses simply cease to exist. To perpetuate the names of the former sees the new bishop sometimes assumes the titles of both, but in administration no account is taken of the fact that they were formerly separate sees. Such a union is equivalent to the suppression of the dioceses.

(c) Suppression of Dioceses.—Suppression of dioceses, properly so called, in a manner other than by union, takes place only in countries where the faithful and the clergy have been dispersed by persecution, the ancient dioceses becoming missions, prefectures, or vicariates Apostolic. This has occurred in the Orient, in England, the Netherlands. All changes of this nature are not regulated by canon law.

(d) Change of Boundaries.—This last mode of novatio is made by the Holy See, generally at the request of the bishops of the two neighbouring dioceses. Among the sufficient reasons for this measure are the small number of the faithful, the loss of resources, the difficulty of communication. In part, at least, the mountain or of a large river, disputes between the inhabitants of one part of the diocese, also the fact that they belong to different countries. Sometimes a re-settlement of the boundaries of two dioceses is necessary because the limits of each are not clearly defined. Such a settlement is made by a Brief, sometimes also
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by a simple decretum or decision of the Congregation of the
Consistory approved by the pope, without the formality of a Bull or Brief.

IV. DIFFERENT CLASSES OF DIOCESES.—There are
several kinds of dioceses. There are dioceses properly
so called and archdioceses (q. v.). The diocese is
therefore circumscription administrated by bishop; the archdiocese is placed under the jurisdic-
tion of an archbishop. Considered as a territorial cir-
cumscription, no difference exists between them; the
power of their pastors alone is different. Generally,
several dioceses are grouped in an ecclesiastical prov-
ince, ecclesiastical province subject to the authority of
an archbishop. Some, however, are said to be ex-
empt, i.e. from any archiepiscopal jurisdiction, and
are placed directly under the authority of the Holy
See. Such are the dioceses of the ecclesiastical prov-
ince of Rome, and several other dioceses or archdioc-
eses, especially in Italy, also in other countries.
The exempt archbishops are called titular archbishops, i.e.
they possess only the title of archbishop, have no suf-
fragan bishops, and administer a diocese. The term
“titular archbishop”, it is to be noted, is also applied
to bishops who do not administer a diocese, but who
have been appointed with the episcopal consecration a titular
archbishop. For the better understanding of this
it must be remembered that archdioceses and di-
oceses are divided into titular and residential. The
bishop of a residential see administers his diocese
personally. The bishop of a titular see, on the other
hand, possesses a titular bishop only. This is so,
because, these bishops have only an episcopal title; they
are not bound by any obligations to the faithful of the di-
oceses whose titles they bear. These were formerly called
bishops or archbishops in partibus infidelium, i.e. of
a diocese or archdiocese fallen into the power of infidels;
but since 1829, when they are called titular bishops of
archbishops. Such are the vicars Apostolic, auxiliary
bishops, administrators Apostolic, nuncius, Apostolic
delegates, etc. (see TITULAR BISHOP). Mention must
also be made of the suburbanicarian dioceses (dioceses
suburbicarian), i.e. the six dioceses situated in the im-
mediate neighbourhood of Rome and each of which is
administered by one of the six cardinal-bishops. These
form a special class of dioceses, the titulars or occupants
of which possess certain special rights and obligations
(see SUBURBICARIAN DIOCESES).

V. NOMINATION, TRANSFER, RENUNCIATION,
AND RESIGNATION OF A BISHOP.—The general rules rela-
ting to the nomination of a residential bishop will be
found in the article BISHOP. They are applicable
whenever there may have been the cause of the vacancy
of the diocese, except in the case of a contrary order of the
pope. The Church admits the possibility of the
renunciation of the perpetuity of ecclesiastical benefices.
Once invested with a see the bishop continues to hold it until
his death. There are, however, exceptions to this rule.
The bishop may be allowed by the pope to resign his
see when actuated by motives which do not spring
from personal convenience, but from concerns for the
public good. Some of these reasons are expressed in
the canon law; for instance, if a bishop has been guilty of
a grave crime (conscientia criminis), if he is in failing
health (debilitus corporis), if he has not the requisite
knowledge (defectus scientiae), if he meets with serious
disagreement from the faithful (malitia peccati), if he has
been a cause of public scandal (scandalum populii), if he
is irregular (irregularitas)—c. 10, X, De renuntia-
tione, I, 9; c. 18, X, De regularibus, III, 32. The
pope alone can accept this renunciation and judge of the
sufficiency of the alleged reasons. Pontifical authori-
ization is also necessary for an exchange of dioceses be-
tween two bishops, which is not allowed except for
grave reasons. The same principles apply to the transfer
(translatio) of a bishop from one diocese to another.
Canonical legislation compares with the indissoluble
marriage the bond which binds the bishop to his diocese.
This comparison, however, must not be
understood literally. The pope has the power to sever
the mystical bond which unites the bishop to his
church, in order to grant him another diocese or to
promote him to an archiepiscopal see. A bishop may
also be deposed from his functions for a grave crime.
In such a case the pope generally states his decision
of his own accord, and deposes him only upon refusal.
As the Holy See alone is competent to try
the crime of a bishop, it follows that the pope alone, or
the congregation to which he has committed the bishop's
trial (Congregation of Bishops and Regulars of the
Propaganda Fide), sometimes the authority of the metropolitan
bishop, can inflict a penalty or pronounce the declaratory sentence
required when the law inflicts deposition as the sanction of a
specified delinquency. Finally, the pope has always the
right, strictly speaking, to deprive a bishop of his
diocese, even if the latter is not guilty of crime; but for
this act there must be grave cause. After the conclu-
sion of the Concordat of 1801 (q. v.) with France, Pius
VII removed from their dioceses all the bishops of
France. It was, of course, a very extraordinary mea-
sure, but was justified by the gravity of the situation.

VI. ADMINISTRATION OF THE DIOCESE.—The bishop
is the general ruler of the diocese, but in the adminis-
tration he must conform to the general laws of the
Church (see BISHOP). According to the Council of
Trent he is bound to divide the territory of his diocese
into parishes, with ordinary jurisdiction (q. v.) for
their titulars (Sess. XXIV, c. xiii, De factis), unless
the bishop personally confines the jurisdiction of the
parishes or unless the Holy See has arranged the matter
otherwise (Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, nos.
31–33). The bishop needs also some auxiliary service
in the administration of a diocese. It is customary for
each diocese to possess a chapter (q. v.) of canons in
the cathedral church; they are the counsellors of the
bishop. The cathedral itself is the church where the
bishop has his seat (sede). The pope reserves to
himself the right of authorizing its establishment as
well as that of a chapter of canons. In many dioceses,
principally outside of Europe, the pope does not estab-
lish canons, but gives as auxiliaries to the bishop other
officials known as consultores cleri diocesani, i.e. the
most distinguished members of the diocesan clergy,
chosen by the bishop, often in concert with his clergy
or some members of it. The bishop is bound to ask
the advice of those counsellors, canons or consultants,
in those most important matters. The bishop, in some
cases, has the right to nullify episcopal action taken
without their consent. The consultores cleri diocesani,
however, possess but a consultative voice (Third Plen.
Council of Baltimore, nos. 17–22; Pien. Conc. American
Latina, no. 246.—See CONSULTORS, DIOCESE).
After the bishop, the principal authority in a diocese is
the vicar-general (vicarius generalis in spiritualibus);
he is the bishop's substitute in the administration of
the diocese. The office dates from the thirteenth cen-
tury. Originally the vicar-general was called the
"diocesan" (officinalis); even yet officinals and vicarius
generalis in spiritualibus are closely connected. Strictly
speaking, there should be in each diocese only one vicar-
general. In some countries, however, local custom
has authorized the appointment of several vicars-gen-
eral. The one specially charged with the canonical
lawsuits (jurisdiction contentiosa), e. g. with criminal
actions against ecclesiastics or with matrimonial cases,
is still known as the "official"; it must be noted that he
is none the less free to exercise the functions of vicar-
general in other departments of diocesan administra-
tion. A contrary custom prevails in certain dioceses
of Germany, where the "official" possesses only the
jurisdiction contentiosa, but not other ecclesiastical
common law. For the temporal administration of the
church the bishop may appoint an acononus, i.e. an
administrator. As such functions do not require
ecclesiastical jurisdiction, this administrator may be a
layman. The choice of a layman fully acquainted
### Table of the Diocesan System of the Catholic Church

#### Latin Rite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Cardinals</th>
<th>Archbishops</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Auxiliary Bishops</th>
<th>Apostolic Administrators</th>
<th>Prefects of the Apostolic Signatures</th>
<th>Total Dioceses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria-Hungary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Also three titular patriarchs of the Latin Rite reside in Rome.
† The six suburbicarian dioceses must be added to these.
‡ The Russian Government has suppressed three of these.
§ Titular Patriarchate of the West Indies.

#### Oceania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oceania</th>
<th>Cardinals</th>
<th>Archbishops</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Auxiliary Bishops</th>
<th>Apostolic Administrators</th>
<th>Prefects of the Apostolic Signatures</th>
<th>Total Dioceses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay Archipelago</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippine Islands and Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polynesia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Though Bulls have been issued four of these dioceses have not been erected.

#### Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Cardinals</th>
<th>Archbishops</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Auxiliary Bishops</th>
<th>Apostolic Administrators</th>
<th>Prefects of the Apostolic Signatures</th>
<th>Total Dioceses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Diocese of Ceuta is not enumerated, as it belongs to Cadiz, Spain.
† Delegation of Arabia and Egypt. See above, foot-note to Asia.

#### Oriental Rites

**Armenian Rite:**
- Austria
- Russia
- Asia
- Africa

**Coptic Rite:**
- Africa

**Greek Bulgarian Rite:**
- Macedonia
- Thrace

**Greek Melchite Rite:**
- Asia

**Greek Rumanian Rite:**
- Asia

**Greek Ruthenian Rite:**
- Russia
- Austria

**Syrian Rite:**
- Asia

**Syro-Chaldean Rite:**
- Asia

**Syro-Malabar Rite:**
- Asia

**Syro-Malankara Rite:**
- Asia

#### Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Cardinals</th>
<th>Archbishops</th>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Auxiliary Bishops</th>
<th>Apostolic Administrators</th>
<th>Prefects of the Apostolic Signatures</th>
<th>Total Dioceses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India and Indo-China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Apostolic Delegation of Arabia also includes Egypt.
with the civil law of the country may sometimes offer many advantages (Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, no. 75). In certain very extensive dioceses the pope appoints a vicarius generalis in pontificiis, or auxiliary bishop, whose duty is to supply the place of the bishop, in the exercise of those functions of the sacred ministry which demand episcopal order. In the appointment of this bishop the pope is not bound to observe the special rules for the appointment of a residential bishop. These titular bishops possess no jurisdiction by right of their office; the diocesan bishop, if he can grant them, e.g., the powers of a vicar-general.

The common ecclesiastical law contains no enactments relating to the rights and powers of the chancellor, an official meet with in many dioceses (see DIACONAL CHANCERY). The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (no. 74) advises the establishment of a chancellor in every diocese of the United States. The chancellor is specially charged with the affixing of the episcopal seal to all acts issued in the name of the bishop, in order to prove their authenticity. He appears also in the conduct of ecclesiastical lawsuits, e.g., in matrimonial causes. He is, in the absence of the bishop, the authorized signatory of the council, or of its acts. The chancellor is sometimes employed to vouch for the authenticity of the acts of the diocese. Because of the importance of his functions, the chancellor sometimes holds the office of vicar-general in spiritualibus. By episcopal chancery is sometimes understood the office where the written documents issued in the name of the bishop, and to which is appended the seal, are deposited corresponding to the administration of the diocese; sometimes also the term signifies the persons employed in the exercise of these functions. The term chancery or its equivalents is not exactly defined in the ordinary. It seems to have been in the twelfth century that a chancellor was appointed, as a rule, to supervise the acts of the diocese and to make them authentic by an episcopal seal (see CHANCERY).

The term ius orius, or ius episcopi, is the ecclesiastical chancery with the affairs of the diocese, and with the diocesan and metropolitan rights and powers. It is an essential part of the chancery, and it is exercised by the bishop himself or his chancellor. An assistant, who is called fiscal advocate (advocatus fiscalis), may be appointed to aid the officer.

The diocese was divided into a number of archdeaconries, each having a bishop by an archdeacon who possessed considerable authority in that part of the diocese placed under his jurisdiction. The Council of Trent restricted very much their authority, and since then the number of the archdeacon is gradually diminishing. It exists in the present day only as an honorary title, given to a member of the cathedral chapter (see ARCHDEACON). On the other hand, the ancient office of vicar foranei, decani rurales, or archipresbyteri still exists in the Church (see ARCHPRIEST; DEAN). The division of the diocese into deaneries is not obligatory, but in large dioceses the bishop usually entrusts to certain priests known as deans or vicars foranei the oversight of the clergy of a portion of his diocese, and generally delegates to them special jurisdictional powers (Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, no. 27-30). Finally, by means of the diocesan synod all the clergy participates in the general administration of the diocese. According to the common law, the bishop is bound to assemble a synod every year, to which he must convocate the vicar-general, the deans, the canons of the cathedral, and at least a certain number of parish priests. Here, however, custom and pontifical briefs have departed in some points from the general legislation. At this meeting all questions relating to the moral and the ecclesiastical discipline of the diocese are publicly discussed and settled. In the synod the bishop is the sole legislator; the members may, at the request of the bishop, give their advice, but they have only a deliberative voice in the choice of the examinatores dei diocesani, i.e. the ecclesiastics charged with the examination of candidates for the parishes (Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, nos. 23-26). It is because the diocesan statutes are generally elaborate and promulgated in a synod that they are sometimes known. In dioceses which possess the general laws of the Church and the enactments of national or plenary and provincial synods, the bishop may regulate by statutes that are often real ecclesiastical laws, the particular discipline of each diocese, or apply the general laws of the Church to the special needs of the diocese. Since the bishop alone possesses all the legislative power, it is not possible in a synod these diocesan statutes, he may modify them or add them on his own authority.

VII. VACANCY OF THE DIOCESE.—We have already explained how a diocese becomes vacant (see V above); here it will suffice to add a few words touching the appointments of the bishop during the vacancy. In dioceses where there is a coadjutor bishop with right of succession, the latter, by the fact of the vacancy of the diocesan bishop, becomes the residential bishop or ordinary (q.v.) of the diocese. Otherwise the government of the diocese during the vacancy belongs regularly to the chapter or college of canons. Each chapter must choose within eight days a vicar capitular, whose powers, although less extensive, are in kind like those of a bishop. The chapter does not fulfill its obligation, the archbishop appoints et officia a vicar capitular. In dioceses where a chapter does not exist, an administrator is appointed either by the bishop himself before his death, or, in case of his neglect, by the metropolitan or by the senior bishop of the province (see ADMINISTRATOR).

VIII. DIOCESAN SYSTEM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.—The accompanying table of the diocesan system of the Church shows the state of the Church at present throughout the world: 9 patriarchates of the Latin, 6 of the Oriental Rites; 6 suburbanian dioceses; 163 (or 166 with the Patriarchates of Venice, Lisbon, and Goa, in reality archdioceses) archdioceses of the Latin, and 26 of the Oriental Rites; 975 dioceses of the Latin, and 52 of the Oriental Rites; 55 prefectures Apostolic of the Latin Rite; 12 Apostolic delegations; 21 abbeys or prelatures nullius dioceses, i.e. exempt from the jurisdiction of the diocesan or archdiocesan authority. Therefore there are also 80 titular archdioceses and 432 titular dioceses.

THOMAS, Vitus et nova disciplinae ecclesiae, etc. (Paris, 1861); Part I, II, III, nos. 51-59, 161; DONITZ, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenrechts (Strassburg, 1878), I, 410; II, 129 sqq.; HARFORD, The Council of Trent, 1545-1563, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1891); JURGENS, Vorlesungen über das kirchliche Recht (Leipzig, 1892); JOHNSON, History of the Catholic Church (London, 1905); ARTZ, Geschichte des Kirchenrechts (Freiburg, 1900); 231, 346, and bibliographical supplement (Bonn, 1903); SCHMIEER, Gesch. der kathol. Kirche in Schottland (Mainz, 1883); TRAUTGER, Kirchenrecht (Leipzig, 1885); JOHNSON, The Catholic Church in England (London, 1891); MÜLLER, Die Geschichte der Kirche in England (Leipzig, 1893); BAILLIERE, Gesch. der kathol. Kirche in Holland (Utrecht, 1894); MÜLLER, Die Geschichte der Kirche in Frankreich (Paris, 1895); MÜLLER, Die Geschichte der Kirche in Deutschland (Freiburg, 1901); and the multivolume works of BORCHARDT, Church History, in which are treated the history of all known Catholic dioceses to 1198, with names and regular dates of bishops; see GAMS, Series episcoporum ecclesiarum, I, 976-59, and his Appendix to the Catholic Encyclopedia, New York (1908), and the descriptive work of WERNER, Orbis terrae, Epistola (Freiburg, 1900). It is also due to him in the jurisdic-
Dioclea, a titular see of Phrygia in Asia Minor. Dioclea is mentioned by Ptolomy (V, ii, 23), where the former editions read Doka; this is probably the native name, which must have been hellenized at a later time; in the same way Dioclea in Dalmatia is most probably called Diocletianopolis. The autonym as well as the rights of Dioclea are proved by its coins struck in the reign of Elagabalus (Head, Hist. Num., 562). It figures in the “Syneodemus” of Hierocles, in Parthey, “Notitiae Episcopatum” (II, X, XIII), and in Gelzer, “Nova Tactica”, i.e. as late as the twelfth or thirteenth century, as a bishopric of Phrygia Caesarea, the metropolis of which was Laodicea. Only two bishops are known, in 431 and 451 (Lequien, Or. Christ., I, 823). An inscription found near Doghla, or Dola, in a village in the vilayet of Smyrna, shows that it must be the site of Dioclea, though there are no ruins.

S. PÉTRIDES.

Diocletian (Valerius Diocletianus), Roman Emperor and persecutor of the Church. He was born at Salona, a.d. 245; d. at Salona, a.d. 313. He entered the army and by his marked abilities attained the offices of Governor of Mesia, consult, and commander of the guards of the palace. In the Persian war, under Carus, he especially distinguished himself. When the son and successor of Carus, Numerian, was murdered, the choice of the army fell upon Diocletian, who immediately slew with his own hand the murderer Aper (17 Sept., 284). His career as emperor belongs to secular history. Here only a summary will be given. The reign of Diocletian (284-305) marked an era both in the military and political history of the empire. The triumph which he celebrated together with his colleague Maximian (20 Nov., 303) was the last triumph which Rome ever held. Britain, the Rhine, the Danube, and the Nile furnished trophies, but the proudest boast of the conqueror was that of Persia, the persistent enemy of Rome, had at last been subdued. Soon after his accession to power Diocletian realized that the empire was too unwieldy and too much exposed to attack to be safely ruled by a single head. Accordingly, he associated with himself Maximian, a bold but rude soldier, as Caesar, and afterwards as Augustus, 293. Later on, he further distributed his power by granting the inferior title of Caesar to two generals, Galerius and Constantius (292). He reserved for his own portion Thrace, Egypt, and Asia; Italy and Africa were Maximian’s provinces, while Galerius was stationed on the Danube, and Constantius had charge of Gaul, Spain, and Britain. But the supreme control remained in Diocletian’s hands. None of the rulers resident in Rome, and thus the way was prepared for the downfall of the imperial city. Moreover, Diocletian undermined the authority of the Senate, assumed the diadem, and introduced the severe ceremonial of the Persian court. After a prosperous reign of nearly twenty-one years, he abdicated the throne and retired to Salona, where he lived in magnificence seclusion until his death.

Diocletian’s name is associated with the last and most terrible of all the ten persecutions of the early Church. Nevertheless it is a fact that the Christians enjoyed peace and prosperity during the greater portion of his reign. Eusebius, who lived at this time, describes in glowing terms “the glory and the liberty which with the doctrine of piety was honoured”, and he extols the clemency of the emperor towards the Christian governors whom they appointed, and towards the Christian members of their households. He tells us that the rulers of the Church “were courted and honoured with the greatest subserviency by all the rulers and governors”. He speaks of the vast multitudes that flocked to the religion of Christ, and of the spacious and splendid churches erected in the place of the humber buildings of earlier days. At the same time he bewails the falling from ancient fervour “by reason of excessive liberty” (Hist. Eccl., VIII, i). In 305 Diocletian remained sole emperor, he would probably have allowed this toleration to continue undisturbed. It was his subordinate Galerius who first induced him to turn persecutor. These two rulers of the East, at a council held at Nicomedia in 302, resolved to suppress Christianity throughout the empire. The cathedral of Nicomedia was demolished (21 Feb., 303). An edict was issued “to tear down the churches to the foundations, and to destroy the Sacred Scriptures by fire; and commanding also that those who were in honourable stations should be degraded if they persevered in their adherence to Christianity” (Euseb., op. cit., VIII, ii). Three further edicts (303-304) marked successive stages in the severity of the persecution: the first ordering that the bishops, priests, and deacons should be imprisoned, the second that they should be tortured and compelled by every means to sacrifice; the third including the laity as well as the clergy. The atrocious cruelty with which these edicts were enforced, and the vast numbers of those who suffered for the Faith are attested by Eusebius and the Acts of the Martyrs. We read even of the massacre of the whole population of a town because they declared themselves Christians (Euseb., loc. cit., xi, xii; Lactant., “Div. Inst.”, V, xi). The abdication of Diocletian (1 May, 305) and the subsequent partition of the empire brought relief to many provinces. In the East, however, Galerius and Maximian held sway, the persecution continued to rage. Thus it will be seen that the so-called Diocletian persecution should be attributed to the influence of Galerius; it continued for seven years after Diocletian’s abdication. (See Persecutions.)


T. B. SCANNELL.

Diocletianopolis, a titular see of Palæstina Prima. This city is mentioned by Hierocles (Syneodemus, 719, 2), Georgius Cyprius (ed. Gelzer, 1012), and in some “Notitiae Episcopatum” as a suffragan of Caesarea. Its native name is unknown, and its site has not been identified. One bishop is known, Elias, in 359 (Lequien, Oriens Christianus, III, 460).

(2) Another Diocletianopolis was a suffragan see of Philippopolis in Thrace. Its site is unknown. Two bishops are mentioned, Cyrilus in 431, and Epictetus in 451 and 458. A third, Elias, in 555, is doubtful (Lequien, op. cit., I, 1161). (3) Still another Diocletianopolis was a suffragan of Trolemis in Thessalia Secunda (Parthey, Notit. Episc., I). This city is also mentioned by Hierocles (op. cit., 732, 3), and by...
Diodorus of Tarsus, date of birth uncertain; d. about A.D. 592. He was of noble family, probably of Antioch. St. Basil calls him a "nursing" or "counselor" of Tarsus, but whether this episcopate was at Antioch or at Tarsus is not known. He studied at Athens, and then embraced the monastic state. He became head of a monastery in or near Antioch, and St. Chrysostom was his disciple. When Antioch groaned under Arian bishops, he did not join the small party of irremovable heads. He accordingly asked to have written some of his works against the pagans as early as the reign of Julian, for that emperor declared that Diodorus had used the learning and eloquence of Athens against the immortal gods, who had punished him with sickness of the throat, emaciation, wrinkles, and a hard cough. In the persecution of Valens (368-78), Flavian and Diodorus, now priests, during the exile of Mecitus kept the Faith together, assembling them on the northern bank of the Orontes, when the Arian emperor did not permit Catholic worship within the city. Many times banished, Diodorus, in 370, made a visitation of St. Basil in Ararat, whether that saint had come to visit Mecitus. On the return of the latter to his flock, he made Diodorus Bishop of Tarsus and Metropolitan of Cilicia. Theodosius soon after, in a decree, named Diodorus and St. Pelagius of Laodicea as norms of orthodoxy for the whole East. Diodorus was at the Councils of Antioch in 379 and of Constantinople in 381. These men makes him responsible at the latter council for the proposal of Nestorius as bishop of that city, and represents him as one of the chief movers in the appointment of St. Flavian as successor to Mecitus, by which the unhappy schism at Antioch was prolonged.

Diodorus came to Antioch in 380 or later, when St. Chrysostom was already a priest. In a sermon he spoke of Chrysostom as "st. John the Baptist, the voice of the Church, the rod of Moses." Next day Chrysostom ascended the pulpit and declared that when the people had applauded, he had groaned; it was Diodorus, his father, who was John the Baptist; the Antiochenses could bear witness how he led without possession, having his food from alms, and persevering in prayer and preaching; like the Baptist he had taught on the other side of the river, often he had been imprisoned—nay, he had been often beheaded, at least in will, for the Faith. In another sermon he likens Diodorus to the martyrs: "See his mortified limbs, his face, having the form of a man, but the expression of an Angel!" (379) Diodorus in 375 asked Diodorus to disown a furtitious letter circulated in his name, permitting marriage with a deceased wife's sister. In the following year he criticizes the rhetorical style of the longer of two treatises sent him by Diodorus, but gives warm praise to the shorter. Diodorus's style is praised by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Photius, but of his very numerous writings only a few unimportant fragments have been preserved, chiefly in Catena (q. v.). He wrote against some of the heresies and still more against heretical heathen philosophy. Photius gives a detailed summary of his writings, but some of the books are evidently very dull from a modern point of view. According to Lequien he composed commentaries on the whole Bible. St. Jerome says that these were imitations of those of Eusebius of Emesa, but less distinguished by secular learning. Diodorus rejected the allegorical interpretations of the Alexandrians, and adhered to the literal sense. In this he was followed by his disciple Theodore of Mopsuestia, and by Chrysostom in his unequalled expositions. The Antiochene School of which he was the leader was discredited by the subsequent heresies of Nestorius, of whom his disciple Theodore of Mopsuestia was the predecessor. Theodore wrote to extol Diodorus, but St. Cyril declared him a heretic. The dashing passages cited by Marius Mercator and Leontius seem, however, to belong to a work of Theodore, not of Diodorus; nor was the latter condemned when Theodore and his followers were condemned by the Fifth General Council (553). It seems certain that Diodorus went too far in his opposition to the (younger) Apollinaris of Laodicea, according to whom the rational soul in Christ was supplied by the Logos. Diodorus, in emphasizing the completeness of the Lord's person, appears to have asserted two hypotheses, not necessarily in a heretical sense. If the developments by Theodore throw a shade on the reputation of Diodorus, the praise of all his contemporaries and especially of his disciple Chrysostom tend more strongly to exculpate him. It will be best to look upon Diodorus as the innocent source of Nestorianism (q. v.) only in the sense that St. Cyril of Alexandria is admittedly the unwilling origin of Monophysitism through some incorrect expressions. Against this view are Jülicher [Theol. lit. Z. (1902), 29-50] and Frenk [in "Rev. hist. eccl." 1 (1902), 91-71; reprinted with improvements in "Kirchengesch. Abhandl." (Paderborn, 1907), 32-3]. The fragments of his Commentaries on the Old Testament are collected in Migne, P. G., XXXIII, from the Catena of Nicephorus and that published by V. Jiilicher [Analecta Hierosolimitana, 1878], also from Patrum Bibl., VI. A few more are found in Pitra, "Spicilegium Solesmenscense" (Paris, 1832), I. A long list of the lost works is in Fabricius, "Bibl. Gr." V, 24 (reprinted in Migne, loc. cit.). Some Syriac dogmatic fragments are in Lagarde, "Analecta Syriaca," 1855. Fragments of Pseudo-Justin Martyr have been attributed to Diodorus by Harnack ("Texte und Unters.,” N. F., VI, 1, 1901). For his life, see Tellenmont, "Mémoires," vol. VIII, and Vennerr in "Dict. d'Hist. Beaux," vol. XXXIII. Diodorus as an exegete in Theologie und Geschichte in "Bibl. H. Ch." 1860, 1862. An introduction to his work was by Tüxen in "Hastens, Dict. of the Bible," V, 500. The influence of Diodorus is described by the Antiochenes in the Th. Quaest. in "Dict. in Antiqu." 1861, 1862; Diodore de lausoria, Diodore de l'Orontes, Diodore de la Moria, Diodore de la Mitri in "Mémoires," nouv. série (1901), 1, 431; Iadem, École théol. d'Antioche in "Dict. des écol. cath.," II, 145 sqq., see also Diodore d'Égypte, École élamite d'Antioche in "École élamite d'Antioche," 1, 583 sqq. On the School of Antioch in general see bibliography of article Antioche by Leclercq in "Dict. d'Arch. eccl." (1870.)

John Chapman.

Diognetus, Epistle to (Epistola ad Diognetum).

This beautiful little apology for Christianity is cited by no ancient or medieval writer, and came down to us in a single MS., which is in Maggiolo in Strasbourg (1870). The identification of Diognetus with the teacher of Marcus Aurelius, who bore the same name, is at most plausible. The author's name is unknown, and the date is anywhere between the Apostles and the age of Constantine. It was clearly composed during a severe persecution. The manu-
DIONYSIUS

script attributed it with other writings to Justin Martyr; but that earnest philosopher and pious writer was quite incapable of the restrained eloquence, the smooth flow of thought, the limpid clearness of expression, which mark this epistle as one of the most perfect compositions of antiquity. The last two chapters (xi, xii) are florid and obscure, and bear no relation to the rest of the letter. They seem to be a fragment of a homily of later date. The writer of this addition describes himself as a “disciple of the Apostles”; and through a misunderstanding of these words the epistle has, since the eighteenth century, been classed with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. The letter breaks off at the end of chapter x; it may have originally been much longer.

The writer addresses the “most excellent Diognetus”, a well-disposed pagan, who desires to know what is the religion of Christians. His worship is ridiculed, and it is shown that Jewish sacrifices and ceremonies cannot cause any pleasure to the only God and Creator of all. Christians are not a nation nor a sect, but are diffused throughout the world, though they are not of the world, but citizens of heaven; they are the sons of the invisible Creator, who sent His Child, by whom He made all things, to save man, after He has allowed man to find out his own weakness and proneness to sin and his incapacity to save himself. The last chapter is an exposition, “first” of the love of the Father, and “secondly” by the Son; but this is lost. The style is harmonious and simple. The writer is a practised master of classical eloquence, and a fervent Christian. There is no resemblance to the public apologies of the second century. A closer affinity is with the “Ad Donatum” of Justin, which is an inquiry addressed to a judge, on the Son; but this is lost. The style is harmonious and simple. The writer is a practised master of classical eloquence, and a fervent Christian. There is no resemblance to the public apologies of the second century. A closer affinity is with the “Ad Donatum” of Justin, which is an inquiry addressed to a judge, on the Son; but this is lost. The style is harmonious and simple. The writer is a practised master of classical eloquence, and a fervent Christian. There is no resemblance to the public apologies of the second century. A closer affinity is with the “Ad Donatum” of Justin, which is an inquiry addressed to a judge, on the Son; but this is lost. The style is harmonious and simple. The writer is a practised master of classical eloquence, and a fervent Christian. There is no resemblance to the public apologies of the second century. A closer affinity is with the “Ad Donatum” of Justin, which is an inquiry addressed to a judge, on the Son; but this is lost. The style is harmonious and simple. The writer is a practised master of classical eloquence, and a fervent Christian. There is no resemblance to the public apologies of the second century. A closer affinity is with the “Ad Donatum” of Justin, which is an inquiry addressed to a judge, on the Son; but this is lost. The style is harmonious and simple. The writer is a practised master of classical eloquence, and a fervent Christian. There is no resemblance to the public apologies of the second century. A closer affinity is with the “Ad Donatum” of Justin, which is an inquiry addressed to a judge, on the Son; but this is lost.

DIONYSIUS, a titular see in Arabia. This city, which figures in the “Synecdemos” of Hierocles (723, 3) and Georgius Cyprius (1072), is mentioned only in Parthey’s “Prima Notitia”, about 840, as a suffragan of Bostra. Lequien (Or. christ., II, 815) gives the names of three Greek bishops, Severus, consecrated at Nicea in 325, Epiphanius at Constantia in 381, and Maras at Chaledon in 451. Another, Peter, is known by an inscription (Waddington, Inscriptions... de Syrie, no. 2327). Fifteen or sixteen titular Latin bishops are known throughout the fifteenth century (Lequien, op. cit., III, 1909; Bubel, I, 272, II, 100). The last bishop is known by an inscription with Soada, now as Suweda, the chief town of a caza in the vilayet of Damascus, where many inscriptions have been found. Soada, though an important city, is not alluded to in ancient authors under this name; inscriptions prove that it was built by a “lord builder Dionysos” and that it was an episcopal see. Soada is an ancient city, though an important one.

References to all these writers will be found in Petrie, Apost.. ed. Funk. See also Bollaert, Geschichte der altchristl. Lit., I, and bibliography in Richardson, Biblioth. Synopsis, and Chrysologue, Bio-bibl. On the date of the Donatist and the Epiphanius of Harnack, Gesch der alt-chr. Lit., I, 757. The concluding chapters are attributed to Histories, Di Pauli in Theol. Quartalschrift, LXIII (1906), I, 28.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

DIONYSIUS, SAINT, POPE, date of birth unknown; d. 26 or 27 December, 268. During the pontificate of Pope Stephen (254-57) Dionysius appears as a presbyter of the Roman Church and as such took part in the controversies regarding Acacius and in the discussions over the validity of baptism (see Baptism under sub-title Rebaptism). This caused Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria to write him a letter on baptism in which he is described as an excellent and learned man (Eusebius, Hist. eccl., VII, vii). Later, in the time of Pope Sixtus II (257-84) the same Bishop of Alexandria presented to a jurisdiction of Dionysius a letter concerning Lucianus (ibid., VII, ix); who this Lucianus was is not known. After the martyrdom of Sixtus II (6 August, 258) the Roman See remained vacant for nearly a year, as the violence of the persecution made it impossible to elect a new head. It was not until the persecution had begun to subside that Dionysius was raised (22 July, 259) to the office of Bishop of Rome. Some months later the Emperor Gallienus issued his edict of toleration, which brought the persecution to an end and gave a legal existence to the Church (Eusebius, Hist. eccl., VII, xiii). Thus the Roman Church came again into possession of its buildings for worship, its cemeteries, and other properties, and Dionysius was able to bring its administration once more into order. About 260 Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria wrote his letter to Ammonius and Euphranor against the Galileans in which he expressed himself with inexactness as to the Logos and its relation to the God the Father (see Dionysius of Alexandria). Upon this an accusation against him was laid before Pope Dionysius who called a synod at Rome about 260 for the settlement of the matter. The pope issued, in his own name and that of the council, an important doctrinal letter in which, first, the errors of
doctrine of Sabellius was again condemned and, then, the false opinions of those were rejected who, like the Marcionites, in a similar manner separate the Divine monarchy into three entirely distinct hypostases, or who represent the Son of God as a created being, while others. The doctrine of Alexandria did in his passages in the Bible, such as Deut., xxxii, 6, Prov., xviii, 22, cannot be cited in support of false doctrines such as those. Along with this doctrinal epistle Pope Dionysius sent a separate letter to the Alexandrian Bishop in which the letter was called on to explain his views. This letter was called the "Apologia" (Athanasius, De sententia Dionysii, V, xiii, De deo perfecte Nicanor synodi, xxxvi). According to the ancient practice of the Roman church Dionysius also extended his care to the faithful of distant lands. When the Christians of Cappadocia were in great distress from the marauding incursions of the Goths, the pope addressed a consolatory letter to the Church of Cesarea and sent a large sum of money by messengers for the redemption of enslaved Christians (Basilius, Epist. lxxx, ed. Garnier). The great synod of Antioch which deposed Paul of Samosata sent a circular letter to Athanasius and Bishop Maximus of Alexandria concerning its proceedings (Eusebius, Hist. eccl., VII, xxx). After death the body of Dionysius was buried in the papal crypt in the catacomb of Callistus.

Dionysius, Saint, Bishop of Corinth about 170. The date is fixed by the fact that he wrote to Pope Soter (c. 170 to 176); Harnack gives 167 to 173-5. Eusebius placed his "floris" in the eleventh year of Marcus Aurelius (171). When Hegesippus was at Corinth in the time of Pope Anicetus, Primitius was bishop (about 150-5), while Bacthylus was Bishop of Corinth at the time of the Paschal controversy (about 190-8). Dionysius is only known to us through Eusebius, for St. Jerome (De viris ill. xxvii) has used no other authority. Eusebius knew a collection of seven of the "Catholic Letters to the Churches" of Dionysius, together with a letter to him from Primitius, Bishop of Gressus, and a private letter of spiritual advice to a holy named Chrysophrone, who had written to him.

Eusebius first mentions a letter to the Macedonians, teaching orthodoxy, and enjoying peace and union. A second was to the Athenians, stirring up their faith exhorting them to live according to the Gospel, since they were not far from apostasy. Dionysius spoke of the recent martyrdom of the bishop Publius (in the persecution of Marcus Aurelius), and says that Dionysius the Areopagite was the first Bishop of Athens. To the Nicomedeans he wrote against Marcionism. Writing to Cretans and the other decese of Crete, he praised the bishop, Philip, for the ascension to hisesy. To the Church of Antioch in Pontus he wrote at the instance of Bachelides and Epistius (otherwise unknown), mentioning the bishop's name as Palmas; he spoke in this letter of marriage and continence, and recommended the charitable treatment of those who had fallen away into sin and heresy. Writing to the Creations, he recommended their bishop, Primitius, not to lay the yoke of continence too heavily on the brethren, but to consider the weakness of most. Primitius replied, after polite words, that he hoped Dionysius would send strong meat next time, that people might not grow up on the milk of babies. This severe prelate is mentioned by Eusebius (IV, xxiv) as an ecclesiastical writer, and the historian praises the tone of his letter.

But the most important letter is that to the Romans, the only one from which extracts have been preserved.

Pope Soter had sent alma and a letter to the Corinthians:—"For this has been your custom from the beginning, to do good to all the brethren in many ways, and to send alms to many Churches in different cities, now relieving the poverty of those who asked aid, now as carrying the brethren the abundance which he has supplied, and by comforting with blessed words the brethren who came to him, as a father to his children." Again: "You also by this instruction have mingled together the Romans and Corinthians who are the planting of Peter and Paul. For they both came to our Corinth and planted us, and taught alike; and alike going to Italy and teaching there, were martyred at the same time." Again: "To-day we have kept the holy Lord's day, on which we have read your letter, which we shall ever possess to read and to be admired, even as the former one written to us through Clement." The testimony to the generosity of the Roman Church is carried on by the witness of Dionysius of Alexandria in the third century; and also in the Epistle to the Romans (ed. Kon:ilienaf^r}i). For this it is still was seen in his own day in the greatest persecution. The bishops of Rome and St. Paul, are the authorities which are of first-rate importance, and so is the mention of the Epistle of Clement and the public reading of it. The letter of the pope was written to his "dear brother"

Dionysius's own letters were evidently much prized, for in the last extract he says that he wrote them by request, and that they have been falsified ""of the apostles of the devil." No wonder, he adds, that the Scriptures are falsified by such persons.

The extracts are in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., IV, xxiv, also II, xxv (Reuth, Religionsgeschichte). See Harnack, Gesch. der Alten Kirche, I, 290 (pp. 785 are mentioned two fragments attributed to Origen, Rome may be from Dionysius's letters to Romans; they will be found in Holl, Fragmenta sacrae ecclesiasticae, and in the Canar Perseverance (Leipzig, 1896); ed. ib., i, 313. Bardenhewer, Gesch. der altchristl. Lit. I, 532.

John Chapman.

Dionysius Exiguus, the surname Exiguus, or "The Little", adopted probably in self-deprecation and not because he was small of stature, flourished in the earlier part of the sixth century, dying before the year 541. According to his friend and fellow-student, Cassiodorus (De divinis Lectionibus, c. xviii), though born a Scythian, he was in character and language Roman and thorough Catholic, most learned in both tongues—i.e. Greek and Latin—and an accomplished Scripture scholar. Much of his life was spent in Rome, where he governed a monastery as abbot. His industry was great and he did good service in translating the standard works from Latin into Greek, notably the Life of St. Pachomius, the Instructions of St. Pachomius, the Instruction of St. Pachomius of Constantinople for the Armenians, the De opificio hominis of St. Gregory of Nyssa, the history of the discovery of the head of St. John the Baptist. The translation of St. Cyril of Alexandria's synodal letters against Nestorius, and other works long attributed to Dionysius, are now acknowledged to be earlier and are assigned to Marius Mercator.

Of great importance were the contributions of Dionysius to the science of canon law, the first beginnings of which in Western Christendom were due to him. His Collectio Dionysiana embraces (1) a collection of synodal decrees, of which he has left two editions:—

(a) "Codex canonum Ecclesiae Universalis".

This contains copies of the Roman synods and councils only in Greek and Latin, including those of the four ecclesiastical councils from Nicea (325) to Chalcedon (451).

(b) "Codex canonum ecclesiasticorum Romanorum". This is in Latin only: its contents agree generally with the other, but the Council of Ephesus (431) is omitted, while the so-called "Canons of the Apostles" and those of Sardica are included, as well as 138 canons of the
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African Council of Carthage (419).—(c) Of another bilingual version of Greek canons, undertaken at the instance of Pope Hormisdas, only the preface has been preserved. (2) A collection of papal Constitutions (Collectio decretorum Pontificum Romanorum) from Dionysius II (384–408).

In chronology Dionysius has left his mark conspicuously, for it was he who introduced the use of the Christian Era (see CHRONOLOGY) according to which dates are reckoned from the Incarnation, which he assigned to 25 March, in the year 754 from the foundation of Rome (A.D. 754). By this method of computation he intended to supersede the "Era of Diocletian" previously employed, being unwilling, as he tells us, that the name of an impious predecessor should be thus kept in memory. The Era of the Incarnation, often called the Dionysian Era, was soon much used in Italy and, to some extent, a little later in Spain; during the eighth and ninth centuries it was adopted in England. Charlemagne is said to have been the first Christian ruler to employ it officially. It was not until the tenth century that it was employed in the papal chancery (Lersch, Chronologie, Freiburg, 1899, p. 233). Dionysius directed "three attention to the calculation of the years which so greatly occupied the early Church." To this end he advocated the adoption of the Alexandrian Cycle of nineteen years, extending that of St. Cyril for a period of ninety-five years in advance. It was in this work that he adopted the Era of the Incarnation. His works are in P. L., LXXVII, and the testimonia Cassiodorus, ibid., LXX. See also MAASE, Quellen der Lit. des, auct. Römis. im Abendlande (Graz, 1870); BARDEHWEWER, Gesch. der älteren Lit. (Freiburg im Br., 1902).

JOHN GERARD.

Dionysius of Alexandria (bishop from 217-8 to 264-5), called "the Great" by Eusebius, St. Basil, and others, was undoubtedly, after St. Cyprian, the most eminent bishop of the third century. Like St. Cyprian he was less a great theologian than a great administrator. Like St. Cyprian his writings usually took the form of letters. Both saints were converts from paganism; both were engaged in the controver-
sies as to the restoration of those who had lapsed in the Decian persecution, about Novatian, and with regard to the iteration of heretical baptism; both corresponded with the popes of their day. Yet it is curious that neither mentions the name of the other. A study of the life of Dionysius has been attempted by Bardenhewer. For the rest we are dependent on the many citations by Eusebius, and, for one phase, to the works of his great successor St. Athanasius.

Dionysius was an old man when he died, so that his birth will fall about 190, or earlier. He is said to have been of distinguished parentage. He became a Chris-
tian when still young. At a later period, when he was warned by a priest of the danger he ran in studying the books of heretics, a vision—so he informs us—assured him that he was capable of proving all things, and that this faculty he had in fact been the cause of his conver-
sion. He studied under Origen. The latter was ban-
ished by Demetrius about 231, and Heraclea took place at the head of the catechetical school. On the death of Demetrius very soon afterwards, Heraclea became bishop, and Dionysius took the headship of the church. It is then that he retained this office even when he himself had succeeded Her-
aclea as bishop. In the last years of Philip, 249, although the emperor himself was reported to be a Christian, a riot at Alexandria, roused by a popular prophet and poet, had all the effect of a severe persecution. It is descri-
based by Dionysius in a letter to his fellow-

och. The mob first seized an old man named Metras, beat him with clubs when he would not deny his faith, pierced his eyes and face with reeds, dragged him out of the city, and stoned him. Then a woman named Quinta, who would not sacrifice, was drawn along the rough pavement by the feet, dashed against mill-
stones, scourged, and finally stoned in the same sub-
urb. The houses of the faithful were plundered. Not one, so far as the bishop knew, apostatized. The aged virgin, Apollonia, after her teeth had been knocked out, sprang of her own accord into the fire prepared for her rather than utter blasphemies. Serapa-
don had all his limbs broken, and was dragged from the upper story of his own house. It was impos-
able for any Christian to go into the streets, even at night, for the mob was shouting that all who would not blaspheme should be burnt. The riot was stopped by the civil war, but the new Emperor Decius insti-
tuted a legal persecution in January 250. Dionysius describes how at Carthage the Christians rushed to sacrifice, or at least to obtain false certificates of having done so. Similarly Dionysius tells us that at Alexandria many conformed through fear, others on account of official position, or persuaded by friends; some pale and trembling at their aer, others boldly as-
serting that they had never been Christians. Some endured imprisonment for a time; others abjured only at the sight of tortures; others held out until the tortures conquered their resolution. But there were noble in-
stances of constancy. Julian and Kronion were tortured through the city, and then thrown to death. A soldier, Bessus, who protected them from the insults of the people, was beheaded. Macar, a Libyan, was burnt alive. Epimachus and Alexander, after long imprisonment and many tortures, were also burnt, with four women. The virgin Ammonaria was long tortured. The aged Mercantia and Dio-

nysia, a mother of many children, suffered by the sword. Hieron, Ater, and Isidore, Egyptians, after many tortures were given to the flames. A boy of fifteen, Dioecorus, who stood firm under torture, was dismissed by the judge by a formal act, and was cut off by hunger, thirst, cold, sickness, robbers, or wild beasts. A bishop named Charmon escaped with his σύζυγος (wife?) to the Arabian mountain, and was no more heard of. Many were carried off as slaves by the Saracens and some of these were later ransomed for large sums.

Some of the lapsed had been readmitted to Christian fellowship by the martyrs. Dionysius urged upon Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, who was inclined to join Novatian, that it was right to respect this judgment delivered by blessed martyrs who "now seated with Christ, and had all his blood and treasures with him in the judgment." He adds the story of an old man, Sera-
pion, who after a long and blameless life had sacrificed, and could obtain absolution from no one. On his death-bed he sent his grandson to fetch a priest. The priest was ill, but he gave a particle of the Eucharist to the child, telling him to moisten it and place it in the old man's mouth. Sera-
pion received it with joy, and immediately expired. Sabinus, the prefect, sent a frumentarius (detective) to search for Dionysius directly the decree was published; he looked everywhere in Dionysius's own house, where the saint had quietly remained. On the fourth day he was inspired to depart, and he left at night, with his domestics and certain brethren. But it seems that he was soon made prisoner, for soldiers escorted the whole party to Ta-
posiris in the Marcots. A certain Timotheus, who had not been taken with the others, informed a passing
countryman, who carried the news to a wedding-feast he was attending. All instantly rose up and rushed to release the bishop. The soldiers took to flight, leaving their prisoners on their uncleaned litters. Dionysius, believing his rescuer to be robbers, held out his clothes to them, retaining only his tunic. They urged him to rise and fly. He begged them to leave him, declaring that they might as well cut off his head at once, as the soldiers would shortly do so. He let himself down on the ground on his back; but they seized him by the hands and feet and dragged him away, carrying him out of the little town, and setting him on an ass without a saddle. With two companions, Gaius and Peter, he remained in a desert place in Libya until the persecution ceased in 251. The whole Christian world was then thrown into confusion by the news that Novatian claimed the Bishopric of Rome in opposition to Pope Cornelius. Dionysius at once took the side of the latter, and it was largely by his influence that the whole East, after much disturbance, was brought in a few months into unity and harmony. Novatian wrote to him for support. His curt reply has been preserved entire: Novatian can easily prove the truth of his assertion that he was martyred; and he will by voluntarily retiring: he ought to have suffered martyrdom rather than divide the Church of God; indeed it would have been a particularly glorious martyrdom on behalf of the whole Church (such is the importance attached by Dionysius to a schism at Rome); if he should now persuade his followers the Roman Church to take the past will be forgotten; if not, let him save his own soul. St. Dionysius also wrote many letters on this question to Rome and to the East; some of these were treated on penance. He took a somewhat milder view than Cyprian, for he gave greater weight to the ancient and received arguments of the Roman Church, the author of the martyrdom, and refused forgiveness in the hour of death to none.

After the persecution the pestilence. Dionysius describes it more graphically than does St. Cyprian, and he reminds us of Thucydides and Defoe. The heathen thrust their dead into the throes of the bodies half dead into the streets; yet they suffered more than the Christians, whose heroic acts of mercy are recounted by their bishop. Many priests, deacons, and persons of merit died from succouring others, and this death, writes Dionysius, was in no way a martyrdom. The baptismal ceremony spread from Africa throughout the East. Dionysius was far from teaching, like Cyprian, that baptism by a heretic rather beforals than clearer; but he was impressed by the opinion of many bishops and some councils that repetition of such a baptism was necessary, and it appears that he besought Pope Stephen not to break off communion with the Churches of Asia on this account. He also wrote on the subject of Dionysius of Rome, who was not yet pope, and to a Roman named Pheilonem, both of whom had written to him. He knows seven letters from him on the subject, two being addressed to Pope Sixtus II. In one of these he asks advice in the case of a man who had received baptism a long time before from heretics, and now declared that it had been improperly performed. Dionysius had refused to renew the sacrament after the lapse of so many years even in the Holy Eucharist; he asked the pope's opinion. In this case it is evident that the difficulty was in the nature of the ceremonies used, not in the mere fact of their having been performed by heretics. We gather that Dionysius himself followed the Roman custom, either by the tradition of the Church, or else out of obedience to the decrees of Stephen. In 253 Origen died; he had not been at Alexandria for many years. But Dionysius had not forgotten his old master, and wrote a letter in his praise to Theoctemus of Cesarea.

An Egyptian bishop, Nepos, taught the Chiliastic error that there would be a reign of Christ upon earth for a thousand years, a period of eternal delights; he founded this doctrine upon the Apocalypse in a book entitled "Refutation of the Allegorizers." It was only after the death of Nepos that Dionysius found himself obliged to write two books "On the Promises" to counteract this error. He treats Nepos, and refutes his doctrine, as indeed the Church has done since, though it was taught by Papias, Justin, Irenæus, Victorinus of Pettau, and others. The diocese proper to Alexandria was still very large (though Heraclas is said to have instituted new bishoprics), and the Arsinoite nome formed a part of it. But the persecution was very severe in the villages, and St. Dionysius went in person to the villages, called together the priests and teachers, and for three days instructed them, refuting the arguments they drew from the book of Nepos. He was much edified by the docile spirit and love of truth which he found. At length Korakion, who had introduced the book and the doctrine, declared himself convinced. The chief interest of the incident is not in the picture it gives of ancient Church life and of the wisdom and gentleness of the bishop, but in the remarkable disquisition, which Dionysius appends, on the authenticity of the Apocalypse. It is a very striking example of "higher criticism", and for clearness, precision, and keenness and insight, is hardly to be surpassed. Some of the brethren, he tells us, in their zeal against Chaldean error, repudiated the Apocalypse altogether, and took it chapter by chapter to ridicule it, attributing the authorship of it to Cerinthus (as we know, St. Irenæus says he did some years before the apostles), and Dionysius treats it with reverence, and declares it to be full of hidden mysteries, and doubtless really by a man called John. (In a passage now lost, he showed that the book must be understood allegorically.) But he found it hard to believe that the writer could be the author of Zech. and that the Catholic Epistle, on account of the great contrast of character, style, and "what is called working out," shows that the one writer calls himself John, whereas the other only refers to himself by some periphrasis. He adds the famous remark, that "it is said that there are two tombs in Ephesus, both of which are called that of John." He demonstrates the close likeness between the Gospel and the Epistle, and points out the wholly different vocabulary of the Apocalypse; the latter is full of solemnities and barbarisms, whereas the former are in good Greek. This acute criticism was unfortunate in his time. It was the use of the frequent rejection of the Apocalypse in the Greek-speaking Churches, even as late as the Middle Ages. Dionysius's arguments appeared unanswerable to the liberal critics of the nineteenth century. Lately the swing of the pendulum has brought many, guided by Bousset, Harnack, and others, to be impressed rather than by the undeniable points of contact between the Gospel and the Apocalypse, than by the differences of style (which can be explained by a different scribe and interpreter, since the author of both books was certainly a Jew), so that even Loisy admits that the opinion of the reformed and liberal conservative scholars "no longer appears impossible." But it should be noted that the modern critics have added nothing to the judicious remarks of the third-century patriarch.

The Emperor Valerian, whose accession in 253, did not persecute until 257. In that year St. Cyprian was banished to Curibus, and St. Dionysius to Nepi, in the Marcicots, after being tried, together with one priest and two deacons, before Emilius, the prefect of Egypt. He himself relates the facts in his letter to the prefect, writing to defend himself against a certain Germanus, who had granted him permission to make this disgraceful flight. Cyprian suffered in 258, but Dionysius was spared, and returned to Alexandria directly toleration was decreed by Gallienus in 260. But not to peace, for in 261-2 the city was in a state of tumult little less dangerous than a persecution. The great
DIONYSIUS the Pseudo-Areopagitc.—By “Dionysius the Areopagite” is usually understood the judge of the Areopagus who, as related in Acts, xvii, 34, was converted to Christianity by the preaching of St. Paul, and according to Dionysius of Corinth (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., IV, ii, 36, with Athenaeus, xvi, 465 B), was the first Bishop of Athens. Some time, however, two errors of far-reaching importance arose in connexion with this name. In the first place, a series of famous writings of a rather peculiar nature was ascribed to the Areopagite and, secondly, he was popularly identified with the holy martyr of Gaul, Dionysius (of Paris), the first Bishop of that city. It is not to take up directly the latter point: we shall concern ourselves here (1) with the person of the Pseudo-Areopagite; (2) with the classification, contents, and characteristics of his writings; (3) with their history and transmission; under this head the question as to the genuineness, origin, and gradual spread of these writings will be answered.

Deep obscurity still hovers about the person of the Pseudo-Areopagite. External evidence as to the time and place of his birth, his education, and later occupation is entirely wanting. Our only source of information regarding this problematic personality is the writings themselves. The clues furnished by the first appearance and by the character of the writings enable us to conclude that the author belongs at the very earliest to the latter half of the fifth century, and that, in all probability, he was a native of Syria. His thoughts, ideas, and phrases, have expressed a great familiarity with the works of the neo-Platonists, especially with Plotinus and Proclus. He is also thoroughly versed in the sacred books of the Old and the New Testament, and in the works of the Fathers as far as Cyril of Alexandria.

(Passages from the Areopagite writings are indicated by title and chapter. In this article D. D. N. stands for “De divina nominibus”; C. H. for “Celestis hierarchia”; E. H. for “Ecclesiastica hierarchia”; Th. M. for “Theologia mystica”, which are all found in Migne, P. G., vol. III.) In a letter to Polyarp (Ep. vii; P. G., III, 1050 A) and in “Ciel hier,” 3; P. G., III, 260 D) he intimates that he was formerly a pagan, and this seems quite probable, considering the peculiar character of his literary work.

But one should be more cautious in regard to certain other personal references, for instance that he was the teacher of the first Bishop of Athens, Dionysius wrote to the Church of Antioch on the subject, as he was obliged to decline the invitation to attend a synod there, on the score of his age and infirmities. He died soon afterwards.

St. Dionysius is in the Roman Martyrology on 17 Nov., but he is also intended, with the companions of the Declan mission, by the rubric in the Loisiine Martyrology on 3 Oct.: Dionysius, Faustus, Gaius, Peter, and Paul, Martyrs(). The same error is found in Greek menologies.
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and Mark, xv, 33; the latter refers to apoplyphic descriptions of the "Dormition of Mar." For the same purpose, i.e. to create the impression that the author belonged to the times of the Apostles and that he was acquainted with the Areopagite mentioned in the Acts, the passages are taken from the writings of Clement, Paul, Timothy, Titus, Justus, and Corpus, with whom he is supposed to be on intimate terms, figure in his writings.

The doctrinal attitude of the Pseudo-Areopagite is not clearly defined. A certain vagueness, which was perhaps intended, is characteristic of his Christology, especially in the question concerning the two natures in Christ. We may well surmise that he was not a stranger to the later, and rather modified, form of Monophysitism and that he belonged to that conciliatory group which sought, on the basis of the Henotic issue in 482 by the Emperor Zeno (Evagrius, Hist. Eccl., III, xiv), to reconcile the extremes of orthodoxy and heresy. This reserved, indefinite attitude of the author explains the remarkable fact that opposite factions claimed him as an adherent. As to his social rank, a careful comparison of certain details through his works shows that he belonged to the class of scholars who were known at the time as "schoiastic.

The writings themselves form a collection of four treatises and ten letters. The first treatise, which is also the most important in scope and content, presents in four chapters an exposition of the doctrine of the names. Setting out from the principle that the names of God are to be learned from Scripture only, and that they afford us but an imperfect knowledge of God, Dionysius discusses, among other topics, God's goodness, being, life, wisdom, power, and justice. The one underlying thought of the whole, recurring, so to say, again under different forms and phrases, is: God, the One Being (ο ίδα), transcending all quality and predication, all affirmation and negation, and all intellectual conception, by the very force of His love and goodness gives to beings outside Himself their countless gradations, unites them in the closest bonds (σύνοπλοιο), keeps each by His care and direction in its appointed sphere, and draws them again in an ascending order to Himself (εντοποιήσα). While he illustrates the inner life of the Trinity by metaphors of blossom and light applied to the Second and Third Persons (D. D. N., v, 7 in P. G., III, 712 B), Dionysius' presentation of all created things from God by the exaltation of being in the Godhead (ο ιδα), its outpouring and overflow (D. D. N., i, 9 in P. G., III, 909 C; cf. ii, 10 in P. G., III, 648 C; xii, 10 in P. G., III, 977 B), and as a flashing forth from the sun of the Deity (D. D. N., iv, 6 in P. G., III, 701 B; iv, 1 in P. G., III, 603 B), exactly according to their physical nature created things absorb more or less of the radiated light, which, however, grows weaker the farther it descends (D. D. N., xi, 2 in P. G., III, 592 A; 1 in P. G., III, 588 C). The mighty root sends forth a multitude of plants which, as it were, clasp them. In fact, all these things owe their origin and creation to the All-Ruling Deity (D. D. N., x, 1 in P. G., III, 936 D). Patterned upon the original of Divine love, righteousness, and peace, is the harmony that pervades the universe (D. D. N., chapters iv, viii, xii). All things tend to God, and in Him all are gathered and completed, just as the circle returns into itself (D. D. N., iv, 14 in P. G., III, 712 D), as the radii are joined in the centre, or as the numbers are contained in unity (D. D. N., v, 6 in P. G., III, 589 sq.). These and many similar expressions are given rise to frequent charges of Pantheism against the author. But in reality, he does not assert a necessary emanation of things from God, but admits a free creative act on the part of God (D. D. N., iv, 10 in P. G., III, 708 B; cf. i, iv, 1 in P. G., III, 177 C); still the echo of neo-Platonism is unmistakable.

The same thoughts, or their applications to certain orders of being, recur in his other writings. The second treatise develops in fifteen chapters the doctrine of the celestial hierarchy, comprising nine angelic choirs which are divided into closer groupings of three choirs each (triads). The names of the nine choirs are taken from the books of letters. In the case of the choirs, Paul, Timothy, Titus, Justus, and Corpus, with whom he is supposed to be on intimate terms, figure in his writings.

The third treatise is not continuous, but a continuous discussion of the hierarchical classifications and their purposes, and of the various departments of the Church and the Church, and which pictures Christ as its Head, holy and supreme, Dionysius treats of three sacraments (baptism, the Eucharist, extreme unction), of the three grades of the Teaching Church (bishops, priests, deacons), of three grades of the "Learning Church" (monks, people, and the class composed of catechumens, energumens, and penitents), and, lastly, of the burial of the dead (C. H., iii, 3; 6 in P. G., III, 436 sq.; vi in P. G., III, 529 sq.). The main purpose of the author is to disclose and turn to the uses of contemplation the deeper mystical meaning which underlies the sacred rites, ceremonies, institutions, and symbols. The fourth treatise is entitled "Mystical Theology", and presents in five chapters guiding principles concerning the mystical union with God, which is entirely beyond the compass of sensuous or intellectual perception (πνεύματα). The ten letters, four addressed to a monk, Paus, and six to a priest, Sopater, to the bishop, Polycarp, to a monk, Demophilus, to the bishop, Titus, and to the Apostle John, contain, in part, additional or supplementary remarks on the above-mentioned principal works, and in part, practical hints for dealing with sinners and unbelievers. Since in all these writings the same salient thoughts on philosophy and theology recur with the same striking peculiarities of expression and with manifold references, both formal and matter, from one work to another, the assumption is justified that they are all to be ascribed to the same author. The first appearance in the literary world the entire corpus of these writings was assembled as it is now. An eleventh letter to Apollonius, given in Migne, P. G., III, 1119, is a medieval forgery based on the seventh letter. Apocryphal, also, are a letter to Timothy and a second letter to Titus.

Dionysius would lead us to infer that he is the author of still other learned treatises, namely: "Theological Outlines" (D. D. N., ii, 3 in P. G., III, 640 B); "Sacred Hymns" (C. H., vii, 4 in P. G., III, 212 B); "Symbolic Theology" (C. H., v, 6 in P. G., III, 336 A), and treatises on "The Righteous Judgment of God" (D. D. N., not, 355 B); on "The Soul" (D. D. N., iv, 2 in P. G., III, 706 B); and on "The Objects of Intellect and Sense" (E. H., i, 2 in P. G., III, 373 B). No reliable trace, however, of any of these writings has ever been discovered, and in his references to them Dionysius is not uncontrollable as in
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his citations from Hierotheus. It may be asked if these are not fictions pure and simple, designed to strengthen the belief in the genuineness of the actually published works. This suspicion seems to be more warranted because of other discrepancies, e.g. when Dionysius' letter to Timothy, extols the latter as a "θεοτόκος, ἔξωθεν, ἄνωθεν λόγῳ", nevertheless seeks to instruct him in those sublime secret doctrines that are for bishops only (E. H. I. 5 in P. G. III. 377 A), doctrines, moreover, which, since the cessation of the Disciplina Arcani, had already been veiled public. Dionysius again quotes (D. D. N. III. 2 in P. G. III. 681 B; cf. E. H. IV. 2 in P. G. III. 476 B) that his writings are intended to serve as catechetical instruction for the newly-baptized. This is evidently another contradiction of his above-mentioned statement.

We may now turn to the history of the pseudo-Dionysian writings. This embraces a period of almost fifteen hundred years, and three distinct turning points in its course have divided it into as many distinct periods: first, the period of the gradual rise and settlement of the writings in Christian literature, dating back from the latter part of the fifth century to the Larraian Council, 449; second, the period of the highest and universally acknowledged authority, both in the Western and Eastern Church, lasting till the beginning of the fiftieth century; third, the period of a continual clash waged about their authenticity, begun by Laurencius Valla, and closing only within recent years. The writings were for fifteen years supposed to have made their first appearance, or rather to have been first noticed by Christian writers, in a few pseudo-epigraphical works which have now been proved to be the products of a much later period; as, for instance, in the following: Pseudo-Origenes, "Homilia in diversa sexa"; Pseudo-Athanasius, "Areopagite Antiochus duces", VII. vili; Pseudo-Hippolytus, against the heretic Beron; Pseudo-Chrysostom, "Sermon de pseudo-prophetis". Until quite recently more credence was given to other lines of evidence on which Franz Hippel endeavoured to support his entirely new thesis, to the effect that the author of the writings lived about the year 375 in Egypt, as Abbot of Rhinokorura. Hippel's attempts, however, at removing the textual difficulties, ἀλληλογραφία, εὔμνημα, proved to be unsuccessful. In fact, those very passages in which Hippel supposed that the Patristics had made use of the Areopagite (e.g. in Gregory of Nazianzus and Jerome) do not tell in favour of his hypothesis; on the contrary, they are much better explained if the converse be assumed, namely, that Pseudo-Dionysius drew from them. Hippel himself, convinced by the results of recent research, has abandoned this opinion. Other events also, both historical and literary, evidently exerted a marked influence on the Areopagite: (1) the Council of Chaledon (451), the Christological terminology of which was studiously followed by Dionysius; (2) the writings of the neo-Platonist Proclus (411-486), from whom Dionysius borrowed most of his ideas, chiefly as to the purpose of the Areopagite; (3) his introduction of the Credo into the liturgy of the Mass, which is alluded to in the "Ecclesiastical Hierarchies" (III. 2, in P. G. III. 425 C, and III. 7, in P. G. III. 430 C); cf. the explanation of Maximus in "the Proconsul", in his letter to Timonius of the Emperor Zeno (482), a formula of union designed for the bishops, clerics, monks, and faithful of the Orient, as a compromise between Monophysitism and orthodoxy. Both in spirit and tendency the Areopagite correspondence fully to the sense of the Henotic; and one might easily infer that they not only originated in the Orient, but that they were made further the purpose of the Henotic.

The result of the foregoing is that the first appearance of the pseudo-epigraphical writings cannot be placed earlier than the latter half, in fact at the close, of the fifth century.

Having ascertained a terminus post quem, it is possible by means of evidence taken from Dionysius himself to fix a terminus ante quem, thus narrowing to about thirty years the period within which these writings must have originated. The earliest reliable citations from the writings of Dionysius are from the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century. The first is by Severus, the head of a party of moderate Monophysitism named after him, and Patriarch of Antioch (512-518). In a letter addressed to a certain abbot, John (Mai, Script. vet. nov. coll. VII. 1, 71), he quotes in proof of his doctrine of the μνήμη τῶν ἁρμάτων in Christ the Dionysian Ep. iv (P. G. III. 1072 C), where a καὶ τινὰς βασιλείας ἐντύνεται is mentioned. Again, in the treatise "Adversus anathem. Juliani Halicarn." (Cod. Syr. Vet. 140, fol. 100 b), Severus cites a passage from D. D. N. ii. 9, P. G. III. 648 A (καὶ ἤτοι τὸ άγάλημα_οίσιν διακατορρέοντο, and returns once more to Ep. iv. In the Syrian "History of the Church" of Zacharias (ed. Ahrens-Krüger, 134-5) it is related that Severus, a man well-versed in the writings of Dionysius (Areop.), was present at the Synod of Tyre (513). Andreas, Bishop of Cessarea in Cappadocia, wrote (about 520) a commentary on the Apostle Paul, wherein he confines the period of the Areopagite four times and makes use of at least three of his works (Migne, P. G. CVI. 257, 305, 356, 780; cf. Diekamp in "Hist. Jahrb." XVIII, 1897, pp. 1-36). Like Severus, Zacharias Rhetor and, in all probability, also Andreas of Cappadoxes, inclined to Monophysitism (Diekamp, vii. 228, 230), was accustomed to quote the Areopagite as authority for the orthodox teaching (P. G. III. 795). So also Ephrem, Archbishop of Antioch (357-374), interprets in a right sense the well-known passage from D. D. N. i. 4, P. G. III. 529 A: "ἀπὸ πάντοτο Ἱεροσολύμων συνετεχθέν, δι' ἑξισορροπίαν καὶ συνετοῦσα σωτηρία αυτοῦ. Between the years 352-358, if not earlier, John of Scythopolis in Palestine wrote an interpretation of Dionysianus (Pitina, "Anakletus", 1901, 257, 270 sqq.) from an anti-Syrian standpoint. In Leontius of Byzantium (485-548) we have another important witness. This eminent champion of Catho- lice doctrine in at least four passages of his works builds on the μνήμη Δαυίδos (P. G. LXXV, 1213 A; 1288 C; 1304 D; Canisius-Basnage, "Thesaur. monum. eccles.", Antwerp, 1725, I. 571). Sergius of Resina in Mesopotamia, archiater and presbyter (d. 536), at an early date translated the works of Dionysius into Syriac. He admitted their genuineness, and for his defence also translated into Syriac the already current "Apologies" (Brit. Mus. cod. add. 1251 and 22370; cf. Zacharias Rhetor in Ahrens-Krüger, p. 208). He himself was a Monophysite.

By far the most important document in the case is the report given by Bishop Maximus of Moravia of the religious debate held at Constantinople in 533 between seven orthodox and seven Severian speakers (Har- douin, II. 1159 sqq.). The former had as leader and spokesman Hypatius, Bishop of Ephesus, who was thoroughly versed in the literature of the subject. On the second day the "Orientalis" (Severians) accused against the Council of Chaledon, that it had by a novel and erroneous expression **συνέτοσσα** three natures in Christ. Besides Cyril of Alexandria, Athanasius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Felix and Julius of Rome, they also quoted Dionysius the Areopagite as an exponent of the doctrine of one nature. Hypatius re-
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over to the Latin literature, is Liberatus of Carthage (Breviarium cause Nestor, et Eutych, ch. vi). Joanna Maladas, of Antioch, who died about 545, narrates, in his "Universal Chronicle", the conversion of the judge of the Areopagus through St. Paul (Acts, xvi, 32-34), and praises his inner spiritual life as a spiritual and antagonist of the Greeks (P. G., XVII, 381; cf. Krumbaher, Gesch. d. Byz. Lit., 3rd ed., p. 112 sq.). Another champion was Theodore, presbyter. Though it is difficult to locate his chronologically, he was, according to Le Nourry (P. G., III, 496), an "auctor antiquus" who flourished, at all events, before the Lateran Council in 649 and, as we learn from Photius (P. G., cIII, 44 sq.), undertook to defend the genuineness of the Areopagic writings. The repute, moreover, of these writings was enhanced in a marked degree by the following eminent churchmen: Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria (580-607), knew and quoted, among others, the D. D. N., viii, 2; verbatim (P. G., cIII, 1061; cf. Der Katholik, 1807, II, p. 95 sq.). From Eulogius we naturally pass to Pope Gregory the Great, with whom he enjoyed a close and honourable friendship. Gregory the Great (590-604), residing finally on Lake Trasimene, the thirty-four years of his pontificate, states we have been all the more valuable. Hereupon the Severians dropped this objection and turned to another.

The fact must, indeed, appear remarkable that these writings, though rejected outright by such an authority as Hesychius, were within little more than a century looked upon as genuine by Catholics, so that they could be used against the heretics during the Lateran Council in 649 (Hardouin, III, 600 sq.). How had this revision been brought about? As the following group will show, it was chiefly heterodox writers. Monophysites, Nestorians, and Monothelites, who during several decades appealed to the Areopagitica. But among Catholics also there were not a few who assumed the genuineness, and as some of these were persons of consequence, the way was gradually paved for the authorization of his writings in the above-mentioned council. To the group of Monophysites belonged: Thinform, deacon in Alexandria about 557 (Hardouin, III, 784, 883 sq., 1240 sq.); Cuthbert of Alexandria, about 540 (Hefele, LXXVI, 788, 813, 848); John Philoponus, an Alexandrian grammairian, about 546-549 (W. Reichardt, "Philoponus, de opificio mundi"); Petrus Callinicus, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, in the latter half of the sixth century, cited Dionysius in his polemic against the Patriarch Damascius of Alexandria (II, xii and xlvii; cf. Frothingham, op. cit., after Cod. Syr. Vat., 108, f. 282 sqq.). As examples of the Nestorian group may be mentioned Joseph Huzaja, a Syrian monk, teacher about 360 at the school of Nisibis (Assenmacher, Bibli. orient., vol. III, pt. I, p. 183) also Ischoreb, ca. 560 (Hardouin, III, 680 sqq.); Procopius "Buch der Synodien", p. 229 sqq.; and John of Apamea, a monk in one of the monasteries situated on the Orontes, belonging most probably to the sixth century (Cod. Syr. Vat., 34). The heads of the Monothelites, Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople (610-638), Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria (630-641), Porphyrion, the successor of Cyrus in Constantinople (630-641), took as the starting point in their heresy the fourth letter of Dionysius to Caius, wherein they altered the oft-quoted formula, θεοσθεοσθεος into μια θεοσθεοσθεος.

To glance briefly at the Catholic group we find in the "Historia Euthymii", written about the middle of the sixth century, a passage taken, according to a citation of John Damascene (P. G., XCVI, 748), from D. D. N., i, 2, P. G., III, 682 D. παραθές δι’-εταρτοις.

Another witness, who at the same time lends his approbation to all these citations, and showed that Cyril never made the slightest use of them, though on various occasions they would have served his purpose admirably. He suspects that these falsifiers are Apollinarists. When the Severians rejoined that they could point out the philosophical writings of Cyril which the Donatists and Theodore the use made of such evidence, Hesychius persisted in the stand he had taken: "sed nunc videtur quoniam et in illis libris [Cylliri] heretici falsantes addiderunt eam.

The references to the archives at Alexandria had just as little weight with him, since Alexandria, with its libraries, had long been in the hands of the heretics. How could an interested party of the opposition be introduced as a witness? Hesychius refers again especially to Dionysius and successfully puts down the opposition: "illa enim testimonia quae vos Dionysii Areopagitis dicitis, unde potestis ostendere vera esse, sicut sparscimini? Si enim eius erat, non potes sine latere beatum Cyrillum. Quod autem de beato Cyrillo dico, quando et beatus Athanasius, si pro certo separent eius fuisset, ante omnin in Niceno concilio de consubstantiali Trinitate eadem testimonia protulisset adversus Aril diversa substantiae philosophiae. Indeed, as the last forty years of the life of the Father and the Son the Areopagitica has statements that leave no room for misinterpretation; and had these come from a disciple of the Apostles, they would have been all the more valuable. Hereupon the Severians dropped this objection and turned to another.

The fact must, indeed, appear remarkable that these writings, though rejected outright by such an authority as Hesychius, were within little more than a century looked upon as genuine by Catholics, so that they could be used against the heretics during the Lateran Council in 649 (Hardouin, III, 600 sq.). How had this revision been brought about? As the following group will show, it was chiefly heterodox writers. Monophysites, Nestorians, and Monothelites, who during several decades appealed to the Areopagitica. But among Catholics also there were not a few who assumed the genuineness, and as some of these were persons of consequence, the way was gradually paved for the authorization of his writings in the above-mentioned council. To the group of Monophysites belonged: Thinform, deacon in Alexandria about 557 (Hardouin, III, 784, 883 sq., 1240 sq.); Cuthbert of Alexandria, about 540 (Hefele, LXXVI, 788, 813, 848); John Philoponus, an Alexandrian grammairian, about 546-549 (W. Reichardt, "Philoponus, de opificio mundi"); Petrus Callinicus, Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, in the latter half of the sixth century, cited Dionysius in his polemic against the Patriarch Damascius of Alexandria (II, xii and xlvii; cf. Frothingham, op. cit., after Cod. Syr. Vat., 108, f. 282 sqq.). As examples of the Nestorian group may be mentioned Joseph Huzaja, a Syrian monk, teacher about 360 at the school of Nisibis (Assenmacher, Bibli. orient., vol. III, pt. I, p. 183) also Ischoreb, ca. 560 (Hardouin, III, 680 sqq.); Procopius "Buch der Synodien", p. 229 sqq.; and John of Apamea, a monk in one of the monasteries situated on the Orontes, belonging most probably to the sixth century (Cod. Syr. Vat., 34). The heads of the Monothelites, Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople (610-638), Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria (630-641), Porphyrion, the successor of Cyrus in Constantinople (630-641), took as the starting point in their heresy the fourth letter of Dionysius to Caius, wherein they altered the oft-quoted formula, θεοσθεοσθεος into μια θεοσθεοσθεος.

To glance briefly at the Catholic group we find in the "Historia Euthymii", written about the middle of the sixth century, a passage taken, according to a citation of John Damascene (P. G., XCVI, 748), from D. D. N., i, 2, P. G., III, 682 D. παραθές δι’-εταρτοις.

Another witness, who at the same time lends
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authorization of the Areopagitics. A lover of theologico-mystical speculation, he showed an uncommon reverence for these writings, and by his glosses (P. G., IV), in which he explained dubious passages of Dionysius, in the orthodox sense, he contributed greatly towards the recognition of Dionysius in the Middle Ages. Another equally indefatigable champion of Dyonysianism was Anastasius, a monk from the monastery of Sinai, who in 640 began his chequered career as a wandering preacher. Not only in his “Guide” (μέτρητον), but also in the “Questions” and in the seventh book of the “Meditations on the Holy Apocalypse,” he unhesitatingly makes use of different passages from Dionysius (P. G., LXXXIX). By this time a point had been reached at which the official seal, so to speak, could be put upon the Dionysian writings. The Lateran Council of 649 solemnly rejected the Monothelite heresy (Hardouin, III, 609 sqq.). Pope Martin I quotes from the D. D. N., ii, 9; iv, 20 and 23; and the “Ep. ad Caecum”; speaks of the author as “beata memoria Dionysii,” “Dionysii egregius, sanctus, beatus,” and vigorously objects to the perversion of the text: una instead of mona dei et hominum. The influence which Maximus exerted by his personal appearance at the council and by his above-mentioned explanation of θεου τού παρθένου εἰκονος is easily recognized (“Dionysius duplicem [operationem] duplicae naturae compositivo sermone abusus est.” Hardouin, III, 787). Two of the testimonies of the Fathers which were read in this session are taken from Dionysius. Little wonder, then, that from thenceforth no doubt was expressed concerning the genuineness of the Areopagitics. Pope Agatho, in a dogmatic epistle directed to the Emperor Constantine (680) cites among other passages from the Fathers on the D. D. N., ii, 6. The Sixth Ecumenical Council of Constantineople (680) followed in the footsteps of the Lateran Synod, again defended “Ep. iv ad. Caecum” against the falsification of Pyrrhus, and rejected the meaning which the Monothelite Patriarch Macarius assigned to the passage (Hardouin, III, 1090, 1346, 1086). In the second Council of Nicaea (787) we find the “Celestial Hierarchy” of “dei firmon Dionysii” cited against the Iconoelasts (Hardouin, IV, 362). This finishes the first and darkest period in the history of the Areopagitics; and it may be summarized as follows. The Dyonysian writings appeared at the right time in the Monophysite controversies. The Severians made use of them first and were followed by the orthodox. After the religious debate at Constantinople in 533 witnesses for the genuineness of the Areopagitics began to increase among the different heretics. Despite the opposition of Hypatius, Dionysius did not altogether lose his authority even among Catholics, which was due chiefly to Leontius and Ephrem of Antioch. The number of orthodox Christians who defended him grew steadily, comprising high ecclesiastical dignitaries who had come from monasteries. Finally under the influence of Maximus. The Sixth Ecumenical Council (649) cited him as a competent witness against Monothelism.

As to the second period, universal recognition of the Areopagitic writings in the Middle Ages, we need not mourn the Greek Church, which is especially proud of him; but neither in the West was a voice raised in challenge down to the first half of the fifteenth century; on the contrary, his works were regarded as exceedingly valuable and even as sacred. It was believed that St. Paul, who had communicated his revelations to St. Peter in Athens, spoke through these writings (Histor. Blätter, CXXV, 1900, p. 541). As there is no doubt concerning the fact itself, a glance at the main divisions of the tradition may suffice. Rome received the original text of the Areopagita undoubtedly through Greek monks. The oppressions on the part of Islam during the sixth and seventh centuries compelled many Greek and Oriental monks to abandon their homes and settle in Italy. In Rome itself, a monastery for Greek monks was built under Stephen II and Paul I. It was also Paul I (757-767) who in 757 sent the writings of Dionysius, together with other books, to Pepin in France. Adrian I (772-795) also mentioned Dionysius as a testis praedicatarius in a letter accompanying the Latin translation of the Acts of the Nicanor Council (787) which he sent to Charlemagne. During the first half of the ninth century the facts concerning Dionysius are mainly grouped around the Abbé Hildegard of Saint-Denis at Paris. Through the latter the false idea that the Gallic martyr Dionysius of the third century, whose relics were preserved in the monastery of Saint-Denis, was identical with the Areopagite rose to an undoubted certainty, while the works ascribed to Dionysius gained in repute.

Through a legation from Constantinople, Michael II had sent several gifts to the Frankish Emperor Louis the Pious (827), and among them were the writings of the Areopagite, which gave particular joy and honour to Hildegard, the influential arch-chaplain of Louis. Hildegard knew well to have them translated into Latin and he himself wrote a life of the saint (P. L., CVI, 13 sq.). About the year 900 the works of Dionysius, translated into Greek, made a new Latin translation of the Areopagite, which became the main source from which the Middle Ages obtained a knowledge of Dionysius and his doctrines. The work was undertaken at the instance of Charlemagne, who sent to Matthaeus Scotus and enjoyed great influence (P. L., CXXII, 1026 sq.; cf. Traube, “Poet. lat. av. Carol.”, II, 520, 859 sq.). Compared with Hildegard’s, this second translation marks a decided step in advance. Scotus, with his keen dialectical skill and his soaring speculative mind, found in the Areopagite a kindred mind. Despite many errors of translation due to the obscurity of the Greek original, he was able to grasp the connections of thought and to penetrate the problems. As he accompanied his translations with explanatory notes and as, in his philosophical and theological writings, particularly in the work “De divisione naturae” (P. L., CXXII), he recurs again and again to Dionysius, it is readily seen how much he did towards securing recognition for the Areopagite.

The works of Dionysius, thus introduced into Western literature, were readily accepted by the medieval Scholastics. The great masters of the thirteenth century, in particular those of Paris, foremost among them the much-admired Hugh, based their teaching on the doctrine of Dionysius. Peter Lombard and the greatest Dominican and Franciscan scholars, Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, adopted his theses and arguments. Master poets, e.g. Dante, and historians, e.g. Otto of Freising, built on his foundations. Scholars as renowned as Robert Grosseteste of Lincoln and Vincent of Beauvais drew upon him freely. Popular religious books, such as the “Legenda aurea” of Giacomo da Varagine and the “Life of Mary” by Brother Philip, gave him a cordial welcome. The great mystics, Eckhart, Tauler, Suso, and others, entered the mysterious obscurity of the writings of Dionysius with a holy reverence. In rapid succession there appeared a number of translations: Latin translation by Johannes Sacramenius (1170), Robert de Grosseteste (about 1220), Thomas Vincentinus (1400), Ambrosius Camaldulensis (1436), Marsilius Feicinus (1492); in the sixteenth century those of Faber Stapulensis, Periornius, etc. Among others, St. Thomas of Aquin, Thomas of the Carthusian for its pious spirit and its masterly inclusion of all previous commentators.

It was reserved for the period of the Renaissance to break with the time-honoured tradition. True, some of the older Humanists, as Pico della Mirandola, Mar-
silius Ficinus, and the Englishman John Colet, were still convinced of the genuineness of the writings; but the keen and daring critic, Laurentius Valla (1407–1457), in his glosses to the New Testament, expressed his doubts quite openly and thereby gave the impulse, at first for the scholars, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in the entire scientific world, to take sides either with or against Dionysius. The consequence was the formation of two camps; among the adversaries were not only Protestants (Luther, Scolatus, Dalleus, etc.), but also prominent Catholic theologians (Beatus Rhenanus, Cajetan, Morinus, Sirentius, etc., and among the defenders of Dionysius were Baronius, Bellarmine, Lancelus, Corderius, Balloix, Delrio, de Rubeis, Lessius, Alexander Natalis, and others. The literary controversy assumed such dimensions and was carried on so vehemently that it can only be compared to the dispute concerning the Pseudo-Isidorian decrets and the Pseudo-Constantian donation. In the nineteenth century the general opinion inclined more and more towards the opposition; the Germans especially, Möller, Fessler, Dollinger, Hagenröther, Alzog, Fink, and others made no reserve of their denunciation of the authenticity of Dionysius. But professor Franz Hippler came forward and attempted to save the honour of Dionysius. He finds in Dionysius not a falsifier, but a prominent theologian of the fourth century who, through no fault of his own, but owing to the misinterpretation of some passages, caused the Aequiparte to be confused with the Areopagit. Many Catholic theologians and many Protestants as well, voiced their approval. Finally, in 1895 there appeared almost simultaneously two independent researches, by Hugo Koch and by Joseph Stiglmayr, both of whom started from the same point and arrived at the same goal. The conclusion reached was that extracted from the treatise of the neo-Platonist Proclus, "De malorum subsistentiis" (handed down in the Latin translation of Morbeka, Cousin ed., Paris, 1864), had been used by Dionysius in the treatise "De div. nom." (c. § 19–35). A careful analysis brought to light an astonishing agreement of both works in arrangement, sequence of thought, examples, figures, and expressions. It is easy to point out many parallelisms from other and later writings of Proclus, e. g. from his "Institutio theologica", "Theologia Platonica" and his commentary on Plato's "Parmenides", "Adeabades I", and "Timæus" (these five treatises were written after 462).

Accordingly, the long-standing problem seems to be solved in its most important phase. As a matter of fact this is the decision pronounced by the most competent judges, such as Bardenhewer, Ehrhard, Funk, Lehmann, Ritschl, Risse, J. J. Duchesne, Batifol; and the Protestant scholars of early Christian literature, Geiler, Harnack, Krüger, Bonnewitz. The chronology being thus determined, an explanation was readily found for the various objections hitherto alleged, viz. the silence of the earlier Fathers, the later dogmatic terminology, a developed monastic, ceremonial, and penitential system, the echo of neo-Platonicism, etc. On the other hand it sets at rest many hypotheses which had been advanced concerning the author and his times and various discussions—whether, e. g., a certain Apollinaris, or Syncellus, or Dionysius Alexandriaeus, or a bishop of Æthiopis, or a pagan hierophant was the writer.

A critical edition of the text of the Areopagit is urgently needed. The Justinian (1516), that of Basle (1589), of Paris (1602 and 1615), and lastly the principal edition of Antwerp (1654) by Corderius, S.J., who was frequently reprinted (Paris, 1654) and was included in the Migne collection (P.G., III and IV with Lat. trans. and additions), are insufficient because they make use of only a few of the numerous Greek manuscripts and take no account of the Syriac, Armenian, and Arabic translations. The following translations have thus far appeared in modern languages: English, by Lupton (London, 1869) and Parker (London, 1894), both of which contain only the "Caeciliae" and the "Eccles. Hier."; German, by Engelhardt (Sulzbach, 1823) and Storr, "Kirchliche Hierarchie" (Kempten, 1877); French, by Darboy (Paris, 1844) and lastly for the theological literature, by Ficinus, "De decr. pagani" (Mainz, 1495).


JOSEPH STIGLMAYR.
Dioscurus, Bishop of Alexandria (also written Dioxorus; Dioscorus from the analogy of Dioscori), date of birth unknown; d. at Gangra, in Asia Minor, 11 Sept., 434. He had been archdeacon under St. Cyril, whom he succeeded in 444. Soon afterwards Theodosius II had been converted to the orthodox faith, and Dioscurus, since 433, wrote him a polemic letter, in which he speaks of the report of Dioscurus's virtues and his modesty. In such a letter no contrary report would be mentioned, and we cannot infer much from these vague expressions. The peace established between John of Antioch and Cyril seems to have continued between their successors until 418, when Domnus, the successor and nephew of John, had to judge the case of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, who was accused of heresy and many crimes by the Cyrilian party. Domnus acquitted Ibas. The Cyrilian monks of Osrhoene were furious, and betook themselves to Dioscurus as their natural protector. Dioscurus wrote to Domnus, complaining that he championed the Nestorian Ibas and Theodoret. Domnus and Theodoret both replied defending themselves, and showing their perfect orthodoxy. The accusers of Ibas went to the court at Constantinople, where the feeble Theodosius II was only too ready to listen to an expression of ecclesiastical quarrels. For this purpose they got him the Cyrilians obtained a decree against the Nestorians, and in particular against Irenaeus, who had befriended the Nestorians at the Council of Ephesus, where he was in authority as imperial representative; he was now deposed from the Bishopric of Tyre which he had accepted. Theodoret was forbidden to leave his Diocese of Cyprus. In September a new Bishop of Tyre was appointed, and the Patriarch Domnus, feeling that Dioscurus was about to triumph, wrote to Flavian of Constantinople in order to get his support. Alexandria had of old been the first see of the East and was now only surpassed in power by Constantinople. The Egyptian patriarch had vast civil and political influence, as well as an almost autocratic sway over a hundred bishops and a great army of monks, who were heart and soul devoted to the memory of Cyril, and rather fervent than discriminating in their orthodoxy. Constantinople had been granted the next dignity after Rome by the great Council of 381, and this humiliation of Alexandria had embittered the long-standing rivalry between the two sees. Antioch had always tended to support Constantinople, and Domnus was now ready to grant precedence to Flavian. Dioscurus, he said, knew that he, Domnus, was betraying the rights of Antioch and Alexandria in admitting the canon of 381, which had never been accepted by Alexandria or Rome. But Flavian was not a helpful ally, for he had neglected to obtain the favour of the emirchryssaphus, who was all-powerful at court. An unforeseen incident was now to set the world on a blaze. At a council held by Flavian in November of the same year, 418, Eusebius of Dorylaeum accused the archimandrite Eutyches of teaching one nature only in Christ. He was treated with all consideration, but his obstinacy made it unavoidable that he should be deposed and excommunicated. Now Eutyches was godfather to Chrysaphus, and “one nature” was precisely the unfortunate expression of St. Cyril, which his followers were already interpreting in a heretical sense. Eutyches was therefore at once banished to the province of Upper Syria. Being excommunicated by the Archimandrite and exiled, he had given his name to the Monophysite heresy, into which the whole Cyrilian party now plunged once for all.

The Cyrilians were further incensed by the failure of the scheme to attempt to contact Ibas. The emperor procured an order from the emperor, 25 Oct., 448, for a fresh trial. The bishops who met for this purpose at Tyre in Feb., 449, were obliged by the violence of the Eastern monks to transfer some of their sittings to Berytus. At the end of the month Ibas was excommunicated, though the emperor was known to be against him. Dioscurus and his party replied by an unexpected stroke; in March they induced the emperor to issue an invitation to all the greater bishops to attend with their suffragans a general council to be held at Ephesus in August. It was indeed unreasonable to desire any permanent settlement of existing contention, and they hoped to hinder the Emperor Leo I, warmly accepted the emperor's proposition, or rather order. Eutyches had written to him, pretending that he had appealed at the time of his condemnation, and promising to abide by his judgment. He wrote also to other bishops, and we still possessed by the Emperor Peter Chrysologus, Bishop of Ravenna, where the court of Valentinian III, the Western emperor, had its head-quarters. St. Peter tells him to await the decision of the pope, who alone can judge a case concerning the Faith. St. Leo at first complained that the matter had not at once been referred to him, then, on finding that a full account sent by St. Flavian had been accidently delayed, wrote a compendious explanation of the whole doctrine involved, and sent it to St. Flavian as a formal and authoritative decision of the question. He reproves Flavian's council for want of due respect to the Pope, and adds that the archimandrite may be restored if he repent. This letter, the most famous of all Christian antiquity, is known as “St. Leo's Tome.” He sent as legates to the council a bishop named Julius, a priest, Renatus (he died on the way), and the deacon Hilarius, afterwards pope. St. Leo expresses his regret that the shortness of the notice must prevent the presence of any other bishop of the West. It is probable that this difficulty had been anticipated by Dioscurus, who had answered an appeal from Eutyches, who had apparently been excommunicated by the emperor, and had received an appeal from Eutyches, who had apparently been excommunicated by the emperor. As his predecessor Peter had appointed a bishop for Constantinople, and as Theophilus had judged St. Chrysostom, so Dioscurus, with the air of a superior, actually declared Eutyches absolved and restored. In April Eutyches obtained a slight revision of the Acts of the council which had condemned him. In the same month the case of Ibas was again examined, by the emperor's order, this time at Edessa itself, and by a lay inquisitor, Chereas, the Governor of Osrhoene. The people received him with shouts of joy. No defence was heard. On the arrival of Chereas's report, which was already completed by the Emperor, it was decided to quiet down the matter by the presence of Ibas's most furious accuser, the monk Bar Tsouma (Barsumas), and other monks at the approaching council. In all this we see the influence of Dioscurus dominant. In March Theodosius had prohibited Theodoret from coming to the council. On 6 August he shows some fear that his order may be disregarded, in a letter in which he constitutes Dioscurus president of the synod.

The council met at Ephesus on 8 Aug., 449. It was to have been ecumenical in authority, but it was disturbed by Leo, a presbyter, and “The Robber Council” has been its title ever since. A full history of it would be out of place here (see Ephesus, Robber Council of). It is only necessary to say that the assembly was wholly dominated by Dioscurus. Flavian was not allowed to sit as a bishop, but was only to be a presbyter. Bishop of Ephesus. When St. Eutyches, Bishop of Ephesus, attempted to give Communion to Flavian's clergy, he was attacked by soldiers and monks of Eutyches, 300 in number, who cried out that Stephen was the enemy of the emperor, since he received the emperor's enemies. Eutyches was admitted to defend himself, but the emperor heard only so much of the report of the council which had condemned him were read in full. Not content with restoring Eutyches, Dioscurus proceeded to the deposition of Flavian. This bold measure could only be carried by terrorism. The soldiers and monks were brought into the council, and many
bishops were forced to sign a blank paper. The papal legate Hilarus uttered the protest Contra dictum, and saved himself by flight. Flavian and Eusebius of Doryleum (q. v.) appealed to the pope, and their letters, only lately discovered, were probably taken by Hilarus. The majority of the bishops, however, did not agree. St. Flavian was thrown into prison, and died in three days of the blows and ill usage he had received. The bishops who were present gave their testimony, when the Acts were publicly read at the Council of Chalcedon, to the violence used at Ephesus. No doubt they exaggerated somewhat, in order to procure their base compliance. But there were too many witnesses to allow them to falsify the whole affair; and we have also the witness of the letters of Hilarus, of Eusebius, and of Flavian, and the martyrology of the latter, to confirm the charges against Dioscurus.

No more was read at Chalcedon of the Acts. But at this point begin the Syriac Acts of the Robber Council, which tell us of the carrying out by Dioscurus of a thoroughgoing but short-sighted policy. The papal legates came no more to the council, and Domnus excused himself through illness. A few other bishops were now or escaped, from the original 128, and some nine new-comers raised the total to 110. The deposition of Ibas was voted with cries, such as "Let him be burnt in the midst of Antioch." The accused was not present, and no witnesses for the defence were heard. Daniel, Bishop of Heliopolis, was the only bishop of Ibas, was degraded. The ban of Tyre, already depoised, was anathematized. Then it was the turn of the leaders of the Antiochene party. Ibas had been accused of immorality and a misuse of ecclesiastical property, as well as of heresy: no such charges could be made against the great Theodoret; his character was unblemished, and his orthodoxy had been admitted by St. Cyril himself. Nevertheless his earlier writings, in which he had ineptly and with incorrect expressions attacked St. Cyril and defended Nestorius, were now raked up against him. None ventured to dissent from the sentence of deposition pronounced by Dioscurus, which ordered his writings to be burnt. If we may believe the Acts, Domnus, from his bed of real or feigned sickness, gave a general assent to all that the council had done. But this could not save him from the accusation of favouring Nestorians. He was deposed without a word of defence, and a new patriarch, Maximus, was set up in his place.

So ended the council. Dioscurus proceeded to Constantinople, and there made his own secretary, Anatolius, bishop of the city. One foe remained. Dioscurus had avoided reading the pope's letter to the Council of Ephesus, though he promised more than once to do so. He evidently could not then venture to contest the pope's ruling as to the Faith. But now, with his own creatures on the thrones of Antioch and Constantinople, and sure of the support of Chrysaphius, he stopped at Nicaea, and with ten bishops included an interdict against St. Leo himself. It would be vain to attribute all these acts to the desire of his own aggrandizement. Political motives could not have led him so far. He must have known that in attacking the pope he could have no help from the bishops of the West or from the Western emperor. It is clear that he was genuinely infuriated with his heresy, and was fighting in its interests with all his might.

The pope, on hearing the report of Hilarus, immediately annulled the Acts of the council, abjured all those whom it had excommunicated, and excommuni cated them. The father of the second emperor had taken part in it. He wrote to Theodosius II insisting on the necessity of a council to be held in Italy, under his own direction. The emperor, with the obstinacy of a weak man, supported the council, and paid no attention to the intervention of his sister, St. Pulcheria, nor to that of his colleague, Valentinian III, who, with his mother Galla Placidia, and his wife, the daughter of Theodosius, wrote to him at St. Leo's suggestion. The reasons given to the pope by Theodosius for his conduct are unknown, for his letters to Leo are lost. In June of July, 450, he died, falling from a horse on a journey to the diocese of Antioch. The pope succeeded by his sister Pulcheria, who took for her colleague and nominal husband the excellent general Marcian. St. Leo, now sure of the support of the rulers of the East, declared a council unnecessary; many bishops had already signed his Tome, and the excommunicands would do without difficulties. But the new emperor had already taken steps to carry out the pope's wishes, by a council not indeed in Italy, which was outside his jurisdiction, but in the immediate neighbourhood of Constantinople, where he could himself watch its proceedings and ensure its orthodoxy. St. Leo therefore agreed, and sent legates who this time were to preside.

The council, in the intention of both pope and emperor, was to accept and enforce the definition given long since from Rome. Anastolus was ready enough to please the emperor by signing the Tome; and at Pulcheria's request, he gave 101 out of 110, save St. Leo. The latter permitted the restoration to communion of those bishops who repented their conduct at the Robber Council, with the exception of Dioscurus and of the leaders of that synod, whose case he first reserved to the Apostolic See, and then committed to the council. The emperor ordered six hundred bishops made it the largest of ancient councils (see CHALCEDON, ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF). The papal legates presided, supported by lay commissioners appointed by the emperor, who were in practice the real presidents, since the legates did not speak for the bishops. The first point raised was the position of Dioscurus. He had taken his seat, but the legates objected that he was on his trial. The commissioners asked for the charge against him to be formulated, and it was replied that he had held a council without the permission of the Apostolic See, a thing which had never been permitted. This statement was difficult to explain, before the discovery of the Syriac Acts; but we now know that Dioscurus had continued his would-be general council for many sessions after the papal legates had taken their departure. The commissioners ordered him to sit in the midst as accused. The sentence in this passage of the Acts is wrongly translated in the old Latin version; this was care lessly followed by Hefele, who thus led Bright into the error of supposing that the commissioners addressed to the legates a rebuke they meant in reality for Dioscurus.) The Alexandrian patriarch was now as much deserted by his own party as his victims had been deserted at Ephesus by their natural defenders. Some sixty bishops, Egyptian, Palestinian, and Illy rian, were on his side, but were afraid to say a word in his defence, though they raised a great commotion at the introduction into the assembly of Theodoret, who had been excluded from Leo's council, and who refused to accept it in Ephesus. The Acts of the first session of the Robber Council were read, continually interrupted by the disclaimers of the bishops. The leaders of that council, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassium of Cæsarea, Maximus of Antioch, now declared that Flavian was orthodox; Anatolius had long since gone over to the winning side. Dioscurus alone stood his ground. He had at least no time-server, and he was a convinced heretic. After this session he refused to appear. At the second session (the third, according to the printed texts and Hefele, but the Ballerini are right in inverting the order), the emperor had taken part, and in the case of Dioscurus was continued. Petitions against him from Alexandria were read. In these he was accused of injustice and cruelty to the family of Cyril and of many other crimes, even against the emperor and the State. How much of this was true it is impossible to say, as
Dioscorus refused to appear or to make any defence. The accusations were dropped, and judgment must necessarily go against Dioscorus, if only for contempt of court. The bishops therefore repeatedly demanded that the legates should deliver judgment. Paulus, who came to denote the papal legate, realized the crimes of Dioscorus—he had absolved Eutyches contrary to the canons, even before the council; he was still transubstantiation when others asked for pardon; he had not had the pope’s letter read; he had coexcommunicated the pope; he had been three formally cited and had refused to appear. Therefore the holy and blessed Archbishop of older Rome, Leo, by us and the present most holy council, together with the thrice blessed and praiseworthy Peter the Apostle, who is the rock and base of the Catholic Church and the foundation of the orthodox Faith, has stripped him of the episcopal and of all sacerdotal dignity. Wherefore this most holy and great council will decree that which is in accordance with the canons against the aforesaid Dioscorus. All the bishops signified their agreement in a few words, and then all signed the papal sentence. A short notice of his deposition was sent to Dioscorus. It is this almost word for word from that sent to Nestorius by the Council of Ephesus twenty years before. With the rest of the council—its definition of the Faith imposed upon it by Pope Leo, its rehabilitation of Theodoret and of Ibas, etc.—we have nothing to do. Dioscorus affected to right the transubstantiation, saying that he should not be restored. But the council decreed that he was incapable of restoration, and wrote in this sense to the emperors, reciting his crimes. He was banished to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died three years later. The whole of Egypt revered him as the true representative of the Cyrillic tradition, and from this time forth the Patriarchate of Alexandria was lost to the Church. Dioscorus has been honoured in its as its teacher, and it has remained Eutychian to the present day.

The chief authority for the events which preceded the Robber Council (besides some letters of Theodoret) is the Syriac version of the Acts of that council, published from a codex of 335 in the Brit. Mus.; Secundum Syntomum Ephesinum neum excerpta quod ad rom pertinent ..., Perry ed. (Oxford, 1875); the second Syllaphon of Ephesus, from Syriac MSS., ed. by Perry (Oxford, 1875); German tr. by Bohn (1881), Verhandlungen der Kirchverseammlung zu Ephesos am 22. August CXXIX and XCI (Kiel, 1879); the best dissertation upon it is Martin, Le Pseudo-Synode connu dans l’histoire sous le nom de brandiegage d’Ephes, etude d’apres ses actes, en syriaque (Beitrage zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Rechts, 1877), and with the same in Rev. des Quat. Rel. 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881. Rivington has well noted the mistakes of Bright, but he has fallen into some himself, e.g., when he calls Dioscorus the nephew of St. Cyril or blames him for ignoring the so-called Constantinopolitan Creed.

The appeals of Flavian and Eusebius were first published by Amelain, San Leonis Magni et Ephesini (Rome, 1882), and Monte cassino, 1901, and with other documents in his Syllaphon, Casian. (Montecassino, 1893); also by Mommmen, in Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde, XI (1886). The older historians, who wrote before the discovery of the Syriac Acts, are antiquated as regards Dioscorus, including Befer (but we await the next volume of the new French edition by Leclerc), and Bright, with the exception of his posthumous The Fathers (London, 1869). For more recent literature see Chalcedon; a fragment of a letter of Dioscorus written to the Alexandrians is found in the Antiquities of Nicephorus Phocas, Syllog. Selv., IV, 380. A panegyric on Macarius of Tkhod, preserved in Coptic, is not genuine (published by Amelain, Mommmen), but at the time before the council, for the year 380. A panegyric on the emperor was written by F. N. Chali, Historie de Dioscore, by son disciple Théophile, in Journal Asiatique, IX (1836), i. 244. Coptic Life of the Emperor, 267. A letter to Dioscorus from St. Leo, 21 June, 440. Attmore, in his edition of the Syriac, says that the Bishops of the open, last, point of view, orders all ordinations of priests and deacons to be in the night between Saturday and Sunday, and that on festival days which are after a great concourse, the Sacrament is to be repeated as often as the basilica is filled, that none may be deprived of its devotion.

John Chapman.

Diospolis, Diocese of. See Sebaste.

Diospolis, Synod of. See Pelagianism.

Diplomatics, Papal.—The word "diplomatics," following a Continental usage which long ago found recognition in Mabillon’s De Re Diplomatice, has of late come to denote a papal legate, realizing the crimes of Dioscorus—he had absolved Eutyches contrary to the canons, even before the council; he was still transubstantiation when others asked for pardon; he had not had the pope’s letter read; he had coexcommunicated the pope; he had been three formally cited and had refused to appear. Therefore the holy and blessed Archbishop of older Rome, Leo, by us and the present most holy council, together with the thrice blessed and praiseworthy Peter the Apostle, who is the rock and base of the Catholic Church and the foundation of the orthodox Faith, has stripped him of the episcopal and of all sacerdotal dignity. Wherefore this most holy and great council will decree that which is in accordance with the canons against the aforesaid Dioscorus. All the bishops signified their agreement in a few words, and then all signed the papal sentence. A short notice of his deposition was sent to Dioscorus. It is this almost word for word from that sent to Nestorius by the Council of Ephesus twenty years before. With the rest of the council—its definition of the Faith imposed upon it by Pope Leo, its rehabilitation of Theodoret and of Ibas, etc.—we have nothing to do. Dioscorus affected to right the transubstantiation, saying that he should not be restored. But the council decreed that he was incapable of restoration, and wrote in this sense to the emperors, reciting his crimes. He was banished to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died three years later. The whole of Egypt revered him as the true representative of the Cyrillic tradition, and from this time forth the Patriarchate of Alexandria was lost to the Church. Dioscorus has been honoured in its as its teacher, and it has remained Eutychian to the present day.

The chief authority for the events which preceded the Robber Council (besides some letters of Theodoret) is the Syriac version of the Acts of that council, published from a codex of 355 in the Brit. Mus.; Secundum Syntomum Ephesinum neum excerpta quod ad rom pertinent ..., Perry ed. (Oxford, 1875); the second Syllaphon of Ephesus, from Syriac MSS., ed. by Perry (Oxford, 1875); German tr. by Bohn (1881), Verhandlungen der Kirchverseammlung zu Ephesos am 22. August CXXIX and XCI (Kiel, 1879); the best dissertation upon it is Martin, Le Pseudo-Synode connu dans l’histoire sous le nom de brandiegage d’Ephes, etude d’apres ses actes, en syriaque (Beitrage zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Rechts, 1877), and with the same in Rev. des Quat. Rel. 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881. Rivington has well noted the mistakes of Bright, but he has fallen into some himself, e.g., when he calls Dioscorus the nephew of St. Cyril or blames him for ignoring the so-called Constantinopolitan Creed.

The appeals of Flavian and Eusebius were first published by Amelain, San Leonis Magni et Ephesini (Rome, 1882), and Monte cassino, 1901, and with other documents in his Syllaphon, Casian. (Montecassino, 1893); also by Mommmen, in Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde, XI (1886). The older historians, who wrote before the discovery of the Syriac Acts, are antiquated as regards Dioscorus, including Befer (but we await the next volume of the new French edition by Leclerc), and Bright, with the exception of his posthumous The Fathers (London, 1869). For more recent literature see Chalcedon; a fragment of a letter of Dioscorus written to the Alexandrians is found in the Antiquities of Nicephorus Phocas, Syllog. Selv., IV, 380. A panegyric on Macarius of Tkhod, preserved in Coptic, is not genuine (published by Amelain, Mommmen), but at the time before the council, for the year 380. A panegyric on the emperor was written by F. N. Chali, Historie de Dioscore, by son disciple Théophile, in Journal Asiatique, IX (1836), i. 244. Coptic Life of the Emperor, 267. A letter to Dioscorus from St. Leo, 21 June, 440. Attmore, in his edition of the Syriac, says that the Bishops of the open, last, point of view, orders all ordinations of priests and deacons to be in the night between Saturday and Sunday, and that on festival days which are after a great concourse, the Sacrament is to be repeated as often as the basilica is filled, that none may be deprived of its devotion.

John Chapman.
Dom Ruinart. Seeing, however, that this pioneer work had not extended to any documents later than the thirteenth century and had taken no account of certain classes of papers, such as the ordinary letters of the popes and privileges of a more private character, two distinguished members of the Holy See, Dom Tassin and Dom Vaines, compiled a work in six large quarto volumes, with many facsimiles etc., known as the "Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique" (Paris, 1750-1765), which, though it marks but a small advance on Mabillon's own treatise, has been widely used, and has been presented in a more summary form by Dom Vaines and others.

With the exception of some useful works specially consecrated to particular countries (e.g. Maffei, "Italia diplomaica," Mantua, 1727, unclassified; and Muratori, "De Diplomatibus Antiquis," included in his "Antiquitates Italicae," 1740, vol. III.), as also the treatise of G. Marin on papyri documents (1 papiri diplomatici, Rome, 1805), no great advance was made in the science for a century and a half after Mabillon's death. The "Dictionnaire raisonné de diplomatique chretienne," by M. Quentin, which forms part of Migeon's "Encyclopédie," is a rather unskillful digest of older works, and the small "Eléments de paléographie" of de Wailly (2 vols., 1808) has little independent merit. But within the last fifty years immense progress has been made in all diplomatic knowledge, and not least of all in the study of papal diplomacy. The bibliography appended to the articles BULLS AND BRIEFS, in Bullarium, the reader will find references to the more important works. Amongst the pioneers of this revival the names of Léopold Delisle, the chief librarian of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and of M. de Mas-Latrie, professor at the Sorbonne, as well as that of Julius von Pflugk-Harttung, the editor of a magnificent series of facsimiles of papal Bulls, deserve to occupy a foremost place; but their work has been carried on in Germany and elsewhere, often by those who are not themselves Catholics. It must be obvious that the photographic reproduction of documents which can now be procured so easily and cheaply have enormously facilitated the process of minute comparison of documents which forms the basis of all palaeographic studies. Further, the improvement in the cataloguing and the extension of facilities under Pope Leo XIII in such great libraries as that of the Vatican, and the contents of such libraries have made their researches more accessible and have rendered possible such a calendar of early papal Bulls as has been appearing since 1926, being the result of the researches of Messrs. P. Kehr, A. Brackmann, and W. Wiederhold, in "Notizen über die Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften". Of the series of papal regesta now being published by various scholars, especially by members of the Ecole Française de Rome, a sufficient account has been given in the second part of the Bullarium. Still greater progress in the study of diplomatics is no doubt to be looked for from the facilities afforded by the recently founded journal, "Jahrbuche für Urkundenforschung" (Leipzig, 1907), edited by Messrs. Karl Brandi, H. Bresslau, and M. Tangan, all acknowledged masters in this subject.

BISHOP.-The history of the Chancery is clearly only a study preparatory to the examination of the document itself. Secondly, we have the text of the document. As the business of the Chancery increased, and we note a marked tendency to adhere strictly to the forms prescribed by tradition. Various collections of these forms, of which the "Liber Diurnus" is one of the most ancient, were compiled at an early date. Many others will be found in the "Recueil général des formules" by de Rosière (Paris, 1861-1871), though these, like the series published by Zeuner (Formulae Merovingici et Karolinae Avi, Hanover, 1886), are mainly secular in character. After the text of the document, which of course varies according to its nature, and in which not merely the wording but also the rhythm (the so-called cursus) has often to be considered, attention must be paid (1) to the manner of dating, (2) to the signatures, (3) to the attestations of witnesses etc., (4) to the seals and the attachment of the seals, (5) to the material upon which it is written and to the manner of folding, and (6) to the handwriting. Under the head of handwriting the whole science of palaeography may be said to be involved.

All these matters fall within the scope of diplomatics, and all offer different tests for the authenticity of any given document. There are other details which often need to be considered, for example the Tironian (or handwritten) notes, which are not infrequently found in primitive Urkunden, both papal and imperial, and which have only begun of late years to be adequately investigated (see Tangi, "Die tironischen Noten" in "Archiv für Urkundenforschung," 1907, L, 173-190). A special section in any comprehensive study of diplomacy is likely to be devoted to spurious documents, of which, as already stated, the number is surprisingly great.

Besides the books referred to in the course of this article see the bibliography of the article Bullarium, and Bresslau's "Handbuch der Urkundenlehre" (Leipzig, 1888). I. One very useful work for the study of papal diplomacy is the "Practica Cantianarum," ed. SCHMITT-KALLENBERG (Munich, 1904), though confined to the working of the Chancery at the close of the fifteenth century, is valuable for the indirect light thrown on the course of the papal Bulls. Consult also the important works of E. Scharz in the "Studien und Unterrichts-Ordnungen von 1290-1500" (Innsbruck, 1894); Kranz, "Urkundensammlungen" (Munich, 1897), and Schmitz-Kallenberg's "Fortsetzungen der Diplomatik seit Mabillon" (Munich, 1897), though these last two books have little directly to do with papal documents. A. MEISTER's important work on the "Liber Diurnus" (Paderborn, 1912), the papal Chancery is hardly mentioned (see, however, the appendix). Finally, the best summary account of papal diplomacy is to be found in the section contributed by SCHMITT-KALLENBERG to the "Gründung der Geschichtswissenschaft" (Leipzig, 1906), vol. I, pp. 172-280.

HERBERT THURSTON.
IVORY DIPTYCH, X CENTURY THE LOUVRE
IVORY DIPTYCH (LEGEND OF S. DENIS), XIV CENTURY, MUSÉE DE CLUNY
 arose between profane and ecclesiastical (liturgical) diptychs, the former being frequently given as presents by high-placed persons. It was customary to commemorate in this way one's elevation to a public office or any event of personal importance, e.g. a marriage. The consuls, or bishops, of the fourteenth century, when they were to offer diptychs to their friends and even to the emperor. Those presented to the latter often had a border of gold and were quite large. Their tablets often exhibited on a central plate the portrait of the subject, surrounded by four other plates. The (undated) Barberini ivories at Louvre in this case were constructed and once served as an ecclesiastical diptych (see below). Some believe it to be the binding of a book offered to the emperor. Strzygowski holds it to be of Egyptian origin and thinks that the portrait is that of Constance the Great, defender of the Faith. The oldest dated consular diptych is that of Probus (406); it is kept in the treasury of the cathedral of Aosta, Piedmont. The latest is that of the Eastern consul, Basilius (541), one tablet of which is at the Uffizi Museum in Florence and the other at the Brera in Milan. The Theodosian Code (534) forbade the offering of ivory diptychs to any but the regular (i.e. not honorary) consuls. The tablet at the Mayer Museum in Liverpool, bearing the image of Marcus Aurelius (d. 180), is prior to this enactment. The consular diptychs are recognizable by their inscriptions or by the figure of the consul which they bear. Of the two groups of Boetius (487) at Avignon, and others of the same type, the consul is clad in a tunique (a kind of toga); he holds in his left hand the scipio (consular sceptre) and in his right the mappa circensis, or white cloth which he used to wave as a signal for the games in the circus. These games (ludi) or other liberal works offered to the pond by the consul were frequently represented on the tablets of the diptychs.

There is less certainty concerning the diptychs of official other than consuls, e.g. prebends, quasators, etc. The diptych of Rufius Probusianus V.C. (i.e. air clavisromanae) vicarius urbis Romae, in the Berlin Museum, is the most precious relic of this class, and probably dates from the end of the fourth century. Among the diptychs of private individuals that of Gallienus Concessor, discovered at Rome on the Esquiline, exhibits only the name of its owner. Others were richly ornamented and reproduced often some of the masterpieces of ancient art. Thus on a diptych in the Mayer Museum, Liverpool, are seen Asclepius and Telephorus, Hygieia, and Amor. The most beautiful of the profane diptychs was carved at the time of a marriage between the Symmachus and the Nicomachi (392 to 394, or 401). It represents on each leaf (one of which is at the South Kensington Museum and the other, in a very damaged condition, at Cluny) a woman performing a sacrifice. Many of the profane diptychs were preserved in the treasuries of the churches, where they were eventually used for liturgical purposes or enshrined in book-bindings or in goldsmith work. The diptych of Boetius at Brera bears, on the interior, some liturgical texts and religious paintings, attributed to the seventh century. The Ligii diptych of the consul Anastasius (517), one leaf of which is at Berlin and the other at South Kensington, bears an inscription of the prayer Communicantes from the Canon of the Mass. Another of the same consul (in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) has a list of the bishops of Bourges. At the cathedral of Monza, Lombardy, a diptych represents the gift of consuls King David and St. Gregory the Great. It is perhaps an ancient compost, transformed in the eighth or ninth century; according to some it appears to be of ecclesiastical origin. Many carved diptychs reproduced purely religious subjects. On a diptych in the treasury of Rouen cathedral the figure of St. Paul is exactly the same as that on a sarcophagus in Gaul. A diptych leaf in the treasury of Tongres was evidently influenced by the carvings on the cathedra of St. Maximinus at Ravenna, and seems to have belonged to an ancient episcopal see. Certain diptychs with religious subjects, e.g. the Holy Sepulchre and the holy women at the Tomb of Christ (Diptychum), probably date from the fourth or fifth century. Diptych leaves divided into five compartments have generally served as a cover for copies of the Gospels. The diptychs, though often clumsily executed, are important for the history of sculpture, there being a number of them dated, and several being accurately dated. At different periods in the Middle Ages, numerous diptychs or triptychs of ivory were made, to serve as little devotional panels.

The liturgical use of diptychs offers considerable interest. In the early Christian ages it was customary to write on diptychs the names of those, living or dead, who were considered as members of the Church, a signal evidence of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints. Hence the terms “diptychs of the living” and “diptychs of the dead”. Such liturgical diptychs varied in shape and dimensions. Their use (sacra tabulae, tabulae, multiformes et diversae) is attested in the writings of St. Cyprian (third century) and by the history of St. John Chrysostom (fourth century), nor did they disappear from the churches until the twelfth century in the West and the fourteenth century in the East. In the ecclesiastical life of antiquity these diptychs had liturgical purposes. It is probable that the names of the baptized were written on diptychs, which were thus a kind of baptismal register. The “diptychs of the living” would include the names of the pope, bishops, and illustrious persons, both lay and ecclesiastical, of the benefactors of a church, and of those who offered the Holy Sacrifice. To these names were sometimes added those of the Blessed Virgin, of martyrs, and of other saints. From such diptychs came the first ecclesiastical calendars and the martyrology. The “diptychs of the dead” would include the names of persons otherwise qualified for inscription on the diptychs of the living, e.g. the bishops of the community (also other bishops), moreover priests and laitymen who had died in the odour of sanctity. It is to this kind of diptychs that the later necrologies owe their origin. Occasionally special diptychs were divided into two compartments, to contain each a name of a saint and a bishop; in this way arose at an early date the episcopal lists or catalogues of occupants of sees. Whatever their immediate purpose the liturgical diptychs admitted only the names of persons in communion with the Church; the names of heretics and of excommunicated members were never inserted. Exclusion from these lists was a grave ecclesiastical penalty; the highest dignity, episcopal or imperial, would not avail to save the offender from its infliction. The content of the diptychs was read out, either from the ambo (q. v.) or from the altar by a priest or a deacon. In this respect a variety of customs obtained in different churches and at different periods; sometimes the diptychs were simply laid on the altar during Mass, and when read publicly, such reading did not always occur at the same stage of the Mass. The order of which traces are now seen in the Roman Canon of the Mass shows at forty-two lines and the prayer Communicantes from the Canon of the Mass. Another of the same consul (in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) has a list of the bishops of Bourges. At the cathedral of Monza, Lombardy, a diptych represents the gift of consuls King David and St. Gregory the Great. It is perhaps an ancient compost, transformed in the eighth or ninth century; according to some it appears to be of ecclesiastical origin. Many carved diptychs reproduced purely religious subjects. On a diptych in the treasury of Rouen cathedral the figure of St. Paul is exactly the same as that on a sarcophagus in Gaul. A diptych

In the direction of the Church's sacred activity, by which the Holy Ghost speaks through the sovereign pontiff and the bishops of the Church, the work of the private spiritual director must never be at variance with this infallible guidance. Therefore the Church has condemned the doctrines of Molinos, who taught that directors are independent of the bishops; that the Church does not judge about secret matters, and that God and the director alone enter into the inner conscience (Denzinger, Enchiridion, nos. 1132, 1153). Several of the most learned Fathers of the Church devoted much attention to spiritual direction, for instance, St. Jerome, who directed St. Paula and her daughter St. Eustochium; and some of them have left us learned treatises on ascetic theology. But while the hierarchy of the Church is Divinely appointed to guard the purity of faith and morals, the Holy Spirit, who inspires and animated the Church from the day of the Resurrection, is also with and within us. And if we may judge by the Holy Ghost, who through the Holy Spirit inspires and guides the Church, then the Church, being thus guarded, might be said to be infallible in matters of faith and morals. But again, the Church is not infallible in matters of doctrine, nor is the Church infallible in matters of prudence, nor is the Church infallible in matters of discipline.

V. Whoever the director may be, he will find the principal means of progress towards perfection to consist in the exercise of prayer (q. v.) and mortification (q. v.). But upon the special processes of these two means, spiritual guides have been led by the Holy Spirit in various directions. Different is the type for the solitary in the desert, the cenobite in the community, for a St. Louis or a Blanche of Castile in a palace, St. Frances of Rome in her family, or a St. Zita in her kitchen, for contemplative and for active religious orders and congregations. Another marked difference in the direction of soul is the presence or absence of the mystic element in the guidance of the soul; and as the soul is to be directed (see Mysticism). Mysticism involves peculiar modes of action by which the Holy Ghost illumines a soul in ways which transcend the normal use of the reasoning powers. The spiritual director who has such persons in charge needs not to make the same conclusions as he would make if he were dealing with persons who had not made such progress. Often, especially sad mistakes have been made by presumption and impudent zeal, for men of distinction in the Church have gone astray in this matter.

II. Still more frequently is spiritual direction required in the lives of Christians who aim at the attainment of perfection (see Perfection). All religious are obliged to do so by their profession; and many of the faithful, married and unmarried, who live amidst worldly cares aspire to such perfection as is attainable in their states of life. This striving after Christian perfection means the cultivation of certain virtues and watchfulness against faults and spiritual dangers. The knowledge of this constitutes the science of asceticism (q. v.). The spiritual director must be well versed in this science, as his advice is very necessary for such souls. For, as Cassian writes, "by no wise does the devil draw a monk headlong and bring him to death sooner than by persuading him to neglect the counsel of the Elders and trust to his own judgment and determination" (Conf. of John of Patmos).

III. Since, in teaching the Faith, the Holy Ghost speaks through the sovereign pontiff and the bishops of the Church, the work of the private spiritual director must never be at variance with this infallible guidance. Therefore the Church has condemned the doctrines of Molinos, who taught that directors are independent of the bishops; that the Church does not judge about secret matters, and that God and the director alone enter into the inner conscience (Denzinger, Enchiridion, nos. 1132, 1153). Several of the most learned Fathers of the Church devoted much attention to spiritual direction, for instance, St. Jerome, who directed St. Paula and her daughter St. Eustochium; and some of them have left us learned treatises on ascetic theology. But while the hierarchy of the Church is Divinely appointed to guard the purity of faith and morals, the Holy Spirit, who inspires and animated the Church from the day of the Resurrection, is also with and within us. And if we may judge by the Holy Ghost, who through the Holy Spirit inspires and guides the Church, then the Church, being thus guarded, might be said to be infallible in matters of faith and morals. But again, the Church is not infallible in matters of doctrine, nor is the Church infallible in matters of prudence, nor is the Church infallible in matters of discipline.

V. Whoever the director may be, he will find the principal means of progress towards perfection to consist in the exercise of prayer (q. v.) and mortification (q. v.). But upon the special processes of these two means, spiritual guides have been led by the Holy Spirit in various directions. Different is the type for the solitary in the desert, the cenobite in the community, for a St. Louis or a Blanche of Castile in a palace, St. Frances of Rome in her family, or a St. Zita in her kitchen, for contemplative and for active religious orders and congregations. Another marked difference in the direction of soul is the presence or absence of the mystic element in the guidance of the soul; and as the soul is to be directed (see Mysticism). Mysticism involves peculiar modes of action by which the Holy Ghost illumines a soul in ways which transcend the normal use of the reasoning powers. The spiritual director who has such persons in charge needs not to make the same conclusions as he would make if he were dealing with persons who had not made such progress. Often, especially sad mistakes have been made by presumption and impudent zeal, for men of distinction in the Church have gone astray in this matter.

II. Still more frequently is spiritual direction required in the lives of Christians who aim at the attainment of perfection (see Perfection). All religious are obliged to do so by their profession; and many of the faithful, married and unmarried, who live amidst worldly cares aspire to such perfection as is attainable in their states of life. This striving after Christian perfection means the cultivation of certain virtues and watchfulness against faults and spiritual dangers. The knowledge of this constitutes the science of asceticism (q. v.). The spiritual director must be well versed in this science, as his advice is very necessary for such souls. For, as Cassian writes, "by no wise does the devil draw a monk headlong and bring him to death sooner than by persuading him to neglect the counsel of the Elders and trust to his own judgment and determination" (Conf. of John of Patmos).

III. Since, in teaching the Faith, the Holy Ghost speaks through the sovereign pontiff and the bishops of the Church, the work of the private spiritual director must never be at variance with this infallible guidance. Therefore the Church has condemned the doctrines of Molinos, who taught that directors are independent of the bishops; that the Church does not judge about secret matters, and that God and the director alone enter into the inner conscience (Denzinger, Enchiridion, nos. 1132, 1153). Several of the most learned Fathers of the Church devoted much attention to spiritual direction, for instance, St. Jerome, who directed St. Paula and her daughter St. Eustochium; and some of them have left us learned treatises on ascetic theology. But while the hierarchy of the Church is Divinely appointed to guard the purity of faith and morals, the Holy Spirit, who inspires and animated the Church from the day of the Resurrection, is also with and within us. And if we may judge by the Holy Ghost, who through the Holy Spirit inspires and guides the Church, then the Church, being thus guarded, might be said to be infallible in matters of faith and morals. But again, the Church is not infallible in matters of doctrine, nor is the Church infallible in matters of prudence, nor is the Church infallible in matters of discipline.
the Sacrament of Penance." It also forbids them to refuse to their subjects an extraordinary confessor, especially in cases where the conscience of the persons so refused stands greatly in need of this privilege; as also "to take it on themselves to permit at their pleasure to approach the Holy Table, or sometimes to forbid them Holy Communion altogether." The pope abrogates all constitutions, usages, and customs so far as they tend to the contrary; and absolutely forbids such superiors as are here spoken of to induce in any way their subjects to make to them manifestations of conscience. His decree "Quemadmodum," with explanations, in the American Ecclesiastical Review, March, 1893.)

VII. Catholic literature is rich in works of ascetic and mystical theology; of which we mention a few below. But it must be noticed that such works cannot be recommended for the use of all readers indiscriminately. The higher the spiritual perfection aimed at, especially when mysticism enters into the case, the more caution should be used in selecting and consulting the guide-books, and the more danger there is that the direction given in them may be misapplied. Spiritual defects are much a matter for the personal supervision of an experienced living guide as is the practice of medicine; the latter deals with abnormal defects of the body, the former with the acquisition of uncommon perfection by the soul.

Directories, CATHOLIC.—The ecclesiastical sense of the word directory, as will be shown later, has become curiously confused with its secular use, but historically speaking the ecclesiastical sense is the earlier. Directory simply means guide, but in the later Middle Ages it came to be specially applied to guides for the recitation of the Mass. For example, in the early part of the fifteenth century one Clement Mayeston, probably following earlier foreign precedents, adopted the title "Directorium Sacrdotum" for his reorganized Sarum Ordinal. In this way the words "Directorium Sacrdotum" came to stand at the head of a number of books, some of them among the earliest products of the printing press in England, which were issued to instruct the clergy as to the form of Mass and Office to be followed from day to day throughout the year. This employment of the word directorium was by no means peculiar to England. To take one convenient example, though not the earliest that might be chosen, we find a very similar work published at Augsburg in 1501, which bears the title: "Index sive Directorium Missarum Horarumque secundum ritum chori Constantinensis diocesis dicendarum." As this title suffices to show, a directorium is or guide for the recitation of the Mass and Office, manifestly dealing with the needs of a particular diocese or group of dioceses, for as a rule each diocese has certain saints' days and feasts peculiar to itself, and these have all to be taken account of in regulating the Office, a single change often occasioning much disturbance by the necessity it creates of transferring coincident celestial events to other days. Out of the "Directorium Sacrdotum," which in England was often called the "Pye," and which seems to have come into almost general use about the time of the invention of printing, our present Directory, the "Ordo divini Officii recitandi Sacrdorum," has gradually developed. We may mention a few of the characteristics both of the actual and the ancient usage.

Actual Usage.—It is now the custom for every diocese, or, in cases where the calendar followed is substantially identical, for a group of dioceses belonging to the same province or country, to have a "Directorium," or "Ordo recitandi," printed each year for the use of all the clergy. It consists simply of a calendar for the year, in which, there are printed against each day concise directions concerning the Office and Mass to be said on that day. The calendar is usually provided with some indication of fast days, special indulgences, days of devotion, and other items of information which it may be convenient for the clergy to be reminded of as they occur. This Ordo is issued with the authority of the bishop or bishops concerned, and is binding upon the clergy under their jurisdiction. The religious orders have usually a Directory of their own, which, in the case of the larger orders, differs according to the country in which they are resident. For the secular clergy the calendar of the Roman Missal and Breviary, apart from special privilege, always forms the basis of the "Ordo recitandi." To this the feasts and saints' days are added, and, as the higher grade of these special celebrations often causes them to take precedence of those in the ordinary calendar, a certain amount of shifting and transposition is inevitable, even apart from the complications introduced by the movable feasts. All this has to be calculated and adapted to hand in accordance with the rules supplied by the general rubrics of the Missal and Breviary. Even so, the clergy of particular churches have further to provide for the celebration of their own pastoral or dedication feasts, and to make such other changes in the Ordo as these matters only affecting the clergy, it is apt to acquire a somewhat professional and exclusive character.

How long a separate and annual "Ordo recitandi" has been printed for the use of the English clergy it seems impossible to determine. Possibly Bishop Chaloner, Vicar Apostolic from 1741 to 1781, had something to do with its introduction. But in 1759 a Catholic London printer conceived the idea of translating the official "Directorium," or Ordo, issued for the clergy, and accordingly published in that year. "A Latin Directory or a help to find out and assist at Vespers, ... on Sundays and Holy Days." Strange to say, another Catholic printer, seemingly the publisher of the official Ordo, shortly afterwards, conceiving his privileges invaded, produced a rival publication: "The Laity's Directory or the Order of the (Catholic) Church Vestments and Rites," which was issued year by year for three-quarters of a century, gradually growing in size, but in 1837 it was supplanted by "The Catholic Directory," which since 1855 has been published in London by Messrs. Burns & Lambert, now Burns & Oates. The earliest numbers of the "Catholic Directory" contained nothing save an abbreviated translation of the clerical Verordtandi, but towards the end of the eighteenth century a list of the Catholic churches in London, advertisements of schools, obituary notices, important ecclesiastical announcements, and other miscellaneous matters began to be added, and at a still later date we find...
an index of the names and addresses of the Catholic clergy serving the missions in England and Scotland. This feature has been imitated in the "Irish Catholic Directory" and in the Catholic Directories of the United States. Hence the widespread idea that Catholic directories are so-called because they commonly form an address book for the church. It should be noted, however, that the ordinary calendar is peculiar to Scotland, and the examination of the early numbers of the "Laity's Directory" conclusively shows that it was only to the calendar with its indication of the daily Mass and Office that the name originally applied.

In the Middle Ages, and indeed almost down to the invention of printing, the books used in the service of the Church were much more divided up than they are at present. Instead of one book, our modern Breviary for example, containing the whole office, we find at least four books—the Psalterium, the Hymnarium, the Antiphonarium, and the Legendarium, or book of lessons, all in separate volumes. Rubrics or ritual directions were rarely written down in connexion with the text to which they belonged (we are speaking here of the Mass and Office, not of the services of rarer occurrence such as those in the Pontifical), but they were probably at first communicated by oral tradition only, and when they began to be fixed they took the form of a summation, as we find in the "Ordines Romani" of Hittorp and Mabillon. However, about the eleventh century there grew up a tendency towards greater elaboration and precision in rubrical directions for the services, and at the same time we notice the beginning of a more or less strongly marked division of these directions into two classes, which in the case of the Sarum Use are conveniently distinguished as the Customary and the Ordinal. Speaking generally, we may say that the former of these rubrical books contains the principles and the latter their application; the former determines those matters that are constant and primarily the duties of persons, the latter deals with the arrangements which vary from day to day and from year to year. It is out of the latter of these books, i.e., the Ordinal (often called Ordinarium and Liber Ordinarius), that the "Directorium" or "Pye", and eventually also our own modern "Ordo rectandi" were in due time evolved. These distinctions are not clear-cut. The process was a gradual one. But we may distinguish in the English and also in the Continental Ordinals two different stages. We have, first, the type of book in common use from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. It was represented by the "Sarum-Ordinary", edited by W. H. Frere, or the "Ordinaria of Leoun" edited by Chevalier. Here we have a great deal of miscellaneous information respecting feasts, the Office and Mass to be said upon them according to the changes necessitated by the occurrence of Easter and the shifting of the "Sunday" as we may call the "Ineptrica" the details of the service, e.g., of the lessons to be read and the commemorations to be made. The second stage took the form of an adaptation of this Ordinal for ready use, an adaptation with which, in the case of Sarum, the name of Clement Mayeston is prominently connected. This was the "Directorium Sacramenti" or the complete "Pye" (known in Latin as Pica Sarum), abbreviated editions of which were afterwards published in a form which allowed it to be bound up with the respective portions of the Breviary. The Idea of the "Pye" was to give as near as possible, the thirty-five possible combinations, five to each of the Dominical Letters, in which the fixed and movable elements of the ecclesiastical year admitted of, assigning a separate calendar to each, more or less corresponding to our present "Ordo rectandi". This arrangement was peculiar to England. One of the earliest printed books of the kind was that issued about 1475 for the Diocese of Constance, of which a rubricated copy is to be found in the British Museum. It is a small folio in size, of one hundred and twelve leaves, and after the ordinary calendar it supplies summary rules, under thirty-five heads, for drawing up the special calendar for each year according to the Golden Number and the Dominical Letter. Then the Ordo for each of the thirty-five possible combinations is set out in detail. The name most commonly given to these "Pyes" on the Continent is more rarely "Directorium Missae". For example, the title of such a book printed for the Diocese of Liège in 1492 runs: "In nomine Domini Amen... Incipit libri Ordinarius ostendens quod legatur et cantetur per totum annum circulum in ecclesiis leodiensi tam de seminariis quam de festis quos recipit divinis..." Such books were also provided for the religious orders. An "Ordinarium Ordinis Praemonstratensis" exists in manuscript at Jesus College, Cambridge, and an early printed one in the British Museum. When the use of printing became universal, the step from these rather copious directories, which served for all possible years, to a shorter guide of the type of our modern "Ordo recantandi", and intended only for one particular year, was a short and easy one. Since, however, such publications are useless after their purpose is once served, they are very liable to destruction, and it seems impossible to say how early in the year they may date the appearance of a new edition in this fashion. The fact that at the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, De Reform., cap. xviii) it was thought necessary to urge that ecclesiastical students should be trained in the understanding of the computus, by which they could determine the ordo rectandi for each year for themselves, seems to imply that such Ordas as we now possess were not in familiar use in the middle of the sixteenth century.

Modern Directories.—At the present day it may be said that in every part of the world not only is a printed Ordo provided for the clergy of every diocese and religious institute, but that almost everywhere some adaptation of this is available for the use of the laity. The earliest English attempt at anything of the sort seems to have been a little "Catholic Almanac", which appeared for three or four years in the reign of James II (see The Month, vol. CXI, 1908). But this was a mere calendar of feasts without any directions for the Office and Mass. In Ireland the work which at present appears under the title "The Irish Catholic Directory and Almanac for 1909", with a complete Directory in English" seems to have existed under various names since 1837 or earlier. It was first called "The Complete Catholic Directory" and "Sarum-Ordinary", and in 1854 "Battersby's Register", from the name of the publisher. For Scotland, though the Scottish missions are included in the "Catholic Directory" published in London, there is also a separate "Catholic Directory for the Clergy and Laity of Scotland" which began under a slightly different name in 1868. Catholic Directories also exist for the Australian and Canadian provinces, and occasionally for separate dioceses, e.g. the Diocese of Birmingham, England, possesses an "Official Directory" of its own. Attention may briefly be called, also, to two Roman handbooks of a character somewhat analogous to our Directories, which supply names and details regarding the Catholic hierarchy throughout the world and especially regarding the cardinals, the Roman Congregations and their personnel, the prelates and camerali, etc., in attendance upon the papal court. The first of these, called "Elenco del Censu dei Cardinali e della Corte Pontificia", was first published in 1716 and was long familiarly known as "Crasus" from the name of the publisher. Officially, the early numbers were simply called "Notizie per l'Anno 1716, etc." (see Moroni, Dizionario, XX, 20 sqq.). The other work, which is much better known in character, but which from its information, has appeared since 1895 under the title "Annuario Ecclesiastico". Finally we notice the
The United States.—These publications begin in the United States with an "Ordo Divini Officii Recitandi", published at Baltimore, in 1801, by John Hayes. It had none of the directory or almanac features. "The Catholic Laity's Directory to the Church Service with an Almanac for the year", an imitation of the English enterprise, was published in 1817. It was published in New York with the permission of the Right Rev. Bishop Connolly by Mathew Field, who was born in England of an Irish Catholic family and left there for New York in 1815. He died at Baltimore, 1832. His son, Joseph M. Field, was six years old when he arrived in New York, and became an influential and business-minded man. He died at Baltimore in 1856. Joseph's daughter, Kate Field, was later the well-known author and lecturer. Though both were baptised, neither was a profesed Catholic. This Field production, in addition to the ordinary almanac calendars, had a variety of pious and informative reading matter with an account of the churches, colleges, seminaries, and institutions of the United States. It made up a small 32mo book of sixty-eight pages. Among other things, it promised the preparation of a Catholic magazine which, however, was never started. The next effort in the same direction, and on practically the same lines, was also at New York, in 1822, by W. H. Creagh. It was edited by the Rev. Dr. John Power, rector of St. Peter's church, and says in the preface that it was "intended to accompany the Missal with a view to facilitate the use of the Liturgy". The contents include "the account of the Establishment of the Episcopacy in the United States"; "Present State of religion in the respective Dioceses"; "A short account of the present State of the Society of Jesus in the U. S. "; and obituaries of priests who had died from 1811 to 1821. This was the only number of this almanac.

In 1834 Fielding Lucas of Baltimore took up the idea and brought out "The Metropolitan Catholic Calendar and Laity's Directory" for that year, to be published annually. He said in it that he had "intended to present it in 1832 but from circumstances over which he had no control it has been delayed to the present period." It printed a list of the hierarchy and the priests of the several dioceses, with their stations. In this publication and its various successors the title Directory is used in its purely secular meaning, as the issues include ecclesiastical calendars, or Diocesan Annals. The last number of the series, 1845, was published at Baltimore, "prepared at much expense to exhibit at a glance the extent and relative situation of the different dioceses", with a table of comparative statistics, 1835 to 1845. A list of the clergy in England and Ireland was added in the volume for 1850. "Lucas Brothers" is the imprint on the almanac for 1856-57, and the Baltimore publication then ceased, to be taken up in 1858 by Edward Dunigan & Brother of New York, as "Dunigan's American Catholic Almanac and List of the Clergy". All general reading matter was omitted in this almanac, publication of which was stopped following the following: John Murphy & Co. of Baltimore, and there the compilation of the "Metropolitan Catholic Almanac". Owing to the Civil War no almanacs were printed during 1862 or 1863. In 1864 D. & J. Sadler of New York started "Sadler's Catholic Directory, Almanac and Ordo", which John Gilmary Shea compiled and edited for them. It made a volume of more than half that number of pages and gave lists of the clergy in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Ireland, and Australasia, with diocesan statistics. This publication continued alone in the field until 1896, when Hoffman Brothers, a German family of publishers of Milwaukee, brought out "Hoffman's Catholic Directory", which Rev. James Fagan, a Milwaukee priest, compiled for them. In contents it was similar to the New York publication. This directory continued until 1896, when the Hoffman Company failed, and their plant was purchased by the Wiltzius Company, which has since continued the directory. The Sadler "Directory" ceased publication in 1895.

The Wiltzius "Catholic Directory, Almanac and Clergy List" has reports for all dioceses in the United States, Canada, Alaska, Cuba, Sandwich Islands, Porto Rico, Philippine Islands, Newfoundland, England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and contains statistics of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Belgium, Costa Rica, Guatemala, British Honduras, Nicaragua, San Salvador, German Empire, Japan, Luxemburg, the United States of Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Oceania, South Africa, The United States of Brazil, Curacao, Dutch Guiana, Switzerland, and the West Indies. It contains also an alphabetical list of all clergymen in the United States and Canada, as well as a map of the ecclesiastical provinces in the United States. It gives a list of English-speaking confessor missions to the American colleges in Europe, and the leading Catholic societies; statistics of the Catholic Indian and Negro missions, and a list of Catholic newspapers and periodicals in the United States and Canada.

In the almanac for 1837 it is noted, concerning the statistics, that "the numbers marked with an asterisk are not given as strictly exact, though it is believed they approximate to the truth, and are as accurate as could be ascertained from the statements forwarded to the editor from the several dioceses." On the same topic "Hoffman's Directory" for 1890 says: "It is much to be regretted that the statistics are not more carefully kept. In every diocese there are parishes that fail to report and many diocesan reports statistics only partially, so that any general summary that can be made up at best is only an approximation."

Dealing with this long-standing and well-founded complaint of inaccurate Catholic statistics, the archbishops of the United States, at their annual meeting in 1907, resolved to co-operate with the United States Census Bureau in an effort to collect correct figures. Archbishop Glennon of St. Louis was appointed a special census official by the Government for this purpose and under his direction an enumeration of the Catholics of every parish in the United States was made. The figures thus obtained were used in the "Directory" for 1909. It is the first, therefore, of these publications giving statistics of population on which any reliance can be placed in respect to accuracy, as inserted a map of the United States.
Bishops of Quebec in the issue for 1908, in commemoration of the centenary celebrations. The Rev. Charles P. Beauchien edited the publication.

Films of these various publications: *Pioveni, Bibliotheca Catholica Americana* (New York, 1872).

**THOMAS F. MEEHAN.**

**DISCERNMENT**

**DIRIMENT**

**14). They obedience. preceding recall or congregation self-direction it that But These...**

**DISCERNMENT**

**Displaced Impediments.** See Impediments.

**Displaced (Lat. *dis*, without, and *cudaeus*, shoe), a term applied to those religious congregations of men and women, the members of which go entirely unshod or wear sandals, with or without other covering for the feet. These congregations are often distinguished on this account from other branches of the same order. The custom of going unshod was introduced into the West by St. Francis of Assisi for men and St. Clare for women. After the various modifications of the Rule of St. Francis, the Observantines adhered to the primitive custom of going unshod, and in this they were followed by the Minims and Capuchins. The Discalced Franciscans or Alcantarines, who prior to 1597 formed a distinct branch of the Franciscan Order went without footwear of any kind. The followers of St. Clare at first went barefoot, but later came to wear sandals and even shoes. The Colettines and Capuchin Sisters returned to the use of sandals. Sandals were also adopted by the Camaldolese monks of the Congregation of Monte Corvino (1522), the Carmelite Canons, the Poor Hermits of St. Jerome of the Congregation of Bl. Peter of Pisa, the Augustinians of Thomas of Jesus (1532), the Barefooted Servites (1593), the Discalced Carmelites (1568), the Prévôtés (1573), Trinitarians (1594), Mercedarians (1604), and the Passionists. (See *Franciscans*.)

**Hambacher, *Die Ordnung...**

**Discernment of Spirits.**—All moral conduct may be summed up in the rule: avoid evil and do good. In the language of Christian asceticism, *spirits*, in the broad sense, is the term applied to certain complex influences, capable of impelling the will, the ones toward good, the others toward evil; we have the worldly spirit of error, the spirit of race, the spirit of Christianity, etc. However, in the restricted sense, *spirits* indicate the various spiritual agents which, by their influences and movements, may influence the moral value of our acts. Here we shall speak only of this second kind. They are reduced to four, including, in a certain way, the human soul itself, because in consequence of the original Fall, its lower faculties are at variance with its superior powers. Consequence, that is to say, disturbances of the imagination and of the sensibility, thwart or pervert the operations of the intellect and will, by deterring the one from the true and the other from the good (Gen. viii, 21; James, i, 14). In opposition to our vitiated nature or, so to speak, to the flesh which drags us into sin, the Spirit of God acts within us. Hence, a supernatural help given to our intellect and will to lead us back to good and to the observance of the moral law (Rom., vii, 22-25). Besides these two spirits, the human and the Divine, in the actual order of Providence, two others must be observed. The Creator willed that there should be communication between angels and men, and as the angels are of two kinds (see *Angels*), good and bad, the latter try to win us over to their rebellion and the former endeavour to make us their companions in obedience. Hence four spirits lay siege to our liberty: the angelic and the Divine seeking the good and the human (in the limited sense, i.e., the human intellect): the diabolical its misery. In ordinary language they may, for brevity sake, be called simply the good and the evil spirit.

Discernment of spirits is the term given to the judgment whereby to determine from what spirit the im-
Disciple.—This term is commonly applied to one who is learning any art or science from one distinguished by his accomplishments. Though derived from the Latin discipulus, the English name conveys a meaning somewhat narrower than its Latin equivalent: disciple is opposed to master, as scholar to professor, whilst both disciple and scholar are included under the Latin disiculus. In the English versions of the Old Testament the word disciple occurs only once (Is., viii., 16); but the idea it conveys is to be met with in several other passages, as, for instance, when the Speaker of the book of Proverbs speaks of the "sons of the prophets" (IV K., ii, 7); the same seems, likewise, to be the meaning of the terms children and son in the Sapiential books (e.g. Prov., iv, i, 10; etc.). Much more frequently does the New Testament use the word disciple in the sense of pupil, adherent, one taught by the Master's word (Matt., xxii., viii, 31). So also, read of disciples of Moses (John, ix, 28), of the Pharisees (Matt., xxiii., 16; Mark, ii, 18; Luke, v, 33), of John the Baptist (Matt., x., 14; Luke, vii, 18; John, iii, 25). These, however, are only incidental applications, for the word is almost exclusively used of the Disciples of Jesus.

In the Four Gospels it is most especially applied to the Apostles, sometimes styled the "twelve disciples" (Matt., x., 1; xi., 1; xx, 17; xxvi., 20; the sixteenth verse of chapter xxvii., having reference to events subsequent to Christ's Passion, mentions only the "eleven"), at times merely called the "disciples" (Matt., xiv., 19; xv., 33, 36, etc.). The expression "his disciples" frequently has the same import. Occasionally the Evangelists give the word a broader sense and make it a synonym for believer (Matt., x., 42; xxvii., 57; John, iv., 1; ix., 27, 28, etc.). Besides the designation of "Apostle" and that of "believer" there is a third one, found in St. Luke, and perhaps also in the other Evangelists. St. Luke narrates (vi, 13) that Jesus "called unto him his disciples, and he chose twelve of them (whom also he named apostles)". The disciples in this context, are the followers who flocked around Christ, but a smaller body of His followers. They are commonly identified with the seventy-two (seventy, according to the received Greek text, although several Greek MSS. mention seventy-two, as does the Vulgate) referred to (Luke, x., 3) as having been chosen by Jesus. The names of these disciples are given in several lists (Chronicon Paschale, and Pseudo-Dorotheus in Migne, P. G., XCII, 521–524; 543–545; 1061–1065): but these lists are unfortunately worthless. Eusebius positively asserts that no such roll existed in his time, and mentions among the disciples only Barnabas, Simeon, Thomas, Matthias, Thaddeus, and James "the Lord's brother" (Hist. Eccl. I., xii). In the Acts of the Apostles the name disciple is exclusively used to designate the converts, the believers, both men and women (vi, 1, 2, 7; ix, 1, 10, 19; etc.; in reference to the latter connotation see in particular ix, ix, 19), even such as were only imperfectly instructed, like those found by St. Paul at Ephesus (Acts, xix, 1–5).

---

**Charles L. Souvey.**

Disciples of Christ, a sect founded in the United States of America by Alexander Campbell. Although the largest portion of his life and prodigiously active work was spent in the United States, Alexander Campbell was born, 12 Sept., 1788, in the County Antrim, Ireland. On his father's side he was of Scotch extraction; his mother, Jane Conrigeal, was of Huguenot descent. Both parents are reported to have been persons of deep piety and high literary culture. His father, after serving as minister to the Anti-Burgher Church in Aboyne and director of a prosperous academy at Richhill, emigrated to the United States and engaged in the off-attempted and ever futile effort "to unite all Christians as one communion on a purely scriptural basis", the hallucination of so many noble minds, the only outcome of which must always be, against the will of the Founder, to increase the discord and Christendom by the creation of a new sect.

On 12 June, 1812, with his wife, father, mother, and three others, Alexander was rebaptized by immersion. Nothing was left him now but to seek association with one or other of the numerous Baptist sects. This he did, but with the proviso that he should be allowed to preach and teach whatever he learned from the Holy Scriptures. The Baptists never took him cordially; and in 1817, after five years of herculean labours, his followers, whom he wished to be known by the appellation of "Disciples of Christ", but who were generally styled "Campbellites", numbered only one hundred and fifty persons. Campbell's mission as a messenger of peace was a failure; as time went on he developed a polemical nature, and became a sharp critic in speech and in writing of the weaknesses and vagaries of the Protestant sects. Only one did he come in direct contact with the Catholics, on the occasion of his five days' debate, in 1837, with Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, which excited great interest at the time but is now forgotten. His sixty volumes are of no interest. Campbell was twice married and was the father of twelve children.
He died at Bethany, West Virginia, where he had established a seminary, 4 March, 1848.

According to their census prepared in 1906 the sect then had 6175 ministers, 11,653 churches, and a membership of 1,253,394. It is strongest in the West and South, especially in Missouri, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Ohio having the largest bodies. J. H. Garrison, editor of their organ “The Christian Evangelist”, outlines (1906) the belief of his sect. According to their investigations of the New Testament the confession of faith made by Simon Peter, on which Jesus declared he would build His Church, namely “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” was the creed of Christianity and the essential faith, and that all those who would make this confession from the heart, being penitent of their past sins, were to be admitted by baptism into the membership of the early Church; that baptism in the early Church consisted of the burial of a penitent believer in water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and that only such were fit subjects for baptism; that the form of church government was congregational; that each congregation had its deacons and elders or bishops, the former to look after the temporal and the latter the spiritual interests of the church; that they preach weekly communion and consider it not as a sacrament but as a memorial feast. While they hold both New and Old Testaments to be equally inspired, both are not equally binding upon Christians. Accepting the Bible as an all-sufficient revelation of the Divine will, the sect employs all authoritative creeds and human grounds of fellowship.

Campbell, Christian System (Cincinnati, 1853); Errett, Our Position (Cincinnati, 1863); Richardson, Life of Alexander Campbell (Philadelphia, 1863); Garrison, The Formation of the Nineteenth Century (St. Louis, 1901).

James F. Loughlin.

Discipline, Ecclesiastical.—Etymologically the word discipline signifies the formation of one who places himself at school and under the direction of a master. All Christians are the disciples of Christ, desiring to form themselves at His school and to be guided by His teachings and precepts. He called Himself, and we, too, call Him, Our Master. Such, then, is evangelical discipline. However, in ecclesiastical language the word discipline has been invested with various meanings, which must be here enumerated and specified.

I. Meaning of Discipline.—All discipline may be considered first in its author, then in its subject, and finally in itself. In its author it is chiefly the method employed for the formation and adaptation of the precepts and directions to the end to be attained, which is the perfect conduct of subjects; in this sense discipline is said to be severe or mild. In those who receive it discipline is the more or less perfect conformity of acts to the directions and formation received; it is in this sense that discipline may be said to flourish in a monastery. Or, again, it is the obligation of subjects to conform their acts to precepts and directions, and is thus defined by Cardinal Cusanus: “Praeclarum astutorum facit consensum—’conduct conforming itself to faith’” (Inst. jur. publ. eccl. Bk. IV, n. 147). More frequently, however, discipline is considered objectively, that is, as being the precepts and measures for the practical guidance of subjects. Thus understood ecclesiastical discipline is the aggregate of laws and directions given by the Church to the faithful for their conduct both public and private. This is discipline in its widest acceptance, and includes natural and Divine as well as positive laws, and faith, worship, and morals; in a word, all that affects the conduct of Christians. But if we eliminate laws merely inspired by the Church as the exponent of natural or Divine law, there remain the laws and directions laid down and formulated by ecclesiastical authority for the guidance of the faithful; this is the restricted and more usual acceptance of the word discipline. Nevertheless, it must be understood that this distinction, however justified, is not made for the purpose of separating ecclesiastical laws into two clearly divided categories in so far as practice is concerned; the Church does not always make known to which class of laws she speaks in the name of the natural or Divine law, and with this corresponds the observance of laws by her subjects.

II. Object of Discipline.—Since ecclesiastical discipline should direct every Christian life, its object must differ according to the obligations incumbent on each individual. The first duty of a Christian is to believe; hence dogmatic discipline, by which the Church proposes what we should believe and so regulates our conduct that it shall not fail to assist our faith. Dogmatic discipline springs from the power of magisterium, i.e. the teaching office, in the exercise of which power the Church can proceed only by declaration; therefore it is ecclesiastical discipline only in a broad sense. The second duty of Christians is to observe the Commandments, hence moral discipline (disciplina morum). Strictly understood the latter does not depend much more upon the Church than the first; it is the natural discipline of the Christian. They proceed by the weekly observance of the Sacrament and superior to ecclesiastical law; however, the Church authoritatively proposes to us the moral law, she specifies and perfects it; hence it is that we generally call moral discipline whatsoever directs the Christian in those acts that have a moral value, including the observance of positive laws, both ecclesiastical and secular. Among the chief duties of a Christian the worship of God must be assigned a place apart. The rules to be observed in this worship, especially public worship, constitute liturgical discipline. This cannot be said to depend absolutely upon the Church, as it derives the essential part of its laws and rules of the Sacraments from Jesus Christ; however, for the greater part, liturgical discipline has been regulated by the Church and includes the rites of the Holy Sacraments, the administration of the Sacraments and of the sacramentals, and other ceremonies.

There still remain the obligations incumbent on the faithful considered individually, either on the members of different groups or classes of ecclesiastical society, or, finally, on those who are to any extent whatever depositaries of a portion of the authority. This is discipline properly so called, exterior discipline, established by the free legislation of the Church (not, of course, in a way absolutely independent of natural or Divine law, but outside of, yet akin to this law) for the good government of society and the sanctification of individuals. On individuals it imposes common precepts (the Commandments of the Church); then it states their mutual obligations, in conjugal society by matrimonial discipline, in larger societies by denominating relations with ecclesiastical superiors, parish priests, bishops, etc. Special classes also have their own particular discipline, there being clerical discipline for the clergy and religious or monastic discipline for the religious. The government of Christian society is in the hands of prelates and superiors, and is subject to a special discipline either for the conditions of their recruitment, for the determining of their privileges and duties, or for the manner in which they should fulfill their functions. We may include here the rules for the administration of temporal goods. Finally, any authority from which emanate those or which emanate which should have power to ratify the same by penal measures applicable to all transgressors; hence, another object of discipline is the imposing and inflicting of disciplinary sanctions. It must be noted, however, that the object of these measures is to ensure observance or to chastise infractions of the natural and Divine as well as of ecclesiastical laws.

III. Disciplinary Power of the Church.—It is evident, therefore, that the disciplinary power of the
Discipline is a phase, a practical application, of its power of jurisdiction, and includes the various forms of the latter, namely, legislative, administrative, judicial, and coercive power. As for the power of order (potestas ordinis), it is the basis of liturgical discipline by which its exercise is regulated. Moreover, the power of the Church is a society and, as such, it necessarily has the power of jurisdiction which it derives from Divine institution through the Apostolic succession, see Church. Disciplinary power is proved by the very fact of its exercise: it is an organic necessity in every society whose members it guides to its end by providing the will of action. Historically it can be shown that a disciplinary power has been exercised by the Church uninterruptedly, first by the Apostles and then by their successors. The Apostles in the first council at Jerusalem formulated rules for the conduct of the faithful (Acts, xv).

St. Paul gave moral advice to the Christians of Corinth on virginity, marriage, and the agape (1 Cor., vii, xi). The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul are a veritable code of clerical discipline. The Church, moreover, has never ceased to represent herself as charged by Christ with the guidance of mankind in the way of eternal salvation. The Council of Trent enjoins the Church to manifest the power of the Sacraments in all that concerns liturgical discipline and Divine worship (Sess. XXI, c. ii): “In the administration of the sacraments, the substance of the latter remaining intact, the Church has always had power to establish or to modify whatever she considered most expedient for the utility of those who receive them, or best calculated to ensure respect for the sacraments themselves according to the various circumstances of time and place.” In fact, we need only to recall the numerous laws enacted by the Church in the course of centuries for the maintenance, development, or restoration of the moral and spiritual life of Christians.

V. Disciplinary Infallibility.—What connexion is there between the discipline of the Church and her infallibility? Is there a certain disciplinary infallibility? It does not appear that the question was ever discussed in the past by theologians unless apropos of the laws and the question of the modifications of religious orders. It has, however, found a place in all recent treatises on the Church (De Ecclesia). The authors of these treatises decide unanimously in favour of a negative and indirect rather than a positive and direct infallibility, inasmuch as in her general discipline, i.e. the common laws imposed on all the faithful, the Church can prescribe nothing that would be contrary to the natural or the Divine law, nor prohibit anything that the natural or the Divine law would expect. If well understood this thesis is undeniable; it amounts to saying that the Church does not and cannot impose practical directions contradictory of her moral teaching. It is quite clear that to inquire how far this infallibility extends, and to what extent, in her disciplinary activity, the Church makes use of the privilege of inerrancy granted her by Jesus Christ when she defines matters of fact and morals. Infallibility is directly related to the teaching office (magisterium), and although this office and the disciplinary power reside in the same ecclesiastical authorities, the disciplinary power does not necessarily depend directly on the teaching office. Teaching pertains to the order of truth; legislation to that of justice and prudence. Doubtless, in last analysis all disciplinary laws are based on certain fundamental truths, but as laws their purpose is neither to confirm nor to condemn these truths. It does not seem, therefore, that the Church needs any special privilege of infallibility to prevent her from enacting laws contradictory of her doctrine. To claim that disciplinary infallibility consists in regulating, without possibility of error, the adaptation of a general law to its end, is equivalent to the assertion of a (quite unnecessary) positive infallibility, which the incessant abrogation of laws would belie and which would be to the Church a burden and a hindrance rather than an advantage, since it would prevent her from observing the best. Moreover, this would make the application of laws to their end the object of a positive judgment of the Church; this would not only be useless but would become a perpetual obstacle to disciplinary reform.

From the disciplinary infallibility of the Church, correctly understood, as an indirect consequence of her doctrinal infallibility, it follows that she cannot be rightly accused of introducing into her discipline anything opposed to the Divine law; the most remarkable instance of this being the suppression of the chalice in the Communion of the laity. This has often been wrongly attacked as done by the Church with her discipline. This changes with time, grows old with the years, is rejuvenated, is subject to growth and decay. Though in its early days admirably vigorous, with time defects crept in. Later it overcame these defects and although along some lines its usefulness increased, in other ways its first splendour waned. That in its old age it languishes is evident from the leniency and indulgence which now seem absolutely necessary. Moreover, all things fairly considered, it will appear that old age is a higher stage than their defects and good qualities.” Were it necessary to exemplify the mutability of ecclesiastical discipline it would be perplexing indeed to make a choice. The ancient catechumeneate exists only in a few rites; the Latin Church no longer gives Communion to the laity under two kinds; the Church has undergone a profound evolution; matrimonial law is still subject to modifications; fasting is not what it formerly was; the use of censures in penal law is but the shadow of what it was in the Middle Ages. Many other examples will easily occur to the mind of the well-informed reader.
DISCIPLINE

kind] must be regarded as erroneous, and those who obstinately affirm it must be cast aside as heretics."

The opinion, generally admitted by theologians, that the Church is infallible in her approbation of religious orders, must be interpreted in the same sense; it means that in her regulation of life destined to provide for the practice of the evangelical counsels she cannot come into conflict with these counsels as received from Christ together with the rest of the Gospel revelation. (See Roman Congregations.)

T. Massin, Vetus et nova Ecclesiae disciplina (ed. Lyons, 1706), preface; J. J. Kellner in Kirchenlex., s.v.: Disciplina; all treatises on public ecclesiastical law, especially by Curatag, Inst. jur. publ. and canon, 1865, I, ch. 125, and II, ch. 315, which consist essentially in theological works, especially in Hunter, Theol. dogm. comp. (Hins Thatcher, 1875); I, thesis, viii, and Wilmers, De Christi Ecclesiae (Ratisbon, 1887), 480 sq.

A. Bouillon.

Discipline of the Secret (Lat. Disciplina Arcani; Ger. Arcandisciplinare), a theological term used to express the custom which prevailed in the earliest ages of the Church, by which the knowledge of the more intimate mysteries of the Christian religion was carefully kept from the heathen and even from those who were undergoing instruction in the Faith. The custom itself is beyond dispute, but the name for it is comparatively modern, and does not appear to have been used before the controversies of the seventeenth century, when special dissertations bearing the title "De disciplina arcani" were published both on the Protestant and the Catholic side.

The origin of the custom must be looked for in the recorded words of Christ: "Give not that which is holy to dogs; neither cast ye your pearls before swine; lest perhaps they trample them under their feet, and turn upon you, they tear you" (Matt., viii, 7), "The practice is so essentially vouchèd for by St. Paul's assurance that he had led the Corinthians "as . . . little ones in Christ", giving them "milk to drink, not meat", because they were not yet able to bear it (1 Cor., iii, 1-2).

With this passage we may compare also Heb., v. 12-14, where the same illustration is used, and it is declared that "solid food is for the perfect; for them who by custom have their senses exercised to the discerning of good and evil." Although the origin of the custom is thus to be traced back to the very beginnings of Christianity, it does not appear to have been so general, or to have been carried out with so much strictness in the earlier centuries as it was immediately after the persecutions had ceased. This may be due in part to the absence of detailed information with regard to the earlier period, but it is probable enough that the discipline was growing more strict all through the second and third centuries on account of the pressure of persecution, and that, when persecution was at last relaxed, the need for reserve was felt at first, while the Church was still surrounded by hostile paganism, to be increased rather than diminished. After the fifth or sixth century, when Christianity was thoroughly established and secure, the need of such a discipline was no longer felt, and it passed rapidly away. The practice of reserve (secreta disciplina) was exercised mainly in two directions, in dealing with catechumens, and with the heathen. It will be convenient to treat of these separately, as the reasons for the practice, and the mode in which it was carried out, differ somewhat in the two cases.

(1) Catechumenum. — It was desirable to bring learners slowly and by degrees to a full knowledge of the Faith. A convert from heathenism could not profitably be inculcated into the whole Catholic religion at once, and must be taught gradually. It would be necessary for him to learn first the great truth of the unity of God, and not until this had sunk deep into his heart could he safely be instructed concerning the Blessed Trinity. Otherwise tritheism would have been the inevitable result. So again, in times of persecution, it was necessary to be very careful about those who offered themselves for instruction, and who might be spies wishing to be instructed only that they might betray. The doctrines to which the reserve was more especially applied were those of the Holy Trinity and the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. The Lord's Prayer too, was jealously guarded from the knowledge of all who were not fully instructed. With regard to the Holy Eucharist and the Lord's Prayer some relics of the practice still survive in the Church. The Mass of the Catechumens, that earliest portion of the Christian service to which learners and neophytes were admitted, and which consisted of prayers or readings from Holy Scripture and sometimes included a sermon, is still quite distinguishable, though the custom no longer survives in the Western Liturgy, as it does in the Eastern, of formally bidding the uninitiated to depart when the more solemn part of the service is about to begin. So also the custom of saying the Lord's Prayer in silence in all public services, except the latter part of the Mass, when catechumens would according to the ancient use no longer have been present, preserves its origin to this discipline.

The earliest formal custom for the custom seems to be Tertullian (Apol., vii): "Omnia mysteriorum silentii jubes adhibetur." Again, speaking of heretics, he complains bitterly that their discipline is lax in this respect, and that evil results have followed: "Among them it is doubtful who is a catechumen and who a heretic; all can come in and they hear side by side and pray together; even heathens, if any chance to come in. That is how they cast the dogs to the dogs, and their pearls, though to be sure they are not real ones, they fling to the swine." (Prescr. adv. Haer., xli). Other passages from the Fathers which may be cited are St. Basil (De Spiritu, 103): "They must not be told to the uninitiated"; St. Gregory Nazianzen (Oratio xi, in S. Bap.): "where he speaks of a difference of knowledge between those who are without and those who are within, and St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose "Catechetical Discourses" are entirely built upon this principle, and who in his first discourse cautions his listeners not to tell what they have heard. "Should a catechumen ask what the teachers have said, tell nothing to a stranger; for we deliver to thee a mystery . . ." Let no man say to thee, What harm is there in what I also know? Let it out nothing; not that what is said is not worth telling, but that he that hears does not deserve to receive it. Thou wast once a catechumen, and then I told thee not what was coming. When thou hast come to experience the height of what is taught thee, thou wilt know that the catechumens are not worthy to hear them" (Cat., Lect. i, 12). St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom in like manner frequently stop short in their public addresses, and, after a more or less veiled reference to the mysteries, continue with: "The initiated will understand what I mean."
censure applied to all the sacraments, and no catechumen was ever allowed to be present at their celebration. St. Basil (De Spir. S. ad Amphilocho, xxvii) speaking of the sacraments says: “One must not circulate in writing the doctrine of mysteries which none but the initiated are allowed to see.” For his reference may be made to Theodoret (Epitom. Decret., xviii), St. Cyril of Alexandria (Contr. Julian., i), and St. Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. xi, de bapt.).

The discipline with respect to the Holy Eucharist of course requires no proof. It is involved in the very nature of the Missa Catechumenorum, and one can scarcely turn to any passage of the Fathers which deals with the subject in which the reticence to be observed is not expressly stated. Confirmation was never spoken of openly. St. Basil, in the treatise already quoted (De Spir. S., xxv, 11), says that no one has ever ventured to speak openly in writing of the holy oil of unction, and Innocent I, writing to the Bishop of Gubbio on the sacramental “form” of this ordinance answers: “I dare not speak the words, lest I should seem rather to betray a trust, than to respond to a request for information” (Epist., i, 3). Holy oil, for the same way were never given public. The Council of Laodicea forbade it definitely in its fifth canon. St. Chrysostom (Hom. xvi in II Cor.), in speaking of the practice of begging the prayers of the faithful for those who are to be ordained, says that those who understand co-operate with and assist to who do so. “For it is not lawful to reveal anything to those who are yet uninitiated.” So also St. Augustine (Tract xi, in Joann.): “If you say to a catechumen, Dost thou believe in Christ? he will answer, I do, and will sign himself with the Cross. . Let us ask him, Dost thou eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink the Blood of the Son of Man? He will not know what we mean, for Jesus has not trusted himself to him.”

The Heathen.—The evidence for the reserve of Christian writers when dealing with religious questions in books which might be accessible to the heathen is, naturally, to a large extent of a negative character, and therefore difficult to produce. Theodoret (Quest. xv in Num.) lays down the general principle in terms which are quite clear and unmistakable: “We speak in obscure terms concerning the Divine Mysteries, on account of the unintoxicated, but what we have withdrawn from the initiated, we reveal plainly.” That passage alone would suffice to refute the allegation not unfrequently made that the Discipline of the Secret was a confinement of the knowledge of the mysteries of the Faith to a chosen few, and was introduced in imitation of the heathen “mysteries.” On the contrary all Christians were taught the whole truth, there was no esoteric doctrine, but they were brought to full knowledge slowly, and precautions were taken, as was very necessary, to prevent heathens from learning anything of which they might make an evil use. A very striking example of the way in which the discipline was observed is found in the writings of St. Chrysostom. He writes to Pope Innocent I to say that in the course of a disturbance at Constantinople an act of irreverence had been committed, and “the blood of Christ had been spilt upon the ground.” In a letter to the reason for not speaking plainly. But Palladius, his biographer, speaking of the same incident in a book for general reading, says only, “They overturned the symbols” (Chrys. ad Inn., i, 3 p. G., L.I, 534; cf. Döllinger, “Lehre der Eucharistie,” 15). It is, no doubt, on this account that almost all the early apostles who are associated with Felix, Athanasius, Arnoldobius, Tatian, and Theophilus, are absolutely silent on the Holy Eucharist. Justin Martyr and to a less degree Tertullian are more outspoken; the frankness of the former has been unduly urged to prove the non-existence of this institution in the first half of the second century. So again, as Cardinal Newman has observed (Development, 27), both Minucius Felix and Arnobius in controversy with heathens deny absolutely that Christians used altars in their churches. The obvious meaning was that they did not use altars in the sense that the heathen sensibly understood it. For his reason may be seen as denying the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that, in a Christian sense, “we have an altar.”

The controversial importance of this subject in more recent times is, of course, obvious. The Catholics answered the accusation of Protestant writers, that their special doctrine could not be found in the writings of the early Fathers, by showing the existence of this practice of reserve. If it was forbidden to speak or write publicly of these doctrines, silence was completely accounted for. So again, if here and there in early writings terms were used which seemed to countenance Protestant teaching—as for instance by speaking of the Holy Eucharist as symbols—it became necessary always to examine whether these terms were not used intentionally to conceal the true doctrine from the unintoxicated, and whether the same writers did not, under other circumstances, use much more definite language. Protestant controversialists, therefore, endeavoured first of all to show that the practice had ever really existed, and then when they were driven from this position, they asserted that it was unknown to the earliest Christians, as shown by the freedom with which Justin Martyr speaks on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, and the great result of persecution. They alleged therefore that Catholics could not use it to account for the silence of any writer before the latter part of the second century at the earliest. To this Catholics responded that, although no doubt the practice may have been intensified through persecution, it goes back to the very beginnings of Christianity, and to Christ’s own words. Moreover it can be shown to have been in force before St. Justin’s time, and his action must be regarded as an exception, rendered necessary by the need for putting before the emperor an account of the Christian religion which should be true and full.

The monuments of the earliest centuries afford interesting examples of the principle of the Discipline of the Secret. Monuments which could be seen by all could only speak of the mysteries of religion under veiled symbols. So in the catacombs there is scarcely an instance of a painting of a subject which is directly Christian, although all spoke of Christian truth to those who were instructed in their meaning. Jewish subjects typical of Christian truths were commonly chosen, while the representation of Christ under the name and form of a fish (see Fish) made the allusion to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist possible and plain. There is, for example, the famous Autun inscription (see Pecotrinius): “Take the fish, honey-sweet, of the redeemer of the saints, eat and drink holding the Fish in thy hands”; words which every Christian would understand at once, but which conveyed nothing to the heathen. The name of Abercius (q. v.) offers another notable instance.

The need for this reticence became less pressing after the fifth century, as Europe became Christianized and the discipline gradually passed away. We may, however, still see its effects in that they must not be entirely in the absurd misstatements contained in the Koran on the subject of the Blessed Trinity and the Holy Eucharist. This, perhaps, is almost the last instance which could be brought forward. Once the doctrines of the Church had been publicly set forth, any such indiscretion became impossible. It must be noted that in the second half of the first millennium the practice was practicable. For a refutation of the theory of G. Anrich (Das antike Mysterienwesen, 1894), that the primitive Christians borrowed this practice from the mysteries of Mithra, see Cumont, “The Mysteries of Mithra.” (London, 1903), 196–99.
De reconditá vet. Ecclei. theol. (Heimste, 1670); Schrollinger, Dissert. de Dioce. arc. (Venice, 1730); Lienhardt, De antiqu. litteris (Strassburg, 1825); Tolstoi, De use d. litteris (Cologne, 1836); Weiss, Die altkirchl. Pädagogik (1869); Marpigny, Diei. Newman, Arias, i., §. Among Protestant writers are: De Dioce. arc. in, vet. Ecclei. (Leona, 1853); Rotte, De Dioce. arc. (Heidelberg, 1841); Credner in Jenaer Literaturzeitung (1844); Bonwetsch, Uber Eiren, Eintr. u. Gewinnung d. Eiren in Zeitzeichen, fur kat. Theol. (1872), 203-299; cf. also Bingham, Antiq. Ecclei., and the Archiv für Liturg. De disziplin ciplina Martigny, revealed decently (1873), can be highly instructive. In these discussions have been held at the instigation of the civil authorities; for the Church has rarely yielded to any sort of pressure to the extent of venturing revealed truths. This attitude of opposition on the part of the Church is wise and intelligent. A champion of orthodoxy, possessed of all the qualifications essential to a public debater, is not easily to be found. Moreover, it seems highly improper to give the antagonists of the Church the opportunity to conceal mysteries of the institutions which should be spoken of with reverence. The fact that the Catholic party to the controversy is nearly always obliged to be on the defensive places him at a disadvantage before the public, who, as Demosthenes remarks, “listen eagerly to realizations and accusations.” At any rate, the Church of Revelation, cannot abridge her office and permit a jury of more or less competent individuals to decide upon the truths committed to her care.

St. Thomas (II-II, Q. x, a. 7) holds that it is lawful to dispute publicly with unbelievers, under certain conditions. To discuss as doubting the truth of the faith, is a sin; to discuss for the purpose of refuting error, is praiseworthy. At the same time the character of the audience must be considered. If they are well instructed and firm in their belief, there is no danger; if they are simple-minded, then, where they are solicited to abandon their own beliefs, the order of defence is needed, provided it can be undertaken by competent parties. But where the faithful are not exposed to such perverting influences, discussions of the sort are dangerous. It is not, then, surprising that the question of disputations with heretics has been made the subject of ecclesiastical legislation. By a decree of Alexander IV (1254-1261) inserted in “Sextus Decretalium”, Lib. V, c. ii, and still in force, all laymen are forbidden, under threat of excommunication, to dispute publicly or privately with heretics on the Catholic Faith. The text reads: “Inhibe qumque, qui vult cum aliquo, iuxta fide catholicae disputare. Qui vero contra fecerit, excommunicationis laqueo inocuatur.” (We furthermore forbid any lay person to engage in disputations, either private or public, concerning the Catholic Faith. Whoever shall act contrary to this decree, let him be bound in the fetters of excommunication.) This law, like all penal laws, must be very narrowly construed. The terms Catholic Faith and dispute have a technical signification. The former term refers to questions purely theological; the latter to disputations more or less formal, and engrossing the attention of theologians. The Church has no interest in such disputations, or in the polemics of the apologists. There are many laymen who have received no scientific theological training who can treat more intelligently than a priest. In modern life, it frequently happens that an O'Connell or a Montalembert must stand forward as a defender of Catholic interests upon occasions when a theologian would be out of place. But when there is a question of dogmatic or moral theology, every intelligent layman will concede the propriety of leaving the exposition and defence of it to the clergy. Hence the clergy are free to engage in public disputes on religion without due authorization. In the "Collectanea S. Cong. de Prop. Fide" (p. 102, n. 294) we find the following decree, issued 8 March, 1625: “The Sacred Congregation has ordered that public disputes shall not be held with heretics, because for the most part, either owing to their incorrigible audacity or to the applause of the audience, error prevails and the truth is crushed. But should it happen that such a discussion is unavoidable, notice must first be given to the S. Congregation, which, after weighing the circumstances of time and persons, will prescribe in detail what is to be done.” The Sacred Congregation enforced this decree with such vigour, that the custom of holding public disputes with heretics well-nigh fell into desuetude. [See the decree of 1631 regarding the missionaries in Constantinople; also the decrees of 1643 and 1662, the latter forbidding the General of the Jesuit Order to authorize such discussions (Collectanea, 1674, n. 302).]

That this legislation is still in force appears from the letter addressed to the bishops of Italy by Cardinal Rampolla in the name of the Cong. for Ecclesiastical Affairs (27 Jan., 1902) in which it is declared that disputes are subject to the prohibition of the Holy See regarding public disputes with heretics; and, in accordance with the decree of Propaganda, 7 Feb., 1645, such public disputations are not to be permitted unless there is hope of producing greater good and unless the conditions prescribed by theologians are fulfilled. The Holy See, it is added, holds that these discussions often produce no result at all or even result in harm, has frequently forbidden them and ordered ecclesiastical superiors to prevent them; whereas this cannot be done, care must be taken that the discussions are not held without the authorization of the Apostolic See; and that only those who are well qualified to secure the triumph of Christian truth shall take part therein. It is evident, then, that no Catholic priest is ever permitted to become the aggressor or to issue a challenge to such a debate. If he receives from the other party to the controversy a public challenge which he thinks it impossible, he must refer the case to his canonical superiors and be guided by their counsel. We thus reconcile two apparently contradictory utterances of the Apostles: for according to St. Peter (I Pet., iii, 15) you should be “ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you”; while St. Paul admonishes Timothy (II Tim., ii, 14), “Contend not in words, for it is to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers.”

HISTORIC DISPUTATIONS IN EARLY TIMES.—The disputes of St. Stephen and St. Paul, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, were carried on in a very elementary fashion of apologetics rather than of formal discussions. St. Justin’s “Dialogue with Tryphon” was, in all probability, a literary effort after the model of Plato’s dialogues. St. Augustine, the ablest disputant of all time, engaged in several set debates with Arians, Manicheans, Donatists, and Pelagians. An interesting summary of each of these great disputations is preserved among the saint’s works, and ought to be closely studied by those who are called to defend the Catholic cause. Of particular interest is the celebrated Conference of Carthage, convened by order of Emperor Honorius to finish the iniquitous heresies of the Donatists. It opened 1 June, 411, and lasted three days. The tribune Macellinus represented the emperor, and in the presence of 286 Catholic and 279 Donatist bishops, St. Augustine, as chief spokesman of the Catholics, so completely upset the sectarian arguments, that the victory was
awarded to the Catholics, many prominent members of the sect were converted, and Donatism was doomed to a lingering death. Another memorable disputation took place in Africa—a couple of centuries later (645) between St. Maximus, Abbot of Chrysopolis (Scutari) and his opponent Bish. Macarius of Thebes. Both bishops had been driven from Constantinople by popular violence. It was conducted with rare skill and ended with the temporary conversion of Pyrrhus to the orthodox faith.

During the Reformation Period.—At the outbreak of the Lutheran and Zwinglian revolution, tumultuous discussions ofgeloup subjects grew to be epidemic. Luther opened the revolt by inviting discussion upon his ninety-five theses, 31 Oct., 1517. Although ostensibly framed to furnish matter for an ordinary scholastic dispute, Luther did not seriously contemplate an oral debate; for several of his theses were at variance with Catholic doctrine and could not be discussed at a Catholic university. Instead, they were widely scattered throughout Europe, everywhere creating confusion. An opportunity of disseminating more openly his peculiar tenets regarding justification by faith alone, the slavery of the human will, and the sinfulness of good works was offered to Reformer by his order during a council held at Heidelberg in April, 1518, when he directed a debate on ninety-eight theological and forty philosophical theses in the presence of many professors, students, citizens, and courtiers. Though his novel theses were viewed with deep displeasure by the older heads, he was successful in winning over hearers, notably Brenz and the Dominican, Martin Bucer. Emboldened by the outcome of the Heidelberg Dispute, and having discovered that the road to success lay in captivating the young, the agitator made futile attempts at organizing disputes to advance the seats of higher learning; but his university would lend its halls to the dissemination of un-Catholic doctrines.

The imprudence of Dr. Eck, who had become involved in a literary contest with Carlstadt and had hastily challenged his adversary to a public debate, gave Luther his long-looked-for opportunity. With his customary energy, he took the direction of the intellectual duel, encouraged both antagonists to persevere, and arranged the details. The city of Leipzig was chosen as the scene. Although the faculty of the university entered a vigorous protest, and the Bishops of Mainz and Brandenburg denounced prohibition and an excommunication, the disputation took place under the aegis of Duke George of Saxony. The discontent of the Catholics was increased when they learned that Luther had secured permission to subjoin a controversy with Eck on the subject of papal supremacy. Eck came to Leipzig with one attendant; Luther and Carlstadt entered the city accompanied by an army of adherents, mostly students. The preliminaries were carefully arranged; after which, from 27 June to 4 July (1519) Eck and Carlstadt debated the subject of free will and our ability to cooperate with grace. Eck had the better part of the argument throughout, and forced his antagonist to make admissions which stultified the new Lutheran doctrine. Thereupon Luther himself came forward to assail the dogma of Roman supremacy by Divine right. Sweeping away the authority of decreats, councils, and Fathers, he discovered to his hearers, and possibly also to himself, how completely he had abandoned the basic principles of the Catholic religion.

There could no longer remain a doubt that a new Hus had arisen to scourge the Church. The debate on the primacy was succeeded by discussions of purgatory, indulgences, subscriptions, etc. On 14 and 15 July Carlstadt, regaining courage, resumed the debate on free will and good works. Finally, Duke George declared the disputation closed, and each of the contendents departed, as usual, claiming the victory.

Of the two universities, Erfurt and Paris, to which the final decision had been reserved, Erfurt declined to intervene and returned the documents; Paris sat in judgment upon Luther's writings, attaching to each of his opinions the proper theological censure. The most tangible outcome of this disputation was that the primacy of the See of Rome. In January it opened the doors of the Duke of Saxony, who had been driven from Constantinople by popular violence. It was conducted with rare skill and ended with the temporary conversion of Pyrrhus to the orthodox faith.

During the Reformation Period.—At the outbreak of the Lutheran and Zwinglian revolution, tumultuous discussions ofgeloup subjects grew to be epidemic. Luther opened the revolt by inviting discussion upon his ninety-five theses, 31 Oct., 1517. Although ostensibly framed to furnish matter for an ordinary scholastic dispute, Luther did not seriously contemplate an oral debate; for several of his theses were at variance with Catholic doctrine and could not be discussed at a Catholic university. Instead, they were widely scattered throughout Europe, everywhere creating confusion. An opportunity of disseminating more openly his peculiar tenets regarding justification by faith alone, the slavery of the human will, and the sinfulness of good works was offered to Reformer by his order during a council held at Heidelberg in April, 1518, when he directed a debate on ninety-eight theological and forty philosophical theses in the presence of many professors, students, citizens, and courtiers. Though his novel theses were viewed with deep displeasure by the older heads, he was successful in winning over hearers, notably Brenz and the Dominican, Martin Bucer. Emboldened by the outcome of the Heidelberg Dispute, and having discovered that the road to success lay in captivating the young, the agitator made futile attempts at organizing disputes to advance the seats of higher learning; but his university would lend its halls to the dissemination of un-Catholic doctrines.

The imprudence of Dr. Eck, who had become involved in a literary contest with Carlstadt and had hastily challenged his adversary to a public debate, gave Luther his long-looked-for opportunity. With his customary energy, he took the direction of the intellectual duel, encouraged both antagonists to persevere, and arranged the details. The city of Leipzig was chosen as the scene. Although the faculty of the university entered a vigorous protest, and the Bishops of Mainz and Brandenburg denounced prohibition and an excommunication, the disputation took place under the aegis of Duke George of Saxony. The discontent of the Catholics was increased when they learned that Luther had secured permission to subjoin a controversy with Eck on the subject of papal supremacy. Eck came to Leipzig with one attendant; Luther and Carlstadt entered the city accompanied by an army of adherents, mostly students. The preliminaries were carefully arranged; after which, from 27 June to 4 July (1519) Eck and Carlstadt debated the subject of free will and our ability to cooperate with grace. Eck had the better part of the argument throughout, and forced his antagonist to make admissions which stultified the new Lutheran doctrine. Thereupon Luther himself came forward to assail the dogma of Roman supremacy by Divine right. Sweeping away the authority of decreats, councils, and Fathers, he discovered to his hearers, and possibly also to himself, how completely he had abandoned the basic principles of the Catholic religion. There could no longer remain a doubt that a new Hus had arisen to scourge the Church. The debate on the primacy was succeeded by discussions of purgatory, indulgences, subscriptions, etc. On 14 and 15 July Carlstadt, regaining courage, resumed the debate on free will and good works. Finally, Duke George declared the disputation closed, and each of the contendents departed, as usual, claiming the victory.

Of the two universities, Erfurt and Paris, to which
eloquent and conciliatory address. He pictured the evils which had befallen Germany, "once the first of all nations in fidelity, religion, piety, and divine worship," and warned his hearers that "all the evils that shall come upon you and your people, if, by clinging stubbornly to preconceived notions, you prevent a real concord of opinion, will be ascribed to you as the author of them." On behalf of the Protestants, Melan- chaton returned "an intrepid answer"; he threw all the blame upon the Catholics, who refused to accept the new Gospel.

A great deal of time was spent in wrangling over points of oral; finally it was decided that Dr. Eck should be spokesman for the Catholics and Melanchaton for the Protestants. The debate began 11 Jan., 1541. A tactical blunder was committed in accepting the Augsburg Confession as the basis of the conference. That document had been drawn up to meet an emergency. It was apologetic and conciliatory, so worded as to persuade the young emperor that there was no radical difference between the Catholics and the Protestants. It admitted the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops and tacitly acknowledged the supremacy of the pope by laying the ultimate appeal to be resolved by him. The truth was that many events had taken place in the ten intervening years. The bishops had been driven out of every Protestant territory in Germany; the Smalkald confederates had solemnly abjured the pope and solemnly professed of a council; each petty territorial prince had constituted had been made and accepted without any control. For all practical purposes the Augsburg Confession was as useless as the laws of Lycurgus. Moreover, as Dr. Eck pointed out, the Augsburg Confession of 1540 was a different document from the Confession of 1530, having been changed by Melanchaton and the council of canons. Had the theologians at Worms reached an agreement on every point of doctrine, the discord in Germany would have continued none the less; for the princes had not the remotest idea of giving up their lucrative dominion over their territorial churches. Eck and Melanchaton battled four days over the topic of original sin and its consequences, and a formula was drafted to which both parties agreed, the Protestants with a reservation.

At this point Granovella suspended the conference. On a point at Ratisbon, whether the emperor was summoned a diet, which he promised to attend in person. This diet, from which the emperor anticipated brilliant results, was called to order 5 April, 1541. As legate of the pope appeared Cardinal Contarini, assisted by the nuncio Morone. The inevitable Calvin was present, ostensibly to represent Lorraine in reality to foster discord in the interest of France. As collectors at the religious conference which met simultaneously, Charles appointed Eck, Pflug, and Gropper for the Catholic side, and Melanchaton, Bucer, and Pistorius for the Protestants. A document of mysterious origin, the "Ratisbon Book," was presented by Jochim of Brandenburg as the basis of agreement. This strange compilation, it developed later, was the result of secret conferences, held during the meeting at Worms, between the Protestants, Bucer and Capito, on one side, and the Lutheranizing (gropper) party, consisting of the emperor and the other. It consisted of twenty-three chapters, in which, by an ingenious phraseology, the attempt was made so to formulate the controverted doctrines that each party might find its own views therein expressed. How much Charles and Granovella had done in the translation is unknown; they certainly knew and approved of it. The "Book" had been submitted by the Elector of Brandenburg to the judgment of Luther and Melanchaton; and their contemptuous treatment of it augured ill for its success. When it was shown to the legate and Morone, the latter was for rejecting it summarily; Contarini, after making a score of emendations, notably emphasizing in Article 14 the dogma of Transubstantiation, declared that now "as a private person" he could accept it; but as legate he must consult with the Catholic theologians. Eck secured another promise of acceptance, which he explained by the dogma of justification. Thus emended, the "Book" was presented to the collectors by Granovella for consideration. The first four articles, treating of man before the fall, free will, the origin of sin, and original sin, were accepted. The battle began in earnest when the fifth article, on justification, was reached. After long and vehement debates, a formula was presented by Bucer and accepted by the majority, so worded as to be capable of bearing a Catholic and a Lutheran interpretation. Naturally, it was unsatisfactory to both parties. The Holy See condemned it and administered a severe rebuke to Contarini for not protesting against it. No greater success was attained as to the other articles of importance.

On 22 May the conference ended, and the emperor was informed as to the articles agreed upon and those on which agreement was impossible. Charles was sorely disappointed, but he was powerless to effect anything further. But many events had taken place in the ten intervening years. The wars had increased, and the remonstrance of Melanchaton had succeeded in breaking the dam. The emperor was left in the lurch at a moment of greatest need, fully conscious that the slightest event might decide the fate of the Reformation.
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Disibod, Saint, Irish bishop and patron of Disenberg (Disdobenberg), born c. 619; d. 8 July, 700. His life was written in 1170 by St. Hildegard, from her visions. St. Disibod journeyed to the Continent about the year 653, and settled in the valley of the Nahe, not far from Bingen. His labours continued during the latter half of the seventh century, and, to the end, though he led the life of a hermit, he was in a numerous community, which built bee-hive cells, in the Irish fashion, on the eastern slopes of the mountain. Before his death he had the happiness of seeing a church erected, served by a colony of monks following the Rule of St. Columba, and he was elected abbot-bishop, in 700, and died. His body was moved to the valley of the Altenburg, at Bingen, in 1170.

Disibod was a man of letters, and his fame has never been equalled. His book, the "Lives of the Saints," is one of the most famous in the monastic period. His other works include a "Life of St. Patrick," a "Life of St. Columba," and a "Life of St. Columbanus." He is said to have written over 150 works, of which only a few are extant.

His feast day is celebrated on 8 July.

Disparity of Worship (Disparitas Cultus), a concept introduced by the Church to reconcile or safeguard the sanctity of the Sacredness of Marriage. To effect this purpose a law was necessary that would debar Catholics from contracting marriage with persons unfit to receive the sacrament. The unfitness consists in (a) either non-reception of the Sacrament of Baptism, which is the door to the other six sacraments; or (b) in an unbelief in the sacramental character of marriage or in either or both of its essential properties (unity and indissolubility); or (c) in a profession of belief or unbelief that endangers the three ends and threefold substantial blessings or advantages of this "great sacrament" in Christ and the church. This unfitness, in whole or in part, is to be found in all persons who are not of the Catholic faith and worship. Disparity of worship, in a general way, signifies a difference of religion or worship between two persons. This state of disagreement may be understood to mean that one of the parties is a Catholic, and the other a non-Catholic. Consequent disparity occurs in the case of two pagans or unbaptized persons, one of whom, becoming a convert, is baptized in the Catholic faith and validly baptized in some Christian sect after marriage. The marriage is not affected by this consequent disparity of religion. Another case of consequent disparity of worship which does not militate against the marriage is that of two Catholics, one of whom after their union apostatizes, or turns infidel, Mohammedan, etc. Antecedent disparity is twofold: considered in its strict and proper sense it is called perfect disparity of worship,
or simply disparity of worship, and implies a different relation on the part of the contracting parties in the matter of an essential religious rite, to wit, the Sacra-
ment of Baptism. Viewed in a less strict, but still a pro-
cer, sense, it is named imperfect disparity of wor-
schip, a commonly mingled religion (mixtum religi-
hum, Uglia), which presupposes an equality as to the re-
ception of baptism, but denotes a diversity as to form
of belief and religious observance. Imperfect dis-
parity, or mixed religion, does not render void the
marriage of a Catholic with a baptized non-Catholic;
but, of course, it does make it (unless dispensation
indulged and granted) impossible for souls to be
salvific. However, such a marriage may be null and
void on account of another diriment impediment,
for instance, the non-Catholic recipient of
baptism is not a Christian, but a pseudocrani.

Disparity of worship, in its strict sense, and as
the subject of this article, is that diversity which exists
to two persons, one of whom has, and the other
has certainly not, received Christian baptism. This
disparity exists between a baptized Christian, whether
Catholic or non-Catholic, and a pagan, Moham-
medan, Jew, or even a catechumen (believer in
the Catholic Faith yet not baptized).

Imperfect disparity of worship, or mixed religion, might more strictly and aptly be named disparity
of faith, since faith is an internal act, and not baptism, is the point of difference; perfect disparity of
worship, on the contrary, might more aptly and properly be called disparity of baptism, for the reason
that the external act (bap-
tism), the internal act (faith, since faith is an internal
act), and not baptism, is the point of dissimilarity.

Disparity of worship has been
chosen as the basis of this diriment impediment for
a twofold reason: (1) it is an external ceremony, easy
of recognition and proof, and (2) it is a sacrament which
imprints an indelible character upon the soul of the
recipient, so as to present a personal religious condition
which is fixed and unchangeable. Personal faith, on
the contrary, viewed either as the internal assent of
the mind or as the outward profession of the internal
act, is subject to change and not always easy of
demonstration, and hence could not afford a certain
and indubitable foundation. The primary reason why
Catholics are debarred from intermarriage with
unbaptized persons is because the latter are not capable
of receiving the Sacrament of Matrimony, as baptism is
the door to all the other sacraments. Furthermore,
according to the more probable opinion of the Catholic
party who, with a dispensation, marries an
unbaptized person, does not receive the sacrament or the
concomitant graces (cf. Sanchez, Bk. II, disp.
viii, n. 2; Pirhing, Bk. IV, tit. i, n. 71; Schmalzgrue-
ber, Bk. IV, tit. i, n. 307; Billot, "De Ecclesia Sacra-
tismo,"pars posterior, 350 sqq.; Hurter, Bk. III,
n. 598; and Wernz, who examines the reasons for
the opposite opinion and answers them, "Jus Decret.",
IV, 63 sqq.). The Church has not decided this ques-
tion; hence the opinion of Dominicus de Soto (In IV
Sent., art. iii, 3d fem.), Perrone (II, 306), Rosset,
who holds that it is the more probable (De Sacr. Matri-
monii, I, 284 sqq.), and Tuenqueray (Synopsis Theol.
Dogmat., II, 618, n. 31), to wit, that the Catholic does
receive the sacrament, is tenable. The marriage,
according to both opinions, is certainly sacred (Leo
XIII, "Aeternum", 10 Feb., 1880) and indissoluble.

Intermarriage exists only in instances where the disparity is of such
nature that one of the contracting parties is, and the other
party is certainly not, baptized. Every bap-
tized person, Protestant as well as Catholic, is subject
to this qualifying and annihilating impediment, be-
cause the Church has given the Jurisdiction over
it to the Church. Under the name "Cath-
lie" are here included, besides practical Catholics,
children baptized as infants in the Catholic Church
but never reared or instructed in her teachings, Catho-
ils who have fallen away or apostatized from the
Catholic Faith and have joined other denomina-
tions or turned infidel. Once baptized always bap-
tized, and always subject to the laws of Christ and His
infallible Church, is axiomatic. Disparity of worship
embraces and renders null and void (no dispensation
having been granted) the marriage (a) of a Catholic
Christian, Jew, Mohammedan or infidel; and (b) of baptized
non-Catholics, e.g. heretics and schismatics, with unbaptized persons. It does
not extend to, or make void, the marriage (1) of two
certainly unbaptized persons, for, since they do not
belong to Christ by baptism, the Church has no juris-
diction over them; (2) of a Catholic with a baptized
Protestant, or schismatic, or apostate Catholic, or
Catholic turned infidel; (3) of baptized non-Catholics
with one another. Seeing that the parties in the
second and third classes have been baptized, it is evi-
dent that their marriages are outside the domain of
the diriment impediment, whose aim is to protect the
sacrament.

Difficulties as to the marriages of Catholics with
non-Catholics, and of non-Catholics with one another,
or with pagans or other unbaptized persons have in
these days multiplied, due either to absolute omission of baptism, or its careless and often in-
expedient administration even among the so-called Christian denominations.

Doubts about the administration (dubium facti) or valid administration (dubium juris) of
baptism in these sects are as a consequence frequent, and render complex the question whether or not disparity
of worship covers the marriage. The safe guide in this confusion is the axiom: a
Pentecostal baptism, as regards a marriage already, or about to
be, celebrated, is presumed to be valid if, after due in-
vestigation, the doubt is still insoluble or it is not
prudent (on account of delay, etc.) to remove it.
In this rule, so different from that governing baptism as a
necessary means for salvation, is based upon the principle that the right to marry yields but to the evi-
cence (not doubt) of the non-baptism. Accordingly,
disparity of worship invalidates the matrimonial
union of one doubly baptized with another cer-
tainly not baptized. The doubt may concern the act
of baptizing or the validity of the ceremony.
Investigation on these points must proceed in this manner:
search must be made of the ritual belonging to the
denomination of the party concerning whose baptism
there is doubt, and if the ritual teaches the necessity
of baptism and exposes the use of the valid matter
and form in its administration, and further, if the
parents are strict adherents and observers of their
religion, there is a certainty (sufficient for marriage)
that the baptism was valid. If the ritual prescribes
baptism with the necessary matter and form, but,
upon investigation, a serious doubt remains, the bapt-
ism is still considered valid. If, on the contrary, the
sect repudiates baptism, forbids infant-baptism, or
admits to baptism only adults of thirty years, or the
parents assert that they do not belong or wish to be
long to any sect or denomination, but are satisfied with
practicing the "Supreme Rite" by means of the simple
administered to the infant, rather than by any fixed form of worship, then there
is no certainty, not even a presumption, in favour of
the baptism in childhood. Should the parents be
careless and negligent in the observances of the sect of
which they are members, or belong to a denomination
which, whilst not rejecting baptism, yet does not ad-
mit its necessity, and in which, ordinarily, baptism is
not administered, then there is no presumption for or
against the baptism of their offspring, and each indi-
vidual case must be referred to Rome (Congreg. of the
Inquisition, 1 Aug., 1883).

Disparity of worship does not affect the marriage
of a Catholic or baptized non-Catholic with one whose
baptism, even after careful investigation concerning the
baptismal ceremony or its validity, remains doubtful.
Neither does it in any way influence the mar-
riage of two who, after diligent examination, are still
DISPARITY

39

considered doubtfully baptized. There is a difference of opinion among the jurists and theologians as to the influence of this diriment impediment upon the marriage of two doubtfully baptized, if after investigation it turns out for a certainty that one was certain, the modern common opinion is that the disparity of worship does not nullify this marriage. Gasparri gives as reason that the consuetudinary law never contemplated this case, and hence does not influence it (De Mariandino, I, nos. 597 and 601). Wenz (IV, 772, note) Gury Ballerini (II, 531), and others say that the marriage is valid, but give as reason the Church's dispensation, either special or general. Lehmkulli (II, 536) distinguishes and asserts that if a dispensation from the prohibitive impediment of "mixed religion" has been granted antecedent to the marriage, the union is valid; his reason, however, that the Church in dispensing with the prohibitive did implicitly dispense with the diriment impediment, seems to be at variance with a decree of the Holy Office (29 April, 1840, n. 2) which clearly states that the Holy See dispenses with the impediment of disparity of worship only in express terms. Where no dispensation has been granted, he holds that the marriage is null and therefore of the existing disparity of worship and must be revalidated. He recognises, however, as valid the marriage of the doubtfully baptized, if they had been considered and had considered themselves Catholics, and had followed Catholic practices, and afterwards it was discovered that one of them had not been a Catholic (loc. cit., in note 10).

ORIGIN OF THE IMPEDIMENT.—This impediment, inasmuch as it is diriment, is not enjoined by the natural, Divine, or written ecclesiastical law, but has been introduced by a universal custom and practice in the Eastern and Western Church since the twelfth century. The natural and Divine laws do, however, repudiate and prohibit such marriages as tend to frustrate the primary ends of marriage by exposing believers and their offspring to the loss of their Catholic faith, and this prohibition continues in force so long as the danger exists and no proportionately grave cause dictates the necessity of such marriage. The Mosaic Law (Deut., vii, 3) prohibits marriage between the Israelites and the Chanaanites, and even the Samaritans (who kept the Law and had the Book of Moses), on account of the heathenish ceremonies they observed. If the Jews might be kept from the service of the true God and cling to the worship of the false gods of their pagan wives. The Pauline injunctions (I Cor., vii, 39), "... let her marry to whom she will but only in the Lord" and (II Cor., vi, 14): "... bear not the yoke with [i.e. do not marry] unbelievers", do not, indeed, declare invalid the marriages of Christians with unbelievers, but certainly do earnestly forbid the faithful to marry unbelievers unless the ends of Christian marriage are safeguarded and grave and weighty reasons exist for the union. Certainly in the time of St. Paul and immediately afterwards the proportionate importance of this necessity would be proportionately greater for the Christian if Christianity was sufficiently grave cause for permitting such intermarriages with the hope of the conversion of the unbelieving partner.

With the development of the Church and its growth in numbers, opportunities for Christian marriage increased, proportionately grave reasons for mixed unions (unless in rare cases) ceased, and then the natural and Divine laws asserted their right to prohibit such marriages as tended to frustrate the ends of the matrimonial sacrament by exposing the Catholic to a weakening or loss of faith, the offspring to a lack of Christian education, and the family and the good name of that Christian love which is its very corner-stone. The Christian laity, as well as clergy, realized from sad experience and observation the ordinary tendency of mixed unions to a compromise or loss of faith on the part of the Catholic, and the un-Catholic bringing-up, or at least religious indifference, of the children, and, finally, injury to domestic peace and happiness by the constant exposure to disputes, and sometimes bitter quarrels, about the fundamental principles of Catholic Faith, and the consequent weakening, if not total extinction, of Christian life between husband and wife (St. Ambrose, De Abstinentia, Bk. 6, ch. 15), says: "There can be no unity of love where there is no unity of faith"). At different periods and in different countries (especially Spain and Gaul) particular councils inveighed against them, and although these canons were not strictly observed, and there were many mixed marriages in the days of Sts. Jerome (Lib. I in Jovinianum) and Augustine (Lib. de Fide et operibus, ch. xix), yet after the death of the latter, and especially from the seventh to the twelfth century, the detestation of them so increased, and the conviction that they were not Christian marriages, and therefore to be shunned and not contracted, grew so strong and general throughout the entire Church that as far back as the twelfth century it was a universal custom and practice which even had the force of a universal church law (Bellarmine, De Controversiis, III, De Sacramento Matrimonii, Bk. I, ch. xxiii; Benedict XIV, Constit. "Singulares nobis", paragraphs 9 and 10).

This impediment is binding on Christians of newly converted or even pagan countries, where there has been no such custom inasmuch as there have been no Catholics. The opinion of Lessius and others to the effect that marriage is clearly repudiated by Gregory XIII to the Christian missionaries of Japan to dispense with this impediment in the cases of newly converted Japanese Catholics. Many theologians and canonists say that there is one exception to the nullity of the law, and that is the instance of an emigrant Catholic family settled in a country without a single Catholic neighbour, forty or fifty days journey removed from the nearest Catholic, and unable on account of the distance or want of means to leave the country or procure a dispensation from the impediment, and thus compelled to remain their whole lives single or marry pagans (Santi-Leitner, IV, 74; Gasparri, De Matrimonio, I, 429). It does not seem that disparity of worship holds in a case of this kind; the ecclesiastical law under such circumstances does not bind a man so as to deprive him of his natural right to marriage (Wenz, Jura Decret., IV, 775, n. 37), holds the opposite opinion.

DISPENSATION FROM THE IMPEDIMENT.—The Church can dispense from this impediment, inasmuch as it is of ecclesiastical institution. It never does so unless for gravest reasons and upon the fulfillment of certain conditions and guarantees that safeguard, as far as possible, the ends of the Sacrament of Matrimony. The natural and Divine laws, before permitting mixed marriages, exact the removal of all danger to the faith of the Catholic and to the baptism and Catholic bringing-up of all of the children of the marriage. The Church cannot dispense with this necessary requirement, and, the better to ensure its presence, insists upon certain conditions and promises, which must be committed to writing and signed and, in some instances and countries, also sworn to, by the unbaptized party to the pact. The unbeliever promises faithfully to confess and to baptize, if he should become a Christian, his children, and to bring up both the children of this union in the Christian religion and education. The unbaptized party also promises to assist the children in their baptism and to permit them to be brought up in the Christian religion and education. The Church on her part grants the permission for the marriage. The promises on the part of the unbaptized party are: (1) that he (or she) will afford the Catholic partner full and perfect freedom to practise the Catholic Faith, and that he (or she) will abstain from saying or doing anything which will weaken or change the faith of the Catholic; (2) that he or she will not change his (or her) domicile to become a inhabitant of a pagan country, that he will not practise polygamy; (2) that he (or she) will permit all children of their union to be baptized and reared in the Catholic Faith and practice, and that he (or she) will do or say nothing calculated to lessen their faith or turn
then away from it or its practices. The Catholic petitioner for the dispensation must also give promise (usually also written, in order that the dispenser may have a moral certainty of the absence of danger to the substantial ends of the sacrament) that he (or she) will strictly attend to his (or her) personal religious duties and have all the children baptized and properly reared and trained in the Catholic doctrine and practice, and that by prayer and good example and other legitimate and prudent means he (or she) will constantly labor to bring about the conversion to the Catholic Faith of his (or her) unbaptized partner.

The promise to effect the conversion of the unbeliever is of special importance, although too frequently lost sight of. The conversion most assuredly eliminates the last vestige of possible perversion of the Catholic party, ensures the primary end of marriage, i.e. the bearing and rearing of children for the Church and heaven, and rounds out, by the perfect unity of the married couple in faith and Christian love, their marriage according to its great type, the union of Christ with the Church. Even with all these promises, written and sworn to as safeguards to Christian marriage, a dispensation cannot be licitly given unless a grave, proportionate risk to the great ends to be encountered, justifies the marriage.

This dispensation, in former days very rarely granted in Catholic countries, is now of more frequent occurrence, owing to the existence of "civil marriage" and the growing independence on the part of parents of their children's baptism. The rule of the Church was, and is, not to grant a dispensation from this impediment unless in provinces or countries where the Catholics are largely outnumbered by the non-baptized inhabitants. Rather than dispense, the Church prefers to convert the heathen and educate them. The Church will more willingly and readily grant dispensation from the diriment impediments of affinity and consanguinity, precisely for the reason that in the latter cases there is no danger to the faith of either Catholic or unbeliever, while in the case of the former, even though the marriages are licit and kept, there is always danger of religious indifference on the part of the Catholic parent, and especially of the children on account of the example of the non-baptized parent.

The pope alone summa juris can dispense with this impediment; bishops cannot. They, however, are delegated to do so, but in the pope's name and by virtue of his authorized delegated authority. Thus the bishops in pagan countries—China, Japan, Africa, etc.—and in countries where the unbaptized largely outnumber the Catholics, as England, United States, etc., have ample faculties in respect of this impediment. To-day the only case (and should there be danger in delay, it is not: see Formula T, 11 June, 1907) reserved to Rome in the faculties granted to bishops of the United States is that of a Catholic with an orthodox Jew, i.e., a circumcised follower of Judaism. The case of a Jew uncircumcised, or even circumcised if he has abandoned Judaism, is not reserved.

This delegated faculty to bishops is given only for a specified period of five years or for a certain number of cases and requires that the bishop in granting a dispensation must state that it was conceded by virtue of the delegations of specific date. Where the impediment is occult and there is danger in delay, bishops may dispense without express faculty of Rome, which in such cases is presumed to grant it. All bishops can (decree of Congreg. of Inquis., 20 Feb., 1888, and 1 March, 1888) dispense, and delegate that faculty to their respective, from the impediment of disparity of worship in the case of one who is in danger of death but is only civy married or lives in concubinage. The aforesaid promises cannot be omitted. The sick party must promise absolutely to observe the requirements of the natural and Divine laws, and to carry out the injunctions of the ecclesiastical law as far as possible (Collectanea S. C. de Prop. Fide, n. 2188). Bishops cannot dispense in instances where the ends, purposes, and substantial blessings of the sacrament are well protected, unless there also exists a grave and proportionately weighty reason. There are some cases of personal respect or some practical dangers, which are not very grave (Instruct. S. C. de Prop. Fide, 9 May, 1877). Should the bishop dispense without cause, the dispensation would be null and void. The pope's dispensation, in a similar case laboured under the same defect, would be valid. The reason of this difference is that the bishop cannot violate a law of his superior (in this instance the universal law), whereas the pope, who is supreme legislator, can dispense from universal ecclesiastical laws. He cannot, however, do so validly with the prohibition of the natural and Divine laws; hence he must have, before conceding the dispensation, a moral certainty that the practice of the Faith by the Catholic, and the Catholic baptism and rearing of the children, are amply protected.

The Holy See dispenses from this impediment only for the gravest reasons and only in express terms (Collectanea S. C. de Prop. Fide, n. 948, 2); hence a dispensation from mixed religion instead of disparity of worship would not suffice for the validity of the marriage.

All the European Governments (except Austria) ignore this impediment. The Austrian impediment is different from the ecclesiastical impediment. It rests in the profession of faith, and not in the baptism of the parties, and so far as concerns the Church, is civil impediment is more injurious than otherwise. According to the Austrian law, the marriage of a Catholic with a Jew, or other unbaptized party, is civilly invalid as long as the Catholic remains in the Catholic Church. Should the Catholic leave the Church, and announce that he (or she) holds no belief in any faith, the marriage with an unbaptized partner would be civilly valid. Unbaptized parties can, on the other hand, enter into civilly valid marriage with baptized Protestants. The Church in granting dispensation from disparity of worship, thus permitting the marriage of a Catholic and an unbaptized person, by that act dispenses also from all impediments of purely ecclesiastical institution, from which the unbaptized is exempt (except clandestinity; cf. "Praxia Curiae Romana"; "Ne Temere," 2 Aug., 1907); the Church declares it not a dispensation, but an exemption of the unbaptized may, on account of the indissolubility of the marriage, be communicated to the Catholic party (Congreg. of Inquis., 3 March, 1825). This dispensation never includes dispensation in any degree in the direct line nor in the first degree of the transverse line (Gasparri, op. cit., nos. 76 and 761). This impediment, which is public juris, can be invoked by any Catholic to annul a marriage contracted without the necessary dispensation. The burden of proof rests upon the challenger, who must clearly demonstrate that there was either no act of baptismal administration or that this act of administration which actually took place was certainly invalid. The usual canons of evidence are supplemented by special laws laid down for the demonstration of the ceremony or the validity of the baptism. The customary norm (c, iii, X, De fresby, non-lap., III, xliii) in case of practical Catholic does not govern the cases of non-Catholics or negligent Catholics. The rules prescribed by the Congreg. of the Inquisition (1 Aug., 1883, and 5 Feb., 1851) for the verification of the fact or non-fact of the baptism, as also of the validity of the act, must be strictly followed.
Dispensation (Lat. dispensatio), an act whereby in a particular case a lawful superior grants relaxation from an existing law. This article will treat: I. Dispensation in General; II. Matrimonial Dispensation: For dispensations from vows see Vows and Religious Orders; and from fasting and abstinence, Fast, ABSTINENCE.

I. Dispensation in General.—Dispensation differs from abrogation and derogation, inasmuch as the latter supress the law totally or in part, whereas a dispensation leaves it still in vigour; and from epieikeia, or a favourable interpretation of the purpose of the legislator, which supposes that he did not intend to include a particular case within the scope of his law, whereas by dispensation a superior withdraws from the power of the law or case which otherwise would fall under it. The raison d'être for dispensation lies in the nature of prudential administration, which often counsels the adapting of general legislation to the needs of a particular case by way of exception. This is peculiarly true of ecclesiastical administration. Owing to the universality of the Church, the adequate observance by all its members of a single code of laws would be very difficult. Moreover, the Divine purpose of the Church, the welfare of souls, obliges it to reconcile as far as possible the general interests of the community with the spiritual needs or even weaknesses of its individual members. Hence we find instances of dispensational laws from the very earliest centuries; such early instances, however, were meant rather to legitimize accomplished facts than to authorize beforehand the doing of certain things. Later on antecedent dispensations were frequently granted; as early as the eleventh century Yves of Chartres, among other canonists, outlined the theory on which they were based. With reference to matrimonial dispensations now common, we meet in the sixth and seventh centuries with a few examples of general dispensations granted to legitimize marriages already contracted, or prevent them about to be celebrated. But, however, until the second half of the eleventh century that we come upon papal dispensations affecting individual cases. The earliest examples relate to already existing unions; the first certain dispensation for a future marriage dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century. In the sixteenth century the Holy See began to give ample faculties to bishops and missionaries in distant lands; and in the seventeenth century such privileges were granted to other countries. Such was the origin of the ordinary faculties (see FACULTIES, CANONICAL) now granted to bishops.

Dispensation is a dispensation granted to the faithful to allow them to violate a law of the Church without impeding a vow, the pope remits the obligation resulting from the promise made to God, consequently also the impediment it raised against marriage. (d) A dispensation may be in fœno gratiatis, in formâ commissâ, or in formâ commissâ mixtâ. Those of the first class need no execution, but contain a dispensation which takes effect ipso facto by the union or by presentation of the parties. Those of the second class give jurisdiction to the person named as executor of the dispensation, if he should consider it advisable; they are, therefore, favours to be granted. Those of the third class command the executor to deliver the dispensation if he can verify the accuracy of the facts for which such dispensation is asked; they seem, therefore, a favour already granted. From the respective nature of each of these forms of dispensation result certain important consequences that affect delegation, obetion, and revocation in the matter of dispensations (see DELEGATION; OBSESSION; REVOCATION).

(2) The Dispensation Process.—In the very notion of dispensation that only the legislator, or his lawful successor, can of his own right grant a dispensation from the law. His subordinates can do so only in the measure that he permits. If such communication of ecclesiastical authority is made to an inferior by means of a delegate of an office he holds, his power, or right derived, is known as ordinary. If it is only given him by way of commission it is known as delegated power. When such delegation takes place through a permanent law, it is known as delegation by right of law. It is styled habitus, when, though given by a particular act of the superior, it is granted for a certain period of time or a certain number of cases. Finally, it is called particular if granted only for one case. When the power of dispensation is ordinary it may be delegated to another unless this be expressly forbidden. When it is delegated, as stated above, it may not be subdelegated or transferred; this be expressly permitted, except by the pope, however, for delegation ad universalem causarum, i.e. for all cases of a certain kind, and for delegation by the pope or the Roman Congregations. Even these exceptions do not cover delegations made because of some personal fitness of the delegate, nor those in which the latter receives, not actual jurisdiction to grant the dispensation, but an appointment to execute it, e.g. in the case of dispensations granted in formâ commissâ mixtâ (see above).

The power of dispensation rests in the following persons: (A) The Pope.—He cannot of his own right dispense from the Divine law (either natural or positive). When he does dispense, e.g. from vows, oaths, unconsummated marriages, he does so by derived power communicated to him as Vicar of Christ, and the limits of which he determines by his magisterium, or authoritative teaching power. There is some diversity of opinion as to the nature of the pope's dispensing power in this respect; it is generally held that it operates by way of indirect dispensation: that is, by virtue of his power over the wills of the faithful the pope, acting in the name of God, remits for them an obligation resulting from their delinquency and therewith the consequences that by natural or positive Divine law flowed from such obligation. The pope, of his own right, has full power to dispense from all ecclesiastical laws, whether universal or particular, even from the disciplinary decrees of ecumenical councils. Such authority is consequent on his primacy and the fullness of his immediate jurisdiction. A part of this power, however, he usually communicates to the Roman Congregations.

(B) The Bishop.—Of his ordinary right, the bishop can dispense from his own statutes and from those of his predecesors, even promulgating as it affects the law directly, by suspending its operation, or indirectly, by modifying the object of the law in such a way as to withdraw it from the latter's control. For instance, when a dispensation is granted from the matrimonial
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tained by some authors, viz. that the bishop can grant all dispensations which the pope has not reserved to himself, cannot be admitted. But by derived right (either ordinary or delegated according to the terms of the grant) the bishop can dispense from those laws that expressly permit him to do so; and from those which he has received an indult to that effect. Moreover, by ordinary right, based on custom or the tacit consent of the Holy See, he may dispense: (a) in a case where recourse to the Holy See is difficult and where delay would entail serious danger; (b) in doubtful cases, especially when the doubt affects the existence of the dispensation or the sufficiency of the motives; (c) in cases of frequent occurrence but requiring dispensation, also in frequently occurring matters of minor importance; (d) in decrees of national and provincial councils, although he may not pronounce a general decree to the contrary; (e) in pontifical laws specially passed for his diocese. It should be always remembered that to fix the exact limit of these various powers legitimate custom and the interpretation of reputable authors must serve as guides. Superiors of exempt religious orders (see Exception) can grant to their subjects, individually, those dispensations from ecclesiastical laws which the bishop grants by his ordinary power. When there is question of the rules of their order they are bound to follow what is laid down in their constitutions (see Religious Orders).

(C) The Vicar-General.—He enjoys by virtue of his office the ordinary dispensing power of the bishop, also the delegated powers of the latter, i.e., those granted him not personally but as ordinary (according to present discipline, the pontifical faculties known as ordinary); exception is made, however, for those powers which require a special mandate like those of Chapter Licitae for dealing with irregularities and secret cases. The vicar capitular likewise has all the dispensing power which the bishop has of his own right, or which has been delegated to him as ordinary.

(D) Parish Priest.—By his own ordinary right, founded on custom, he may dispense (but only in particular cases, and for individuals separately, not for a community or congregation) from the observance of fasting, abstinence, and Holy Days. He can also dispense, within his own territory, from the observance of diocesan statutes when the latter permit him to do so; the terms of these statutes usually indicate the extent of such power, also whether it be ordinary or delegated. Dispensation being an act of jurisdiction, a superior can exercise it only over his own subjects, though as a general rule he can do so in their favour even outside his own territory. The bishop and the parish priest, except in circumstances governed by special enactments, acquire jurisdiction over a member of the faithful by reason of the domicile or quasi-domicile he or she has in a diocese or parish (see Domicile). Moreover, in their own territory they can use their dispensing power in respect of persons without fixed residence (provy), probably also in respect of travellers temporarily resident in such territory. As a general rule he who has power to dispense others from certain obligations can also dispense himself.

(C) Causes for Granting Dispensations.—A sufficient cause is always required in order that a dispensation may be both valid and licit when an inferior dispenses from a superior's law, but only for the licit of the act when a superior dispenses from his own law. Nevertheless, in this latter case a dispensation granted on the motive would not (in so far as not for some special reason, e.g., scandal, constituting a serious fault. One may be satisfied with a probably sufficient cause, or with a cause less than that, of itself and without any dispensation, would excuse from the law. It is always understood that a superior intends to grant only a licit dispensation. Therefore a dispensation is null when in the motives set forth for obtaining it a false statement is made which has influenced not only the causa impulsa, i.e., the reason inclining the superior more easily to grant it, but also the causa motus, i.e., the really determining reason for the grant in question. For this reason the information which should accompany the petition, in order that a dispensation be valid, see below apropos of oblation and subrogation in rescripts of dispensation. Consequently a false statement or the fraudulent withholding of information, i.e., done with the motive of deceiving the superior, totally annuls the dispensation, unless such statement bear on a point foreign to the matter in hand. But if made with no fraudulent intent, a false statement does not affect the grant unless the object of the statement be some circumstance which ought to have been expressed under pain of nullity, or unless it affects directly the motive cause as above described. Even then false statements do not always nullify the grant; for (a) when the dispensation is composed of several distinct and separable parts, that part or element alone is nullified on which the oblation or subrogation is founded; (b) when several adequately distinguished motive causes are set forth, the dispensation is null and void only when the oblation or subrogation in question affects them all. It is enough, moreover, that the accuracy of the facts be verified at the moment when the dispensation is granted. Therefore, in the case of dispensations ex gratia (or in forma gratiis), i.e., granting favours, the facts must be true when the dispensation is expedited: on the other hand, in the case of dispensations in forma commissae (and according to the more general opinion, in those in forma commissae mitis), the causes alleged must be verified only through the fact that it is actually executed.

(1) Form and Interpretation.—It is proper, generally speaking, that dispensations be asked for and granted in writing. Moreover, the Roman Congregations are forbidden, as a rule, to receive petitions for dispensations or to answer them by telegram. The execution of a dispensation made on receipt of telegraphic information that such dispensation had been granted would be null, unless such means of communication had been officially used by special authorization from the pope. Except when the interest of a third party is at stake, or the superior has expressed himself to the contrary, the dispensing power whether ordinary or delegated, ought to be strictly interpreted, since its object is the common good. But the actual dispensation (and the same holds true of the dispensing power given for a particular case) ought to be strictly interpreted unless it is a question of a dispensation authorized by the common law, or one granted motu proprio (by the superior spontaneously) to a whole community, or with a view to the public good. Again, that interpretation is lawful without which the dispensation would prove hurtful or useless to the beneficiary, also that which extends the benevolence of the dispensation to whatever is juridically connected with it.

(5) Cessation of Dispensations.—(a) A dispensation ceases when it is renounced by the person in whose favour it was granted. However, when the object of the dispensation is an obligation exclusively resulting from one's own will, e.g., a vow, such renunciation is not valid until accepted by the competent. Moreover, neither the non-use of a dispensation nor the fact of having obtained another dispensation incompatible with the former is, in itself, equivalent to a renunciation. Thus, if a girl had received a dispensation to marry Peter and another to marry Paul, she would remain free to marry either of them. A dispensation ceases when it is revoked after due notice to the recipient. The legislator can validly revoke a dispensation, even without cause, though in
the latter case it would be illicit to do so; but without a cause an inferior cannot revoke a dispensation, even validly. With a just cause, however, he can do so if he has dispensed by virtue of his general powers (ordinary or delegated); not so, however, when his authority has been merely to one particular case, since thereby his authority was exhausted. (d) Dispensations cease by the death of the superior when, the dispensation having been granted in foro commis- 
sis, the executor had not yet begun to execute it. But the grant holds good if given ex gratia (as a favour) and even, more probably, if granted in foro commissum. We believe a new pope is worse qualified to validate all favours granted in the immediately previous year by his predecessor and not yet availed of. (d) A conditional dispensation ceases on verification of the condition that renders it void, e.g. the death of the superior when the dispensation was granted with the clause ad beneplacitum nostrum (at our good pleasure). (e) A dispensation ceases by the adequate and total cessation of its motive causes, the dispensation thereupon ceasing to be legitimate. But the cessation of the influencing causes, or of a part of the motive causes, does not affect the dispensation. However, when the motive cause itself is complex, though complexly it is substantially one, it is rightly held to cease with the disappearance of one of its essential elements.

II. MATRIMONIAL DISPENSATIONS.—A matrimonial dispensation is the relaxation in a particular case of an impediment prohibiting or nullifying a marriage. It may be granted in any case, the following: (a) in favour of a marriage or to legitimize one already contracted; (b) in secret cases, or in public cases, or in both (see IMPEDMENTS OF MATRIMONY); (c) in foro interno only, or in foro externo (the latter includes also the former). Power of dispensing in foro interno is not always restricted to secret cases (such faculties, as stated above, are by no means identical. We shall classify the most important considerations in this very complex matter, under four heads: (1) general powers of dispensation; (2) particular indults of dispensation; (3) causes for dispensations; (4) costs of dispensations.

(1) General Powers of Dispensation.—(A) The Pope.—The pope cannot dispense from impediments founded on Divine law—except, as above described, in the case of sors, espousals, and non-consummated marriages, or valid and consummated marriages contracted before baptism (see NORMS ON MARRIAGE). In doubtful cases, however, he may decide authoritatively as to the objective value of the doubt. In respect of impediments arising from ecclesiastical law the pope has full dispensing power. Every such dispensation granted by him is valid, and when he acts from a sufficient motive it is also licit. He is not wont, however, out of consideration for the public welfare, to exercise this power personally, unless in very exceptional cases, where certain specific impediments are in question. Such cases are error, violence, Holy orders, disparity of worship, public conjugicide, consanguinity in the direct line or in the first degree (equal) of the collateral line, and the first degree of affinity (from lawful intercourse) in the direct line. As a rule the pope exercises his power of dispensation through the Roman Congregations and Tribunals.

Up to recent times the Pontifical was the most important channel for matrimonial dispensations when the impediment was public or about to become public within a short time. The Holy Office, however, had exclusive control in foro externo over all impediments connected with or juridically bearing on matters of faith, e.g. the dispensation of public order, Holy orders, etc. The dispensing power in foro interno lay with the Penitentiary, and in the case of pauperes or quasi-pauperes this same congregation had dispensing power over public impediments in foro externo. The Penitentiary held as pauperes for all countries outside of Italy those whose united capital, productive of a fixed revenue, did not exceed $370 lire (about 1050 dollars); and as quasi-pauperes, those whose capital did not exceed 9306 lire (about 1850 dollars). It likewise had the power of promulgating general indults affecting public impediments, as for instance the dispensation of marriage by the pope in the result of 15 Nov., 1890, which was valid with all dispensations, both in foro interno and in foro externo, for countries under its jurisdiction, as was the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs for all countries depending on it, e.g. Russia, Latin America, and certain vicariates and prefectures Apostolic.

On 3 November, 1908, the duties of these various Congregations received important modifications in consequence of the Constitution "Sapienti," in which Pope Pius X reorganized the Roman Curia. Dispensating power from public impediments in the case of pauperes or quasi-pauperes was transferred from the Datary and the Penitentiary to a newly established Congregation known as the Congregatio de Disciplinis Sacramentorum. The Penitentiary retains dispensing power over occult impediments in foro interno only. The Holy Office retains its faculties, but res- tricted to cases under three heads: (1) disparity of worship; (2) mixta religio; (3) the Pauline Privilege [see DIVORCE IN MORAL THEOLOGY]. Propaganda remains the channel for securing dispensations for all countries under its jurisdiction, but as it is required for the sake of executive unity, to defer, in all matters concerning matrimonial dispensation to the various Congregations competent to act thereon, its functions is henceforth that of intermediary. It is to be remembered that in America, the United States, Canada and Newfoundland, and in Europe, the British Isles are now withdrawn from Propaganda, and placed under the common law of countries. These changes make the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs lose all its powers; consequently the countries hitherto subject to it must address themselves either to the Holy Office or to the Congregatio de Disciplinis Sacramentorum according to the nature of the impediment.

It should be noted that the powers of a Congregation are suspended during the vacancy of the Holy See, except those of the Penitentiary in foro interno, which, during that time, are even increased. Though suspended, the powers of a Congregation may be used in cases of urgent necessity.

(B) The Diocesan Bishops.—We shall treat first of their fixed perpetual faculties, whether ordinary or delegated, afterwards of their habitual and temporary faculties. By virtue of their ordinary power (see JURISDICTION) bishops can dispense from those proh- ibited impediments of ecclesiastical law which are not reserved to the pope. The reserved impediments of this kind are espousals, the vow of perpetual chastity, and vows taken in diocesan religious institutes (see RELIGIOUS CONGREGATIONS), mixta religio, public display and solemn blessing at marriages within for- bidden times, the interdict or interdict laid on the marriage by the pope, or by the metropolitan in a case of appeal. The bishop may also dispense from ditimpt impediments after the following manner:

(a) By tacit consent of the Holy See he can dispense in foro interno from secret impediments from which the pope is wont to exercise his power in the three following cases: (1) in marriages already contracted and consummated, when urgent necessity arises (i.e. when the interested parties cannot be separated without scandal or endangering their souls, and there is no time to have recourse to the Holy See or to its delegate)—it is, mixta religio; (2) in marriages having taken place in lawful form before the Church, and that one of the contracting parties at least shall have been ignorant of the impediment; (2) in marriages about to be contracted and which are called embarrassing (perplexis cases, i.e. where everything
being ready a delay would be defamatory or would cause scandal; (3) when there is a serious doubt of fact as to the existence of an impediment; in this case the dispensation seems to hold good, even though in course of time the impediment becomes certain, and even public. In cases where the law is doubtful, it is likewise necessary, even if the bishop may, if he thinks proper, declare authentically the existence and sufficiency of such doubt. (b) By virtue of a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition or Holy Office (20 February, 1888) diocesan bishops and other ordinaries (especially vicars Apostolic, administratores Apostolicæ, bishops within their territories, even an allocated territory, also vicars-general in spiritualibus, and vicars capitular) may dispense in very urgent (graviorimum) danger of death from all diriment impediments (secret or public) of ecclesiastical law, except priesthood and affinity (from lawful intercourse) in the direct line. However, they can use this privilege only in favour of persons actually living in real concubinage or united by a merely civil marriage, and only when there is no time for recourse to the Holy See. They may also legitimize the children of such unions, except those born of adultery or sarailege. In the decree of 1888, also included from time to time, was the question of diriment impediments. This decree permits therefore (at least until the Holy See shall have issued other instructions) to dispense, in the case of concubinage or civil marriage, from the presence of the priest and of the two witnesses required by the Decree “Ne temere” in the admission of marriages already licensed. Bishops do not agree as to whether bishops hold these faculties by virtue of their ordinary power or by general delegation of the law. It seems to us more probable that those just described under (a) belong to them as ordinaries, while those under (b) are delegated by the Vatican. In the former case, in order to subdelegate the latter they must be guided by the limits fixed by the decree of 1888 and its interpretation dated 9 June, 1889. That is, if it is a question of habitual delegation parish priests only should receive it, and only for cases where there is no time for recourse to the bishop.

Besides the fixed perpetual faculties, bishops also receive from the Holy See habitual temporary faculties for a certain period of time or for a limited number of cases. These faculties are granted by fixed form (formulis), from which the Holy See, from time to time, as occasion requires it, makes some slight modifications. (See Faculties, Canonical) These faculties call for a broad interpretation. Nevertheless it is well to bear in mind, when interpreting them, the actual legislation of the Congregation whereby they issue, so as not to extend their use beyond the places, persons, number of cases, and impediments laid down in a given indult. Faculties thus delegated to a bishop do not in any way restrict his ordinary faculties; nor (in so far as the faculties issued by one Congregation affect those granted by another. When several specifically different impediments occur in one and the same case, and one of them exceeds the bishop's powers, he may not dispense from any of them. Even when the bishop has faculties for each impediment taken separately he cannot (unless he possesses the faculty known as de crumulo) use his various faculties simultaneously in a case where all the impediments being public, one of them exceeds his ordinary faculties. It is not necessary for a bishop to delegate his faculties to his vicars-general; since 1897 they are always granted to the bishop as ordinary, therefore to the vicars-general also. With regard to other prelates a decree of the Holy Office (14 Dec., 1898) declares that for the future temporary faculties may be always subdelegated unless the indult expressly states the contrary. These faculties are valid from the date when they were granted in the Roman Curia. In actual practice they do not expire, as a rule, at the death of the pope nor of the bishop to whom they were given, but pass on to those who take his place (the vicar capitular, the administrator, or succeeding bishop). Faculties granted for a fixed period of time, or for a limited number of cases, cease when the period or number has been reached; but while awaiting their renewal the bishop, unless culpably neglecting it, may proceed provisionally. A bishop can use his habitual faculties only in favour of his own subjects. The matrimonial discipline of the Decree “Ne temere” (2 Aug., 1907) contemplates as such all persons having a true canonical domicile, or continuously resident for one year. Among them, also, viihi, who have no domicile anywhere and can claim no continuous stay of one month. When a matrimonial impediment is common to both parties the bishop, in dispensing his own subject, dispenses also the other.

(C) Vicars Capitular and Vicars-General.—A vicar capitular, or in his place a lawful administrator, enjoys all the dispensing powers possessed by the bishop in virtue of his ordinary jurisdiction or of delegation of the law; according to the actual discipline he enjoys even the habitual powers which have been granted the deceased bishop for a fixed period of time or for a limited number of cases, even if the indult should have been made out in the name of the bishop of N. Considering the actual praxis of the Holy See, the same is true of particular indults (see below). The vicar-general has by virtue of his appointment all the ordinary powers of the bishop over prohibit impediments, but requires a special mandate to give him common-law faculties for diriment impediments. As for habitual temporary faculties, since they are now addressed to the ordinary, they belong also ipso facto to the vicar-general while he holds that office. He can also use particular indults when they are addressed to the ordinary, and when they are not. He can address the bishop can always subdelegate him, unless the contrary be expressly stated in the indult.

(D) Parish Priests and Other Ecclesiastics.—A parish priest by common law can dispense only from an interdict laid on a marriage by him or by his predecessor. Some canonists of note accord him authority to dispense from secret impediments in what are called embarrassing (perplici) cases, i.e. when there is no time for recourse to the bishop, but with the obligation of subsequent submission of the cause to a suitable authority. A similar authority is attributed to them by other canonists. The case seems gravely probable, though the Penitentiary continues to grant it on the condition that his habitual faculties a special authority for such cases and restrict somewhat its use.

(2) Particular Indults of Dispensation.—When there is occasion to procure a dispensation that exceeds the powers of the ordinary, or when there are special reasons for direct recourse to the Holy See, procedure is by way of supplica (petition) and private rescript. The supplica need not necessarily be drawn up by the petitioner, nor even at his instance; it does not, however, become valid until he accepts it. Although, since the Constitution “Sedem,” and the faithful may have direct recourse to the Congregations, the supplica is usually forwarded through the ordinary (of the person's birthplace, or domicile, or, since the Decree “Ne temere,” residence of one of the petitioners), who transmits it to the proper Congregation either by letter or through his accredited agent; but if there is question of sacramental secrecy, it may continue to use them to the Penitentiary, or hand it to the bishop's agent under a sealed cover for transmission to the Penitentiary. The supplica ought to give the names (family and Christian) of the petitioners (except in secret cases), the name of the ordinary forwarding it, and the name of the priest to whom, in secret cases, the rescript must be sent; the age of the parties, especially in dispensations affecting consanguinity and affinity; their religion, at least
when one of them is not a Catholic; the nature, degree, and number of all impediments (if recourse is had to the Congregatio de Disciplinâ Sacramentorum or to the Holy Office in a public impediment, and to the Penitentiaria at the same time in a secret one, it is necessary to the latter should know of the public impediment and that recourse has been had to the competent Congregation). The supplica must, moreover, contain the causes set forth for granting the dispensation and other circumstances specified in the Propaganda Instruction of 9 May, 1877 (it is no longer necessary, either for the validity or legality of the dispensation, to observe the paragraph relating to the exception of course, even when probably this very thing had been alleged as the only reason for granting the dispensation). When there is question of consanguinity in the second degree bordering on the first, the supplica ought to be written by the bishop's own hand. He ought also to sign the declaration of poverty made by the petitioners when the dispensation is sought from the Penitentiaria in formâ pauperum; when he is in any way hindered from so doing he is bound to commission a priest to sign it in his name. A false declaration of poverty henceforth does not invalidate a dispensation. 

Moreover, the evidence of the facts alleged in the case must be given. For this reason, the statements are bound in conscience to reimburse any amount unduly withheld (regulation for the Roman Curia, 12 June, 1908). For further information on the many points already briefly described the reader is referred to the special canonical works, which, inasmuch as all necessary details must be expressed so as to avoid nullity. When a supplica is affected (in a material point) by obversion or subreption it becomes necessary to ask for a so-called "reformatory decree" in case the favour asked has not yet been granted by the Curia, or for the letter known as "Perinde ac valere". Except when the former has already been granted. If, after all this, a further material error is discovered, letters known as "Perinde ac valere super perinde ac valere" must be applied for. See Gasparri, "Tractatus de matrimonio" (2nd ed., Rome, 1892), I, no. 302.

Dispensation rescripts are generally drawn up in formâ commissâ missâ, i.e. they are entrusted to an executor who is thereby obliged to proceed to execute, if he finds that the reasons are as alleged (si vera sint eosquâs). Canonsists are divided as to whether rescripts in formâ commissâ missâ contain a favour granted that a dispensation may or must be granted on the request being actually made, and therefore the moment of the dispensation is considered to have taken place. The executor holds it as received practice that it suffices if the reasons alleged be actually true at the moment when the petition is presented. It is certain, however, that the executor required by the Penitentiaria rescripts may safely fulfill his mission even if the pope should die before he had begun to execute it. The executor named for public impediments is usually the ordinary who forwards the supplica and for secret impediments an approved confessor chosen by the petitioner. Except when the cardinal who has given the person delegated cannot validly execute a dispensation before he has seen the original of the rescript, therein it is usually prescribed that the reasons given by the petitioners must be verified. This verification, usually no longer a condition for valid execution, can be given in the case of public impediments, extra-judicially or by subdelegation. In foro interna it can be made by the confessor in the very act of hearing the confessions of the parties. Should the inquiry disclose no substantial error, the executor proclaims the dispensation, i.e. he makes known, usually in writing, especially if he acts on the initiative of one of the parties, that the impediment which debarred the parties to marry is no longer a barrier and that they are free to marry. The reason, however, is added which dispenses the petitioners if the rescript authorizes him, he also legitimizes the children. Although the executor may subdelegate the preparatory acts, he may not, unless the rescript expressly says so, subdelegate the actual execution of the decree, unless he subdelegates to another ordinary. When the impediment is common to, and known to, both parties, execution ought to be made for both; wherefore, in a case in foro interna, the confessor of one of the parties hands over the rescript, after he has executed it, to the confessor of the other. The executor who is thus set to observe with the full certificate of the decree, as some of them constitute conditions sine qua non for the validity of the dispensation. As a rule, these clauses affecting validity may be recognized by the conditional conjunction or adverb of exclusion with which they begin (e.g. dummodo, "provided that"; et non aliter, "in no other way" absolute). When, however, a clause only prescribes a thing already of obligation by law it has merely the force of a reminder. In this matter also it is well to pay attention to the stulos curiae, i.e. the legal dictum of the Roman Congregations and Tribunals, and to consult authors of repute.

(3) Causes for Granting Dispensations.—Following the principles laid down for dispensations in general, a matrimonial dispensation granted without sufficient cause, even by the pope himself, would be illicit; the more difficult and numerous are the impediments the more serious must be the motives for removing them. An unjustified dispensation, even if granted by the pope, is null and void, in a case affecting the Divine law; and if granted by other bishops or superiors in cases affecting ordinary ecclesiastical law. Moreover, as it is not possible that the pope wishes to act improperly, it follows that he has had the motives for removing the allegations to grant a dispensation, even in a matter of ordinary ecclesiastical law, such dispensation is invalid. Hence the necessity of distinguishing in dispensations between motive or determining causes (causa motiva) and impulsive or merely influencing causes (causa impulsive). If the former are not lacking, the dispensation is still more valid when the acts spontaneously (motus proprio) and "with certain knowledge", the presumption always is that a superior is acting from just motives. It may be remarked that if the pope refuses to grant a dispensation on a certain ground, an inferior prelate, properly authorized to dispense, may grant the dispensation in the same case on other grounds which in his judgment are sufficient. Canonists do not agree as to whether he can grant it on the identical ground by reason of his divergent appreciation of the latter's force. Among the sufficient causes for matrimonial dispensations we may mention twenty-four causes, i.e. classified and held as sufficient by the common law and canonical jurisprudence, and reasonable causes, i.e. not provided for nominally in the law, but deserving of equitable consideration in view of circumstances or particular cases. An Instruction issued by Propaganda (9 May, 1877) enumerates sixteen canonical causes. The "Formulary of the Dataria" (Rome, 1901) gives twenty-eight, which suffice, either alone or concurrently with others, and act as a norm for all sufficient causes. They are: smallness of place or places; smallness of time coupled with the fact that outside it a sufficient dowry cannot be had; lack of dowry; insufficiency of dowry for the bride; a larger dowry; an increase of dowry by one-third; cessation of family feuds; preservation of peace; conclusion of peace between princes or states; avoidance of lawsuits over an inheritance, dowry, or similar case; a public business transaction; the fact that a fiancée is an orphan; or the care of a family; the age of the fiancée over twenty-four; the difficulty of finding another partner; owing to the fewness of male acquaintance, or the difficulty the latter experience in coming to her; the hope of still living the faithful married life; the nature of a Catholic relation; the danger of a mixed marriage; the hope of converting a non-Catholic party; the keeping of property in a family; the preservation of an illustrious or honourable family; the excellence and merit of the parties; defamation to be avoided, or scandal pre-
vented; intercourse already having taken place between the petitioners, or rape; the danger of a civil marriage; of marriage before a Protestant minister; revalidation of a marriage that was null and void; finally, all reasonable causes judged such in the opinion of the pope (e.g. the public undulion), or special causes causing the petitioners and made known to the pope, i.e. motives which, owing to the social status of the petitioners, it is opportune should remain unexplained out of respect for their reputation. These various causes have been stated in their briefest terms. To reach their exact force, some qualifications are needed with the stipulations of the pertinent works of reputable authors, always avoiding anything like exaggerated formalism. This list of causes is by no means exhaustive; the Holy See, in granting a dispensation, will consider any weighty circumstances that render the dispensation really justifiable.

(3) Costs of Dispensations.—The Council of Trent (Nest. X. XIV, cap. V, De ref. matrim.) decreed that dispensations should be free of all charges. Diocesan chanceries are bound to conform to this law (many pontifical documents, and at times clauses in indulgences, remind them of it) and neither to exact nor accept any payment for the modest contribution to the church necessary expenses sanctioned by an Instruction approved by Innocent XI (8 Oct., 1678), and known as the Innocentian Tax (Tasa Innocentiana). Rosset holds that it is also lawful, when the diocese is poor, to demand some expenses as a condition for dispensation. Sometimes the Holy See grants a smaller freedom in this matter, but nearly always with the monition that all revenues from this source shall be employed for some good work, and not go to the diocesan curia as such. Henceforth every rescript requiring execution will state the sum which the diocesan curia is authorized to collect for its execution.

In the Roman Curia the expenses incurred by petitioners fall under four heads: (a) expenses (expense) of carriage (postage, etc.), also a fee to the accredited agent, when one has been employed. This fee is fixed by the Congregation in question; (b) a tax (tasa) to be used in defraying the expenses incurred by the Holy See in the organized administration of dispensations; (c) the componentium, or elenquatory fine to be paid to the Congregation and applied by it to pious uses; (d) an alms imposed on the petitioners and to be distributed by themselves in good works. The moneys paid under the first two heads do not affect, strictly speaking, the gratuity of the dispensation. They constitute a just compensation for the expenses the petitioners occasion the Curia. As for the componentium, besides the fact that they do not profit the pope nor the members of the Curia personally, but are employed in pious uses, they are justifiable, either as a fine for the faults which, as a rule, give occasion for the dispensation, or as a check to restrain a too great frequency of petitions often based on frivolous grounds. And if the Tridentine prohibition be still urged, it may be truly said that the pope has the right to abbreviate the decrees of councils, and is the best judge of the reasons that legitimate such abrogation. We may add that the custom of tax and componentium is neither uniform nor universal in the Roman Curia.

Dispersion of the Apostles (Lat. Divino Apostolorum), a feast in commemoration of the missionary work of the Twelve Apostles. It is celebrated as a double major on 15 July. The first vestige of this feast is found in the sequence composed for it by a certain Saeculare Godescale (d. 1009) in the diocese of the Haardt; he also introduced this feast at Aachen, when provost of the church of Our Lady. The sequence is authenticated by doubt (G. M. Drees, Hymnographia Latin., L. 399, Leipzig, 1907; Iden, Godescaulische Liturgies, ib., 1897). It is next mentioned by William Durandus, Bishop of Mende (Rationale Div. Off. 7.15), in the second half of the thirteenth century. Under the title, "Dimissio", "Dispersio", or "Divisio Apostolorum" it was universally celebrated in the northern countries of Europe, but unknown during the Middle Ages in Spain and Italy.

The object of the feast (so Godescale) is to commemorate the departure (dispersion) of the Apostles from Jerusalem for the various parts of the world, some fourteen years after the Ascension of Christ. According to Durandus some of his contemporaries honoured this feast with (apocryphal) the relics of the twelve (bodies) of St. Peter and St. Paul by St. Sylvester (Schnell, Bibl. ecl., 1591, 2. 2, 173 sq; M. Armellini, Chiese di Roma, 1891, 902 sq.). The feast is now kept with solemnity by modern missionary societies, in Germany and Poland, also in some English and French dioceses, and in the United States by the ecclesiastical provinces of St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, Dubuque, and Santa Fé.

Dispersion of the Jews. See Diaspora.
Dissenters. See Nonconformists.

Dissentia, Abbey of, a Benedictine monastery in the Canton Grisons in eastern Switzerland, dedicated to Our Lady of Mercy. Tradition ascribes its foundation to Sts. Placid and Sigebert, in the year 614, but Mabillon places the date two years earlier. The history of the abbey has been somewhat chequered, but it has at times risen to positions of great importance and influence. It was destroyed by the Avars in 670, when its abbot and thirty monks suffered martyrdom, but was rebuilt by Charles Martel and Abbot Pirminius in 711. Charlemagne visited the abbey on his return journey from Rome in 800 and bestowed upon it many benefactions. Abbot Udalric I (1031–1055) was the first of its superiors to be the emperor, whose dignity was subsequently held by several other of its abbeys; many of them also became bishops of the neighbouring sees. In 1581 the abbey was honoured by a visit from St. Charles Borromeo. After enjoying independence for a thousand years it was incorporated into the newly formed Swiss Congregation in 1617, since which date it has, in common with the other five Benedictine abbeys of Switzerland, been subject to the jurisdiction of the president of that Congregation. In 1799 it was burned and plundered by the soldiers of Napoleon's army, when amongst other valuable treasures, a seventh century MS. chronicle of the abbey perished. The printing press that had been set up in 1729 was also destroyed at the same time, but much of the melted type and other metal was saved and from it were made the pipes of the organ of St. Martin's church at Dissentis, which is still in use. The abbey was rebuilt by Abbot Anselm Huonder, the last of its superiors to enjoy the rank and title of Prince of the Empire. During the nineteenth century the monastery greatly suffered from misfortunes of various kinds, and so great was the relaxation of discipline in consequence that its reputation was almost deserted of. Abbot Paul Kniker came from his abbey of St. Boniface at Munich to assist in restoring regular observance, but so little success attended his efforts that he left Dissentis in 1861 and returned to Munich as a simple monk. The abbey has, however, survived those evil times and is in a satisfactory and flourishing condition. Dom Benedict Prevoit, the eighthieth who has ruled over its fortunes, was abbott in 1905 of a community of between thirty and forty monks, who, among their other duties, served five public oratories and conducted successfully a gymnasia of nearly a hundred boys.

Dissidents in Poland. See POLAND.

Distraction (Lat. distractio, to draw away, hence to distract) is here considered in so far as it is wont to happen in time of prayer and in managing the sacraments. It hardly needs to be noted that the idea of mental prayer and mind-wandering are destructive of each other. So far as vocal prayer is concerned, the absence of natural prayers, if voluntary, will take its from its perfection and be morally reprehensible. Distractions, however, according to the commonly accepted teaching, do not rob prayer of its essential character. To be sure one must have had the intention to pray and therefore in the beginning some formal advercence; otherwise a man would not know what he was doing, and his prayer could not be described even as a human act. So long, however, as nothing is done outwardly which would be incompatible with any degree whatever of attention, in the case of prayer, the lack of explicit mental application does not, so to speak, invalidate prayer. In other words, it keeps its substantial value as prayer, although, of course, when that is the case, it is the dissipation of thought is wilful our addresses to the throne of mercy lose a great deal in efficacy and acceptability. This doctrine has an application for example in the case of those who are bound to recite the canonical Office and who are esteemed to have fulfilled their obligation substantially even though their distractions have been abundant and absorbing. Voluntary distractions, that is to say, what are not free from the mind to thoughts foreign to prayers, are sinful because of the obvious irreverence for God with Whom at such times we are assuming to hold intercourse. The guilt, however, is judged to be venial. In the administration of the sacraments their validity cannot be assailed merely because the one who confers them happens to be a man who is a man and who is a man. Provided he has the required intention and posits the essentials of the external rite proper to each sacrament, no matter how taken over he may be by outside reflections, his act is distinctly a human one and such its value cannot be impugned. Such a state of mind, however, when it is wilful, is sinful, but the guilt is not mortal unless one has thereby laid himself open to the danger of making a mistake in what is regarded as essential for the validity of the sacrament in question.

Joseph F. Delany.

Distributions (from Lat. distributio, canonically termed distributions quotidiana), are certain portions of the revenue of a church, distributed to the canons present at Divine service. There are many regulations concerning these distributions in the "Corpus Juris". The latest law on the subject is found in the decrees of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. iii, De ref.), where it is ordained that bishops have power to set aside one-third of the revenues of officials and dignitaries of cathedral and collegiate chapters and convert this third into distributions for those who clearly and distinctly have been consecrated for temporary or permanent present every day at the service to which they are bound. Canons retired on account of their age retain their right to the distributions, as do also capitulars who have received coadjutors, and supernumerary canons who are waiting a regular stall in the chapter. To earn these distributions it is necessary only to chant the Office in common, according to the custom of the particular church to which the beneficiary belongs. A mere corporal presence, however, without mental application to the services performed, will not entitle one in conscience to these distributions. Annaux, Année-Wagner, Decl. du Droit Can. (Paris, 1901); Ferraris, Bull. Can. (Rome, 1899), iii, William H. W. Fanning.

District of Columbia. See WASHINGTON.
Dioecese which had been almost ruined by Giseler, the second Bishop of Merseburg, in his unholy ambition to become Archbishop of Magdeburg in 981. At the same time he fearlessly defended the canonical liberty of ecclesiastical elections against the encroachments of worldly powers.

While Bishop of Merseburg he composed his famous chronicle "Chronicon Thietmar", which comprises in eight books the reigns of the Saxon Emperors Henry I (called the Fowler), the three Ottos, and Henry II (the Saint). The first three books, covering the reigns of Henry I and the first two Ottos, are largely based on previous chronicles, most of which are still extant; the fourth book, comprising the reign of Otto III, contains much original matter; while the remaining four books, which describe the reign of Henry II to the year 1018, are the independent narrative of Thietmar. As councillor of the emperor and participant in many important political transactions, he was well equipped for writing a history of his times. The spirit of sincerity which pervades his chronicle is abundant compensation for the barbarous expressions which occasionally mar the literary style. The last four books, besides being the principal source for Saxon history during the reign of the holy emperors, contain valuable information, not to be found elsewhere, regarding the contemporary history and civilization of the Slavic tribes east of the river Elbe, especially the Poles and Hungarians. Thietmar's original manuscript, with corrections and additions made by himself, is still preserved at Dresden. A facsimile edition of it was prepared by L. Schmidt (Dresden, 1895). The chronicle was also published by Kurze in "Script. Ren. Germ." (Hanover, 1888), and by Lappenburg in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script. P. T. CXXXIX. 1081-1472". A German translation was made by Laurent (Berlin, 1848, and Leipzig, 1892).

**KURZE IN N. Archiv. der Gesellschaft für deutsche Geschichte (Hanover, 1889), XIV, 50-56; Wattenbach, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter (7th ed., 1904), 1. Horstner, Nomenclatur (3d ed., Innsbruck, 1903). 1, 950 sq; Weitz in Kirchenk., v. c.**

**Michael Ott.**

**Diurnal** (horae diurnae). See Hours.

**Dives** (Latin for rich).—The word is not used in the Bible as a proper noun; but in the Middle Ages it came to be employed as the name of the rich man in the parable. The rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 19-31. It has often been thought that in this lesson on the use of riches Christ spoke of real persons and events. The "House of Dives" is still pointed out in Jerusalem; but, of course, if such a house ever existed, it must have long since disappeared.

**RENARD IN VIEUX, Dict. de la Bible, s. v. LAZARE: Commentaries on this passage of St. Luke.**

**W. S. Reilly.**

**Divination**, the seeking after knowledge of future or hidden things by inadequate means. The means being inadequate they must, therefore, be supplemented by some power which is represented all through history as coming from gods or evil spirits. Hence the secular word divination has a sinister signification. As prophecy is the lawful knowledge of the future, divination, its superstitious counterpart, is the unlawful. As magic aims to do, divination aims to know. Divination is practically as old as the human race. It is found in every age and country, among the Egyptians, Hindus, Romans, and Greeks; the tribes of Northern Asia had their shamanism, the indigenous aborigines of South America, the aboriginals of North America, — all recognized diviners and wizards. Everywhere divination flourished and nowhere, even to-day, is it completely neglected. Ciceró's words were, and apparently always will be, true, that there is no nation, civilized or barbarian, which does not believe that there are signs of future and persons who can interpret them. Cicero divided divination into natural and artificial. Natural (untaught, unskilled) in- cludes dreams, oracles, to which the diviners, in the ancient world, were constantly referring, when engaged in practical business. Cicero says that the practice of divination was a passive subject of inspiration, and the predictions were drawn from a power supposed to be then and there with him. Artificial (taught, studied) comprised all foretelling from signs found in nature or produced by man. Here the diviner was active, and the divination came apparently from his own skill and observation. This branch of divination is almost the same as the Chaldean or Mistic circle. Nathan and others were regarded as divine oracles. St. Thomas with respect to the invocation of demons: divination with express invocation of spirits, embracing dreams, oracles, oracles, oracles, and necromancy, and divination with tacit invocation through signs and movements observed in nature, such as stars, birds, fish, figures, etc., or through signs and arrangements produced by man, such as molten lead poured in water, casting of lots, etc. Dreams here mean these expressly prepared and prayed for with hope of intercourse with gods or the dead. Portents or prodigies are unusual and marvellous sights coming from a real power. Here we are considering artificial divination.

**Methods.**—The diversity of divinatory methods is very great. Secrètly an object or movement in the heavens, on the earth, or in the air or water escaped being metamorphosed into a message of futurity. Add to these the inventions of man, and there is a glimpse of the immense entanglement of superstitions in which pagan people grooped their way. They can, however, be grouped into three classes, as seen from St. Thomas's division. A detailed list has been given by Cicero, Clement of Alexandria in his "Stromata", and others of the Fathers. The first class, express invocation, come oneiricism or divination by dreams; necromancy, by so-called apparitions of the dead or spirit; apparitions of various kinds, which may be either external or in imagination, as Cajetan observes; Pythianism or by possessed persons, as the Delphic Pythianess; hydromancy, by signs in water; aero- mancy, by signs in air; geomancy, by signs in terrestrial substances (geomancy has also another meaning); auspices, by signs in the entrails of sacrificial victims, etc. The second class, tacit invocation and signs found ready-made in nature, embraces judicial or general astrology, pretended to by the nations, through the stars; augury, through the notes of birds, and later covering prediction through their mode of acting, feeling, flying, and also the neighing of horses and sneezing of men, etc.;—with us it comprises all foretelling by signs; oracles, when chance words are turned into signs; empiricism, when the lines of the hand are read; and many similar modes. The third class, tacit invocation and signs prepared by man, includes geomancy from points or lines on paper or pebbles thrown at random; divination of straws; throwing dice; cutting cards; letting a staff fall or measuring it with the finger; the "cage of ferrets"; they will, I will not"; opening a book at random, called Sortes Virgilianae, so much was that confused in this fashion by the Romans; etc. This last transferred to the Bible is still common in Germany and elsewhere. Homomancy is also used for purposes of divination.

**History.**—To attempt to trace the origin of divination is a waste of time, since, like religion it is universal and indigenous in one form or another. Some nations cultivated it to a higher degree than others, and their influence caused certain modes of divination to spread. Oracles, in practice, gained a wide reputation for occult power. Pre-eminent in history stand the Chaldeans as seers and astrologers, but the Egyptians and Chinese were also great adepts in elaborate mysterious rites. Which of them had priority within is still an open question, though the larger share
in the development of divination, especially in connection with celestial phenomena, is attributed to the Chaldeans, a vague term embracing here both Babylonians and Assyrians. In Greece from the earliest historic times are found diviners, some of whose methods came from the Persians and from the Egyptians, a people very versed in this art. While the Romans had modes of their own, their intercourse with Greece introduced new forms, and principally through these two nations they spread in the South and West of Europe. Before Christianity divination was practised everywhere according to rites native and foreign. In early days priest and diviner were one, and their power was very great. In Egypt the pharaoh was generally a priest; in fact, he had to be initiated into all the secrets of the sacerdotal class, and in Babylon and Assyria almost every movement of the monarch and his courtiers was regulated by forecasts of the official diviners and astrologers. The cuneiform inscriptions and the papyri are filled with magical formulae. Witness the two treatises, one on terrestrial and the other on celestial phenomena, compiled by Sargon several centuries before our era. In Greece, where more attention was paid to aerial signs, the diviners were held in high esteem and were treated at the public games. No man, who placed most reliance in divination by sacrifice, had official colleges of augurs and aruspices who by an adverse word could postpone the most important business. No war was undertaken, no colony sent out without consulting the gods, and at critical moments the most trivial occurrence, a sneeze or a cough, would be invested with meaning. Alongside all this official divining there were practised secret rites by all kinds of wizards, magicians, wise men, and witches. Chaldean soothsayers and strolling sybils spread everywhere telling fortunes for gain. Between the regulars and the irregulars, the latter being a very bitter feeling, and as the latter often invoked gods or demons regarded as hostile to the gods of the country, they were regarded as illicit and dangerous and were often punished and prohibited from exercising their art. From time to time in various countries the number and influence of the regular diviners were diminished on account of their pride and oppression, and no doubt at times they in turn may have adroitly mitigated the tyranny of rulers. With an increase of knowledge the fear and respect of the cultivated people for their magicians was so decreased that their authority suffered greatly and they became objects of contempt and satire. Cicero's "De Divinatione" is not so much a description of its various forms as a refutation of them; Horace and Juvenal launched many a keen arrow at diviners and their dupes, and Cato's saying is well known, that he wondered how two augurs could meet without laughing at each other. Rulers, however, retained them and honoured them publicly, the better to keep the people in subjection, and outside classical lands, workers of magic still held sway. Wherever Christianity went divination lost most of its old-time power, and in one form, the natural, ceased almost completely. The new religion forbade all kinds, and after some centuries it disappeared as an official system though it continued to have many adherents. The Fathers of the Church were its vigorous opponents. The tenets of Gnosticism gave it some strength, however, and Neo-Platonism won it some followers. Within the Church itself it proved so strong and attractive to her to new converts that synods forbade it and councils legislated against it. The Council of Ancyra (c. xxiv) in 314 decreed five years penance to consulters of diviners, and that of Laodicea (c. xxxvi), after the clergy to make amulets, and those who wore them to be driven out of the Church. A canon (xxxvi) of Orléans (511) excommunicates those who practised divination, auguries, or lots falsely called Sortes Sactorum (Bibliorum), i.e., deciding one's future conduct by the first passage found on opening a Bible. This method was evidently a great favourite, as a synod of Vannes (c. xvi) in 461 had forbidden it to clerics under pain of excommunication, and that of Agde (c. xliii) in 506 condemned it as against piety and faith. Sixtus IV. Sextus V. and the Fifth Council of Lateran likewise condemned divination. Governments have inflicted great severity. Constantius decreed the penalty of death for diviners. The authorities may have feared that some would-be prophets might endeavour to fulfill forcibly their predictions about the death of sovereigns. When the races of the North, which swept over the old Roman empire, it was only to be expected that some of their lesser superstitions should survive. All during the so-called Dark Ages divining arts managed to live in secret, but after the Crusades they were followed more openly. At the time of the Renaissance and again preceding the French Revolution, there was a marked growth of noxious methods. The latter part of the sixteenth century witnessed a strange revival, especially in the United States and England, of all sorts of superstitious, necromancy or spiritism being in the lead. Today the number of persons who believe in signs and omens to know the future is much greater than appears on the surface. They abound in communities where dogmatic Christianity is weak.

The natural cause of the rise of divination is not hard to discover. Man has a natural curiosity to know the future, and coupled with this is the desire of personal gain, or future, which is closely allied to the desire for eternal life. Some there is, therefore, in every age to lift the veil, at least partially. These attempts have at times produced results which cannot be explained on merely natural grounds, they are so disproportionate or foreign to the means employed. They cannot be regarded as the direct work of God, but, if anything, in the mind of man, as material cause; hence they must be attributed to created spirits, and since they are inconsistent with what we know of God, the spirits causing them must be evil. To put the question directly: can man know future events? Let St. Thomas answer: Substance. Future things can be known either in their causes or in themselves. Some causes always and necessarily produce their effects, and these effects can be foretold with certainty, as astronomers announce eclipses. Other causes bring forth their effects not always and necessarily, but they generally do so, and they can be foretold from their causes. We can only see them in themselves when they are actually present to our eyes. Only God alone, to whom all things are present in His eternity, can see them before they occur. Hence we read in Isaías (xli, 23), "Shew the things that are to come hereafter, and we shall know that ye are gods." Spirits can know better than men the effects to come from the second class of causes because their knowledge is broader, deeper, and more universal, and many occult powers of nature are known to them. Consequently they can foretell more events and more precisely, just as a physician who sees the causes cleaner can better diagnose than one who sees them in the unmodified state. The difference, of course, between the first and second classes of causes is due to the limitations of our knowledge. The multiplicity and complexity of causes prevent us from following their effects. Future contingent things, the effects of the third class, spirits cannot know better than men, need not in every instance be made to come to their decision. On the contrary, they may wisely conjecture about them because of their wide knowledge of human nature, their long experience, and their judgments based upon our thoughts as revealed to them by our words, countenances, or acts. Unless we wish to deny the value of
human testimony, it cannot be doubted that diviners foretold certain contingent things correctly and magicians produced at times superhuman effects. The very survival of divination for so many centuries would otherwise be inexplicable and its role in history an insoluble problem. On religious grounds, to the ancients divination and kindred arts were complete impostures to be contrasted with Scripture. In it we read laws forbidding magie, we have facts like the deeds of Janne and Membres before Pharaoh, and we have a declaration of God showing it possible for a sign or wonder to be foretold by false prophet and false diviner. But, except when God gave them knowledge, their ignorance of the future resulted in the well-known ambiguity of the oracles.

Attempts to give artificial divination a merely natural basis have not succeeded. Chrysippus (de Divinatione, ii, 60) spoke about a power in man to recognize and interpret signs, and Plutarch (de Oraculis) wrote on the special qualifications an augur should have and the nature of the signs; but a preternatural influence was recognized in the end. Some modes may have been natural in their origin, especially when men's superstitions were concurrence was complete without occult influence, but these must have been comparatively rare, for the client, if not always the seer, generally believed in supernatural assistance. That some analogy may be traced between artificial divination and witchcraft, an owl's vision of evil and sad events, the Athenians a welcome omen—and that to send a tooth to lose a friend, may readily be admitted, but to try to connect these with future contingent events would be to reason badly from a very slight analogy, just as to stab an image, to injure the person it represents, would be to mistake a horse's kick for a real one. Human instinct demanded a stronger foundation and found it in the belief in an intervention of some supernatural agency. Reason demands the same.

A corporeal sign is either an effect of the same cause of which it is a sign, as smoke of fire, or it proceeds from the same cause. But the signs of living creatures can be passed over by almost the same reasoning. From those who believed in fatalism, or pantheism, or that man, gods, and nature were all in close communion, or that animals and plants, men and gods, were the same, a belief in omens and auguries of all kinds might be expected (see Animism). Everywhere as a matter of fact, divination and sacrifice were so closely connected that no strict line could have been drawn in practice between divination and sacrifice. If we were to try answering all his questions, while the private wizards boasted of their 'familiar spirits'.

Theological Aspect.—From a theological standpoint divination supposes the existence of devils who have great natural powers and who, actuated by personal interest, or interested in God, ever seek to snare Him or to pervert the divine glory and to draw man into perdition, or at least to injure him bodily, mentally, and spiritually. Divination is not, as we have seen, foretelling what comes from necessity or what generally happens, or foretelling what God reveals or which can be discovered by human effort, but it is the supernatural knowledge of the future, i.e., arriving at it by inadequate or improper means. This knowledge is a prerogative of Divinity and so the seer is said to divine. Such knowledge may not be sought from the evil spirits except rarely in exorcisms. Yet every divination is from them either because they are expressly invoked or because they mix themselves up in these vain searchings after the future that they may entangle men in their snares. The demon is invoked tacitly when anyone tries to acquire information through means which he knows to be inadequate, ignorant of the means are incorrect and the promises of any Divinity or promise they are capable of producing the desired effect. Since the knowledge of futurity belongs to God alone, to ask him directly or indirectly from demons is to attribute to them a Divine perfection, and to ask their aid is to offer them the superabundances of worship; this is superstitious and seditious. But, except when God gave them knowledge, their ignorance of the future resulted in the well-known ambiguity of the oracles.

When the future is not in question the present, and the present and the past, but when all things are contingent, and if we have a knowledge of the future, we have not really knowledge of it, but only a probable knowledge. But when the future is in question, present possibility and past experience are both involved.
Hebrews fell into idolatry, divination, which always accompanied idolatry, revived and flourished, but all during their history it is evident that secretly and again more openly wrongful acts were used, and as a result condemnations were frequent (I K., xxvi, 27; II K., xi, 17). It should be borne in mind that their history is a very long one, and when we reflect how completely other nations were given over to all kinds of impious arts and silly observances we shall readily admit that the Hebrews were in comparison remarkably free from superstitions. When on these flourishing more strongly and permanently it was during the decay of faith and credence and following the time of Christ (see Jos. Ant. Jud., XX, i, viii, 6; Bell. Jud., VI, v, 2). The Talmud shows the downward tendency.

The various methods of divining and kinds of diviners are not always clearly distinguished in Scripture, the Hebrew words being differently interpreted and sometimes merely synonyms. The following list is based mainly upon Lesèr's article in Vigouroux's "Dict. de la Bible":—

1. Divination by consulting the Teraphim (תֶּרַפִּים), or household gods of which we first read in the time of Abraham and Laban (Gen., xxxi, 19). How they were consulted is not known. It was apparently a Chaldean form, as Laban came from that country. They are met with in Judges, xvii, 5; IV K., xxiii, 24, and elsewhere. They sometimes deceived their importers (Zech., x, 2).

2. The Horummin (חורים), a name translated by "interpreters" (Vulg. conjoctores) in the Douay version (Gen., xli, 8), but elsewhere (Dan., ii, 2) by "diviners" (Vulg. oriol) and other names, especially "Chaldeans".

3. The Hakamim (حكامim) are the wise men (Vulg. sapientes) of the Bible (Gen., xli, 8), a name given to those skilled in divination in Egypt, Iudæa (Abd., 8), Persia (Esth. i, 13), and Babylon (Jer., i, 35).

4. Qegom or Magom (מגומ, מג'ומ) designated divination in general and is always used in the Scripture in a bad sense except in Prov., xvi, 10. By it the witch of Endor raised up the dead Samuel (I K., xxviii, 8). "The king of Babylon stood in the high-way, at the head of two ways, seeking divination (qegom), shuffling arrows; he inquired of the idols (Baalim), and consulted envoys" (Esth., xxii, 21). The arrow bore the signs or names of towns, and the first name drawn was the one to be attacked. This was a Babylonian mode. The Arabs practised it so: three arrows were prepared and the first inscribed "The Lord wills it"; the second, "The Lord wills it not"; and the third was blank. If the blank came a new drawing followed until an inscribed arrow was taken. The last method mentioned in text quoted was auspicy (Vulg. exa consulti).

5. Nahold (נוחל) is soothsaying (Vulg. augurium) in the Bible (Num., xxiii, 23). The precise method signified by it is in dispute. The versions make it equivalent to divination by the flight of birds, but this mode, so common among the Greeks and Romans, was apparently not used by the Hebrews except towards the time of Christ. From its derivation, as commonly accepted, it would mean divination by sorpents, opened out on the other hand it is never used in sense in the Scriptures. Balaam's divination by animal sacrifices is so termed (Num., xxiv, 1) and also Joseph's (Gen., xlv, 5) which remains a vexed question in spite of Caluget's triumphant solution (Dict. of the Bible, III, p. 30) except the explanation of Gomorri later be accepted (Hummelauer, Com. in Gen., p. 561).

6. Mekeššheph (מְכֶשֶׁפ) is the magician (Vulg. maleficus) in Ex., vii, 11, and the wizard in Deut., xxviii, 10, who not only seeks the secrets of the future but works wonders. St. Paul mentions two of their leaders, Iannes and Mambres, and their modes are styled sorceries (Vulg. beneficia) in IV K., ix, 22 and (Vulg. maleficia) Micheas, v, 11.

7. The word 'obh (וה) signifies the spirit called and the person calling him, the necromancer. In Deut., xvii, 11, it is expressed by "seeking the truth from the dead" (the best known is connected with Endor) and elsewhere by Pythons (Is., viii, 19), divining spirits (I K., xxviii, 7). The Septuagint translates the words by "ventriloquist," because when the necromancers failed or wished to deceive the people they muttered as if from under the ground as though the client would call them in with a giber". (Cf. Is., xxix, 4). A bottle or skin water-bag is 'obh: the use of the word here may come from the diviner containing the spirit or being influenced by it.

8. The Yiddish word (ניב) were diviners whom we generally find connected with necromancers, and the two terms are perhaps practically synonymous (I K., xxviii, 3; IV K., xxi, 6; etc.)

9. Divining by Me'obn (עובנ) included apparently many methods: divination by chance words, as when Abraham's servant sought a wife for Isaac (Gen., xxiv, 14; I K., xiv, 9; III K., xx, 33); auguries (Is., x, 6); observers of dreams (Deut., xviii, 10), etc. There were also modes by consulting seers (Is., xvii, 17), astrology (Is., xlvii, 13), and by consulting the Elders (I K., xxix, 9).

In the N. T. diviners are not specifically mentioned except in Acts, xvi, 16, concerning the girl who had a daemoniacal spirit; but it is altogether likely that Simon Magus (Acts, viii, 9), Elymas (Acts, xiii, 6), and others (II Tim., iii, 13), including the possessors of the magical books burnt at Ephesus (Acts, xix, 19), practised divination and that it is included in the wonders by which Antichrist will seduce many (Apoc., xix, 20). Under the New Law all this is that of the witches because, placed on a higher plane than under the Old Dispensation, we are taught not to be solicitous for the morrow (Matt., vi, 34), but to trust Him perfectly. Who numbers the very hairs of our heads (Matt., x, 30). In divination, apart from the fraud of the Father of Lies, there was much merely human fraud and endless deception: the predictions were generally as vague and as worthless as modern fortune-telling, and the general result then as now favoured vice and injured virtue. (See Astrology.)

---

DIVINE

DIVINE, Society of (Societas Divinae Charitatis), founded at Maria-Martental near Kaisersesch, in 1903, by Joseph Tillmanns for the solution of the social question through the pursuit of agriculture and trades (printing, etc.) as well as by means of intellectual pursuits. The society consists of both priests and laymen.

TILLMANNS AND OXENHAM, Die wahre Lösung der sozialen Frage (Martental, 1905).

SISTERS OF DIVINE CHA RITY, founded at Besançon, in 1799, by a Vincentian Sister, and modelled on the Sisters of Mercy of St. Vincent de Paul. The motherhouse, originally at Naples, is now in Rome, and there are many filial establishments in Italy, in Malta, and
Gozzo. The sisters have charge of educational institutions, orphanages, hospitals, and insane asylums.

Daughters of Divine Charity, founded at Vienna, 21 November, 1808, by Franziska Lehner (d. 1894) on the Rule of St. Augustine, and approved by the Holy See in 1811, and definitively confirmed 22 July, 1891. The purpose of the congregation is to furnish girls without positions, shelter, care, and the means of obtaining a position, without compensation, likewise to care for servants no longer able to work. The sisters are also engaged in schools, orphan asylums, and kindergartens. The mother-house and novitiate are at Vienna; the congregation has 36 filial houses, 766 sisters, and 59 postulants.

F. M. Rodgers.

Divine Compassion, Institute of the, founded in the City of New York, U. S. A., by the Rt. Rev. Thomas Stanislaus Preston. On 8 September, 1809, Father Preston began a weekly gathering of the poor and abject children of the street in one of the most wretched quarters of the city; after this came the opening of a house for the reformation of young girls not yet hardened in vice, and the preservation of children and elder girls from the moral danger in which they lived. The foundress called it the House of the Holy Family and became its spiritual director. The work was fostered by many prominent Catholic ladies of New York, under the name of The Association for Befriending Children and Young Girls. Foremost among them was Mary C.D. Starr (in religion Mother Veronica; d. at White Plains, 9 Aug., 1904), who became the president of the association and devoted all her time and energies to this work of charity under the direction of Father Preston. Seeing the necessity of a religious community which should be trained to this work and perpetuate it, Father Preston compiled a rule of life for those who desired to devote their lives to it. The first draft was written 8 September, 1833, and was observed in its elemental form until 1846, when it was elaborated and obtained the informal approbation of the Archbishop of New York. The constitution, which was an enlargement of the rule, and represent the norm of living in the institute, were written gradually, as it developed, and reached their completion in 1869. On the 29th of September, 1900, both rule and constitutions received the express canonical approbation of Archbishop Rappoltswiler of New York. The object of the institute is (1) the reformation of erring girls; and (2) the training, religious, mental, and industrial of girls in moral danger from ignorance, indolence, or waywardness, or dangerous influences. The institute is composed of two classes, choir sisters and little (or lay) sisters. In addition to the House of the Holy Family the sisters are in charge of a training school for girls at White Plains, and a working-girls' home in New York City. The institute comprises about 40 sisters in charge of 215 girls.

Divine Office. See Office.

Divine Providence, Sisters of.—I. Sisters of Divine Providence of St. Vincent de Paul, founded at Molsheim, in the Diocese of Strasbourg, by Vicar Ludwig Kremp (1783). After the Revolution, the community reassembled at Bindernheim and, in 1807, received both ecclesiastical and civil approbation, the former from the Arch Bishop of Strasbourg, the latter from Napoleon I. In 1819 the mother-house was suitably located at Rappoltswiler, and in 1820 the institute received papal confirmation. The congregation has (1808) 1800 members, over 1200 of them teachers in 337 primary schools of Alsace. The sisters have over 44,000 children under instruction; they conduct boarding and day schools, orphan asylums, reformatory, a housekeeping school, a high school for girls, and a deaf and dumb institution. Attached to the novitiate are a teacher's seminary and practice school.

II. The Society of Divine Providence, founded, in 1842, at St. Mauritz near Münster by Eduard Micheils, chaplain and private secretary to Archbishop Droste von Vischerlinck, and definitively confirmed 22 July, 1891. The purpose of the congregation is to furnish girls without positions, shelter, care, and the means of obtaining a position, without compensation, likewise to care for servants no longer able to work. The sisters are also engaged in schools, orphan asylums, and kindergartens. The mother-house and novitiate are at Vienna; the congregation has 36 filial houses, 766 sisters, and 59 postulants.

F. M. Rodgers.

Divine Providence, Congregation of the Sisters of, founded in Lorraine, 1762, by the Venerable Jean-Martin Moye (b. 1730; d. 1793), priest of the
Diocese of Metz. Afterwards missionary to China, for the propagation of the faith, the ensuring of a Christian education to children, especially those of the rural population, for the care of the sick, and other works of mercy. Approved by the Bishop of Metz in 1762, and recommended to the solicitude of his clergy, within six years the congregation had exceeded the limits of his diocese and planted itself on the banks of the Vosges. Marie Morel was the first superior. Suppressed in 1792, the congregation was re-established after the Revolution; in 1810 the Rules and Constitutions were confirmed by Pope Pius VII. The mother-house general is at St.-Jean-de-Bassel, in the Diocese of Metz, Lorraine, with establishments in Lorraine, Alsace, Belgium, and the United States. There are about 400 sisters in the Diocese of Metz, and 300 in the Diocese of Strasbourg, who direct schools, boarding schools, industrial schools, domestic economy institutes, hospitals, etc. At St.-Jean-de-Bassel there is a normal institute devoted exclusively to the training of the young teachers of the congregation, generally 185 in number, and connected with this institute is a model school, all under supervision of the education department of the German Imperial Government. In Belgium there are about 100 sisters. At Prop, near Tournai, they direct a normal school and a boarding school. Elsewhere they have charge of schools and kindergartens.

The unpublished Annals of Congregations: Directoire des Sœurs de la Providence (St-Germain-en-Laye 1859) was published in 1911 under the title: La vie d'une sœur (Metz, 1901); MARCHAL. Vie de M. F. de Moye (Paris, 1872).

Sisters of Divine Providence, of Kentucky, incorporated American provincial house at Mt. St. Martin's convent, Newport, Kentucky. Mother Anna Houliné, superior general (d. 1908) of the congregation succeeded in placing the sisters of St.-Jean-de-Bassel in the foremost ranks of teachers in Alsace-Lorraine, and then, like Moye, longed to see them labour for the Christian education of youth in America, where she rightly judged the labourers to be few. In 1888 Bishop Maes of Covington, Kentucky, visited the mother-house general at St.-Jean-de-Bassel, and arranged to have the sisters introduced into his diocese. Accordingly, in August, 1889, three sisters arrived in Covington and took up residence in one of the historical mansions of northern Kentucky, now known as Mt. St. Martin's convent. This Oregon, U.S.A. branch of the American province has now a new convent, the work of which has caused the building of a new convent. In October, 1908, a considerable estate was acquired at Melbourne, Kentucky, the site of a new St. Ann's Convent, where it is designed to erect the new provincial house. Mother Anna visited the American Province in 1892. There are 215 sisters; until 1903 occasional small colonies were added from the mother-house general; about one-third of the subjects are American. At Mt. St. Martin's convent are the novitiate and normal school for the province. Teaching is the primary object of the sisters. They conduct an academy and a preparatory and preparatory school, a grammar school, an infant asylum, a home for French emigrant and working girls, and a home for the aged. The sisters are working in the dioceses of Covington, Providence, and Cleveland, and the archdioceses of New York, Baltimore, and Cincinnati. Sister M. Camillus.

VI. SISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE, founded at Castroville, Texas, U. S. A., 1868, by Sister St. Andrew from the mother-house at St.-Jean-de-Bassel, Lorraine, at the instance of Bishop Dubuis of Galveston. In 1896 the mother-house was transferred to San Antonio, Texas. The Constitutions were approved by Pope Leo X, 28 May, 1907. The sisters have charge (1898) of 67 schools and academies in Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma. Mother Mary Florenc.

VII. SISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE, St. Andrew, founded at Hambourg-la-Forteresse, in 1806, by Father Anton Gapp, "for the Christian instruction of children in the primary schools and higher schools for girls". The congregation received the authorization of the French Government in 1826, and the mother-house was established at Forbach, Lorraine, but in 1839 was removed to Peltre. Destroyed in 1870 by the Prussians, it was rebuilt after the close of the Franco-Prussian War. The congregation has now in Lorraine 138 institutions, among them 7 higher schools for girls, 20 trade and several housekeeping schools, and 9 hospitals. In Belgium they have 35 foundations. There are altogether 900 sisters, who teach 17,000 children in Lorraine and 4000 in Belgium.

Hillpuchen, Die Orden und Kongregationen (Paderborn, 1908), III; 1925 in Kirchenlex., s. v. Verkehrung.

Divine Redeemer, daughters of the mother-house at Oedenburg, Hungary; founded in 1863 from the Daughters of the Divine Saviour of Vienna. This congregation has 37 filial houses and 300 sisters, who conduct schools of all kinds and care for the sick.

Divine Saviour, society of the, founded at Rome, 8 Dec., 1881, by Johann Baptist Jordan (b. 1848 at Cartwel in Breisgau), elected superior general as Father Francis Mary of the Cross. The original name, Society of Catholic Instruction, was changed some years after its foundation to the present title. The first papal approbation was given by the "Divitum laudis" of 27 May, 1905. The founder impressed on his congregation, in addition to the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, a fourth of apostolic mission work. The rules and constitutions are based largely on those of the Society of Jesus. The habit is black with a white veil, and the scapular is black, the four knots of which are tied to remind the wearer of his four vows. In tropical countries the habit is white and the cincture is red. On 13 Dec., 1889, the newly erected Prefecture Apostolic of Assam was placed in charge of the society, which has now 7 principal and 32 dependent stations, served by 13 missionaries, aided by 12 native catechists. The Fathers have published many books in the Khasi dialect, and since September, 1906, a periodical, "Ka ing Khristan". At Luchau, near Bregenz, a German college was established 15 Sept., 1908; in the same year a station was founded at Corvallis, Oregon, U.S.A.; in 1896 several members began work in Brazil. At present (1908) missions are given in thirteen languages from the various centres. The Salvatorians have foundations in Italy, Sicily, Austria, Poland, Moravia, Galicia, Hungary, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, England, the United States, Brazil, and Colombia. The congregation numbers 400 members, 175 priests, the rest scholastics, lay brothers, and novices, in 35 foundations, of which 28 are Marian Colleges and 7 mission centres.

Among the periodicals issued by the society, in addition to the "Apostol-Kalender" (in German and Hungarian), are the "Nuntius Romanus", "II Missionario" (in German "Der Missionar", since 1907 "Illustrate Monatshefte fürs christl. Haus"; also in Polish), "L'amico dei fanciulli" (in German "Mamma für Kinder"; also in Polish), and the "Savoirianische Mitteilung und Post" (Gentile and Kolarz), containing reports of the work of the society. Connected with the society are a Third Order for lay men and women; the "Academia litteratorum", the members of which cooperate with the fathers in the advancement of Catholic knowledge and literature; the Angel Societies, founded 1884, for children under fourteen, which has as its organ "L'amico dei fanciulli", and a membership of 40,000.

Sisters of the Divine Saviour, founded 8 Dec., 1888, by Father Jordan, to supplement the work of the Salvatorian Fathers, and placed under the Third Rule of St. Francis. The mother-house is in Rome and
there are stations in Assam (where the sisters conduct 6 orphan asylums), Austria, Hungary, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Sicily, British Burma, and in the United States. They conduct orphan asylums, kindergartens, and schools, and visit the sick in their homes. The congregation numbers about 200.

Daughters of the Divine Saviour, mother-house at Vienna, a branch of the Niederbrunn Sisters of the Most Holy Saviour, established 1857. The congregation has over 1200 sisters, choir and lay, who care for the sick in hospitals and in their homes, and conduct schools for girls, primary and grammar schools, kindergartens, and schools, etc. The sisters have 72 houses in the Dioceses of Vienna, St. Pölten, Seekau, Koniggratz, Brunn, Gran, Raab, and Parenzo-Pola.

Hülewein, Order und Kongregationen (Paderborn, 1908).
F. M. Rudge.

Divine Service. See Breviary; Feasts; Liturgy; Mass; Worship.

Divine Word, Society of the (Societas Verbi Divini), the first German Catholic missionary society established. It was founded in 1875 during the period of the Kulturkampf at Steyl, near Tegelen, Holland, by a priest, Rev. Arnold Janssen (d. 15 January, 1909), for the propagation of the Catholic religion among pagan nations. It is composed of priests and lay brothers. On completion of their professional studies the students make a two years' novitiate, at the end of which they take the ordinary vows binding for three years. Before ordination the members of the society make perpetual vows. The coadjutor brothers renew their vows every three years for nine years, when they take perpetual vows. The first congregation of the society was established in 1882 in Southern Shantung, China, a district containing 158 Catholics and about 10,000,000 pagans. According to the statistics of 1906-07, this mission numbered 35,378 Catholics, 36,367 catechumens, 1 seminary with 64 Chinese seminarians, 46 European priests, 12 Chinese priests, 12 coadjutor brothers of the society, 3 teaching brothers, and 19 nuns. The second mission founded was in Togo, West Africa, in 1891. There were there then only a hundred Catholics in the district. In 1906 the mission had a prefect Apostolic, 31 priests, 12 coadjutor brothers, 149 nuns, 53 native teachers, and 48 mission stations. There were nearly 3000 children attending the schools; the Catholics numbered 3000. The third mission was in German New Guinea. It is a comparatively new colony. Dangerous fevers are common. The natives (Negritos) are all savages, recognizing no form of authority, having no fixed customs, or administration of justice. The greatest difficulty experienced by the missionaries is the incredible number of languages. Thus in the entire mission district, 452 sq. m., probably more than a hundred languages are spoken. The first Catholic missionaries arrived in German New Guinea in August, 1896. At the close of 1906, there were in the mission a prefect Apostolic, 16 European priests, 13 coadjutor brothers, 18 nuns, 1000 native Catholics, and 400 children in the schools.

In the Argentine Republic the society numbers 51 priests, 31 coadjutor brothers, and 41 nuns. They have charge of colleges, seminaries, and of 12 parishes in the four Dioceses of Buenos Ayres, La Plata, Santa Fe, and Paraná. Part of the mission district, 1000 sq. m., is occupied by the famous Jesuit Reductions of Paraguay. The mission was established in 1808. In Brazil there are 39 priests, 14 coadjutor brothers, and 13 nuns. The society also has a mission in the United States, at Shermerville Techay, Cook Co., Illinois. There are 13 priests and 27 coadjutor brothers in charge of a technical school, and 30 nuns who conduct a home for the aged. In Europe the society has six houses or colleges with 126 priests, 546 coadjutor brothers, and 1059 students for the society. The training convent for the nuns has 231 members. The colleges in Europe are: (1) St. Michael, at Steyl near Tegelen, Holland, founded 8 Sept., 1875, with here 47 priests, 314 coadjutor brothers, and 282 students for the society. (2) Heiligenkreuz (Holy Cross) near Neisse, Silesia, founded 24 Oct., 1892. There are 23 priests, 84 coadjutor brothers, and 241 students. (3) St. Wendel, in the Diocese of Trier, with 18 priests, 68 coadjutor brothers, and 183 students. (4) St. Gabriel, near Vienna, established 4 Oct., 1889. There are 26 priests, 370 novices and students of philosophy and theology, and 80 coadjutor brothers. (5) St. Raphael, Rome, with 5 priests and one coadjutor brother. (6) Bischofsheiden, near Salzburg in Austria, established 17 Aug., 1874.

Nuns.—The Society of the Servants of the Holy Ghost (Societas Servorum Spiritus Sancti) was founded in 1889, at Steyl, Holland, by the Rev. Arnold Janssen. It numbers about 300 nuns who help the fathers in their missions, chiefly by teaching.


Ev. Limbrock.

Divinity of Christ. See Jesus Christ.

Divisch, Procopius, Premonstratensian, b. at Svinenberg, Bohemia, 26 March, 1698; d. at Prenditz, Moravia, 21 December, 1765. He was christened Weneciusa, but took the name of Procopius when he became a religious. He began his studies at the Znaym Gymnasium and later entered the cloister school of the Premonstratensians at Bruck, Styria. In 1726 he was ordained and soon after became professor of philosophy at the school. His lectures on physics were illustrated by numerous interesting experiments. He received the doctorate in theology at Salzburg in 1753, his thesis being: Tractatus de Dei unitate sub inscriptione A 8 18. In 1758 he took charge of the little parish of Prenditz near Znaym. Here he had sufficient leisure for work and experiment in his favourite subjects, hydrostatics, electricity, constructing the necessary instruments himself. His fame soon spread abroad, and he was called to Vienna to repeat his electrical experiments to the Emperor Francis and the Empress Maria Theresa. He was one of the first to apply electricity in the treatment of disease. In 1750, prior to the publication of the French translation of Franklin's letters to Collinson (1751), he knew of the discharging property of pointed rods and applied his knowledge to the performances of curious tricks. The first lightning-rod was erected by Divisch at Prenditz, in 1754, before Franklin's suggestions were known and before they had been carried out elsewhere. Divisch's device is quite different from that proposed by the Philadelphian. He petitioned the emperor in 1755 to put up similar rods all over the country and thus protect the land from lightning. This proposal was rejected on the advice of the mathematicians of Vienna. He also constructed the Denyor (Denis, "Divine", d'or, "of gold"), a musical instrument, imitating strings, and producing mechanical effects. His theories are expounded in his published work, Theoretischer Tractat oder die längst verlangte Theorie von der meteorologischen Elektricität (Tübingen, 1765; Frankfort, 1768; Bohemen in Prague, 1769).

Peliz, Abhandlungen über den Golbe (Vienna, 1777); Nuss, Protop Divinæ (Prague, 1899); Fugger-Gasser, Gesch. d. Physik (Leipzig, 1879).

William Fox.

Divorce.—This subject will be treated here under two distinct heads: I. in Moral Theology; II. in Civil Jurisprudence.

I. in Moral Theology.—The term divorce (divortium, from divortere, divortere, "to separate") was
employed in pagan Rome for the mutual separation of married people. Etymologically the word does not indicate whether this mutual separation included the dissolution of the marriage bond, and in fact the word is used by the Church and in ecclesiastical law in this and other significations. Hence we distinguish between *divortium plenum* or *perfectum* (absolute divorce), which implies the dissolution of the marriage bond, and *divortium imperfectum* (limited divorce), which leaves the marriage bond intact and implies only the cessation of common life (separation from bed and board, or in addition the separation of dwelling place). In civil law divorce means the dissolution of the marriage bond; *divortium imperfectum* is called separation (*séparation de corps*).

The Catholic doctrine on divorce may be summed up in the following propositions: A. In Christian marriage, which implies the restoration, by Christ Himself, of marriage to its original indissolubility, there can never be an absolute divorce, at least after the marriage has been consummated; B. Non-Christian marriage can be dissolved by absolute divorce under certain circumstances in favour of the Faith; C. Christian marriage before consummation can be dissolved by solemn profession in a religious order, or by an act of papal authority; D. Separation from bed and board ( *divortium imperfectum*) is allowed for various causes, especially in the case of adultery or lapse into infidelity or heresy on the part of husband or wife, or other causes which shall explain in every case the indissolubility of marriage (cf. Matt., xix, 9; Luke, xvi, 18). In like manner, St. Paul: "To them that are married, not I but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife except she do peccate; and in the case of adultery or members; and if anyone shall put away his wife, he may not remarry, neither may she marry another, until she be reconciled to her husband. And if she depart, and marry another, he shall not marry her, except she be reconciled to her husband."

A. *In Christian marriage*, which implies the restoration, by Christ Himself, of marriage to its original indissolubility, there can never be an absolute divorce, at least after the marriage has been consummated.

1. *The Original Indissolubility of Marriage and Its Restoration by Christ*.—The indissolubility of marriage was ordained by Christ Himself according to the testimony of the Apostles and Evangelists: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery" (Matt., xix, 11, 12).—*Cf. Matt., xix, 9; Luke, xvi, 18.* In like manner, St. Paul: "To them that are married, not I but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife except she do peccate; and in the case of adultery or members; and if anyone shall put away his wife, he may not remarry, neither may she marry another, until she be reconciled to her husband. And if she depart, and marry another, he shall not marry her, except she be reconciled to her husband."

2. *Divorce among the Israelites*.—In spite of the Divine law of the indissolubility of marriage, in the course of time divorce, in the sense of complete dissolution of marriage, became prevalent to a greater or less extent among all nations. Moses found this custom among the people of Israel. As lawgiver, he ordained in the name of God (Deut., xxiv, 1): "If a man take a wife, and have her, and she find not favour in his eyes, for some uncleaness: he shall write a bill of divorce, and shall give it in her hand, and send her out of his house." The rest of the passage shows that this divorce was understood as justifying the wife in her marriage with another husband, and to be a complete annulment of the first marriage. Some regard it only as a freedom from penalty, so that in reality the remarriage of the divorced wife was not allowed, and was adultery, because the bond of the first marriage had not been dissolved. This former opinion was held by the humanist and canonist Peter Lombard (IV Sent., del. xxxii, 3), St. Bona-venture (IV Sent., del. xxxii, art. 3, Q. 1), and others. Others again, however, believe that there was a real permission, a dispensation granted by God, as otherwise the practice sanctioned in the law would have been inequitable. They quote the following passage from the Old Testament: "Moreover, (Christ loc. cit.) seems to have rendered illicit what was illicit in the beginning, but what had really been allowed later, even though it was allowed "by reason of the hardness of your heart" (St. Thomas, III, Suppl., Q. lvii, a. 3, B.; Bellarmine, "Controverses de matrim.", I, xvii; Sanchez, "De matrim.", 1, disp. 4, 251, in which several works of the Turin professor, J. N. Nuyts, and a series of propositions defended by him were condemned, as is expressly said, "de Apostolice sedis festivegium", 22 August,
12; etc.). This second opinion maintains and must
maintain that the expression “for some uncleanness” (in Hebrew דֶּרֶךְ צְנָעִים) does not mean any slight cause, but a serious one, which is the usual and customary
expression against the purpose of marriage or marital fidelity. A separation at will, and for slight reasons, at the pleasure
of the husband, is against the primary
principles of the natural moral law, and is not subject to
Divine dispensation in such a way that it could be made licit in every case. There are serious causes governed by
Divine law. This, indeed, does not correspond perfectly
with the secondary purposes of marriage, but on that
account it is subject to Divine dispensation, since the
inconvenience to be feared from such a separation can be
corrected or avoided by Divine Providence. In the
time of Christ there was an acute controversy between the
recent, lax school of Hillel and the strict, conservative school of Shammai about the meaning of the phrase דֶּרֶךְ צְנָעִים. Hence the question with which the Pharisees tempted Our Lord: “Is it lawful to put away a wife for every cause?” The
wife of frivouls reasons had already been sharply
denounced by God through the Prophets Microchus (ii, 9) and Malachias (ii, 14), but in later days it became
very prevalent. Christ abolished entirely the
permission which Moses had granted, even though this permission was strictly limited. He allowed a similar
to the דֶּרֶךְ צְנָעִים as reason for putting away the
wife, but not for the dissolution of the marriage bond.

3. The Dogmatic Basis and Practical Application of
the Complete Indissolubility of Consummated Marriage
within the Catholic Church.—(a) Its Foundation in Scripture. The doctrine of divorce (divortium perfectum) in Christian marriage is expressed in the words quoted above (Mark, x; Luke, xvi; I Cor., vii). The words in St. Matthew’s Gospel (xix, 9), “except it be for fornication”, has, however, given rise to the question whether the putting-away of the wife and the
dissolution of the marriage bond were not allowed on account of adultery. The Catholic Church and Catholic
theology have always maintained that by such an
explanation St. Matthew would be made to contradict St. Paul, and Paul and St. Matthew, as is clearly indicated by these latter words, would have been brought into
error with regard to the real doctrine of Christ. As this is
inconsistent both with the infallibility of the Apostolic
teaching and the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture, the
explanation in Matthew must be explained as the more
deliberate of the understanding of the unforeseen adultery without the dissolution of the marriage bond. Such a dismissal is not excluded by the parallel
texts in Mark and Luke, while Paul (I Cor., vii, 11) clearly indicates the possibility of such a
dismissal: “And if she depart, that she remain
unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband”. Gram-
marically, the clause in St. Matthew may modify one
member of the sentence (that which refers to the putting-
away of the wife) without applying to the following
member (the remarriage of the other), though we
must admit that the construction is a little harsh. If
it be so, however, given rise to the question whether the putting-away of the wife and the dissolution of the marriage bond were not allowed on account of adultery. The Catholic Church and Catholic
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we are not allowed even to marry, although we put our wives away"; Clement of Alexandria (d. 217), “Strom.,” II, xxi (P. G., VIII, 1096), mentions the ordinance of Holy Scripture in the following words: "You shall not put away your wife except for fornication and [Holy Scripture] considers as adultery a remarriage while the other of the separated persons survives." Similar expressions are found in the course of the following centuries both in the Latin and in the Greek Fathers, e. g. St. Basil of Caesarea, “Epist. can. ii,” “Ad Amphilochemum,” can. xlvii (I. G. c. XLI, 752); St. Ambrose, “in Luc.” VIII, v. 18 sqq. (P. L. XV, 1855); St. Jerome, Epist. iv (ad Amand.), n. 3 (P. L., XXII, 562); St. Augustin, “De adulterinis conjugibus,” iv (P. L., XL, 472), etc., etc. The occurrence of passages in some Fathers, even among those just quoted, which treat the husband more mildly in case of adultery, or seem to allow him a new marriage after the infidelity of his spouse, does not prove that these expressions are to be understood of the permissibility of a new marriage, for the lesser cannot be an exemption from punishment by civil law. Or if they refer to a command on the part of the Church, the new marriage is supposed to take place after the death of the wife who was dismissed. This permission was mentioned, not without reason, as a concession for the intercourse, because at some periods the Canon laws in regard to the guilty party forbade forever any further marriage (cf. can. vii of the Council of Compiègne, 757). It is well known that the civil law, even of the Christian emperors, permitted in several cases a new marriage after the separation of the wife. Hence, without contradicting himself, Basil could say of the husband, "He is not condemned," and "He is considered excusable" (Ep. clxxviii, can. ix, and Ep. cxxix, can. xxi, in P. G., XXXII, 678, 721), because he is speaking distinctly of the milder treatment of the husband than of the wife with regard to the canonical penance imposed for adultery. St. Epiphanius, who is especially reproached with teaching that the husband who had put away his wife because of adultery or another crime was allowed by Divine law to marry another (Heres., lix, 4, in P. G., XI, 1024), is speaking in reality of a second marriage after the death of the dead wife, and, whilst he has granted, though either of the parties be unfaithful, the possibility of such a second marriage is allowed, but is less honourable, still he makes the exception in regard to this last part in favour of one who had long been separated from his first wife. The other Fathers of the following centuries, in whose works ambiguous or obscure expressions may be found, are to be explained in like manner.

The practice of the faithful was not indeed always in perfect accord with the doctrine of the Church. On account of defective morality, there are to be found regulations of particular synods which permitted unjustifiable concessions. However, the synods of all centuries, and more clearly still the decretals of the popes, have constantly declared that divorce which annulled the marriage and permitted remarriage was never allowed. The Synod of Elvira (A. D. 300) maintains, and whilst the laws of the marriage bond, even in the case of adultery, Canon ix decreed: "A faithful woman who has left an adulterous husband and is marrying another who is faithful, let her be prohibited from marrying; if she has married, let her not receive communion until the man to whom she has left shall have lived less ill than she should make this an imperative necessity" (Labbe, “Concilia,” II, 7). The Synod of Arles (344) speaks indeed of counselling, as far as possible, that the young men who had dismissed their wives for adultery should take no second wife (ut, in quantum possit, consilium eis detur); but it declares at the same time the illicit character of such a second marriage, because it says of these husbands, "They are forbidden to marry" (prohibentur nubere, Labbe, II, 472). The same declaration is to be found in the Second Council of Mileve (416), canon x (Labbe, IV, 331); the Council of Alexandria (467), canon x (Labbe, VII, 554); and the Council of Friuli (Forum Juli), in northern Italy (791), canon x (Labbe, IX, 46). All of these teach distinctly that the marriage bond remains even in case of dismissal for adultery, and that new marriage is therefore forbidden to them who are adulterers on both sides."

Compare also with “Epist. ad Vict. Rothom.”, xiii, 15 (P. L., XX, 479). "In respect to all cases the rule is kept that whoever marries another man, while her husband is alive, must be held to be an adulteress, and must be granted no leave to do penance unless one of the parties be dead. The impediment of absolute divorce during the entire life of married people could not be expressed more forcibly than by declaring that the permission to perform public penance must be refused to women who remarried, as to a public sinner, because this penance presupposed the cessation of sin, and to remain in a second marriage was to continue in sin.

Besides the adultery of one of the married parties, the laws of the empire recognized other reasons for which marriage might be dissolved, and remarriage permitted, for instance, protracted absence as a prisoner of war, or the decay of religious life by virtue of the spouses. In these cases, also, the popes pronounced decidedly for the indissolubility of marriage, e. g. Innocent I, “Epist. ad Probum”, in P. L., XX, 602; Leo I, “Epist. ad Nicolatum Aquil.”, in P. L., LIV, 1136; Gregory I, “Epist. ad Urbeam Abb.”, in P. L., LXXVII, 893, and “Epist. ad Hadrianum Notar.”, in P. L., LXXVII, 1169. This last passage, which is found in the “Decretum” of Gratian (C. xxvii, Q. ii, c. xxi), is as follows: "Although the civil law provides that, for the sake of conversion (i. e. for the purpose of choosing the religious life), a marriage may be dissolved, the parties in general must, if it be not against the Divine law, to have done." That the indissolubility of marriage admits of no exception is indicated by Pope Zacharias in his letter of 5 January, 747, to Pepin and the Frankish bishops, for in chapter vii he ordains "by Apostolic authority," in answer to the questions that had been proposed to him: "If any layman shall put away his own wife and marry another, or if he shall marry a woman who has been put away by another man, let him be deprived of communion" (Monum. Germ. Hist.: Epist. III: Epist. Merovingii et Karolini aevi, I (Berlin, 1892), 482.

(c) Laxer Admissions and their Correction.—

Whilst the popes constantly rejected absolute divorce in all cases, we find some of the Frankish synods of the eighth century which allowed it in certain acute cases. In this regard the Councils of Verberie (752) and Compiegne (753), especially the last, pass judgment on the first council is undoubtedly erroneous (Labbe, VIII, 407). In this can it is laid down that if a man must go abroad, and his wife, out of attachment to home and relatives, will not go with him, she must remain unmarried so long as the husband is alive. If he then returns and she refuses to rejoin him, she is held to be the blameworthy woman, a second marriage is allowed to the husband: "If he has no hope of returning to his own country, if he cannot abstain, he can receive another wife with a penance." So deeply was the pre-Christian custom of the people engraven in their hearts that it was believed allowance should be
made for it to some degree. Canon v seems also to grant the unauthorized permission for a second marriage. It treats of the case in which the wife, with the help of other men, seeks to murder her husband, and he escapes from the plot by killing her accomplices in self-defense, such a husband might be allowed to take another wife: "That husband can put away that wife, and, if he will, let him take another. But let that woman who made the plot undergo a penance and remain without hope of marriage." Some explain this canonic to mean that the husband might marry again after the death of his first wife, but that the crime of the wife who had conspired forever to murder. This is in agreement with the penitential discipline of the age, because the crime in question was punished by life-long canonical penance, and hence permanent exclusion from married life.

In its thirteenth canon (according to Labbe, VIII, 432; others call it the sixteenth), the Council of Compiègne gives a somewhat ambiguous decision and may seem to allow absolute divorce. It says that a man who has dismissed his wife in order that she might choose the religious life, or take the veil, can marry a second wife; for the former has carried out her resolution. Nevertheless, the intended object of the state of Christian perfection seems to imply that this canon must be limited to a marriage that has not been consummated. Hence it gives the correct Catholic doctrine, of which we shall speak below. This must also be the meaning of Labbe, VIII, 432, and others, canon xxviii, which allows the dissolution of a marriage between a leper and a healthy woman, so that the woman is authorized to enter upon a new marriage, unless we suppose that there here is question of the diriment impediment of impotence. If these canons were really intended in all cases, then they are contrary to the general doctrine of the Church. Other canons, in which separation and second marriage are allowed, refer undoubtedly to the diriment impediments of affinity and spiritual relationship, or to marriage contracted in error by persons one of whom is free and the other not free. Such a husband is allowed to take another wife, and another wife might be allowed. The following cases are mentioned in several of these Penitential Books: adultery, slavery as punishment for crime, imprisonment in war, willful desertion without hope of reunion, etc. (Schmitz, II, 129 sqq.). Then, Penitential Books had indeed no official character, but they influenced for a time the ecclesiastical practice in these countries. However, their influence did not last long. In the first decades of the ninth century, the Church began to proceed energetically against them (cf. the Synod of Chalons, in the year 813, canon xxxviii; Labbe, IX, 367). They were not completely suppressed at once, especially as a general decay of Christian morality took place in the tenth and early part of the eleventh century. Towards the end of the eleventh century, however, every concession to the laity in general, as regards divorce, had been completely swept away. The complete indissolubility of Christian marriage had become so firmly fixed in the juridical conscience that the authentic collections of church laws, the Decretals of the twelfth century, do not even see the necessity of expressly declaring it, but simply suppose it, in other juridical decisions, as a matter of course and beyond discussion. This is shown in the entire series of cases in IV, Decretal, xiv. In all cases, whether the cause be criminal plotting, adultery, loss of faith, or anything else, the bond of marriage is regarded as absolutely indissoluble and entrance upon a second marriage as impossible.

(d) Dogmatic Decision on the Indissolubility of Marriage.—The Council of Trent was the first to make a dogmatic decision on this question. This took place in Session XXIV, canon v: "If anyone shall say that the bond of matrimony can be dissolved for the cause of such a surplusity as, under pretense of mere desertion; let him be anathema." And in canon vii: "If anyone shall say that the Church has erred in having taught, and in teaching that, according to the teaching of the Gospel and the Apostles, the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved, and that neither party—no, not even the innocent, who has given up his unchaste act of adultery—can obtain another marriage while the other lives, and that he, or she, commits adultery who puts away an adulterous wife, or husband, and marries another; let him be anathema." The decree defines directly the infallibility of the church doctrine in regard to the indissolubility of marriage, even in the case of adultery, but indirectly the decree defines the indissolubility of marriage. Doubts have been expressed here and there about the dogmatic character of this definition (cf. Sasse, "De Sacramentis," II, 426). But Leo XIII, in his encyclical "Aeterni Patris," 10 June, 1879, and "Aeterni patris," 1890, excommunicates all the condemned by the Council of Trent "the baneful heresy." The acceptance of this indissolubility of marriage as an article of faith defined by the Council of Trent is demanded in the creed by which Orientalists must make their profession of faith. The formula prescribed by Urban VIII contains the following section: "Also, that the bond of the Sacrament of Marriage is indissoluble; and that, although a separation of persons be made between the parties, for adultery, desertion, or other causes, yet it is not lawful and in no way contrary to the law of God, to contract another marriage, and to join another bond of matrimony, which might be very much offended, according to the testimony of the Venetian ambassadors, if the anathema had been directed against them, whereas they would find it easier to accept the decree that the Roman Church was not guilty of error in her strict adherence to the law (Pallavicini, "Hist. Conc. Trid.," XXII, iv).

(e) Development of the Doctrine on Divorce outside of the Catholic Church. —In the Greek Church, and the other Oriental Churches in general, the practice, and finally even the doctrine, of the indissolubility of the marriage bond became more and more lax. Zhihman (Das Eherecht der orientalischen Kirchen, 729 sqq.) testifies that the Greek and Oriental Churches separated from Rome permit in their official ecclesiastical documents the dissolution of marriage, not merely on account of adultery, but also of those occasions and actions the effect of which might be regarded as similar to natural death or to adultery, or which justify the dissolution of the marriage bond in consequence of a well-founded supposition of death or adultery. Such reasons are, first, high treason; second, criminal attacks on life; third, frivolous conduct giving rise to suspicion of adultery; fourth, the act of a person of willful and stubborn infidelity, as the mother of baptism; sixth, prolonged disappearance; seventh, incurable lunacy rendering cohabitation impossible; eighth, entrance of one party into a religious order with the permission of the other party.

Among the sects that appeared at the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, there can hardly be question of any development of church law about divorce. Jurisdiction in matrimonial affairs was relegated, on principle, to the civil law, and only the blessing of marriage was assigned to the Church. It is true
that the interpretation of the so-called ecclesiastical officials, their approbation or disapprobation of the civil marriage laws, might find expression in certain cases should they refuse to bless an intended marriage of people who had been divorced when the reason for the divorce was to be too much opposed to the teachings of Scripture. It is not surprising that in this respect the tendency should have been downwards, when we remember that in the various sects of Protestantism the growth of liberalism has advanced even to the denial of Christ [Dr. F. Albert, Verbrechen und Strafen als Eheverbrechen und nach evang. Kirchenrecht (in Stutz, Kirchen. Abhandlungen. Stuttgart, 1903), I, IV]

1. Declaration of Nullity.—The declaration of nullity must be carefully distinguished from divorce proper. It can be called divorce only in a very improper sense, because it presupposes that there is and has been no marriage. However, as there is question of an alleged marriage and of a union which is not considered by the public as a true marriage, we can understand why a previous ecclesiastical judgment should be required, declaring the presence of a diriment impediment and the consequent invalidity of a supposed marriage, before the persons in question might be free to separate or to enter upon a new union. It is only when the invalidity of a marriage becomes publicly known, and further cohabitation gives scandal, or when other important reasons render a prompt separation of domicile necessary or advisable, that such a separation should take place at once, to be made effective by a later judicial sentence. When the invalidity of a marriage is publicly known, official procedure is necessary, and the ecclesiastical process of nullification must be introduced. In the case of impediments which refer exclusively to the rights of the husband and wife, and which can be removed by their own consent, only the one of them whose right is in question is permitted to impugn the marriage by complaint before the ecclesiastical court, provided it is desired to maintain this right. Such cases are the impediments of fear or violence, of essential error, of impotence on the part of the husband, which is not fully established, and failure to comply with some fixed condition. In cases of the other possible impediments, every Catholic, even a stranger, may enter a complaint of nullity if he can bring proofs of such nullity. The only plaintiffs excluded are those who, on account of private advantage, were unwilling to declare the invalidity of the marriage before its dissolution by death, or who knew the impediment when the banns of marriage were proclaimed and culpably kept silence. Of course it is allowed to the married parties to disprove the reasons alleged by strangers against their marriage (Wernz, "Jus decreetalum", IV, n. 743).

That separation and remarriage of the separated parties may not take place merely on account of private convictions of the invalidity of a supposed marriage, but only in consequence of an ecclesiastical judgment was taught by Alexander III and Innocent III in IV Decretal., xix, 3, and II Decretal., xiii, 13. In the earlier centuries the summary decision of the bishops sufficed; at present the Constitution of Benedict XIV, "De miseratione", 3 November, 1714, must be followed. This prescribes that in matrimonial cases the minister of the matrimonial tie (defensor matrimonii) must be appointed. If the decision is for the validity of the marriage, there need be no appeal in the second instance. The parties can be satisfied with the first decision and continue in married life. If the decision is for the invalidity of the marriage, an appeal must be made, and sometimes even a second appeal to the court of third instance, so that it is only after two concordant decisions on the invalidity of the marriage in question that it can be regarded as invalid, and the parties are allowed to proceed to another marriage. (Cf. III Conc. plen. Baltim., App. 262 sqq.; Conc. Americ. latin., II, n. 16; Laurentius, "Instit. juris eoc.", 2nd ed., n. 696 sqq.; Wernz, "Jus decreetal.", IV, n. 741 sqq.) Sometimes, however, in missionary countries, Apostolic prefects are permitted to give summary decision of cases in which two concordant opinions of approved theologians or canons were pronounced on the invalidity of the marriage in question.

Moreover, in cases of evident nullity, because of a manifest impediment of blood-relationship or affinity, of previous marriage, of the absence of form, of lack of baptism on the part of one party, a second sentence of nullity is no longer demanded (Deer, of the Holy Office, 5 June, 1904, Acta S. Sedis, XXVII, 141; also Deer. of the Holy Office, 27 March, 1901, Acta S. Sedis, XXXIII, 756). The court of first instance in the process of nullification is the episcopal court of the diocese, of second instance the metropolitan court, of third instance the Roman See. Sometimes, however, Rome designates for the third instance a metropolitan see of the country in question (Laurentius, above, 697, not. 6). No one, however, is prohibited from immediate application in the first instance to the Holy See. Custom reserves to the Holy See matrimonial cases of reigning princes.

In the Decreetals of new marriage is treated under the title "De Divortiis". But it is important that these matters should be carefully distinguished from one another. The lack of exact distinction between the expressions "declaration of invalidity" and "divorce", and the different treatment of invalid marriages at different periods, may lead to a misinterpretation of ecclesiastical decisions. Decisions of particular Churches are too easily regarded as dissolutions of valid marriages, where in fact they were only declarations of nullity; and even papal decisions, like those of Gregory VII, were communicated to St. Boniface and Alexander III, by the bishops of the Roman Church, and were in the first place carried on by some writers as permissions granted by the popes to the Frankish Churches to dissolve a valid marriage in certain cases. The decision of Gregory II, in the year 726, was embodied in the collection of Gratian (C. xxvi, Q. vii, c. xvii), and printed in "Mons C. Hist.", III, Epist. (Epist. Merovingici et Carolin. I), p. 276; the decision of Alexander III is given in the Decretals as pars decia, i.e., a part of the papal letter (IV Decretal., xx, 2) left out in the Decretal itself. In both cases there was question of a declaration of the nullity of a marriage which was invalid from the very beginning because of antecedent impotence. A certain concession to the Frankish Churches was, however, made in these cases. According to Roman custom such supposed husband and wife were not separated, but were bound to live together as brother and sister. In the Frankish Churches, however, a separation was pronounced and permission to contract another marriage was allowed to the one not afflicted with absolute impotence. This custom Alexander III granted to the Frankish Churches for the future. If, therefore, the union in question is spoken of as a lepulta conjunctio, or even as a legitima matrimonium, this is done only on account of the external form of the marriage contract. That in such cases a diriment impediment according to the natural law was present, and an actual marriage was impossible, was well understood by the pope. He says this expressly in the part of his letter that has been embodied in the Decretals of IV Decretal., xx, 2. (Cf. Nagmüller, "Die Ehe Heinrichs II" in the tibingen "Theol. Quartalschr.", LXXXVII, 1905, 31 sqq.). That in similar cases decision has been given sometimes for separation and sometimes against it, need excite no surprise, for even at the present day, the ecclesiastical title of the wife is not settled (cf. controversy in "The American Eccle. Review", XXVIII, 51 sqq.).

B. Non-Christian Marriage Can Be Dissolved by Absolute Divorce under Certain Circumstances in Favour of the Faith.
1. The Pauline Privilege.—The Magna Charta in favour of Christian faith is contained in the words of the Apostle, I Cor., vii, 12-13: "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And if any woman have a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband: otherwise your children should be unclean; but now they are holy. But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a man not brought up in the law is under no necessity, and the Lord will open a way for him to depart. But God hath called us in peace." (On the interpretation of these words see Cornely on I Cor., 175 sqq.) The exegetical controversy, as to whether these words are dependent on the preceding sentence, "For to the rest I speak, not the Lord," or whether that sentence refers to the one preceding it, is of no importance in this question. In the first supposition, we should seem to have here an ordinance which is not immediately Divine, but was established by the Apostle through the power of Christ. In the second supposition, it may be an immediately Divine party will be decided.

These words of the Apostle tell us that in all cases when one of the married parties has received the Christian Faith, and the other remains an infidel and is not willing to live in peace with the Christian, the believer is not bound but is free. The Apostle does not insist expressly and formally that the marriage bond has been dissolved, but, if it were not at least the power of the Christian to dissolve the previous bond and to enter upon another marriage, the words would not have their full truth. Hence the Church has understood the words in this sense, and at the same time has fixed more exactly how and under what conditions this so-called Pauline privilege may be exercised. Innocent III declares authoritatively (IV Decretal, xii, 7, in cap. "Quanto") that the convert is justified in entering upon another marriage if he will, provided the non-Christian is unwilling either to live with the convert or to cohabit with him. But the reason given is not that the convert would be excluded from the grace of the Divine name or be an incentive to mortal sin:

"Si enim alter infidelium conjunxit ad fidem convertatur, altero vel nullo modo, vel non sines blasphemiam divini nominis, vel ut eum pertractat ad mortalem pecorum et cadentiam volente: qui relinquitor, unde a sacrificio, si volunt, si velut ad casum intelligimus, quandam Apostolus: Sis infidelis discedi, etc., et non minimam in quo quid dictur: Contumelia creditoris solus jus matrimonii eum qui relinquitor. According to the Church's interpretation and practice, the dissolution of the marriage that was contracted before conversion is not effected by the separation of the married parties, but only when a new marriage is contracted by the Christian party because of this privilege. The Holy Office says this expressly in the decree of 6 August, 1739, ad 2: "Then only may the voice of the matrimonial bond with an infidel be understood to be loosed when the convert spouse proceeds to another marriage with a believer" (Collectan. S. Congr. de Prop. F., n. 1312). The manner of obtaining this right to enter upon a new marriage is fixed by the Church under penalty of invalidity, and consists in a demand (interpellation) made of the non-Christian party whether he or she be willing to live with the other in peace or not. If this interpellation is not possible, an Apostolic dispensation ab interpellationibus must be obtained (Collectan. n. 1323). If the spouse that remains in infidelity agrees to live in peace, but later refuses contrary to this agreement by abusing the Christian religion, or tempting the Christian to infidelity, or preventing the children from being educated in the Christian Faith, or becomes a temptation for the Christian to commit any mortal sin, the latter regains the right to proceed to a new marriage after any lapse of time. This consequence which follows from the very nature of the privilege was expressly declared by the Holy Office in the decree of 27 September, 1845, and was confirmed by Pius IX (Collectan. n. 1337; Ballerini-Palmieri, "Opus theol. Mor.", 3d ed., VI, n. 488). If, however, the non-Christian party refuses after careful deliberation, then, as a result of this refusal, permission may be granted to the Christian party to enter upon a new marriage and thereby to dissolve the previous one. This procedure, allowed by Sixtus V, received the confirmation of direction under Leo XIII by the decree of the Holy Office, 29 November, 1882 (Collectan., n. 1338, ad 3).

The Pauline privilege is said to be in favour of the Christian Faith, but the meaning of the privilege and the right in such cases to absolute divorce is not exactly defined thereby. Doubt might arise in regard to catchlumens, and also in regard to such a divorce of a Christian denomination but not to the Roman Catholic Church. The solution of these doubts is contained in the following proposition: the Pauline privilege is attached to baptism. That the privilege is granted to nobody before the actual reception of baptism is beyond question from the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, 16 January, 1803 (Collectan., n. 1319), and also from the decree of the Holy Office, 13 March, 1901 (Acta S. Sedis, XXXIII, 550). Even the interpellation of the non-Christian party must be postponed until after the reception of baptism. It requires a papal dispensation to proceed to such an interpellation validly before baptism (Cf. Instructio S. Officii, under the authorization of Pius IX, 3 June, 1874, in Collectan., n. 1357). It is also certain that the dissoluteness here in question is not limited to the marriages of pagans, but to all marriages of unbaptized persons, even though they should belong to some non-Catholic Christian denomination (Acta S. Sedis, loc. cit.). Whether, however, the privilege is so joined to baptism that it belongs to Christian adherents of a non-Catholic denomination when they pass by the reception of baptism is a question disputed by theologians. Some theologians of repute assert that the privilege is granted in this case, and that a practical decision to this effect has been made by a Roman Congregation, according to the testimony of Konings, Theol. mor., II, 394 (New York, 1878). (Cf. Palmieri, "De matrim. christ.," th. xxvii, p. 224; Tarquini in "Archiv für kath. Kirchenrecht," L, 224 sqq.; Wernz, "Jus decretal.," IV, n. 702, not. 50; Giuseppe, "De matrimonio," II, n. 1331; Ballerini-Palmieri, "Opus theol. mor.," Collectan., VI, 157, sqq.). Even in the early ages, the Venerable Bede and St. Augustine seem to have understood the passage from St. Paul (1 Cor.) in this sense.

2. The Papal Authority to Dissolve a Non-Christian Marriage.—From the ecclesiastical decisions that have been already quoted, it is clear that the Church
has at least the authority of explaining the Pauline
privilege, of limiting, and extending it. This would
give rise to no difficulties if the Pauline privilege, as
expressed in I Cor. vii. 15, were an immediate Aposto-
lic ordinance and only mediately Divine, inasmuch
as it had been granted to the power in general in a
case of necessity to dissolve in favour of the
marriage contracted in infidelity. For the entire
Apostolic power passed to the supreme head of the
Church, and as the Apostle could determine fixed
rules and conditions for the dissolution of the mar-
rriages in question, the power would have precisely the
same scope and effect as an ordinance of the Church.
Moreover, if the successors of St. Peter should ever
be granted the power of granting a divorce,
There is no such provision and the question will be
referred to the Church; and, in any case, the Church
has not settled the dispute. For, even if the privilege as
promulgated by St. Paul was of immediate Divine right,
the Church's power to make at least modifications in
case of necessity can readily be explained because such
a power belongs to her without a doubt in other matters
that are of Divine right. The first opinion seems
to have been held in the fourteenth century by eminent
scholars like P. de Palude and de Tudeschis, and in
the fourteenth century by St. Antoninus; in recent times
it is defended by Gasparri, Rossi, Fahrner, and others.
The second opinion is held by Paulus, Peronne, etc.
However, in spite of the disagreement in regard to the
Pauline privilege, the defenders of both opinions agree
that there is another method for the dissolution of the
marriage of infidels when one of the parties receives
baptism, namely, by papal authority. This power is
indeed not admitted by all theologians. Even Lam-
bertini (who later became Pope Benedict XIV) doubted it when he was secre-
ty of the Congregation of the Council, in the causa Florentina, in
the year 1726. But earlier papal decisions, as well as
the actual decision in this very case, leave no room for
doubt that the pope attribute to themselves this
power and act accordingly.

If the Pauline privilege alone be applied, it will fol-
low that when a pagan is converted who has been liv-
ing in polygamy, he can be permitted to choose any
one of his wives who may be willing to receive bap-
tism, provided his first wife is unwilling to live with
him in peace or, under the circumstances, to be con-
verted to the Faith. Hence the Roman Congregations based on the Pauline privilege
always include the phrase nisi prima voluerit converti.
Now several of the pope have at times granted per-
mission to whole nations to choose any of the sev-
eral wives, without adding the clause “unless the
first be willing to be converted.” This was done for
India by St. Pius V, 2 August, 1571, in the Constitu-
tion “Romani Pontificis.” Urban VIII, 20 October,
1626, and 17 September, 1627, did the same for the
South American nations, and expressly declares: “Con-
sidering that such pagan marriages are not so firm that
in case of necessity they cannot be dissolved.” Similarly,
Gregory XIII, 25 January, 1585 (cf. Ballerini-
Palmieri, “Opus theol. mor.”, 3d ed., VI, nn. 444, 451,
452). The theological proof of this papal authority is
easy for those who, as has been said, regard the Pauli-
ne privilege as an immediate Apostolic ordinance.
For it is then expressly testified by Holy Scripture
that the Apostolic authority, hence also the papal au-
thority, can allow in favour of the Faith the dissolution
of marriage contracted in infidelity. The method of
procedure and the precise application in various cases
would naturally be committed to the bishops of
Apostolic authority. The only question is whether the
Pauline privilege is an immediate Divine determina-
tion of the case in which marriage may be dissolved,
prove the papal authority in another way. Since it
follows from I Cor., vii, 15, that marriage contracted in
infidelity is not absolutely indissoluble according to
Divine right, it follows from the general power of
loosing which was granted to the successor of St. Peter,
Matt., xvi, 19—“Whosoever thou shalt loose on
earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven”—that this
power extends also to our present matter. Moreover,
the successors of St. Peter are the interpreters of their power.
Whenever the exercise of an authority that has not hitherto been clearly recog-
nized occurs, not merely on one occasion but fre-
quently, there can be no more doubt that such au-
thority is rightfully exercised. Now this is precisely
what took place in the grants of Pius V, Gregory XIII,
and Urban VIII for the vast territories of India, the
West Indies, etc.
3. The Dissolution of Marriage Contracted in Infid-
ernity by Profession in a Religious Order.—When the
document explained above, which now is practically
admitted beyond doubt, has been established, the
question, whether a marriage contracted in infidelity
can be dissolved by the religious profession of the
converted party, is not very important. It is so to be
understood that the baptized party may choose the
religious life, even against the will of the one still un-
converted, and, in consequence of this, the former
can enter upon a new marriage. According to the
document we have just explained, it is clear that the pope,
at least in single cases, can permit this. Whether, ac-
cording to a general law, and by immediate Divine
ordinance, without the intervention of the pope, this
privilege belongs to the baptized party, is somewhat
connected with another question, viz., for what reason
Christian (i.e. sacramental) marriage, not yet con-
summated, can be dissolved by religious profession.
This leads us to the third proposition about this sub-
ject of divorce.
5. Christian Marriage before Consumption Can Be
Dissolved by Solemn Profession in a Religious Order, or
by an Act of Papal Authority.
1. Dissolution by Solemn Profession.—The fact that
religious profession causes the dissolution of the mar-
rriage bond, provided the marriage has not been con-
summated, is distinctly taught in the Extrav. Joan,
XXII (tit. VI, cap. unico.), and was solemnly defined
by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, can. vi).
The reason why this dissolution takes place is a theo-
logical question. The definition reads: “If anyone shall say
that a marriage contracted, but not consummated, is
dissolved by the solemn profession of the religious
order, whether of one of the parties to the marriage, let him be
anathema.” The expression, by the solemn profession,
is important. Neither the mere entrance into a reli-
ger order, nor life in the novitiate, nor the so-called
profession of simple vows, even though, they be for
life, as is customary in modern congregations, is capa-
bile of dissolving a previous marriage. The simple
vows which are pronounced in the Society of Jesus,
either as vows of scholastics or as vows of formed
coadjutors, do not dissolve a marriage which has been
consummated and not yet consummated, though they
cause a divergent impediment in regard to any future
marriage. The question as to how and for what rea-
son such marriage is dissolved by solemn religious pro-
fession is answered by some by pointing to an im-
mediate Divine right, as if God himself had so ordained
immediately. Others, however, object that the power
which the Church has received from God, and
its ordinance. The first opinion is defended by
Dominic Soto, Thomas Sanchez, Benedict XIV, Perrone,
Rosset, Palmieri, and others; the second by Henry de
Segusia (commonly called Hostiensis), Suarez, Lay-
mann, Fugger, the Wurzburg theologians, Gasparri,
Latantius, Fahrner, and others. The tradition of the
Christian Church for centuries bears witness that Christian marriage before consumma-
tion has not the same indissolubility as a consummated
marriage. Scholars, however, are not unanimous
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about the limits of its dissolubility. Many facts from the lives of the saints, of St. Thecla, St. Cecilia, St. Alexius, and others, such for example as are narrated by Gregory the Great (Dialog. xiv, in P. L., XXXII) and by the Venerable Bede (Hist Angl., i, p. 175, note), prove the universal Christian conviction that, even after marriage had been contracted, it was free for either of the married parties to separate from the other in order to choose a life of evangelical perfection. Now this would be a violation of the right of the other spouse if in such circumstances the marriage bond were not dissolved. But at least could not easily be dissolved under certain conditions, and thereby the right granted to the other to enter upon another marriage. The precise conditions under which this dissolution of the marriage bond actually took place, and still takes place, can only be decided with certainty by the authentic declaration of the Church. Such a declaration was made by Alexander III, according to III Decretal, xxxii, 2: "After a lawfully accorded consent affecting the present, it is allowed to one of the parties, even against the will of the other, to choose a monastery (just as certain saints have been called from marriage), provided that the state of evangelical perfection be not placed between them; and it is allowed to the one who is left to proceed to a second marriage." A similar declaration was made by Innocent III, op. cit., cap. xiv. From this latter declaration we learn that religious profession alone has this effect, and that therefore those who wished to practise a life of high perfection in any other manner could be obliged by the other spouse either actually to choose the religious state or else to consummate the marriage. Under earlier ecclesiastical conditions, no long delay was imposed upon the other party before entering another marriage, because religious profession might be made without a long novitiate. The introduction of a novitiate of at least one year by the Council of Trent, and the time of three years prescribed by Pius IX and Leo XIII for simple vows before the solemn profession, and the general restriction of solemn profession by the establishment of simple profession, which does not dissolve the marriage bond, have rendered difficult the dissolution of unconsummated marriage by religious profession. So that now it seems practically necessary that if one of the married parties should choose the state of evangelical perfection before the consummation of the marriage, the marriage bond should be dissolved by papal authority.

2. Dissolution by the Pope of Marriage not yet Consummated.—The pope's authority as supreme head of the Church to dissolve Christian marriage not yet consummated is proved on the one hand from the words of Christ to Peter, Matt., xvi, 19 (see above, under B 2), and on the other, from the dissolubility of such a marriage by religious profession, inasmuch as such profession must be solemn, for according to the declaration of Boniface VIII (III Novi Decretal, xxv, xvi), solemn vows as such depend entirely upon the ordinance of the Church—"voti solemnitas ex soli constitutioe ecclesiastica inventa." Hence it follows without a doubt that the dissolution of a marriage by solemn profession could never take place without the exercise of the Church's authority. Now for reasons of common morality and also of the teaching of the Church, it is impossible to assert that such a dissolution according to a general law, a fortiori she can do this in single cases—not indeed arbitrarily, but for grave reasons—because this power has been granted by God to dispense in matters of Divine right, and a delegated authority may not be exercised without a sufficient reason. (cf. Wernz, "Jus decretal," IV, n. 698, not. 30). The actual exercise of this power on the part of the popes, which has become constant and general, is a further proof of its propriety and its actual existence. Clear instances occur during the pontificates of Martin V (1417-31) and Eugenius IV (1431-47). St. Antoninus tells us that he had seen several Bulls of these popes which granted such a dispensation or a dissolution of a marriage that had not been consummated, so that thereafter they might proceed to a new marriage (Summa theol., III, tit. i, c. xxi). We can find traces of such a practice even in the pontificate of Gregory the Great, Decretal of Alexander III, namely, IV Decretal, xiii, 2, seems, according to a probable interpretation, to refer to a possible concession of such a dissolution. Perhaps the decision of Gregory II to St. Boniface, in 726 (see above under A 4), might possibly be explained in the same sense, though it is very uncertain, for it seems to refer neither to the dissolution of a case of marriage, as some supposed, nor to the dissolution of a real marriage that had not been consummated, but rather to a declaration of invalidity. For several centuries the exercise of this power of dissolving such marriages has belonged to the ordinary functions of the Holy see, and is exclusively papal, for the work of the Roman Congregations in such cases is only preparatory. However, exceptional instances occur when it has been delegated to bishops (Wernz, op. cit., n. 698, not. 41). The judicial procedure in such cases was exactly prescribed by Benedict XIV in his Bull of 1741 (section 15), obligatory on the whole Latin Church. Any uncertainty about this ecclesiastical power (cf. Fehörer, Geschichte des Unauflöslichkeits-prinzips, p. 170 sqq.) was removed by this Bull; for this power did not belong to the Church, but the Bull itself was to be understood and carried out as a rule and institution against all good morals. It is, however, inconceivable that the pope could issue a general prescription that would contain an attack on morality and could formally sanction bigamy in certain cases. Several of the older ecclesiastics, especially those of Bologna, brought forward some special reasons which are supposed to justify the dissolution of a marriage before consummation. If they wished to justify the right of dissolution by private authority, then they erred. If they intended to speak of a dissolution that could be granted by the Church, that is, by its supreme head, and the permission for a new marriage, then they had merely collected the cases in which such a dissolution might take place in virtue of the papal authority just spoken of, but they had not given a new title to such dissolution. Some held the erroneous opinion that the false marriage was to be dissolved, because they regarded such a union as no real marriage, but simpliciter betrothal, and therefore they treated it according to the juridical principle in regard to betrothal. This theory of marriage, however, was not opposed by the Church, but has long disappeared from theological schools; nothing does it deserve any consideration at present, because it is in conflict with established Catholic dogmas.

D. Limited Divorce, or Separation from Bed and Board (Divortium Imperfectum) is allowed for various causes, especially in the case of adultery or lapse into infidelity or heresy on the part of husband or wife.

Separation of marriage, dissolved by the marriage bond intact is mentioned by St. Paul, I Cor., iv: "If she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." From the very nature of the case it follows that occasions may arise when further cohabitation is impossible or even unseemly and morally impossible. If such circumstances do not bring about a dissolution of the marriage bond, at least a cessation of married life must be permitted. Hence it is that the Council of Trent, immediately after its definition of the indissolubility of the marriage bond, on "in case of adultery, added another canon (Sess. XXIV, c. viii): "If anyone shall say that the Church err, she, for many causes, comes to a separation of husband and wife in respect to bed and dwelling-place for a definite or an indefinite period, let him be anathema." The cessation of married life in common may have different degrees. There
can be the mere cessation of married life (separatio quoad torum), or a complete separation as regards dwelling-place (separatio quoad cohabitationem). Each of these may be permanent or temporary. Temporary abstinence from married life, or separatio a toro, may be by mutual parting consent from higher religious motives, not, however, if such continuing for the occasion of moral danger to either of the parties. Should such danger threaten either, it would become their duty to resume married life. The Apostle speaks of this in I Cor., vii; "Defraud not one another, except, perhaps, by consent, for a time, that you may give yourselves to prayer; and return together again, lest Satan tempt you for your incontinency."

1. The Choice of Evangelical Perfection.—For a permanent separation on account of entrance into the state of Christian perfection, i.e. entrance into religious life on the part of the wife or of the husband, or by the reception of Holy orders on the part of the husband, there is required not only mutual consent, but also some arrangement on the part of ecclesiastical authority, according to the laws about such cases. This holds in regard to the reception of the major orders immediately after the consummation of marriage, even before the separation takes it to be obtained for religious life, it holds only after consummated marriage. For, as we have said above, by the religious marriage which has not yet been consummated can be dissolved, and on that account newly-married parties have the right to a delay of two months to consider the nature of the state of their separation, during which the consummation of the marriage may be refused (St. Alphonsus, "Theol. mor.", VI, n. 938). In case the marriage is not dissolved, the reception of Holy orders or religious profession cannot take place before provision has been made for a continent life on the part of the other party. In accordance with the judgment of the diocesan bishop, he or she must enter either a religious order, or, if age and other circumstances remove all suspicion and all danger of incontinency, at least take a private vow of perpetual chastity. In no case can it ever be allowed that the husband who should receive Holy orders might dwell in the same house with the wife bound only by a private vow (cf. Laurentius, "Instit. jur. eccl.", 2nd ed., n. 694).

2. Adultery of One of the Parties.—Cause for the cessation of complete community of life, which in itself is not incurable, is given to the innocent party by the adultery of the spouse. In order, however, that this right may exist, the adultery must be, first, proven; second, not attributable to the other spouse either entirely or as accomplice; third, not alreadycondoned; fourth, not, as it were, compensated by the adultery of the other party (cf. IV Decretal., xiii, 6, and xiv, 4, 5; Wernz, "Jus decretor.", IV, n. 707 sq; St. Alphonsus, VI, n. 960). If the innocent party is certain of the sin of the other, he or she has a right immediately to refuse the continuation of married life. If the crime is manifest, then the innocent party is justified in leaving at once the guilty one, or in dismissing him or her from the house. If, however, the crime is not known, or not proved with certainty, then complete separation can follow only after a judicial investigation and a judicial decision, which must be made by ecclesiastical authority (IV Decretal., xix, 4, 5; i, 9; Wernz, "Jus decretor.", IV, n. 711). All sexual intercourse outside of married life is regarded as equivalent to adultery in justifying complete separation, even the unnatural sins of sodomy and bestiality. As proof of the crime may be alleged what are called suspiciones vehementes. In the first centuries of the Church, there was no commandment imposed on the innocent party, to separate from the party guilty of adultery. There never, however, was any such general legislation. The duty, however, of separation was founded partly on the canonical penance imposed for adultery that was publicly known (and this penance was incompatible with marital life), and partly on the duty of avoiding scandal, as continued living with a husband or wife addicted to adultery might seem to be a scandalous approval of this criminal life. For this latter reason, even nowadays, circumstances may arise making the dismissal of the guilty party a duty (cf. St. Alphonsus, VI, n. 963 sq). Commonly, however, at least for a single violation, there is no duty of separation; still less is there any duty of permanent separation; in fact, charity may in certain cases demand that after a temporary separation the contrite party might be invited or admitted to a renewal of the matrimony. There is, however, never any obligation of justice to receive again the guilty party. The most that some theologians recognize is an obligation of justice when the party originally innocent has meanwhile become guilty of the same crime. The innocent party always retains the right in justice to recall or to demand the return of the guilty party. If the innocent husband or wife wishes to give up this right forever, then he or she can enter a religious order, or he may receive Holy orders, without the necessity of consent on the part of the guilty wife or husband who has been dismissed, or without any further composition being imposed upon this party (III Decretal., xxxii, 10; Wernz, op. cit., n. 710, not. 126; St. Alphonsus, VI, n. 960).

3. Heresy or Defection from the Faith.—Next to adultery, a reason for separation almost equivalent to it is defection from the Faith, whether by the rejection of Christianity or by heresy (IV Decretal., xix, 6, 7). However, there are some important differences to be noted:

(a) In the case of adultery, a single action, if proven, is enough for permanent separation, but in the case of incontinency or heresy, a certain persistence in the sin is required (cf. St. Thomas, IV Sent., dist. xxxv, Q. i, a. 1), such for example as adhesion to a non-Catholic denomination.

(b) An ecclesiastical sentence is necessary in this case for the right of permanent separation. If this has not been obtained, the innocent party is bound to receive the guilty party after conversion and reconciliation with the Church. This is expressly decided by IV Decretal., xix, 6. When, however, the right to permanent separation has been granted, the innocent party can proceed at once to the religious life or receive Holy orders, and thereby render it impossible to return to married life. It need hardly be mentioned that infidelity or heresy, as such, gives no just cause for separation of any kind, if it existed before the marriage was contracted, and if a dispensation from the impediment of disparity of worship between a baptized and a non-baptized person has been granted, or if a valid marriage, even without ecclesiastical dispensation, has taken place between a Catholic and a baptized non-Catholic. In such cases, passage from one denomination to another does not give a reason for separation.

4. Danger to Body or Soul.—Besides these special cases of separation founded on ecclesiastical law, many other cases may arise, which, of their nature, justify temporary separation. They are summed up under the general notion of "danger to body or soul" (periculum corporis aut animum). There must, of course, be question of an approximate danger of great
harm, because this very important right of the other party may not be set aside, or even partially limited, for trivial reasons. The reasons for a temporary separation are as various as the evils which may be inflicted. To judge the gravity correctly, reasonable consideration is demanded from the courts of the nature, character, and duration of the danger to the soul, which is given as a reason for separation, almost always supposes a crime on the part of the other party. It consists in temptation to some mortal sin, either to the denial of the Catholic Faith, or the neglect of the proper education of the children, or to other grievous sin and violation of the moral law. Dangerous solicitation, or pressure, or intimidation, or threats inflicted either by, or with the consent of, one party, or silent approbation to induce the other to a grievous violation of duty would give justification—and even the obligation, if the danger were great— to proceed to separation, which should last as long as the danger exists. Such a reason as this might later on justify a separation in the case of a mixed marriage. Danger to the body, which is a further reason for a separation, means any great danger to life or health, as well as other intolerable conditions, without danger, plotting against one's life, ill-treatment which in the circumstances should be regarded as gross, well-grounded fear of dangerous contagion, insanity, serious and constant quarrelling, etc. It is to be noted that in every case there must be a very serious evil to justify separation from a civil marriage. Otherwise, such a divorce was prevalent and borne with Christian patience. Great crimes of one party, provided they are not against marital fidelity, or do not include any incentive to sin on the part of the other, do not, according to Catholic law, of themselves give any right to separation, neither do punish- ments which might be inflicted on one party. The consequence of such crimes, even when this punishment is joined with dishonour. The Catholic view of this matter is directly opposed to the non-Catholic, which, as we have seen above under A. 3. (6), permits in such cases the dissolution of the marriage bond.

Private authority, i.e. without previous application to an ecclesiastical court and its decision, a temporary separation may take place when delay would bring danger. The church law does not allow a separation in other cases (Wenz, "Jus Decret.", P. n. 74.; St. Alphonsus, "Theol. mor.", VI, n. 751), although there are exceptions, i.e. for separation, the non-ob servance of the Church's regulations can more easily be overlooked. Separation because of the mere decision of a civil judge is never allowed to Catholics. (Cf. III Conc. Pien. Polt., tit. IV, c. ii.)


II. In Civil Jurisprudence.—Divorce is defined in civil jurisprudence as "the dissolution or partial suspension by law of the marriage relation" (Bouvier's Law Dictionary). Strictly speaking, there is but one form of absolute divorce, known, under the name divinitis matrimonii, of the church, and vinulum matrimonii, i.e. from the marriage tie. In the states where it is administered this form of divorce puts an end legally to the marriage relation. There is, however, a limited form of divorce which is, more accurately speaking, a suspension, either for a time or indefinite, of the marriage relation, and is known as divorce a mensah et toro, or from bed and board. In addition, in some states courts grant decrees declaring marriages absolutely void, ab initio, i.e. from the beginning. Such marriages never having been valid, the parties cannot be said to have been divorced; however, proceedings for nullity are frequently provided for under divorce statutes.

Pre-Christian Divorce Legislation among the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans.—Before the adoption of Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire, it would appear that divorce in some form existed among some ancient people. In European civilization is derived. Among the Hebrews the law of divorce was at least 2500 years old. In Athens, but the party suing had to appeal to the magistrate, state the grounds of complaint, and submit to his judgment; if the wife was the prosecutor, she was obliged to appear in person. The lxx customs of the Spartans made divorce rare. Among the Romans the law of Divorces permitted divorce to men, but refused it to women. Adultery, poisoning of children, and falsification or counterfeiting of keys, were sufficient grounds. While divorce was so far free that there was no one authorized by the civil power to oppose it, this freedom was restrained by the moral feeling of the people and their respect for the marriage bond. It was necessary to consult the family council and there was fear of the authority of the censors. There were three forms of marriage among the Romans: the coniubium, which was celebrated with certain highly religious ceremonies peculiar to that form of the marriage contract; the pietas, which was affected by a simulated purchase (coemptio), a much more simple ceremony; and the usus or prescription, where, after living with her husband for one year without being absent for three days, the woman came, as in the other forms of marriage, in manus marit., that is to say, under the control of her husband. No instance of divorce is known before A. D. 520 or 523.

It is thought that this was the first instance of divorce under the Roman Republic, but it would seem probable that it was the first divorce for the special purpose of retaining the wife's dowry (dote). This is the suggestion of some who point out that the divorce of Antonius took place in 87 B.C., and states that other proof exists that in much earlier times divorce was properly established and strictly ordained by laws. He quotes also from Cicero (Phil., II, 28) where he says jokingly of Antonius, who had dismissed his wife Cynisca under the same formalities as those of divorce, "that he commanded her to have her own property according to the Twelve Tables; he took away her keys and drove her out."

The causes for divorce on the part of the woman were capital offences, adultery, and drinking. After the Punic wars the number of divorces reached scandalous proportions. P. Sulpicius Severus, Tiberius Antony, Augustus, and Titus all put away their wives. Under Augustus an effort was made to curb the licence of divorce. In the interest of publicity, that emperor made it necessary for the party seeking
a divorce to make his declaration in the presence of seven witnesses, all Roman citizens of full age. Divorce remained, however, a private legal act. Women could obtain divorce without any fault of their husbands. Under the Roman law of the early imperial period, the marriage pronouncement, first, between parties whose marriage engagement had not been legally contracted; second, where parties were separated when the contract of espousals had been made but not consummated by actual marriage. This was known as repudium. Divorciem was a separation of persons already married, and included divorce a mensd et toro and a vinculo matrimonii.

Imperial Christian Legislation.—In 331 Constantine the Great restricted the causes for divorce to three on the part of the man, viz., if he was a murderer, a poiser, or a robber of graves; and three on the part of the woman, viz., if she was an adulteress, a poisoner, or a corruptor of youth. Among soldiers an absence of four years was sufficient to entitle the petitioner to a divorce. This edict was ratified by Theodosius the Great and Honorius. Under Justinian several reasons for divorce were added, and liberty of divorce by mutual consent was restored by his law of 20 January, A.D. 528. No provision was made in the Roman law until after a lapse of 340 years, when Leo the Philosopher (886-912) made a collection of laws known as the "Libri Basilici," from which he excluded the edicts of Justin.

In the Christianized Church, according as Catholic doctrine penetrated more profoundly the medieval life, the laws of European nations were gradually accommodated to its demands. In this way, for example, the teaching of the Council of Trent (1563), which anathematized the error that marriage could so far be dissolved by divorce that it was lawful to marry again, was universally accepted among the nations adhering to the Catholic Church. This council, however, introduced thereby no essential change in the divorce law of the Church. Originally, under the common law of England, there was no jurisdiction on the subject of divorce, and in the ecclesiastical courts they had jurisdiction in all matters relating to marriage and divorce, the restitution of conjugal rights, suits for limited divorce and for annulment of marriage. This followed from the Catholic doctrine that marriage, being a sacrament, could not be dissolved; for the same reason any question relative to its validity or to a suspension of conjugal relations must necessarily pertain to the ecclesiastical courts. The ecclesiastical law of England, though originating differently from the other branches of the common law and distinguished by special rules, was part of the unwritten law of the State, just as what are technically called the common law, the law of admiralty, and equity.

The Protestant Reformers rejected the sacramental theory of marriage, and agreed that absolute divorce should be granted for adultery and for malicious desertion, and that the innocent party might then remarry. As they also rejected the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts it was for some time a question among them whether marriage was dissolved ipso facto by the commission of one of these offences, or whether it was necessary to have the dissolution declared by public authority. Luther taught that the parish priest as the proper tribunal. Appeals were sometimes taken to the prince or sovereign. Gradually "consistorium courts" were created, of both lay and ecclesiastical members, under sanction of the civil power. In England under Henry VIII., after his separation from the Catholic Church, divorce remained practically unchanged. An effort was made in the time of Edward VI. to secure the adoption of a new code of ecclesiastical laws, drafted mainly by Cranmer, under which separation a mensd et toro was not recognized and complete divorce was granted in cases of extreme conjugal faithlessness; in cases of conjugal desertion or cruelty; in cases where a husband not guilty of desertion of his wife, had been several years absent from her, provided there was reason to believe him dead; and in cases of such violent hatred as rendered it in the highest degree improbable that the husband and wife would survive their animosities and again love one another. Divorce was denied when both parties were guilty of unfaithfulness, and when only one was guilty the innocent party might marry again. The ecclesiastical court was to decide all questions concerning those cases. It is said by Howse and (Hist. of Institutions, p. 80) that the principles of this code, known as the "Reformatio Legum," were carried out in practice, though not enacted into law. Head ald that "according to the ancient form of judgment divorce was probably still pronounced only a mensa et thoro; but whatever the shape of the decrees, there is strong evidence that from about 1548 to 1602, except for the short period of Mary's reign, 'the community, in cases of adultery, relied upon them as justifying a second act of matrimony.' He says also that throughout nearly the whole of Elizabeth's reign new marriages were freely contracted after obtaining divorce from unfaithful partners. However, in 1602 the Star Chamber pronounced a marriage invalid which had been contracted after separation from bed and board by the decree of an ecclesiastical judge (Foljambe's case, 3 Salk. 193).

Following this decision the canon law was administered in the English spiritual courts with such rigor that it required an Act of Parliament to permit a remarriage after divorce. In the tenth year of James I. (1613) an Act was passed to restrain remarriage by one party while the other was alive, excepting, however, that the divorce had been pronounced by ecclesiastical courts. There were some cases where, after sentences had been pronounced by an ecclesiastical court, a second marriage was upheld, but the decisions are generally to the effect that a perfect marriage cannot be dissolved excepting by death. Oughton says (tit. 215) that the marriage tie once perfected cannot be dissolved by man, but only by natural death. The parties may be separated, but they remain man and wife. The Puritans of England strongly advocated the right of divorce, but without effect: and until 1857 there was no English statute which permitted the granting of a decree of absolute divorce by any court, the only jurisdiction being vested in Parliament. Precedents of divorce by Parliament strictly so called are not found earlier than 1698, but it came to be understood that if a divorce a mensd had been granted by the spiritual court, a divorce would be granted by Parliament absolutely dissolving the marriage, though only for the cause of adultery on the part of the wife. By the Act of 1857 the entire jurisdiction in matrimonial questions was transferred to a new civil court for divorce and matrimonial causes, and since the Judicature Act of 1873 this jurisdiction has been vested in the probate, divorce, and admiralty division of the High Court of Justice. Its power is restricted, however, to England alone. The principles upon which divorce legislation may be based and which may be traced in the legislation of those countries that permit divorce are recommended by Bishop (Marriage, Divorce and Separation, § 40, ed. of 1891) as follows:

"Matrimony is a natural right, to be forfeited only by some wrongful act. Therefore the government should permit every suitable person to be the husband or wife of another, unless the law relieves those duties of the matrimonial relation; and when it is in good faith entered into, and one of the parties without the other's fault so far fails in those duties as practically to frustrate his ends, the government should provide some means whereby, the failure being estab-
lished and shown to be permanent, the innocent party may be freed from the mere legal bond of what has in fact ceased to be marriage, and left at liberty to form another alliance. The guilty party would have no claim to be protected in a second marriage; and whether it should be permitted to him or not, rests upon him, not of right with him, but of public expediency, upon which there is considerable diversity of opinion."

Modern European Legislation.—A full collection of laws and statistics relating to marriage and divorce in European countries will be found in the report of the U. S. Commissioner of Labor, Carroll D. Wright, for 1880. It is therein stated that “prior to 1868 the ecclesiastical courts had in most of the countries named more or less complete jurisdiction over matrimonial causes, but the civil courts have now exclusive jurisdiction over such matters in all of them.” In Austria-Hungary absolute divorce is not allowed to members of the Catholic Church. Prior to 1 January, 1876, all the cantons of Switzerland had their own peculiar laws of divorce, but subsequent to that date a general law governing the subject was established. In Germany perpetual or limited divorce was abolished throughout the empire, and the causes for such separation were made causes for absolute divorce. In Hungary divorce has been legal for Protestants since 1786 and for Hebrews since 1863. The laws of their respective churches apply to their adherents for almost all of the countries named, as to Greeks. Questions of divorce or validity of marriage among Protestants are subject to the jurisdiction of the civil courts. Excepting for Protestants and Hebrews, the ecclesiastical courts of other bodies have jurisdiction. In case of mixed marriage the court of the subject’s jurisdiction jurisdiction. In Italy, Spain, and Portugal, still Catholic countries, no absolute divorce is permitted. In Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Mexico, and Cuba, limited divorce alone is permitted.

The following causes in Austria and in Hungary for absolute divorce are typical: In Austria, adultery; commission of a crime punishable by five years imprisonment; malicious abandonment or non-appearance after one year’s solicitation where the absentee’s residence is known; assault endangering life or health; refusal to endure unconquerable aversion, on account of which both parties demand a divorce. In the latter case a limited divorce or separation from bed and board must first be obtained. In Belgium, where the husband is at least twenty-five years of age and the wife twenty-one, and the parties have been married two years or longer, divorce may be obtained by mutual consent on certain terms and conditions, but must be approved by the courts. In France divorce was introduced by the law of 1792. This law was modified in 1798 and in 1803 (Code Napoleon), was subsequently abrogated in 1816, and reintroduced in 1851; the grounds of divorce being adultery of either party; excesses, cruelty, grave injury inflicted by one spouse on the other; condemnation to infamous penalty of either of the spouses; mutual and persevering agreement of the parties to separate, if said consent is expressed and established as prescribed. By recent legislation, however, the lapse of a fixed period of time, a decree of separation can be changed into a judgment of divorce on the application of either of the parties. (Civil Code, Sec. 307.) In the German Empire perpetual judicial separations have been abolished, and all subject to the empire, without regard to their religious status may apply to the house of the laws of divorce which exist in their respective states. In Prussia there are seven causes known as major causes for divorce and six as minor causes. Among the major causes are: insanity, disorderly conduct or mode of living, refusal of maintenance or support by the husband. It may be noted that in the divorce laws of European states there exists much similarity as regards the causes for divorce. In Scotland divorce is granted for adultery, for desertion, the former since 1560; the latter since 1573. The injured party has the right to choose either a judicial separation or an absolute divorce. In Ireland the civil courts have no jurisdiction to grant decrees of absolute divorce. In Canada exclusive authority was conferred upon the Parliament by the British North America Act of 1867 (Sec. 91). At that time courts of divorce existed in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, and they still continue to exercise their functions. Excepting in Prince Edward Island, the divorce courts appear to have been modelled upon the English court of divorce and matrimonial causes. A court of divorce and alimony was established in Prince Edward Island as early as 1836. In the other provinces of Canada no divorce court has ever been constituted and divorces are granted only by special Act of Parliament. The courts of Quebec can grant separation de corps under the English divorce court practice and annul marriage on the ground of impotence.

In Australia, at the time of the formation of the Commonwealth, there were divorce courts in all the constituent states. Under the Constitution (Act 63–64, Vict., ch. xi, part V, Sec. 51), power was granted to the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, comprising the states of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, and Western Australia, with respect to divorce and matrimonial causes and in relation to parental rights and the custody and guardianship of infants. The object of this subsection is stated to have been to avoid "the great mistake made by the framers of the Constitution of the United States of America, who left the question to the states to deal with as they respectively thought proper" and "to provide for uniformity in the law of divorce" (Quick and Garran, Aust. Const., pp. 262–609). The local statutes in the various states still prevail, however, with the right of appeal to the High Court with respect to judgments of the Supreme Court of a state (Act of 1903, 2 Com. 148, p. 149). In New South Wales, which is a part of the Australian Commonwealth, divorce is allowed for adultery on the part of the wife, and adultery with certain aggravating circumstances, or with cruelty, on the part of the husband. (New Zealand Statutes, Vol. I, p. 229.)

Divorce in the United States.—Colonial Period (1607–1787).—At the time of the settlement of the various colonies which subsequently declared their independence of Great Britain, there were no ecclesiastical courts; as in England, therefore, the practice of separation and matrimonial causes and in relation to parental rights and the custody and guardianship of infants. There are many instances of legislative divorces granted in the New England colonies, all being divorces a vinculo. Adultery and desertion were sufficient reasons, though male adultery would require additional circumstances. In the Southern colonies there was no court having jurisdiction to grant divorce, though in some of them an appeal for alimony would be considered in a court of equity. Under the Dutch government of New York divorce jurisdiction was exercised by the courts for absolute, as well as for limited, separation; but when the English took possession of the colony, this jurisdiction was no longer recognized. In Pennsylvania under "The Great Law of 1682" divorce was authorized for adultery. The legislature also granted di-
 divorces. In New Jersey there was no divorce jurisdiction granted the courts. It may be said, therefore, that outside of New England during the colonial period there was no such thing as a judicial divorce. From 1787–1906.—The Constitution of the United States does not grant the Federal Government power over the subject of divorce. In this matter, therefore, Congress can legislate only for the District of Columbia and for the territories. The organic acts creating the territories give power to their legislatures over all "rightful subjects of legislation not inconsistent with the constitution or laws of the United States"; special and general divorce laws are, therefore, within the power of territorial legislatures, but by the Act of 30 July, 1886, all special divorce acts have been expressly forbidden. The various states of the Union succeeded to the full sovereign rights exercised by the Parliament of England over all subjects relating to marriage and divorce, but in the absence of special divorce statutes, there being no tribunal having jurisdiction, the law would remain the same as in the colonies prior to the Revolution. However, all states of the Union have adopted divorce statutes, except Virginia, Carolina, and New Hampshire, and have clothed their courts with full jurisdiction to administer relief. In most of the states and territories divorces a vinculo and a mensa et toro are provided for, and in some of the states courts of equity take jurisdiction over special proceedings for a decree of nullity of marriage. In some states a marriage contract, however, decreed to be null and void is expressly forbidden. The causes for which a decree may be granted vary from the single cause of adultery on the part of either husband or wife (law of New York and the District of Columbia) to nine separate causes in the State of Washington, the last being known as the "menses et toro", which proved to be another cause deemed by the court sufficient, provided that the court shall be satisfied that the parties can no longer live together. In most of the states there is no restriction upon the parties remarrying after divorce, though in some, as in New York, the court may forbid the guilty party to remarry during the lifetime of the innocent, and in others, as in Pennsylvania, marriage of the guilty party with a paramour during the lifetime of the innocent party is null and void.

Great uncertainty as to the effect of the divorce statutes of the different states has arisen where relief has been sought by a party whose domicile is in one state and residence of a different state from that in which the proceeding was brought. While it is a fundamental principle that the courts of any state have entire control over the citizens of that state in divorce proceedings, a different question arises where the husband is a resident of one state and the wife of another. The English doctrine that the domicile of the husband is that of the wife, irrespective of where she may actually be living during coverture, does not prevail in the United States. For the purposes of a divorce proceeding the wife may have a domicile separate from that of her husband. In consequence of this result of American law it has frequently happened that actions for divorce have been initiated and carried to a conclusion without the respondent receiving any actual notice of the proceeding. This is made possible by processes not being used by the party where the domicile of the defendant is located. The remedy is by publication, where actual service cannot be had upon a respondent by reason of absence from the state. While decrees granted in accordance with the statutes of any particular state are valid in that state, there is no power to enforce a recognition of their validity in other states, and frequently happens that a divorce may be valid in one state and invalid in another; the children of a second marriage legitimate in one state and illegitimate in another; the property rights of the former husband and wife terminated in one state and in full force in another. The Constitution of the United States (Art. IV, Sec. 1) provides that "full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other state, and the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof." However, it does not require the recognition of a divorce where one of the parties is not a citizen of the state that has granted the decree. Thus in a case where a husband abandoned his wife without justifiable cause, and removed to another state and acquired a domicile in the same, and the wife remained in the matrimonial domicile, since her domicile did not follow that of her husband when he sued for a divorce in the state of his new domicile, and a decree was rendered upon a merely constructive service of process, it was held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the court of the husband’s domicile did not acquire such jurisdiction over the wife as would entitle a decree to obligatory enforcement in the state of her domicile, though the state in which the decree was rendered had power to enforce it within its borders, and the state of the wife’s domicile had the power to give the decree effect, because the parties could not mutually consummate it; because the parties could not mutually dissolve it; because an act of God incapacitating one to discharge his duties will not release it; because there is no accepted performance of the act that will end it; because a minor of marriageable age can no more rescind it than an adult; because it is not dissolved by failure of the original consideration; because no suit for damages will lie for the non-fulfillment of its duties; because legislation may annul it at pleasure; and because none of its other elements are those of contract but are all of status. (1, Marriage and Divorce, § 46.)

It was also perceived that a suit for divorce is not an act on a contract, but is a proceeding sui generis founded on the violation of duty enjoined by law and resembling more an act of tort than of contract. The law looks upon marriage as a permanent status, to be ended only by the death of one of the parties, a promise of competent persons to marry at their pleasure requiring a marriage licence merely to attest their competency. To change this status by divorce it is necessary to satisfy the court that the purpose of the marriage relation has been ended by the fault of the guilty party, and that greater injury will follow from marriage with another than from terminating it. Therefore, in theory, the divorce statutes embrace only such causes as are recognized as being of such a nature as to defeat the ends for which the marriage was entered into. In the great majority of the United States six causes are set up in this category: (1) adultery, (2) bigamy, (3) conviction of crime in certain classes of cases, (4) intolerable cruelty, (5) wilful desertion for two years, (6) habitual drunkenness. These are recognized as just causes, either for absolute divorce or for divorce a mensa et toro. The following consequences also result to a lawful marriage that upon their being made to appear, the courts will decree such marriages null and void, in some jurisdictions under a separate proceeding for nullity, and in others under the form of a proceeding for divorce. These causes are (1) impotence, (2) consanguinity and affinity properly lim-
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ited, (3) existing marriage, (4) fraud, force, or coercion, (5) insanity unknown to the other party.

The growth of divorce in the United States under the general divorce laws has been unprecedented, and exceeds in number those of any other modern nation, excepting France. It was urged for the first time in

the United States by Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, in 1889, that the total number of divorces for a period of twenty years, from 1867 to 1887, to be 328,716, an increase of 157 per cent, while the increase in population for the same period was 60 per cent. The Census Bulletin upon marriage and divorce, 1886, the United

States, states that by the Department of Labor and Commerce under authority of an Act of Congress, in 1908, shows that the total number of divorces for the entire country from 1887 to 1906 inclusive was 915,025.

For the earlier investigation covering the twenty years, from 1867 to 1886 inclusive, the number reported was 297,307, or hardly more than one-third of the number reported in the second twenty years.

At the beginning of the forty-year period covered by the two investigations, divorces occurred at the rate of 10,000 a year. At the end of that period the annual number was about 60,000. This increase has

been considered to be connected with the increase in population. An increase of 30 per cent in population between the years 1870 to 1890, was accompanied by an increase of 79 per cent in the number of divorces granted. In the next decade, 1890 to 1900, the population increased 25 per cent and divorces 70 per cent. In the following decade, 1900 to 1910, an increase of 21 per cent in population was accompanied by an increase of 66 per cent in the number of divorces.

In the six years from 1900 to 1906, population, as estimated, increased 10.5 per cent and divorces 25 per cent. This increase of divorces in the forty-year period that divorces were increasing about three times as fast as the population, while in the first decade, 1870 to 1880, they increased only about two and two-thirds as fast.

The divorce rate per 100,000 population increased from 29 in 1870 to 82 in 1900. In the former year there was one divorce for every 3,411 persons and in the latter year one for every 1,218. The rate per 100,

000 married population was 81 in the year 1870 and 200 in the year 1900. This comparison indicates that divorce is at present two and one-half times as common, compared with married population, as it was forty years ago. Divorce rates appear to be much higher in the United States than in any of the foreign countries for which statistics relating to this subject have been obtained. Two-thirds of the total number of divorces granted in the twenty-year period covered by this investigation were granted to the wife. The most common single ground for divorce is desertion. This accounts for 38.9 per cent of all divorces (period 1887 to 1906), 49.4 per cent or almost one-half of those granted to the husband, and 33.5 per cent or one-third of those granted to the wife. The next most

important ground of divorce is, for habitual adultery, and for wives, cruelty. Of the divorces granted to husbands (1887 to 1906), 28.8 per cent were for adultery, and of those granted to wives 27.5 per cent were for cruelty. Only 10 per cent of the divorces granted to husbands were for adultery of the husband, and 10.5 per cent of divorces granted to husbands were for cruelty on the part of the wife. Drunkenness was the ground for divorce in 3.3 per cent of the cases for which the wife brought suit, and in 1.1 per cent of the cases in which the suit was brought by the husband. In Pennsylvania, drunkenness was reported as an indirect or contributory cause for divorce in 5 per cent of the divorces granted to the husband, and in 18 per cent of the divorces granted to the wife, and appeared as a direct or indirect cause in 19.5 per cent of all divorces, and 26.3 per cent of those granted to wives, and 6.1 per cent of those granted to husbands. Only 15 per cent of the divorces were returned as contested and probably in many of these cases the contesting was hardly more than a formality. Alimony was demanded in 18 per cent of the divorces granted to the wife and was granted in 12.7 per cent. The proportion of husbands who were granted the property was 22 per cent and the proportion obtaining it was 2 per cent. The average duration of marriages terminated by divorce is about ten years. Sixty per cent or three-fifths last less than ten years and forty per cent last longer. Of the di-

vorce couples known to have been married in the United States 88.5 per cent were married in the same state in which they were divorced. Of the divorced couples known to have been married in foreign countries 38.9 per cent were married in Canada, 12.7 per cent in England, 16.1 per cent in Germany and 1.9 per cent in Ireland. Children were reported in 39.8 per cent of the total number of divorced cases. The proportion is much larger for divorces granted to the wife than for divorces granted to the husband; children being present in 46.8 per cent of the former class of divorces and 26 per cent of the latter. A reason suggested for this is that the children are usually claimed by the court on the ground of love. Therefore, divorce does not imply separation from her children, while to the husband it involves a severance of the parental as well as the marital relation. In Canada during 1900 there were eleven divorces; in 1901 nineteen. In England there were 284 in 1902, as compared with 477 in 1901. In France at the same time there were about 10,000 annually, and in France 21,933, with a tendency towards a rapid increase. Among the Japanese there are about 100,000 divorces per annum. It is estimated that about fifty per cent of divorced couples have children, and it is urged "that consideration of the interest of the children should be a first concern in stimulating restrictive legislation". It has been stated that three-quarters of the boys in two reformatories, one in Ohio and one in Illinois, come from families broken up by death or divorce "mainly by divorce" (The Divorce Question in New Hampshire, Rev. W. Stanley Emery).

Divorce Congress of 1906.—A well concerted effort was made in 1906, upon the initiative of the State of Pennsylvania, to secure uniform legislation by the various states and territories of the Union so as to eliminate as far as possible fraudulent proceedings for the purpose of divorce. It resulted in the Constitutional Provisions of Washington, where all of the states, excepting Nevada, Mississippi, and South Carolina, were represented, in addition to the District of Columbia and the territory of New Mexico. The outcome of this congress was the adoption of a form of statute designed to overcome flagrant evils arising from lack of uniformity, and also from inherent objections to various existing methods of procedure. A summary of these points will show how far the existing statutes were considered to need amendment. Having in mind the evils that have arisen from migratory divorce (that is, where the plaintiff has obtained a residence for the purpose of divorce in another) the congress recommended that all suits for divorce should be brought and prosecuted only in the state where one of the parties has a bona fide residence; that when the courts are given cognizance of suits where the plaintiff was domiciled in a foreign jurisdiction at the time the cause of complaint arose, relief should not be granted unless the cause be included among those recognized in the foreign domicile, and the same rule should apply in the case of the defendant. At least two years residence should be required of one of the parties before jurisdiction should be assumed. The defendant should be given every opportunity to appear and make defence, and one accused as co-respondent should be permitted to defend in the same suit. Hearings and trials should always be before the court and not before a delegated representative of it, and in
all uncontested cases, and in any other case where in the judgment of the court it is wise, a disinterested attorney should be assigned to defend the cause. No decree should be granted on affirmative proof aside from the admission of the respondent. A decree dissolved may in some cases remarry in either party should not become operative until the lapse of a reasonable time after hearing or trial upon the merits of the case. If an inhabitant of one state should go into another state or territory to obtain a divorce for a cause which occurred in the matrimonial domicile, or for a cause which would not authorize divorce by the laws of that domicile, such divorce should have no force or effect in the state of the domicile. Fraud or collusion in obtaining or attempting to obtain divorces should be made a statutory crime. The legitimacy of children born during coverture, except in the case of bigamous marriages, should not be affected by divorce of the parents. On the subject of causes each state should legislate for its own citizens and the common sentiment of that state should be properly expressed by the enumeration of causes in its own statute. Those heretofore given are recognized as representing the view of the great majority as covering offenses against the marital contract of such a character as to so seriously disturb the peace of the marital relation. The congress expressed the hope that the number of causes for divorce would be reduced rather than increased and declared its opinion that in such jurisdictions as New York and the District of Columbia, where the only cause of divorce is called for, it is recommended that where conviction of crime is made a cause, it must be followed by imprisonment for two years, but no absolute divorce should be granted for insanity, and that desertion should not be a cause unless it has persisted in for at least two years. Practically the same causes for divorce are set forth in Delaware and New Jersey. The provisions of this statute have already been adopted in Delaware and New Jersey and are under consideration (1908) in other states. While the reforms thus suggested will not put an end to what is known as the divorce evil, it is believed that they will have the effect of safeguarding trials and abating fraud upon the courts.

Philosophical thinkers recognize the fact that the prevalence of divorce in the United States arises from two causes. The first of these causes is the gradual growth in the attitude of society towards women in the recognition of their individual rights to their own property, and of their capacity to earn their own living in many vocations heretofore closed to them. The legal fiction that the identity of the woman was merged in that of her husband has given place to a growing recognition of her individuality in all relations of life. This has weakened the dependence of women upon their husbands for support and has affected the concept of the family relation. The theory of the Protestant leaders of the sixteenth century, that marriage is but a civil contract, devoid of sacramental character, has been strengthened by the vicissitudes of modern life, while the facility with which divorces can be obtained has tended to a constant increase of their number. Marriage, not being accounted a sacrament by non-Catholic Christians, is entered into with greater ease than a contract of far less moment affecting property alone. The knowledge that in case of disagreement the parties may obtain a divorce no doubt has its effect. The second cause is the gradual increase and development of irreligion and materialism among non-Catholic members of the community. Leaders of the Protestant Churches in the United States have been alarmed at the progress of divorce, and have been employing in their various denominations to adopt such regulations as would restrict it to flagrant cases or abolish it entirely. It is evident that the prevalence of divorce is an indication of an unsound condition of society. Those who now endeavour to reform the civil statutes in the interest of honest trials, may succeed in abating some of the evils flowing from lax methods of administering the divorce statutes in some of the states, and in obtaining restrictive legislation in all of them, but it is not probable that the moral situation will be stopped until the majority of the people of the civilized nations return to the supernatural sanction of marriage and "that it is a sacramental union, productive of the graces necessary to bear with one another's shortcomings; an indissoluble union as that of soul and body, which can be dissolved only in death. This means a return to the Catholic view of marriage and this return also removes the national evil of divorces." (See Marriage; Woman; Parents; also the articles on the various states and countries for divorce legislation.)

THOMAS L. D. BUCKLER, Cathedral of Christ the King, New York, N. Y.

WALTER GEORGE SMITH.

DIXON, JOSEPH, Archbishop of Armagh, Ireland, b. at Coalisland, Co. Tyrone, in 1806; d. at Armagh, 29 April, 1866. Having entered Maynooth College at the age of sixteen he was ordained priest in 1829. In 1834 he was appointed to the chair of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew, a post he worthily occupied for the next eighteen years. His class had an average of 200 students, amongst whom was John McEvilly, afterwards Archbishop of Tuam and a distinguished writer on scriptural subjects. Dr. Dixon's professorship was complicated by his "Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures", a work highly praised by Cardinal Wiseman and which was very much needed at the time. The first edition appeared in 1827 and a second in 1875. As Primate of Armagh he held an important synod in 1854, at which all the bishops of the northern province were present. The synod was notable for the introduction of the Liturgy of St. Vincent de Paul (1855), who opened a house in Drogheda; the Marist Fathers (1861) who opened a college and novitiate in Dundalk, and the Vincentian Fathers who were placed in charge of the ecclesiastical seminary the same year. The primate was a staunch and fearless defender of the rights of the Holy See and at a public meeting in Drogheda denounced Napoleon III for complicity in the acts of the Italian revolutionists. His speech and subsequent letter to the "Free-man's Journal" created a great sensation and the em- ployer made them a subject of complaint to Pius IX. The primate was the organizer of the Irish Brigade in the papal service. 

AMBROSE COLEMAN.

Dlugosz (Lat. LONGINTUS), JAN, an eminent medieval Polish historian, b. at Bresznica, 1415; d. 19 May, 1480, at Cracow. He was one of the twelve sons born to John and Beata. He received his primary education in Nowy Korczyn, then entered the Seminary of Cracow, where he studied literature and philosophy. He was ordained priest in 1440, and appointed secretary of Cardinal Zbigniew Oleśnicki, Bishop of Cracow. Later he became a prelate of the cathedral and preacher for the children of the Polish King,
Casimir IV, Jagiellończyk. He was employed as the ambassador of the Polish king to different foreign countries, and especially to Bohemia and Hungary, where he settled political disturbances. His ecclesiastical superiors sent him as their representative to I. V. IV, and as delegate to the Council of Basle. He declined the Archbishor of Prague, but shortly before his death was appointed Archbishop of Lemberg. Dlugosz expended his great income for religious and philanthropic purposes; he founded both churches and monasteries, also built for the maintenance of poor scholars.

The most beautiful church which he founded, and beneath which he was buried, is in Cracow, and is called Na Skale (meaning, "Upon Rock", as the church was built on an enormous rock). As a Polish historian he outranks all who preceded him. He was not content to repeat the statements made by other chroniclers, but examined for himself the oldest Polish, Bohemian, Hungarian, Ruthenian, and German documents, in order to understand the church thoroughly he studied, in his old age, several foreign languages. His works offer abundant and reliable material not only for Polish, but also for general, history. Dlugosz paid least attention to the beauty of style than to veracity of statement, and wrote in a philosophic manner, as one who saw the action and purposes of Providence in all historical events. His great history of Poland (Historia Poloniae in twelve volumes) was composed by order of his friend and master Cardinal Dusznicki. The works of Dlugosz were first published incompletely in 1614, and fully in 1711. The best edition is that in fourteen volumes by M. Casimir Kozłowski: "Joanna Dlugosz Senioris (Cracoviensis Opera Omnia)" (Cracow, 1863-87). It includes his herialc work "Benedicta Prutenorum", also his "Life of St. Stanislaus", "Life of St. Kinga", lives of many Polish bishops (Seeof Wroclaw, Posen, Plock, Cracow, etc.), "Liber beneficiorum diocesis Cracoviensis", "Lites ac res gestae inter Polonos ordinemque Cruciferorum", "Annales seu cronica inediti regni Poloniae"

CARO, J. Lomianska (Cieszyn), Die politische Geschichte der unteren Mittelkönige (Leipzig, 1873); BRUCKNER, Dieceze Literaturfonds (Warsaw, 1900). JOHN GODRYTZ.

Dobeneck. See Cochleus.

Dobmayer, Marian, a distinguished Benedictine theologian, b. 24 Oct., 1753, at Schwandorf, Bavaria; d. 21 Dec., 1805, at Amberg, Bavaria. He first entered the Society of Jesus, and after its suppression in 1816, joined the Benedictines in the monastery of Weissenau, Diocese of Bamberg, where he was professed in 1775, and in 1778 ordained priest. He was subsequently professor of philosophy at Neuburg, Bavaria (1781-87), of dogmatic theology and ecclesiastical history at Amberg (1787-94), and of dogmatic theology and patrology at the University of Ingolstadt (1794-91). On the reorganization of the latter school in 1799 he returned to his monastery of Weissenau, where he remained until its secularization. He then retired to Amberg, where he taught theology until his death. In 1780 he published at Amberg a "Con spectus Theologicum Dogmaticum". His chief work is the "Systema Theologicum Catholicae", edited after his death by Th. P. Senestrey in eight volumes (Salzburg, 1807-19). The work is very learned and devoid of all harshness in its controversial parts.

Dobrizhoffer, Martin, missionary, b. in Graz, Styria, 7 Sept., 1717; d. in Vienna, 17 July, 1791. He became a Jesuit in 1736, and twelve years later set out for the missions of South America, where he laboured among the Guaranis and the Abipones for eighteen years. On the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Spanish possessions in 1767, he returned to his native land. The Empress Maria Theresa frequently sent for Dobrizhoffer that she might hear his adventures from his own lips; and she is said to have taken great pleasure in his reported conversion of a whole tribe to the Christian religion. In the preface to the author of a work in three volumes entitled "Historia de Abiponibus, equestri bellicosae Paraguainae natione" etc. (Vienna, 1783-1801), a German translation of which, by Professor Kell, of the University of Freiburg, was published in Vienna the same year. This book is of great ethnological value. In the preface he says, "A seven years residence in the four colonies of the Abipones has afforded me opportunities of closely observing the manners, customs, superstititions, military discipline, sacrifices inflicted and received, political and economical regulations, together with the vicissitudes of the colonies" He further decides that what he learned amongst the Paraguayans in the course of eighteen years, what he himself beheld in the colonies of the Indians and the Spaniards, in frequent and long journeys, through woods, mountains, plains and vast rivers, he sets forth, if not in an elegant and brilliant narrative, certainly in a candid and an accurate manner. He was, in the course of the work, Dobrizhoffer frequently taken occasion to refuse and expose the erroneous statements of other writers respecting the Jesuits in Paraguay, and the malicious calumnies by which the ruin of their institutions in that country was unhappily effected. The English translation of Sir Arthur Wilson's "The Equestrian People of Paraguay" (London, 1822), commonly ascribed to Southey, is the work of Sara Coleridge, daughter of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who judged it a performance "unsurpassed for pure and English by anything I have read," and long since Dobrizhoffer in 1773 was appointed preacher to the Court in Vienna, a post which he held till his death.


DOCETÆ (Gr. δοκεται), a heretical sect dating back to Apostolic times. Their name is derived from the Greek "appearance" or "semblance" of Christ. They taught that Christ only "appeared" or "seemed" to be a man, to have been born, to have lived and suffered. Some denied the reality of Christ's human nature altogether, some only the reality of His human body or of His birth or death. The word Docetæ, which is best rendered by "Illusionists", first occurs in a letter of Serapion, Bishop of Antioch (190-203) to the Church at Rhio, where troubles had arisen about the public reading of the apocryphal Gospel of Peter. Serapion at first unsuspectingly allowed, but soon after forbade, this, saying that he had borrowed a copy from the sect who called themselves "Docetæ". He suspected a connexion with Marcion and found in this Gospel "some additions to the right teaching of the Saviour". A fragment of this apocryphon was discovered in 1886 and contained three passages which savoured strongly of illusionism. The name further occurs in Clement Alex. (i. 210), Strom. I, xiii, vii, xvii, where these sectaries are mentioned together with the Haemites as instances of heresies being named after their own special error. The heresy itself, however, is much older, as it is combat in the New Testament. Clement mentions a certain Julius Caiusin and the "bouros ekeges", the "founder of illusionism". This name is also known also to St. Jerome and Theodoret; and Caiusin is said to be a disciple of Valentinian, but nothing more is known of him. The idea of the unreality of Christ's human nature was held by the oldest Gnostic sects and
cannot therefore have originated with Ctesias. As Clement distinguished the Docetæ from other Gnostic sects, he probably knew some sectaries the sum-total of whose errors consisted in this illusion theory; but Docetism, as far as at present known, was always an accomplishment of Gnosticism. For later of Manichæanism the Docetæ described by Hippolytus (Philos. VIII. i-iv. X, xii) are likewise a Gnostic sect; these perhaps extended their illusion theory to all material substances.

Docetism is not properly a Christian heresy at all, as it did not arise in the Church from the misunderstanding of a dogma by the faithful, but rather came from without. Gnostics starting from the principle of antagonism between matter and spirit, and making all salvation consist in becoming free from the bondage of matter and returning as pure spirit to the Supreme Spirit, could not possibly accept the sentence, "the Word was made Flesh," in a literal sense. In order to borrow from Christianity the doctrine of a Saviour who was Son of the Good God, they were forced to modify the doctrine of the Incarnation. Their embarrassment with this dogma caused many very remarkable and inconsistent ideas. The dwelling of an Aeon in a body which was indeed real but was not his own, others denying the actual objective existence of any body or humanity at all; others allowing a "psychic," not a "hylic" or really material body; others believing in a real, yet not human body; others denying that reality of the body but not the reality of the birth from a woman, or the reality of the passion and death on the cross. Christ only seemed to suffer, either because he ingeniously and miraculously substituted some one else to bear the pain, or because the whole occurrence on Calvary was a visual delusion. Simon Magus first spoke of a "putative" passion of Christ and blasphemously asserted that it was really he, Simon himself, who underwent these apparent sufferings. "As the angels governed this world badly because each angel coveted the principality for himself, he [Simon] came to improve matters, and was transfigured and rendered like unto the Virtues and Powers and Angels, so that he appeared amongst men as man though he was no man and was believed to have suffered in Judea though he had not suffered" (passum in Judæo putatum cum non esset passus—Irenæus, Adv. Haer. I, xii). The mendacity and the speech of the angels stamps this passage as a piece of Gnosticism. Soon after a Syrian Gnostic of Antioch, Saturninus or Saturinus (about 125) made Christ the chief of the Aeons, but tried to show that the Saviour was unborn (ἀνεμφατος) and without body (ἄσωμα) and without form (ἀπειθεος) and only apparently (παρασιρα) seen as man (Irenæus, Adv. Haer. XXIV, ii).

Another Syrian Gnostic, Cerdó, who came to Rome under Pope Hyginus (137) and became the master of Marcion, taught that "Christ, the Son of the Highest God, appeared without birth from the Virgin, yea with a body, and on earth in human nature, for matter not being the creation of the Highest God but of the Demiurge, Christ could have none of it. This is clearly brought out by Tertullian in his polemic against Marcion. According to this heresiarch (140) Christ, without passing through the womb of Mary and endowed with only a putative body, suddenly came from heaven to Capharnaum in the thirteenth year of Tiberius; and Tertullian remarks: "All these tricks about a putative corporeality Marcion has adopted lest the truth of Christ's birth should be argued from the reality of human nature that Christ should be vindicated as the work of the Creator [Demiurge] and be shown to have human flesh even as he had human birth" (Adv. Marc. III, xi). Tertullian further states that Marcion's chief disciple, Apelles, slightly modified his master's system, accepting indeed the truth of Christ's flesh, but strenuously denying the truth of His birth. He contended that Christ had an astral body made of superior substance, and he compared the Incarnation to the appearance of the angel to Abraham. This, Tertullian sarcastically remarks, is getting from the frying-pan into the fire, de calcaris in carbonarius, palam the Egyptian attempted to substitute his system still more closely to Christian doctrine by admitting not merely the reality of the Saviour's body but even a seeming birth, saying that the Saviour's body passed through Mary as through a channel (θρόνον καθέσι, though he took nothing from her but had a body from above. This approach to orthodoxy, however, was only apparent, for Valentinus distinguished between Christ and Jesus. Christ and the Holy Ghost were emanations from the Aeon Nous; and from all Aeons together proceeded Jesus the Saviour, who became united with the Messias of the Demiurge.

In the East, Marinos and the school of Bardesanes, though not Bardesanes himself, held similar views with regard to Christ's astral body and seeming birth. In the West, Polycarp reduced Docetism to absurdity by saying that Christ was indeed a real man, but His substance was a combination of the pneumatic and the psychic (spiritual and ethereal). The pneumatic He received from Achamoth or Wisdom, the psychic from the Demiurge; His psychic nature enabled him to suffer and feel pain, though He possessed nothing of a material or human kind (Irenæus, Adv. Haer., I, xii, iv). As the Docetæ objected to the reality of the birth, so from the first they particularly objected to the reality of the passion. Hence the clumsy attempts at substitution of another victim by Basilides and others. According to Basilides, Christ seemed to be a man and to perform miracles. It was not, however, Christ who suffered but Simon of Cyrene, who was constrained to carry the cross and was mistakenly crucified in Christ's stead. Simon having received Jesus' form, Jesus assumed Simon's and thustood by and laughed. Simon was crucified and Jesus returned to his father (Irenæus, Adv. Haer. I, xxiv). According to some apocrypha it was Judas, not Simon the Cyrenian, who was thus substituted. Hippolytus describes a Gnostic sect who took the name of Docetæ, though for what reason is not apparent, especially as their semblance theory was the same as that of Gnosticism. Their views were in close affinity to those of the Valentinians. The principal Being is, so to speak, the seed of a fig-tree, small in size but infinite in power; from it proceed three Aeons, tree, leaves, fruit, which, multiplied with the perfect number ten, become thirty. These thirty Aeons together fructify one of themselves, from whom proceeds the Virgin-Saviour, a perfect representation of the Highest God. The Saviour's task is to hinder further transference of souls from body to body, which is the work of the Great Archon, the Creator of the world. The Saviour enters the world unnoticed, unrecognised, hidden, obscure. An angel announced the glad tidings to Mary. He was born and did all the things that are written of him in the Gospels. But in baptism he received the figure and seal of another body besides that born of the Virgin. The object of this was that when the Archon perceives the peculiar and peculiar figment of flesh to the death of the cross, the soul of Jesus—that soul which had been nourished in the body born of the Virgin—might strip off that body and nail it to the accursed tree. In the pneumatic body received at baptism Jesus could triumph over the Archon he had eluded.

This heresy, which destroyed the very meaning and purpose of the Incarnation, was combated even by the Apostles. Possibly St. Paul's statement that in Christ dwelt the fulness of the Godhead corporaliter (Col. i, 19, ii. 9) has some reference to Docetic errors. Beyond doubt St. John (I John, i, 1-3; iv, 1-3; I 1
Doceticism. See DOCETISM.

Doceticism, a titular see of Asia Minor. This city, as appears from its coins where the inhabitants are called Macedonenses, must have been founded by Antigonos Dokimos. Its name is written Dokimeion, Dokimia, Domokiana, later Dokimion. It was famous for its marble-quarries, and is now identified with Isteia Kara Assar, a village north-east of Afion Kara Hisar, in the district of Boruza. On this site have been found Christian inscriptions, later than Constantine. Docimism was a suffragan of SYNNAEA in Phrygia Salutaris. Six or seven bishops are known, from 344 to St. Lequin (Or. Christ., I, 553); another bishop is mentioned in an inscription.

Texta, Description de l'Asie Mineure, I, 149; LEAKE, Asia Minor, 94; RAMSAY, Cities and Bishops of Phrygia, passim and 784; DOEL, E. L., Geschicht und Geschichte der Gnosis (Halle, 1883), II, 290. For Doceticism in Bulletin de correspondent helvétique (1860), XXIV, 179. S. PETRIDES.

Doctor (Lat. doctor, to teach), the title of an authorized teacher. In this general sense the term occurs in the O. T.; the "doctors" are mentioned with the "princes and ancients" (Deut., xxix, 10: xxxi, 28), and Azariah prophesies (II Paral., xv, 3) that "many days shall pass in Israel, without the true God, and without a priest a teacher, and without the law" (verse 4 et aliae loca), ut sit docetum. It was the duty of these doctors to expound the law, and they performed it at the time of Christ, who was found in the temple "in the midst of the doctors" (St. Luke, ii, 46). Another meeting of Our Lord with the "doctors of the law" is recorded in St. Luke, vi, 17. The later Jewish teachers also received the title (doctor gentium, doctor misERICORSIS, et aliae loca); the duty of these doctors to expound the law, and they performed it at the time of Christ, who was found in the temple "in the midst of the doctors" (St. Luke, ii, 46). Another meeting of Our Lord with the "doctors of the law" is recorded in St. Luke, vi, 17. The later Jewish teachers also received the title (doctor gentium, doctor misERICORSIS, et aliae loca); the duty of these doctors to expound the law, and they performed it at the time of Christ, who was found in the temple "in the midst of the doctors" (St. Luke, ii, 46).

During the first half of the twelfth century, the title Doctor acquired a more special significance, though it still implied personal excellence rather than official position. The "Four Doctors" who succeeded Innocent at Bologna were the distinguished jurists, Martinus (d. before 1160), Bulgarus (d. 1166), Ilduo (d. 1165), and Jacobus (d. 1175). But when the doctors formed a collegium they prescribed conditions on which other persons might become members of the teaching body, and thus laid the foundation of the system of academic degrees. The doctorate was first granted in civil law (doctores legum), later in canon law (doctores decretorum), and, during the thirteenth century, in medicine, grammar, logic, and philosophy. The doctorate in music was conferred at Oxford and Cambridge in the fourteenth century. For graduate degrees in arts the doctor was more generally employed than doctor, but for a long time these titles were synonymous.

The English universities, adopting the usage of Paris, at first designated teachers of law as doctors, and pro-
fessors of theology as masters; but in the course of time the former title was given to all the superior faculties, and the latter was reserved for grammar and arts. In Germany, doctor and magister were interchangeable (Kaufmann, "Geschichte", etc., II, 268 sqq.). Though the master was conferred as a separate degree, a trace of the medieval practice is still found in the diploma which styles its recipient "Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Arts".

Bologna at first conferred only the doctorate, but Paris and the English universities very soon introduced the preparatory degree of baccalaureate and licentiate. Later, it is true, the licentiate was granted in the Italian university also at the first examination (privata); but this merely implied permission to proceed to the second, more formal, examination (publica) in which the licentia docendi was given. At Paris, the licentiate meant a real authorization to teach, besides being a pre-requisite for admission to the final examination (incepto) at which the doctorate was conferred. There was a corresponding difference in the length of the course for the degree. Bologna required six years of study for the doctorate in canon law, or eight for those who undertook a licentiate and a doctorate in civil law; the student might begin his course at the age of fourteen and become a doctor at twenty or twenty-one. At Paris the statutes drawn up in 1215 by the Cardinal Legate Robert de Courcy provided that no one should lecture in theology as a master unless he was thirty years of age, had studied for eight years, and taken a five-year course in theology. According to Denifle (Universitaten, 100-102), the eight years meant three years in arts and five years in theology. (Cf. Rushdall, "Universities", I, 462 sqq.) At Oxford, candidates who had already taken the M.A. degree were required to study theology seven years more for the licentiate. In medicine, M.A. candidates had a six-years' course for the doctorate. For the subjects required in these courses see University. (Cf. Rushdall, op. cit., II, 452 sqq.)

In regard to examinations there seems to have been considerable leniency: at times they were reduced to mere formalities, at other times they were dispensed with. The degree was awarded by the chancellor on the advice of the regent masters of the faculty as to the candidate's fitness. The ceremony of inception was conducted by a regent; it consisted in the traditional public taking of the cap, the raising of the hand, and the kiss of fellowship. At Paris, however, the degree in theology was conferred by the chancellor himself, who placed the biretta upon the candidate's head with the words, "Incipisti in nomine Patris et Fili et Spiritus Sancti. Amen." Then followed a disputation (addeo) in which the chancellor, the masters, and one of the bachelors took part. It was customary also to hold, on the evening before inception, an elaborate disputation known as vesperia (see, for details, "Carthularium", II, App., p. 693).

Among the various disputes, that in theology was most frequent. It was no uncommon thing for those who had received the degree in the other faculties to take additional courses for the S.T.D. In the German universities, for instance, licentiates in law or medicine might become bachelors in theology after five years of theological study; they were therefore obliged to pursue the course prescribed for the other candidates. Conversely, theologians were sometimes permitted to follow courses in civil law and medicine. This privilege was granted to Bologna by Clement V (10 March, 1310) for a period of ten years but it applied only to ecclesiastical persons who were priests or superiors of religious orders elected. It was renewed twice by John XXII (1317 and 1330) but when the university (1343-44) petitioned for an indefinite extension of the privilege, Clement VI refused. Innocent VI, however, renewed it (30 June, 1360) for ten years (Denifle, op. cit., 209)

The chief significance of the doctorate lay in the fact that it authorized the recipient to teach everywhere without undergoing further examination—jus ubique docendi. This prerogative developed gradually out of the licentia docendi which the degree itself implied; i.e., the right to teach was no longer reserved by the doctorate. But as the older universities, Bologna, Paris, and Oxford, grew in importance and attracted students from all parts, the idea naturally spread that their graduates had the right to teach everywhere. Subsequently, this authorization was expressly granted to newly founded universities: by Gregory IX to Toulouse (1233), and by Alexander IV to Salamanca (1255). It was long, however, before the universities came to a mutual recognition of their degrees. Paris held tenaciously to its rights; Oxford was more liberal, but would not permit a Parisian doctor to teach merely on the strength of his degree. The doctors themselves were not always anxious to exercise their prerogative; the teaching devolved in large measure upon the bachelors, and the masters were classified as regents (those who taught) and as non-regents, who were content with the prestige implied by the title without the responsibility of teaching.

The essence of the degree of Doctor of Laws, as fixed by the medieval universities, is preserved in modern academic usage; the degree implies a qualification to teach. It has, however, undergone various modifications which are due partly to the development of the universities and partly to the changes in educational theory and practice. The degree, Doctor of Laws, is often conferred as an honorary title. The doctorate in theology, or divinity, has been retained by Catholic institutions as a degree to be given either after a course of study and an examination or as a distinction (honores causa); while the tendency among non-Catholic universities is to confer it only as an honorary degree. Of late the doctorate in philosophy has attained great importance, and its value has been enhanced as the result of stricter requirements. For this and for the other doctorates, research is now generally considered the principal qualification, and in consequence the candidate's work is becoming more specialized.

The influence of the Holy See, in regard to the doctorate, especially in theology, has been exerted in various ways, e.g., by authorizing universities to confer the degree, by prescribing through papal legates the conditions for obtaining it, and by regulating those abuses, notably laxity of requirements, which crept in from time to time. The historical details will be found in the article University. Legislation concerning the ecclesiastical side of the subject may be summarized as follows:

1. The power of creating doctors belongs to the pope; but he may, and often does, delegate it to universities, seminaries, and other institutions of learning. Charters granted by civil authority are valid; but to obtain canonical recognition, doctorates in theology and canon law must be conferred in virtue of pontifical authorization.

2. The candidate for the degree must be a baptized Christian and must subscribe to the profession of faith formulated by Pius IV. As a rule, only priests receive the doctorate in theology and canon law. It is not, however, necessary that the recipient should be in Sacred orders. Laymen as well as priests are allowed to appear as advocates before the Roman tribunals (Rota, Signatura) and they are required to have the doctorate at least in canon law (Cont. "Sapienti consilio", 29 June, 1908).

3. The doctoral biretta, or four-cornered cap, may be worn on academic occasions, but not in choir (Cong. of Rites, "In Venusina", 1844, and reply to the Archbishop of Santiago de Chile, 6 Sept., 1895); the ring may be worn at all times except at Mass and other ecclesiastical functions (Cong. of Rites, 12 Feb., 1902).

4. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, c. ii, "de
Ref.'decreed that a bishop must be either doctor or licentiate in theology or in canon law; if a religious, he should have proper testimonials from his superiors. It enacted the same requirement for the archdeacon (Sess. XXIV, c. xii, "de Ref."). Regarding the vicar capitular and the penitentiary, it prescribed that they should either have the degree or be otherwise well qualified. The Congregation of Studies recently decided (7 March, 1908) that the penitentiary and theologian of the cathedral chapter, if not already doctors, must receive the degree within a year. The Cong. of Conc. (Decret. Hors Consilio," 20 June, 1908) prescribes the doctorate in theology and canon law for the officials of the Rota and Signatura. It has been a matter of controversy whether the vicar-general is obliged to be a doctor, and whether the Tridentine decree concerning the archdeacon is still in force. For the divergent opinions, see Card. Gennari, "Quotestiones Canonicae" (Rome, 1908), pp. 272-293. The whole tenor of ecclesiastical legislation has been in favour of requirements which secure scientific qualifications in those who are appointed to official positions in the Church.

ERMAN-HORN, Bibliographie d. deutschen Universitaten (Leipzig, 1893), i, 252. Denifle, Die Universitas des Mitelalters (Berlin, 1885); Kaufmann, Die Geesch. d. deutschen Universitaten (Stuttgart, 1895); University of Europe, etc. (Oxford, 1895); Labrie, The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities (New York, 1898); Battandier, Annaire Pontifical (Paris, 1900).

DOCTORS, SURNAMES OF FAMOUS. It was customary in the Middle Ages to designate the more celebrated among the doctors by certain epithets or surnames which were supposed to express their characteristic excellence or dignity. This was especially the case with the doctors in law and theology. The following list exhibits the principal surnames with the dates of death.

Doctors in Theology—

- Abstractionum—Francis Mayron, O.F.M., 1325 or 1327.
- Accutitates—Sixtus IV, 1484.
- Acutus—Gabriel Vasquez, S.J., 1604.
- Amoenus—Robert Conton, O.F.M., 1340.
- Angelicus—St. Thomas Aquinas, O.P., 1274.
- Area testamenti—St. Anthony of Padua, 1311.
- Authenticus—Gregory of Rimini, O.S.A., 1538.
- Acerrarum et philosophicorum—Urbansus, O.S.B., 1403.
- Beatus et fundatissimus—Egidius of Colonna, O.S.A., 1316.
- Bonus—Walter Brinkley, O.F.M., 1310.
- Christianus—Nicholas of Cusa, 1464.
- Clavis—Louis of Montesinos, 1621.
- Clarus or subtilis—Denis of Citeaux, 15th cent.
- Collectivus—Landolfo Canacciolo, O.F.M., 1351.
- Colloquium doctorum—William of Champeaux, O.S.B., 1121.
- Contradictionum—Johann Wessel, 1489.
- Doctor doctorum, Scholasticus—Anselm of Laon, 1117.
- Dulciflavus—Antonio Andreas, O.F.M., 1320.
- Ecclesiasticus—Denys the Carthusian, 1471.
- Emoens—St. John of Matha, O. Trin., 1213.
- Emperiorum theologus—Laurent Gervais, O.P., 1483.
- Excellentissimus—Antonio Corsetti, 1503.
- Eremitus—Francisco Suarez, S.J., 1617.
- Facundus—Petrus Aureolus, O.F.M., 1322.
- Famosissimus—Petrus Alberti, O.S.B., 1426.
- Fabricius—Bertrand de la Nar, O.F.M., 1334.
- Fetatis—Francis of Canida, O.F.M., 15th cent.
- Fls mundi—Maurice O'Febhly, O.F.M., Abp. of Tuam, 1513.
- Fundamentalis—Jeanne Faber of Bordeaux, 1530.
- Fundatissimus—see Beatus.

Doctors in Law—

- Fundatus—William Ware, O.F.M., 1270.
- Illibatus—Alexander Alamanieus, O.F.M., 15th cent.
- Illuminatus—Francis Mayron, O.F.M., 1325-27.
- Raymond Lully, O.F.M., 1315.
- Illuminatus et sublimis—Joannes Tauler, O.P., 1361.
- Illustratus—Franciscus Picenus, O.F.M., 14th cent.
- Illustris—Adam of Marisco, O.F.M., 1308.
- Inclitus—William Mackelfield, O.P., 1300.
- Ingeniosissimus—Andrew of Newcastle, O.F.M., 1309.

- Inter Aristotelicos Aristotelesissimus—Hayno of Faversham, O.F.M., 1241.
- Invincibilis—Petrus Thomas, O.F.M., 14th cent.
- Irreptagibilis—Alexander of Hales, O.F.M., 1215.
- Magister Sententiarum—Peter Lombard, 1164.
- Magnus—Albertus Magnus, O.P., 1250; Gilbert of Citeaux, O.Cist., 1280.
- Marianus—St. Anselm of Canterbury, O.S.B., 1109.
- Melleflusus—St. Bernard, O.Cist., 1153.
- Mirabilis—Antonio Perez, S.J., 1649; Roger Bacon, O.F.M., 1291.
- Moralis—Carried Eudo, O.F.M., 1349.
- Notabilis—Pierre de l'He, O.F.M., 14th cent.
- Ordinatissimus—Johannes of Bassolis, O.F.M., c. 1347.
- Oratioetissimus et sufficiens—Petrus de Aquila, O.F.M., 1344.
- Paraniessis—Guillaume de Perpignan, O.Carm., 1342.
- Planus et utilis—Nicholas of Lyre, O.F.M., 1340.
- Paschalibus—Peter of Kaiserlautern, O.Prem., 1330.
- Prachtissimus—Thomas Netter (of Walden), O.Carm., 1431.
- Profundissimus—Paul of Venice, O.S.A., 1425.
- Gabriel Bie, Can. Reg., 1460; Juan Alfonso Curiel, O.S.B., 1609.
- Profundus—Thomas Bradwardine, 1349.
- Refugialisus—Alexander V, 1110.
- Resolutissimus—Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, O.P., 1334.
- Resolutus—John Bacon, O.Carm., 1346.
- Scholasticus—Peter Abelard, 1112; Gilbert de la Porée, 1154; Peter Lombard, 1164; Peter of Poitiers, 1220; Hugh of Newcastile, O.F.M., 1322.
- Sediocorius—St. Bonaventure, O.F.M., 1274.
- Singularis et singularibus—William of Occam, O.F.M., 1347 or 1359.
- Solennis—Henry of Ghent, 1293.
- Solidus, Cospout—Richard of Middleton, O.F.M., 1300.
- Speculatus—James of Viterbo, O.S.A., 1307.
- Sublimis—Francis de Barcione, O.Carm., 1372.
- Jean Courcet-Cuisse, 1425.
- Subtilis—Duns Scotus, O.F.M., 1308.
- Subtilissimus—Peter of Manutius, 14th cent.
- Sustentatorius—Francis of Accoli, c. 1344.
- Universale—Alanus of Lille, 1202; Gilbert, Bishop of London, 1134.
- Venerabilis et Christianissimus—Jean Gerson, 1429.
- Venerandus—Geoffroy de Fontibus, O.F.M., 1240.
- Vita Arbor—Johannes Wallensis, O.F.M., 1300.

Doctors in Law—

- Aristotelis anima—Johannes Doninus, O.F.M., 1359.
- Doctor a doctoribus—Antonius Francisceus, 1528.
- Fons canonicus—Johannes Andrea, 1348.
- Fons juris utriusque—Henry of Susa (Ostia), 1287-91.
- Lucerno juris—Baldus of Ubaldis, 1400.
- Lucerno juris posticipi—Nicholas Tedesci, O.S.B., 1415.
- Lumen juris—Clement IV, 1268.
- Lumen legum—Irnerius, 13th cent.
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ST. AMBROSE
ST. GREGORY

ST. AUGUSTINE
ST. JEROME
DOCTOR Angelicus. See Thomas Aquinas, Saint.

DOCTOR of the Law. See LAW; SCRIBE.

DOCTORS of the Church (Lat. Doctores Ecclesiae).—Certain ecclesiastical writers have received this title on account of the great advantage the whole Church has derived from their doctrine. In the Western Church four eminent Fathers of the Church attained this honour in the early Middle Ages: St. Gregory the Great, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome. The "four Doctors" became a commonplace among the Scholastics, and a decree of Boniface VIII (1298) ordered that these feasts be kept as doubles in the whole Church is contained in his sixth book of Decretals (cap. "Gloriosus", de reliqua, et vener. sanctorum, in Sexto, III, 22). In the Eastern Church three Doctors were pre-eminent: Chrysostom, Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen. The feasts of these three saints were made obligatory throughout the Eastern Church by Leo VI, the Wise, the deposer of Photius. A common feast was later instituted in their honour on 30 January, called "the feast of the three Hierarchs". In the Menæa for that day it is related that the three Doctors appeared in a dream to John, Bishop of Euchaita, and commanded him to institute a festival in their honour, in order to put a stop to the rivalry of their votaries and panegyrist. This was under Alexius Comnenus (1081-1188; see "Aeta SS."); 11 June, under St. Basil, c. xxxviii.), but sermons for the feast are attributed in MSS. to Cosmas Vestitor, who flourished in the tenth century. The three are as common in Eastern as in Western. Durandus (I, 3) remarks that Doctors should be represented with books in their hands. In the West analogy led to the veneration of four Eastern Doctors, St. Athanasius being very properly added to the three hierarchs.

To these great names others have subsequently been added. The requisite conditions are enumerated as three: eminis doctrina, insigne vitae sanctitas, Ecclesia declaratio (i.e. eminent learning, a high degree of sanctity, and proclamation by the Church). Benedict XIV explains the third as a declaration by the Church, officially, either by its Acts, or by an Act that general councils have acclaimed the writings of certain Doctors; no council has actually conferred the title of Doctor of the Church. In practice the procedure consists in extending to the Universal Church the use of the Office and Mass of a saint in which the title of Doctor is applied to him. The decree is issued by the Congregation of Sacred Rites and approved by the pope, after a careful examination, if necessary, of the saint's writings. It is not in any way an ex cathedra decision, nor does it even amount to a declaration that no error is to be found in the teaching of the Doctor; it is, indeed, well known that the majority of them are not wholly immune from error. No martyr has ever been included in the list, since the Church and the Mass are for Confessors. Hence, as Benedict XIV points out, St. Ignatius, St. Ireneus, and St. Cyprian are not called Doctors of the Church.

DOCTRINE

The proper Mass of Doctors has the Introit "In medio" borrowed from that of the Theologus per excellence, St. John the Evangelist, together with special prayers and Gregorian chant. The Credo is said. The principal peculiarity of the Office is the antiphon to the Magnificat at both Vespers, "O Doctor optimize", and it is further by this antiphon that the bishop or any other priest whose feast is celebrated is to be a Doctor (S. R. C., 7 Sept., 1754). In fact, St. John Damascene has a Mass of his own, while Athanasius, Basil, Leo, and Cyril of Jerusalem have not the Gospel of Doctors, and several have not the collect. The feasts of the four Latin Doctors were not added until the fourteenth century, when St. Thomas Aquinas was declared a Doctor by the Dominican St. Pius V in his new edition of the Breviary (1558), in which the feasts of the four Greek Doctors were also raised to the rank of doubles. The Franciscan Sixtus V (1588) added St. Bonaventure. St. Anselm was added by Clement XI (1720), St. Isidore by Innocent XIII (1721). St. Peter Chrysologus by Benedict XIII (1723), St. Leo I (a well-deserved but belated honour) by Benedict XIV (1754), St. Peter Damian by Leo XII (1828), St. Bernard by Pius VII (1830). Pius IX gave (1851) the honour to St. Hilary and to two more modern saints, Alphonsus Liguori (1787) and Francis de Sales (1857). Pius IX (1869) has added to the venerable list of Doctors, St. Isidore of Seville, St. Bede to England and to all Benedictines. St. Lander of Seville and St. Fulgentius are kept as Doctors in Spain, and the former by Benedictines also, as they were in earlier times claimed as a monk. St. Idefonseus has the Introit "In medio" in the same order (for the same reason) and in Spain, without the rank of Doctor.

Doctrinarians. See BUS, CÉSAR DE; VENERABLE.

Doctrine, Christian. — Taken in the sense of "the act of teaching" and "the knowledge imparted by teaching", this term is synonymous with catechesis and catechism. "A doctrine is, in the Vulgate, the word doctrina, are often used in the N.T., especially in the Pastoral Epistles. As we might expect, the Apostle insists upon "doctrine" as one of the most important duties of a bishop (1 Tim., iv, 13, 16; v, 17; 1 Tim., iv, 2, etc.)."

The word σαρκικὸς means instruction by word of mouth, especially by questioning and answering. Though it may apply to any subject-matter, it is commonly used for instruction in the elements of religion, especially preparation for initiation into Christianity. The word and others of the same origin occur in St. Paul's Gospel: "They have no light and see not the true light, because their minds are darkened, and being excluded from the life of God, are in the darkness. (John 1:1): 14). In the Acts, xviii, 25, Apollo is described as "[sarxv]nidos, edoctos, edoctos] in the way of the Lord". St. Paul uses the word twice: "I had rather speak five words with
my understanding, I may instruct (καταχωρίζων, instruc-
tion) others also (1 Cor., xiv, 19); and "Let him that is
instructed (καταχωρίζων, qui cathchēzetur) in
the word, communicate to him that instructeth (τῷ κατα-
χωρίζοντι, et qui cathchēzet) him, in all good things
(Col., vi, 6). Hence the word, with its technical mean-
ing, was in the instruction (κατάκτομον), and is applied both to the act of
instructing and the subject-matter of the instruction. The word
catechumen was also formerly used for the act of
instructing ("To say ay, and no, to these particulars, is more than to answer in a catechism"—As You Like It, act i, sc. i). And we are told that it was still used in the
church, but it is now more properly applied to the little printed
book in which the questions and answers are contained.
The subject will be treated in this article under the
title of the catechumen. I. History of Catechetics; II. Prac-
tical Catechetics; III. Modern Catechisms.

I. History of Catechetics. (1) Oral instruction by
means of questions and answers has occupied a
prominent place in the scholastic methods of the moral
and religious teachers of all countries and of all ages. The
Socratic dialogues will occur to every one as brilliant
examples. But many centuries before Socrates' day
the method was practised among the Jews (Exod.
xii, 26; Deut., vi, 7, 20, etc.). They had three forms of
catechizing: domestic, conducted by the head of the
family for the benefit of his children and servants;
secular, by teachers in schools; and ecclesiastical,
by priests and Levites in the Temple and the syna-
gogues. Proselytes were carefully instructed before
being admitted to become members of the Hebrew
faith. The regular instruction of children began when
they were twelve years old. Thus we read of Christ
"in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors
(οδηγούμενοι), hearing them, and asking them questions.
And all that heard him were astonished at his wisdom,
and his answers" (Luke, ii, 46, 47). During His public
life He frequently made use of the catechetical method
to impart instruction: "What think ye of Christ? Whose son
is he?" "Whom do men say that the son of
man is?" "Whom do you say that I am?" etc. In
His final charge to His Apostles He said: "Teach
ye (μαθηταίας, make disciples, or scholars) all
nations; . . . teaching (διδάσκαλος, instructing) or
them to observe all things whatsoever I have com-
manded you" (Matt., xxviii, 19). And after this
instruction they were to initiate them into the Church,
"teaching them in the name of the Father, and of the
Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (ibid.).

(2) In obedience to Christ's command, St. Peter,
"standing up with the eleven," declared to the Jews
on Pentecost day, and proved to them from the Scrip-
tures that Jesus, whom they had crucified, was "Lord
and Christ." When they had been convinced of this
truth, and had compunction in their heart for their
crime, they asked, "What shall we do?" And Peter
answered, "Do penance, and be baptized . . . in
the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your
sins." "And with many other words did he testify and
exhort, showing by the acts of the Spirit the power of
the first catechetical instruction given by the Apostles.
It is both doctrinal and moral—the hearers are
to believe and to repent. This twofold element is also
contained in St. Peter's second discourse after healing
the lame man in the Temple (Acts, iii). St. Stephen
went further, and brings out that belief in Jesus as the
Christ (Messias) meant the ending of the Old Covenant
and the coming in of a New (Acts, vi, vii). St. Philip
the Deacon preached "of the kingdom of God, in the
name of Jesus Christ;" and the Samaritans were
"baptized, both men and women" (Acts, vii). Fur-
thermore, St. Peter and St. John came from Jerusalem
and "prayed for them, that they might receive the
Holy Ghost;" and doubtless declared to them the
doctrine of that Holy Spirit (ibid.). The same deacon's
discourse to the eunuch deals with the proof from Scrip-
ture, and notably Isaiah (liii, 7), that "Jesus Christ
is the Son of God," and the necessity of baptism. No
mention is made of penance or repentance, as the
eunuch was a just man anxious to do God's will. So,
too, Cornelius, "a religious man, and fearing God
with his house, giving much alms to the people, and
always praying to God, that he might receive a good
spiritual instruction; according to St. Peter speaks to him
of Jesus Christ who is "lord of all . . . Jesus of Nazareth;
how God anointed him with the Holy Ghost, and with
power, who went about doing good, and healing all
who were oppressed by the devil, for God was with
him. And we are told that all things were done in Der-
branch the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem, whom they
killed, hanging him upon a tree. His God raised up
the third day, and gave him to be made manifest . . .
even to us who did eat and drink with him after he
arose again from the dead; and he commanded us to
preach to the people, and to testify that it is he who
was appointed by God, to be judge of the living and of
the dead. To him all the prophets do testify, that
by his name all receive remission of sins, who believe
in him" (Acts, x). In this discourse we have the chief
articles of the Creed: the Trinity (God, Jesus Christ
"Lord and Christ," the Holy Ghost, the Incarnation,
Resurrection, and Redemption of Our Lord; His coming
to judge the living and the dead, and the remission of
sins. These are also the subjects of St. Paul's discourses,
though, of course, in addressing the pagans. Whether
peasants at Lystra or philosophers at Athens, he deals
with the fundamental truths of the existence and
attributes of God (Acts, xii, xiv, xvii). As he himself
summed up the matter, he taught "publicly, and from
house to house, testifying both to Jews and Gentiles
penance towards God, and faith in (δε) our Lord
Jesus Christ" (Acts, xx). We find also that though
Apologia was "instructing" (διδάσκαλος) the people, the Lord,
Priscilla and Aquila "explained to him the way of the
Lord more diligently" (διδάσκαλος, Acts, xii.—See Apostles' Creed).

(3) The materials for describing the catechetical
Teaching of the ages immediately succeeding the
Apostles are scanty. The books of the New Testa-
mament were available, and all that would be needed
would be to supplement these. Thus, in the Didache
we find little but moral instruction; but it is clear
that those to whom it is addressed must have already
received some knowledge of what they were to be
baptized. Later on we find more explicit dogmatic teach-
ing, for instance, in St. Justin's Apology, and in the
writings of Clement of Alexandria. Still, even this is
not much more advanced than what we have seen
above as taught by St. Peter, except that Justin
delves on the Creation and proves the Divinity of
Christ, the Logos and only-begotten Son of the
Father.

(4) In the ages of persecution it became necessary
to exercise great caution in admitting persons to
membership in the Church. The danger of falling away,
or even of betrayal, must be guarded against by a
twofold doctrinal and moral training. Hence the in-
stitution of the catechumenate and the Discipline of the
Secret. The work of the Apologists had been to
remove prejudices against Christianity, and to
set forth its doctrines and practices in such a way as
to appeal to the fair-minded pagan. If anyone
were moved to embrace the true religion, he was not at
once admitted, as in the days of the Church. At
first he was treated as an inquirer, and only the funda-
mental doctrines were communicated to him. As
soon as he had given proof of his knowledge and fitness
he was admitted to the catechumenate proper, and
was further instructed. After some years spent in this
stage he was promoted to the rank of a catechume-
nus, i.e., those ready for baptism. As might be
expected, he was now instructed more especially in
the rites for this purpose. Even when he had been
initiated, his instruction was not yet at an end. During the week after Easter, while the grace of first fervour was still upon him, the various rites and mysteries in which he had just participated were more fully explained to him.

When considering the catechetical writings of the Fathers we must bear in mind the distinction of these different grades. When addressing a mere inquirer they would naturally be more guarded and less explicit than if they had to do with one who had passed through the catechumenate. Sometimes, indeed, the language was so chosen that it conveyed only half the truth, and the catechumen, who had not yet understood the whole. The distinction between the elementary and advanced instruction is noted by St. Paul: "As unto little ones in Christ. I gave you milk, not meat; for you were not able as yet." (I Cor. iii. 2).

For our present purpose it will be best to take as typical examples of catechesis in the patristic times the works of St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) and St. Augustine (351-430), merely noting by the way the work done by St. Ambrose (the instructor of St. Augustine) and St. Gregory of Nyssa ("The Catechetical Oration"). Ed. J. H. Stawley (1903). We have from St. Cyril twenty-four catechetical discourses, forming together a complete course of moral and doctrinal instruction. In the first of these, called the "Pro-catechesis", he sets forth the greatness and efficacy of the grace of initiation into the Church. The "Catecheses" proper (numbered i to xvii) are divided into two parts, i.e., repeating the "Pro-catechesis"; and treating of sin and repentance, baptism, the principal doctrines of the Christian religion, and the nature and origin of faith; vii-xviii, setting forth, article by article, the baptismal Creed of the Church of Jerusalem. The "Pro-catechesis"! and the discourses were intended for the instruction of the hearers. During Lent, in immediate preparation for reception into the Church. The remaining discourses (xix-xxiv), called the "Catecheses Mystagogiae", were delivered during Easter week to those who had been baptized at Easter; and these, though much shorter than the others, treat clearly and openly of baptism, confirmation, and the Holy Eucharist, the veil of secrecy being now removed. This is not the place to point out how completely in accord with Catholic teaching are the doctrines of St. Cyril (see CILYOF JERUSALEM: TRANSUBSTANTIATION, and what valuable instruction is required of the deacon of the Liturgy in his day. In studying these "Catecheses" we should bear in mind that they were intended for grown-up persons; hence they are not couched in the simple language which we have to use in our instructions to children. They resemble, rather, the instruction given to converts, for which purpose they are still of great use. The same remark applies to all the catechetical writings of the Fathers.

St. Augustine's treatise "De Catechizandis Rudioibus" deals with both the theory and the practice of catechizing. It is divided into twenty-seven chapters: i-xiv theory, xv-xxvii practice. This short work, written about the year 400, shows that the great Doctor did not disdain to devote most careful attention to the work of instructing those who wished to learn the rudiments of the Faith. It could be well borne in mind that we may have to use words of encouragement, pointing out that we must judge of our discourses not by their effect upon ourselves, but by their effect upon our hearers. The story may be familiar enough to us, who go on repeating it over and over again, but it is not so to those who are listening to it for the first time. Bearing this in mind, the catechist should put himself in the position of the hearer, and speak as though he were telling something new. Hilaritas, a bright and cheerful manner, must be one of the chief qualifications of an instructor. "Gomorrah is a fruitful giver" applies to the giving of the word as well as to the giving of wealth. He should so speak that the hearer hearing should believe, believing should hope, and hoping should love (Quidquid narras ita narre, ut illi cuil loqueris audiendo credat, credendo speret, sperans amet-i.e., the Sermo dicendi erat, quod haec per annum vidit spiritualiter, quod per annum visum seculo est). But the fear of God, "for it seldom, or rather never, happens that anyone wishes to become a Christian without being moved thereto by some fear of God". If he comes from some worldly motive he may be only pretending, though a mere pretender may sometimes be turned into a genuine convert by our efforts. Hence, continues the holy Doctor, it is of great importance to ascertain the state of mind and the motives of those who come to us. If we are satisfied that they have received a Divine call, we have a good opening for instruction on the care of God for us. We shall be shown through the story of God's dealings with men, from the time when He made all things even to our own days; showing especially that the Old Testament was a preparation for the New, and the New a fulfilment of the Old (in veteri testamento est occultatio novi, in novo testamento est manifestatio veteris). This is a fact which is developed greatly by the author in the "De Civitate Dei". After we have finished our story we should go on to exultate in the resurrection of the body—a doctrine as much ridiculed in St. Augustine's day as it was in St. Paul's day, and as it is in ours. Then should come the account to be rendered at the last judgment, and the reward and the punishment of the wicked. The convert should be put on his guard against the dangers and difficulties in trying to lead a good life, especially those arising from scandals within as well as without the Church. Finally, he should be reminded that the grace of his conversion is not due either to his merits or to ours, but to the goodness of God. So far the saint has been speaking of persons of little or no education. In chap. vii he goes on to deal with those who are well educated, and are already acquainted with the Scriptures and other Catholic writings. We must have before us some form of instruction, and this should be imparted in such a way as to let them see that we are aware of their knowledge of the Faith. Doubtless St. Augustine had in mind his own ease, when he presented himself to be received into the Church by St. Ambrose. We note, too, the wisdom of this piece of advice, especially when we have to deal with Anglican converts. But though less instruction is needed in such cases, continues the holy Doctor, we may rightly inquire into the causes which have induced these persons to wish to become Christians; and in particular as to the books which have influenced them. If these are the Scriptures or other Catholic books we should praise and recommend them; but if these are heretical we should point out wherein they have distorted the true faith. Throughout our instruction we should speak with modesty, but also with authority, that he to whom we are speaking may experience that we have some form of humility rather than pride or contempt. Humility is also the principal virtue to be urged upon that intermediate class of converts who have received some education but not of the higher sort. These are disposed to scoff at Christian writings, and even at the Scriptures for their impiety. It is only the fear of God who is made to see that it is the matter rather than the language which is of importance; it is more profitable to listen to a true discourse than to one which is eloquent. The whole of this chapter should be taken to heart by many who join the Church nowadays. After dealing
with these different classes of inquirers, the saint devotes less than five lengthy chapters (x to xiv) to the causes of weariness (the opposite of 

hilaritas) and the remedies for it. This portion is perhaps the most valuable of the whole treatise, at least from a practical point of view. Only St. Augustine’s advice as to the remedies can be given here. We must bring ourselves down to the level of the lowest of our hearers, even as Christ humbled Himself and took upon Himself “the form of a servant.” We must vary the subjects, and we must increase in earnestness of manner so as to move even the greatest influence on catecheties. If it seems to you that the talk is ours, we should reflect, as already pointed out, that the instruction, though not up to our ideal, may be exactly suited to our hearer and entirely fresh and new to him; in any case the experience may be useful as a trial to our humility. Other occupations may be pleasanter, but we cannot say that they are certainly more profitable: for duty should come first, and we should submit to God’s will and not try to make Him suit us. After laying down these precepts, St. Augustine goes on to give a short catechetical instruction as an example of what he has been inculcating. It is supposed to be addressed to an one type of inquirer, neither grossly ignorant nor highly educated (xvi to xxv), and might well be used at the present day. What specially strikes one in reading it is the admirable way in which the saint brings out the prophetic and typical character of the Old-Testament narrative, and insinuates gradually all the articles of the Creed without seeming to reveal them. The sketch of Christ’s life and passion, and the doctrine of the Church and the sacraments are also noteworthy. The discourse ends with an earnest exhortation to perseverance. This short work has exercised the greatest influence on catechetics. In all ages of the Church it has been adopted as a textbook.

(5) When all fear of persecution had passed away, and the empire had become almost entirely Christian, the need for a prolonged period of trial and instruction no longer existed. About the same time the Saxon people, being instructed about the administration of baptism to infants. In such cases instruction was, of course, impossible, though traces of it are still to be seen in the rite of infant baptism, where the godparents are put through a sort of catechery. There is of the child’s life, was taught its religion both at home and at the services in church. This instruction was necessarily more simple than that formerly given to grown-up catechumens, and gradually came to be what we now understand by catechetical instruction. Meanwhile, however, the barbarian invaders were being brought into the Church, and in their case the instruction had to be of an elementary character. The missionaries had to go back to the methods of the Apostles and content themselves with exacting a renunciation of idolatry and a profession of belief in the great truths of Christian doctrine. Patrick in Ireland, St. Remigius among the Franks, St. Augustine in England, St. Boniface in Germany. We should bear in mind that in those ages religious instruction did not cease with baptism. Sermons were far more common than in our day, and the Bishop spoke rather as a catechist than as a preacher. We may take the practice among the Anglo-Saxons as typical of what was done in other countries. Among the duties incumbent on the parish priest the first was to instruct his flock in the doctrines and duties of Christianity; and to expound, from among those the sermon rested upon the pages of their common life, as for instance their ten commandments; to take care that all could repeat and understand the Lord’s Prayer and the Creed; to expound in English on Sundays the portion of Scripture proper to the Mass of the day, and to preach, or, if he were unable to preach, to read at least from a book some lesson of instruction” (Lingard, “Anglo-Saxon Church”, c. iv). The laws enacting these duties will be found in Thorpe, “Ecclesiastical Institutes”, i, 378; ii, 33, 34, 84, 191.

(6) It is the custom with non-Catholic writers to assert that during the Middle Ages, “the Ages of Faith”, religious instruction was entirely neglected, and that the Protestant Reformers were the first to restore the practice of the Early Church. In the “Dict. de théol. cath.”, s. v. “Catéchisme”, and in Bareille, “Le Catéchisme Romain”, Introd., pp. 36 sqq., will be found long lists of authors showing these assertions. We must here content ourselves with stating what was done in England. Abbot Gasquet has thoroughly gone into the subject, and declares that “in pre-Reformation days the people were well instructed in their faith by priests who faithfully discharged their plain duty in their regard” (Old English Bible and other Essays, p. 180). In proof of this he quotes the constitutions of John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury (1281), in which it is enjoined that every priest shall explain to his people in English, and without any elaborate subtleties (ulsterique obscurae conceptuales subtletates), four times in the year, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the two precepts of the Gospel (viz. love of God and man), the seven deadly sins, the seven chief virtues (theological and cardinal), and the seven sacraments. In these constitutions is contained a brief instruction on all these heads, “lest anyone should excuse himself on the ground of ignorance of these things which all the ministers of the Church are bound to know”. This legislation, after all, was nothing but an instruction on a practice dating from Saxon days, as we have already seen. Moreover, it is constantly referred to in subsequent synods and in collections of canon law. One of Peckham’s predecessors, St. Edmund Rich (1241-1240), was not only a man of great learning, but also a zealous teacher of Christian doctrine among the people. He wrote familiar instructions on prayer, the seven deadly sins, the Commandments, and the sacraments. Cardinal Thoresby, Archbishop of York, published in 1557 a catechism in Latin and English, the “Lay Folks Catechism”, for the purpose of carrying out Peckham’s Constitutions, and it is based on Peckham’s instruction. The two, with the English translation in rude verse, have been reprinted by the Early English Text Society. As the child grew older, the Visitations and Visitation of the Church, and the Visitations and Visitations of the People (Gasquet, op. cit., pp. 191). The part which pictures, statues, relics, paintings, and especially miracle plays took in the religious instruction of the people must not be forgotten. All of these provided an extensive knowledge of sacred history and an astonishing skill in conversing the moral and moral lessons. It is enough to refer to Ruskin’s “Bible of Amiens”, and to the Townley, Chester, and Coventry miracle plays. (Cf. Bareille, op. cit., pp. 12 sqq.)
The invention of printing and the revival of learning naturally had great influence on catechetical instruction. The first great name to be mentioned, though it belongs to a slightly earlier period, is that of John Gerson (1363-1429). He realized that the neglected reform of the Church should be undertaken by the instruction of the young; and though he was chancellor of the University of Paris he devoted himself to this work. He composed a sort of little catechism entitled "The A B C of Simple Folk". To enable the clergy to catechize he also composed the "Opus Tripartitum de Praeceptis Decalogi, de Confessione, et de Baptismo". In 1540, Close, the author of the "Catechismus Romanus" (1363-1429) was printed in many hundreds of thousands; if the name Canisius came to be synonymous with Catechism (Bareille, op. cit., p. 61).

The Catechism of the Council of Trent ("Catechismus Romanus") is not a catechism in the ordinary sense of the word. It is rather a manual of instruction for the clergy ("Catechismus Romanus") and he briefly expounded the Creed, the Commandments of God, the sins to be mentioned in confession, and the art of dying well. This was printed many times and was translated into French. It was the forerunner of the Catechism of the Council of Trent. In the year 1570, before Luther was born, a German catechism, "Christenspiegel" (the Christian's Mirror), written by Dederich, was printed, and at once became very popular. Two other catechisms, "The Soul's Guide" and "The Consolation of the Soul", were printed a little later and issued in many editions. In 1558 Calvin composed his famous "Enchiridion", which was really the third edition of his smaller catechism, was published in 1559, and speedily ran through a number of editions; it is still used in Germany and in other Protestant countries. In 1556 Calvin composed a Catechism in French, which was considered the first of that kind to be composed in French. It was translated into Italian, French, German, and Polish. Brought out under such conditions (1566), the authority of this catechism is higher than that of any other, but is, of course, not on a level with that of the canons and decrees of a council. As to its value Cardinal Newman's estimate may be gathered from these words: "I cannot praise it with less truth. Le formulaire, d'instruire les enfans en la chrestienté, fait en maniere de dialogue où le ministre interroge et l'enfant répond". He candidly admits that it was always the custom in the Church to instruct children in this way. Of course he takes care to introduce the chief points of his heresy: the certainty of salvation, the imposibility of losing justice (righteousness), and the justification of children independently of baptism. It is noteworthy that as regards the Eucharist he teaches that we receive not merely a sign, but Jesus Christ Himself "really and effectually by faith in substantial union and accordance". In England the first Book of Common Prayer (1549) contained a catechism with a brief explanation of the Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. The explanation of the sacraments was not added until the year 1604. If this catechism be compared with that of Cardinal Thoresby, mentioned above, it will be seen that the instruction given to Protestant children in the middle of the sixteenth century was far inferior to that given in pre-Reformation days. In 1647 the Westminster Assembly of Divines drew up the Presbyterian "Larger" and "Smaller" Catechisms. On the Catholic side St. Peter Canisius published three catechisms, or rather one catechism in three forms: major (1555), minor (1558), and minus (1556). Taking as his foundation Ecclus., i, 33; he divides his treatment into two great parts: wisdom and justice. In the first he deals with Faith (the Catechism of the Lord's Prayer and the Commandments). This has been described by the present writer. In the second he deals without avoiding evil (sin and the remission of sin) and doing good (prayer, fasting and almsgiving, the cardinal virtues, the gifts and fruits of the Holy Ghost, the beatitudes, the evangelical counsels, and the Four Last Things). To obtain a perfect endowment of spiritual virtue, he considers that the sacraments are necessary, and hence he places the treatment of the sacraments between the two parts. After the Council of Trent (1563) Canisius added a chapter on the Fall and Justification. The form of the three books is that of questions and answers, some of the latter being as long as four or five pages. In striking contrast to the Protestant catechisms, the tone throughout is calm, and there is an absence of controversial bitterness. The success of Canisius' catechisms was enormous. They were translated into every language in Europe, and were printed in many hundreds of thousands; if the name Canisius came to be synonymous with Catechism (Bareille, op. cit., p. 61).

Cardinal Bellarmine's Catechism was ordered by Clement VIII to be used in the Papal States, and was recommended for use throughout the world. It appeared in two forms: "Dottrina Cristiana Breve" (1597) and "Dichiarazione púr Copiosa della Dottrina Cristiana" (1598). The first is for scholars, the second for teachers; in the first the teacher asks the questions and the scholar replies, whereas in the second the teacher reverses the order. The first, which is meant to be learnt by heart, contains eleven chapters and ninety-five questions, and is arranged in the following order: the Calling of the Christian and the Sign of the Cross; the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Hail Mary; the Commandments of God, the Commandments of the Church, the Commandments of the Societies; the Sacraments, the Theological and Cardinal Virtues, the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Works of Mercy, the Sacraments, the Last Things, and the Rosary. It is an improvement on Canisius' catechisms, and hence it was recommended at the Vatican Council to serve as a model for the projected universal catechism.
Appendix of the Fall of Man and Justification. Translated into English (by Fr. Garnet) at St. Omer for John Heigham. With permission of Superiors: 1822.

A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, in fifteen conferences. Paris: 1826, 2nd ed., 1859. The author was Thomas White, alias Blacklow, of Lisbon and Douai. The most important, by Gillow and Hurst, of London, 1793, and Dublin, 1828; the author was Henry Turberville, a Douai priest. There was also a smaller edition, "An Abstract of the Douay Catechism. For the use of children and ignorant people. London, printed in the year 1858; it was reprinted many times, and continued in use until the Douai students came to England.

In 1825, the Franciscan Florence O'Conor published an Irish catechism at Louvain, entitled "Mirror of a Christian Life". This, like the catechisms of Hessey (Louvain, 1808) and Stapleton (Brussels, 1830), was written for the benefit of the Irish troops serving in the Netherlands. In the same century another of the descendants of the Franciscan order, Father Francis Molloy, a native of the County Meath, Ireland, and at the time professor of theology in St. Isidore's College, Rome, published a catechism in Irish under the title "Lucerna Fidelium". We should also mention Andrew Donlevy's "The Catholic Christian Doctrine by way of question and answer. Paris, 1742". This was in English and Irish on opposite pages. "The Poor Man's Catechism or the Christian Doctrine explained with short admonitions", 1st ed., 1752; it was edited by the Rev. George Bishop. The author's name does not appear. A later work tells who he was: "The Poor Man's Controversy. By J. Mannock, O. S. B., the author of the Poor Man's Catechism", 1769.

Dr. James Butler, Archbishop of Cashel, published his catechism in 1775, and it was soon adopted by many Irish bishops for their dioceses. An account of it was given by Archbishop Walsh in this "Irish Eccel. Record", Jan., 1892. In 1787 Bishop Challoner published "The Catholic Christian instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice, Ceremonies, and Observances of the Church by way of question and answer. By R. C. London, 1777." The following year Bishop Challoner published "An Abriggement of Christian Doctrine, with a short Daily Exercise", "corrected by the late Bp. Challoner", 1783. Bishop Hay's admirable works: "The Sincere Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ from the Written Word" (1781); "The Devout Christian instructed in the Faith of Christ" (1783); and the "Pious Christian" are catechisms on a large scale in the form of question and answer.

During the eighteenth century catechetical instruction received a fresh impulse from Pope Benedict XIII, who issued (1725) three ordinances prescribing in detail the methods: division into small classes and special preparation for confession under the oversight of the rational-tic tendencies in the pedagogical movement of the century, Clement XIII uttered a protest in 1761. Pius VI wrote (1787) to the Bishops, proposing for their use a catechism in Arabic prepared by the Propaganda. In Germany the "Pastoral Instruction" issued by Raymond Anton, Bishop of Eichstätt (1768; new ed. Freiburg, 1902) emphasized the need and indicated the method of instruction (Tt. XIV, Cap. V). Prominent among the writers on the subject were Franz Neumayr, S. J., in his "Rhetorica catechetica" (1769); M. I. Schmidt, "Katechisten", and J. R. Lemer, "Vorlesungen über die Katholische Katechistik" (Vienna, 1774).

In France, during the same century, great activity was shown, especially by the bishops, in publishing catechisms. Each diocese had its own textbook, but though occasional attempts were made at uniformity, they were not successful. Several catechisms composed by individuals other than the bishops were put on the Index (see Migne, "Catechismes", Paris, 1842). The French original of "An Abriggement of the Quebec Catechism" (Quebec, 1817) appeared in Paris (1782) and Quebec (1792).

The pedagogical activity of the nineteenth century naturally exerted an influence upon religious instruction. German writers of the first rank were Overberg (d. 1826), Salzer (d. 1832), Gruber (d. 1835), and Hirscher (d. 1863), all of whom advocated the psychological method and the curricular preparation of teaching. Deharb's "Catechisme" (1847) was translated between 1853 and 1860 into thirteen languages, and his "Erklärungen des Katechismus" (1857-61) has passed through numerous editions. In France, Napoleon (1806) imposed upon all the churches of the empire uniformity in the matter of catechisms and, in spite of the opposition of Pius VII, published the "Imperial Catechism", containing a chapter on duties towards the emperor. This was replaced after the fall of the empire by a large number of diocesan catechisms which again led to various plans for securing uniformity. Dupanloup, one of the foremost critics, advocated the "Catechisme chrétien" in 1865. At the time of the Vatican Council (1869-70) the question of having a single universal catechism was discussed. There was great diversity of opinion among the Fathers, and consequently the discussion led to no result (see Martin, "Les travaux du concile du Vatican", pp. 113-115). The arguments for and against the project will be examined when we come to speak of catechisms in the third part of this article. The most important event in the recent history of catechetics has been the publication of the Encyclical "Acerbo nimis" on his doctrine of Christ (15 April, 1870). In this document Pope X advocates the most religious crisis to the widespread ignorance of Divine truth, and lays down strict regulations concerning the duty of catechizing (see below). For the purpose of discussing the best methods of carrying out these orders a number of catechetical congresses have been held: e.g., at Munich, 1905 and 1907; Vienna, 1905 and 1908; Salzburg, 1906; Lucerne, 1907; Paris, 1908, etc. At these gatherings scientific, yet practical, lectures were delivered, demonstrations were given of actual catechizing in school, and an interesting feature was the publication of much literature and a large list.

Two periodicals have likewise appeared: "Katachtische Blätter" (Munich) and "Christlich-pädagogische Blätter" (Vienna).

In the United States, the few priests who in the early days toiled in this vast field were so overburdened with work that they could not produce original textbooks for religious instruction; they caused to be reprinted, with slight alterations, books commonly used in Europe. Others were composed in the manner described by Dr. England, first Bishop of Charleston, who, in 1821, published a catechism which, he wrote, had had much labor and care, containing from various sources and adding several parts which I consider necessary to be explicitly dwelt upon under the peculiar circumstances of my diocese. The first to edit a catechism, so far as is known, was the Jesuit Father Robert Molyneux, an Englishman by birth and a man of extensive learning, who, till 1809, laboured among the Catholics in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Copies of this work are not known to exist now, but, in letters to Bishop Carroll, Father Molyneux mentions two catechisms which he issued—one in 1785, "a spelling primer for children with a Catholic catechism attached". In 1788 a catechism was published in New York which in all likelihood was a reprint of "Butler's Catechism" mentioned above. Bishop Hay's "Abridgment of Christian Doctrine" (152 pp.) appeared in Philadelphia in 1800; another edition (143 pp.) in 1803.
and one with some alterations in the language in Baltimore in 1809 (108 pp.). Many editions were published of the catechism entitled "A Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine, Newly Revised for the Use of the Catholic Church in the United States of America". The entire book is from 36 to 48 pages. One edition, with title page torn, bears on the last page the record: "Bought September 14, 1794." The Philadelphia edition of 1796 is styled the thirteenth edition; that of Baltimore, 1798, the seventeenth. Whether all these editions were printed in America, or some of the earlier ones in Europe, cannot be ascertained.

This "Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine," approved by Archbishop Carroll, was generally used throughout the United States until about 1821. In that year Bishop England published his catechism for his own diocese, and in 1825 appeared the "Catechism of the Diocese of Bardstown," recommended as a class-book by Bishop Flaget of Bardstown, Kentucky. The author of the latter catechism was Jean-Baptiste David, coadjutor of Bishop Flaget. It comprised the "First or Small Catechism for Little Children" (13 pp.), and "Second Catechism" (149 pp.). The English was criticized by Archbishop Marshael and others. Still more defective and inexact in language was the catechism of Bishop Conwell of Philadelphia, and, at the request of the archbishop, the author suppressed the book. An old English catechism, the "Abridged of Christian Doctrine," by Hennepin, and Berville, first published at Douai in 1649, was reprinted in New York in 1833. Whereas this edition preserved the quaint old language of the original, another edition of the same book appeared in Philadelphia, as "revised by the Right Rev. James Doyle and prescribed by him for the united dioceses of Kildare and Leighlin" (Ireland). In the New England States the "Boston Catechism" was used for a long time, the "Short Abridgement of Christian Doctrine," newly revised and augmented and authorized by Bishop Fenwick of Boston. But the catechisms which were used most exclusively during several decades were Butler's "Larger Catechism" and "Abridged Catechism." In 1788 Samuel Campbell, New York, published "A Catechism for the Instruction of Children. The Seventh Edition with Additions, Revised and Corrected by the Author." This seems to be the first full-size edition of this catechism (1852) appointed by the Provincial Council of Canada (1851) prescribed it for the English-speaking Catholics of the Dominion. Some other American catechisms may be briefly mentioned: the so-called "Dubuque Catechism" by Father Hattenberger; the Small and the Larger Catechism of the Jesuit missionary, Father Weigner (1866); and the French catechism, the Redemptorist Father Muller (1874). For more extensively used than these was the English translation of Deharbe. From 1869 numerous editions of the small, medium, and large catechisms, with various minor revisions, were published in the United States. An entirely new and much improved edition was issued in New York in 1901.

Repeated efforts have been made in the United States towards an arrangement by which a uniform textbook of Christian Doctrine might be used by all Catholics. Early as 1829, the First Provincial Council of Baltimore decreed: "A catechism shall be written which is better adapted to the circumstances of this Province; it shall give the Christian Doctrine as explained in Cardinal Bellarmine's Catechism, and when approved by the Holy See, it shall be published for the common use of Catholics" (Deer. xxxiii). The clause recommending Bellarmine's Catechism as a model was added at the special request of the Congregation of Propaganda. It may be mentioned here that Bellarmine's "Small Catechism," Italian text with English translation, was published at Boston, in 1853. The wish of the bishops was not carried out, and the First and Second Plenary Councils of Baltimore (1852 and 1866) repeated the decree of 1829. In the Third Plenary Council (1884) many bishops were in favour of "revised" editions of Butler's Catechism, but finally the matter was given into the hands of a committee of six bishops. At last, in 1885, was issued "A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Prepared and Enjoined by Order of the Third Council of Baltimore." Although the council had desired a catechism "perfect in every respect" (Acta et Deer., p. 219), theologians and teachers criticized several points (Nelles, "Commentaria," II, 205, 1858). Soon various editions came forth with additions of word-meanings, explanatory notes, some even with different arrangements, so that there is now a considerable diversity in the books that go by the name of Catechism of the Council of Baltimore. Besides, in the meantime, a few new catechisms have been published, "one or two a decided improvement" (the Council Catechism) (Messer, "Spirago's Method," p. 553). Among the recent catechisms are the two of Father Faerber, the large and small catechisms of Father Groenings, S. J., and the "Holy Family Series" by Father and Mother Butler, of the Diocese of Boston (1902). The three graded catechisms of this series give on the left page the questions and answers, on the right the "Reading Lesson," dealing in fuller, and connected, form with the matter contained in the questions and answers. Some very practical questions and answers, appropriate hymns, and pictorial illustrations) mark the "Text-books for Parochial and Sunday Schools," edited since 1898 by Father Yorks. These last two series to some extent depart from the traditional method and indicate a new movement in catechetical teaching. A more radical change in the style of the catechism, namely the complete abandonment of the question-and-answer method, has recently been proposed (see below, under II and III of this article, and "Am. Eccle. Rev.," 1907: Jan. and Feb., 1908). The First Plenary Council of Balti-
more (1854) decreed that the catechism to be issued by its order should be translated into the languages of those parishes in which religious instruction is given in any other than the English tongue. But the translation of the council catechism met with little favour. Another regulation, however, enacted in the same decree of the council (1866) was gradually carried into effect. The bishops assembled expressed an earnest desire that in schools where English was not used the Christian Doctrine should be taught not only in the foreign tongue there used, but also in English. Undoubtedly this was the true provision. For the young people in the second or third generation find it difficult to understand the native language of their parents; hearing discussions or attacks on their religion, they are hardly able to answer if they have not learnt the catechism in English. Moreover, after leaving school many young people have to live among people who do not understand English. The bishops assembled expressed an earnest desire that in places where there is no congregation of their own nationality; if they have not been taught religion in English they are tempted not to attend sermons, they feel embarrassed in going to confession, and thus may gradually drift away from the Church. In order to obviate these dangers, various catechisms (Deharbe,
Faerber, Groenings, etc.) have been published with German and English texts on opposite pages. Similarly, there are Polish-English, Bohemian-English, and other editions with double text. In most Italian schools catechism is taught chiefly in English, and only the children in every parish would receive a change of language in catechetical teaching. The introduction of the English language in the United States was done early, but it would be equally injudicious to artificially retard the natural development. The slow but steady tendency is towards the gradual adoption of the English language in preaching and teaching catechism, and it seems but reasonable to think that some day there will be only English in the schools of the Catholic Church in the United States. The English language is the language of the United States, but it is in its external form and language.

A number of German immigrants entered Pennsylvania about 1700, a considerable portion of them being Catholics. In 1750 the German Catholics in Philadelphia outnumbered those of the English tongue, and in 1789 they opened the church of the Holy Trinity, the first exclusively national church in the United States. Since 1741 German Jesuits have ministered to the spiritual needs of their countrymen, and Catholic schools have been established in the Pennsylvania settlements. It was natural that in such a place the example should introduce the Catechism of Canisius, which for centuries had been universally used throughout Germany. The best known American edition of this famous catechism is that printed in Philadelphia, in 1810: "Catholischer Catechismus, worin die Katholische Lehre in der form und Geordnung dieser fünf Hauptbegriffe: V. P. F. von Canisius, aus der Gesellschaft Jesu, erklärt wird." The author or editor of this book was Adam Britt, pastor of the Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia, who died at Conecuh (1822) as a member of the Society of Jesus. During several decades the Catechism of Canisius was the one used by the German Catholics in the United States. The Redemptorists came to this country in 1833 and soon had charge of flourishing German parishes in nearly all the more important cities. The Venerable John N. Neumann, afterwards Bishop of Philadelphia, wrote while pastor of the Redemptorist house at Pittsburgh, about the year 1846, a small and a large catechism. These texts, also known as the "Redemptorist Catechisms," had a wide circulation, whereas those written later by Father Weininger, S. J., and Father Muller, C. Ss. R., never became popular. The second half of the nineteenth century may be called the era of Deharse's Catechism. In 1850 the "Katholischer Katechismus der Lehrbegriffe" was issued in Cincinnati, which by this time had become a centre of German Catholic population with flourishing parochial schools. Bishop Purell declares in the preface that the German catechisms previously published were not reprinted, but that this "Regensburg [Ratisbon] Catechism, long in use in Germany," was to be the only one in his diocese. Although the name of the author was not given, it was in reality Father Deharse's "Large Catechism." Since that time numerous editions of the different catechisms of Deharse appeared with various adaptations and modifications, and for nearly fifty years Deharse reigned supreme. This supremacy has been challenged within the last two decades. Father Muller, C. Ss. R., in the preface to his catechism, severely criticized Deharse's as a book "which it is difficult for children to learn and to understand." Father Faerber, who devoted forty years to catechetical instruction, produced in 1895 a textbook which commends itself by its simplicity and clearness, although the critics, who charged it with incompleteness and a certain lack of accuracy, were not altogether wrong. Almost contemporaneously with Father Faerber's book appeared an excellent, thoroughly revised, edition of Deharse's texts, from which many defects had been expunged. Finally, in 1900, Father Groenings, S. J., published two catechisms, a small and a large one.

Development of Catechizing after the Council of Trent.
—Mindful that the work of catechizing was more important than the issue of catechisms, the Council of Trent decreed that "the bishops shall take care that on at least the Lord's day and other festivals the children shall be removed from the schools to hear the catechisms of the faith and obedience to God and their parents" (Sess. IV, De Ref., c. iv.). In 1560 the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine was founded in Rome by a Jesuit, and was approved by St. Pius V in 1571. St. Charles Borromeo in his provincial synods laid down excellent rules for teaching: every Christian was to know the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments; confessors were ordered to examine their penitents as to their knowledge of these formularies (V Proc. Concil., 1579). He also established schools in the villages, in addition to increasing the number in the towns. Besides the renewed activity of the older orders, the Jesuits, the Barnabites, and the Clerks Regular of Pious Schools (Piarists), who devoted themselves to the education of the young, took special care of the religious instruction of those entrusted to them. In this connexion three names are especially worthy of mention. St. Vincent de Paul, St. Ignatius of Loyola, and St. Francis de Sales. One of St. Francis's first acts as a bishop was to organize catechetical instruction throughout his diocese, and he himself took his turn with his canons in this holy work. St. Vincent founded his congregation of Priests of the Mission for the purpose of instructing the poor, especially in the villages. The missionaries were to teach the catechism twice a day during each mission. In his own parish of Châtillon he established the Confraternity for the Assistance of the Poor, and one of the duties of the members was to instruct as far as to give material aid. So, too, the Sisters of Charity not only took care of the sick and the poor but also taught the children. M. Olier, both in the seminary and in the parish of Saint-Sulpice, laid special stress on the work of catechizing. The method which he introduced will be described in the second part of this article. The Brothers of the Christian Schools, founded by St. Jean-Baptiste de la Salle, devoted themselves especially to religious as well as secular instruction. Finding that the very poor were unable to attend school on weekdays, the saintly founder introduced secular lessons on Sundays. This work was given in Protestant England.

II. Practical Catechetics.—Catechizing (catechesis), as we have seen, is instruction which is at once religious, elementary, and oral.

Catechizing is a religious work not simply because it treats of religious subjects, but because its end or object is religious. The teacher should endeavour to influence the child's heart and will, and not be content with putting a certain amount of religious knowledge into its head; for, as Aristotle would say, the end of catechizing is not knowledge, but practice. Knowledge, indeed, there must be, and the more of it the better in this age of widespread secular education, but the knowledge must lead to action. Both teacher and child must realize that they are engaged in a religious work, and not in one of the ordinary lessons of the day. It is the neglect to realize this that is responsible for the little effect produced by long and elaborate teaching. Religious knowledge comes to be looked upon by the child merely as a branch of other knowledge, and having as little to do with conduct as the study of vulgar fractions. "When the child is fighting its way through the temptations of the world, it will have to draw far more largely on its stock of pieté than on its store of knowledge." (Pius IX, "Sunday Schools, Catechism?)." "The work of a teacher in the Church will be directed chiefly to this, that the faithful earnestly desire 'to know Jesus Christ and Him crucified,' and that they be firmly convinced and with
the innermost piety and devotion of heart believe, that 'there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved,' for He is the propitiation for our sins. But as in this do we know that we have known Him, if we keep His commandments, the Apostolate is intimately connected with the foregoing, is to show that life is not to be spent in ease and sloth, but that we 'ought to walk even as He walked,' and with all earnestness 'pursue justice, godliness, faith, charity, mildness;' for He 'gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people to be His own, having taken nothing works;' which things the Apostle commands pastors to 'speak and exhort.' But as our Lord and Saviour has not only declared, but has also shown by His own example, that the Law and the Prophets depend on love, and as also, according to the confirmation of the Apostle, 'the end of the commandments and the fulfilment of the Law is charity, no one can doubt that this, as a paramount duty, should be attended to with the utmost assiduity, that the faithful people be excited to a love of the infinite goodness of God towards us; that, inflamed with a sort of divine ardour, they may be powerfully attracted to the supreme and perfect good, to seek to whom 'true happiness' (Catech. of the Council of Trent, Pref., x).

The persons concerned in catechizing (teachers and taught) and the times and places for catechizing can hardly be treated apart. But it will be best to begin with the persons. The duty of providing suitable religious instruction for children must be laid on parents, and their parents, who this they may fulfill either by teaching them themselves or by entrusting them to others. Next to the natural parents the godparents have this duty. The parish priest should remind both the parents and godparents of their obligation; and he, too, as the spiritual father of those entrusted to his care, is bound to instruct them. In Pius X's Encyclical Letter on the teaching of Christian doctrine it is enacted "(1) that all parish priests, and in general, all those entrusted with the care of souls, shall on every Sunday and fast day throughout the year, without exception, give boys and girls an hour's instruction from the catechism on those things which every one must believe and do in order to be saved; (2) at stated times during the year they shall prepare boys and girls by continued instruction, lasting several days, to receive the sacraments of penance and Holy Communion; (3) they shall likewise and with special care on all the weekdays in Lent, and if necessary on other days after the feast of Easter, prepare boys and girls by suitable instruction and exhortations to make their first Communion in a holy manner; (4) in each and every parish the society, commonly called the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, shall be canonically erected; through this the parish priests, especially in the places where there is a scarcity of priests, will have lay helpers for the catechistical instruction in pious lay persons who will devote themselves to the office of teaching." In countries where there are Catholic schools religious instruction is given on weekdays either before or after the secular instruction. As is well known, for the sake of this privilege the faithful have contributed enormous sums of money to build and support schools. Where this is the case the difficulty is lessened. Nevertheless, if the civil Council of Westminster warns the pastor not to make over this duty of catechizing "so far to others, however good or religious they may be, as not to visit the schools frequently and instil into the tender minds of youth the principles of true faith and piety." We see, however, that the work of giving religious instruction belongs to the parents, to priests with the care of souls, to the teachers in Catholic schools, and to other lay helpers.

Turning now to those who are to be taught, we may consider first the young and then those who are grown up. The young may be divided into those who are receiving elementary education (primary scholars) and those who are more advanced (secondary scholars). Although in many dioceses the scholars are arranged in classes corresponding to the secular classes, it is possible for us to consider them separately. We may consider the instruction given in the catechism divided into three groups: those who have not been to confession; those who have been to confession but have not made their first Communion; and those who have made their first Communion. In the case of the first group the instruction must be of the most rudimentary kind; but, as already pointed out, this does not mean that the little ones should not be taught the first part of some catechism; they should have the Creed and the Commandments, the Our Father and the Hail Mary, explained to them, together with the forgiveness of sin by the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance. The principal events in the life of Christ will be found to be an ever-interesting subject for them. How far it is wise to talk to them about Creation and the Fall, the Deluge and the stories of the early patriarchs, may be a matter of discussion among teachers. In any case great care should be taken not to give them any notions which they may afterwards have to oppose. It is of importance that the children in the simplest language something about the services of the Church, for they are now beginning to be present at these. Any one who has charge of them there, or, better still, who will recall his own early memories, will understand what a hardship it is to a child to be told that a Mass is a holy Mass. The second group (those preparing for first Communion) will of course be able to receive more advanced instruction in each of the four branches mentioned above, with special reference to the Holy Eucharist. In instructing both groups the subjects should be taught dogmatically, that is, with a view to having the children to the latter's faith rather than to their reasoning powers. The After-communion instruction of elementary scholars will be almost similar to the instruction given to younger secondary scholars, and will consist in imparting wider and deeper knowledge and insisting more upon proofs. When they grow up their difficulty will be not only the observance of the law, but the reason of it. They will ask not only, What must I believe and do? but also, Why must I believe it or do it? Hence the importance of thorough instruction in the authority of the Church, Scripture texts, and also appeals to right reason. This brings us to the subject of catechizing grown-up persons. Pius X goes on to speak of this matter, after laying down the regulations for the young: "In these days adults not less than the young stand in need of religious instruction. All parish priests, and others having the care of souls, in addition to the homily on the Gospel delivered at the parochial Mass on all days of obligation, shall explain the catechism for the faithful in an easy style, suited to the intelligence of their hearers, at such time of the day as they may deem most convenient for the people, but not during the hour in which the children are taught. In this instruction they shall make use of the Catechism of the Council of Trent; and they shall order it that the whole matter of the Creed, the Sacraments, the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, and the Precepts of the Church shall be treated in the space of four years or five years."

The subjects to be treated of are laid down by Pius X: "As the things divinely revealed are so many and so various that it is no easy task either to acquire a knowledge of them, or, having acquired that knowledge, to retain them in the memory, . . . our preachers have very wisely divided this study into a simple and methodical scheme of saving doctrine to these four distinct heads: the Apostles' Creed; the Sacraments; the Ten Commandments; and the Lord's Prayer. In the doctrine of the Creed are contained all things which are to be held according to the discipline of the Catholic Faith,
The doctrine of the Seven Sacraments comprehends the signs and as it were the instruments of grace by which we may... the Decalogue is laid down whatever has reference to the Law, 'the end whereof is charity.' Finally, in the Lord's Prayer is contained whatever... and a matter of observation by a Christian man" (ib., xii.). It must be borne in mind that catechetical instruction should be elementary; but this of course is a relative term, according as the pupil is an adult or a child. This difference has been dealt with above in speaking of the persons concerned in catechizing. It may be pointed out here, however, that elementary knowledge is not the same as partial knowledge. Even young children should be taught something of each of the four divisions mentioned above, viz., that they have to believe in God and to do God's will, and to obtain His grace by means of prayer and the sacraments. Further instruction will consist in developing each of these heads. Besides what is ordinarily understood by Christian doctrine, catechizing should treat of Christian history and Christian worship. Christian history will include the story of the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Church. Christian worship will include the Church's calendar (the festivals and fasts) and her services and devotion. These—doctrine, history, and worship—are not altogether distinct, and may often be best taught together. For example, the second article of the Creed may be brought out the doctrine of the Incarnation, the beautiful story of Christ's birth and childhood, and the meaning and the services of Advent and Christmas. The Bible history and the history of the Church will afford countless instances bearing on the various doctrines and heroes of the doctrinal part of the catechism, and the virtues and contrary views of the practical part.

The question of catechetical methods is difficult and has given rise to much controversy. Father Furniss long ago, in his "Sunday School or Catechism?" and Bishop Bellord later on, in his "Religious Education and its Failures," passed a wholesale condemnation on our present method, and attributed to it the falling away of so many Catholics from the Faith. "The chief cause of the 'leakage' is the imperfection of our systems of religious instruction. Those methods seem to be antiquated, injudicious, wasteful, sometimes positively injurious to the cause" (Bp. Bellord, op. cit., p. 7). Part of the blame is laid upon catechizing, and part upon the catechisms. Of the latter we shall speak presently. Again, the blame is twofold and is not altogether consistent. The children are declared not to know their religion, or, knowing it quite well, not to put it into practice. In either case they are of course lost to the Church when they grow up. Both the bishop and the Redemptorist complain that religious instruction is made a task, and so fails either to be learnt at all, or, if it be learnt, it is learnt in such a way as to make it hateful to the children and to have no bearing on his conduct in after-life. Both are especially severe on the attempt to make the children learn by heart. The bishop quotes number of experienced missionary priests who share his views. It seems to us that, in considering the methods of catechizing, we have to bear in mind two very evident facts. In some countries religious instruction forms part of the daily curriculum, and is mainly given on weekdays by trained teachers. Where this is the case it is not difficult to secure that the children shall learn by heart some official textbook. With this as a foundation the priest (who will by no means restrict his labours to Sunday work) will be able to explain and illustrate and enforce what they have learnt by heart. The teachers' business will be chiefly to put the catechism into the child's head; the priest must get it into the child's heart. Very different is the view of Father Furniss and Bishop Bellord are dealing with. Where the priest has to get together on a Sunday, or one day in the week, a number of children of all ages, who are not obliged to be present; and when he has to depend upon the assistance of lay persons who have no training in teaching method it is obvious that he should do his best to make the instruction as simple, as interesting, and as devotional as possible. As in other branches of instruction we may follow either the analytical or the synthetical method. In the former we take a textbook, a catechism, and explain it word for word to the scholar and make him commit it to memory. The book is of prime importance; the teacher occupies quite a secondary place. Though it might convey a wrong impression to call this the Protestant method, yet it is in exactly in accordance with the Protestant system of religious teaching generally. The written, printed words (Bible or Catechism) are the basis of this method. If the synthetical method, on the other hand, puts the teacher in the forefront. The scholars are bidden to look up to him and listen to his voice, and receive his words on his authority. "Faith cometh by hearing." After they have thoroughly learnt their lesson in this way, a book may be the written word explained to them and committed to memory, as containing in a fixed form the substance of what they have received by word of mouth. Whatever may be said of the relative advantages of the two methods in the teaching of secular subjects, there can be no doubt that the synthetic method is the proper one in catechetical instruction. The office of catechizing belongs to the Church's magisterium (teaching authority), and so is best exercised by the living voice. "The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth" (Mal. ii, 7).

(a) The Subjunctive Method of catechizing is celebrated throughout the world, and has produced wonderful fruits wherever it has been employed. We cannot, therefore, do better than give a short account of it here.

The whole catechism consists of three principal exercises and three principal facts. The facts are: (1) the recitation of the letter of the catechism, with an easy explanation of it by way of question and answer; (2) the instruction; (3) the reading of the Gospel and the homily. The secondary exercises are: (1) the admonitions from the head catechist; (2) the hymns; (3) prayers. These should be interspersed with the former. The duration fixed by St. Francis de Sales for a complete catechism is two hours. The place should be the church, but in a separate chapel rather than in the body of the church. Great importance is attached to the "game of the good mark" (le jeu du bon point) and the analogous "game of the bad mark." The catechist is to select the child who has answered best in the first part (the questioning on the catechism), and putting him a series of short, clear, and definite questions upon the matter in hand, and doing this as a sort of challenge to the child. The other children are roused to interest at the notion of a contest between the catechist and one of themselves, and this gives occasion for a better understanding of the subject under treatment. If the child is considered to have won, he receives a small card of reward (le bon point). "For the success of the game of the bon point it is important to put the cards beforehand and to write down the questions which are to be put to the children and the answers. These should be made to write out a short account of the instruction given after the questioning. These analyses should be corrected by the teacher, and a mark ("fair", "good", "very good")
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should be attached to each. In order to secure regular attendance, registers should be carefully kept, and rewards (pictures, medals, etc.) should be given to those who have not missed a catechism. Treats and feasts should also be given. The spirit of emulation should be encouraged both by attendance and by answering and analyses. Various minor offices should be conferred upon the best children. Punishment should very seldom be resorted to.

Though the Sulpician method insists upon a thorough knowledge of the letter of the catechism, it is clear that the teacher is of paramount importance rather than the book. Indeed, the success or failure of the catechism may be said to depend entirely upon him. It is he who has to do the questioning and give the instruction and the homily on the Gospel. Unless he can keep the attention of the children fixed upon him, he is bound to fail. Hence, the greatest care should be taken in selecting and training the catechists. These are sometimes seminarians or nuns, but lay persons must often be taken. By far the larger portion of "The Method of Saint Sulpice" is devoted to the instruction of the catechists (cap. iv, "Of the instruction of the children"; cap. v, "Of the sanctification of the catechism"; vi, "Of the necessity of making the catechism pleasant to the children, and some means for attaining this object"; cap. viii, "How to turn the catechism into exercises of emulation"; cap. vii, "How to maintain good order and ensure the success of the catechisms".)

So far the "Method" has dealt with the catechisms generally. Next comes the division of the catechisms. These are four in number: the Little Catechism, the First-Communion Catechism, the Weekday Catechism, and the Catechism of Perseverance. The Weekday Catechism is the only one which requires any explanation. A certain time before the period of first Communion a list is made out of such children as are to be admitted to the Holy Table, and these are prepared by more frequent exercises, held on weekdays as well as on Sundays. As a rule, only children who have attended for twelve months are admitted to the weekday catechisms, and the usual age is twelve years. The weekday catechism is held on two days of the week and for about three months. The order is much the same as that of the Sunday catechism, except that the Gospel and the homily are omitted. The catechism is examined twice during the weekday catechisms: the first time about the middle of the course; the second, a week before the retreat. Those who have often been absent without cause or who have answered badly, or whose conduct has been unsatisfactory, are rejected.

A complete account of the method will be found in "The Method of Saint Sulpice" (Tr.), and also in "The Ministry of Catechising" (Tr.) by Mgr. Dupanloup.

(b) The Munich Method.—In 1898 Dr. A. Weber, editor of the "Katechetische Blätter" of Munich, urged the adoption of the Hart- Zeller system of teaching Christian doctrine. This system requires, "first, a division of the catechetical matter into strict methodical units, so that those questions are co-ordinated which are essentially one. Secondly, it insists on a methodical following of the three essential steps, viz., Presentation, Explanation, and Application— with a short Preparation before Presentation, then Combination after Explanation, as more or less non-essential points. It therefore never begins with the catechetical questions, but always with an objective Presentation—in the form of a story from life or the Bible, a cauliflower, a bluebell picture, a general picture, a special picture, a picture of the liturgy, church history, or the lives of the saints, or some such objective lesson. Out of this objective lesson only will the catechetical concepts be evolved and abstracted, then combined into the catechism answer and formally applied to life. These catechists aim at capturing the child's interest from the start and preserving his good-will and attention throughout." (Amer. Eccl. Rev., March, 1908, p. 342). "Preparation turns the attention of the pupil in a definite direction. The pupil hears the lesson-aim in a few well-chosen words. At this stage of the process, the pupil's ideas are also corrected and made clearer. Presentation gives an object-lesson. If at all possible, use one such object only. There are sound psychological reasons for this, although it becomes occasionally useful to employ several. Explanation might also be called concept-formation. Out of the objective lesson are here constructed, or evolved, the catechetical concepts. From the concrete objective presentation we here pass to the general concept. Combination gathers all the ideas derived from the lesson into the text of the catechism. Application finally strengthens and deepens the truths we have gathered and variously widens them for purposes of life. We can here insert further examples, give additional motives, apply the lessons to the actual life of the child, train the child in judging his own moral conduct, and end with some particular resolution, or an appropriate prayer, song, hymn, or quotation." (Amer. Eccl. Rev., April, 1908, p. 465).

In Munich, too, there is an excellent lesson on "Sin," drawn up on the lines of the Munich Method. Further information will be found in Weber's "Die Münchener katechetische Methode" and Götter's "Der Münchener Katechetische Kurs," 1905.

III. MODERN CATECHISMS.—When speaking of the history of catechetics we saw that, though the method was originally and properly oral, the custom soon set in of giving the catechism in a short manual of elementary religious instruction, usually by means of questions and answers. A catechism is of the greatest use both to the teacher and the scholar. To the teacher it is a guide as to the subjects to be taught, the order of dealing with them,
and the choice of words in which the instruction should be conveyed; above all, it is the best means of securing uniformity and correctness of doctrinal and moral teaching. The use which the teacher should make of it must be understood in connexion with what has been said about the method of catechizing. The scholastical a catechism gives in a brief form a summary of what the teacher has been imparting to him; and by committing it to memory he can be sure that he has grasped the substance of his lesson. As already observed, this is not a difficult matter where there are Catholic schools under trained expert teachers accustomed to instructing the children where the teaching has to be done in evening or Sunday schools by inexperienced persons, and the scholars are not under the same control as in the day schools, the portions to be committed to memory must be reduced to a minimum.

A good catechism should conform strictly to the definition given above. That is to say, it should be elementary, not a learned treatise of dogmatic, moral, and ascetical theology; and it should be simple in language, avoiding technical expressions as far as consistent with accuracy. Should the form of question and answer be maintained? No. It is not an interesting form for grown-up persons; but children prefer it because it lets them know exactly what they are likely to be asked. Moreover, this form keeps up the idea of a teacher and a disciple, and so is most in conformity with the fundamental notion of catechizing. What form should the answers take? Each should be an exact and unambiguous statement—i.e. a matter of disagreement among the best teachers. It would seem that the decision depends on the character of the different languages and nations; some of them making extensive use of the affirmative and negative particles, while others reply in the interrogative form. Scholars of today, like those of Dublin, in his instructions for the revision of the catechism, recommended "the introduction of short reading lessons, one to be appended to each chapter of the catechism. These reading lessons should deal, in some what fuller form, with the matter dealt with in the questions and answers of the catechism. The insertion of such lessons would make it possible to omit without loss many questions the answers to which now impose a heavy burden on the memory of the children... If these lessons are written with care and skill, and in a style attractive as well as simple, the children will have them learned by heart, from the mere fact of repeatedly reading them, and without any formal effort at committing them to memory" (Irish Eccl. Record, Jan., 1892). An excellent means of assisting the memory is the use of pictures. These should be selected with the greatest care; they should be accurate as well as artistic. The catechism used in Venice when Pius X. was patriarch was illustrated.

As there are three stages of catechetical instruction, there should be three catechisms corresponding with these. The first should be very short and simple, but should give the little child some information about all four parts of religious knowledge. The second catechism, for those preparing for first Communion, should embody, word for word, without the slightest change, all the questions and answers of the first catechism. Further questions and answers, dealing with a more extensive knowledge, should be added in their turn. Each stage should have special reference to the sacraments, more particularly the Holy Eucharist. The third catechism, for those who have made their first Communion, should in like manner embody the contents of the first and second catechisms, and add instruction belonging to the third stage mentioned above. For scholars beyond the elementary stages this third catechism may be used, with additions not in the form of question and answer but necessarily to be learnt by heart. The great idea running through all the catechisms should be that the later ones should grow out of the earlier ones, and that the children should not be confused by differently worded answers to the same questions. Thus, the answer to the questions: What is charity? What is a sacrament? should be exactly the same in all the catechisms. Further instruction can be given to the scholastical a catechism gives in a brief form a summary of what the teacher has been imparting to him; and by committing it to memory he can be sure that he has grasped the substance of his lesson. As already observed, this is not a difficult matter where there are Catholic schools under trained expert teachers accustomed to instructing the children where the teaching has to be done in evening or Sunday schools by inexperienced persons, and the scholars are not under the same control as in the day schools, the portions to be committed to memory must be reduced to a minimum.

It was mentioned in the historical portion of this article that at the time of the Vatican Council a proposal was made for the introduction of a uniform catechism for use throughout the Church. As no decision was not carried out, we may here discuss the advantages and disadvantages of a universal catechism. There can be no doubt that the present system of allowing each bishop to draw up a catechism for use in his diocese is open to strong objection. Happily, in these days there is no difficulty on the head of diversity of doctrine. The difficulty arises rather from the importance attached to learning the catechism by heart. People do not nowadays remain stationary in the neighborhood in which they were born. Their children, in passing from one diocese to another, are obliged to unlearn the teaching of one country (the most difficult process) and learn the different wording of another. Even where all the dioceses of a province or country have the same catechism the difficulty arises in passing into a new province or country. A single catechism for universal use would prevent all such waste of time and confusion; besides being a strong bond of union between the nations. At the same time it must be recognized that the conditions of the Church vary considerably in the different countries. In a Catholic country, for instance, it is not necessary to touch upon controversial questions, whereas in non-Catholic countries these are merely discussed. This will possibly be the case with regard to the introduction of texts in the actual words of the Holy Scriptures. Thus, in the Valladolid Catechism there is not a single quotation from the Old or New Testament except the Our Father and the first part of the Hail Mary—and even of these the source is not mentioned. The Commandments are not given in the words of Scripture. There is no attempt to prove any doctrine; everything is stated dogmatically on the authority of the Church. A catechism on these lines is clearly unsuited for children living among Protestants. As already pointed out, the introduction of new catechisms made their first Communion should embrace proof as well as statement. The Fathers of the Vatican Council recognized the difficulty, and endeavoured to meet it by a compromise. A new catechism, based upon Bellarmine's Catechism and other catechisms of approved value, was to be drawn up in Latin, and was to be translated into the different vernaculars with the authority of the bishops, who were empowered to make such additions as they might think fit; but these additions were to be kept quite distinct from the text itself. The unhappy events of the latter part of the year 1870 prevented this proposal from being carried out.

(a) The present pontiff, Pius X., has prescribed a catechism for use in the Diocese of Rome and in its ecclesiastical province, and has expressed a desire that it should be adopted throughout Italy. It has been translated into English, French, Spanish, and German, and a movement has begun with a view to extending its use to other countries besides Italy, especially to Spain, where the conditions are similar. (See "Irish Eccl. Record", March, 1906, p. 221; "Amer. Eccl. Rev.", Nov., 1906). This catechism consists of two parts, or rather two distinct books: one for "lower classes" and one for "higher classes". The term "lowest class catechism", is meant for those who have not made their first Communion; the second, or "Longer Catechism", is meant for those who have already been through the other. Both are constructed on the same lines: an introduc-
tory portion, and then five sections treating in turn of the Creed, Prayer, the Commandments, the Sacraments, the Virtues, etc. The "Longer Catechism" contains, in addition, in catechetical form, an instruction of Our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints, and a short "History of Religion" (the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Church) in the form of a narrative. But though the two catechisms are on the same main lines, they have very little connexion with each other. Hardly any of the questions and answers are the same; so that a knowledge of the wording of one is of little use, but rather an obstacle, in learning the second. It is worthy of note that, though texts of Scripture are not quoted, the second catechism contains a large number of questions and answers relating to the Holy Scriptures, among others the following: "Is the reading of the Bible necessary to all Christians?"-"The reading of the Bible is not necessary to all Christians, because they are taught by the Church; still, the reading of it is very useful and recommended to all." Many of the answers in the second catechism are much longer than those in other catechisms. The catechism itself, without the lengthy instruction on the first page of the "History of Religion," fills more than 200 pages in Bishop Byrne's translation.

(b) Throughout Great Britain only one catechism is officially in use. It was drawn up by a committee appointed by the Second Provincial Council of Westminster, and is based on the Douay-Catholic version. It has undergone several revisions, the last of these being for the purpose of eliminating the particles yes and no, and making all the answers distinct categorically. It is remarkable for its frequent appeal to proofs from Holy Scripture. Though it has been subject to many attacks, it is justly considered to be a clear and logical statement of Catholic belief and practice, fitted to the needs of both children and grown-up persons seeking instruction. Perhaps it has this latter class too much in view, and hence it is sometimes wanting in simplicity. The omission of yes and no and the avoidance of pronouns in the answers have been carried to a pedantic excess. Besides this ordinary catechism there is a smaller catechism, for younger children, which goes over the whole ground in a more elementary form; it is to some extent free from the objection just mentioned; but this advantage of some verbal differences is at the same time a disadvantage, in that the answers of the two catechisms are not always a rigid repetition of the words of the question. Various important improvements have been suggested by Archbishop Walsh (see "Irish Ecc. Record", Jan., 1892, and following numbers). There is also a smaller edition of the Maynooth Catechism. The manuals used in the advanced classes in the Higher Forms have much the same form as those used in Great Britain, together with the "Companion to the Catechism" (Gill). Religious instruction is general.

(For the United States, see above under HISTORY OF CATECHISMS.)

d) The First Provincial Council of Quebec (1852) ordered two catechisms for use in Canada: Butler's Catechism for those speaking English, and a new French catechism for those speaking French. The latter is called "The Quebec Catechism," and is also issued in an abridged form.

e) In Australia the Maynooth Catechism is generally used. But the bishops in the Plenary Council of 1885 decreed that a new catechism should be drawn up for use throughout Australia.

From this enumeration it will be seen how far we are from having any uniform catechism for the English-speaking peoples. In France and in Europe, we find that in France, Germany, and Spain different catechisms are in use in the different dioceses. In the German-speaking provinces of Austria there is one single catechism for all the dioceses, approved by the whole episcopate in 1894. It is issued in three forms: small, middle, and large. All are arranged on exactly the same lines: a short introduction, Faith and the Apostles' Creed, Hope and Prayer, Charity and the Commandments, Grace and the Sacraments, Justification and the Last Things. The middle catechism contains all the questions and answers of the small, with many added, and some of the same questions with fuller answers. The large catechism makes further additions. The small catechism has no texts from Scripture; the other two contain many texts, usually placed in notes at the foot of the page. The chief difference between the middle and large catechisms is that the latter deals more with reasons and proofs, and consequently gives a greater number of Scripture texts. Austria is, therefore, better off than most countries in the matter of the catechism. She has none of the difficulties arising from a multiplicity of manuals, and her single textbook is in the three stages as described above as the ideal for all countries. Schuster's excellent Bible History is also in universal use, and is arranged by means of different type and signs so as to be accommodated to the three stages of the catechism. Religious training in Austria has, however, been severely criticized by Dr. Pichler, a high authority in that country. He considers the catechism as cumbersome, the work of a good theologian but a poor catechist; he advocates the compilation of a new Bible History on the lines of Knecht's manual; and he advocates the adoption of inductive methods. See "Unser Religionsunterricht, seine Mängel und deren Ursachen".

One of the best of the German catechisms is that of the Diocese of Augsburg, mainly the work of Kinsel and Hauser, and published in 1901. It is on the lines of Deharbe, but much simplified, and copiously illustrated. The new Hungarian catechism (1907), which is issued in three editions: one for the first and second grade of elementary schools, one for the remaining four grades, and one for the high schools. Bishop Malachy of Transylvania has had the direction of the work. Poland has not been behind in re-forming her catechetical teaching. A catechism has just been drawn up for the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades by Bishop Likowski and Valentine Gadowski. The answers to be learnt by heart are limited to forty in each year, and are short and simple. Each is followed by a fairly long explanation. This catechism contains 216 illustrations.
It should be noted that all Continental reformers have dropped the idea of making the answers theologically complete. The subsequent explanations supply what may be wanting. The answers are complete sentences, Yes and No being seldom used by themselves, and the order of the words in the answers follows that in the questions.


On catechizing, Methods, etc.: DE FAVNGNE, Method of Catechizing, tr. by E. WALSH, 2d ed. (London, 1907); WALSH, A Manual of Instruction on the Christian Doctrine, chs. 7, 8 (New York, 1901); J. DE GAECHE, Catechizing, 2d ed. (London, 1895); HOWE, The Catechist or Headings and Suggestions for the Explanation of the Catechism (Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1905); SLOAN, The Young School Teacher's Guide to Success (New York, 1907); Amer. Rev., July 1, Jan., May, 1908; WEBER, Die Minderdie Katholische (München, 1899), 2, 1, 5 (1906).

Catechism, Manuals, etc.—It would not be possible to give anything like a complete list of these. We shall content ourselves with mentioning a few of the best known in use in England.

There are many Bible histories in use, but none of them officially recommended, though published with scriptural authority. The Children's Bible for Home and School Use (in small elementary work of which nearly a million and a half have been printed; it is capable of improvement) (London, 1872); FORMBY, Picturesque Bible and Church History Stories, including Old Testament History, the Life of Christ, and Church History (London, 1917); KEIGHT, Bible Commentary for Schools (ed. GLAS); FREIX, DeSCRIPTIO IESOU (London, 1804); WESMANN, Readings from the Old Testament, New Testament, Sacraments, etc. (London, 1877); RICHARDS, Manual of Scripture History (London, 1899); WESMANN, The Catechism, An Aid to the intelligent knowledge of the Catechism (London, 1890); POWER, Catechetical, Doctrinal, Moral, Historical, and Liturgical (5th ed., Dublin, 1909); ANTHONY, MACCLER, A Catechism of the Catechism of the Catholic Church (London, 1901).

There are many Bible histories in use, but none of them officially recommended, though published with scriptural authority. The Children's Bible for Home and School Use (in small elementary work of which nearly a million and a half have been printed; it is capable of improvement) (London, 1872); FORMBY, Picturesque Bible and Church History Stories, including Old Testament History, the Life of Christ, and Church History (London, 1917); KEIGHT, Bible Commentary for Schools (ed. GLAS); FREIX, DESCRIPTIO IESOU (London, 1804); WESMANN, Readings from the Old Testament, New Testament, Sacraments, etc. (London, 1877); RICHARDS, Manual of Scripture History (London, 1899); WESMANN, The Catechism, An Aid to the intelligent knowledge of the Catechism (London, 1890); POWER, Catechetical, Doctrinal, Moral, Historical, and Liturgical (5th ed., Dublin, 1909); ANTHONY, MACCLER, A Catechism of the Catechism of the Catholic Church (London, 1901).

Doctrines, Development of. See Revelation.

Doctrine of Addai (Lat. Dogma Addai), a Syrian document which relates the legend of the conversion of Parthia. It begins with the story of the letter sent by Abgar to Christ (see ABGAR) and the reply of the latter, with some variations from the account drawn by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., i, xiii) from the Edessean archives. The reply was not a letter, as Eusebius says, but a verbal message, together with a portrait of Christ (see EUSEBIUS). In the ascension of Thomas sent Addai, one of the seventy-two disciples, to Abgar. Addai (Thaddeus in Eusebius) healed the king of his sickness, and preached before him, relating the discovery of the True Cross by Pontonius, wife of the Emperor Claudius: this, with all that follows, is later than Eusebius, being founded on the story of St. Helena. Addai then preaches to the people, who are converted. The heathen altars are thrown down, and the people are baptized. King Abgar induces the Emperor Tiberius to chastise the Jews for having crucified the Saviour. Christ appears to the king, and makes deacons and priests. On his death-bed he appoints Agadd his successor, ordains the deacon Palut priest, and gives his last admonitions. He was buried in the sepulchre of the king's ancestors. Many years after his death, Agadd, who ordained holy orders for the first time, was martyred as he taught in the church by a rebellion of his son. Agadd's successor, Palut, was obliged to go to Antioch in order to get episcopal consecration, which he received from Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, who "himself also received the hand from Zephyrion, Bishop of the city of Rome, from the succession of the hand of the priesthood of Simon Cephas, which he received from our Lord, who was then Bishop of Rome twenty-five years, in the days of the Caeur, who reigned there thirteen years" (evidently Nero is meant, who reigned from October, 54, to June, 68). The anxiety of the writer to connect the Edessene succession with Rome is interesting; its derivation from the Petrine See of Antioch does not suffice him.

The doctrine of the book is not unorthodox, though some expressions might be understood in an Apollinarian sense. The mention of Holy Scripture must be noticed: "They read in the Old Testament and the New, and the Prophets, and the Acts of the Apostles, every day they meditated on them," "a large number of people assembled day by day and came to the prayer of the service, and to [the reading] of the Old and New Testament, of the Diatessaron"; "But the Law and the Prophets and the Gospel, which ye read every day before the people, and the Epistles of Paul, which Simon Peter sent us from the city of Rome, and the Acts of the twelve Apostles, which John, the son of Zebedee, sent us from Ephesus, these books read ye in the Churches of Christ, and with these read not any other, as there is not any other in which the truth that ye hold is written, except these books, which retain you in the faith to which ye have been called." The canon therefore excludes the Apocalypse and all the Catholic Epistles; in this it agrees with Aphraates, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Syriac stichometrical list of Cod. Sin. 10 (in Mrs. Lewis's Catalogue of Sinai MSS.), and probably the Church, indeed, never accepted the Apocalypse and the four shorter 'catholic' Epistles; the three longer were admitted at all events later than 400, at an uncertain date. The Diatessaron was employed by the Syriac Church from its composition by Tatian c. 160 until it was proscribed by the famous Bishop of Edessa, Rabbbula (d. 435).

We seem to find firm historical ground in the statement that Paulus was consecrated bishop by Serapion, who was Bishop of Antioch c. 191-212 and really a deputy or papacy of Pope Zephyrion. But this shows that Addai, who made Paulus bishop, was not a priest of the seventy-two Disciples of Christ. The first Christian King of Edessa was in reality Abgar IX (179-214) who was converted soon after 201, and this date tallies with that of Paulus. It is possible that Paulus was the first Bishop of Edessa; but it is surely more likely that there was already a Church and a bishop under the pagan kings in so important a city. An early date for the Abgar legend is sometimes based upon the promise in the message of Christ: "Thy city shall be blessed, and no enemy shall again become master of it for ever." It is argued that this could not have been invented after the sackings of the city of Edessa in 116; but the writer might have passed over this event after a century and a half. The confusion of dates can hardly have arisen before the latter half of the third century, and the Edessean Acts used by Euse-
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The "Doctrine of Addai" is yet later. The finding of the Cross must be dated some time later than St. Helena; the miraculous picture of Christ was not seen by the Abbess, either when she visited Edessa c. 385. Hence the date of the work may be c. 400.

The "Doctrine of Addai" was first published in Syriac in a fragmentary form by Cureton, "Ancient Syriac documents" (London, 1864, a posthumous work), with a translation; another translation in "Ante-Nicene Chr. Libr.," XX. The full Syriac text was published with a translation (London, 1876). An Armenian version and (separately) a Persian translation, by the Mechtitar Father Leo Alishan, "Labounia, Lette d’Adbgar" (Venice, 1868).

The literature of the subject (including the Addai legend, the finding of the Cross, the Greek legend in the Acta Thaddaei, and the origins of the Church of Edessa) is very large. The following works may be especially mentioned: L. Chabert, Die edessischen Abgaberegeluntersuchungen (Bruenick, 1886); Tischendorf, Les origines de l’Eglise d’Edesse et de la legende d’Adbgar (1878); M. della Pietra, L’Eglise d’Edesse et des epitaphe syriennes (transl. from Revue des rev. sc. Paris, 1889); Burkitt, Early Eastern Christianity (London, 1904); Nestle, Die synopische Cron (Berlin, 1889); on the picture of Christ, von Dobschütz, Christusbilder (Leipzig, 1899). Further references will be found in Buskitt, Gesell, der altchristl. Lit., I, 435; Chevalier, Repertoire, v. v. Adbgar.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles. See Didache.

Dodd, Charles. See Toottell, Hugh.

Dodone. See Bodone.

Doering, Henry. See Poona.

Dogma.—I. Definition.—The word dogma (Gr. δόγμα, from δοέειμι) signifies, in the writings of the ancient classical authors, sometimes, an opinion or that which seems true to a person; sometimes, the public or private doctrines of a person or a school. As a public, distinctive philosophical doctrine, of a particular school of philosophers (cf. Cic. Ac., ii, 9); and sometimes, a public decree or ordinance, as δόγμα ποιοτάτα. In Sacred Scripture it is used, at one time, in the sense of a decree or edict of the civil authority, as in Luke, ii, 1: "And it came to pass, that in those days there went out a decree [edictum, δόγμα] from Caesar Augustus." (Acts, xvii, 7; Esther, iii, 3); at another time, in the sense of an ordinance of the Mosaic Law, as in Exh., ii, 15: "Making void the law of commandments contained in decrees" (δόγμαις)—and again, it is used of the ordinances decreed of the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem: "And as they passed through the cities, they delivered unto them the decrees [dogmata] for to keep, that were decreed by the apostles and ancients who were at Jerusalem." (Acts, xvi, 4). Among the early Fathers the usage was prevalent of designating as dogmas the doctrines and moral precepts taught or promulgated by the Saviour or by the Apostles; and a distinction was sometimes made between Divine, Apostolical, and ecclesiastical dogmas, according as a doctrine was conceived as having been taught by Christ, or by the Apostles, or as having been delivered to the faithful by the Church. But according to a long-standing usage a dogma is now understood to be a truth appertaining to faith or morals, revealed by God, transmitted from the Apostles in the Scriptures or by tradition, and proposed by the Church for the acceptance of the faithful. It might be described briefly as a revealed truth defined by the Church; but private revelations do not constitute dogmas, and some theologians confine the word defined to doctrines solemnly defined by the pope or by a general council, while a revealed truth becomes a dogma when proposed by the Church through her ordinary magisterium or teaching office. A dogma therefore implies a twofold relation: to Divine revelation and to the authoritative teaching of the Church.

Theologians distinguish three classes of revealed truths: truths formally and explicitly revealed; truths revealed formally, but only implicitly; and truths only virtually revealed. A truth is said to be formally revealed, when the speaker or revealer really means to convey that truth by his language, to guarantee it by the authority of his word. The revelation is formal and explicit, when made in clear express terms. It is formal and explicit only, when it is defined, or in the strict sense, when it is defined with absolute certainty, or when the rules of interpretation must be carefully employed to determine the meaning of the revelation. And a truth is said to be revealed only virtually, when it is not formally got by the word of this revealer, but is inferred from something formally revealed. Now truths formally and explicitly revealed by God are certain dogmas in the strict sense when they are proposed or defined by the Church. Such are the articles of the Apostles’ Creed. Similarly, truths revealed by God formally, but only implicitly, are dogmas in the strict sense when proposed or defined by the Church. Such, for example, are the doctrines of Transubstantiation (q. v.), papal infallibility (q. v.), the Immaculate Conception (q. v.), some of the Church’s teaching about the Saviour, the sacraments, etc. All doctrines defined by the Church as being contained in revelation are understood to be formally revealed, explicitly or implicitly. It is a dogma of faith that the Church is infallible in defining those two classes of revealed truths; and the deliberate denial of one of these dogmas certainly involves the sin of heresy. There is a diversity of opinion about virtually revealed truths, which has its roots in a diversity of opinion about the material object of faith (see Faith). It is enough to say here that, according to some theologians, virtually revealed truths belong to the material object of faith and become dogmas in the strict sense when defined or proposed by the Church; and according to others, they do not belong to the material object of faith prior to their definition, but become strict dogmas when defined; and, according to others, they do not belong to the material object of Divine faith at all, nor become dogmas in the strict sense when defined, but may be called mediately-Divine or ecclesiastical dogmas. In the hypothesis that virtually revealed conclusions do not belong to the material object of faith, it has not been defined that the Church is infallible in defining these truths; the infallibility of the Church, however, in relation to these truths is a doctrine of the Church theologically certain, which cannot lawfully be denied; and though the denial of an ecclesiastical dogma would not be heresy in the strict sense, it could entail the surrender of the bond of faith and expulsion from the Church by the Church’s anathema or excommunication.

II. Divisions.—The divisions of dogmas follow the lines of the divisions of faith. Dogmas can be (1) general or special; (2) material or formal; (3) pure or mixed; (4) symbolic or non-symbolic; (5) they can differ according to their various degrees of necessity.—

(1) General dogmas are a part of the revelation meant for mankind and transmitted from the Apostles; while special dogmas are the truths revealed in private revelations. Special dogmas, therefor, strictly speaking, dogmas at all; they are not revealed truths transmitted from the Apostles; nor are they defined or proposed by the Church for the acceptance of the faithful generally.—(2) Dogmas are called material (or Divine) when they are the objects of faith and the origin of faith; when abstraction is made from their definition by the Church, when they are considered only as revealed; and they are called formal (or Catholic, or “in relation to us"), when they are considered both as revealed and defined. Again, it is evident that material dogmas are not dogmas in the strict sense, when abstraction is made from their definition by the Church, when they are considered only as revealed; and they are called formal (or Catholic, or “in relation to us"), when they are considered both as revealed and defined. (3) Pure dogmas are those which can be known only from revelation, as the Trinity (q. v.), Incarnation (q. v.), etc. Mixed dogmas are truths which can be known from revelation or from philosophical reasoning, as the existence and attributes of God.
Both classes are dogmas in the strict sense, when considered as revealed and defined.—(4) Dogmas contained in the symbols or creeds of the Church are called symbolic; the remainder are non-symbolic. Hence all the articles of the Apostles' Creed are dogmatic. Symbolic dogmas are rational and technically real truths of faith, though an ordinary dogma is sometimes spoken of as an article of faith. (5) Finally, there are dogmas of faith in which is absolutely necessary as a means to salvation, while faith in others is rendered necessary only by divine precept; and some dogmas must be explicitly known and believed, while others are not.

III. OBJECTIVE CHARACTER OF DOGMATIC TRUTH; INTELLECTUAL BELIEF IN DOGMA.—As a dogma is a revealed truth, the intellectual character and objective reality of dogma depend on the intellectual character and objective truth of Divine revelation. We will here apply to dogma the conclusions developed at greater length under the heading of revelation (q.v.). Are dogmas, considered merely as truths revealed by God, real objective truths addressed to the human mind? Are we bound to believe them with the mind? Should we admit the distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental dogmas?

(1) Rationalists deny the existence of Divine supernatural revelation, and consequently of religious dogmas. A certain school of mystics has taught that what Christ inaugurated in the world was "a new life." The "Modernist" theory of reason by its results calls for a treatment of the three different shades of opinion among Modernists. There are no such, apparently, any intellectual value to dogma (cf. Le Roy, "Dogme et Critique").

Dogmas, like revelation, they say, is expressed in terms of action. Thus when the Son of God is said "to have come down from heaven," according to theologians He did not come down, as bodies descend as angels are conceived to pass from place to place, but the hypostatic union is described in terms of action. So when we profess our faith in God the Father, we mean, according to M. Le Roy, that we have to act towards God as sons, but not the fatherhood of God, nor the other dogmas of faith, such as the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection of Christ, etc. imply of necessity any objective intellectual conception of fatherhood, Trinity, Resurrection, etc., or convey any idea to the human mind. Revelation, they say, began as a consciousness of right and wrong; and the evolution or development of revelation was the progressive development of the religious sense until it reached its highest level, thus far, in the modern liberal and democratic State. Then, according to these writers, the dogmas of faith, considered as dogmas, have no meaning for the mind; we need not believe them mentally; we may reject them; it is enough if we employ them as guides for our actions. (See Modernism.)

Over against this doctrine the Church teaches that God has made a revelation to the human mind. There are no doubt, relative Divine attributes, and some of the dogmas of faith may be expressed under the symbolism of action, but they also convey to the human mind a meaning distinct from action. The fatherhood of God He would act towards His children towards a father; but it also conveys to the mind definite analogical conceptions of our God and Creator.

There are truths, such as the Trinity, the Resurrection of Christ, His Ascension, etc., which are absolute objective facts, and which could be believed even if their practical consequences were ignored or were deemed of little value. The dogmas of the Church, such as the existence of God, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection of Christ, the sacraments, a future judgment, etc., have an objective reality and are facts as really and truly as it is a fact that Augustus was Emperor of the Romans, and that George Washington was first President of the United States.

(2) Abstracting from the Church's definition, we are bound to render to God the homage of our assent to revealed truths as satisfied with His word. He has spoken. Even atheists admit, hypothetically, that if there be an infinite Being distinct from the world, we should pay Him the homage of believing His Divine word.

(3) Hence it is not permissible to distinguish revealed truths as fundamental and non-fundamental in the sense that some truths, though known to have been revealed by God, may be lawfully denied. While we should believe, at least implicitly, every truth attested by the word of God, we are free to admit that some are in themselves more important than others, more necessary than others, and that an explicit knowledge of some is necessary while an implicit faith in others is sufficient.

IV. DOGMA AND THE CHURCH.—Revealed truths become formally dogmas when defined or proposed by the Church. There is considerable hostility, in modern times, to dogmatic religion when considered as a body of truths defined by the Church, and still more when considered as defined by the Pope. The theory of dogma which is here expounded depends for its acceptance on the doctrine of the infallible teaching office of the Church and of the Roman pontiff. It will be sufficient to notice the following points: (1) the reasonableness of the definition of dogmas; (2) the immutability of dogma; (3) the necessity for Church unity of belief in dogma; (4) the incoherences which are alleged to be associated with the definition of dogmas.

(1) Against the theory of interpretation of Scripture by private judgment, Catholics regard as absolutely unacceptable the view that God revealed a body of truths to the world and appointed no official teacher of revealed truth, no authoritative judge of controversy: this view is as unreasonable as would be the notion that the civil legislature makes laws, and then commits to individual private judgment the right and the duty of interpreting the laws and deciding controversies.

The Church and the supreme pontiff are endowed by God with the privilege of infallibility in discharge of the duty of universal teacher in the sphere of faith and morals; hence we have an infallible testimony that the dogmas defined and delivered to us by the Church are the truths contained in Divine revelation.

(2) The dogmas of the Church are immutable. Modernists hold that religious dogmas, as such, have no intellectual meaning, that we are not bound to believe them mentally, that they may be all false, that it is sufficient if we use them as guides to action; and accordingly they teach that dogmas are not immutable, that they should be changed when the spirit of the age is opposed to them, when they lose their value as rules for a liberal religious life. But in the Catholic tradition that Divine revelation is acting on the human mind and expresses real objective truth, dogmas are immutable Divine truths. It is an immutable truth for all time that Augustus was Emperor of Rome and George Washington first President of the United States. According to Catholic belief, these are and will be for all time immutable truths: that if there are three Persons in God, that Christ died for us, that He arose from the dead, that He founded the Church, that He instituted the sacraments. We may distinguish between the truths themselves and the language in which they are expressed. The full meaning of certain revealed truths has been only gradually brought out; the truths themselves will always remain the same, but we can always learn what meaning was attached to particular words in the past.
(3) We are bound to believe revealed truths irrespective of their definition by the Church, if we are satisfied that God has revealed them. When they are propounded or defined by the Church, and thus become dogmas, we are bound to believe them in order to maintain the bond of faith.

(4) Finally, Catholics do not admit that, as is sometimes alleged, dogmas are the arbitrary creations of ecclesiastical authority, that they are multiplied at will, that they are devices for keeping the ignorant in subjection, that they are obstacles to conversions. Some of these are points of controversy which cannot be settled without reference to more fundamental questions. Dogmatic definitions would be arbitrary if there were no Divinely instituted infallible teaching office in the Church; but if, as Catholics maintain, God has established in His Church an infallible office, dogmatic definitions cannot be considered arbitrary. The same Divine Providence which preserves the Church from error will preserve her from inordinate multiplication of dogmas. She cannot define arbitrarily. We need only observe the life of the Church or of the Roman pontiffs to see that dogmas are not multiplied arbitrarily. And dogmatic definitions are but the authentic interpretation and declaration of the meaning of Divine revelation, they cannot be considered devices for keeping the ignorant in subjection, or reasonable obstacles to conversions; on the contrary, the authoritative definition of truth and error is the surest safeguard of the truth. It is the Church, the Church, the Church, that is the bulwark of the truth.

V. DOGMA AND RELIGION.—It is sometimes charged that in the Catholic Church, in consequence of its dogmas, religious life consists merely in speculative beliefs and external sacramental formalities. It is a strange charge, arising from ignorance of the very nature of Catholic life. Religious life in conventional and monastic establishments is surely not a merely external formality. The external religious exercises of the ordinary Catholic layman, such as public prayer, confession, Holy Communion, etc., suppose careful and serious internal self-examination and self-regulation, and various other acts of internal religion. We need only observe the public, civic life of Catholics, their philanthropic works, their schools, hospitals, orphanages, charitable organizations, to be convinced that dogmatic religion does not convey the atomism of "formalities." On the contrary, in non-Catholic Christians, bodies a general decay of supernatural Christian life follows the dissolution of dogmatic religion. Were the dogmatic system of the Catholic Church, with its authoritative infallible head, done away with, the various systems of private judgment would not save the world from re-lapsing into and following pagan ideals. Dogmatic belief is not the be-all and end-all of Catholic life; but the Catholic serves God, honours the Trinity, loves Christ, obeys the Church, frequents the sacraments, assists at Mass, observes the Commandments, becomes the be-all and end-all of "formalities." On the contrary, in non-Catholic Christians, a general decay of supernatural Christian life follows the dissolution of dogmatic religion. Were the dogmatic system of the Catholic Church, with its authoritative infallible head, done away with, the various systems of private judgment would not save the world from re-lapsing into and following pagan ideals. Dogmatic belief is not the be-all and end-all of Catholic life; but the Catholic serves God, honours the Trinity, loves Christ, obeys the Church, frequents the sacraments, assists at Mass, observes the Commandments, becomes the be-all and end-all of "formalities." On the contrary, in non-Catholic Christians, a general decay of supernatural Christian life follows the dissolution of dogmatic religion. Were the dogmatic system of the Catholic Church, with its authoritative infallible head, done away with, the various systems of private judgment would not save the world from re-lapsing into and following pagan ideals.

VI. DOGMA AND SCIENCE.—But, it is objected, dogma checks investigation, antagonizes independence of thought, and makes scientific theology impossible. This difficulty may be supposed to be put by Protestants or by unbelievers. We will consider it from both points of view.

(1) Beyond scientific investigation and freedom of thought. Dogma, by no means, antagonizes independence of thought, and makes scientific theology impossible. This difficulty may be supposed to be put by Protestants or by unbelievers. We will consider it from both points of view.

Acta et Doctrina Consilii Vaticanici I in Coll. Litr. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1870-80); VII; Salmes, Opera Omnia, De Fide Theologica, De Logo, Opera; De fide; VACANT, Etudes théologiques sur les constitutions du concile du Vaticain (Galeria; Constitutions dogmatiques Sacrosancte Concilii Vaticanii ex ipsa ejus actus explicata atque illustrata (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1883); SCHREINER, Eric; M. G. E., De fide; VACANT, De Gratia Infusa (Rome, 1885); SCHWABE, De Gratia Infusa (Rome, 1885); MAZZELLA, De Gratia Infusa (Rome, 1895); NEWMAN, Idea of a University (London, 1899).

DANIEL COGHILAN.
Dogmatic Facts.—(1) Definition.—By a dogmatic fact, in wider sense, is meant any fact connected with a dogma and on which the application of the dogma to a particular case depends. The following questions involve dogmatic facts in the wider sense: Is Pius X, for instance, the legally and truly elected and recognized by the Universal Church? This is connected with dogma, for it is a dogma of faith that every pontiff duly elected and recognized by the Universal Church is a successor of Peter. Again, Was this or that council ecumenical? This, too, is connected with dogma, for the ocumenal council is the one in which infallibility and jurisdiction over the Universal Church. The question also whether canonized saints really died in the odour of sanctity is connected with dogma, for every one who dies in the odour of sanctity is saved. In the stricter sense the term dogmatic fact is confined to books and spoken discourses, and its meaning will be explained by a reference to the condemnation by Innocent X of five propositions taken from the posthumous book of Jansenius, entitled “Augustinus.” It might be asked, for example, whether the pope could define that Jansenius was really the author of the book entitled “Augustinus.” It is conceded that Jansenius, and its condemned doctrine was not taught in the “Augustinus.” This brings us to what are called “particular facts of doctrine.” Thus it is a fact that God exists, and that there are three Persons in God; here the same thing is fact and dogma. The Jansenists admitted, for instance, that the pope is competent to deal with particular facts of doctrine, but not to determine the meaning of a book. The controversy was then carried to the meaning of the book. Now it is conceded that the pope cannot define the purely personal, subjective, perhaps, perhaps, literal meaning, which an author might attach to his words. But the pope, in certain cases, can determine the meaning of a book judged by the general laws of interpretation. And when a book or propositions from a book are condemned, “in the sense of the author,” they are condemned in the context of the particular doctrine; the pope or propositions would be understood when interpreted according to the ordinary laws of language. The same formula may be condemned in one author and not in another, because, interpreted by the context and general argument of the author, it may be unorthodox in one case and not in the other. In the strict sense, therefore, a dogmatic fact may be defined as “the orthodox or heterodox meaning of a book or proposition”; or as “a fact that is so connected with dogma that a knowledge of the fact is necessary for teaching and conserving sound doctrine.” When we say that a book contains unorthodox doctrine, we convey that a certain doctrine is contained in the book and that the doctrine is unorthodox; here we have close connexion between fact and dogma.

(2) The Church and Dogmatic Facts.—Jansenists distinguished between “fact” and “dogma.” They held that the Church is infallible in defining revealed truth and in condemning errors opposed to revealed truth; but that the Church was not infallible in defining facts which are not contained in Divine revelation, and consequently that the Church was not infallible in declaring that a particular doctrine, in a particular sense, was contained in the “Augustinus” of Jansenius. This would confine the infallible teaching of the Church to mere abstract doctrines, a view that cannot be accepted. Theologians are unanimous in teaching that the Church, or the pope, is infallible, not only in defining what is formally contained in Divine revelation, but also in defining virtually revealed truths, or generally in all definitions and condemnations which are necessary for safe-guarding the body of revealed truth. Whether it is to be regarded as a defined doctrine, as a doctrine de fide, that the Church is infallible in defining facts about which the Church is infallible in defining the Church is infallible in defining dogmatically the Catholic Church. The reason of this difference of opinion will appear below (3). The Church, in all ages, has exercised the right of pronouncing with authority on dogmatic facts; and this right is essential to her teaching office. She has always claimed the right of defining whether the doctrine of a writer is orthodox, heretical, or not. The doctrine is contained in her writings, in her decrees, or in her discourses. We can scarcely imagine a theory like that of the Jansenists advanced within the sphere of the civil authority. We can scarcely conceive it to be held that a judge and a jury may pronounce on an abstract proposition of libel, but cannot find that a particular paragraph in a book or newspaper is libellous in the sense in which it is written. If the Church could not define the orthodox or unorthodox sense of books, sermons, conferences, and discourses generally, she might still be inadequate to the task of defining doctrine, but she could not fulfill her task as practical teacher of human faith, nor protect her children from actual concrete dangers to their faith and morals.

(3) Faith and Dogmatic Facts.—The more extreme Jansenists, distinguishing between dogma and fact, maintain that the doctrine is the proper object of faith but that to the definition of fact only respectful silence is due. They refused to subscribe the formula of the condemnation of Jansenism, or would subscribe only with a qualification, on the ground that subscription implied internal assent and acquiescence. The less extreme party, though limiting the Church’s infallibility to the question of dogma, thought that the formula might be signed absolutely and without qualification, on the ground that, by general usage, subscription to such a formula implied assent to the doctrine. As regards the other dogmas, they held that there was nothing to prevent the church from defining dogmatic facts, but that the definition of dogmatic facts demand real internal assent; though about the nature of the assent and its relation to faith theologians are not unanimous. Some theologians hold that definitions of dogmatic facts, and especially of dogmatic facts in the “Augustinus” sense of the term, are believed by Divine faith. For instance, the dogmatic proposition that Peter is the “successor of Peter,” is formally revealed. Then, say these theologians, the proposition, “Pius X has been duly elected pope,” only shows that Pius X is included in the general revealed proposition that “every pope duly elected is the successor of Peter.” And they conclude that the proposition, “Pius X is successor to Peter,” is a formally revealed proposition; that it is believed by Divine faith; that it is a doctrine of faith, de fide; that the Church, or the pope, is infallible in defining such doctrines. Other theologians hold that the definitions of dogmatic facts, or the wider and stricter sense of dogmatic facts, are received, not by Divine faith, but by ecclesiastical faith, which some call mediate Divine faith. They hold that in such syllogisms as this: “Every duly elected pontiff is Peter’s successor; but Pius X, for example, is a duly elected pontiff; therefore he is a successor of Peter,” the conclusion is not formally revealed by God, but is inferred from a revealed and an unrevealed proposition, and that consequently it is believed, not by Divine, but by ecclesiastical faith. It would then also be held that it has not been formally defined de fide that the Church is infallible in the definition of dogmatic facts, but only de fide that the Church is infallibly to be theologically certain that the Church is infallible in these definitions; and this infallibility cannot lawfully be questioned. That all are bound to give internal assent to Church definitions of dogmatic
facts is evident from the correlative duties of teacher and persons taught. As it belongs to the duty of supreme pastor to define the meaning of a book or proposition, correlative it is the duty of the subjects who are taught to accept this meaning. (See Dogma, Faith, Infallibility, Jansenism.)

HUNTER, Outlines of Dogmatic Theol., 1; BOLGELI, Fatti domen- matici, etc. (Brescia, 1877); SCHEINKEN in Kuenstler, s. v. Pasta Dogmatica; Newman, Apologia; see also the various treatises De Ecclesi.

DANIEL COGHLAN.

Dogmatic Theology. See Theology.

Dol and Saint-Malo, Diocese of. See Rennes, Diocese of.

Dolbeau, Jean, Recollect friar, b. in the Province of Anjou, France, 12 March, 1586; d. at Orleans, 9 June, 1652. He entered the order at the age of nineteen at Balmette, near Angers, and was one of the four Recollects who were the first missionaries of Canada. He landed at Quebec in May, 1615, and celebrated the first Mass ever said there. He became missionary provincial of the mission in 1618 and preached the first jubilee accorded to Canada. This zealous missionary built the first monastery of the Recollects at Quebec in 1620. He returned to France in 1625, taking with him a young Indian boy who was later baptized at Angers. Endowed with many striking qualities, Father Dolbeau was remarkable for extraordinary spiritual insight and profound humility. He was successively master of novices, guardian, definitor, and provincial delegate at the general chapter of the order held in Spain in 1633. He died in the forty-seventh year of his religious life.

Biographical notices, seventeenth Century MSS. (Public Library, Orleans; Sagard, Hist. du Canada (Paris, 1858), ed. Trois (1860); Leclercq, Premier établissement de la foi dans la Nouvelle France (Paris, 1691); Sheu Tr., (New York, 1881).

Ogebic M. Jouve.

Dolci, Carlo, painter, b. in Florence, Italy, 25 May, 1616; d. 17 January, 1666. The grandson of a painter, he seems to have inherited a talent for art. He studied under D. Vignali, and when only eleven years old he attracted attention by the excellence of his work, notably a figure of Saint John and a head of the infant Jesus. The precocious youth made a carefully-finished picture of his mother, and thereafter he was kept busy filling the numerous commissions he received in Florence, a city he seldom left during his long life, which he devoted to art. Dolci was one of the few masters whose pictures were eagerly sought for by his countrymen during his lifetime. He was very pious and painted religious works exclusively. It is recorded that in every Passion week he painted a picture of the Saviour. He limited his brush to heads—usually of Christ and the Virgin—and seldom undertook a large-sized canvas. He is celebrated for the soft, gentle, and tender expression of his faces, the transparency of his colour, the excellent management of chiarosuro, and the careful and ivory-like finish of his pictures. The simplicity and tranquility on the faces of his paintings of Christ and the Virgin seem little short of inspired. Hinds calls him mawkish and affected; but Dolci was the last of the Florentine School, the last real “master of the Renaissance”, and as decadent sweetness permeated all Italian art, his pictures but reflected the dominant character of the close of the seventeenth century. Patient and slow, he painted pictures that are perfectly finished in every detail. His masterpiece (1646) is “St. Andrew praying before his Crucifixion” (Pitti Gallery, Florence). It is one of the few works where his figures, always well drawn and standing out in beautiful relief, are life-size. Next in excellence to this is the “St. John writing his Gospel” (Berlin). His “Mater Dolorosa” called “Madonna del Dito” (of the thumb) is known throughout the civilized world because of its many reproductions. In 1662 Dolci saw with chagrin Giordano accomplish in a few hours what would have taken him weeks, and it is said he was thereupon seized with melancholy which ultimately led to his death. Loma, Mancini, Mariani, and Agnese Dolci (his daughter) were a few of his pupils and imitators. Contemporary copyists have filed European collections with spurious Dolcis. Agnese Dolci, who died the same year as her father, not only made marvellous copies of the master’s pictures, but was herself an excellent painter. Her “Consecration of the Bread and Wine” is in the Louvre. Other works by him are: “Virgin and Child”, National Gallery, London; “The Saviour seated with Saints”, Florence; “Madonna and Child”, Borghese Gallery, Rome.

Dolche, a titular see of Commagene (Augusto-Euphratesia). It was a small city on the road from Germanicia to Zeugma (Ptolemy, V, 15, 10; Itiner. Anton., 184, 189, 191, 194; Tab. Peutinger), famous for its temple of Zeus Dolichenus; it struck its own coins from Marcus Aurelius to Caracalla. The ruins stand at Tell Dulk, three miles northwest of Antab, in the vilayet of Aleppo. Dolche was at an early date an
episcopal see suffragan of Hierapolis (Mabbough, Membidj). Leqien (18) (Christ, II, 937) mentions eight Greek bishops: Archelaus, present at Nicea in 325, and at Antioch in 341, Olympius at Sarada in 344; Cyril at Seleucia in 359; Maris at Constantinople in 358; Abbas, a Nestorian, in 382, deposed in 434; Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria. The see of Theodoret, present at Antioch in 441 and at Chalcedon in 451; Philoxenus, a nephew of the celebrated Philoxenus of Hierapolis, deposed as a Severian in 518, reinstalled in 533 (Brooks, The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, London, 1904, II, 50, 90, 100, 102). The see figured in the Episcopatum ed. Parthey, about 840. At a later time Doliche took the place of Hierapolis as metropolis (Vailhé, in Echos d'Orient, X, 94 sqq. and 367 sqq.). For a list of fourteen Jacobite Bishops of Doliche (eighth to ninth century), see "Revue de l'Orient chrétien", VI, 195.

Döllinger, Johann Joseph Ignaz von, historian and theologian, b. at Bamberg, Bavaria, 28 February, 1799; d. at Munich, 10 January, 1890.

Family and Education.—Döllinger's father was a professor of medicine in the University of Bamberg, and his son was influenced, in an unusual degree, by the family traditions and his whole environment. The medical faculty of the University of Bamberg owed its foundation to his grandfather, whose son, the father of Ignaz (as Döllinger was usually called), became a professor of medicine in the same university in 1794, but in 1803 was called to Würzburg. It was only natural that amid surroundings predominantly academic the youthful Ignaz should acquire a strong love of books, the best of which were then written in Latin. Before his return to Bamberg in 1805, however, he was able to acquire a knowledge of Italian. A Benedictine monk taught him English privately, and he learned Spanish at the university. His orderly acquisition of learning and the full development of all his rich gifts would have led to extraordinary achievements. He had also sufficient means to satisfy any reasonable wishes for foreign travel and the purchase of books. All these circumstances, doubtless, combined to render his mind particularly receptive; and, at the same time, the multitude of impressions daily made on the young student led him to outline a plan of studies by far too comprehensive.

On entering the University of Würzburg at the age of sixteen, he took up at once history, philosophy, philology, and the natural sciences. In this choice there is already evident a certain mental irregularity, the more remarkable if we recall what he said, two years later, apropos of his choice of a vocation, viz., that, "no professor in the faculty of philosophy had been able to attract him to his particular science." The conversion of such men as Eckhart, Werner, Schlegel, Stölbner, and Winkelmann turned his thoughts to theology, which he took up in 1818, but without abandoning botany, mineralogy, and entomology, to which studies he continued for many years to devote considerable time. We quote from Friedrich Schlegel's following noteworthy utterance of Döllinger: "To most other students theology was only a means to the end, the end, the choice of a vocation only the means." During his studies he seldom attended the regular lectures on theology, but he was assiduous at the lectures in the faculty of philosophy and law; privately, however, he read many works on theology. In botanical studies were better regulated when in 1820 he entered the ecclesiastical seminary at Bamberg and followed the theological courses given at the lyceum. The year and a half spent in this manner made up, but not sufficiently, for the previous lack of a systematic training in theology.

He was ordained priest 22 April, 1822, spent the summer at his home, and in November, was appointed chaplain at Marktseifeld in Middle Franconia. Despite the profound grasp of dogma and moral theology that his works at times exhibit, his career gives evidence enough that he never took the pains to round out satisfactorily his preparation for the duties of his vocation in theology. The elder Döllinger had hoped to see his son follow an academic career and opposed his choice of the priesthood; among the reasons for his opposition was the conviction, openly expressed (and then prevalent enough among the German clergy), that for philosophical reasons he was not fitted for the first place in theology.

Career.—Döllinger's father soon obtained (November, 1823) for him a place as professor of canon law and church history in the lyceum of Aschaffenburg. It was here that in 1826 he published his first work, "Die Eucharistie in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten," an eloquent and solid treatise, still much appreciated. It obtained for him from the theological faculty of the Bavarian University of Landshut the title of Doctor of Theology in absentia. In the same year he was called to Munich as professor extraordinary of canon law and church history, and in 1827 was made professor of canon law by the king. In 1830 the king gave him a canonry in the royal chapel (Hofkollegiatstift) of St. Cajetan at Munich, and on 1 January, 1847, he was made mitred provost or head of that body of canons. In the same year he was dismissed from his chair, in punishment of his protest as representative of the university in the collective letter of the Bavarian bishops: to which he had been appointed in 1844, against the dismissal of several university professors. But in 1848 he was chosen representative to the Frankfort Parliament and remained in attendance until the middle of 1849. Then followed (24 Dec., 1849) according to some authorities 1 Jan., 1850) his dismissal, of which his father, then archbishop of Munich, had informed him on 18 April, 1847, when Archbishop von Scherr publicly excommunicated him. Thereupon he laid down his ecclesiastical charges, recognized the binding force of his excommunication and, though he held his professorship another year, taught only a course of modern history. In 1860 King Louis II of Bavaria had appointed him royal councillor, and maintained him in his office as provost of St. Cajetan, even after his excommunication; practically, this meant only the continuance to him of the revenue of the position. Döllinger received in 1877 another evidence of the royal favour, when, on the death of his colleague, von Liebig, he was named by the king to the presidency of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences and general conservator of the scientific collections of the State. As early as 1857 he had been made member extraordinary of the Academy, in 1843 a regular member, and from 1860 was secretary of its historical section.

Many attempts were made, by ecclesiastics and laymen, to induce Döllinger to return to the Church. The personal conviction of the latter may be read in his correspondence (ed. by Friedrich, Munich, 1899-1901) with Archbishop Stechele and Monsignor Ruffo-Seilla. In 1886 and 1887 both of these prelates together with Bishop von Hefele of Rottenburg besought Döllinger to abandon his Old-Catholic attitude and be reconciled with the Church. In response to the archbishop contained these words: "ought I (in obedience to your suggestion) to appear before the Eternal Judge, my conscience burdened with a double perjury?" At the end of his letter to the nuncio he said: "I think that what I have written so far will suffice to make clear to you that with such convictions one may stand even on the threshold of eternity in a condition of peace and spiritual calm." He died aged ninety-one, still outside the communion of the Church.

Life and Writings.—It was at Munich that Döllinger began his life-work. Formally, he was pro-
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fessor of canon law and ecclesiastical history, but was soon burdened with the teaching of dogma and New-Testament exegesis, a task to which a weaker or inferior mind would not have proved equal. He declined, in 1821, a call to Breslau, although King Louis I was eager to have him out of Brandenburg; he also rejected a later call to Freiburg in the Breisgau. He was offered, in 1839, a professorship at an English college, but preferred to remain in Munich. To facilitate the coming of Johann Adam Mohler from Tübingen to Munich (1835), he gave over to him the courses of ecclesiastical history. New-Testament exegesis, and when Mohler died (12 April, 1838) he collected a number of essays of this great theologian which for the most part were already in print, but were widely scattered, and published them in two volumes (1839) under the title of "Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze". While Mohler taught at Munich, Dollinger lectured on the history of dogma ("Historische Dogmatik"). At the request of Abel, Minister of the Interior, Dollinger began, in 1838, a course of lectures in the Faculty of Philosophy on the philosophy of religion in opposition to the teaching of the honorary professor Von Baader, the theologian, and of Schelling. He continued, however, his lectures on dogma and ecclesiastical history. From November, 1846, to February, 1848, Bavarian public affairs were disturbed by the royal attachment to Lola Montez, a Spanish ballerina; the Abel ministry was dismissed, and professors Lasaulx, Moy, Phillips, Hofler, and Deutinger either dismissed or removed. Dollinger, finally, as stated above, was removed from his office. After his restoration in 1850 he continued to the end as professor of church history. In 1862 he was made Knight of the Order of Maximilian for science and art.

Apart from his aforesaid offices of canon and professor he held but one other ecclesiastical office in Munich. After the conflict concerning mixed marriages (1832), he was made defender matrimonii in the matrimonial court of first instance, later in that of second instance, which office he held until 1862. His circle of friends was from the beginning quite extensive; the physicians and professors of the natural sciences who frequented his father's house were themselves men of distinction. As a student he formed the acquaintance of the poet, Graf von Platen, and of Victor Aimé Huber. Later, Platen wished to study with Dollinger, and visited him twice at Marktscheinfeld. In the evening of the same day he met Prince Alexander von Hohenlohe (q. v.), of whose miraculous cures he said later: "Cures there were; but such as often happen in the history of the Church; the deep stirring of the emotions suffices easily enough to explain them", a remark that fails to account for the presence of deep emotions in the absent sick. On a visit to Platen at Erlangen, in 1822, he met Pfaff, Schubert, and Schelling, the last a friend of his. In his early days at Munich he was much in the company of the above-mentioned philosopher, Franz von Baader. When, in 1827, the famous Joseph Görres came to Munich as professor of history, there formed about him at once a sympathetic circle of scholars, among them the youthful Dollinger. Dollinger's relations with Lamennais, more particularly with Count Montalembert, gave occasion in 1832 to a visit to Paris in the Bavarian General Consul's house and his friends. Lamennais at that time contemplated the establishment at Munich of a house of studies for young Frenchmen ("École des études allemandes"), who might thus come under the influence of Görres, Baader, and others, and on their return to France stand manfully for the sanity and realism of the Church. In the mean time Dollinger had met Andreas Röss, the founder (1821) of "Der Katholik" (still published at Mainz), who in 1828 was rector of the ecclesiastical seminary at Strasbourg as well as professor of dogma and homiletics; with Dollinger he projected various literary enterprises which, through pressure of other work, were never realized.

At this time Monsignor Wiseman, later Cardinal, and Archbishop of Westminster, then professor at the Roman University (Sapienza) and rector of the English College, saw the necessity of strengthening Catholicism in the development of its new opportunities in England, and for this reason was minded to effect closer relations with the learned clergy of Germany. Dollinger seemed to him the proper mediator; he therefore visited Munich in 1835, made the acquaintance of the distinguished professor, and spoke with him of the plans. Wiseman, already well known in Europe by his "Hortus Syracusae", aroused in Dollinger so deep an interest, that the next year the latter visited England. His biographer, Friedrich, describes the result of this visit as follows: "Dollinger had a life-long hatred of bureaucracy both in Church and State; the large independence, therefore, of English public life delighted him and filled him with an admiration that was often excessive. Thereafter he remained always in close touch with England, kept constantly in his home, and at considerable sacrifice, a number of young English students, and directed the studies of others whom he could not keep under his own roof." In 1850 the youthful Sir John Emerich Edward Acton (q. v.) entered his house as a student, to become later his intimate friend. Later, as John Lord Acton and Regius Professor of modern history at Cambridge, he remained in close touch with the Old Catholics, though he never formally severed his connexion with the Church. We do not as yet know details of the progress accurate knowledge concerning Acton's share in the work known as "Letters from Rome" concerning the Vatican Council (Romische Briefe vom Konzil), published by Dollinger in the Augsburg "Allgemeine Zeitung".

As a rule Dollinger observed with his pupils a strict academic dignity and reserve; among the few whom he treated as intimate friends Acton was easily the foremost. Among those who in this early period exerted the greatest influence over Dollinger was Karl Ernest Jäcke, founder and editor (since 1832) of the Berlin "Politische Wochenblätter", confidant of Metternich, and a frequent visitor to the Bavarian capital. In 1838 came the foundation of the "Historisch-politishe Blätter" by Guido Gorres, Phillips, and Jäcke; the new organ soon greatly augmented the influence of Görres and his circle of friends, the most loyal and earnest of whom at this time was Dollinger.

The dispute over the question of mixed marriages in Prussia, known as the Kolzer Streit (1831), followed close upon that in Bavaria (1831); both were fought out dramatically, and brought Dollinger and his Munich friends to the front as vigorous defenders of the holy rights of the Church. The first estrangement of Dollinger from Görres and his friends came about through the publication of an important manual of canon law by Phillips (from 1834 to 1847 professor of canon law at Munich). To Dollinger it seemed that the latter emphasized excessively the extent of the papal pre-
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rogative. Nevertheless, he continued for a decade to collaborate on the "Historisch-politische Blätter"; it was only slowly and almost imperceptibly that the change in his opinions came about. Gradually, owing to his opposition to the Jesuits and particularly to the Roman Curia, he sought to seek new friends and form全新的 circles. As member of the Frankfort Parliament (1818) he sat with the Right, among men like Radwitz, Liehnowski, Schwerin, Vincke, and others; he also belonged to the Club "Zum steinernen Haus."

The change that had come about in Döllinger's view during the preceding years may best be made clear by the fact that his colleagues in Frankfort obtained his consent to the following plan. General von Radwitz, in the name of the Catholic deputies, was to make this declaration in Parliament: "The orders, including the Jesuit Order, are not a part of the living organism of the Catholic Church; the Jesuit Order is no wise necessary in Germany; the German episcopate and the German clergy do not need its help to fulfil their obligations; German learning [die deutsche Wissenschaft] needs no aid of this nature. The possible advantages for the Catholic Church accruing from the cooperation of the Jesuit Order would be given up to the disadvantage and disservice of the Church, and its presence would create. If it were proposed to introduce the Jesuits into any German State, moved by the higher interests of the Catholic Church, we would protest most decidedly against the execution of any such plan."

The relations of Döllinger with the German episcopate were frequent, particularly after the meeting of the German and Austrian prelates at Würzburg (22 Oct. to 16 Nov., 1818). His report concerning the national Church and national synods, as submitted to this national assembly, aroused deep interest, was received with approval in many episcopal circles, and assured him the leadership in the acute ecclesiastico-political discussions then impending. Between 1822 and 1854 he visited Northern and Central Italy, and in 1857 Rome. Apart from his learned researches on these occasions, he profited by these journeys to strengthen his existing relations with numerous Italians, ecclesiastics and laymen, also to make new acquaintance and friendships. While Döllinger sought in every way to retain the favour of King Maximilian II, the cleft between him and his former friends as well as his own past continued to trouble him. For a while the famous professor seemed to stand almost alone, particularly after the stormy scenes of the Munich Congress of Catholic savants (28 Sept. to 1 Oct., 1863). Daniel Bonfantius von Haneberg, Abbot of St. Boniface in Munich, opened this Congress of eighty-four members, mostly German theologians, on which occasion Döllinger delivered his famous discourse, "Die Vergangenheit und Gegenwart der katholischen Theologie" (The Past and Present of Catholic Theology). Many of those present, among them Haneberg, saw with sorrow that they could not follow Döllinger along the new path he was taking. He held no longer in his writings the universal idea of Catholicism as a world-religion; in its place, nourished by the court atmosphere he loved so well, arose a strictly nationalistic concept of the Catholic Church. All ecclesiastical measures he henceforth opposed from the narrow angle of Gallicanism, and ridiculed in anonymous articles and other writings. He was in daily communion with the principal Bavarian statesmen, and amid these relations conceived an idea of the Church's office which in the end could not be other than un-Catholic. It may be noted here that his intimacy with the philosopher Johann Huber, a disciple of Schelling, had attracted attention long before this. Nevertheless (and it was a sign of the strong tension of those days and the mental tempest of many) a number of German bishops still held to Döllinger, although they had long since parted company with Joseph Hubert Reinken, professor of church history at Breslau and later first bishop of the Old Catholics. It was not until 18 July, 1870, when the dogma of Papal Infallibility was proclaimed at Rome, that there was a sharp division in the ranks of German Catholics. This compelled Döllinger henceforth to ally himself with the leaders of the Kulturkampf and the Old Catholics, as also among anti-Catholic statesmen and princes.

Döllinger, as is well known, wrote much and admirably, and his writings exhibit, with a rare fidelity, every phase of his mental conflict. He was still a young writer when his profound learning and brilliant diction, coupled with an unusual breadth and rapidity in the critical treatment of whatever historical thesis lay before him, earned him an international reputation. He lacked, however, the methodical training necessary for the scientific editing of original texts and documents, in which respect his deficiencies were occasionally too evident. He was not content with bare investigation of the facts and problems of Christian antiquity, or of medieval and modern history, but sought always a satisfactory solution for the difficulties that confronted the student. His diction was always charming, whether the subject were one demanding a strictly scientific treatment or one requiring a rapid style called for by the pressing, but ephemeral, needs of the hour. He was likewise skilful as a public speaker, not only when delivering a carefully prepared discourse, but also when called on for an extemporaneous address. A typical example of his ability in this respect was his extempore discourse in St. Paul's Church, Frankfort, on Church and State, apropos of Article III of the fundamental articles (Grundrechte) of the Constitution: several of the best speakers had preceded him, and, in order to closely follow their line of thought, his whole address had to be extemporized; nevertheless, it was admitted by all that, both in form and logic, his address was by far the best delivered on that occasion. The admiration of his students, no doubt, was due in great measure to the beautiful diction in which he was wont to dress the facts of history. The writings of Döllinger may be divided into purely scientific and political or ecclesiastico-political. They exhibit for the most part, however, a mutual interdependence and often complete one another. To avoid repetition, it seems better to follow the chronological order. It is worthy of note that when writing anonymously, his tone was considerably bolder and even violent; writing over his own name he usually avoided such extremes. His first work (1826), "Die Eucharistie in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten", has already been mentioned. In 1828 he published the first volumes of Hortig's "Kirchengeschichte", from the Reformation to the end of the eighteenth century. He also wrote frequently at this time for "Eos", a new review founded by his friends, Baader and Görres; most of the articles dealt with contemporary subjects. According to Friedrich he also prepared "Ümriss zu Dante's Paradies von P. von Cornelius", i.e. an introduction to Dante's Divine Comedy. His journalistic activity, however, was far from pleasing to the ministerial councillor, Joseph Freiherr von Hombay, a somewhat erratic, but influential, person, who so influenced the king that he wished Döllinger well out of Bavaria, as has been seen in the case of his call to Breslau. In these years, also, he defended with vigour the matrimonial legislation of the Church, in connexion with the "Mixed Marriages" conflict (1831) in the Upper House of the Bavarian Parliament, and he was author of an anonymous work "Über die gemischten Ehen", at the same time he suggested as a means of avoiding all conflict, that the civil marriage be separated from the religious ceremony. Meanwhile he continued to collect the material for his scientific works. In 1833 and 1835 respectively he published the first and second parts of his "Handbuch der Kirch-
engeschichte" (to the end of the seventh century). The next year (1836) he brought out the first volume, and in 1838 the first half of the second volume of his "Lerubrh der Kirchengeschichte" (to the end of the fifteenth century). The essay "Muhammeds Religion, eine historische Betrachtung" was read before the Munich Academy about the aforesaid work on mixed marriages; early in 1838 he published his "Beurtheilung der Darlegung des geheimen Rathes Bunsen: eine Stimme zum Frieden". A long controversy with Professor Thiersch followed this entrance of Döllinger into the Prussian conflict over mixed marriages (Kölner Stimmen); his articles were printed in the Augsburg "Allgemeine Zeitung", and are apparently his earliest contributions to the journal in which thirty-one years later he was to consummate his apostasy. Karl von Abel, Minister of the Interior, now asked him to publish a popular "Weltgeschichte", or universal history, from the Catholic point of view, also a manual of religion (Religionslehrebuch) for the gymnasium or high-schools; he began these works, but, feeling himself unsuited to their composition, persuaded the minister to relieve him from the undertaking. Lateron, he undertook to explain his failure in the Pius IX demanding an explanation, however, seemed impossible, and may be looked on as either a meaningless piece of malice or a case of self-deception.

A royal order (1838) that compelled all soldiers to genuflect before the Blessed Sacrament was soon the cause of much friction; in 1843 the matter came before the Upper House, where representatives of the non-Catholic soldiers protested against the measure as contrary to liberty of conscience. Döllinger defended the king and the Government in an anonymous work entitled: "Die Frage der Kniebeugung der Protestanten von der religiösen und staatsrechtlichen Seite erläutert", wherein he treated the question from both the religious and political point of view; this was followed by a long controversy with the Protestant deputy, Harless. In the meantime he was chosen by the University of Vienna as its representative in the Bavarian Parliament, where he protested against the admission of the Jews and defended the emancipation of the Jews, both of which acts drew upon him the enmity of many.

During this political agitation, and while Lola Montez still held the king infatuated, appeared the first volume of his great work "Die Reformation, ihre unterlassenen und ihre Wirkungen und ihre Wirkungen des lutherischen Bekenntnisses", i.e. on the origin, development, and consequences of the Reformation in Lutheran circles; the second volume appeared in 1847, the third in 1848. A second edition of the first volume was printed in 1851. This work unfortunately remained incomplete; Friedrich says that Döllinger's friends prevented him from publishing the corresponding three volumes, i.e. an account of the conditions within the Catholic Church in the same period. This work long exercised a powerful influence and still retains its value. Johannes Janssen (q. v.) was inspired by it to make the exhaustive studies which he did so much to destroy the traditional legends that so long did duty as a history of the Reformation.

The foolish attempt of some zealots to have the temporal power of the pope proclaimed a dogma (Doplatunierung des Kirchenstaates) excited Döllinger to an extraordinary degree. He began firmly persuaded that theological science could be saved only by the German Catholic Church, not by the Catholic Church in Germany. By theological science he meant chiefly historical theology. All other ecclesiastical interests seemed to this great scholar quite subordinate. This work itself is the foundation of the education of seminaries, later quite pronounced, was another result of this mental attitude, the trend of which he revealed on various occasions at the Frankfort Parliament, and in the above-mentioned report (1848) of the Würzburg meeting of the German and Austrian bishops. Gradually he came to be looked upon as a Gallican, nor was this because of his frequently expressed and strong dislike of the Jesuits. Many persons, among them the best and most loyal supporters of the Church, looked henceforth with a certain anxiety on the course of Döllinger. It could even be said that he was the Pope. Munich admired him unreservedly. On the other hand, throughout the ranks of the German and Austrian clergy there was still only a mediocre theological knowledge, the legacy of an earlier period of infidelity and rationalism, and the concept of Catholic doctrine had not been disseminated widely from the true ecclesiastical ideal of both.

To understand fully the profound changes working in the mind of Döllinger during the critical years from 1847 to 1852, it is well to recall his discourses at the general meetings of the "Katholischer Verein" in Ratisbon (1849) and Linz (1850), also those in the Upper House of the Bavarian Parliament in St. Paul's at Frankfort, and at the meetings of the German hierarchy at Würzburg (1849) and Freising (1850). To some extent, also, disappointment was responsible for his new mental attitude; his friends and admirers had tried in vain to obtain for him a cardinal. It is worthy of note that about 1856 the author of the work on the Reformation began gradually to modify his views to such an extent that eventually (in 1859) he wrote a panegyric on Protestantism.

The Greek patristic text entitled "Philosophoumena, or Refutation of all Heresies", discovered in 1842 and edited by Miller (Oxford, 1851), at once fascinated Döllinger, and he devoted to its study all the rich powers of his erudition, critical skill, and insight. In 1853 he published the result of his labours in "Hippolytus und Katholikum", etc., a study of the Roman Church from 200 to 250, in reply to the interpretations of the "Philosophoumena" published by Bunsen, Wordsworth, Baur, and Gieseler. Despite the contrary arguments of De Rossi, Döllinger's opinion has prevailed, and it is now generally acknowledged that Hippolytus is the author of the work in question. Döllinger's essay in the "Historisch-Politische Blätter" (1853) entitled "Betrachtungen über die Frage der Kaiserkrönung", considerations on the imperial coronation, contributed not a little to the driving Napoleon out of Germany. Concerning the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception Döllinger exhibited a prejudiced mind and a rather superficial historical grasp of the question; the defects in his theological equipment were here most noticeable. Indeed, he was much less concerned with the doctrine itself than with the person who wished to proclaim it as a dogma of faith. It was also his first open protest against a pope who was soon to proclaim that Papal Infallibility which seemed to Döllinger an utterly intolerable doctrine, from his view-point of exaggerated esteem for historical theology.

The year 1857 was marked by the appearance of his "Heidenthum und Judenthum, Vorhalle des Christenthums" (Heathenism and Judaism, the Vestible of Christianity), the first part of his long contemplated history of the Church; the second part appeared in 1869 (2nd ed., 1869) as "Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung", dealing with the Apostolic period. The work, as he had planned, was never completed. Most of the abundant material he had collected for an exhaustive history of the papacy was afterwards utilized in an ephemeral journal called "Papst, Kaiser, und Kirche", in which he had done so, it is possible that he would have come into conflict with the Holy See much sooner than he did.

In 1861 some of the principal ladies of Munich requested him to deliver a series of public discourses on...
the Temporal Power; to this he acceded with pleasure, and the discourses given in the royal Odeum were followed with deep attention by crowded audiences. His utterances, however, were so imprudent and so clearly inspired by Liberalism that in the midst of one of them the papal nuncio, Monsignor Chigi, arose with impressing effect and left the hall. The impulse given by these discourses on the Catholic world was painful in the extreme. Döblinger was himself deeply troubled by the agitation aroused; to justify himself in some measure, also to strengthen his position, now seriously compromised, he composed in great haste and published the same day, 

"Die Veränderungen der Kirchen, Papstthum und Kirchenstaat". It seems incredible that the opinions and judgments one reads in this work are really Döblinger's own; the reader is haunted by the suspicion that he has before him a remarkable mixture of Byzantinism and hypocrisy.

The Catholic academic circles of Germany were in the meantime deeply agitated by the discussions incident to the renaissance of Scholasticism (see Neo-Scholasticism) in theology and philosophy, and those over the merits of the episcopal seminaries as against the theological faculties of the universities for the education of candidates for the priesthood. There were excesses on both sides that intensified the situation, whereupon it seemed to many that an academical congress would be a helpful measure. An assembly of Catholic scholars met in 1863 at Munich, before which, as already stated, Döblinger delivered (28 September) his "Einige Erwägungen über die Gegenwart der Katholischen Theologie" (The Past and Present of Catholic Theology). His views, as expressed on this occasion, were calculated to irritate and embitter his opponents, and a reconciliation seemed farther away than before. Shortly afterwards, in the thirteenth number of the episcopal Syllabus of 8 December (see Quanta Curæ), certain opinions of Döblinger were condemned.

It was unfortunate, but not surprising, therefore, that the "Papstfabeln des Mittelalters", medieval fables about the popes (Munich, 1863, 2nd ed., 1866), received no impartial appreciation from his opponents; the pages (131–55) on the Monothelism of Pope Honorius were considered particularly offensive. From this period to the publication of the "Janus" letters, the pen of Döblinger produced mostly anonymous articles, in which his approaching apostasy was disclosed; but his scholar it was not. He had also been brought up to the plan of a universal German biography, the present "Allgemeine deutsche Biographie". Though it was finally von Ranke who induced the Munich Academy to undertake the now practically finished work which, unfortunately, still shows frequent traces of partisanship, it was Döblinger's ardour and insistence that first moved the Academy to consider the proposition. There is even yet a very widespread conviction, and it was believed by the great Christian archaeologist De Rossi, who was quite accurately informed on all the details of the Vatican Council, that Döblinger would scarcely have left the Church if he had been invited to take an honourable share in the preliminary work for the council. Nor does this seem at all improbable to those who understand his character. It is, in any case, very regrettable that on the one hand the influence of Cardinal Reusch in Munich has outweighed that of Cardinal Schwarzenberg, and on the other many rejoiced that the world-renowned scholar had not bent his neck under the yoke of Rome.

Döblinger had definitely severed connexion with the Church. Three weeks later (18 April, 1871) both Döblinger and Friedrich were publicly declared excommunicate. The action of the archbishop, under the circumstances unavoidable, aroused much feeling; the one side it was hailed as a decisive step that ended a situation growing more and more scandalous, the other rejoiced that the world-renowned scholar had not bent his neck under the yoke of Rome. This marked the rise of the sect of the Old Catholics. At Pentecost of the same year (1871) a declaration was published, chiefly the work of Döblinger, setting forth the need of an ecclesiastical organisation. Döblinger also signed a petition to the Government asking for one of the churches of Munich. Hitherto the opposition of this party to the Church had been mostly of a philosophico-historical character, and the dominant statesmen of the time could turn it to little practical account. It was now the hour for a number of pan-Catholic tendencies of the governments of the period. Prince Bismarck's plan of a National German Catholic Church, as independent of Rome as it was possible to
make it (foreshadowed by Dollinger in 1849), corresponded now with the wishes of the apostate Catholics, henceforth governed absolutely by the canonist von Schulte (see OLD CATHOLICS). The first assembly of these opponents of the Vatican Council was held at Munich on 22-24 Sept., 1871. On the suggestion of von Schulte, and despite the opposition and warnings of Dollinger, it was decided to establish the "Old Catholic Church". Henceforth Dollinger followed a policy of vacillation, avoiding on the one hand any formal relationship to the new Church, on the other, fearing to commit himself by a public act of dissension. The "New Church" lacked distinction and was very personally distasteful to him; in public, however, though with measured reserve, he defended it. Henceforth formally excommunicated from the Catholic Church, he recognized the validity and legality of that act; at the same time he held it beneath his dignity to submit to the jurisdiction of Bishop Reinkens, for whom the Old Catholics had obtained concession from the Jansenists in Holland. He stood, therefore, between the two covenants, and looked with almost a calmness that the most insignificant members of the new sect considered him, more or less, an Intimate adherent and a sharer of their trials.

The next seven years he spent in purifying his conscience, or, in his own words, in a process of internal excommunication. In 1887 he published a series of essays, his academic discourses, and the work "Ungeburchte Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trient", an unedited account, and a series of historical and theological essays on the work "Ein ungedruckten Berichten und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trient", unedited reports and dairies used for a history of the Council of Trent (1876). In 1887 he edited, with Reusch, the autobiography of Belkarrane up to 15 June, 1613, in Gnosis; with Reusch he also published (1889-90) in two volumes "Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der römisch-katholischen Kirche seit dem sechszehnten Jahrhundert", mit Beiträgen zur Geschichte und Charakteristik des Jesuitenordens", or a history of the moral-theological discussions in the Roman Catholic Church since the sixteenth century, including studies on the history and characteristics of the Jesuit Order. About the same time he published in two volumes his "Beiträge zur Keng misogynie des Mittelalters"; after his death appeared (1891) the third volume of his "Beiträge zur Keng misogynie des Mittelalters".

He retained to the end a remarkable physical and mental strength. Though his latest writings met with a kindly reception in scientific circles, they were not considered as superior in merit, either from the viewpoint of scientific criticism or as historical narrative. Seldom has it been so clearly proven that whenever a man turns completely from a glorious and honourable past, however stormy, his fate is irrevocably sealed.


Paul Maria Baumgarten.

Dolman, Charles, publisher and bookseller, b. at Monmouth, England, 20 Sept., 1807; d. in Paris, 31 December, 1863. He was the only son of Charles Dolman, a surgeon of Monmouth, and Mary Frances his wife, daughter of Thomas Booker, a Catholic publisher in London. Educated at St. John's College, Oxford, where he was first a student of theology, then of music, and afterwards of mathematics, he was engaged in the printing and publishing business, and became a Catholic. He was afterwards for some time resident in Paris, and lived in the house of a Catholic family. His father had married, to go to London. When Joseph Booker died in 1837, he was induced to carry on the business with his aunt, Mary Booker, and his cousin, Thomas Booker. In 1840 the name of the firm was changed to Booker & Dolman, and finally the business was continued under the name of Dolman & Booker. The publisher of periodical literature began when in 1838 he brought out a new series of "The Catholic Magazine", which up to that time had been known as "The Edinburgh Catholic Magazine", in contradiction to "The Catholic Magazine", a much older publication which had gone out of existence in 1835. Dolman's publication was discontinued in June, 1841, but his name had become so widely known that in March, 1845, he brought out a new periodical called "Dolman's Magazine and Monthly Miscellany of Criticism". This was at first under the sole management of its publisher, but later the Rev. Edward Price succeeded him. Like the others it was short-lived and in 1849 it was merged with "The Catholic Weekly and Monthly Orthodox", under the title of "The Weekly Register". It first appeared under the new name, 4 August, 1849, published by Thomas Booker. From the name was dropped the "periodicals" and devoted himself solely to works that had never before been brought out by the Catholic press. His many efforts to raise the standard of the Catholic press ended in failure. Disheartened by his ill-success and broken down in health, he retired to his country seat, where he died in 1863. He was survived by his only son, the Rev. Charles Vincent Dolman, of Hereford, Canon of Newport.


Thomas Gaffney Taffape.

Dolores Mission (or Mission San Francisco de Asis de los Dolores), in point of time the sixth in the chain of twenty-one California Indian Missions, formally opened 9 Oct., 1776. The date intended for the celebration was 4 Oct., the feast of St. Francis of Assisi, but owing to the absence of the military command of the neighboring presidio, which had been established on 17 Sept., the feast of the Stigmata of St. Francis, the formal founding was delayed. The first Mass or on near the site was celebrated in a tent by Father Francesco Palou, on the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul, 29 June, and on 28 July the first Mass was offered up in the church. Father Palou on the title pages of the mission records gives 1 August as the day of foundation. The early missionaries, however, always celebrated the 4th of October as the patronal feast of the mission. The appellation "Dolores" was added because the mission was established on a stream which Father Pedro Font, O.F.M., and Captain Juan Bautista de Anza had discovered on 28 March, 1776, and in honour of the Blessed Virgin had called Arroyo de Nuestra Señora de los Dolores. In all official documents, reports, and in the records, however, the mission bears no other name than San Francisco de Asis; but after 1824, when the Mission San Francisco Solano was established at Sonoma, to avoid confusion it was popularly called Dolores, that is to say, the mission on the Dolores. The founders of the mission were Father Francisco Palou, the historian, and Father Pedro Benito Cambon. The other missionaries stationed here in the course of time were the Franciscan Fathers Tomás de la Peña, Miguel Giribet, Vincente de Santa María, Matías Noriega, Norberto de Santiago, Diego García, Faustino de Solís, Antonio Danti, Martín de Landau, Diego de Noboa, Manuel Fernández, José de Espí, Ramón Antelló, Bartolomé, Juan Sainz, Vincenzo Oliva, Juan Cabot, Bartolomé Ordás, José Altamira, Tomás Estébane, Lorenzo Quijós, José Guiterres, José Mercado, José Real, Miguel Muro. The Rev. Prudencio Santillán, the first secular priest, took charge in 1846.

The cornerstone of the present church, the oldest
building in San Francisco, and which survived the earthquake of 1906 practically without damage, was laid in 1782 and finished with a thatched roof. In 1793 tiles replaced the thatch. The mission buildings as usual were erected in the form of a square. The church stood in the south-east corner fronting the east wing of the square contained the rooms of the missionaries, two of whom were always there until about June, 1828, the shops of the carpenters, smiths, saddlers, rooms for melting tallow and making soap, for agricultural implements, for spinning wool and weaving coarse fabrics. There were twenty looms in constant operation, and two mills moved by mule-power ground the grain. Most of the neophytes were engaged in agriculture and stock-raising. Owing to the barren nature of the soil and the high winds in the neighbourhood, sowing and planting was done ten or twelve miles down the peninsula. The stock also grazed far away from the mission. About one hundred yards from the church stood the neophyte village, composed of eight rows of one-story dwellings. The girls lived at the mission proper under the care of a matron (see California Missions). A school was in operation in 1818. The highest number of Indians living at the mission was reached in 1820, when 1,278 were living there which is about the number of Indians who lived in the mission in 1800. The number fluctuated a great deal. The last baptism of an Indian occurred on 24 June, 1777. From that date till October, 1845, when the last Franciscan departed, 7,200 names entered into the baptismal record, about 900 of which represented white people. The stock also grazed far away from the mission. During the same period 530 deaths occurred, and 2,156 marriages were blessed; about eighty of the latter were those of white couples. From 1785 to the end of 1832, for which period we have the reports, the mission raised 120,000 bushels of wheat, 70,226 bushels of barley, 18,260 bushels of corn, 14,386 bushels of beans, 72,986 bushels of peas, and 905 bushels of lentils and garbanzos or horse beans. The largest number of animals owned by the mission was as follows: cattle, 11,340 head in 1809; sheep, 11,324 in 1814; goats, 65 in 1786; horses, 1,250 in 1787; mules, 45 in 1813.

Records of Mission San Francisco, Ms.; Archives of Mission Santa Barbara, Ms.;_FONT_Durot at Berkeley University, Ms. (Berkeley, Cal.); _PALOU, Noticia (San Francisco, 1874), III, IV; PALOU, _Vida del Fray Junipero Serra_, Mexico 1857; BANKROFT, _History of California_ (San Francisco, 1886), I, V; ENGELHARDT, _The Franciscans in California_ (Harper Springs, Mich., 1897).

Dolores Mission, San Francisco

Dolphins on the Baleria Latoria Tombstone

Dolphins (Lat. delphinus). — The use of the dolphin as a Christian symbol is connected with the general ideas underlying the more general use of the fish (q. v.). The particular idea is that of swiftness and celerity symbolizing the desire with which Christians, which are represented as being sharers in the nature of Christ the true Fish, should seek after the knowledge of Christ. Hence the representation is generally of two dolphins tending towards the sacred monogram or some other emblem of Christ. In other cases the particular idea is that of love and tenderness. Aringhi (Roma Subterr., II, 327) gives an example of a dolphin with a heart, and other instances have some such motto as PIGNUS AMORIS HABES (i.e. thou hast a pledge of love). It is sometimes used as an emblem of merely conjugal love or funeral mourning, though an anchor the dolphin occurs frequently on early Christian rings, representing the attachment of the Christian to Christ crucified. Speaking generally, the dolphin is the symbol of the individual Christian, rather than of Christ Himself, though in some instances the anchor seems to have been used as a representation of Christ upon the Cross. _Masoch, De Orig. et Ant. Chr., III; Mastino_ _dus Ant. Chr., s. v.; Smith and Cheetham, ed., _Dict. of Christian Antq., s. v.; see especially Wilpert, Le Pictore delle Catacombe Romane_ (Freiburg, 1903; and DALTON, _Catalogue of Early Christian Antiques_ etc. in the British Museum (London, 1901).

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

Dom. See Benedictine Order.

Dome (Lat. domus, a house), an architectural term often used synonymously with cupola. Strictly speaking, it signifies the external part of a spherical or polygonal covering of a building, of which the cupola (q. v.) is the inner structure, but in general usage dome means the entire covering. It is also loosely used, as in the German Dom and the French _Dome_, to designate a cathedral, or, at times, to signify some other building of importance. A dome may be of any material, wood, stone, metal, earthenware, or it may be built of a single mass or of a double or even triple series of concentric coverings. The dome is a roof, the base of which is a circle, an ellipse, or a polygon, and its vertical section a curved line, concave towards the interior. Hence domes are called circular, elliptical or polygonal, according to the figure of the base. The most usual form is the spherical, in which case its plan is a circle, the section a segment of a circle. Domes are sometimes semi-elliptical, pointed, or formed in curves of contrary flexure, bell-shaped, etc. Except in the earlier period of the development of the dome, the interior and exterior forms were not often alike, and, in the space between a staircase to the lantern was generally made.

Domes are of two kinds, simple and compound. In the simple dome, the dome and the pendentives are in one, and the height is only a little greater than that of an intersecting vault formed by semicircular arches. The dome over the central part of the tomb of Galla Placidia, at Ravena, and those over some of the aisles of Saint Sophia, Constantinople, are of this description. In the compound dome two methods were followed. In both methods a greater height is obtained, and the compound dome was consequently the one used on all important buildings of the later period. In one, the dome starts directly from the top of the circle formed by the pendentives; in the other, a cylindrical wall or "drum" intervenes between the pendentives and the dome, and the height is considerably increased. In churches with domes without drums, the windows are in the dome itself immediately above the springing; otherwise, they are in the drum, and the surface of the dome is generally unbroken. At
the monastery of St. Luke, Phocis, Greece, are two churches of the eleventh century, side by side, the smaller of which has a drum with windows in it, whereas the larger church has no drum, and the windows are in the dome. The drum is universal in all domed churches of the Renaissance, at which period it received special treatment and became a most important feature. Many of these drums are not circular in plan externally, but are many-sided, and the angles are often enriched by marble shafts, etc. The carrying-up of the walls vertically is a good expedient constructionally, as it provides weight above the haunches of the dome and helps to neutralize its thrusts. In the churches of the second period, at Constantinople, Salonica, Athens, and other parts of Greece, in which the true drum occurs, it is of considerable height and is generally eight-sided. Windows come at each side, and over the windows are arches which cut into the dome itself.

A primitive form of the dome and the barrel vault is of great antiquity. In some districts men were compelled to build in stone or brick or mud, because there was no wood, as in Assyria; in other districts they had not the tools to work wood. In all such cases some form of dome or tunnel vault had to be devised for shelter. In tracing the growth of the dome in historical times, it has been regarded as an outcome of the architecture of the Eastern Empire, because it was at Constantinople and in the Byzantine provinces that it was first employed in ecclesiastical structures. But it was the Romans who in reality developed the use of the dome, as of all other applications of the semicircular arch. From Rome it was carried to Constantinople and from the same source to different parts of the Western Empire. In Eastern Christendom the dome became the dominant factor in church design, whether a single dome, as at Saint Sophia, Constantinople (built, 532–537), or a central dome encircled by other domes, as at St. Mark's, Venice, or a row of domes, as at Angoulême. The plan and domes of Angoulême are reproduced in the new Catholic cathedral at Westminster. The Roman dome was a hemisphere supported by a circular wall. Its finest example was the Pantheon, Rome. Equally characteristic, though smaller, examples abound, e.g. at Rome, the temple of Minerva Medica, the tomb of Constantia, now the church of Santa Costanza, etc. Viollet-le-Duc in writing of the dome of the Pantheon says, "This majestic cupola is the widest, the most beautiful, the best constructed, and most stable of all the great domes of the world." The inside diameter of the dome is 142 feet. Previous to the building of the Pantheon in its present domical form, during the reign of Hadrian about A.D. 123, the history of the dome is for the most part a blank.

The primitive Eastern dome seems to have been on a very small scale, and to have been used for subordinate purposes only. It was a common architectural feature in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia. In later times the dome was largely employed in architecture by the Persian Sassanide, Mohammediands, and the Byzantines. From the first domed churches built for Christian worship sprang Byzantine architecture and its offshoots. The builder of the earliest domed church of any magnitude was Constantine; its locality the famous city of Antioch in Syria. The problem of the Christian domed church, so far at least as its interior is concerned, received in Saint Sophia its full solution. The dome is the prevailing conception of Byzantine architecture, and M. Choisy, in his "Art de bâtir chez les Byzantins," traces the influence of this domical construction on Greek architecture and shows how from their fusion the architecture of the Eastern Empire became possible. Domes were now, from the time of the construction of Saint Sophia, placed over square apartments, their bases being brought to a circle by means of pendentives, whereas, in Roman architecture, domes as a rule were placed over a circular apartment. The grouping of small domes round a large central one was very effective, and one of the peculiarities of Byzantine churches was that the dome had no additional outer covering. The dome was rarely used by medieval builders except when under oriental influence, hence it was practically confined to Spain and Italy. The dome of the cathedral at Pisa, the first model of the Tuscan style of architecture, was begun in the eleventh century, and in the thirteenth was founded the cathedral at Florence. Its dome equals in size that of St. Peter's at Rome, and was its model. During the Italian Renaissance, domed construction became again of the first importance, possibly on account of its classical precedent, and it is interesting to note that the Pantheon became once more the starting-point of a new development which culminated in the domes of St. Peter's, Rome, and St. Paul's, London.

The substructure of the dome of St. Peter's is a round drum, which serves as a stylobate and lifts it above the surrounding roofs. On this stands the ringwall of the drum, decorated with a Corinthian order and carrying an attic; on this sits the oval mass of the noblest dome in the world. The drum, fifty feet high, is pierced by sixteen square-headed windows. The enormous thickness of the stylobate allows an outside offset to receive the buttresses which are set between the windows, in the shape of spurwalls with engaged columns at the corners, over which the entablature is broken. The curve of the dome is of extraordinary beauty. Between its ribs, corresponding to the buttresses below, are three diminishing tiers of small dormer windows. The lantern above, with an Ionic order, repeats the arrangement of windows and buttresses in the drum below, and is surmounted by a Latin cross rising 438 feet above the pavement. The foremost Renaissance church in Florence is the church of the Annunziata, and is remarkable for a fine dome carried on a drum resting directly on the ground. To the latest time of the Renaissance in Venice belongs the picturesque domed church of Santa Maria della Salute. The two finest domes in France are those of the Hôtel des Invalides and the Panthéon (formerly the church of Sainte-Geneviève) at Paris. Domes built in the early part of the twelfth century are to be found at Valencia, Zámbra, Salamanca, Clermont, Le Puy, Cahors. They are also found in Faitou, Périgord, and Auvergne; at Aachen, Cologne, Antwerp, and along the banks of the Rhine; at Aosta, Pavia, Como, Parma, Piacenza, Verona, Milan, etc. There are, besides, the bulbous domes of Russia and the flattened cupolas of the Saracens. The dome became the lantern in English Gothic, and the octagon of Ely cathedral is said to be
the only true Gothic dome in existence. The central octagon of the Houses of Parliament, London, is the best specimen of a modern Gothic dome. Arab domes are mostly of the pointed form such as are derived from the rotation of the Gothic arch or bulbous, the section being a horse-shoe arch. Very beautiful examples are seen in the buildings known as the tombs of the caliphs at Cairo. Among the finest examples of domed buildings in the East are the Tombs of Mohammedan sultans in the south of India and at Agra. The largest dome in America is that of the Capitol at Washington. It is built of iron.

FLETCHER, A History of Architecture (New York, 1900); BOND, Gothic Architecture in England (New York, 1900); CUMMINGS, A History of Architecture in Italy (Boston, 1901); Brown, From Schola to Cathedral (Edinburgh, 1886); SMITH, Architecture, Gothic and Renaissance (London, 1888); SIMPSON, A History of Architectural Development (New York, 1905); WALCOTT, Sacred Architecture (London).

THOMAS H. POOLE.

DOMENECH, EMANUEL-HENRI-DIEUDONNÉ, Abbé, missionary and author, b. at Lyons, France, 4 November 1826; d. in France, June 3, 1886. In the spring of 1846, before completing his seminary studies and when not yet twenty years of age, he left France in response to an urgent appeal for missionaries to help develop the Church in the wilds of Texas, then rapidly filling up with American and European immigrants. He went first to St. Louis, where he spent two years completing his theological course, studying English and German, and gathering knowledge of missionary requirements. In May, 1848, he was assigned to duty at the new German settlement of Castroville in Texas, from which he was transferred later to Brownsville. The war with Mexico was just concluded; raiding bands of Mexicans and rangers were ravaging on both sides of the Rio Grande, while outlaws from the border States and almost equally lawless discharged soldiers filled the new towns, and hostile Indians hovered constantly in the background. A cholera epidemic added its horrors. Nevertheless, the young priest went bravely to work with such energy that he soon became an efficient power for good throughout all Southern Texas. In 1850 he visited Europe and was received by the pope. Returning to Texas, he continued in the mission field two years longer, when he returned to France with health broken and was appointed titular canon of Montpellier. When the French troops were dispatched to Mexico in 1861 he was selected to accompany the expedition as almoner to the army and chaplain to the Emperor Maximilian. After the return to France he devoted his remaining years to European travel, study, and writing, and the exercise of his ecclesiastical functions. In 1882-3 he again visited America.

St. Jerome (Detail) Doménichino, Vatican

Among his numerous works dealing with travel, history, and theology, may be noted: "Jour d'un missionnaire au Texas et au Mexique" (Paris, 1857); "Voyage dans les solitude américaines" (Paris, 1858); "Histoire du jansénisme"; "Histoire du Mexique" (Paris, 1868). His principal works have appeared also in English translation. In regard to his much-controversed "Manuscrit pictographique américain" (Paris, 1860), an examination of the supposed Indian pictographs leaves no doubt that in this case the unsuspecting missionary was grossly deceived.

Consult his own works, with introductions; also Petenöt, Le livre des sauvages (Brussels, 1861).

JAMES MOONEY.

Doménichino, properly Domenico Zampieri, an Italian painter, b. in Bologna, 21 Oct., 1581; d. in Naples, 16 April, 1641. He began his art studies in the school of Calvaert, but being ill-treated there, his father, a poor shoemaker, placed him in the Carracci Academy, where Guido Reni and Al- bani were also students. He was a tall, thoughtful, plodding youth whom his companions called the 'Ox', a nickname also borne by his master Ludovico. He took the prize for drawing in the Carracci Academy, gaining thereby both fame and hatred. Stimulated by success, he studied unremittingly, particularly the expression of the human face, so that Bellori says he could delineate the soul.

His student days over, he first visited Parma and Modena to study Correggio, and then went to Rome, where his earliest friend and patron, Cardinal Agueci, commissioned him to decorate his palace. In Rome he assisted the Carracci with their frescoes in the palace of Cardinal Farnese, who became such an admirer of Doménichino that he had him execute many of the pictures in the Basilian Abbey of Grotta Ferrata. Doménichino's best frescoes are in this church. With Guido he painted, for Cardinal Borghese, in S. Gregorio; for Cardinal Aldobrandini he executed ten frescoes at Villa Frascati; for Cardinal Montalto he decorated S. Andrea della Valle; and for Cardinal Bandini he painted four pictures for S. Silvestro which rank among his best productions.

He immortalized his name by painting (1614) for the altar of S. Girolamo della Carità, the "Communion of St. Jerome", a copy of which, in mosaic, is in S. Pietro's. This is one of the great pictures of the world and was considered second only to Raphael's "Transfiguration". He received about fifty dollars for it. Napoleon took it to Paris but the Allies returned it. Jealousy of Doménichino long accumulating now burst forth, and he was accused of copying his master-piece from Agostino Carracci. Weary of attacks, the
THE COMMUNION OF ST. JEROME—DOMENICHINO

THE VATICAN, ROME
artist went to Bologna but later returned to Rome, where Pope Gregory XV made him painter and architect of the Apostolic Camera (pontifical treasury). In 1630 he settled in Naples and there opened a school, but was assassinated, as in Rome, by envious artists (chiefly of Naples), who disapproved of his paintings. Mental suffering, perhaps poison, hastened his death. Domenichino, although not a master of great originality and inspiration, was a prominent figure in the Bolognese School. Potent in fresco he also excelled in decorative landscapes; his colour was warm and harmonious; his style simple, his chiaroscuro superbly managed, and his subordinate groups and accessories well adjusted and of great interest. The most famous masters of the burin engraved his works, which are: “Portrait of Cardinal Aguichi”, Uffizi, Florence; “Life of St. Nius” (fresco) in Grottina Ferrata near Rome; “Condensation of Adam and Eve”, Louvre, Paris; “St. George and the Dragon”, National Gallery, London; “St. John”, Hermitage, St. Petersburg.

**Domesday Book** is the name given to the record of the great survey of England made by order of William the Conqueror in 1085-86. The name first occurs in the famous “Dialogus de Scaccario”, a treatise compiled about 1176 by Richard Fitznigel, which states that the English called the book of the survey “Domeslei”, or “Day of Judgment”, because the inquiry was one which none could escape, and because the verdict of this matter as to the holding of the land was final and without appeal. Certain it is that the native English resented William’s inquisition. “It is shame to tell”, wrote the chronicler, “what he thought it no shame for him to do. Ox, nor swine, nor swine was left that was not set down upon his writ.” The returns give full information about the land of England, its ownership both in 1085 and in the time of King Edward, its extent, nature, value, cultivators, and villains. The survey embraced all England except the northernmost counties. The results are set down in concise and orderly fashion in two books called the “Exon Domesday”. Another volume, containing a more detailed account of Wilts, Dorset, Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, is called the “Exon Domesday”, as it is in the keeping of the cathedral chapter of Exeter.

The chief interest of the Domesday Book for us here lies in the light which it throws upon church matters. As Professor Maitland has pointed out, a comparison of Domesday with our earliest charters shows not only that the Church held lands of considerable, sometimes of vast, extent, but that she had obtained these lands by free grant from kings or underking during the Saxon period. We find, for example, that four ministers, Worcester, Evesham, Pershore, and Westminster, were lords of seven-twelfths of the soil of Worcestershire, and that the Church of Worcester alone was lord of one-quarter of that shire besides other holdings elsewhere. It is probable, however, that this did not imply absolute ownership, but only superiority and a right to certain services (Maitland, “Domesday Book and Beyond”, pp. 206-42). This must be borne in mind when we see it stated, and so far correctly, on the statute first occurring in 1066 that the Church represented twenty-five per cent of the assessment of the country in 1066 and twenty-six and one-half per cent of its cultivated area in 1086. These lands were in any case very unequally distributed, the proportion of church land being much greater in the South than in the North. The record does not enable us to tell clearly how far the parochial system had developed, and though in Norfolk and Suffolk all the churches seem to have been previously, amounting to 243 in the former, and 364 in the latter, county, the same care to note the churches was obviously not exercised in the West of England. Much church property seems to have been of the nature of a tenancy held from the king upon condition of some service to be rendered, often a rent in kind. Thus we read; “Alwin the priest holds the sixth part of a hide”, at Turvey, Beds, “and held it tempore regis Edwardi”, and could do what he liked; King William afterwards gave it to him in alms, on condition that he should celebrate two feria masses [feriae missae] for the souls of the King and Queen twice a week.” Valuable as is the information which the Domesday Book supplies, many questions suggested by it remain obscure and are still keenly debated. A face-simile of the whole record was brought out some years ago by photography, and at the end of the eighteenth century an edition was printed in type specially cast to represent the contractions of the original manuscript.

The most convenient introduction to the subject is BALLARD, The Domesday Inquest (London, 1896). The student may be referred to MAITLAND, Domesday Book and Beyond (new ed., London, 1907); to ROUND, Feudal England (London, 1895); and to ETYON, Domesday Studies. But there are many minor essays dealing with questions of local interest.

**Herbert Thurston.**

**Domestic Prelate.** See **Prelate**.

**Domicile** (Lat. *jus domicilii*, right of habitation, residence).—The canon law has no independent and original theory of domicile; both the canon law and all modern civil codes borrowed this theory from the Roman law; the canon law, however, extended and perfected the Roman theory by adding thereto that of quasi-domicile. For centuries ecclesiastical legislation contained no special provision in regard to domicile, adapting itself quite unreservedly on this point both to Roman and Barbarian law. It was only in the thirteenth century, after the revival at Bologna of the study of Roman law, that legislae and then the canonists, returned to the Roman theory, introducing it first into the schools and then into practice. Not that the Church had “canonized” it, so to speak, this particular point of Roman law more than others, but civil law, being more ancient, formed a basis for canon law, which accepted it, at least in so far
as it was not at variance with later decrees of pontifical law. So true is this that there exists no document in which the theory of domicile has been completely and officially expounded by an ecclesiastical legislator.

II. Rome AN Law.—We must therefore revert to Roman law, which established domicile as the extension or communication of a pre-existent legal status of individuals—origin (origo, jus originis). In the theory of the Roman lawyers each man belongs to his municipality, to his city, where, as he contributes his share to the expenses and taxes, so he has a right to the corresponding advantages. Children naturally follow their father's condition and belong likewise to the city, even though born at a distance. Such is the Roman origo, quite akin to what we call nationality, except that the origo relates to the restricted locality of one's birth, and nationality to one's native land. Hence it is birth, the legal birthplace, that determines one's origo, i.e., not the actual site of birth but the place where each one should have been born, the municipality to which the father belonged (L. 1. ff. Ad municip.). Let us now suppose a man settled for a long time in a city which is not his native city. Partly in return for the taxes he pays, and partly to exercise his civic duties, he is granted the status of a real citizen, without loss, however, of his own origo or municipal right. Such then, is the primitive concept of domicile in Roman law: the communication to a man, born in one municipality but residing permanently in another, of the civic rights and duties of the citizens who are natives of the locality. To become as one of the latter, the stranger must create for himself a domicile, and it was this that necessarily led jurists to define domicile and the conditions upon which it could be acquired. Hence the celebrated definition of domicile given by Emperor Diocletian and lustertius (L. 7, C. de incol.): “It is certain that each one has his domicile in the place where he has established his home and business and has his possessions; a residence which he does not intend to abandon, unless called elsewhere, from which he departs only as a traveller and by returning to which he ceases to be a traveller.” The juridical element constitutive of domicile is the intention, the will definitively to settle oneself in a place, this being deduced from the circumstances and especially the conditions of installation. It implies indefinite stability, not perpetuity in the restricted sense of the word, but the abrogation of the right to change domicile. Another domicile may at any time be acquired on the same conditions as the first; it is lost when the intention of abandoning it is coupled with the fact of desertion. Since, therefore, domicile conferred the same rights as origo, its importance became gradually more and more marked.

We can now better understand the words that so often recur in Roman law and have been adopted by canonists: those who belong to a municipality by birth are citizens (civiti); those who come from elsewhere, but have become its members by domicile are inhabitants (incolae), though these terms are used almost synonymously by jurists and canonists; those who have spent a sufficient time there without, however, acquiring a domicile, are strangers (iugiti) to the Empire, and to them canonists concede a quasi-domicile. Finally, those who make but a passing sojourn there are transients (perigrini; cf. L. 239, de Verb. sign.). To these categories canonists have added one which the Roman origo, being permanent, could not recognize, namely the wanderers (vaghi), who have fixed residence only on the day when they abandon one domicile, have not as yet acquired another.

II. Development of "Domicile" in Canon Law.

—In the troublous times that prevailed after the Barbarian invasions, the domicile of Roman law was lost sight of, and even the word itself disappeared from the juridical language of the time. However, this does not mean that persons inhabiting certain limited districts had wholly ceased to be connected with local authority, whether civil or religious, nor that all acts were wholly regulated exclusively, after the barbarian concept, by a personal code. The personal status of habitation could not, it is true, be ignored, but it no longer served for a theory of domicile. The medieval ecclesiastical canons say that each Catholic (fidelis) should pay his tithes in the church where he was baptized and that his obsequies should be held where he pays his tithes and belongs. Hence the mention of domicile.

The Roman theory was again restored to honour by the glossarists of the Bolognese School, especially by Accursius in the beginning of the thirteenth century. Whether it was because they mistook the real meaning of origo or desired to explain it in a way that suited the customs of their time, they interpreted it as a sort of domicile resulting from one's birthplace, and if one was born there per accidens, from the place of one's father's birth. Except for this inaccuracy, the Roman theory was well expounded. Moreover, according to the favourite principles of their time, the glossarists brought into the doctrine of domicile the double constitutive element of domicile (or, properly speaking, of acquired domicile): the material element (corpus, i.e., habitation), and the juridical or formal element (animus), i.e., the intention to remain in this habitation indefinitely. Although they did not contribute directly to this revival of domicile, canonists nevertheless adopted it and it was definitively admitted in the gloss of "Liber Sextus" (cc. 2 and 3, de sepult.). They applied these rules to the acts of Christian life: baptism, passional, communion, viaticum, confession, extreme unction, funerals, interments, etc., and also to ordinary transactions. The actual canonical rules on domicile are about the same.

In the meantime almost the only development of canon law in this matter has been the creation of the quasi-domicile theory, foreign alike to Roman and modern civil law. As its name implies, quasi-domicile is closely patterned on domicile and consists in a sojourn in some one place during a sufficient length of time. Not only does it not call for abandonment of the real domicile, but can co-exist with the latter and even supposes the intention of returning thither. It was evident that the ordinary acts of the Christian life, which, rights and obligations of a part, might be confined to permanent residents only; hence the necessity of assimilating to such residents those who sojourn in the place for a certain length of time. The canonists soon concluded that whoever has a quasi-domicile in a place may receive there the sacraments and perform there legitimately all the acts of the Christian life without forfeiting any of his rights in the place of his real domicile; he may even thus become subject to the judicial authority of his place of quasi-domicile. The only restrictions are, as we shall see, for ordinaries and, to a certain extent, for funerals. For a long time, however, the theory remained vague and indeterminate. Authors could scarcely agree as to precisely what was meant by the "sufficient length" of time (non breve tempus) required for quasi-domicile, and they hesitated to pronounce on the various positions concerning the reasons for a sojourn and the degree in which they could create presumption of an intention to acquire quasi-domicile. Strictly speaking, the question was really important only in regard to those marriages whose validity depended on the existence of a quasi-domicile in countries where the Tridentine decree "Tamesis" had been published; in this way, as we shall see below, new legal questions arose.

The quasi-domicile theory was not definitively settled until the appearance of the Instruction of the Holy Office addressed to the Bishops of England and the United States, 7 June, 1867, in which quasi-domicile is
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patterned as closely as possible on domicile. Like the latter, it is made up of the double element of fact and right, i.e., of residence and the intention of abiding in it for a sufficient length of time, this time being clearly stated as a period covering more than six months—per maiorem anni portem. As soon as these two conditions coexist, quasi-domicile is acquired and immediately involves the legal use of rights and competencies resulting therefrom. (See below for a recent restriction in regard to marriage.) Finally, quasi-domicile is lost by the simultaneous cessation of both its constitutive elements, i.e., by the abandonment of residence without any intention of returning to it. Sufficient to add to that in this matter the canon law, yielding to custom, tends easily to adapt itself to the provisions of civil law, e.g., as regards the legal domicile of minors, wards, and other analogous provisions.

III. PRESENT LAW.—From the preceding explanation there results a very important conclusion which throws a strong light on canonical legislation concerning domicile and which we must now set forth. It is this: the law does not deal with domicile for its own sake, but rather on account of its consequences; in other words, on account of the personal rights and obligations attached thereto.

It is acquired when, according to the case in point, e.g., marriage, ordination, judicial competency. Keeping therefore in view the legal consequences of domicile and its various forms it may be defined as a stable residence which entails submission to local authority and permits the exercise of acts for which this authority is competent.

To this definition the laws and their commentators confine themselves, without touching on the legal effects of domicile. As we have already seen, domicile, properly so called, is the place one inhabits indefinitely (locus perpetua habitationis), such perpetuity being quite compatible with more or less severe restrictions. It matters not whether one be the owner or simply the occupant of the house in which one dwells or whether one owns more or less property in the locality. The place of one's domicile is not the house wherein one resides but the territorial district in which the house or home stands. This district is usually the smallest territory possessing a distinct, self-governing organization. All authors agree that, from a civil viewpoint, the municipality is the place of domicile and, canonically considered, the territorial division in which one resides, e.g., mission or station. It is in the municipality that the acts and rights of civil life are exercised, and the parish of the Christian life. Strictly speaking one cannot acquire domicile in a ward or hamlet or in any territorial division which does not form a self-governing group. Of course there are certain acts that do not depend, or that no longer depend, on local authority; in this sense, it is possible to speak of domicile in a diocese when it is question e.g., of ordination, or of domicile in a province apropos of the competency of a tribunal. But these exceptions are merely apparent; that one has a certain status within a given diocese. The canon law has never recognized as domicile an unstable residence in different parts of a diocese, without intent to establish oneself in some particular parish. Canon law (c. 2, de sepult. in VI, like Roman law (L. 5, 7, 27, Ad munip.), allows a double domicile, provided there be in each an equally morally equal installation; the most ordinary example of this being a winter domicile in the city and a summer domicile in the country. There are three kinds of domicile: domicile of origin, domicile of residence or acquired domicile, and necessary or legal domicile of origin or application of the Roman origo, is that assigned to each individual by his place of nativity unless he be accidentally born outside of the place where his father dwells; practically it is the paternal domicile for legitimate and the maternal domicile for illegitimate children. Again, in reference to the spiritual life, domicile of nativity is the place where adults and abandoned children are baptized. The domicile of residence or acquired domicile is that of one's own choice, the place where one establishes a residence for an indefinite period. It is acquired by the fact of material residence joined to the intention of there remaining as long as one has no reason for settling elsewhere; this intention being manifested either by an express declaration or by circumstances. Once acquired, domicile subsists, despite more or less prolonged absences, until one leaves it with the intention of not returning for an indefinite period.

Finally, the domicile that is imposed by law; for prisoners or exiles it is their prison or place of banishment; for a wife it is the domicile of the husband which she retains even after becoming a widow; for children under age it is that of the parents who have authority over them; for wards it is that of their guardians; lastly, for whoever exercises a perpetual charge, e.g., a bishop, canon, or parish priest, etc., it is the place where he discharges his functions.

Quasi-domicile is of one kind only, namely of residence and choice and cannot be acquired in any other way. This is domicile itself and is deduced mainly from such reasons as to justify a sojourn of at least six months, e.g., the pursuit of studies, or even for an indefinite period, as in the case of domestics. Quasi-domicile is presumed, especially for marriage, after a month's sojourn according to the Constitution "Pacis abhinc annis" of Benedict XIV, 10 March, 1758; but this presumption yields to contrary proof, except however when it is transformed into a presumption juris de jure, which admits of no contrary proof; such is the case for the United States in virtue of the induct of 6 May, 1866, granted at the request of the Consistory of 1884 (Acta et Decreta, p. cix) and extended to the Diocese of Paris, 20 May, 1905. This being so, quasi-residents are regarded as subjects of the local authority just as are permanent residents, being therefore parishioners bound by local laws and possessing the same rights as residents, with this difference, that, if they so choose, they may go and use their rights in their own domicile. They can, therefore, apply to the local parish priest, as to their own parish priest, not only for those sacraments administered to every one who presents himself, e.g., Holy Eucharist and penance, but also for the baptism of their children, for first Communion, paschal Communion, Viaticum, and extreme unction. Their nuptials may also be solemnized in his presence and, except when they have chosen to be buried elsewhere, their funerals should take place from the parish church of their quasi-domicile. Finally, the quasi-domicile permits of their legitimate citation before a judge competent for the locality.

As regards marriage, the quasi-domicile affects its validity in parishes subject to the decree "Tametsi" until the decree "Ne temere" of 2 August, 1907, rendered the competency of the priest in some parishes extradiocesan, so that all marriages contracted in his presence, within his parochial territory, are valid; for a licit marriage, however, one of the two betrothed must have dwelt within the parish for at least a month.

On the other hand those who have neither a domicile nor a quasi-domicile in a parish are only there as transients (peregrini), are not counted as parishioners; the parish priest is not their pastor and they should respect the pastoral rights of their own parish priest at least in so far as possible. The restrictions of former times, it is true, have been greatly lessened and now are at present no obstacle to obtaining parochial rights for annual confession, paschal Communion or the Viaticum. Something, however, still remains: for marriage transients must ask the delegation or authorization of the parish priest of their domi-
The ducal (regularly of the bride) if the contracting parties have not already sojourned for a month within the parish where they seek to contract marriage; funerals also belong to the parish priest of the domicile, i.e. if the interested parties desire to, and can transport to his parish church the body of the deceased, in most events the parish priest may demand the parochial dues known as quarta funeraria. Generally speaking, transients (peregrini) are not subjects of the local ecclesiastical authority, they are not held to the observance of local laws except inasmuch as these affect public order, nor do they become subjects of the local justice, however.

As to the domicile requisite for ordination there are special rules formulated by Innocent XII, in his Constitution “Speculatorum”, 4 November, 1694. The candidate for orders depends upon a bishop, first by reason of his origin, that is to say, of the place where his father had a domicile at the time of his son's birth; second by reason of his own acquired domicile. But the conditions which this domicile must satisfy are rather severe: the candidate must have already resided in the diocese for ten years or else have transported most of his movable goods to a house in which he has resided for three years; moreover, he must firmly settle under oath his intention of definitively establishing himself in the diocese. This is a qualified domicile, the conditions of which must not be extended to other cases.

A. BOUDINON.

**DOMINIC**

Saint, founder of the Order of Preachers, commonly known as the Dominican Order; b. at Calaroga, in Old Castile, c. 1170; d. 6 August, 1221.

His parents, Felix Guzman and Joanna of Azu, undoubtedly belonged to the nobility of Spain, though probably neither was connected with the reigning house of Castile, as some of the saint's biographers assert. Of Felix Guzman, personally, little is known, except that he was in every sense the worthy head of a family of saints. To nobility of blood Joanna of Azu added a nobility of soul which so enshrined her in the private pantheon of the family that she was solemnly canonized by Leo XII. The example of such parents was not without its effect upon their children. Not only Saint Dominic but also his brothers, Antonio and Manes, were distinguished for their extraordinary sanctity. Antonio, the eldest, became a secular priest and, having distributed his patrimony to the poor, entered a hospital where he spent his life ministering to the sick. Manes, following in the footsteps of Dominic, became a Friar Preacher, and was beatified by Gregory XVI.

The birth and infancy of the saint were attended by many marvels forecasting his heroic sanctity and great achievements in the cause of religion. From his seventh to his fourteenth year he pursued his elementary studies under the tutelage of his maternal uncle, the archpriest of Gualdiaz, not far distant from Calaroga. In 1184 Saint Dominic entered the University of Palencia. Here he remained for ten years prosecuting his studies with such arduous and success that throughout the ephemeral existence of that institution he was held up to the admiration of his schoolmen as all that a student should be. Amid the frivolities and dissipations of a university city, the life of the future saint was characterized by a seriousness of purpose and an austerity of manner which singled him out as one from whom great things might be expected in the future. But more than once he proved that under this austere exterior he carried a heart as tender as a woman's. On one occasion he sold his books, annotated with his own hand, to retrieve the starving poor of Palencia. His biographer and contemporary, Bartholomew of Trent, states that twice he tried to sell himself into slavery to obtain money for the liberation of those who were held in servitude by the Moors. These facts are worthy of mention in view of the cruel and satirical attacks to which some non-Catholic writers have endeavored to foist upon one of the most charitable of men. Concerning the date of his ordination his biographers are silent; nor is there anything from which that date can be inferred with any degree of certainty. According to the deposition of Brother Stephen, a fellow of Lombardy, given in the process of canonization, Saint Dominic was still a student at Palencia when Don Martin de Bazan, the Bishop of Osma, called him to membership in the cathedral chapter for the purpose of assisting in its reform. The bishop realized the importance to his plan of reform of having constantly before his canons the example of one of Dominic's eminent holiness. Nor was he disappointed in the result. In recognition of the part he had taken in converting its members into canons regular, Dominic was appointed sub-prior of the reformed chapter. On the accession of Don Alonzo, brother of the Saint, to the chair of Osma in 1201, Dominic became superior of the chapter with the title of prior. As a canon of Osma, he spent nine years of his life hidden in God and rapt in contemplation, scarcely passing beyond the confines of the chapter house.

In 1203 Alfonso IX, King of Castile, deputed the Bishop of Osma to demand from the Lord of the Marches, presumably a Danish prince, the hand of his daughter on behalf of the king's son, Prince Ferdinand. For his companion on this embassy Don Diego chose Saint Dominic. Passing through Toulouse on the pursuit of their mission, they beheld with amazement and sorrow the work of spiritual ruin wrought by the Albigensian heresy. It was in the contemplation of this scene that Dominic first conceived the idea of founding an order for the purpose of combating heresy and spreading the light of the Gospel by preaching to the ends of the then known world. Their mission having ended successfully, Diego and Dominic were dispatched on a second embassy, accompanied by a splendid retinue, to escort the betrothed princess to Castile. This mission, however, was brought to a close by the death of the young woman in question. The two companions went where they would, and they set out for Rome, arriving there towards the end of 1204. The purpose of this journey was to enable Diego to resign his bishopric that he might devote himself to the conversion of unbelievers in distant lands. Innocent III, however, refused to approve this project, and instead sent the bishop and his companion to Languedoc to join forces with the Cistercians, to whom he had entrusted the crusade against the Albigensians. The scene that confronted them on their arrival in Languedoc was not one of encouraging one. The Cistercians, on account of their worldly manner of living, made little or no headway against the Albigensians. They had entered upon their work with considerable pomp, attended by a brilliant retinue, and well provided with the comforts of life. To this display of worldliness the leaders of the heretics opposed a rigid asceticism which commanded the respect and admiration of their followers. Diego and Dominic quickly saw that the failure of the Cistercian apostolate was due to the monks' indulgent habits, and finally prevailed upon them to adopt a more austere manner of life. The result was at once apparent in a greatly increased number of converts. Theological disputes played a prominent part in the propaganda of the heretics. Dominic and his companion, therefore, lost no time in engaging their opponents in this kind of theological exposition. Whenever the opportunity
offered, they accepted the gage of battle. The thorough training that the saint had received at Palencia now proved of inestimable value to him in his encounters with the heretics. Unable to refute his arguments or counteract the influence of his preaching, they protected the women of their country from the repeated insults and threats of physical violence. With Prouille for his head-quarters, he laboured by turns in Faujoux, Montpellier, Servian, Béziers, and Carcassonne. Early in his apostolate around Prouille the saint realized the necessity of an institution that would protect the women of that country from the influence of the heretics. Many of them had already embraced Albigenianism and were its most active propagandists. These women erected convents, to which the children of the Catholic nobility were often sent—for want of something better—to receive an education, and, in effect, if not on purpose, to be tainted with the spirit of heresy. It was needful, too, that women converted from heresy should be safeguarded against the evil influence of their own homes. To supply these deficiencies, Saint Dominic, with the permission of Foulques, Bishop of Toulouse, established a convent at Prouille in 1206. To this convent and afterwards to that of Saint Sixtus, at Rome, he gave the rule and constitutions which have ever since guided the nuns of the Second Order of Saint Dominic.

The year 1208 opens a new epoch in the eventful life of the founder. On 15 January of that year Pierre de Castelnau, one of the Catholic legates, was assassinated. This abominable crime precipitated the crusade under Simon de Montfort, which led to the temporary subjugation of the heretics. Saint Dominic participated in the stirring scenes that followed, but always on the side of heresy, wielding the arms of the spirit, while others wrought death and desolation with the sword. Some historians assert that during the sack of Béziers, Dominic appeared in the streets of that city, cross in hand, interceding for the lives of the women and children, the aged and the infirm. This testimony, however, is based on documents which Touron regards as certainly apocryphal. The testimony of the most reliable historians tends to prove that the saint was neither in the city nor in its vicinity when Béziers was sacked by the crusaders. We find him generally during this period following the Catholic army, reviving religion and reconciling the factions that had caused the retreat of the crusaders. In September, 1209, that Saint Dominic first came in contact with Simon de Montfort and formed with him that intimate friendship which was to last till the death of the brave crusader under the walls of Toulouse (23 June, 1218). We find him by the side of de Montfort at the siege of Lavaur in 1211, and again in 1212, at the capture of La Penne d'Ajen. In the latter part of 1212 he was at Pamiers labouring, at the invitation of de Montfort, for the restoration of religion and morality. Lastly, just before the battle of Muret, 12 September, 1213, the saint is again found in the council that preceded the battle. During the progress of the conflict, he knelt before the altar in the church of Saint-Jacques, praying for the triumph of the Catholic arms. So remarkable was the victory of the crusaders at Muret that Simon de Montfort regarded it as altogether miraculous, and piously attributed it to the prayers of Saint Dominic. In gratitude to God for this decisive victory, the crusader erected a chapel in the church of Saint-Jacques, which he dedicated, it is said, to Our Lady of the miracles wrought there. It would appear, therefore, that the devotion of the French (v. e.), which tradition says was revealed to Saint Dominic, had come into general use about this time. To this period, too, has been ascribed the foundation of the Inquisition by Saint Dominic, and his appointment as the first Inquisitor. As both these much controverted questions will receive special treatment elsewhere in this work, it will suffice for our present purpose to note that the Inquisition was in full operation in 1198, or seven years before the saint took part in the apostolate in Languedoc, and while in the region of the heretics there was for a certain time identified with the operations of the Inquisition, it was only in the capacity of a theologian passing upon the orthodoxy of the accused (see Inquisition, Spanish). Whatever influence he may have had with the judges of that much maligned institution was always employed on the side of mercy and forbearance, as witness the classic case of Ponce Roger.

In the meantime, the saint's increasing reputation for heroic sanctity, apostolic zeal, and profound learning caused him to be much sought after as a candidate for various bishoprics. Three distinct efforts were made to raise him to the episcopate. In July, 1212, the chapter of Béziers chose him for their bishop. Again, the canons of Saint-Lizier wished him to succeed Garcia de l'Orte as Bishop of Comminges. Lastly, in 1215 an effort was made by Garcias de l'Orte himself, who had been transferred from Comminges to Auch, to make him Bishop of Navarre. But Saint Dominic absolutely refused all episcopal honours, saying that he would rather take flight in the night, with nothing but his staff, than accept the episcopate. From Muret Dominic returned to Carcassonne, where he resumed his preaching and missionary success. It was not till 1214 that he returned to Toulouse. In the meantime the influence of his preaching and the eminent holiness of his life had drawn around him a little band of devoted disciples eager to follow wherever he might lead. Saint Dominic had never foreseen the great things that had been accomplished, and the order of the Rosary, which he had founded for his religious community, might have been absorbed. The order of the Rosary was canonically established in 1264. In the meantime the saint became the spiritual father of the community, and his influence extended over the whole world. The next year Pierre Seilla, a wealthy citizen of Toulouse, who had placed himself under the direction of Saint Dominic, put at their disposal his own commodious dwelling. In this way the first convent of the Order of Preachers was founded on 25 April, 1215. But they dwelt here only a year when Foulques established them in the church of Saint Romanus. Though the little community had proved amply the need of its mission and the efficiency of its service to the Church, it was far from satisfying the full purpose of its founder. It was at best but a diocesan congregation, and Saint Dominic had dreamed of a world-order that would carry its apostolate to the ends of the earth. But, unknown to the saint, events were shaping themselves for the realization of his hopes. In November, 1215, an ecumenical council was to meet at Rome to deliberate on the improvement of morals, the extinction of heresy, and the strengthening of the faith. This was certainly the mission Saint Dominic had determined on for his order. With the Bishop of Toulouse, he was present at the deliberations of this council. From the very first session it seemed that events conspired to bring to a conclusion plans to a success of the Rosary. The council not only arraigned the bishops for their neglect of preaching. In canons x they were directed to delegate capable men to preach the word of God to the people. Under these circumstances it would reasonably appear that Dominic's request for the confirmation of an order designed to carry out the mandates of the council would be joy-
fully granted. But while the council was anxious that these reforms should be put into effect as speedily as possible, it was at the same time opposed to the institution of any new religious orders, and had legislated to that effect in no uncertain terms. Moreover, papal bulls had always been looked upon as primarily a function of the episcopate. To bestow this office on an unknown and untried body of simple priests seemed too original and too bold in its conception to appeal to the conservative prelates who influenced the deliberations of the council. When, therefore, his petition for the approbation of his infant institute was refused, it could not have been wholly unexpected by Saint Dominic.

Returning to Languedoc at the close of the council in December, 1215, the founder gathered about him his little band of followers and informed them of the wish of the council that there should be no new rules for religious orders. Thereupon they adopted the ancient rule of Saint Augustine, which, on account of its generality, would easily lend itself to any form they might wish to give it. This done, Saint Dominic again appeared before the pope in the month of August, 1216, and again solicited the confirmation of his order. The pope, bending his ear and observation, gave his consent. December, 1216, the Bull of confirmation was issued.

Saint Dominic spent the following Lent preaching in various churches in Rome, and before the pope and the papal court. It was at this time that he received the order and title of Master of the Sacred Palace, or Pope's Tribunal, as it is called, by the pope. This office has been held uninterrupted by members of the order from the founder's time to the present day. On 15 August, 1217, he gathered the brethren about him at Prouille to deliberate on the affairs of the order. He had determined upon the heroic plan of distributing his little band of followers over all Europe. The result proved the wisdom of an act so wise, to the eye of human prudence at least, seemed little short of suicidal. To facilitate the spread of the order, Honorius III, on 11 Feb., 1218, addressed a Bull to all bishops, abbots, and priors requesting their favour on behalf of the Order of Preachers. By another Bull, dated 3 Dec., 1218, Honorius III bestowed upon the order the church of Saint Sixtus in Rome. Here, amid the tombs of the Appian Way, was founded the first monastery of the order in Rome. Shortly after taking possession of Saint Sixtus, at the invitation of Honorius, Saint Dominic began the somewhat difficult task of restoring the pristine observance of religious discipline among the various Roman communities of women. In a comparatively short time the work was accomplished, to the great satisfaction of the pope. His own career at the University of Palencia, and the practical use to which he had put it in his encounters with the Albigensians, as well as his keen appreciation of the needs of the time, convinced the saint that to ensure the highest efficiency in the work of the apostolate, his followers should be afforded the best educational advantages obtainable. It was for this reason that on the occasion of the dispersion of the brethren at Prouille he dispatched Matthew of France and two companions to Paris. A foundation was made in the vicinity of the University of Paris, and the friars took possession in October, 1217. Matthew of France was appointed superior and Michael de Fabra placed in charge of the studies with the title of Lecturer. On 6 August of the following year, Jean de Barastre, dean of Saint-Quentin and professor of theology, bestowed on the community the hospice of Saint-Jacques, which he had built for his own use. Having effected a footing at the University of Paris, Saint Dominic and his brethren, next determined upon a settlement at the University of Bologna. Bertrand of Garriga, who had been summoned from Paris, and John of Navarre, set out from Rome, with letters from Pope Honorius, to make the desired foundation. On their arrival at Bologna, the church of Santa Maria della Mascarella was placed at their disposal. So rapidly did the Roman community of Saint Sixtus grow that the need of more commodious quarters soon became urgent. Honorius, who seemed to delight in furthering the order and furthering its interests to the utmost of his power, met the emergency by bestowing on Saint Dominic the basilica of Santa Sabina.

Towards the end of 1218, having appointed Reginald of Orleans his vicar in Italy, the saint, accompanied by several of his brethren, set out for Spain. Bologna, Prouille, Toulouse, and Fanjeaux were visited on the way. From Prouille two of the brethren were sent to establish a convent at Lyons. Segovia was reached just before Christmas. In February of the following year he founded the first monastery of the order in Spain. Turning southward, he established a convent for women at Madrid, similar to the one at Prouille. It is quite probable that on this journey he personally presided over the erection of a convent in connexion with his alma mater, the University of Palencia. At the invitation of the Bishop of Barcelona, a house of the order was established in that city.

Again bending his steps towards Rome he recrossed the Pyrenees and visited the foundations at Toulouse and Paris. During his stay in the latter place he caused houses to be erected at Limoges, Metz, Reims, Poitiers, and Orleans, which in a short time became centres of Dominican activity. From Paris he sailed for Naples in 1219, and established his house at Sorrento. His arrival at the papal court was the signal for the showing of new favours on the order. Notable among these marks of esteem were many complimentary letters addressed by Honorius to all those who had assisted the Fathers in their various foundations. In March of this same year Honorius, through his representatives, bestowed upon the order the church of San Eustorgio in Milan. At the same time a foundation at Viterbo was authorized. On his return to Rome, towards the end of 1219, Dominic sent letters to all the convents anew, promising the first general council of the order, to be held at Bologna on the feast of the following Pentecost. Shortly before, Honorius III, by a special Brief, had conferred upon the founder the title of Master General, which till then he had held only by tacit consent. At the very first session of the chapter in the following spring the saint startled his brethren by offering his resignation as master general. It is needless to say the resignation was not accepted and the founder remained at the head of the institute till the end of his life.

Soon after the close of the chapter of Bologna, Honorius III addressed letters to the abbey of San Vittorio at Sillia, and to the prior of the convent of Saint Sabina at Aquila, ordering that several of their religious be deputed to begin, under the leadership of Saint Dominic, a preaching crusade in Lombardy, where heresy had developed alarming proportions. For some reason or other the plan of the pope was not carried out. The promised support failing, Dominic, with a little band of his own brethren, threw himself into the field, and, as the event proved, spent himself in an effort to bring back the heretics to their allegiance to the Church. It is said that 100,000 unbelievers were converted by the preaching and the miracles of the saint. According to Laënnec, Saint Dominic set down his preaching in Lombardy that the saint instituted the Militia of Jesus Christ, or the third order, as it is commonly called, consisting of men and women living in the world, to protect the rights and property of the
DOMINIC

Church. Towards the end of 1221 Saint Dominic returned to Rome for the sixth and last time. Here he received many new and valuable concessions for the order. In January, February, and March of 1221 three consecutive Bulls were issued commending the one and predating the Church. The thirtieth of May, 1221, found him again at Bologna presiding over the second general chapter of the order. At the close of the chapter he set out for Venice to visit Cardinal Ugolino, to whom he was especially indebted for many substantial acts of kindness. He had scarcely returned to Bologna when a fatal illness attacked him. He died after three weeks of illness, the third of which he bore with heroic patience. In a Bull dated at Spoleto, 13 July, 1234, Gregory IX made his cult obligatory throughout the Church.

The life of St. Dominic was one of tireless effort in the service of God. While he journeyed from place to place he prayed and preached almost uninteruptedly. His penances were of such a nature as to cause the brethren, who accidentally discovered them, to fear the effect upon his life. While his charity was boundless he never permitted it to interfere with the stern sense of duty that guided every action of his life. If he abominated the evil and labored against the exaltation of false and heretical tenets, he was far more moved by love for God and hatred of sin than those whom he laboured. He never failed to distinguish between sin and the sinner. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, if this athlete of Christ, who had conquered himself before attempting to conquer any else, was more than once chosen to show forth the power of God. The failure of the fire at Fanjeaux to consume the dissertation he had employed against the heretics, and which was thrice thrown into the flames; the raising to life of Napoleon Orsini; the appearance of the angels in the reign of Sixtus in response to his prayers, and but a few of the supernatural happenings by which God was pleased to attest the eminent holiness of His servant. We are not surprised, therefore, that, after signing the Bull of canonization on 13 July, 1234, Gregory IX declared that he no more doubted the saintliness of Saint Dominic than he did that of Saint Peter and Saint Paul.
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JOHN B. O’CONNOR.

DOMINICAL, Rule of Saint. See PREACHERS, ORDER OF.

DOMINICAL LETTER, a device adopted from the Romans by the old chroniclers to aid them in finding the day of the week corresponding to any given date, and indirectly to facilitate the adjustment of the "Proprium de Tempore" to the "Proprium Sanc- torum" when constructing the ecclesiastical calendar for any year. In the Church of movable and immovable feasts (see CALENDAR, CHRISTIAN), has from an early period taken upon herself, as a special charge to regulate the measure- ment of time. To secure uniformity in the observance of feasts and fasts, she began, even in the patris- tic age, to supply a computus, or system of reckoning, by which the relation of the solar and lunar years might be accommodated and the celebration of Easter determined. Naturally she adopted the astronomical methods then available, and these methods and the terminology belonging to them, having become tradi- tional, were perpetuated, almost as a matter of routine, after the reform of the calendar, in the prolegomena to the Breviary and Missal.

The Romans were accustomed to divide the year into nundinums, periods of eight days; and in their marble fasts, or calendars, of which numerous specimens of the first eight centuries are extant, the month was marked by a to denote the days of each which each period was composed. When the Eastern seven-day period, or week, was introduced, in the time of Augustus, the first seven letters of the alphabet were employed in the same way to indicate the days of this new division of time. In fact, fragmentary calendars on marble still survive in which both a cycle of eight letters—A to H—indicating nundinae, and a cycle of seven letters—A to G—indicating weeks, are used side by side (see "Corpus Inscriptionum Latinae", 2 nd ed., I, 220).

The same peculiarity occurs in the Philocalian Calen- der of A.D. 556, but this, as a calendar, is not attesta- ted by the Christians, and in their calendars the days of the month from 1 January to 31 December were marked with a continuous recurring cycle of seven letters: A, B, C, D, E, F, G. A was always set against 1 January, B against 2 January, C against 3 January, and so on. Thus F fell to 6 January, G to 7 January, A again recurred on 8 January, and also conse- quently, on 15 January, 22 January, and 29 January.

Continuing in this way, 30 January was marked with a B, 31 January with a C, and 1 February with a D. Supposing this to be carried through the ordinary year (i.e. not a leap year), it will be found that a D corresponds to 1 March, G to 1 April, B to 1 May, E to 1 June, G to 1 July, C to 1 August, F to 1 September, A to 1 October, D to 1 November, and F to 1 December—a result which Durandus recalled in the following dictum—

Alta Domat Dominus, Gratias Beata Equerentes Contemnit Ictos, Augebit Dona Fidei.

Now, as a moment’s reflection shows, if 1 January is a Sunday, all the days marked by A will also be Sundays; if 1 January is a Saturday, Sunday will fall on 2 January, which is the day after A. If a leap year, B will be Sundays; if 1 January is a Monday, then Sunday will not come until 7 January, a G, and all the days marked by G will be Sundays. This being explained, the Dominical Letter of any year is defined to be that letter of the cycle, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, which corresponds to the day upon which the first Sunday (and every subsequent Sunday) falls.

It is plain, however, that when leap year occurs, a complication is introduced. February has then twenty-nine days. According to the Anglican and civil calendars this extra day is added to the end of the month; according to the Catholic ecclesiastical calendar February 24 is counted twice. But in either case 1 March is then one day later in the week than 1 February, or, in other words, for the rest of the year the Sundays come a day earlier than they would in a common year. This is expressed by saying that the leap year has two Dominical Letters, the second being the letter which precedes that with which the year started. For example, 1 January, 1907, was a Tues- day; the first Sunday fell on 6 January, or an F. F was, therefore, the Dominical Letter for 1907. The first of January, 1908, was a Wednesday, the first Sun- day fell on 5 January, and E was the Dominical Let- ter, but as 1908 was leap year, its Sundays after Feb- ruary came a day sooner than in the normal year and were D's. The year 1908, therefore, had a double Dominical Letter, E-D. In 1909, 1 January is a Fri- day and the Dominical Letter is C. In 1910 and 1911,
I January falls respectively on Saturday and Sunday and the Dominical Letters are B and A.

This, of course, is all very simple, but the advantage of the device lies, like that of an algebraic expression, in its being a mere symbol adaptable to any year. By constructing a table of letters and days of the year, A always being set against 1 January, we can at once see the relation between the days of the week and the day of any month, if we know the Dominical Letter. This may always be found by the following rule of De Morgan's, which gives the Dominical Letter for any year, or the second Dominical Letter if it be leap year.

II. Take the quotient found by dividing the given year by 4 (neglecting the remainder).

III. Take 10 from the centesimal figures of the given year if that can be done.

IV. Take the quotient of III divided by 4 (neglecting the remainder).

V. From the sum of I, II, and IV, subtract the product III \times \frac{10}{4}.

VI. Find the remainder of V by 7: this is the number of the Dominical Letter, supposing A, B, C, D, E, F, G to be equivalent respectively to 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

For example, to find the Dominical Letter of the year 1913:

\(\begin{align*}
(I, I, IV) & = 1914 + 478 + 0 = 2392. \\
(II, III) & = 19 - 16 = 3. \\
(V) & = 2392 - 3 = 2389. \\
\text{remainder} & = 2.
\end{align*}\)

Therefore the Dominical Letter is E.

But the Dominical Letter had another very practical use in the days before the "Ordo divini officii recitandi" was printed annually and when, consequently, a priest had only to turn to the "Ordo" for himself (see Ducange, Criticon). As will be seen in the articles Easter and Easter Controversy, Easter Sunday may be as early as 22 March or as late as 25 April, and there are consequently thirty-five possible days on which it may fall. It is also evident that each Dominical Letter allows five possible dates for Easter Sunday. Thus in a year whose Dominical Letter is A (i.e. when 1 January is a Sunday), Easter must be either on 26 March, 2 April, 9 April, 16 April, or 23 April, for these are all the Sundays within the defined limits. But according as Easter falls on one or another of these Sundays we shall get a different calendar, and hence there are five possible calendars for years whose Dominical Letter is A. Similarly, there are five possible calendars for years whose Dominical Letter is B, five for C, and so on, thirty-five possible combinations in all. Now, advantage was taken of this principle in the arrangement of the old Pye or directorium which preceded our present "Ordo". The thirty-five possible calendars were all included therein and numbered, respectively, primum A, secundum A, tertium A, etc.; primum B, secundum B, etc. Hence for anyone wishing to use the Pye the first thing to determine was the Dominical Letter of the given year, and then he could use the means of the Golden Number or the Epact, and by the aid of a simple table, to find which of the five possible calendars assigned to that Dominical Letter belonged to the year in question. Such a table as that just referred to, but adapted to the reformed calendar and in more convenient shape, will be found at the beginning of every Brevarian and Missal under the heading, "Tabula Paschalis nova reformata."

The Dominical Letter does not seem to have been familiar to Bede in his "De Temporum Ratione", but in its place he adopts a similar device of seven numbers which calls "cancelaciones" (De Temp. Rat., cap. iii). This was of Greek origin. The Concurrents are numbers denoting the day of the week on which 21 March falls in the successive years of the solar cycle, 1 standing for Sunday, 2 (feria secunda) for Monday,
and about the Hayna River, as well as the remarkable salubrity of the country of the Ozamas, on the south coast, Isabella, which had been found unhealthy, was abandoned. At the mouth of the Ozama River and on its left bank, Bartolomé Colón began the settlement of New Isabella, which was not long afterwards replaced by San Domingo, on the opposite bank. Thus, the present capital of the Dominican Republic, they gradually spread over the eastern end of Hispaniola, creating a claim of occupation which Spain recognized in the Treaty of Ryswick (1697). It was in April, 1655, that an English force, conveyed thither on the fleet commanded by Admiral Penn, was driven ashore, after effecting a landing about thirty miles west of the capital. The natural resources of Hispaniola still enriched Spain, and the mint at Concepción de la Vega continued to coin gold from the Hayna. After the Peace of Ryswick, Hispaniola might almost have been forgotten if an English cabinet-maker had not (about the year 1760) discovered the value of mahogany. The demand, at first created by a shipment from Jamaica, was largely supplied by the Spanish island.

The French Revolution reacted upon Hispaniola. The whites and mulattos of San Domingo, under Spanish leaders, attempted to restore the old regime in the French colony, but in 1795 all Hispaniola was ceded to France. The Spanish authorities transferred San Domingo to the representative of the French Republic, who was the mulatto General Toussaint L’Ouverture. Until the Treaty of Paris (1814) the French whites, the white and coloured partisans of Spain, the blacks of Haiti, and, now and then, a British expeditionary force fought for supremacy in San Domingo. The treacherous capture of L’Ouverture and his mysterious death in prison at Besançon, in 1803, were followed by a general massacre of the whites in Haiti in March, 1804. The Haitian blacks now compelled the submission of San Domingo to the authority of their first president, Dessalines. At last, in 1814, the Treaty of Paris restored to Spain her oldest possession in the New World.

Actual Conditions.—Out of the political chaos, which had lasted for more than half a century, arose the present Dominican Republic. Its constitution was proclaimed 18 November, 1844, and its first president was Pedro Santana; it was recognized by France in 1848, and by Great Britain in 1850. An attempt to restore Spanish rule, in 1861, in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine, ended with a final Spanish evacuation in 1865. In 1897 the foreign debt of the republic had reached the amount of more than $21,000,000; the interest on which was supposed to be secured by customs receipts; following a default of interest (1 April, 1899), the Government of the United States interfered to obtain an equitable settlement, and its efforts led to the convention of 1905 (ratified 1907), by which an agent, always a citizen of the United States, is to be permanently empowered to act as general receiver of the Dominican customs in the interest of the foreign bondholders. Since 9 June, 1905, all lands owned by the Dominican Government have been open for settlement, free for ten years, and after that at a rent of 5 cents per acre. Although there can be little doubt that the national resources of the republic still include large quantities of gold, silver, and copper ore,
and even iron, the actual products are only vegetable sugar (183,734 acres under cultivation in 1906); tobacco (nearly 15,000,000 lbs. of leaf exported annually); coffee. The actual timber output is insignificant. In 1905 the total length of railroad was 112 miles.

The constitution of the Dominican Republic is said to be modelled on that of Venezuela; the president, elected for four years, is assisted by a council of ministers, the legislature is a single chamber elected by popular vote in twenty-four departments. The supreme court of the republic (a president and four judges) is appointed by the national congress, its "minister fiscal", however, being appointed by the chief executive; for courts of first instance, the republic is divided into eleven judicial districts, each presided over by an alcalde. By the terms of the constitution education is gratuitous and compulsory.

The ancient city of San Domingo (population, 16,000) is still the seat of the civil government, as well as that of the archbishop, who, however, no longer has any suffragans. The relations between Church and State are (1908) very cordial. The constitution of the Republic, in which religious liberty is an article, guarantees to the Church freedom of action, which, nevertheless, is curtailed by the law providing that the civil solemnization of marriages must precede the canonical. The municipal cemeteries are consecrated in accordance with the Church's requirements, though in some important centres of population there are non-Catholic cemeteries besides. In the Dominican Republic (with which the Archdiocese of San Domingo is coextensive) there are 600,000 Catholics, upwards of 1000 Protestants, and very few Jews, while the Masonic lodges number about thirteen. The total number of parishes is 56, each with its own church, in addition to which there are 13 chapels and 82 mission stations. The (ecclesiastical) Conciliar seminary, at the capital, is under the care of the Eudist Fathers (Congregation of Jesus and Mary), who also administer the cathedral parish. Another college under ecclesiastical control is that of San Sebastian in La Vega. A diocesan congregation of religious women numbers 30 members, distributed among four houses; these sisters, who have charge of a hospital, care for orphan children and the infirm aged.

Kem, San Domingo (Philadelphia, 1870; Hazan, Santo Domingo, Past and Present (New York, 1872); Del Monte y Trianda, Historia de S. Domingo (Madrid, 1890); Morey, Diccionario, s. v. Dominico. Schomburgk, Notes on S. Domingo in Proceedings of British Association, 1851; Sartori, P., E. MacPherson.

**Dominicans.** See **Preachers, Order of.**

**Dominici, Giovanni, Blessed (Banchini or Baccini was his family name), Cardinal, statesman, and writer, b. at Florence, 1536; d. at Buda, 10 July, 1620.** He entered the Dominican Order at Santa Maria Novella in 1572; after having been cured through the intercession of St. Catherine of Siena, of an impediment of speech for which he had been refused admission to the order two years before. On his return from Paris, where he completed his theological studies, he laboured as professor and preacher for twelve years at Venice. With the sanction of the master general, Blessed Raymond of Capua, he established convents of strict observance of his order at Venice (1391) and Fiesole (1406), and founded the convent of Corpus Christi at Venice for the Dominican Nuns. He was also the author of a history of Venice to the close of 1406 in which Gregory XII was elected; the following year the pope, whose confessor and counsellor he was, appointed him Archbishop of Ragusa, created him cardinal in 1408 and sent him as ambassador to Hungary, to secure the adhesion of Sigismund to the pope. At the Council Constance Dominici read the voluntary resignation which Gregory XII had adopted, on his advice, as the surest means of ending the schism. Martin V appointed him legate to Bohemia on 19 July, 1418, but he accomplished little with the followers of Hus, owing to the smallness of the Venetian embassy. He was declared blessed by Gregory XVI in 1832 and his feast is observed 1 October. Dominici was not only a prolific writer on spiritual subjects but also a graceful poet, as his many vernacular hymns, or Laudi, show. His Regola del governo di cura familiare, written between 1401 and 1406, is a valuable pedagogical work (edited by Salvi, Florence, 1890) which treats, in four books, of the faculties of the soul, the powers and senses of the body, the uses of earthly goods, and the education of children. This last book has been translated into German by Rosler (Herder's Bibliothek der Katholischen Pädagogik, VII, Freiburg, 1894). His work, Cuncta Notetis (see Echard, O. P., Lebenslauf des Texte in the fifteenth century with an introduction, Paris, 1908) in reply to a letter of Nicola di Piero Salutati, is the most important treatise of that day on the study of the pagan authors. Dominici does not flitly commend classical studies, but strenuously opposes the paganizing humanism of the day. See Thomas of Aquino.

**Dominic Loricatus, Saint.** See Fonte Avellana.

**Dominic of Jesus-Mary, Venerable.** See Thomas of Jesus.

**Dominic of M Angusaki, Blessed.** See Martyrs of Japan.

**Dominic of Prussia, a Carthusian monk and ascetical writer, b. in Poland, 1382; d. at the monastery of St. Alban near Trier, 1461.** According to the account he wrote of himself his first teacher was the parish priest, a pious Dominic; later he was a student at the University of Cracow where he was noted for his intelligence. Falling into bad habits he led a vagabond life until twenty-five years of age, when he remedied through the influence of Adolf of Essen, prior of the Carthusian monastery of St. Alban, near Trier. Dominic now became a Carthusian, entered the monastery in 1409. His monastic life was one of severe penance and religious fervour. The spiritual favours he received were numerous, and many visions are ascribed to him. Among the positions he filled were those of master of novices at Mainz and of the monastery of St. Alban, where he died. As an author he composed seventeen treatises, which have been preserved in various libraries. In the "Libri duo experimentalum" he relates the events of his own life; the "Tractus de Contemptu mundi", "Remedium tentationum", "De vera obedientia", and "Sonus epithalami" he prepared during his solitary retreats. A further work is his "Letters of Direction".

Dominic of Prussia is frequently mentioned in the
discussions as to the origin of the Rosary, and what has been improperly called "the Carthusian Rosary" is ascribed to him. To the one hundred and fifty Ave Marias which in those days formed the "Psalter of Mary" he had the thought of adding meditations on the life of Our Lord, and of Jesus Mother. And in his time the Ave Maria terminated with the words: "Fructus ventris tui, Jesus", he joined to each a sentence to recall to mind the mystery, such as "quem Angelo nuntiante de Sancto Spiritu concepisti", "quae concepto, in montana ad Elisabeth ivisti", etc. Both Dominic and his friend Adam sought to spread the use of the Rosary in the Carthusian Order, and among the laity. For these reasons it is held by some authors that the "Psalter" of Dominic was the form, or one of the original forms, from which the present Rosary developed.


AMBROSE MOGUEL.

Dominic of the Mother of God (called in secular life DOMENICO BARBERI), a member of the Passionist Congregation and theologian, b. near Viterbo, Italy, 22 June, 1792; d. near Reading, England, 27 August, 1849. His parents were peasants and died while Dominic was still a small boy. There were six children, and Dominic, the youngest child, was adopted by his maternal uncle, Bartolomeo Paeci. As a boy he was employed to take care of sheep, and when he grew older he did farm work. He was taught his letters by a kind Capuchin priest, and learned to read from a country lad of his own age; although he read all the books he could obtain, he had no regular education until he entered the Congregation of the Passion. He was deeply religious from childhood, felt himself distinctly called to join the institute he entered, and believed that God, by a special manifestation, had told him that he was destined to announce the Gospel truth and to bring back stray sheep to the way of salvation.

He was received into the Congregation of the Passion in 1814, and ordained priest, 1 March, 1818. After completing the regular course of studies, he taught philosophy and theology to the students of the congregation asector for a period of ten years. He then taught in Italy the offices of rector, provincial consultant, and provincial, and fulfilled the duties of these positions with ability. At the same time he constantly gave missions and retreats. He founded the first Passionist Retreat in Belgium at Ere near Tournai in 1840; in 1842, after twenty-eight years of effort, he established the Passionists in England, at Aston Hall, Staffordshire. During the seven years of his missionary life in England he established three houses of the congregation. He died at a small railway station near Reading and was buried under the high altar of St. Anne's Retreat. Among the notable converts whom he received into the Church may be mentioned John Dobree Dalgarno, John Henry Newman, and Newman's two companions, E. S. Bowles and Richard Stanton, all of whom were afterwards distinguished Oratorians. The reception in 1845 of Newman and his friends marked perhaps the greatest happiness of his life. In 1846 Father Dominic received the Hon. George Spencer, in religion Father Ignatius of St. Paul, into the Congregation of the Passion.

Among Father Dominic's works are: courses of philosophy and moral theology, a volume on the Passions of Our Lord; a work on the Sorrows of the Blessed Virgin, "Divina Parainfisa"; a refutation of de Lamennais; three series of sermons; various controversial and ascetical works. In 1841 he addressed a Latin letter to the professors of Oxford in which he answered the objections and explained the difficulties of Anglicans. An English translation of the letter is given in the appendix to the life of Father Dominic by Father Pius Devine.

De la Vie de l'Abbe Domenico, par PADRE FILIPPO (1860); LUCCA DI SAN GIUSEPPE (Genoa, 1873); English, by PATE DE VINE (London, 1886); CAMM, Father Dominic and the Conversion of England in Catholic Truth Society publications (1890); further Father Dominic's letters and correspondence concerning his mission to England are published as a supplement to the 3d vol. of the Oratorian life of St. Paul of the Cross (London, 1858).

ARTHUR DEVINE.

Dominus, MANCO ANTONIO DE, a Dalmatian ecclesiastic, apostate, and man of science, b. on the island of Arbo, off the coast of Dalmatia, in 1596; d. in the Castle of Sant' Angelo, Rome, September, 1624. Educated at the Illyrian College at Loreto and at the University of Padua, he entered the Society of Jesus and taught mathematics, logic, and rhetoric at Padua and Brescia. In 1596, when the Jesuits wrote, he was, through imperial influence, appointed Bishop of Zengg (Segna, Seng) and Modrus in Dalmatia (Aug., 1600), and transferred (Nov., 1602) to the archiepiscopal See of Spalato. He sided with Venice, in whose territory his see was situated, during the quarrel between the Paul V and the Emperor. That fact, combined with a correspondence with Fra Paolo Sarpi and conflicts with his clergy and fellow-bishops which culminated in the loss of an important financial case in the Roman Curia, led to the resignation of his office in favour of a relative and his retirement to Venice. Threatened by the Inquisition he prepared to apostatize, entered into communication with the English ambassador to Venice, Sir Henry Wotton, and having been assured of a welcome, left for England in 1616. On his way there, he published at Heidelberg an attack on Rome: "Briegge del Cristiano naufragio", afterwards reprinted in England. He was received with open arms by James I, who quartered him upon Archbishop Abbot of Canterbury, called on the other bishops to pay him a pension, and granted him precedence after the Archbishops of Canterbury and of York. By the Jesuits, he wrote a number of anti-Roman sermons, published his often reprinted chief work, "De Republica Ecclesiastica contra Primatum Papae" (Vol. I, 1617; vol. II, 1620, London; Vol. III, 1622, Hanover), and took part, as assistant, in the consecration of George Montaigne as Bishop of London, 14 Dec., 1617, and the same year, James I made him Dean of Windsor and granted him the Mastership of the Savoy.

In 1619 De Dominus published in London the first edition of Fra Paolo Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent"; the work appeared in Italian, with an antit Roman title page and letter dedicatory to James I. His vanity, avarice, and irascibility, however, soon lost him his English friends; the projected Spanish marriage of Prince Charles made him anxious about the security of his position in England, and the election of Gregory XV (9 Feb., 1621) finished him with his hopes, he returned to Rome, 1622. Eventually he was allowed to depart, but his chest of hoarded money were seized by the king's men, and only restored in response to a piteous personal appeal to the king. Once out of England his attacks upon the English Church were as violent as had been those on the See of Rome, and in "Sui Reditus ex Anglia Consilium" (Paris, 1623) he repeated all he had written in his "Contra Profesiones" (London, 1616), declaring that he had deliberately lied in all that he had said against Rome. After a stay of six months in Brussels, he proceeded to Rome, where he lived on a pension assigned him by the
pope. On the death of Gregory XV (8 July, 1623) the pension ceased, and irritation loosened his tongue. Coming into conflict with the Inquisition, he was declared a relapsed heretic, was confined to the Castle of Sant’ Angelo, and there died a natural death. His cause, however, continued after his death, his heresy declared manifest, and his body burned together with his works on 21 Dec., 1624.

In 1711 he published, at Venice, a scientific work entitled: ‘Tractatus de radiis visus et lucis in vitris, perspectivis et iride’, in which, according to Newton, he was the first to develop the theory of the rainbow, by his attention to the fact that in each rainbow the light undergoes two refractions and an immediate reflection. His claim to that distinction is, however, disputed in favour of Descartes.


Edward Myers.

Dominus ac Redemptor. See Society of Jesus.

Domitian, Titus Flavius Domitians, Roman emperor and persecutor of the Church, son of Vespasian and younger brother and successor of Titus; b. 21 Oct., A.D. 51, and reigned from 81 to 96. In spite of his private vices he set himself up as a reformer of morals and religion. He was the first of the emperors to derive from his lifetime by assuming the title of “Lord and God”. After the revolt of Saturninus (95) he organized a series of bloodythirsty proscriptions against all the wealthy and noble families. A conspiracy, in which his wife joined, was formed against him, and he was murdered, 18 Sept., 96.

When the acts of Nero’s reign were reversed after his death, an exception was made to the persecution of the Christians (Tertullian, Ad Nat., I, 7). The Jewish revolt brought upon them fresh unpopularity, and the subsequent destruction of the Holy City deprived them of the last shreds of protection afforded them by being confounded with the Jews. Hence Domitian, in his attack upon the aristocratic party found little difficulty in condemning such as were Christians. To observe Jewish practices was no longer lawful; to reject the national religion, without being able to plead the excuse of being a Jew, was atheism. On one count or the other, as Jews or as atheists, the Christians were liable to punishment. Amongst these martyrs in this second persecution were Domitian’s cousin, Flavius Clemens, the consul, and M. Acilius Glabrio who had also been consul. Flavia Domitilla, the wife of Flavius, was banished to Pandataria. But the persecution was not confined to such noble victims. We read of many others who suffered death or the loss of their goods (Dio Cassius, LXVII, iv). The book of the Apocalypse was written in the midst of this storm, when many of the Christians had already perished and more were to follow them (St. Irenaeus,

The text is a continuation of information about Domitian, focusing on his reign as an emperor, the persecution of Christians, and the historical context of the time. It also mentions the writing of the Apocalypse during this period.
DOMITILLA

Adv. Hares., V, xxx.). Rome, "the great Babylon","was drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus" (Apoc., xvi, 5, 6; ii, 10, 13; vi, 11; xiii, 15; xx, 4). It would seem that participation in the feasts held in honour of the divinity of Christ was made the test for the Christians of the East. Those who did not adore the "image of the beast" were slain. The writer joins to his sharp denunciation of the persecutors' words of encouragement for the faithful by foretelling the downfall of the great harlot "who made drunk the earth with the wine of her whoredom", and steeped her robe in their blood. St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians was also written about this time; here, while the terrible trials of the Christians are spoken of, we do not find the same denunciation of the persecutors. The Roman Church continued loyal to the empire, and sent up its prayers to God that He would direct the rulers and magnates in the exercise of the power committed to their hands ( Clem., Ep. ad Cor., i; cxi; cf. St. Paul, Rom., xiii, 1; I Pet., ii, 13). Before the end of his reign Domitian ceased to persecute. (See PERSECUTIONS.)


T. B. SCANNELL.

DOMITIOPOLIS, a titular see of Lusia in Asia Minor. The former name of this city is unknown; it was called Domitioopolis or Dometiopolis after L. Domitius Athenobarbus (Ramsay, in Revue numismatique, 1894, 168 sqq.). Ptolemy (V, vi) places it in Cilicia, according to Constantine Porphyrogennetos (De themat., i, 15) it was one of the ten cities of the Lusorian Decapolis (cf. Georgius Cyprius, ed. Gelzer, S2). It figures in Parthey's "Notitiae episcopatum", I and III, and in Gelzer's "Nova Tactea", 1618, as a suffragan of Seleucia. Leqquen (Oriens christ., ii, 162) mentions five bishops, from 451 to 579. Domitiopolis is to-day Dindebol, a village on the Ermenek Su, in the vilayet of Adana (cf. Sterrett, in Papers of the American School, Athens, III, 80).

S. PETRIDES.

DOMNUS, Pope. See DONUS.

DOMNUS APOLSTOLICUS (DOMINUS APOLSTOLICUS), a title applied to the pope, which was in most frequent use between the sixth and the eleventh centuries. The pope is styled Apostolicus because he occupies an Apostolic see, that is, one founded by an Apostle, as were those of Ephesus, Philippi, Corinth, etc. (cf. Terentiian, De prescript., xxxvi). Rome being the only Apostolic Church of the West, Series apostolica meant simply the Roman See, and Domnus Apostolico the Bishop of Rome. In Gaul, however, as early as the fifth century the expression series apostolica was applied to any episcopal see, bishopship being successor of the Apostles (cf. Sidonius Apollinaris, Epv., lib. VI, i, etc.). By the sixth century the term was in general use, and many letters from the Merovingian kings are addressed Domnus sanctis et apostolico sedis dignissimis. Thus the bishops of Gaul were given the title of Domnus Apostolico (cf. Venantius Fortunatus, "Vita S. Mart."); IV; "Formulae Marculii", II, xxxix, xlix, xlix). Many examples are also found in wills and deeds (e.g. P. L., LXXX, 1281, 1314, etc.) and one occurs in a letter of introduction given by Charlemagne to St. Boniface (Epp. Boniface, xi). However, in the Acts of Charlemagne the councils held during this time, even outside the Frankish Empire, as in England, the term Domnus Apostolico, in its exact usage, meant simply the pope. Perhaps the only example of it found in Greek authors is in the second letter of Theodore the Studite to Leo III, ενω τον επισκόπων. Long before this, however, the word Apostolicus alone had been employed to designate the pope. Probably the earliest example is in the list of popes compiled at the time of Pope Vigilus (d. 555), which begins "Incipit nomina Apostoliceorum" (P.L., LXXXVIII, 1405). The expression recurs frequently in documents of the Carolingian kings, as well as in Anglo-Saxon writings. Clude of Turin gives a curious explanation—Apostolicus. At the Council of Reims held in 1019 the Bishop of Compostella was excommunicated "quia contra fas abhí vendicaret culmen apostolici nominis" (because he wrongly claimed for himself the prestige of the Apostolic name), thinking himself the successor of St. James the Greater, and it was therefore laid down "quod solus Romanus Pontifex universalis Ecclesiae Primas esset et Apostolico" (that only the pontiff of the Roman See was primate of the universal Church and Apostolicus). To-day the title is found only in the Litany of the Saints. There are also the expressions apostolicius (pontificate) and the ablative absolute apostolivente (during the pontificate of). It is to be noted that in ecclesiastical usage the abbreviated form dominus signifies a human ruler as against Domnus, the Divine Lord. Thus at meals monastic grace was asked from the superior in the phrase Jibe Domnus benefideare, i.e.: "Be pleased sir to give the blessing."


DONAHOE, PATRICK, publisher, b. at Munnery, County Cavan, Ireland, 17 March, 1811; d. at Boston, U. S. A., 18 March, 1901. He emigrated to Boston when ten years of age with his parents, and at fourteen was apprenticed to a printer. He worked on "The Jesuit" when that paper was started by Bishop Fenwick in 1832, and after the bishop relinquished its ownership, he carried it on for some time with H. L. Devereaux under the new title of "The Literary and Catholic Sentinel". In 1836 he began the publication of "The Pilot", a weekly paper devoted to Irish American and Catholic interests, which in succeeding years became the organ of Catholic opinion in New England, and had a widespread circulation all over the United States. He established in connexion with it a publishing and book-selling house from which were issued a large number of Catholic books. Later he organized a bank. All his ventures proved successful and the wealth he acquired was generously given to advance Catholic interests. The great Boston fire of 1872 destroyed his publishing plant. Another fire the following year and injudicious loans to friends made him lose so much more that his bank failed in 1876. Archbishop Williams purchased "The Pilot" to help to pay the depositors of the bank, and Mr. Donahoe then started a monthly "Donahoe's Magazine" and an exchange and passenger agency. In 1881 he was able to buy back "The Pilot" and devoted his remaining years to its management. During the Civil War he actively interested himself in the organization of the Irish regiments that volunteered from New England. In 1893 the University of Notre Dame gave him the64 Culture Medal for signal services to American Catholic progress.

Pilot (Boston), 23 March, 1901 and files; LEAHY, Hist. Cath. Ch. in New England States (Boston, 1890), 1; DONAHOE'S MONTHLY, edited by THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

DONAHUE, PATRICK JAMES. See WHEELING.

DONATELLO (DONATO DI NICOLÒ DI BETTO BARDI), one of the great Tuscan sculptors of the Renaissance, b. at Florence, c. 1396; d. there, 13 Dec., 1466. He was the son of Niccolò di Betto Bardi, and was early apprenticed to a goldsmith to learn design. At the age of seventeen he accompanied his friend Brunellesco to Rome, and the two youths devoted themselves to drawing and to making excavations in their pursuit of the antique. Half the week they spent chiselling
for a livelihood. Brunellesco's occupation was architecture; Donatello, though understanding the interrelation of the two arts, always, whether in conjunction with Brunellesco or, as later, with Michelozzo, made sculpture paramount. It is hard to place his work chronologically. While still a mere boy, he contributed an equestrian statue of Cosimo de' Medici in Florence. On his return from Rome to Florence he was engaged for years on the statues for Giotto's belfry and the buildings then in progress. For the Campanile he did "The Baptist", "Jeremias", "Habakkuk", a group representing Abraham and Isaac, and the famous "David" called the "Zuccone" (Baldinucci states that the sculpture is said to have himself cried to it, "Why don't you speak?"; for the Duomo, "St. John the Evangelist" and "The Singing-gallery"; for Or San Michele, "St. Peter" and "St. Mark", and the "St. George", which he executed at the order of the Guild of Armourers—Donatello's most ideal and perfect work. The socle-relief of "St. George and the Dragon and the King of Cappadocia's Daughter" is absolutely Greek in simplicity and plastic beauty. Other fine reliefs are the bronze doors for the sacristy of San Lorenzo; the medallions for the ceiling; and the "Annunciation" in the same church, with its noble figure of the Blessed Virgin and the angels. In the Loggia de' Lanzi is the somewhat ill-proportioned group of "Judith and Holophernes". The marble "David" in the Bargello, uniting the delicacy of the adolescent "Baptist" of Casa Martelli with a classic fashion of wreath-bound hair, seems a link between two of the phases in Donatello's development. Pure Renaissance and yet conceived in the antique spirit are the "Amorino" (Cupid) and the bronze "David" of the National Museum, Florence. Both are instinct with life and the potent vitality of youth, jubilant or contained. Pope John XXIII, a personal friend of the sculptor, died in Florence, 1419. Donatello made his tomb, a recumbent portrait-statue in the baptistery. In the Duomo of Siena he performed the same office for Bishop Pecchi. In Siena also he made several rare statuettes and reliefs for the christening-fount of San Giovanni. At Prato, for the open-air pulpit of the Duomo, he carved the casement with groups of playing children (putti). He is believed to have been in Rome again in 1433. A tabernacle of the Blessed Virgin in St. Peter's is said to be by Donatello, and also the tombstone of Giovanni Crivelli in Santa Maria in Ara Coeli. In 1443 he went to Padua to see the choir-galery, and remained there for ten years. First he carved his "Christ on the Cross", the head a marvel of workmanship and expression; then statuettes of the Blessed Virgin, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Anthony, and other saints; also a long series of reliefs for the high altar. While in Padua Donatello was commissioned to make a monument to the Venetian Condottiere (General) Gattamelata (Erasmio de' Narni), and he blocked out the first great equestrian statue since classic times. The last known statue of Donatello is "St. Louis of Toulouse" in the inns near Santa Croce.

Donatello became bedridden in his latter years, and some of his works were completed by his pupils. Piero de' Medici provided for him. Donatello had always been lavish with his fellow-workers and assistants, and took no thought for himself. His character, above all, this head he enjoyed certain privileges; thus, even before the traditio, or investiture, or handing over, of a donation to a church or a religious institution, the latter acquired real rights to the same (L. 23, C. De sacrosanctis ecclesiis, I. 2). Moreover, the inqnonatio or declaration of the gift before the public authority was required only for donations equivalent in value to 500 solidi (near twenty-six hundred dollars American); it was extended to all donations (L. 34, 36, C. De donationibus, VIII, 53). Finally, bishops, priests, and deacons yet under parental power were allowed to dis-
pose freely, even in favour of the Church, of property acquired by them after ordination [L. 33 (64) C. De episcopis et clericis, I, 3]. The Franks, long quite unaccustomed to dispose of their property by will, were on the other hand generous in donations, especially post mortem, similar to the Roman law in donations in view of death but carrying with them the renunciation on the donor's part of his right of revocation; other Frankish donations to the Church reserved the usufruct. The institution known as preavis ecclesiastica was quite favourable to the granting of donations. At the request of the donor the Church granted him the right of the donation subject for five years, for his life, or even a use transferable to the heirs of the first occupant. Synods of this epoch assert to some extent the validity of pious donations even when the legal requisites had not been observed, though as a rule they were not omitted. Generally speaking, the consent of the civil authority (princeps) was not indispensable for the acquisition of property by religious corporations. The restrictions known as the "right of amortization" (see Mortmain) are of later date, and are the outcome of theories elaborated in the Middle Ages but carried to their logical issue in the modern civil legislation (of Continental countries) concerning biens de mainmorte, or property held by inalienable tenure, i. e. the property of religious corporations, they being perpetual. The Church does not accept such legislation; nevertheless the faithful may act accordingly in order to secure to their donations the protection of the law.

**CANONICAL LEGISLATION.**—Donations are valid and obligatory when made by persons capable of disposing of their property and accepted by the administrators of ecclesiastical institutions. No other formality is required, neither notarial act nor authorization of the civil power. The declaration before the public authority, required by Roman law, is not obligatory in canon law. Nor are the faithful obliged to heed the restrictions which are placed by some modern civil codes in the way of a free disposition of their property. On the other hand the donation must be accepted by the donee; it is not true, as some have maintained, that every donation for works of religion (ad pecus cousae) implies a vow, i. e. an act in itself obligatory independent of the acceptance of the donee. If the administrators of an ecclesiastical institution refuse to accept a donation, that institution can always obtain in law a restitution in integrum, whereby it is again put in a condition to accept the refused donation. The canonical motives for the revocation or diminution of a donation are the birth of children to the donor and the donatio inofficiosa, or excessive generosity on the latter's part, whereby he diminishes the share of inheritance that legitimately belongs to his children. In both cases, however, the donation is valid in canon law to the degree in which it respects the legitimate share of the donor's children. It is worthy of note that while ecclesiastical and religious establishments may give alms, they are bound in the matter of genuine donations by the provisions of canon law concerning the alienation of ecclesiastical property.

**CIVIL LEGISLATION.**—In most European countries the civil authority restricts in three ways the right of the Church to accept donations: (1) by imposing the forms and conditions that the civil codes prescribe for donations; (2) by reserving to itself the right of saying what institutions shall have civil personality and be thereby authorized to acquire property; (3) by accepting the approval of the civil authority, at least for important donations. Austria recognizes a juridical personality not on the grounds which are charged with the maintenance of public worship, but also, through easily granted approval, in religious associations of any kind. The so-called amortization laws (against the traditional inalienability of tenure on the part of religious corporations) have so far remained only a threat, though the Government reserves the right to establish such legislation. Religious communities, however, are required to make known to the civil authorities all their acquisitions of property. In Germany, even after the promulgation of the Civil Code (1896), the legislation varies from State to State. In all, however, property rights are recognized by the law in only those ecclesiastical institutions that are recognized by the State. As a rule, donations must be authorized by the civil power if they exceed the value of five thousand Marks (1250 pounds sterling) though in some states this figure is doubled. In Prussia civil authorization is requisite for all acquisition of real property by a diocese, a chapter, or any ecclesiastical institution. In Italy every donation must be approved by the civil authority, and only the institutions recognized by the State are allowed to acquire property; note, however, that simple benefices (see Benefice) and religious orders cannot acquire this latter privilege. With few exceptions, ecclesiastical institutions in Italy are not allowed to invest in any other form of property than Government securities and the local civil institutions or worship-associations, are recognized by the State as civil entities for the conduct of public worship; it is well known, however, that Pius X forbade the Catholics of France to form such associations. That country, it is true, recognizes the civil personality of licit associations organized for a non-lucrative purpose, but declares illicit every religious congregation not approved by a special law. At the same time, it refuses to approve the religious congregations which have sought this approval, and is gradually suppressing all those which were formerly approved. (See PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL.)

A. Van Hove.

**Donation (in Civil Jurisprudence), the gratuitous transfer, or gift (Lat. donatio), of ownership of property. The Latin word munus also signified a gift, but "a gift on some special occasion such as births or marriages" (Roby, Roman Private Law, Cambridge, 1902, I, 86). The person transferring ownership by donation is termed the donor, the person to whom the transfer is made, the donee. In contemplation of law donation is "based upon the fundamental right every one has of disposing of his property as he wills" (125 New York Court of Appeals, 1904, P797), a right, however, deemed from ancient times an appropriate subject for legal regulation and restraint (see Johns, Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, etc., New York, 1904, XXI). Donation requires the consent not only of the donor to transfer the ownership, but also of the donee to accept it and assume it, "I cannot," as Pothier (Treatise on Obligations, 4), "by the mere act of my own mind transfer another to a right in my goods, without a concurrent intent on his part to accept it." Donations are usually classified as (1)
inter vivos (among the living) and (2) mortis causa (in view of death).

(1) Inter vivos.—Sir William Blackstone explains (in his Commentaries, II, 441) that in English law mutual consent to give and to accept is not a gift, but is an agreement to contract void of all consideration. Yet delivery and acceptance being added to the ineffectual consent, the transaction becomes an irrevocable transfer by donation inter vivos, regarded in law as an executed contract, just as if the preliminary consents had constituted an effectual “act in the law” (see Pollock, Principles of Contract, New York, 1906, 274). It is to this “contract void” remarks Charles, “that no transfer is made perfect by delivery, and every grant, are executed contracts, for they are founded on the mutual consent of the parties in reference to a right or interest passing between them.” (Commentaries on American Law, II, 437; and Milton (Paradise Lost, XII, 67) says:

He gave us only over beast, fish, fowl, his dominion absolute; that right we hold by his donation.

According to English law, writing under seal, known as a deed, so far transfers personal property without actual delivery that ownership rests upon execution of the deed, and the donation is irrevocable until discharged by the donee (J. W. Smith, The Law of Contracts, 36, Philadelphia, 1885). Not only movable things, defined in English law as personal property, but land (real estate) may be the subject of this donation (24 Vermont Reports, 301; 115 New York Court of Appeals Reports, 305). The legislation of the Emperor Justinian abolished requirements which by Roman law had previously been necessary to perfect a donation, and thenceforth, by force of this legislation, the donor’s informal agreement to give, bound him to make delivery. Donations, were, however, rendered revocable by the same legislation for a failure to comply with their conditions, and also for gross ingratitude (Leage, Roman Private Law, London, 1906, 145). The English law “controls,” to quote Chancellor Kent, “gifts when made to the prejudice of existing creditors” (Commentaries, II, 440); and a donation may be avoided if the donor “were under any legal incapacity . . . or if he were drawn in, circumvented or imposed upon by false pretences, bribery or surprise” (Blackstone, Commentaries, II, 441). But English law does not annul donations for ingratitude nor for various other causes mentioned in the Roman law. English law “does not,” according to Chancellor Kent, “indulge in these refinements” (op. cit.). Donations between husband and wife were contrary to the policy of the Roman law which permitted donatio propter nuptias before marriage only (Leage, op. cit., 95). By English common law there accrued to a husband full ownership of his wife’s personal property, and possession for their joint lives of her real property. And because English law deemed husband and wife one person (Bishop, Commentaries on the Law of Married Women, Boston, 1873, I, 251), a gift of personal property from husband to wife was “impossible according to the old and technical common law” (ibid., 730). But the commentator adds that “it is otherwise in equity” (ibid., 731). By the French Code Civil, donations inter vivos, designated entre vifs, are recognized; but they are subjected to many restrictions.

(2) Mortis Causa.—A donation of this kind is made when a person “in his last sickness,” to quote Blackstone (Commentaries, II, 514), “apprehending his dissolution near, delivers or causes to be delivered to another the possession of any personal goods . . . to which he has been entitled as his deceased . . .” The same donation may also be made in presence of any other impending peril of death. The “Institutes” of Justinian cite a classic example: se et apud Homerun Telenachus donat Pirro (II, VI). This donation differs strikingly from donation inter vivos in not being absolute, but conditional on the donor failing to recover from the sickness or to escape the peril; also in being dependent on his not having exercised the right which remains to him, of revoking the donation. The transfer is thus perfected by death only. Roman law permitted such donations between husband and wife because these were donations quae conferatur in tempus soluti matrimonii (Pothier, Pandecte Justinianee, XXIV, t, i, xix). Nor were donations of this kind from husband to wife forbidden by the English common law (24 Vermont Reports, 300). As the danger in view of which the donation is made be actually present, therefore a transfer from an owner “not terrified by fear of any present peril, but moved by the general consideration of man’s mortality”, cannot be sustained as a donation mortis causa. A transfer of ownership of real estate cannot be effected by this form of donation. And any donation mortis causa expressly embracing the whole of the donor’s property has been said to be illegal, being deemed to be an attempt to escape disposition by last will (American Law Register, I, 25). The grounds already referred to on which a donation inter vivos may be avoided seem also grounds for avoiding a donation mortis causa. In every instance evidence establishing such a donation as against a donor’s representatives must “be clear and convincing, strong and satisfactory” (125 New York Court of Appeals Reports, 757). For this “death-bed disposition of property,” as it is termed by Blackstone (op. cit.), is not a favour of the law. Many years ago a Lord chancellor of England, profoundly learned in the law and noted for his conservatism suggested that if “this donatio mortis causa was struck out of our law altogether it would be quite as well” (American Law Register, I, 25). And by the Code Civil it has been “struck out” (op. cit., 757).

Donation of Constantine (Lat. Donatio Constantinii).—By this name is understood, since the end of the Middle Ages, a forged document of Emperor Constantine the Great, by which large privileges and rich possessions were conferred on the pope and the Roman Church. In the oldest known manuscript (Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris, MS. Latin 2777) and in many other manuscripts the document bears the title: “Constitutum domini Constantinii imperatoris”. It is addressed by Constantine to Pope Sylvester I (314-35) and consists of two parts. In the first (entitled “Confessio”) the emperor relates how he was instructed in the Christian Faith by Sylvester, makes a full profession of faith, and tells of his baptism in Rome by that pope, and how he was thereby cured of leprosy. In the second part (the “Donatio”) Constantine is made to confer on Sylvester and his successors the following privileges and possessions: the pope, as successor of St. Peter, has the primacy over the four Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, also over all the bishops in the world. The Lateran basilica at Rome, built by Constantine, shall surpass all churches as their head, similarly the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul shall be endowed with rich possessions. The chief Roman ecclesiastics (lerici cardinales), among whom senators may also be received, shall obtain the same honours and distinctions as the senators. Like the emperor the Roman Church shall have as functionaries cardinali, ostiarii, and excubiores. The pope shall enjoy the same honorary rights as the emperor; the right to wear an imperial crown, a purple cloak and tunic, and in general all imperial insignia or signs of distinction; but as Sylvester refused to put on
his head a golden crown, the emperor invested him with the high white cap (phrygium). Constantine, the document continues, rendered to the pope the service of a strator, i.e. he led the horse upon which the pope rode. Moreover, the emperor makes a present to the pope and his successors of the Lateran palace and Rome and the provinces, districts, and towns of Italy and all the Western regions (tam palatinum nostrum, ut prefectum est, quamque Romae urbis et omnium Italiae seu occidentali regiumpicum provinciarum loca et civitates)

The document goes on to say that for himself the emperor has established in the East a new capital which became the residence of his successors, in which he has removed his government, since it is inconvenient that a secular emperor have power where God has established the residence of the head of the Christian religion. The document concludes with maledictions against all who dare to violate these donations and with the assurance that the emperor has signed them with his own hand and placed them on the tomb of St. Peter.

This document is without doubt a forgery, fabricated somewhere between the years 750 and 800. As early as the fifteenth century its falsity was known and demonstrated. Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa (De Constantino et Constantine, lib. XIII, ii. cap. 1) spoke of it as a dictamen a poecryphum. Some years later (1440) Lorenzo Valla (De falso credita et ementita Constantini donationi declaratio, Mainz, 1518) proved the forgery with certainty. Independently of both his predecessors, Reginald Peckock, Bishop of Chichester (1450–57), reached a similar conclusion in his work, "The Repressor of over Much Blaming of the Clergy", Rolls Series, II, 351–366. Its genuineness was yet occasionally defended, and the document still further used as authentic, until Baronius in his "Annales Ecclesiastic[i]" (ad an. 324) admitted that the "Donatio" was a forgery, whereafter it was soon universally admitted to be such. It is so clearly a fabrication that there is no reason to wonder that, with the revival of historical criticism in the fifteenth century, the true character of the document was at once recognized. The forger made use of various authorities, which Grauer and others (see below) have thoroughly investigated. The introduction and the conclusion of the document are imitated from authentic writings of the imperial period, but formula of other periods are also utilized. In the "Confession of faith" the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is explained at length, and the Fall of man and the Incarnation of Christ. There are also reminiscences of the decrees of the Iconoclast Synod of Constantinople (754) against the veneration of images. The narrative of the conversion and healing of the emperor is based on the apocryphal Acts of Sylvester (Acta or Gesta Sylvætri), yet all the particulars of the "Donation" narrative do not appear in the hitherto known texts of that legend. The distinctions conferred on the pope and the cardinals of the Roman Church the forger probably invented and described according to certain contemporary rites and the court ceremonial of the Roman and Byzantine Church. The author also used the biographies of the popes in the Liber Pontificiæ (q. v.), likewise eighth-century letters of the popes, especially in his account of the imperial donations.

The authorship of this document is still wrapped in obscurity. Occasionally, but without sufficient reason, critics have attributed it to the author of the False Decretals (q. v.) or to some Roman ecclesiastic of the eighth century. On the other hand, the time and place of its composition have lately been thoroughly studied by numerous investigators (especially Germans), though surely not universally accorded. But conclusions have yet been reached. As to the place of the forgery Baronius (Annales, ad. an. 1081) maintained that it was done in the East by a schismatic Greek; it is, indeed, found in Greek canonical collections. Natalis Alexander opposed this view, and it is no longer held by any recent historian. Many of the recent critical students of the document locate its composition at Rome and attribute the forgery to an ecclesiastic, their chief argument being an intrinsic one: this false document was composed in favour of the pope and of the Roman Church, himself must have held the chief interest in a forgery executed for a purpose so clearly expressed. Moreover, the sources of the document are chiefly Roman. Nevertheless, the earlier view of Zaccaria and others that the forgery originated in the Frankish Empire has, perhaps by itself recently been newly defended by Bayet and Grauer and see below). They call attention to the fact that the "Donatio" appears first in Frankish collections, i.e. in the False Decretals and in the above-mentioned St-Denis manuscript; moreover the earliest certain quotation of it is by Frankish authors in the second half of the ninth century. Finally, this document was never used in the papal chancery until the middle of the eleventh century, nor in general is it referred to in Roman sources until the time of Otto III (993–1002, i.e. in case the famous "Diploma" of this emperor be authentic). The first certain use of it at Rome was in 1054, and it is noted that this pope was by birth and training a German, not an Italian. The writers mentioned have shown that the chief aim of the forgery was to prove the justice of the translatio imperii to the Franks, i.e. the transfer of the imperial title at the coronation of Charlemagne in 800; the forgery was, therefore, important mainly for the Frankish Empire. This view is rightly tenable against the opinion of the majority that the forgery originated at Rome.

A still greater divergency of opinion reigns as to the time of its composition. Some have asserted (more recently Martens, Fergusson, and Bayet) that each of its two parts was fabricated at different times. Martens holds that the author executed his forgery at brief intervals; that the "Constitutum" originated after 800 in connexion with a letter of Adrian I (778) to Charlemagne wherein the pope acknowledged the imperial position to which the Frankish king by his own efforts and fortune had attained. Friederich (see below), on the contrary, attempts to prove that the "Constitutum" was composed of two really distinct parts. The gist of the first part, the so-called "Concessio", appeared between 638 and 653, probably 638–639. The "Donatio" proper was written in the reign of Stephen II, between 752 and 757, by Paul, brother and successor of Pope Stephen. According to Bayet the first part of the document was composed in the time of Paul I (757–767); the latter part appeared in or about the year 774. In opposition to these opinions most historians maintain that the document was written at the same time and wholly by one author. But when was it written? Colombier decides for the reign of Pope Conon (680–687). Genelin for the beginning of the eighth century (before 728). But neither of these views is supported by any weighty evidence. Most investigators accept as the earliest possible date the pontificate of Stephen II (752–757), thus establishing a connexion between the forgery and the historical events that led to the origin of the States of the Church and the Western Empire of the Franks. But in what year or period from the above-mentioned pontificate of Stephen II until the reception of the "Constitutum" in the collection of the False Decretals (c. 840–50) was the forgery executed? Nearly every student of this intricate question maintains his own distinct view. It is necessary first to answer a few preliminary questions. Did Pope Adrian I, in his letter to Charlemagne of the year 778 (Codex Carolinianus, ed. Jaffé, Ep. xii) exhibit a knowledge of the "Constitutum"? From a passage of this letter (Sicut temporibus beati Silvestri Romani pontificis a sancta recorda-
tionissimum Constantinum magno imperatore per eius largitatem sancta Dei Catholica et Apostolica Romana ecclesia elevata et exaltata est et positurum in his Hesperiae partibus largi dignatus, ita et in his vectris felicissimae temporibus utique nostris sancta Dei ecclesiae id est beati Petri apostolii, germenque exuites. Archivists, e.g. Dölger, disagree, and others have concluded that Adrian I was then aware of this forgery, so that it must have appeared before 778. Much in Adrian I a knowledge of the "Constitutum" from his letter to Emperor Constantine VI written in 785 (Mansi, Concill. Coll., XII, 1757), which he said is forgeries, however, three letters, from asserting that Adrian I made use of this document from his letters, therefore, the time of its origin cannot be deduced. Most of the recent writers on the subject assume the origin of the "Donatio" between 752 and 795. Among them, some decide for the pontificate of Stephen II (752-757) on the hypothesis that the author of the forgery wished to substantiate thereby the claims of this pope in his negotiations with Pepin (Dölger, Hauck, Frederick, Böhmer). Others lower the date of the forgery to the time of Paul I (757-767), and base their opinion on the political events in Italy under that pope, and on the fact that he ministered power for St. Sylvester, and that the "Donatio" had especially in view the honour of this saint (Scheffer-Boichorst, Mayer). Others again locate its origin in the pontificate of Adrian I (772-795), on the hypothesis that this pope hoped thereby to extend the secular authority of the Roman Church over a greater part of Italy and to create in this way a powerful ecclesiastical State under papal government (Langen, Loening). A smaller group of writers, however, remove the forgery to some date in the ninth century, e.g. after the coronation of Charles Martel as emperor. Among these, Martens and Weiland assign the document to the last years of the reign of Charlemagne, or the first years of Louis the Pious, i.e. somewhere between 800 and 840. They argue that the chief purpose of the forgery was to bestow on the Western ruler the imperial power, or that the forgery refers to the fact that the new emperor, as successor of Constantine the Great, might have conferred on the Roman Church. Those writers also who seek the forger in the Frankish Empire maintain that the document was written in the ninth century, e.g., especially Hergenröther and Grauert. The latter opposes the theory that the "Constitutum" originated in the monastery of St. Denis, at Paris, shortly before or about the same time as the False Decretals, i.e. between 840 and 850. Closely connected with the date of the forgery is the other question concerning the primary purpose of the forger of the "Donatio." Here, too, there exists a great variety of opinions. Most of the writers who locate at Rome itself the origin of the forgery maintain that it was intended principally to support the claims of the popes to secular power in Italy; they differ, however, as to the extent of the said claims. According to Dölger the "Constitutum" was destined to aid in the creation of a united Italy under papal government. Others would limit the papal claims to those districts which Stephen II sought to obtain from Pepin, or to isolated territories which, then or later, the popes desired to acquire. In general, this class of historians seeks to connect the forgery with the historical events and political movements of that time in Italy (Mayer, Langen, Friedried, Loening, and others). Several of these writers lay more stress on the elevation of the popacy than on the donation of territories. Occasionally it is maintained that the forger sought to secure another kind of thing, something akin to imperial supremacy as against the Frankish Government, then solidly established in Italy. Again, some of this class limit to Italy the expression accedentium regionum provinciarum, but most of them understand it to mean the whole former Western Empire. This is the attitude of Weiland, for whom the chief object of the forgery is the increase of papal power over the imperial, and the establishment of a kind of imperial supremacy of the pope over the whole West. For this reason also he lowers the date of the forgery further than the tenth century, and the reign of Charlemagne (814). As a matter of fact, however, in this document Sylvester does indeed obtain from Constantine imperial rank and the emblems of imperial dignity, but not the real imperial supremacy. Martens therefore sees in the forgery an effort to elevate the papacy in a manner rightfully and imaginatively, the title of the pope and of Roman ecclesiastics, all gifts of landed possessions, and rights of secular government are meant to promote and confirm this elevation, and from it all the new Emperor Charlemagne's right to the papacy was to be practical conclusions for his behaviour in relation to the pope. Scheffer-Boichorst holds a singular opinion, namely that the forger intended primarily the glorification of Sylvester and Constantine, and only in a secondary way a defence of the papal claims to territorial possessions. Grauert, for whom the forger is a Frankish subject, shares the view of Hergenröther, i.e. the forger had in mind the elevation of the new Western Empire from the attacks of the Byzantines. Therefore it was highly important for him to establish the legitimacy of the newly founded empire, and this purpose was especially aided by all that the document alleges concerning the elevation of the pope. From the foregoing it will be seen that the word of historical research in this matter still remains to be said. Important questions concerning the sources of the forgery, the place and time of its origin, the tendency of the forger, yet await their solution. New research will probably pay still greater attention to textual criticism, especially that of the first part or "Confession" of faith. As far as the evidence at hand permits us to judge, the forged "Constitutum" was first made known in the Frankish Empire. The oldest extant manuscript of it, certainly from the ninth century, was written in the Frankish Empire. In the second half of that century the document is expressly mentioned by three Frankish writers. Ado, Bishop of Vienne, speaks of it in his Chronicle (De sex etatibus mundi, ad an. 306, in P. L., CXXIII, 92); Aeneas, Bishop of Paris, refers to it in defence of the Roman primacy (Adversus graecos, c. cxiii, CXXI, 99); in the life of John Cassian, Archbishop of Reims, mentions the donation of Rome to the pope by Constantine the Great according to the "Constitutum" (De ordine palatii, c. xiii, op. cit., CXXV, 998). The document obtained wider circulation by its incorporation with the False Decretals (840-850), or more specifically between 847 and 852; Hainachius, Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae, Leipzig, 1863, p. 249). At Rome no use was made of the document during the ninth and the tenth centuries, not even amid the conflicts and difficulties of Nicholas I with Constantine, when it might have served as a base for some argument of the claims of the first pope who used it in an official act and relied upon it, was Leo IX; in a letter of 1054 to Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, he cites the "Donatio" to show that the Holy See possessed both an earthly and a heavenly imperium, the royal priesthood. Thereafter the "Donatio" acquires more and more importance and is more frequently used as evidence in the ecclesiastical and political conflicts between the papacy and the secular power. Anselm of Lucca and Cardinal Deusdedit inserted it in their collections of canons. Gratian, it is true, excluded it from his Decretum, but it was inserted in the False Decretals by the ecclesiastical writers in defence of the papacy during the conflicts of the early part of the twelfth century quoted it as authoritative (Hugo of Fleury, De regia potestate et ecclesiastic dignitate, 11; Placidus of
DONATISTS

Donatists.—The Donatist schism in Africa began in 311 and flourished just one hundred years; until the conference at Carthage in 411, after which its importance vanished.

Causes of the Schism.—In order to trace the origin of the division we have to go back to the persecution under Diocletian. The first edict of that emperor against Christians (24 Feb., 303) commanded their churches to be burned, any of their books and documents to be delivered up and burnt, while they themselves were outlawed. Severer measures followed in 304, when the fourth edict ordered all to offer incense to the idols under pain of death. After the abdication of Maximin in 305, the persecution seems to have abated in Africa. Until then it was terrible. In Numidia the governor, Florus, was infamous for his cruelty, and, though many officials may have been, like the proconsul Anulinus, unwilling to go further than they were obliged, yet St. Optatus is able to say of the Christians of the whole country that some were confessors, some were martyrs, some fell only those who were hanged or escaped. The exaggerations of the highly strung African character showed themselves. A hundred years earlier Tertullian had taught that flight from persecution was not permissible. Some now went beyond this, and voluntarily gave themselves up to martyrdom in order to escape despotic taxation. Their motives were, however, not always above suspicion. Menrarius, the Bishop of Carthage, in a letter to Secundus, Bishop of Tigis, then the senior bishop (primate) of Numidia, declares that he had forbidden any to be honoured as martyrs who had given themselves up of their own accord, or who had appealed to the law, instead of claiming the validity of the Scriptures which they would not relinquish; some of these, he says, were criminals and debtors to the State, who thought they might by this means rid themselves of a burdensome life, or else wipe away the remembrance of their misdeeds, or at least gain money and enjoy in prison the luxuries supplied by the kindness of Christians. The later excesses of the Circumcellions show that Menrarius had some ground for the severe line he took. He explains that he had himself taken the Sacred Books of the Church to his own house, and had substituted a number of homiletic writings which the persecutors had seized without asking for more: the proconsul, when informed of the deception, refused to search the bishop's private house. Secundus, in his reply, without blaming Menrarius, somewhat pointedly praised the martyrs who in his own province had been tortured and put to death for refusing to deliver up the Scriptures; he himself had replied to the officials who came to search: "I am a Christian and a bishop, not a traditor." This word traditor became a technical expression to designate those who had given up the Sacred Books, and also those who had consented to the worse crimes of delivering up the sacred vessels and even their own brethren.

It is certain that relations were strained between the confessors in prison at Carthage and their bishop. If we may credit the Donatists Acts of the forty-nine martyrs of Asbrite, they broke off contact entirely with Menrarius. We are informed in these Acts that Menrarius was a traditor by his own confession, and that his deacon, Cecilian, raged more furiously against the martyrs than did the persecutors themselves; he set armed men with whips before the door of the prison to prevent their receiving any food. The martyrs, according to the piety of Christians was thrown to the dogs by these ruffians, and the drink provided was spilled in the street, so that the martyrs, whose condemnation the mild proconsul had deferred, died in prison of hunger and thirst. This story is recognized by Du-
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St. Peter Damian also relied on it in his writings against the Church of Parma (Discorsio synodalis, in Libelli de lite, I, 88). Gregory VII himself never quoted this document in his long warfare for ecclesiastical liberty against the secular power. But Urban II made use of it in 1091 to support his claims on the island of Corsica. Later popes (Innocent III, Gregory IX, and Innocent IV) took its authenticity for granted (Innocent III, Sermo de sancto Silvestro, P. L., CCXVII, 481 sqq.; Radiationus. Annales, ad an. 1236, n. 24; Potthast, Regesta, no. 11, 848), and ecclesiastical writers often added its evidence in favour of the papacy. The medieval adversaries of the popes, on the other hand, never denied the validity of this appeal to the pretended donation of Constantine, but endeavoured to show that the legal deductions drawn from it were founded on false interpretations. The authenticity of the document, as already stated, was doubted by no one before the fifteenth century. It was known to the Greeks in the second half of the twelfth century, when it appeared in the collection of Theodore Balssamon (1169 sqq.); later on another Greek canonist, Matthias Blaistes (about 1350), admitted it into his collection. It appears also in other Greek works. Moreover, it was highly esteemed in the Greek East. The Greeks claimed, it is well known, for the New Rome (Constantinople) the same honorary rights as those enjoyed by the Bishop of Old Rome. But now, by virtue of this document, they claimed for the Byzantine clergy also the privileges and prerogatives granted to the pope and the Roman ecclesiastics. In the West, long after its authenticity was recognized in the fifteenth century, its validity was still upheld by the majority of canons and jurists who continued throughout the sixteenth century to quote it as authentic. And though Baronius and later historians acknowledged it to be a forgery, they endeavoured to marshal other authorities in defence of its content, especially as regards the imperial donations. In later times even this was abandoned, so that now the whole "Constitutum," both in form and content, is rightly considered in all senses a forgery. See False Decretals; Sylvester I; States of the Church; Temporal Power of the Pope; Donation.
chesne and others as exaggerated. It would be better to say that the main point is incredible; the prisoners would not have been allowed by the Roman officials to starve; the details—that Mensuris confessed himself a traditor, that he prevented the succouring of the imprisoned confessors—are simply founded on the four fathers of the Secundus. Then we may safely reject all the latter part of the Acts as fictitious. The earlier part is authentic: it relates how certain of the faithful of Abitine met and celebrated their usual Sunday service, in defiance of the emperor’s edict, under the leadership of the priest Saturninus, for their bishop was a flamen, and they did not dare to meet in the house of Carthage. made bold replies when interrogated, and were imprisoned by Anulinus, who might have condemned them to death forthwith. The whole account is characteristic of the fervid African temperament. We can well imagine how the prudent Mensuris and his lieutenant, the deacon Cecilian, were disliked by some of the more excitable among their flock.

We know in detail how the inquiries for sacred books were carried out, for the official minutes of an investigation at Ciria (afterwards Constantine) in Numidia are preserved. The bishop and his clergy showed themselves ready to give up all they had, but drew the line at betraying their brethren; even here their generosity was not remarkable, for they added that the names and addresses were well known to the officials. The examination was conducted by Munatius Felix, perpetual flamen, curator of the colony of Carthage, who arrived with sulphur and copper at the bishop’s house—in Numidia the searching was more severe than in Proconsular Africa—the bishop was found with four priests, three deacons, four subdeacons and several foresse (diggers). These declared that the Scriptures were not there, but in the hands of the clerics. In fact the bookcase was found to be empty. The clergy present refused to give the names of the lectors, saying they were known to the notaries; but, with the exception of the books, they gave in an inventory of all possessions of the church: two golden chalices, six of silver, six silver cruets, a silver bowl, seven silver lamps, two candelsticks, seven short bronze lamp-stands with lamps, eleven bronze lamps with chains, eighty-two women’s tunic, twenty-eight veils, sixteen men’s tunics, thirteen pairs of men’s boots, forty-seven pairs of women’s boots, nineteen countrymen’s smocks. Presently the subdeacon Silvanus, wearing a silver breastplate, answered: “You are forced to give up the Four Gospels.” Felix replied: “It was the curator, Valentine; he forced me to throw them into the fire. Forgive me this fault, and God will also forgive it.” Secundus said: “Stand on one side.” Secundus (after another Gaspra) said to Purpurus and Satra: “You have killed the two sons of your sister at Mileum” (Milevis). Purpurus answered with vehemence: “Do you think I am frightened by you as the others are? What did you do yourself when the curator and his officials tried to make you give up the Scriptures? You did not even get off scot-free, for they gave you something, or ordered something to be given? They certainly did not let you go for nothing! For me I have killed and I kill those who are against me; do not provoke me to say any more. You know that I do not interfere where I have no business.” At this outburst a nephew of Secundus said to the primate: “You hear what they say of you! He is ready to withdraw and make a schism; and the same is true of all those whom you accuse; and I know they are capable of turning you out and condemning you, and you alone will then be the heretic. What is it to you if they have come to you and hate you? Each must render account to God.” Secundus (as St. Augustine points out) had apparently no reply ready against the accusation of Purpurus, so he turned to the two or three bishops who remained unaccused: “What do you think?” These answered: “They have God to whom they must give an account.” Secundus said: “You know and God knows. Sit down.” And all replied: Deo gratias.

These minutes have been preserved for us by St. Augustine. The later Donatists declared them forged, but not only could St. Optatus refer to the age of the parchment on which they were written, but they were made easily credible by the testimonies given before Zephynilius in 320. Seeck, as well as Duchesne (see below), upholds their genuineness. We hear from St. Optatus of another fallen Numidian bishop, who refused to ordain a subdeacon, but when he rose against him, he proved that he had offered incense, a crime of which the other bishops were not guilty. The bishops proceeded to ordain a bishop, and they chose Silvanus, who, as a subdeacon, assisted in the search for sacred vessels. The people thought that Victor rose up against him, crying that he was a traditor, and demanded that Optatus should ordain Donatus. But country people and gladiators were engaged to set him to the episcopal chair, to which he was carried on the back of a man named Mutus.  

CECILIAN AND MAJORINUS.—A certain Donatus of
Case Nigre is said to have caused a schism in Carthage during the lifetime of Menusiurs. In 311 Maxentius obtained dominion over Africa, and a deacon of Carthage, Felix, was accused of writing a defamatory letter against the tyrant. Menusiurs was said to have composed it for the deacon in his house and was himself summoned to Rome. He was acquitted, but died on his return journey. Before his departure from Africa, he had given the gold and silver ornaments of the church to the care of certain old men, and had also consigned an inventory of these effects to an aged woman, who was to deposit it to the next bishop. Maxentius gave liberty to the Christians, so that it was possible for an election to be held at Carthage. The bishop of Carthage, like the pope, was commonly consecrated by a neighbouring bishop, assisted by a certain number of others from the vicinity. He was primate not only of the proconsular province, but of the other provinces of North Africa, including Numidia, Byzacene, Tripolitana, and the two Mauretaniae, which were all governed by the vicar of prefects. In each of these provinces the local primate was attached to no town, but was held by the senior bishop, until St. Gregory the Great made the office elective. St. Optatus implies that the nominations of Numidia, many of whom were at no great distance from Carthage, had expected that they would have a voice in the election; but two priests, Botrus and Cælestius, who each expected to be elected, had managed that only a small number of bishops should be present. Cæcilian, the deacon who had been so obstinately to the martyr, was duly chosen by the whole people, placed in the chair of Menusiurs, and consecrated by Felix, Bishop of Antogna or Abutiga. The old men who had charge of the treasure of the church were obliged to give it up; they joined with Botrus and Cælestius in refusing to acknowledge the new bishop. They were summoned before a rich lady named Lucilla, who had a grudge against Cæcilian because he had rebuked her habit of kissing the bone of an uncanonized (non vindicatus) martyr immediately before receiving Holy Communion. Probably we have here again a martyr whose death was due to his own ill-regulated fervour.

Secundus, as the nearest primate, came with his suffragans to Carthage to judge the affair, and in a great council of seventy bishops declared the ordination of Cæcilian to be invalid, as having been performed by a traditor. A new bishop was consecrated, Menusiurs, and a small council of bishops and the old primate assembled. That lady provided the sum of 300 jolles (more than 11,000 dollars), nominally for the poor; but all of it went into the pockets of the bishops, one-quarter of the sum being seized by Purpurius of Limata. Cæcilian had possession of the basilica and the cathedra of Cyriph, and the people were with him, so that he refused to appear before the council. "If I am not properly consecrated," he said ironically, "let them treat me as a deacon, and lay hands on me afresh, and not on another."

No wonder that the action of this council, which sent letters throughout Africa, had a great influence. But at Carthage it was well known that Cæcilian was the choice of the people, and that it was believed that Felix of Antogna had given up the Sacred Books. Rome and Italy had given Cæcilian their communion. The Church of the moderate Menusiurs did not hold that consecration by a traditor was invalid, or even that it was illicit, if the traditor was still in lawful possession of his see. The council declared that a traditor could not act as a bishop, and that any who were in communion with traditors were cut off from the Church. They called themselves the Church of the martyrs, and declared that all who were in communion with public sinners like Cæcilian and Felix were necessarily excommunicate.

The Condemnation by Pope Melchiades.—Very soon there were many cities having two bishops, the one in communion with Cæcilian, the other with Majorinus. Constantine, after defeating Maxentius (28 May, 312) and becoming himself a Christian in his acts. He wrote to Anulinus, proconsul of Africa (was he the same as the mild proconsul of 303?) restoring the churches to Catholics, and exempting clerics of "the Catholic Church of which Cæcilian is president" from civil functions (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., X, v, 1). He wrote to Cæcilian (ibid., X, v, 1) sending him an order for 3000 jolles to be distributed in Africa, Numidia, and Mauretania; if more was needed, the bishop must apply for more. He added that he had heard of turbulent persons who sought to corrupt the Church; he had ordered the proconsul Anulinus and the vicar of prefects to restrain them, and Cæcilian was to appeal to these officials if necessary. The opposing party lost no time. A few days after the publication of these letters, their delegates, accompanied by a mob, brought to Anulinus two bundles of documents, containing the complaints of their party against Cæcilian, to be forwarded to the emperor. St. Optatus has preserved a few words from their petition, in which Constantine is begged to grant judges from Gaul, where under his father's rule there had been no persecution, and therefore no traditors. Constantine was afraid the Church's position too weak to make Gallic bishops judges of the primate of Africa. He at once referred the matter to the pope, expressing his intention, laudable, if too sanguine, of allowing no schisms in the Catholic Church. That the African schismatics might have no ground of complaint, he ordered them to summon Rutilius of Autun, Maternus of Cologne, and Marinus of Arles, to repair to Rome, to assist at the trial. He ordered Cæcilian to come thither with ten bishops of his accusers and ten of his own communion. The memorials against Cæcilian he sent to the pope, who would know, he says, what procedure to employ in order to conclude the whole matter in accordance with justice (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., X, v, 18). Pope Melchiades summoned fifteen Italian bishops to sit with him. From this time forward we find that in all important matters the popes issue their decretal letters, if necessary, to the bishops. The case of Rutilius and Reticius of Autun, Maternus of Cologne, and Marinus of Arles, to repair to Rome, to assist at the trial. He ordered Cæcilian to come thither with ten bishops of his accusers and ten of his own communion. The memorials against Cæcilian he sent to the pope, who would know, he says, what procedure to employ in order to conclude the whole matter in accordance with justice (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., X, v, 18). Pope Melchiades summoned fifteen Italian bishops to sit with him. From this time forward we find that in all important matters the popes issue their decretal letters, if necessary, to the bishops. The case of Rutilius and Reticius of Autun, Maternus of Cologne, and Marinus of Arles, to repair to Rome, to assist at the trial. He ordered Cæcilian to come thither with ten bishops of his accusers and ten of his own communion. The memorials against Cæcilian he sent to the pope, who would know, he says, what procedure to employ in order to conclude the whole matter in accordance with justice (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., X, v, 18). Pope Melchiades summoned fifteen Italian bishops to sit with him. From this time forward we find that in all important matters the popes issue their decretal letters, if necessary, to the bishops. The case of the chief accusers, St. Augustine, and the other Catholic apologists that this was "Donatus the Great," the successor of Majorinus as schismatic Bishop of Carthage. But the Donatists of St. Augustines time were anxious to deny this, as they did not wish to admit that their protagonist had been condemned, and the Catholics at the conference of 411 granted them the existence of a Donatist Bishop of Case Nigre, who had distinguished himself by active hostility to Cæcilian. Modern authorities agree in accepting this view. But it seems inconceivable that, if Majorinus was still alive, he should not have been obliged to go to Rome. It would be very strange, in fact, for Case Nigre should have been the leader of the party, without any explanation, unless Case Nigre was simply the birthplace of Donatus the Great. If we assume that Majorinus had died and had been succeeded by Donatus the Great just before the trial at Rome, we shall understand why Majorinus is never again mentioned. The accusations against Secundus, as being anonymous and unproved. The witnesses brought from Africa acknowledged that they had nothing against him. Donatus, on the other hand, was convicted by his own confession of having
rebutted and of having laid his hands in penance on bishops—this was forbidden by ecclesiastical law. On the third day the unanimous sentence was pronounced by Melchiades: Caecilian was to be maintained in ecclesiastical communion. If Donatist bishops returned to the church in a place where there were two rival bishops, the junior was to remain and the pope was to be another see. The Donatists were furious. A hundred years later their successors declared that Pope Melchiades himself was a traitor, and that on this account they had not accepted his decision; though there is no trace of this having been alleged at the time. But the case of the bishops of Rome were donatized with the seventy bishops of the Carthaginian Council, and a fresh judgment was demanded.

The Council of Arles.—Constantine was angry, but he saw that the party was powerful in Africa, and he summoned a council of the whole West (that is, of the whole of his actual dominions) to meet at Arles on 1 August. 314. Melchiades was dead, and his successor, St. Sylvester, thought it unbecoming to leave Rome, thus setting an example which he repeated in the case of Nicaea, and which his successors followed in the cases of Sardica, Rimini, and the Eastern ecclesiastical Councils. Between forty and fifty sees were represented at the council by bishops or proxies: the Bishops of London, York, and Lincoln were there. St. Sylvester sent legates. The council condemned the Donatists and drew up a number of canons; it reported its proceedings in a letter to the pope, which is entitled the “Life of Caecilian.” But, as in the case of Nicaea, no details remain, nor are any such mentioned by the ancients. The Fathers in their letter salute Sylvester, saying that he had rightly decided not to quit the spot “where the Apostles daily sit in judgment.” He had been with them, they might perhaps have dealt more severely with the heretics among the canons of the council (which was still practised in Africa), another declares that those who falsely accuse their brethren shall have communion only at the hour of death. On the other hand, traitors are to be refused communion, but only when the fault has been proved by public official acts; those whom they have ordained are to retain their positions. The council produced some effect in Africa, but the main body of the Donatists was immovable. They appealed from the council to the emperor. Constantine was horrified: “O insolent man!” he wrote, “they appeal from earth to heaven, from Jesus Christ to a man.”

The Policy of Constantine.—The emperor retained the Donatist envoys in Gaul, after at first dismissing them. He seems to have thought of sending for Caecilian, then of granting a full examination in Africa. The case of Felix of Aptons was in fact examined by his order at Carthage in February. 315 (St. Augustine is probably wrong in giving 314). The minutes of the proceedings have come down to us in a mutilated state; they are referred to by St. Optatus, who appended them to his book with other documents, and they are frequently cited by St. Augustine. It was shown that the letter which the Donatists put forward as proving the crime of Felix, had been interpolated by a certain Ingensius; this was established by the confession of Ingensius, as well as by the witness of Albus, the writer of the letter. It was proved that Felix was actually absent at the time the letter was produced. Sacred Books was made at Aptons. Constantine eventually summoned Caecilian and his opponents to Rome; but Caecilian, for some unknown reason, did not appear. Caecilian and Donatus the Great (who was now at all events, bishop) were called to Milan, where Constantine heard both parties with great severity. He declared that Caecilian was innocent and an excellent bishop (Augustine, Contra Cresconium, III, lixxi). He retained both in Italy, however, while he sent two bishops, Eunomius and Olympius, to Africa, with an idea of putting Donatus and Caecilian aside, and substituting a new bishop, to be agreed upon by all parties. It is to be presumed that Caecilian and Donatus had assented to this course; but the violence of the sectaries made it impossible to carry it out. Eunomius and Olympius declared at Carthage that the Catholic Church was that which was diffused throughout the world and that the See of Rome could not be divided. The Donatists could not be annulled. They communicated with the clergy of Caecilian and returned to Italy. Donatus went back to Carthage, and Caecilian, seeing this, felt himself free to do the same. Finally Constantine ordered that the churches which the Donatists had taken should be returned to Silvanus. Their other meeting-places were confiscated. Those who were convicted (of calumnies?) lost their goods. Evictions were carried out by the military. An ancient sermon on the passion of the Donatists “martyrs,” Donatus and Advocatus, describes such scenes. In one of them a regular massacre occurred, and a bishop was among the slain, if we may trust this curious document. The Donatists were proud of their persecution of Caecilian,” which “the Pure” suffered at the hands of the “Church of the Traditors.” The Comes Leontius and the Dux Fractus were the special objects of their indignation.

In 320 came revelations unpleasant to the “Pure.” Nundinarius, a deacon of Cirta, had a quarrel with his bishop, Silvanus, who caused him to be stoned—so he said in his complaint to certain Numidian bishops, in which he threatened that if they did not use their influence in favor of Silvanus, he would tell all he knew of them. As he got no satisfaction he brought the matter before Zenophilus, the consular of Numidia. The minutes have come down to us in a fragmentary form in the appendix of Optatus, under the title of “Gesta apud Zenophilum.” Nundinarius produced letters from Purpurius and other bishops in favor of Silvanus and to the people of Cirta, trying to have peace made with the inconvenient deacon. The minutes of the search at Cirta, which we have already cited, were read, and witnesses were called to establish their accuracy, including two of the possesores then present and a lector, Victor the grammarian. It was shown not only that Silvanus was a traditor, but that he had assisted Purpurius, together with two priests and a deacon, in the theft of certain casks of vinegar belonging to the treasury, which were in the temple of Aesculapius. Silvanus had retained a priest for the sum of 20 folles (500 to 600 dollars). It was established that none of the money given by Lucilla had reached the poor for whom it was ostensibly given. Thus Silvanus, one of the mainstays of the “Pure” Church, which declared that to communicate with any traditor was to be outside the Church, was himself proved to be a traditor. He was exiled by the consular for robbing the treasury, for obtaining money under false pretences, and for getting himself made bishop by violence. The Donatists later preferred to say that he was banished for refusing to communicate with the “Caelicianists” and Cresconium even spoke of “the persecution of Zenophilus.” But it should have been clear to all that the consecrators of Majorinus had called their opponents traditores in order to cover their own delinquencies.

The Donatist party owed its success in great part to the ability of its leader Donatus, the successor of Majorinus. He appears to have really merited the title of “the Great” by his eloquence and force of character. His writings are lost. His influence with his party was extraordinary. St. Augustine frequently declares against his arrogance and the impetuosity with which he was almost worshipped by his followers. He is said to have been a favorite of the adulation he received, and after death he was counted as a martyr and miracles were ascribed to him.

In 321 Constantine relaxed his vigorous measures, having found that they did not produce the peace
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had hoped for, and he weakly begged the Catholics to suffer the Donatists with patience. This was not easy, for the schismatics broke out into violence. At Carthage, Silvanus having returned, they seized the basilica which the emperor had built for the Catholics. They could not so easily be silenced, for Constantine found it better expedient than to build another. Throughout Africa, but above all in Numidia, they were numerous. They taught that in all the rest of the world the Catholic Church had perished, through having communicated with the traditor Cecilian; their sect alone was the true Church. If a Donatist came into these churches, they drove him out, and washed with salt the pavement where he had stood. Any Catholic who joined them was forced to be rebaptized. They asserted that their own bishops and ministers were without fault, else their ministrations would be invalid. But in fact they were convicted of drunkenness and other sins. St. Augustine tells us on the authority of Tichonius that the Donatists held a council of two hundred and seventy bishops in which they discussed for seventy-five days the question of rebaptism; they finally decided that in cases where tradition refused to believe that they should be rebaptized, these bishops should be rebaptized. But in spite of this; and the Donatist bishops of Mauretania did not rebaptize until the time of Macarius. Outside Africa the Donatists had a bishop residing on the property of an adherent in Spain, and at an early period of the schism they made a bishop for their small congregation in Rome, which was outside the city, and had the name of Montesinos. This antipapal succession without a beginning was frequently ridiculed by Catholic writers. The series included Felix, Boniface, Encolpius, Macrobius (c. 370), Lucian, Claudian (c. 378), and again Felix in 411.

THE CIRCUMCELLIONS.—The date of the first appearance of the Circumcellions is uncertain, but probably they began before the death of Constantine. They were mostly rustic enthusiasts, who knew no Latin, but spoke Punic; it has been suggested that they may have been of Berber blood. They joined the ranks of the Donatists, and were called by them agonitici and "soldiers of Christ", but in fact were brigands. Troops of them were to be met in all parts of Africa. They had no regular occupation, but ran about armed, like madmen. They used no swords, on the ground that St. Peter had been tolled: they wore clubs, which they called "Israelites". They bruised their victims without killing them, and left them to die. In St. Augustine's time, however, they took to swords and all sorts of weapons; they rushed about accompanied by unmarried women, played, and drank. Their battle-cry was Deo laudes, and no bands were more terrible to meet. They frequently sought death, counting suicide as martyrdom. They were especially fond of flinging themselves from precipices; more rarely they sprang into the water or fire. Even women caught the infection, and those who had sought to avoid death cast themselves from the cliffs, to atone for their fault. Sometimes the Circumcellions sought death at the hands of others, by either paying men to kill them, by threatening to kill a passer-by if he would not kill them, or by their violence inducing magistrates to have them executed. While paganism still flourished, they would come in vast crowds to any great sacrifice, not to destroy the idols, but to be martyred. Theodoret says a Circumcellion was accustomed to announce his intention of becoming a martyr long before the time, in order to be well treated and allowed to fight for salvation. He relates an amusing story (Hier. Fab IV. xix) to which St. Augustine also refers. A number of these fanatics, fattened like pheasants, met a young man and offered him a drawn sword to smite them with, threatening to murder him if he refused. He pretended to fear that when he had killed a few, the rest might change their minds and avenge the death of their fellows; and he insisted that they must all be bound. They agreed to this; when they were defenceless, the young man gave each of them a beating and went his way.

When in controversy with Catholics, the Donatist bishops were not proud of their supporters. They declared that self-sacrifice from a cliff had been forbidden in their councils. Yet the bodies of these suicides were sacrilegiously honoured, and crowds celebrated their anniversaries. Their bishops could not always rely on the clergy, or else they often glad enough of the strong arms of the Circumcellions. Theodoret, soon after St. Augustine's death, knew of no other Donatists than the Circumcellions; and these were the typical Donatists in the eyes of all outside Africa. They were especially dangerous to the Catholic clergy, whose houses they attacked and pillaged. They beat and wounded them, put lime and vinegar on their eyes, and even forced them to be rebaptized. Under Axi- dus and Fasir, "the leaders of the Saints" in Numidia, property and roads were unsafe, debtors were protected, slaves were set in their masters' carriages, and the masses made to communi cate with the Donatists. The Donatist bishops invited a general named Taurus to repress these extravagances. He met with resistance in a place named Octavia, and the altars and tablets to be seen there in St. Optatus' time testify to the veneration given to the Circumcellions who were slain; but if their bishops were not martyrs, it seems, on the whole, that they were not to martyrs. It seems that in 336—7 the prefectus praetorio of Italy, Gregory, took some measures against the Donatists, for St. Optatus tells us that Donatus wrote him a letter beginning: "Gregory, stain on the senate and disgrace to prefects". They were to be punished.

THE PERSECUTION OF MACARUS.—When Constantine became master of the East by defeating Licinius in 323, he was prevented by the rise of Arianism in the East from sending, as he had hoped, Eastern bishops to Africa to adjust the differences between the Donatists and the Catholics. Cecilian of Carthage was present at the Council of Nicæa in 325, and his successor, Gratus, was at that of Sardica in 342. The conciliabulum of the Easterns on that occasion wrote a letter to Donatus, as though he were the true Bishop of Carthage; but the Arians failed to get the support of the Donatists, who looked upon the whole East as set off from the Catholic Church, which survived them alone. The Emperor Constans was as anxious as his father to give peace to Africa. In 347 he sent thither two commissioners, Paulius and Macarius, with large sums of money for distribution. Donatus naturally saw in this an attempt to win over his adherents to the Church by bribery; he received the envoys with insolence: "What has the emperor to do with the Church?" said he, and he forbade his people to accept any largess from Constans. In most parts, however, the friendly mission seems to have been not unfavourably received. But at Bagai in Numidia the bishop, Donatus, assembled the Circumcellions of the neighbourhood, who had already been excited by their bishop. Macarius was obliged to ask for the protection of the military. The Circumcellions attacked them, and killed two or three soldiers; the troops then became uncontrollable, and slew some of the Donatists. This unfortunate incident was thereafter continually in the teeth of the Catholics, and they were nicknamed Macarans by the Donatists, who declared that Donatus of Bagai had been precipitated from a rock, and that another bishop, Marculus, had been thrown into the sea. The existence of Arius, and the latter "martyr" do not seem to deserve credit, and the African Catholics believed that the two bishops had sought their own deaths. The Acts of two other Donatist martyrs of 347, Maximian and Isaac, are preserved; they apparently belong to Carthage, and are attributed by Harnack to the Antipope Macrobius.
seems that after violence had begun, the envoys ordered the Donatists to unite with the Church whether they willed or no. Many of the bishops took to flight with their partisans; a few joined the Catholics; the rest were banished. Donatus the Great died in exile. At this time, Victor, who wrote in 367, composed a work to show that the servants of God are hated by the world.

A solemn Mass was celebrated in each place where the union was completed, and the Donatists set about a rumour that images (obviously of the emperor) were to be placed on the altar and worshipped. As nothing of the sort was found to be Africa, and as the emperor merely made a speech in favour of unity, it seems that the reunion was effected with less violence than might have been expected. The Catholics and their bishops boasted God for the peace that ensued, though they declared that they had no responsibility for the action of Paulus and Macarius. In the following year Gratian, the Catholic Bishop of Carthage, held a council, in which the reiteration of baptism was forbidden, while, to please the rallyed Donatists, traitors were condemned anew. It was forbidden to honour suicides as martyrs.

THE RESTORATION OF DONATISM BY JULIAN.—The peace was happy for Africa, and the forcible means by which it was obtained were justified by the violence of the sectaries. But the accession of Julian the Apostate in 361 changed the face of affairs. Delighted to throw Christianity into confusion, Julian allowed the Catholics who had been banished to return to the sees which the Arians were occupying. The Donatists, who had been banished by Constantius, were similarly allowed to return at their own petition, and received back their basiliques. Scenes of violence were the result of this policy both in the East and the West. A Yougos wrote St. Optatus, "returned to Africa at the same moment that the devil was set free", for the same emperor restored supremacy to paganism and the Donatists to Africa. The decree of Julian was considered so discreditable to them, that the Emperor Honorius in 405 had it posted up throughout Africa for their shame. St. Optatus gives a vehe-

The revolt of Firmus, a Mauretanian chieftain who defied the Roman power and eventually assumed the style of emperor (366–72), was undoubtedly supported by many Donatists. The imperial laws against them were strengthened by Valentinian in 375 and by Gratian, who legislated a law to show that the Catholic catechumens of the Donatists were to be given up to the Catholics. St. Augustine shows that even the churches which the Donatists themselves had built were included. The same emperor required Claudian, the Donatist bishop of Rome, to return to Africa; as he refused to obey, a Roman council had him driven a hundred miles from the city. It is probable that the Catholic Bishop of Carthage, Genethlius, caused the laws to be mildly administered in Africa.

St. Optatus.—The Catholic champion, St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis, published his great work "De schismate Donatistarum" in answer to that of the Donatist Bishop of Carthage, Parmenianus, under Valentinian and Valens, 364–75 (so St. Jerome). Optatus himself tells us that he was writing after the death of Julian (363) and more than sixty years after the beginning of the schism (303). The form which we possess is a second edition, brought up to date by the author after the accession of Pope Siricius (Dec., 354), with a seventh book added to the original six. In the first book he describes the origin and growth of the schism; in the sec-

They were driven out of Africa and took refuge in Gaul. In the third book he defends the Catholics from the charge of persecuting, with especial reference to the days of Macarius. In the fourth book he refutes Parmenianus's proofs from Scripture that the sacrifice of a sinner is polluted. In the fifth book he shows the validity of baptism even when conferred by sinners, for it is conferred by Christ, the minister being the instrument only. This is the first important statement of the doctrine that the grace of the sacraments is derived from the opus operatum of Christ independently of the worthiness of the minister. In the sixth book he describes the violence of the Donatists and the sacrilegious way in which they had treated Catholic altars. In the seventh book he treats chiefly of unity and of reunion, and returns to the subject of Macarius.

He calls Parmenianus "brother", and wishes to treat the Donatists as brethren, since they were not unlike other Fathers, he prays that covets the unity of the church, pagans and heretics go to hell; schismatics and all Catholics will eventually be saved after a necessary purgatory. This is the more curious, because before him and after him in Africa Cyprian and Augustine both taught that schism is as bad as heresy, if not worse. St. Optatus was much venerated by St. Augustine and later by St. Fulgentius. He writes with vehemence, sometimes with violence, in spite of his protestations of friendliness; but he is carried away by his indignation. His style is forceful and effective, often concise and epigrammatic. To this work he appended a collection of documents containing the evidence for the history he had related. This dossier had certainly been formed much earlier, at all events before the peace of 347, and not long after the latest document it contains, which is dated Feb., 330; the rest are not later than 321, and may possibly have been put together as early as that year. Unfortunately these important historical testimonies have come down to us only in a single mutilated MS., the archetype of which was also incomplete. The collection was freely used at the conference of 411 and is often quoted at some length by St. Augustine, who has preserved many of the most important portions which would otherwise be unknown to us.

The Maximianists.—Before Augustine took up the mantle of Optatus together with a double portion of his spirit, the Catholics had gained new and victorious arguments from the divisions among the Donatists.
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themselves. Like so many other schisms, this schism bred schisms within itself. In Mauretania and Numidia these separate sects were so numerous that the Donatists themselves could not name them all. We hear of Urbanists; of Claudianists, who were reconciled to the Church of Carthage; of Rogatists, a Mauretanian sect, of mild character, because no Circumcellions belonged to it; the Rogatists were severely punished whenever the Donatists could induce the magistrates to do so, and were also persecuted by Optatus of Thamugadi. But the most famous sect of the Donatists, for the story of the separation from the Donatists reproduces with strange exactitude that of the withdrawal of the Donatists themselves from the communion of the Church; and the conduct of the Donatists towards them was so inconsistent with their avowed principles, that it became in the skilled hands of Augustine the most effective weapon of all his controversial armoury.

Primianus, Donatist Bishop of Carthage, excommunicated the deacon Maximianus. The latter (who was, like Majorinus, supported by a lady) got together a council of forty-three bishops, who summoned Primianus to appear before them, to be heard. The bishop insulted their envoys, tried to have them prevented from celebrating the Sacred Mysteries, and had stones thrown at them in the street. The council summoned him before a greater council, which met to the number of a hundred bishops at Cebarsusium in June, 393. Primianus was deposed; all clerics were to leave communion within eight days; if they should delay till after Christmas, they would not be permitted to return to the Church even after penance; the laity were allowed until the following Easter, under the same penalty. A new bishop of Carthage was appointed in the person of Maximianus himself, and was consecrated by twelve bishops. The heretics of Primianus were rebaptized, if they had been baptized after the permitted delay. Primianus stood out, and demanded to be judged by a Numidian council; three hundred and ten bishops met at Bagas in April, 394; the primate did not take the place of an accused person, but himself presided. He was of course acquitted, and the Maximianists were condemned without a hearing. All but the twelve consecrators and their abettors among the clergy of Carthage were given till Christmas to return; after this period they would be obliged to do penance, composed of sermons in elegant style by Emeritus of Caesarea, and adopted by acclamation, made the Donatists henceforth ridiculous through their having readmitted schismatics without penance. Maximian's church was razed to the ground, and after the term of grace had elapsed, the Donatists persecuted the unfortunate Maximianists, representing themselves as Catholicks, and demanding that the magistrates should enforce against the new sectaries the very laws which Catholic emperors had drawn up against Donatism. Their influence enabled them to do this, for they were still far more numerous than the Catholicks, and the magistrates must often have been of their party. In the reception of those who returned from the party of Maximian they were yet more fatally inconsequent. The rule was theoretically adhered to that all who had been baptized in the schism must be rebaptized; but if a man refused, he and his whole flock were admitted without rebaptism. This was allowed even in the case of two of the consecrators of Maximian, Pretextatus of Asur and Felicianus of Musti, after the proconsul had vainly tried to expel them from their sees, and although a Donatist bishop, Rogatus, had already been appointed at Asur. In another case the party of Primianus was more consistent. Salvius, the Maximianist Bishop of Membressa, was another of the consecrators. He was twice summoned by the proconsul to retire in favour of the Primanian Restitutus. As he was much respected by the people of Membressa, a mob was brought from over from the neighbouring town of Abitene to expel him; the aged bishop was beaten, and made to dance with dead dogs tied round his neck. But his people built him a new church, and three bishops coexisted in this small town, a Maximianist, a Primanian, and a Catholick.

The leader of the Donatists at this time was Optatus, Bishop of Thamugadi (Timgad), called Gildonianus, from his friendship with Gildo, the Count of Africa (380-397). For ten years Optatus, supported by Gildo, was the tyrant of Africa. He persecuted the Rogatists and Maximianists, and he used troops against the Catholicks. St. Augustine tells us that his vices and cruelties were beyond description; but they had at least the effect of disgracing the cause of the Donatists, for though he was hated throughout Africa for his wickedness and his evil deeds, yet the Puritan faction remained always in full communion with this bishop, who was a robber, a Session, an oppressor, a traitor, and a monster of cruelty. When Gildo fell in 397, after having made himself master of Africa for a few months, Optatus was thrown into a prison, in which he died.

SAINT AUGUSTINE.—St. Augustine began his vitiqious campaign against Donatism soon after he was ordained priest in 391. His popular psalm or "Aberedarium" against the Donatists was intended to make known to the people the arguments set forth by St. Optatus, with the same conciliatory end in view. It shows that the sect was founded by traditors, condemned by popes and council, separated from the whole world, a cause of division, violence, and bloodshed; the true Church is the one Vine, whose branches are over all the earth. After St. Augustine had become bishop in 395, he obtained conferences with some of the Donatist leaders, though not with his successor at Hippo. In 400 he wrote the latter of Parmenianus, refuting his calumnies and his arguments from Scripture. More important were his seven books on baptism, in which, after developing the principle already laid down by St. Optatus, that the effect of the sacrament is independent of the holiness of the minister, he shows in great detail that the authority of St. Cyprian is more awkward than convenient for the Donatists. The principal Donatist controversialist of the day was Petilianus, Bishop of Constantine, a successor of the traditor Silvanus. St. Augustine wrote two books in reply to a letter of his against the Church, adding a third book to answer another letter in which he was himself attacked by Petilianus. Before this last book he published his "De Unitate ecclesiae" about 403. To these works must be added some sermons and some letters which are real treatises.

The arguments used by St. Augustine against Donatism fall under three heads. First we have the historical proofs of the regularity of Caecilian's consecration of the innocence of Felix of Apotonga, of the guilt of the founders of the "Pure" Church, also the judgments given by popes and council, separated from the whole world, a cause of division, violence, and bloodshed; the true Church is the one Vine, whose branches are over all the earth. Second, there are the doctrinal arguments: the proofs from the Old and New Testaments that the Church is Catholic, divided throughout the world, and necessarily one and united; appeal is made to the See of Rome, where the succession of bishops is uninterrupted from St. Peter himself; St. Augustine borrows his list of popes from St. Optatus (Ep. II), and in his psalm crystallizes the argument into the famous phrase: "That is the rock against which the proud gates of hell do not prevail." A further appeal is to the Eastern Church, and especially to the Apostolic Churches to which St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John addressed epistles—they are not in communion with the Donatists. The validity of baptism conferred by heretics, the impurity of rebaptizing, are
important points. All these arguments were found in St. Optatus. Peculiar to St. Augustine is the necessity of defending St. Cyprian, and the third category is wholly his own. This third division comprises the argumentum ad hominem drawn from the inconsistence of the Donatists; full fellowship was accorded to malefactors like Optatus Gildonanus and the Circumcellions; Tichonius turned against his own party; Maximin had divided from Primianus just as Majorinus from Caecilian; the Maximianists had been readmitted without reformation.

This last method of argument was found to be of great practical value, and many conversions were now taking place, largely on account of the false position in which the Donatists had placed themselves. This point had been especially emphasized by the Council of Carthage of Sept., 401, which had ordered information as to the treatment of the Maximianists to be gathered from magistrates. The same synod restored the earlier rule, long since abolished, that Donatist bishops and clergy should retain their rank if they returned to the Church. Pope Anastasius I wrote to him himself, urging the importance of the Donatist question. Another council in 403 organized public disputations with the Donatists. This energetic action roused the Circumcellions to new violence. The life of St. Augustine was endangered. His future biographer, St. Possidius of Calama, was insulted and ill-treated by a party led by a grammarian, Crespinus. The latter's bishop, also named Crespinus, tried at Carthage and fined ten pounds of gold as a heretic, though the fine was remitted by Possidius. This is the first case known to us in which a Donatist is declared a heretic, but henceforth it is the common style of the laws and decrees of Maximianus, Bishop of Bagai, is also related by St. Augustine in detail. The Emperor Honorius was induced by the Catholics to renew the old laws against the Donatists at the beginning of 405. Some good resulted, but the Circumcellions of Hippo were excited to new violence. The letter of Petilianus was defended by a grammarian named Cresciognus, against whom St. Augustine published a reply in four books. The third and fourth books are especially important, as in these he argues from the Donatists' treatment of the Maximianists, quotes the Acts of the Council of Carthage by Secundus, and other important documents. The saint also replied to a pamphlet by Petilianus, "De unico baptismae".

The "Collatio" of 411.—St. Augustine had once hoped to conciliate the Donatists by reason only. The violence of the Circumcellions, the cruelties of Optatus of Thamugadi, the more recent attacks on Catholic bishops had all given proof that repression by the secular arm was absolutely unavoidable. It was not necessarily a case of persecution for religious opinions, but simply of the protection of life and property and the securing of freedom and safety for Catholics. Nevertheless the laws were much harsher than this. Those of Honorius were promulgated anew in 408 and 410. In 411 the method of disputation was organized on a large scale by order of the emperor himself at the request of the Catholic bishops. Their case was now complete and unanswerable. But this was to be brought home to the people of Africa, and public opinion was to be forced to recognize the facts, by a public exposure of the weakness of the separatist position. The emperor sent an official named Marcellinus, an excellent Christian, to preside as cognitor at the conference. He issued a proclamation declaring that he would consult his absolute imperial powers in the proceedings and in his final judgment. The Donatist bishops who should come to the conference were to receive back for the present the basilicas which had been taken from them. The number of those who arrived at Carthage was very large, though somewhat less than the two hundred and seventy-nine whose signatures were appended to a letter to the president. The Catholic bishops numbered two hundred and eighty-six. Marcellinus decided that each party should select seven disputants, who alone should speak, and that they might consult, and four secretaries to keep the records. Thus only thirty-six bishops would be present in all. The Donatists pretended that this was a device to prevent their great numbers being known; but the Catholics did not object to all of them being present, provided no disturbance were caused.

The chief Catholic speaker, besides the amiable and venerable Bishop of Carthage, Aurelius, was of course Augustine, whose fame had already spread through the whole Church. His friend, Alypius of Tagaste, and his disciple and biographer, Possidius, were also among the seven. The principal Donatist speakers were Emeritus of Cesarea in Mauretania (Cherchel) and Petilianus of Constantine (Cirta); the latter spoke or interrupted about a hundred and fifty times, until on the third day he was so hoarse that he had to desist. The Catholics made a generous proposal that any Donatist bishop who should join the Donatist question, another council in 403 organ, public disputations with the Donatists. This energetic action roused the Circumcellions to new violence. The life of St. Augustine was endangered. His future biographer, St. Possidius of Calama, was insulted and ill-treated by a party led by a grammarian, Crespi,
hundred. A further law was published in 428. The good Marcellinus, who had become the friend of St. Augustine, fell a victim (it is supposed) to the rancour of the Donatists; for he was put to death in 413, as though an accomplice in the revolt of Heraclius, Count of Africa. Historians deny that the emperor, who did not believe him guilty. Donatism was not now discouraged by the conference and proscribed by the persecuting laws of Honorius. The Circumcellions made some dying efforts, and a priest was killed by them at Hippo.

It does not seem that the decrees were rigidly carried out. In any case, clerical clergy were still found in Africa. The ingenious Emerita was at Carthage in 418, and the wish of Pope Zosimus St. Augustine had a conference with him, without result. But on the whole Donatism was dead.

Even before the conference the Catholic bishops in Africa were considerably more numerous than the Donatists, except in Numidia. From the time of the invasion of the Vandals in 429 little is heard of them until the days of St. Gregory, when they seem to have revived somewhat, for that pope complained to the Emperor Maurice that the laws were not strictly enforced. They finally disappear with the irruptions of the Saracens.

Donatist Writers.—There seems to have been no lack of literary activity among the Donatists of the fourth century, though little remains to us. The works of Donatus the Great were known to St. Jerome, but have not been preserved. His book on the Holy Spirit is lost. It is said that Father to the Church. It is possible that the Pseudo-Cyprianic “De singularitate clericorum” is by Macrobius; and the “Adversus aleatores” is by an antipope, either Donatist or Novatianist. The arguments of Parmenianus and Cresconianus are known to us, though their works are also lost. But that a treatise of St. Augustine’s citations are known in the Pseudo-Augustinian “Contra Felicitianum Donatistam” is certain. Of the donatists, or for the church, which was quite inconsistent with Donatism, and which Parmenianus tried to refute. In the famous words of St. Augustine (who often refers to his illogical position as to the force with which he argued against the cardinal tenets of his own sect): “The Donatists, assailed on all sides by the voices of the holy pages, woke and saw the Church of God diffused throughout the world, as had been foreseen and foretold of her so long before by the hearts and mouths of the saints. And seeing this, he undertook to demonstrate and assert against his own party that no sin of man, however villainous and monstrous, can interfere with the promises of God, nor can any impurity of any persons within the Church cause the word of God to be made void as to the existence and diffusion of the Church to the ends of the earth, which was promised to the Fathers and now is manifest to all men both in the sacred page and in the Church.”
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Donaldus of Bagai. See DONATISTS.

Donaldus of Case Nigre. See DONATISTS.

Donaldus of Fiesole, Irish teacher and poet, Bishop of Fiesole about 829–876. In an ancient collection of the Vita Aurea, a fourth century copy exists in the Laurentian library of Florence, there is an account of the life of Donaldus, from which we glean the following facts. Donaldus was born in Ireland, of a noble family. About 816 he visited the tombs of the Apostles in Rome. On his journey he was led by Divine Providence to the city of Fiesole, which he entered at the moment when the people were crowded around their altars praying for a bishop to deliver them from the evils, temporal and spiritual, which afflicted them. Raised by popular acclaim to the See of Fiesole, Donaldus instituted a revival of piety and learning in the Church over which he was placed. He himself did not disdain to teach the “art of metrical composition.” The “Life” is interspersed with short poems written by the saintly bishop. The best known of these is the twelve-line poem in which he describes the beauty and fertility of his native land, and the prowess and piety of its inhabitants. Donaldus also composed an epitaph in which he alludes to his birth in Ireland, his years in the service of the princes of Italy (Lothair and Louis), his episcopate at Fiesole, and his activity as a teacher of grammar and poetry.


WILLIAM TURNER.

Donaldus the Great. See DONATISTS.

Donders, Peter, missionary among the lepers, b. at Tilburg in Holland, 27 Oct., 1807; d. 14 Jan., 1887. He desired from his early childhood to be a priest, but he had to begin life as a worker in a factory. He afterwards became a servant in a college where he acquired a little and made a beginning. Later a benefactor enabled him to pursue his theological studies in the College of Herlaar. A chance reading of the “Annals of the Propagation of the Faith” determined his vocation for foreign missions. He was accepted in 1832 in the Dutch Guiana Mission, but was ordained priest the following year, and in 1842 arrived at Paramaribo to begin his long apostolic career. He laboured with success among the blacks in the plantations, and by 1850 had instructed and baptized 1200. In the epidemic of 1851 his labours were superhuman, but like his fellow-priests, he too became a victim. Before he was convalescent he not
only resumed his work among the blacks, but extended it to the Indians of Saramaca. In 1655 he took up his residence in Batavia where for nearly thirty-two years he ministered to 600 lepers. He left them only to visit the blacks and Indians. In 1685 the whole colony was confided to the Redemptorist Fathers by the Holy See and the King of Holland. Father Dongan at once asked to be of their number and was received in Paramaribo, in 1687, by Monsignor Swinkels, the first Redemptorist vicar Apostolic. After this he went back to his charge. He studied music to cheer his afflicted children, and though given an assistant he laboured to the end. The process of his beatification has been placed before the Congregation of Sacred Rites.

Dongan, Thomas, second Earl of Limerick, b. 1634, at Castletown Kildrue, now Celbridge, County Kildare, Ireland, d. at London, 1715. He was the youngest son of Sir John Dongan, Baronet, Member of the Irish Parliament; an uncle, Richard Talbot, was afterwards created Earl of Tyrconnell, Lieut.-Governor of Ireland; and another, Sir Robert, married Grace, daughter of Lord Calvert, Baron of Baltimore. At the death of Charles I, the family, retired to the Continent, removed to France. Thomas served in an Irish regiment, participated in all Turenne's campaigns under the name of D'Unguent and rose to the rank of colonel in 1674. After the Treaty of Nimeguen (1678) he returned to England in obedience to the order of the English Government recalling all British subjects in French service. Through the Duke of York, a fellow-officer under Turenne, he was appointed to high rank in the army designated for service in Flanders, and was granted an annual pension of £500. The same year (1678) he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Tangiers. In 1682 the Duke of York, the Lord Proprietor, selected Dongan to govern the Province of New York, then bankrupt and in a state of rebellion. In this office Dongan proved himself an able lawgiver, and left an indelible mark on political and constitutional history. He convened the first representative assembly of New York Province on 14 Oct., 1683, at Fort James within the present boundaries of the city of New York. This assembly, under the wise supervision of Dongan, passed an act entitled "A Charter of Liberties"; decreed that the supreme legislative power under the Duke of York shall reside in a governor, council, and the people convened in general assembly; conferred upon the members of the assembly rights and privileges making them a body coequal to and independent of the British Parliament; established town, county, and general courts of justice; solemnly proclaimed the right of religious liberty; and passed acts enunciating certain constitutional liberties, e.g., no taxation without representation; taxes could be levied only by the people; free election in general assembly; right of suffrage; no martial law or quartering of the soldiers without the consent of the inhabitants; election by majority of votes; and the English law of real property.

Thus to Dongan's term as governor can be dated the Magna Charta of American constitutional liberties, for his system of government became the programme of continuous political agitation by the colonists of New York Province during the eighteenth century. It developed naturally into the present system of state government, and is in keeping with the whole framework of the Federal Government. Moreover, a rare tribute to his genius, the government imposed by him on New York Province, 1683, was adopted by England after the American War of Independence as the framework of her colonial policy, and constitutes the present form of government in South America, Australia, and the Transvaal.

Dongan signed the Charter of Liberties 30 Oct., 1683, and on the following day solemnly proclaimed it at the City Hall of New York City. The Duke of York signed and sealed the Charter 4 Oct., 1684; but never returned it, probably for reasons of prudence, for at the time Charles II had, by a quo warranto proceeding, abolished the Charters of New England, and the Charter of Pennsylvania granted in 1684 distinctly admits the right of Parliament to tax the colonies. Dongan established the boundary lines of the province by settling disputes with Connecticut on the English Governor of Canada on the North, with Pennsylvania on the South, thus marking out the present limits of New York State. By treaty with the Indians made at Albany, New York, 1684, in presence of Lord Howard, Governor of Virginia, Dongan obtained the written submission of the Iroquois to the Great Sachem Charles, on two white deerskins, and outlined the masterly Indian policy which kept the Five Nations, friends of England and a barrier between the English and French possessions in North America, a policy afterwards maintained with success by Sir William Johnson. At the death of Charles II, 1685, James Duke of York was proclaimed King, and New York became a royal province.

The Board of Trade and Plantations, under whose supervision the province passed, vetoed the Charter of Liberties and James approved the veto. The colonists were disappointed, but such was the moral strength of Governor Dongan that we find no trace of popular resentment. In 1685 Dongan established a post office in New York for the better correspondence of the colonies in America. In 1686 he granted charters to the cities of New York and Albany; the former remained unchanged for 135 years and forms the basis of the existing city government; the latter was superseded only in 1870, notwithstanding the extraordinary development in civil and political institutions.

Dongan established a college under the direction of the Jesuit Fathers Harvey (his own private chaplain), Harrison, and Gage in New York City, and advised that the King's Farm, a tract beyond the walls of the then existing city, be set aside for its maintenance. The king vetoed the grant, and in 1705 this land became the property of Trinity Church. He planned that a mission of English Jesuits be permanently established at Saratoga, New York, on land purchased by him for the purpose; that the number of Irish Catholics be founded in the centre of the Province; and that an expedition be made to explore the Mississippi River and take possession of the great valley then made known by the explorations of La Salle. These plans were set aside by the king.

In 1687, the Assembly of New York was dissolved by the king, and in 1688 Andros was appointed Governor of the consolidated Provinces of New York and New England. Dongan refused command of a regiment with the rank of major-general, retired to his estate on Staten Island, New York, but was obliged to leave it for safety in the reign of James II. In 1689 he returned to England. By the death of his brother William (1698), late Governor of the Province of Munster, Ireland, whose son,
Colonel Walter, Lord Donnan, was killed at the battle of the Boyne, Donnan became Earl of Limerick. In 1702 he was recognized as successor to his brother's estates, but only on payment of claims of the purchasers from the Earl of Athlone. Donnan died poor and without direct heirs. By will, dated 1715, he provided that he be buried at an expense of over £100, and left the residue of his estate to his niece, wife of Colonel Nugent, afterwards Marshal of France. The tribute of history to his personal charm, his integrity, and character, is outspoken and universal. His publics papers give evidence of a keen mind and a comprehensive grasp. He was a man of age, tact, and capacity, an able diplomat, and a statesman of prudence and remarkable foresight. In spite of the brief term of five years as Governor of New York Province, by virtue of the magnitude, of the enduring and far-reaching character of his achievements, he stands forth as one of the greatest constructive statesmen ever sent out by England for the government of any of her American colonial possessions.


John T. Driscoll.

Donlevy, Andrew, educator, b. in 1694, probably in Sligo, Ireland; date and place of death uncertain. Little is known about his early life. With the penal laws then rigorously enforced it was difficult to obtain an education at home; and when he went abroad to study for the priesthood he must have gone in disguise, being afraid of any such purpose being a crime. However, he reached Paris in 1710 and became a student at the Irish College. His clerical course finished, he was ordained priest, and in 1728 he was appointed prefect in the college, an office he held till he had also attended lectures at the university, graduating both in theology and law. While holding the office of prefect, he drew up a new code of rules for the government of the college, placing it under the control of the Archbishop of Paris and subject to the university. He also published in 1742 an Irish-English catechism of the Christian Doctrine, an edition of which appeared in Dublin in 1748.

Webber, Compendium of Irish Biography. (Dublin, 1875); O'Reilly, Irish Writers (Dublin, 1820); O'Boyle, The Irish College in Paris (London and Dublin, 1901).

E. A. D'Alton.

Donnan, Saint.—There were apparently three or four saints of this name who flourished about the seventh century.

(1) St. Donnan, Abbot of Eigg, and St. Donnan of Auchterless are regarded by both the Bollandists and Dempster as different personages, but there is so much confusion in their chronology and repetition in what is known of them, that it seems more probable that they were identical. Reeves (Adamnan's Life of St. Columba), moreover, accepts them as the same without discussion. According to Adamnan's Life, St. Columba, who followed him from Ireland to Scotland towards the end of the sixth century. Seeking a solitary retreat, he and his companions settled on the island of Eigg, off the west coast of Scotland, then used only to pasture sheep belonging to the queen of the country. Informed of this invasion, the queen ordered that all should forthwith be slain. Her agents, probably a marauding band of Picts, or pirates according to one account, arrived during the celebration of Mass on Easter eve. Being requested to wait until the Sacrifice was concluded, they did so, and then St. Donnan and his fifty-one companions gave themselves up to the sword. This was in 617. Reeves mentions eleven churches dedicated to St. Donnan; in that at Auchterless his pastoral staff was preserved to the Reformation and is said to have worked miracles. The island of Eigg was still Catholic in 1703 and St. Donnan's memory venerated there (Martin, Journey to the Western Islands, London, 1716).

(2) Son of Liath, and nephew and disciple of St. Senan, in whose life it is related that by his uncle's direction he restored to life two boys who had been drowned. This St. Donnan succeeded St. Ciarran of Clonmacnois as Abbot of Aigin, an island in Lough Ree, on the Shannon (now Hare Island). He flourished about the middle of the sixth century.

(3) St. Donnan, son of Beoadh and brother of St. Ciaran. He was a monk in his brother's monastery at Clon, or Clonmacnois, in Ireland, in the sixth century.


G. Cyprian Alston.

Donner, Georg Raphael, Austrian sculptor, b. at Essling, Austria, 25 May, 1692; d. at Vienna, 15 February, 1741. It is said his fancy was first kindled by the works of art at Halleinkreuz. He received his technical training in the academy at Vienna; in 1724 he entered the imperial service, and in 1729 passed to that of Prince Esterhazy. Donner's work stands out with prominence in a period given over to mannerism, but he is sometimes more mindful of elegance than of character in his subject. He had a true sense of the beautiful, was lifelike and noble in his conceptions, and represents for South Germany and Austria a classic reaction against rococo methods. Among his productions are the marble statue of Charles VI and two bronze reliefs in the Belvedere at Vienna, a fountain for the old Town Hall, representing "Andromeda and Perseus," the marble reliefs of "Hagar" and the " Samaritan Woman," and many busts and statues in different palaces and gardens. In Pressburg he made the equestrian statue of St. Martin, and the decorations for the burial chapel of the Primate Emmerich Esterhazy. Youthful productions (1726) are the marble figures at Minnbell Castle, Salzburg. Donner is best known to-day by his famous fountain (1738–1739) of the Neuen Markt, Vienna; "Providence" or "Foresight," a classic female figure, forms the apex, while lower down four sporting children, each holding a water-spouting fish, embody the four rivers of Austria proper that flow into the Danube. Donner's two brothers, Sebastian and Matthias, are generally numbered among his scholars. Sebastian was a talented sculptor, and produced various works, mostly in marble. Donner, Matthias, brother of the above, also a sculptor, b. 1704; d. 1756. He is known chiefly for his relief carvings and medals. He was appointed court-medallist, professor, and later rector of the Academy, and was employed by various princes. Among his medals may be mentioned ones of Bavaria, 1727, and various ones representing Maria Theresa. His medals are signed D. or M. D.

Linnen, Outline of the History of Art, ed. Stubbs (New York, 1904); Marindan and Frothingham, History of Sculpture.
Donnet, FERDINAND-FRANÇOIS-AUGUSTE, a French cardinal, b. at Bourg-Argental (Loire), 1795; d. at Bordeaux, 1882. He studied in the seminary of St. Ireneus at Lyons, taught at the college of Belley, was ordained priest in 1819, and, after some time spent at the Maison des hautes études founded by Cardinal Fesch, went to Irigny as pastor. From 1821 to 1827 he engaged in missionary work and then returned to Lyon as pastor of the Vieux-Plancher. Appointed coadjutor to the Bishop of Nancy, 1835, he evinced such sterling qualities that two years later he was called to the archiepiscopal See of Bordeaux. During the forty-one years of his administration he showed a prodigious activity in every line of work, religious, social, and even material. To him are due the resumption of provincial councils; the restoration of many shrines like Arecachon, Verdelais, Notre-Dame de la Fin-des-terres; the reconstruction of the Pey Berland tower, etc. Cardinal in 1852, and Senator of the Empire, he used his influence in favour of the pope, the church, and the suppression of the irreligious press. At the Vatican Council he openly sided with the Ultramontanes like Plantier, Pie, etc. His affable disposition and cheerful character endeared him to his people, and few bishops have been loved and regretted as Donnet was. His eulogy was pronounced by Canon Laprie at the cathedral of Bordeaux, 1883, and by M. Boué at the academy of the same place, 1894. Cardinal Donnet's works comprise twelve volumes (8vo) of "Instructions pastorales, mandements, lettres, discours"; also "Lettres, discours et autres documents relatifs à la question royaude (Bordeaux, 1865)."

Pougeois, Vie. apostolat et épiscopat du cardinal Donnet (Paris, 1884); Captant in Rev. Cath. (1884), 453; Ponssec, Le cardinal Donnet, in "L'épiscopat françois, 1802-1905" (Paris, 1907), s. vv. Nancy and Bordeaux.

J. F. SOLLEIR.

Donoso Cortés, JUAN FRANCISCO MARÍA DE LA SALUD, Marquess of Valdegamas, author and diplomat, b. 6 May, 1889, at Valle de la Serena in the province of Estremadura, Spain; d. 3 May, 1883, at Paris. His father, Pedro Donoso Cortés, was a descendant of Hernando Cortés, the conquistador. At the age of eleven, Donoso Cortés had finished his humanities, and at twelve had begun the study of law at the University of Salamanca; at sixteen he received his degree from the University of Seville, and at eighteen became professor of literature at the College of Cáceres. Carried away by the rationalism prevalent in Spain following upon the French invasions, he ardently embraced the principles of Liberalism and fell under the influence of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, whom he later characterized as "the most eloquent of sophists." In 1830 he went to Madrid and, with his characteristic energy, engaged in the political controversies of the day, espousing the cause of the reigning dynasty. A memoir addressed to Ferdinand VII on the situation of the Spanish monarchy, advocating the abdication of the Salic Law, attracted wide attention and procured for him an official position under the Minister of Justice. But the revolutionary events of 1833 led him to reconsider the ground of his political liberalism, and drew a second brochure from his pen seethingly criticizing the revolution movement. On the death of Ferdinand VII (1833) he remained a faithful adherent of the queen-mother Maria Cristina and of her infant daughter Isabelita, whose title was disputed by Don Carlos in virtue of the Salic Law against the succession in the female line to the Spanish throne. In 1836, under the ministry of Maria Cristina, he became secretary of the Council; this same year he gave a brilliant course of lectures on political rights at the Athenaeum of Madrid. In 1837 he was elected deputy to the Cortes from Cadiz. In 1840, following upon the revolution headed by Espartero, Duke of Victoria, he followed the exiled queen Maria Cristina to Paris in the post of private secretary. He accompanied her on her return after the overthrow of Espartero in 1845, and was appointed to the office of secretary and director of the studies of the young queen, Isabella, was created Marquess of Valdegamas, and entered the Senate. For his eloquent advocacy of the "Spanish marriages" (the simultaneous alliance of Isabella with Francesco of Assisi and of her sister with the Duke of Montpensier) he was made an officer of the Legion of Honour by Louis Philippe.

The death of a dearly beloved brother at this time made a profound impression upon Donoso Cortés. The mystery of human destiny assumed for him a new aspect, and from this time he became an ardent champion of the Catholic Church. On the 4th of January, 1849, he pronounced a remarkable discourse in the Cortes in which he pointedly reprehended Liberalism and Socialism, branding them as "sterile and disastrous ideas in which are comprehended all the errors of the past three centuries, intended to disturb and disrupt human society." In 1849 he represented Spain as minister plenipotentiary at the court of Berlin, and afterwards at Paris (1850-53), where he died.

The complete works of Donoso Cortés, with a biographical sketch by Gabino Tejado, were published in 1854-55 (Madrid). A translation into French of his principal works, with an introduction by Louis Veillot, was published at Paris (1858-59). His most valuable work is his "Ensayo sobre El Catolicismo, El Liberalismo y El Socialismo" (English translation, Philadelphia, 1862; Dublin, —). This work was written at the instance of Louis Veillot, who was an intimate friend of the author, and places Donoso Cortés in the first rank of Catholic publicists. It is an exposition of the impotence of all human systems of philosophy to solve the problem of human destiny and of the absolute dependence of humanity upon the Catholic Church for its social and political salvation. Upon its publication the work was acrimoniously attacked by the Abbé Gaudel, Vice-General of Orléans, in a series of articles in the "Ami de la Religion," and vigorously defended by Louis Veillot in "L'Univers." Donoso Cortés at once submitted his work to the Holy See, which refused to interdict it or any of the propositions declared heretical by the Abbé Gaudel. It remains to-day one of the most brilliant and profound expositions of the influence of Catholic truth upon human society from the pen of a publicist. In a notable series of letters, from 1849-53, to Count Raczyński, at that time Prussian ambassador at Madrid, Donoso Cortés gives a penetrating analysis of the social, political, and religious conditions of Europe, and with almost prophetic insight predicts the triumph of Germany in a great empire under the Prussian monarchy as well as the political decadence of France and the latter's loss of Alsace and Lorraine.


CONDE B. PALLEN.
DORCHESTER

Dorchester, Abbey of, founded in 1140 by Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, for Canons of the Order of St. Augustine (or Black Canons). Dorchester, an important Roman city of Mercia, about nine miles from Oxford, had been the seat of a bishopric from A.D. 584, when St. Birinus, the first bishop, was sent to that district by Pope Honorius, until 1085, when the See of Mercia was transferred to Lincoln. The abbey, founded fifty-five years later, was dedicated in honour of Sts. Peter, Paul, and Birinus, richly endowed out of the lands and tithes of the former bishopric, and had twelve parishes subject to it, being included in the Peculiar of Dorchester, until the suppression of peculiars. The first abbot appears to have been Alured, whose name occurs in 1146 and again in 1163; the last was John Merebe, who was elected in 1558, and in the following year subscribed to the king's supremacy, with five of his canons, and was given a pension of £22 a year. The revenues of the abbey were valued at the time of its suppression at about £220. Henry VIII reserved the greater part of the property of the house for a college, erected by him in honour of the Holy Trinity, and the canons and prebendaries; but this was dissolved in the first year of his successor. No register or cartulary of Dorchester Abbey is now known to exist, and only a single charter, confirming the donation of a church by King John, is given by Dugdale. Edmund Ashford was the first impropriator of the abbey site and precincts, which afterwards passed through various hands. The stately church of Dorchester Abbey, as it stands today, was built entirely by the Augustinian Canons, although there are traces on the north side of Saxon masonry, probably the ancient church. The whole length of the church is 230 feet, its width seventy, and its height fifty-five feet. The north transept with its doorway is of the Norman period; the north side of the nave and chancel arch, early English, the south side of nave, south aisle, and chancel, Decorated; the south porch, late Perpendicular. The extraordinarily rich sanctuary, with its highly decorated windows (including the famous northern one known as the "Jessé" window) and beautifully carved sedilia and piscina, dates from 1330. One of the very few existing leaden fonts in England is in this church.

Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum, vi, 233; Parke, History of Dorchester (Oxford, 1882); Willis, Mitched Abbeyes, II, 175; Victoria, History of Oxfordshire (London, 1807), I, 87-
DORÉ (AURATUS). PIERRE, controversialist, b. at
Orléans about 1500; d. at Paris, 19 May, 1559. He
took the degree of Doctor of Law at Padua in 1526;
Doré entered the Dominican Order in 1514 and won his de-
grees at Paris, in 1532, after a brilliant examination.
Through the influence of the office of prior to Biére in 1545,
Doré continued to preach throughout the provinces.
At Châlons the bishop, who had been captivated by his zeal
and eloquence, entrusted him with the reform of
the Carthusian monastery of Val des Choux (Vallis Caullum).
For the same reasons, Claude de Lorraine, Duke of Guise,
and hia consort, Antoinette de Lorraine, were inclined
to choose him as confesser. He wrote thirty-five
aceto-theological works, some of which are only
redactions of his sermons. Chief among these is
"Les voies du Paradis enseignées par notre Sauveur
Jésus-Christ en son évangile", which appeared twice at
Lyons in 1538 (Paris, 1540; Lyons, 1586; Rome, 1610).
In his "Paradoxa ad profugandae heresies ex
divi Pauli epistolis selecta", he refuted the Huguen-
notes, but soon turned to writing ascetical commen-
taries on the Psalms. When Henry II entered Paris
in 1548, Doré wrote a Latin ode which won for him the
post of court preacher and royal confesser. He
[continue reading]
Döring, Matthias, historian and theologian, b. between 1390 and 1400, at Kyritz, in Brandenburg; d. there 24 July, 1469. He joined the Friars Minor in his native place, studied at Oxford, was graduated (1424) at Erfurt as doctor of theology, and for some years taught theology and Biblical exegesis. In 1427 he was professed of his order for Saxony. In the disputes between the Conventuals and those of the Observance he took an active part. In 1443 at Berne the Conventuals elected him minister general. This position he held for six years, receiving approbation from the assembly of prelates still posing as the General Council of Basel. On this council he had been prominent since 1432 as an over-zealous reformer and an adherent of the supremacy of a general council over the pope. He was sent by it to Denmark, to win over the king and the people, and assisted in the deposition (1439) of Eugene IV and the election of the antipope, Felix V. Excommunicated by the Archbishop of Magdeburg he appealed to Rome. In 1461 he resigned his office and spent the last years of his life in literary work at the convent of Kyritz.

Döring is said to be the author of the "Confutatio primatus Pape", written (1443) anonymously and with much success. Name and title were added when the article was edited in 1550 by Matthias Placius Illysrius. It is in part an extract from the "Defensor pacis" of Marsilius of Padua (printed in Goldast, Monarchia, i, 537 sqq.). Other works attributed to Döring are "Defensorium postulii Nicolai Lyranii", against the Spanish bishop, Paul of Burgos, since 1451 frequently printed with the "Postilla"; "Liber perplosum Ecclesiae" (lost); continuation (1420 to 1464) of the Chronicle of Dietrich Engelus. He also wrote on the so-called "Donation of Constantine" and (1444) on the relics of the Precious Blood of Wilsnack.

Dornin, Bernard, first publisher in the United States of distinctively Catholic books, b. in Ireland, 1761; d. in Ohio, 1836. He was forced to leave his native land, in 1803, because of political troubles and, arriving in New York soon after, began a book-selling and publishing concern. He got a New Testament, printed for him in Brooklyn, in 1803, and an edition of Pastoral's "History of the Church" in 1807. He moved to Baltimore, in 1809, and from there to Philadelphia in 1817. During many years he was the leading Catholic publisher of the country, and as such enjoyed the friendship of Archbishop Carroll and of other members of the hierarchy, who esteemed him as a vigorous and gifted writer and editor. In the early thirties he disposed of his business in Philadelphia, where he had published a number of Catholic books, and went to Ohio to reside near his daughter.

Dornin, Thomas, theologian, b. at Berkhamstead, Hertfordshire, England, date uncertain; d. at Tournai, 1572 or 1577. He received his early education through his uncle, Thomas Dorman of Agroundames, now Amersham, Buckinghamshire. His master at Berkhamstead was Richard Reeve, a noted Protestant schoolmaster. He was also known to Thomas More, the Catholic scholar, then professor of Hebrew at Oxford, who took great interest in the boy and sent him to Winchester school in 1547. From Winchester Dorman went to New College at Oxford, of which Harding was a fellow, and here he was elected a probationer fellow. During the Catholic revival under Mary he was appointed fellow of All Souls College (1554) and on 9 July, 1558, took the degree B.C.L. A year or two after Elizabeth's accession, finding that he could not live in England without conforming to the new religion, he sacrificed his fellowship and his patronage to his friend and sectant, Robert Busby, where he met Harding, who was also an exile for the faith. Harding persuaded him to resume his studies, and Dorman accordingly went to Louvain and devoted himself to the study of theology. In 1565 he became B.D. in the University of Douai and finally received the doctorate there. During this period he engaged in controversy with the Anglican divines, Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, and Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's. In 1569, at the invitation of Dr. Allen, he joined the band of scholars at the newly founded English College at Douai which he assisted in the services of his private studies. He died at Tournai where he had been given an important benefice. His works are: "A Prophete of certeine articles in Religion denied by M. Juell" (Antwerp, 1564); "A Displeasure of M. Novellis Reprouthe" (Antwerp, 1565); "A Request to M. Jewell that he keep his promise made by solemm Protestation in his late Sermon at Pauls Cross" (London, 1567; Louvain, 1567).
2 May, 1393, with the permission of the chapter and of the Teutonic Order, established a hermitage near the cathedral. She led a very austere life. Numerous visitors sought her advice and consolation, and she had wonderful visions and revelations. Her confessor, the dean and canons of Marienwerder, a learned theologian, wrote down her communications and composed a Latin biography in seven books, "Septillium", besides a German life in four books. She was never canonised, but the people honoured her as the guardian of the country of the Teutonic Knights and "patroness of Prussia". Her feast is celebrated on 25 June, in some places on 30 Oct. The church at Marienwerder is now in the hands of the Lutherans; her relics cannot be found.


DORIS EMER.

Dorset, Altar. See Altar (in Liturgy), sub-title Altar-curtain.

Dorsey, Anne Hanson, novelist, b. at Georgetown, District of Columbia, U. S. A., 1815; d. at Washington, 26 December, 1896. She was the daughter of the Rev. William McKenney, a chaplain in the United States Navy, and Chloe Ann Langian McKenney. In 1827 she was married to Lorenzo Dorsey, and in 1840 became a convert to the Catholic Faith. From this period, for more than a half a century, she devoted her exceptional talent to Catholic fiction. She was a pioneer of light Catholic literature in the United States and a leading writer for the young. While deeply religious in tone, her stories are full of living interest and a knowledge of the world gained by clear insight and wide experience. Mrs. Dorsey's only son was killed while serving in the Union Army during the Civil War. She left three daughters. Pope Leo XIII twice sent her his benediction, and the University of Notre Dame conferred upon her the Lector medal. Her chief works are: "The Student of Blenheim Forest"; "Flowers of Love and Memory"; "Guy, the Leper"; "Tears of the Diadem"; "Tale of the White and Red Roses"; "Wood-reve Manor"; "Conscience, or the Trials of May Brooke"; "Cocama, the Rose of the Algonquins"; "The Flemings"; "Nora Brady's Vow"; "Moma, the Vestal"; "The Old Gray Rosary"; "Tangled Paths"; "The Old House at Glenarra"; "Adrift"; "Ada's Trust"; "Beth's Promise"; "The Heir of Carignons"; "War and Woof"; "The Palms"; "Coel of the Bough", 11, 1906; A Round Table of American Catholic Novelist (New York, 1896).

MARY T. WAGGAMAN.

DORCHESTERS. See ARMIRANISH.

Dorothy, a titular see of Phrygia Salutaris, in Asia Minor. This city already existed under the kings of Phrygia and is mentioned by most of the ancient geographers. It was situated at Karadja Hassar, six miles south-west of the modern Eski Shehir. About the end of the fourth century it is recorded that it was removed to Shehir Euyuk, at the ruins north of the same Eski Shehir: there it remained during the Byzantine period. Seven bishops are known from the fourth to the ninth century, the most famous being Eusebius, who denounced successively the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches (Lequien, Oriens christ., I, 837). The see is mentioned as late as the twelfth century among the suffragans of Sennada, but must have been suppressed soon after. Dorylaeum was taken and destroyed by the Seljuk Turks probably in 1076. It was there (1 July, 1097) that the crusaders won their great victory over the Turks. The city was rebuilt in 1175 by Manuel Comnenus and fortified as well as possible. At this time John Cinnamus ("Hist.", VII, 2-3) and Nicetas Choniates ("De gestis" 1, 4) write enthusiastically about it as one of the most beautiful cities of Asia Minor. The next year it fell again into the hands of the Turks; in 1240 it passed to Ethemogoul, father of Othman, the founder of the Osmanli dynasty (his tomb is at Sehghud near Eski Shehir). Meanwhile the city stretched away from the hill of Shehir Euyuk and developed along the Poursak (ancient Tembris or Tymbria), under the name of Eski Shehir. The modern town is situated at an altitude of 758 metres, on a vast and fertile plateau, about 400 kilometres from Constantinople. Eski Shehir is the chief town of a canton in the vilayet of Edirne. The population is about 40,000: 2000 Greeks, 200 Armenians, 200 Latins, a few Catholic Armenians, Protestants, and Jews, the rest being Musalmans. Since 1891 the Assumptionists have conducted a mission with a school for boys, and the Oblate Sisters of the Assumption two schools for girls. This is also a Catholic Armenian parish. Eski Shehir has hot springs that are used for baths. Fish, especially gigantic silures, swarm in the Poursak. The meerschaum industry flourishes there; the chief known mine of this mineral is at Mihalkali in the district of Eski Shehir.

ASSWORTH, Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, II, 66-68; TURKEI, Azi Minerve (Paris, 1862), 468-461; RABAT, Asia Minor (London, 1899), 211; CUNY, La Turquie d'Asie, IV, 1842, 320-321. FREDER, Thesaurus in Mythologia, Inventar-Briefe (Athens, 1894), IV, 916-931; RABAT, En Phrygie (Paris, 1895), Echos d'Orient (1888), 82-93; (1906), 356-360; (1907), 37-82.

S. VALIÉE.

DOSITHEANS, followers of Dositho, a Samaritan who formed a Gnostic-Judaic sect, previous to Simon Magus. Although the name of Dositho is often coupled with that of Simon Magus as the first of all heretics, we possess but scanty information concerning him. He is not mentioned in Justin Martyr, but first occurs in Pseudo-Tertullian's "Adv. Her.", a Latin rendering of the lost "Syntagma" of Hippolytus (about a.d. 220). "I pass over in silence", says the author, "the heretics of Judaism, I mean Dositho the Samaritan, who first dared to reject the Prophets, as not having spoken in the Holy Ghost. I pass over the Sadducees, who, springing from this root of error, failed in addition to this heresy to deny even the resurrection of the flesh" (ch. i). If, however, the Sadducees sprang from Dositho, he must have begun to teach sometime previous to the Christian Era, and his sect properly be counted among heresies in the time of St. Jerome, who copied Pseudo-Tertullian, distinctly speaks of "those who before the coming of Christ undid the Law". An independent witness to the same fact is found in the Pseudo-Clementine "Recognitions", I, 54: "the author of this [Sadducee] opinion was first Dositho and then Simon". On the other hand in "Recognitions", II, 8, we read that Dositho founded a sect after the death of John the Baptist. Origen states that "Dositho the Samaritan, after the time of Jesus, wished to persuade the Samaritans that he himself was the Messiah proclaimed by Moses" (Contra Celsum, VI, 11). This is all that he says about John the Baptist, Theodas, and Judas of Galilee as people whom the Jews mistakenly held to be the Christ (Hom. xvi in Lucam; Contra Celsum, I, xvii). He informs us that the Dosithoans gave out
that they possessed some books of Dositheus and told some tales about him as being still alive in this world, and he further accuses Dositheus of having mutilated the Scriptures. It is not certain, however, whether Origen did not confound Dositheus the Pseudo-Messias with an Encratite heretic who lived somewhat later. This is suggested especially by a passage in Origen's "De Principiis", IV, vii, where he ascribes to Dositheus the Samaritan and others some absurd and violent observance of the Sabbath. This is also, probably, the reason why Dositheus is placed by Hegesippus after Simon Magus instead of before. In Talmudic literature (Pirke d. R. Eliezer, xxxviii, and Tanhuma Vayyashbeh, ii) there occurs a Samaritan of the Syro-Macedonian period named Ḥannârî, and it has been plausibly argued that the patristic references which connect Dositheus with the Sadducees arise from a confusion of Dositheus the Samaritan-Pseudo-Messias with this early Jewish heretic. If this be true, there would have been three persons of this name, one at the time of Alexander the Great, another at the time of Christ, and a third, a generation later. But the mention of a fourth at the time of Salmanasar (about 700 B.C.) makes one cautious of Talmudic information. It is certain, however, that a Jewish sect, mentioned by several Arab and other historians under the name of Dustamyes or Dostan, continued to exist till the tenth century, and that they were considered similar to the Kutm, or Samaritans. But they seem never to have possessed any importance in the Christian world, in which from the earliest times there existed but a vague reminiscence of their name, though they continue to be mentioned in descriptions and lists of heresies, such as the "Heresies" of Epiphanius and similar collections.
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years in Canada (1721-23) he was appointed superior of the Seminary of Lisieux in France, and helped to preserve that institution from Jansenism. While acting as proctor-general for the Oriental Missions of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, he was made vicar Apostolic of a portion of India and consecrated titular Bishop of Samos by Benedict XIII (1723). He remained in Rome until appointed coadjutor to Bishop Mornay of Quebec (1729). Bishop Dosquet had to solve many difficulties that had arisen towards the close of the life of Bishop St-Vallier. He legislated wisely in behalf of the religious communities of women and was zealous for the suppression of the liquor traffic. In 1733, after Bishop Mornay's resignation, he succeeded to the See of Quebec, where he promoted education, primary and classical. A patron and benefactor of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, he continued almost exclusively to his missionaries Acadian, the islands of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Cape Breton, Newfoundland, and probably Labrador. He rewarded that congregation by generous endowments, including Sarecane, a property near Paris, which until the Revolution yielded an annual revenue of 2000 livres. In 1735 ill health forced him to leave Quebec, but his resignation was accepted only in 1739. Thenceforth he resided chiefly in Rome, attending to the interests of his former diocese, especially after the English conquest.

Dosquet, Pierre-Herman, fourth Bishop of Quebec, b. at Liège, Flanders, 1691; d. at Paris, 1777. He studied at the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice, Paris, and entered that congregation. After two

J. P. ARENDSEN.

Dossi, Giovanni, actually named Giovanni di Nicolò di Luterò, but also called Dosso Dossi, an Italian

painter, b. about 1479; d. at Ferrara in 1542. Dossi belonged to the School of Ferrara and was a pupil of Lorenzo Costa in Mantua. He is believed to have derived his name from the village of Dossio, in which it has been stated he was born. In conjunction with his brother Battista (1480-1548) Dossi visited Rome and Venice and passed eleven years in these places studying especially the works of Giorgione and Titian, but forming his own style, which was distinguished by
DOUAI

romantic treatment, imaginative power, rich, brilliant, and often novel colouring. He and his brother were frequently employed by Alfonso I, Duke of Ferrara, and by his successor, Ercole II. His greatest work is the altar-piece in the Ferrara Gallery. He also composed the polyphonic setting of the Requiem in the cathedral of that city, for those in the church of San Francesco, and in the ducale palace at Modena. Many of his frescoes still remain in the ducale palace at Ferrara and his paintings can be studied in the cathedral and churches of Modena, in the Louvre, and in the galleries of Dresden, Berlin, Munich, and Vienna. He painted a portrait of Aristot and the poet enrolled his name, in conjunction with those of Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Raphael, and Titian, in the poem of "Orlando Furioso," but the portrait cannot now be identified, although many other portraits by Dossi are still in existence. The landscape backgrounds of his pictures are marked by beauty of colouring and fine imaginative quality. On his return from Venice he appears to have settled down in Ferrara. His work has a close kinship with that of the Venetian School.


George Charles Williamson.

DOUAI

—The town of Douai, in the department of Nord, France, is situated on the River Scarpe, about thirty miles south of Lille. It contains about 30,000 inhabitants and was formerly the seat of a university. It was strongly fortified, and the old ramparts have only been removed in recent years. The town flourished in the Middle Ages, and the church of Notre-Dame dates from the twelfth century.

To English Catholics, the name Douai will always be bound up with the college founded by Cardinal Allen (q. v.) during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, where the majority of the clergy were educated in penal times, and to which the preservation of the Catholic religion in England was largely due. Other British establishments were founded there—colleges for the Scots and the Irish, and Benedictine and Franciscan monasteries—and Douai became the chief centre for those who were exiled for the Faith. The University of Douai may be said to date from 31 July, 1559, when Philip II of Spain (in that then situated) obtained a Bull from Pope Paul IV, authorizing its establishment, the avowed object being the preservation of the purity of the Catholic Faith from the errors of the Reformation. Paul IV died before he had promulgated the Bull, which was, however, confirmed by his successor, Pius IV, 6 January, 1560. The letters patent of Philip II, dated 19 January, 1561, authorized the establishment of a university with five faculties: theology, canon law, civil law, medicine, and arts. The formal inauguriation took place 5 October, 1562, when there was a public procession of the Blessed Sacrament, and a sermon was preached in the market-place by the Bishop of Arras.

There were already a considerable number of English Catholics living at Douai, and their influence made itself felt in the new university. In its early years the chief posts were held by Englishmen, mostly from Oxford. The first chancellor of the university was Dr. Richard Smith, formerly Fellow of Merton and regius professor of divinity at Oxford; the regius professor of canon law at Douai for many years was Dr. Owen Lewis, Fellow of New College, who had held the corresponding post at Oxford; the first principal of Marchiennes College was Richard White, formerly Fellow of New College; while Allen himself, after taking his licentiate at Douai in 1570, became regius professor of divinity. It is reasonable to suppose that many of the traditions of Catholic Oxford were perpetuated at Douai. The university was, however, far from being even predominantly English; it was founded on the model of that of Louvain, from which seat of learning the majority of the first professors were drawn. The two features already mentioned—that the university was founded during the progress of the Reformation in the Catholic Church, and that it was to a considerable extent under English influences—explain the fact that William Allen, when seeking a home for a projected English college abroad, turned his eyes towards Douai. The project arose from a conversation with Dr. Vendeville, then regius professor of canon law in the University of Douai, and afterwards Bishop of Tournai, whom he accompanied on a pilgrimage to Rome in the autumn of 1567; and the foundation took definite shape when Allen made a beginning in a hired house on Michaelmas Day, 1568. His object was to gather some of the numerous body of English Catholics who, having been forced to leave England, were scattered in different countries on the Continent, and to give them facilities for continuing their studies, so that when the time came for the re-establishment of Catholicism, which Allen was always so far distant, they might become a body of learned clergy ready to return to their country. This was of course a very different thing from sending missionaries over in defiance of the law while still remaining in the hands of the Protestants. This latter plan was an afterthought and a gradual growth from the circumstances in which they were found itself, though eventually it became its chief work.

Allen's personality and influence soon attracted a numerous band of scholars, and a few years after the foundation of the college the students numbered more than one hundred and fifty. A steady stream of converso works issued from the printing presses of Douai, and the town became the centre of English literature and learning. By the end of the sixteenth century more than three hundred priests had been sent on the English mission, nearly a third of whom suffered martyrdom; and almost as many had been banished. By the end of the persecution the college numbered more than one hundred and sixty martyrs. Allen had at first no regular source of income, but depended on the generosity of others. This, and especially upon the generosity of the Catholic princes of Spain, the dukes of Mantua, and the abbots and abbesses of the Benedictine and Cistercian monasteries of Saint-Vaast at Arras, Anchin, and Marchiennes, which, at the suggestion of Dr. Vendeville, had from time to time subscribed towards the work. Many private donations were also received from England. After a few years, seeing the extreme need of the college and the importance of the work it was doing, Allen applied to Pope Gregory XIII, who in 1575 granted a regular pension of one hundred gold crowns a month, which continued to be paid down to the time of the French Revolution. Allen himself gave his wholsalary as regius professor of divinity. The work of the college was not allowed to proceed without Allen, so that at one time became so strong that Allen's life was in danger, and in 1578 the English were all expelled from Douai. The college was established temporarily at Reims; but possession was retained of the house at Louvain, and in 1583 it was found possible to return there. By this time Allen had been called to reside in Rome, where he died 16 Oct., 1594. Under his successor, Dr. Richard Barrett, the work was extended to include a preparatory course in humanities, so that it became a school as well as a college. In 1603 under Dr. Worthington, the third president, a regular college was built at Louvain, and the new church of St.-Jacques, in the Rue des Morts, so called on account of the adjoining cemetery. The town at this time formed a single parish. In the eighteenth century it was divided into four parishes, and the present church of St.-Jacques dates from that time.
The English College was the first to be opened in connection with the university. The Collège d'Anchin was opened a few months later, endowed by the Abbot of the neighbouring monastery of Anchin, and entrusted to the Jesuits. In 1570, the Abbot of Marchiennes founded a college for the study of law. The Abbot of Saint-Vaast founded a college of that name. Later on, we find the College of St. Thomas Aquinas, belonging to the Dominicans, the Collège du Roi, and others. The remaining British establishments were all exclusively for ecclesiastics. The Irish College was originally a Spanish foundation. It was established before the end of the sixteenth century, and endowed with 5,000 florins a year by the King of Spain. The course of studies lasted six years and the students attended lectures at the university. The Scots' College has an unfortunate notoriety in consequence of the long dispute between the Jesuits and the secular clergy which centred round it in later times. It was established in 1594, not as a new foundation, but as the continuation of a secular college at Pont-à-Mousson in Lorraine, which, owing to the unhealthfulness of the site, had to seek a new home. In 1606, however, it moved again, and it was the turner several further migrations that terminated finally at Douai in 1612. The college was devoid of resources, and it was due to the zealous efforts of Father Parsons in Rome and Madrid, and of Father Creighton in France and Flanders, that numerous benefactions were given, and it was placed on a permanent footing. For this reason, the Jesuits afterwards claimed the property as their own, although it was admitted that in its early years secular clergy had been educated there. Appeals and counter-appeals were made, but the question was still unsettled when the Jesuits were expelled from France in 1764. The French Government, however, recognized the College of the Scotch secular clergy and allowed them to continue the work of the college under a rector chosen from their own body. The Benedictine and Franciscan houses at Douai were near together and were both bound up in their history with the restoration of the respective orders in England. The Franciscan monastery was founded mainly through the instrumentality of Father John Gennings, the brother of the martyr. It was established in temporary quarters in 1618, the students for the time attending the Jesuit schools; but by 1621 they had built a monastery and provided for admission in June. The first college in their own walls. The Benedictines began in 1605, in hired apartments belonging to the Collège d'Anchin, but a few years later, through the generosity of Abbot Caravel of the monastery of Saint-Vaast, they obtained land and built a monastery, which was opened in 1611. The house acquired a high reputation for learning, and many of the professors of the university were at different times chosen from among its members.

Returning now to the English College, we come upon the unfortunate disputes between the secular and regulars in the seventeenth century. Dr. Worthington, though himself a secular priest, was under the influence of Father Parsons, and for a long time the students attended the Jesuit schools and all the spiritual direction was in the hands of the society. A visitation of the college, however, laid bare many shortcomings in its administration; at the end Worthington was deposed. His successor, Dr. Kellison (1631–1641), succeeded in restoring the reputation of the college, while he gradually arranged for the necessary tuition to be given within its walls. In the latter half of the seventeenth and the early years of the eighteenth century the College went through a troubled time. During the presidency of Dr. Hyde (1646–1651), the University of Douai claimed certain controlling rights over the college, which claim, however, he successfully withstood. His successor, Dr. George Leyburn (1652–1670), fell out with the “Old Chapter”, in the absence of a bishop, governing the Church in England. He attacked one Mr. White (alias Blacklo), a prominent member of their body, and procured a condemnation of his writings by the University of Douai. In the end, however, he himself found it necessary to retire in favour of his nephew, Dr. John Leyburn, who was afterwards vicar Apostolic. Hardy was the dispute with the “Blackloists” (as they were called) finished, when a further storm of an even more serious nature arose, the centre being Dr. Hawarden who was professor of philosophy and then of theology at the English College for seventeen years. His reputation became so great that when a vacancy occurred in 1732 he was solicited by the bishop, the chief members of the university, and the magistrates of the town to accept the post of regius professor of divinity. His candidature, however, was opposed by a party headed by the vice-chancellor. The Jesuits also declared against him, accusing him, and through him the English College of Jansenism. In the end, Dr. Hawarden retired from Douai and went on the mission in England; and a visitation of the college, made by order of the Holy See, resulted in completely clearing it of the imputation. In 1777, Douai was taken by Louis XIV, and a copy that date has been ordered. The college was for the short time that it was held by the English after the siege of the Duke of Marlborough in 1710; but it was retaken by the French the following year.

During the rest of the eighteenth century, there were important changes. While in England, the Jesuits were under the influence of Father Gennings. In 1770, the Jesuit college was re-established, and in 1778, a new English College was founded. The college was rebuilt at the middle of the century and the English Benedictine monastery between 1776 and 1781. But all were destined to come to an end a few years after this, under the Reign of Terror.

As a town, Douai suffered less than many others at the beginning of the Revolution. The university kept up its Catholic character within the walls. The English College was shut up in 1779, when the revival of the five typical Catholic universities to which Pitt appealed for an authoritative declaration as to the Catholic doctrine on the "deposing power" of the pope. During the Reign of Terror, however, it suffered the same fate as many similar establishments. When all the clergy of the town were called upon in 1791 to take the "Civic Oath", the members of the British establishments claimed exemption in virtue of their nationality. The plea was allowed for a time; but after the execution of Louis XVI, when war was declared between England and France, it was not to be expected that this immunity would continue. The superiors and students of most of the British establishments took flight and succeeded in reaching England. The members of the English College, with their president, Rev. John Daniel, remained in the hope of saving the college; but in October, 1793, they were taken to prison at Doullens in Picardy, together with six Anglo-Benedictine monks who had remained for a similar purpose. After undergoing many dangers and hardships, they were allowed to return to Douai in November, 1794, and a few months later, by the order of Dr. Stapleton, President of St. Omer (who with his students had likewise been imprisoned at Doullens), they were set at liberty and allowed to return to England. The English collegians never returned to Douai. The Penal Laws had recently been repealed, and they founded two colleges to continue the work of Douai—Crook Hall (afterwards removed to Ushaw).
in the North, and St. Edmund's, Old Hall, in the South. The Roman pension was divided equally between these two until the French occupied Rome in 1799, when it ceased to be paid. Both these colleges exist at the present day. After the Revolution, Bonaparte restored the Catholic establishment in France under one administrator, Rev. Francis Walsh, an Irishman. On the restoration of the Bourbons, a large sum of money was paid to the English Government to indemnify those who had suffered by the Revolution; but none of this ever reached Catholic hands, for it was ruled that as the Catholic colleges were illegal in France for that religion, they were illegal in England, and were restored to their rightful owners, and most of them were sold. The Anglo-Benedictines alone retained their ancient monastery; and as the community of St. Gregory was then permanently established at Downside, they handed over their house at Douai to the community of St. Edmund, which had formerly been located in Paris. These Benedictines carried on a school at Douai until 1903, when in consequence of the Associations' Law passed by the Government they were forced to leave. They returned to England, and settled at Woolampton, near Reading.

Douai, Church History of England; IDIB, ed. Tierney; R. C. Hist. of Eng. Col., Douai, ed. Done (1718); Boyle, Reminiscences of Douai (1878); IDIB, Life of Cardinal Allen (1882); J. Gillow, Papists Originals (1888); H. Goss, The English College at Douai, History of St. Edmund's College (1892); Husenbeth, Eng. College and Convents of the Continent (1849); Cameron, The Catholic Church in Scotland (1860); Boyle, Trial of the College at Paris (1891); Burke, Downside (1902); Thaude, Francescans in England (1906); Guide of English Mortarists (1873); Husenbeth, English Catholic Colleges (1854); Hansard, History of the Catholic Colleges, Douai (Reims, 1890); Teillier, Chroniques de Douai (1875); Catholic Magazine (1851). Also many unpublished MSS. in the Westminster archives, and in those of the Old Brotherhood (formerly the Old Chapter).

**BENEDICT WARD.**

**DOUAY BIBLE.**—The original Douay Version, which is the foundation on which nearly all English Catholic versions are still based, owed its existence to the religious controversies of the sixteenth century. Many Protestant versions of the Scriptures had been issued and were used largely by the Reformers for polemical purposes. The rendering of some of the texts showed evident signs of controversial bias, and it became of the first importance for the English Catholics of the day to be furnished with a translation of their own, which they could depend on and to which they could appeal in the course of argument. The work of preparing such a version was undertaken by the members of the English College at Douai, in Flanders, founded by William Allen (afterwards cardinal) in 1588. The chief share of the translating was borne by Dr. Gregory Martin, formerly of St. John's College, Oxford. His text was revised by Thomas Worthington, Richard Bristowe, John Reynolds, and Allen himself—all of them Oxford men. A series of notes was added, designed to answer the principal arguments of the Reformers; these were prepared by Allen, assisted by Bristowe and Worthington.

The object of the work was, of course, not limited to controversial purposes; in the case of the New Testament especially, it was meant for pious use among Catholics. In fact, however, that the primary object was controversial explains the course adopted by the translators. In the first place they translated directly, not from the original Hebrew or Greek, but from the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome. This had been declared authoritative for Catholics by the Council of Trent; but it is also commonly asserted that the text was nearer to the Latin original than in any manuscripts at that time extant in the original languages. Then, also, in the translation, many technical words were retained bodily, such as *posch, parasceve, azymes,* etc. In some instances, also, where it was found difficult or impossible to find a suitable English equivalent for a Latin word, the latter was retained in an anglicized form. Thus in Phil., ii, 8, we get "He *exercised* himself," and in Heb., ix, 28, "Christ was offered once to *exhaust* the sins of many.

It was considered that an ordinary reader, finding the text word for word, would have no occasion to refer to the original, and that this was preferable to satisfying him with an inadequate rendering. In other cases Latinisms seem to have crept in unawares, as in Luke, x, 1, "Our Lord *designed* also other seventy-two"; or in Phil., ii, 10, "In the name of Jesus, every knee bow of the *celestialts, terrestrials and infernals*." The proper names are usually translated, though not always (e.g. Paul), but the word *Dominus* is rendered throughout Our Lord. The general result was a version in cumbersome English, so full of Latinisms as to be in places hardly readable, but with scholary and accurate.

In the year 1578, owing to political troubles, the college was temporarily transferred from Douai (which was then in the dominions of the King of Spain) to Reims, and during its sojourn there, in 1582, the New Testament was published, and became consequently known as the "Reims Testament". It contained no episcopal imprimatur, but a recommendation was appended by three doctors of that university. Thus the New Testament appeared nearly thirty years before the Anglican "Authorized Version", and although not officially mentioned as one of the versions to be consulted, it is now commonly recognized to have had a large influence on the King James Version (see Preface to R. V., iv, 1, also, Carleton, "Rheims and the English Bible."

The Reims Testament was reprinted twice at Antwerp—in 1600 and 1621—and a fourth edition was issued at Rouen in 1633. Then it was allowed to rest for over a century, before a fifth edition appeared, with some slight changes, dated 1728, but without any place of publication stated. It is believed to have been printed in London and was edited by Dr. Challoner (afterwards bishop), and Father Blyth, a Carmelite. The Douay Bible was never after this printed abroad. A sixth edition of the Reims Testament was printed at London in 1798, and a seventh dated 1838, which is the accuracy of the last Catholic edition. Several Protestant editions have appeared, the best known being a curious work by Rev. William Fulke, first published in 1598, with the Reims text and that of the Bishops' Bible in parallel columns. A Protestant edition of the Reims Testament was also brought out by Leavitt of New York, in 1834. Although the Bibles in use at the present day by the Catholics of England and Ireland are popularly styled the Douay Version, they are most improperly so called; they are founded, with more or less alteration, on a series of revisions undertaken by Bishop Challoner in 1709-52. His object was to meet the practical want felt by the Catholics of his day of a Bible moderate in size and price, in readable English, and with notes more suitable to the time. He brought out three editions of the New Testament, in 1719, 1750, both separately, and one composite in 1750. The changes introduced by him were so considerable that, according to Cardinal Newman, they "almost amounted to a new translation". So also, Cardinal Wiseman wrote, "To call it any longer the Douay or Rheims Version is an abuse of terms. It has been altered and modified until scarcely any remains as it was originally published nearly every case Challoner's changes took the form of approximating to the Authorized Version, though his three editions of the New Testament differ from one another in numerous passages. The best known
DOUBT

Catholic Bible published in England in modern times is perhaps Haydock's, which was first issued at Manchester in fortnightly parts in 1811-12. The Irish editions are mostly known by the names of the bishops who gave the imprimatur: as Dr. Carpenter's New Testament (1783); Dr. Tristram's Bible (1791); Dr. Murray's (1825); and Dr. Denviri's (1836)—the last two of which have often been reprinted, and circulated largely at the present day in England as well as in Ireland. Of late years the issue of the sixpenny New Testament by Burns and Oates of London has by its large circulation made the Vulgate edition of Challoner's of 1749—the standard one, especially as the same is adopted in Dr. Murray's and Dr. Denviri's Bibles. In America an independent revision of the Douay Version by Archbishop Kenrick (1849-59) is much used.

Doubt (Lat. dubium, Gr. ὑπόθεσις, Fr. doute, Ger. Zweifel), a state in which the mind is suspended between two contradictory propositions and unable to assent to either of them. Any number of alternative propositions on the same subject may be in doubt at the same time; but, strictly speaking, they should be attached separately to each one, as between the proposition and its contradictory, i.e. each proposition may or may not be true. Doubt is opposed to certainty, or the adhesion of the mind to a proposition without misgiving as to its truth; and again to opinion, or social adhesion to a universal proposition together with such a misgiving. Doubt is either positive or negative. In the former case, the evidence for and against is so equally balanced as to render decision impossible; in the latter, the doubt arises from the absence of sufficient evidence on either side. It is thus possible that a doubt may be positive on the one side and negative on the other (positivo-negative or negativo-positive), i.e. in cases where evidence on one side only is attainable and does not, of itself, amount to absolute demonstration, as, for instance, in circumstantial evidence. Again, doubt may be either theoretical or practical. The former is concerned with abstract truth and error; the latter with questions of duty, or of the licitness of actions, or of mere expediency. A further distinction is made between doubt concerning the existence of a particular fact (dubium facti) and doubt in regard to a precept of law (dubium juris). Prudent doubts are distinguished from impudent, according to the reasonableness or unreasonableableness of the considerations on which the doubt is based. It should be observed that doubt is a purely subjective condition; i.e. it belongs only to the mind which has to judge of facts, and has no application to the facts themselves. A proposition or theory which is commonly called doubtful is, therefore, one as to which sufficient evidence to determine assent is not forthcoming; in itself it must be either true or false. Theories which are at one time held as doubtful and are afterwards accepted, or which, finally, become certain truth or false by reason of the discovery of fresh evidence.

Certitude may be produced either by reason (which deals with evidence) or by faith (which rests on authority), it follows that theoretical doubt may be in like manner made concerning the subject-matter of either reason or faith, that is to say, with philosophy or with religion. Practical doubt is concerned with conduct; and since conduct must be guided by principles afforded by reason or by faith, or by both conjointly, doubt concerning it regards the application of principles already accepted under one or other of the foregoing heads. The resolution of doubt of this kind is the province of moral theology, in regard to questions of right and wrong; and in regard to those of mere practical expediency, recourse must be had to the scientific or other principles which properly belong to the subject-matter of the doubt. Thus, for example, doubt as to the occurrence of an historical event can only be resolved by consideration of the evidence; doubt as to the doctrine of the sacraments, by ascertaining what is of faith on the subject; doubt as to the morality of a commercial transaction, by the application of the suitable injunctive decision; doubt as to the moral theology, when the question of the wisdom or the reverse of the transaction in regard to profit and loss must be determined by commercial knowledge and experience. The legitimacy, or the reverse, of doubt in regard to matters of fact is made evident by the forms of logic (induction and deduction), which, whatever may be the extent of their function as a means of acquiring knowledge, are indispensably necessary as a test of the correctness of conclusions or hypotheses already formed.

DOUBT IN PHILOSOPHY.—The validity of human perception and reasoning in general as a means of discovering objective truth has been frequently called in question. The doubt thus raised has been sometimes of the character called methodic, fictitious, or provisional, and sometimes real, or sceptical, as embodying the conclusion that objective truth cannot be known. Doubt of this character is preliminary to all inquiry, and in this sense philosophy is said by Aristotle (Metaph., III, i) to be "the art of doubting". Sir W. Hamilton points out (Lect. on Metaphysics, v) that doubt, as a preliminary to philosophical inquiry, is the only means by which the necessary removal of the prejudice is accomplished, and that the method of philosophical inquiry is to proceed in the primary necessity of putting aside the "idols", or prejudices, by which men's minds are naturally influenced. Thus the Scholastic proof of a proposition or thesis begins by the statement of doubts', or contrary arguments; after which the evidence for the thesis is given, and finally the doubts are resolved. This, it need hardly be said, is the method pursued in the "Summa" of Saint Thomas Aquinas and still in use in the formal disputations of theological students. An instance of this kind of doubt is the Six et Non (Yes and No) of Abelard, which consists of a series of propositions on theological, Scriptural, and philosophical subjects, with a counter-proposition attached to each. The solution of the doubts in the sense of the orthodox thesis, which was clearly intended to follow, was never written or, if so, has not been preserved. (See Victor Cousin's "Fragments Philosophiques"). The philosophical system of Descartes begins with a universal methodic doubt; the famous cogito, ergo sum, on which the whole system is based, is the solution of the philosopher's fundamental doubt of his own existence. This solution had been anticipated by St. Augustine, who took the subjective certainty of one's own existence as the ground of all certainty (e.g. "Tu, qui vis te nosse, scis esse te? Scio. Unde scis? Nescio. Cogitare te scis? Scio."") (Sol., II, i); "Utrum aëris sit vis vivendi, an ignis, dubitavertur homines? vivere semen et minus, scire et scire et scire, et scire et scire et scire"") (De Trin., X, xiv). In general it may be said that doubt, either expressed or implied, is involved in all intellectual research. Doubt among the systematics of moral doubt as to the trust-worthiness of human faculties is not merely provisionally assumed, but is genuine and final, those which find in a supernatural revelation the guide to truth which natural reason fails to provide must be distinguished from those which hold doubt to be the final conclusion of all inquiry into truth. The former de-
precipitate reason in the interests of faith; the latter take reason as the only possible guide, but find no ground for confidence in it. To the former class belongs Nicholas of Cusa (1410), who was the author of two sceptical treatises on human knowledge; certainty is to him as the only attribute of the divine being, now, only the name of mystical knowledge of God. The scepticism of Montaigne made a reservation (whether sincerely or not is uncertain) in favour of revealed truth; and the same principle was advocated by Charron, Sanchez, and Le Vayer. Hume, in his sceptical essays on miracles and immortality, also attributed rational authority to revelation; but with obvious insincerity. The sceptical views of Hobbes, combined with his peculiar theory of government, made all conviction, including that of religious truth, dependent on the civil authority. Gianvili’s “The Vanity of Dogmatizing”, or “Scepsis Scientific”, grounded a serious defence of revealed religion on the uncertainty of natural knowledge. Balfour’s “Defence of Philosophic Doubt”, based on the indemonstrability of ultimate truths, is an attempt in the same direction. (See Fideism.)

In the second class are to be reckoned the various systems which was far the ancient Greek philosophy at a very early date. Heraclitus held the senses to be untrustworthy (κακοτρεπος) and misleading, though he also conceived a supersen- suous knowledge of the universal reason, immanent in the cosmos, to be attainable. Zeno of Elea defended the unity and permanence of being by propounding a series of “hypotheses”, each of which resulted in a contradiction, and by means of them sought to demonstrate the unreality of the manifold and changing. The subjective principle of the Sophists (Protagoras, Gorgias, and others of less note) that “what is true for me is true for all” implied doubt by scepticism, as to all objective reality. Knowledge is resolved by Protagoras into mere variable opinion; and Gorgias asserts that nothing really exists, that if anything existed, it could not be known, and that if such knowledge were possible it would be incomunicable. The Pyrrhonists, or Sceptics, held everything in doubt, even the fact of doubting. The Middle Academics, whose chief representatives were Ares- ciinus and Carneades, while doubting all knowledge, held, nevertheless, that probability could be recognized in varying degrees. The “Encyclopedia of Diderot and d’Alembert” contains a severe contradiction of Montaigne, who claimed a higher degree of probability for the Pyrrhonist than for the Academic opinion. Sextus Empiricus advanced the theory, often since maintained, that the syllogism is really a petitio principii, and that demonstration is therefore impossible. Bayle, in his celebrated “Dictionary”, subjected the philosophy of his time to severe destructive criticism, but was confessedly unable to supply its deficiencies. Hume’s position was purely negative; for him, neither the existence of the external world nor that of the mind by which it is known was capable of demonstration; and the conclusion of Kant’s “Critique of Pure Reason”, that the “thing in itself” (Ding an sich) is unknowable though certainly existing, is evidently sceptical (though the author himself rejected the title), since it embodies a prior conclusion in the doubt as to the nature of ultimate reality. Kant’s argument for the existence of God, as rationally indemonstrable, but postulated by the practical reason, necessarily results in a very limited conception of the Divine nature. Lamarck’s general consent, or the common sense of mankind, as the ground of certitude; the individual person he held to be incapable of attaining it. “Nothing is as evident to us to-day that we can be sure we shall not find it either doubtful or erroneous to-morrow” (Essai sur l’indifférence, II, xii).

It may be observed that theories which deny the validity of simple experience as a guide to truth are really instances of doubt, because, though they assert dogmatically the inadequacy of widely accepted evidence, they are nevertheless in that state of suspense by which doubt is properly characterized in regard to the reality commonly held to be made known by experience. This is true of the name of Agnosticism is a strictly doubtful one towards all that lies beyond sense-experience. The doubt is purely negative in this view; whatever is not cognizable by the aid of the senses is held to be unknowable; God may exist, or he may not, but we can neither affirm his existence nor deny it. Again, the system or method known as Pragmatism regards all reality as doubtful; truth is the correspondence of ideas with one another, and cannot be regarded as anything final, but must perpetually change with the progress of human thought; knowledge must be taken at its ‘face value’ from moment to moment, as a practical guide to well-being, and must not be regarded as having any necessary correspondence with definite and permanent reality.

DOUBT IN REGARD TO RELIGION has at different times assumed a variety of forms. It is perhaps uncertain whether to mention scepticism. This opinion was extensively held in ancient Greek philosophy at a very early date. Heraclitus held the senses to be untrustworthy (κακοτρεπος) and misleading, though he also conceived a supersen- suous knowledge of the universal reason, immanent in the cosmos, to be attainable. Zeno of Elea defended the unity and permanence of being by propounding a series of “hypotheses”, each of which resulted in a contradiction, and by means of them sought to demonstrate the unreality of the manifold and changing. The subjective principle of the Sophists (Protagoras, Gorgias, and others of less note) that “what is true for me is true for all” implied doubt by scepticism, as to all objective reality. Knowledge is resolved by Protagoras into mere variable opinion; and Gorgias asserts that nothing really exists, that if anything existed, it could not be known, and that if such knowledge were possible it would be incomunicable. The Pyrrhonists, or Sceptics, held everything in doubt, even the fact of doubting. The Middle Academics, whose chief representatives were Ares- ciinus and Carneades, while doubting all knowledge, held, nevertheless, that probability could be recognized in varying degrees. The “Encyclopedia of Diderot and d’Alembert” contains a severe contradiction of Montaigne, who claimed a higher degree of probability for the Pyrrhonist than for the Academic opinion. Sextus Empiricus advanced the theory, often since maintained, that the syllogism is really a petitio principii, and that demonstration is therefore impossible. Bayle, in his celebrated “Dictionary”, subjected the philosophy of his time to severe destructive criticism, but was confessedly unable to supply its deficiencies. Hume’s position was purely negative; for him, neither the existence of the external world nor that of the mind by which it is known was capable of demonstration; and the conclusion of Kant’s “Critique of Pure Reason”, that the “thing in itself” (Ding an sich) is unknowable though certainly existing, is evidently sceptical (though the author himself rejected the title), since it embodies a prior conclusion in the doubt as to the nature of ultimate reality. Kant’s argument for the existence of God, as rationally indemonstrable, but postulated by the practical reason, necessarily results in a very limited conception of the Divine nature. Lamarck’s general consent, or the common sense of mankind, as the ground of certitude; the individual person he held to be incapable of attaining it. “Nothing is as evident to us to-day that we can be sure we shall not find it either doubtful or erroneous to-morrow” (Essai sur l’indifférence, II, xii).

It may be observed that theories which deny the validity of simple experience as a guide to truth are really instances of doubt, because, though they assert dogmatically the inadequacy of widely accepted evidence, they are nevertheless in that state of suspense by which doubt is properly characterized in regard to the reality commonly held to be made known by experience. This is true of the name of Agnosticism is a strictly doubtful one towards all that lies beyond sense-experience. The doubt is purely negative in this view; whatever is not cognizable by the aid of the senses is held to be unknowable; God may exist, or he may not, but we can neither affirm his existence nor deny it. Again, the system or method known as Pragmatism regards all reality as doubtful; truth is the correspondence of ideas with one another, and cannot be regarded as anything final, but must perpetually change with the progress of human thought; knowledge must be taken at its ‘face value’ from moment to moment, as a practical guide to well-being, and must not be regarded as having any necessary correspondence with definite and permanent reality.
Pastor, "History of the Popes", chapters on the Renaissance.) It helped to prepare the way, however, for the Reformation, which, beginning with a revolt against ecclesiastical authority, called all the doctrines of Christianity in question, rejecting those which failed to find support in the Bible. Among the different leaders of the movement. Thus among Protestants in general there is great variety of opinion on religious doctrines, those which are firmly held by some being considered doubtfully by others, and by others again, rejected as false. Anglicanism, especially, leaves open many of the tenets which the Church of England holds as of faith, and thus endeavours to comprehend within its boundaries persons who differ widely from one another on important subjects. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, pronounces authoritatively as to the truth or falseness of opinions, by means of general councils, professions of faith, infallible decisions of the supreme pontiff, and the ordinary teaching of her pastors. As St. Avisus, in the sixth century, declared, "it is the law of the councils that if any doubt have arisen in matters which regard the state of the Church, we are to have recourse to the chief priest of the Roman Church, and to him we are bound to submit our objections." As regards the Faith is thus impossible in the Catholic Church without infringing the principle of authority on which the Church itself depends. The field, however, which is open to a variety of opinions on questions not directly involving the essential doctrines of the Faith is very wide; and though it is further limited by future dogmatic decisions, it is probable on the other hand that it will be increased in the future, as in the past, by the emergence of doubtful questions as to the exact bearing of dogmatic truth upon fresh discoveries or theories of all kinds.

It will be evident from what has been said that doubt cannot coexist either with faith or knowledge in regard to any given subject; faith and doubt are mutually exclusive, and knowledge which is limited by a doubt, becomes, in regard to the subject or part of a subject to which the doubt applies, no longer knowledge but opinion. A moral certainty—that is, one which is founded on the normal course of human action—does not strictly exclude doubt, but, as excluding prudent doubt, must be considered a sufficient practical guide. (cf. Butler, "Analogy of Religion", in the same sense.) Thus doubt is sometimes said to imply belief; though such belief or practical certainty cannot properly be held to rise above the most probable kind of opinion. The rhetorical conception of the faith that "lives in honest doubt" (Tennyson, In Memoriam) must be taken to signify that truthful and serious habit of mind which refuses to submit to deception on motives furnished by intellectual sloth or the desire of worldly advantage. Catholic philosophy is entirely opposed both to the Pyrrhonian doubt of external reality and to that form of Idealism which is closely connected with the Kantian method on its sceptical side, and which seeks to reduce all dogma to the mere expression of subjective religious conceptions, relegateing the objective facts with which dogma is concerned to the domain of symbol and parable. In the view of the Scholastic system, human experience is a phenomenon through the senses and the intellect; phenomena being the object both of the senses, which they directly affect, and, after a different manner, of the intellect, which apprehends through sensible impressions the true nature and principles of the reality which causes those impressions. The facts of the Church bears witness in this sense real and objective, and may neither be explained away nor set aside by any system of historical or scientific criticism. Such is the purport of the Encyclical "Pascendi Dominici gregis" (1907), which both controverts and condemns the attempt to evade dogma of its true significance made by the method of religious speculation known as Modernism.

**Practical Doubt**, or doubt as to the lawfulness of an action is, according to the teaching of moral theology, incompatible with right action; since to act with a doubtful conscience is to sin directly against the moral law. To act with a doubtful conscience is, therefore, sinful; and the doubt must be removed before any action can be justified. It frequently happens, however, that the solution of a practical doubt is not attainable, while some decision is necessary. In such cases the conscience holds "reflexive" certainty by adopting an approved opinion as to the lawfulness of the action contemplated, apart from the intrinsic merits of the question. The question is much discussed among different schools of theologians whether the opinion so formed must be of greatly overpowering authority in favour of liberty in order to justify an action the lawfulness of which appears intrinsically doubtful, whether it must be merely more probable than the contrary one, or equally probable, or merely probable in itself, even though less so than its contrary. (See Moral Theology; Probabilism.) The last, however, the theory is generally accepted for all practical purposes; and the principle that lex dubia non obligat—i.e. that a law which is doubtful in its application to the case in hand does not bind—is universally admitted. It must be observed, however, that where the question is of a doubtful law but of a certain practical result, only the "safer" course may be followed. No opinion, however probable, is allowed to take precedence of the most certain means of securing such ends; e.g. in providing for the validity of the sacraments, in discharging obligations of justice, or in avoiding injury to others. Thus doubtful baptisms and ordinations must be repeated conditionally. (See Agnosticism; Certitude; Epistemology; Faith; Heresy; Infallibility; Scepticism.)

*Douglas*, Gavin, Scottish poet and poet, b. about 1474; d. 1522; he was the third son of Archibald, Fifth Earl of Angus, known as "Bell-the-Cut". Educated for the Church at the universities of St. Andrews and Paris, he held for some years a benefice in East Lothian, and during this period composed most of the poetical works which have made his name famous. In 1501 he became provost of the cathedral church of St. Giles, Edinburgh, and subsequently, through the influence of Queen Margaret, who had married his nephew, the young Earl of Angus, he obtained the abbacy of Arbroath and later the Bishopric of Dunkeld. The queen's efforts to have him promoted to the primacy were unsuccessful; and when the popular indignation at her marriage with A. B. Sharpe.
Angus resulted in his being deprived of the regency, Douglas was brought to trial by the new regent, the Duke of Albany, for intriguing with the queen to obtain ecclesiastical promotion without the consent of Parliament. He was imprisoned for a year in Edinburgh, and after his release continued for a time in the administration of his diocese. When, however, Margaret separated from her husband and sided with Albany against the Douglases, Gavin was deprived of his see. He fled to England in 1321 and was kindly received by Henry VIII, but he died of plague the following year. He was buried in the Savoy Church in London.

It was unfortunate for Douglas’s future reputation that his high birth and family connections plunged him into the political turmoil of his time, and thus prematurely closed his career as a poet and scholar of the first order. His participation in the internal divisions by which Scotland was torn during most of his life ended, as far as he was concerned, in failure, exile, and death; and it is as a literary genius, rather than a churchman or a statesman, that he lives in Scottish history. It was during his quiet life as a country parson that the most gorgeous allegory called the “Pelican of Honour”, whose wealth of illustration and poetical embellishments at once won renown for its author; and a little later he produced the translation of Virgil’s “Aeneid”, which gives him his chief claim to literary immortality. The translation is a rather free adaptation of the Roman poet, written in the “Scottish” language then current, while its author prefixed an original prologue in verse. It was printed (for the third time) by the Bannatyne Club in 1839. Douglas wrote two other poems, “King Harter” and “Conscience”, and translated also Ovid’s “De Remedia Amoris”. His complete works were first collected and published in Edinburgh (ed. Small), in 1874.

Dove (Lat. columba).—In Christian antiquity the dove appears as a symbol and as a Eucharistic vessel. As a Christian symbol it is of very frequent occurrence in ancient ecclesiastical art. (1) As a symbol of the Holy Spirit it appears especially in representations of the baptism of Our Lord (Matt., iii, 16) and of Pentecost. St. Gregory the Great (590-604) is generally shown with a dove on his shoulder, symbolizing inspiration or rather Divine guidance. A dove of gold was hung up in the baptistery at Reims after the baptism of Clovis; in general the symbol occurs frequently in connexion with early representations of baptism. In ancient times a dove-like vessel was frequently suspended over the baptismal font and in that case was sometimes used to contain the holy oils (Ariiingi, Roma Subterr., ii, 326). (2) As a symbol of martyrdom it indicated the action of the Holy Spirit in bestowing the fortitude necessary for the endurance of suffering. (3) As a symbol of the Church, the agent through which the Holy Spirit works on earth. When two doves appear the symbolism may represent, according to Macarius (Hagiographa, 222), the Church of the circumcision and that of the Gentiles.

On a sarcophagus or on other funeral monuments the dove signifies (a) the peace of the departed soul, especially if, as is often the case in ancient examples, it bears an olive branch in its beak; (b) the hope of the Resurrection. In each case the symbolism is derived from the story of Noe and the Flood. Such is the meaning of the dove (columba, palumba sine felle) in numerous epitaphs of the Roman catacombs. Occasionally funeral lamps were made in the shape of a dove. Two doves on a funeral monument sometimes signify the conjugal love and affection of the parties buried there. The dove in flight is the symbol of Assumption of Christ or of the entry into glory of the martyrs and saints (cf. Ps. xcviii, 7; “our soul is escaped as a bird from the snare of the hunters, the snare is broken and we are delivered.” In like manner the caged dove signifies the human soul yet imprisoned in the flesh and held captive during the period of mortal life. In general, the dove as a Christian emblem signifies the Holy Spirit either personally or in His works. It signifies also the Christian soul, not the human soul as such, but as indwelt by the Holy Spirit; especially, therefore, as freed from the toils of the flesh and entered into rest and glory.

As a Eucharistic Vessel.—The reservation of the grain was first performed in the presence of a dove (columba) on a certain occasion in the church of St. Martin at Tours in Gaul in the year 1171. He returned to France after labouring as a missionary in the Mississippi Valley for twenty years.

CHARLEVOIX, tr. SHEA, History of New France (New York, 1875–78); vi, 80, 88; MARTIN in CARSON, Deo, Inedit., XIV, 23, 121, 128; KEP, Early Jesuit Missions in N. Amer. (New York, 1846), 289–292; GAYARRE, Histoire de la Louisiane (New Orleans, 1847); iv, 217, 254; SHEA, Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the U. S. (New York, 1865), 428, 430; SPALDING, Narrative and Critical History of America (Boston, 1817–47); v; TAYLOR, Jesuit Relations (Cleveland, 1901), LXXI, 169; LXXVII, 342; LXXIII, DUMONT, Memoires de la Louisiana, ii, 169–183; FRENCH, Hist. Coll. of Louisiana.
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DOUKHOBORS. See Russia.

Doutreleau, Stephen, missionary, b. in France, 11 Oct., 1589; date of death uncertain. He became a Jesuit at the age of twenty-two and migrated to Louisiana, U. S. A., with the Ursuline nun in 1727. Soon after his arrival he was sent to the Illinois mission, for in 1728 he seems to have been at Poste Vincennes, "the fort on the Wabash", which was established about that time. On 1 January, 1730, he set out from N. Orleans on business connected with the mission. The Natchez Indians, only a few weeks before, had massacred all the inhabitants of the little French village of Natches, and the Yazoo, a neighboring Indian tribe, had followed their example. Two Jesuit missionaries perished in these uprisings. Ignorant of the state of the country and accompanied by four or five French voyageurs, Father Doutreleau landed at the mouth of the Yazoo River to offer up the Holy Sacrifice. The Indians attacked the little party killing one of the Frenchmen and wounding the missionary in the arm. Doutreleau escaped to his canoe with two of his companions and began their flight down the Mississippi. After many dangers they reached the French camp at Tonica Bay, where they were received with great kindness; their wounds were dressed and after a night’s rest they proceeded unmolested to New Orleans. A journey of four hundred leagues through this country had been accomplished. Shortly after, Father Doutreleau became chaplain of the French troops in Louisiana, and in this capacity accompanied them on one expedition. At his own request he was sent back to the Illinois Indians, but how long he remained is uncertain. He was at one time chaplain of the hospital at New Orleans. In
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Holy Eucharist for the use of the sick was, certainly since early medieval times, effected in many parts of Europe by means of a vessel in the form of a dove, suspended by chains to the baldaquin and thus hung above the altar. Mention may be made here of the (two) doves or, as they are usually represented, the Roman catacombs as drinking from a Eucharistic chalice (Seyerdy, "Die Darstellungen des eucharist.

Kevels auf altr. Grabinschri
ten", in "Stromation Archæologonen", Rome, 1900, 97-118). The idea of the Eucharistic vessel was probably taken from this dove-like receptacle used at an early period in the baptisteries and often suspended above the fonts. These vessels were usually made of gold or silver. This was no doubt always the case if the vessel was designed to be the immediate holder of the Blessed Sacrament, since the principle that no base material ought to be used for this purpose is early and general. But when, as seems generally to have been the case in later times, the dove was only the outer vessel enshrinning the pyx which itself contained the Blessed Sacrament, it came about that any material might be used which was itself suitable and dignified. Mabilllon (Iter Ital., 217) tells us that he saw one at the monastery of Bobbio made of gilded leather, a dove is shown to this day in the church of San Nazario at Milan which is enamelled on the outside and silver gilt within. The exact time at which such vessels first came into use is disputed, but it was certainly at some early date. Tertullian (C. Valentinian. cap. iii) speaks of the Church as "colymbam auream" and the dove of the dove, and his words are sometimes quoted as exhibiting the use of such vessels in the third century. The reference, however, is clearly to the Holy Spirit. In the life of St. Basil, attributed to St. Amphilo
cius, is perhaps the earliest clear mention of the Eucharistic dove. "Cum patrum divisisset in partes..." (368, 369) ("A super sacrum altare suspendi") (When he had divided the bread into three pieces he placed the third part in a golden dove which was suspended above the holy altar—Opp. Amphilo
cii, P. G., XXXIX). St. Chrysostom's expression concerning the Holy Eucharist, "consecutam Spiritus Sancto, clothed with the Holy Spirit (Hom. xiii, ad pop. Antioch.)," is generally taken to allude to this practice of reserving the Holy Eucharist in a dove, the emblem of the Holy Spirit. The same idea is expressed by St. Irenaeus (Epist. xiii) in the verses, "ut Deus, vivens Spiritus in sanctum Christum vestivit... honore."

And the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove has robed Christ in honour. The general, and certainly the earliest custom, both East and West, was to suspend the dove from the ciborium or baldaquin. At a later period in some parts of the West, especially in Rome, a custom grew up of placing a tower of precious material upon the altar, and enclosing the dove with the Blessed Sacram ent within this tower. Thus, in the "Libera Pontificis" which contains ample records of the principal gifts made to the great basilicas in the fourth and succeeding centuries, we never find that the dove was presented without the tower as its complement. Thus in the life of Pope Hilary it is said that he presented to the baptistery at the Lateran turrem argenteam et columnam auream. In the life of St. Sabas it is said that he presented the same to the Vatican Basilica pateram... cum turre et columna. Innocent I (ibid.) gave to another church turrem argenteam cum columna.

Armellini, Leciones di Archeologia Cristiana (Rome, 1898); Martigny, des ant. civit. (Paris, 1890); Tyrwhitt and Versailles in Dict. of Christ. Antig., s. v.; Kaufmann, Manual de archeologia cristiana (Rome, 1908), 290 and passim.

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

Dowdall, George, Archbishop of Armagh, b. at Drogeda, County Louth, Ireland, in 1487; d. at London, 15 August, 1538. He entered the Order of Crutched Friars, and was the last prior of their monastery at Ardee. On the suppression of the monastery by Henry VIII, in 1539, he received a pension of £20 a year. After the death of Primate Cromer, four years later, he was appointed to the See of Armagh by the King, but his appointment was not recognized by the pope. Dowdall acknowledged Henry VIII as supreme head of the Church on earth, and denounced the real primate, Robert Wauchope, to the Government.

Though a schismatic, he nevertheless vigorously opposed the introduction of Protestantism into Ireland in the following reign and became the leader of the Catholic party. His opposition was fruitless, he withdrew from public life in disgust and shortly afterwards retired to the Continent. On the death of Primate Wauchope, Dowdall, having renounced the schism, was appointed in 1553 by the pope to the very see of which he had been the schismatical archbishop. Ruling during nearly all the reign of Queen Mary, he exerted himself to repair the ravages to religion wrought in the preceding reigns. He held an important synod in Drogeda in 1554 in which decrees were passed against priests who had presumed to marry.

AMBROSE COLEMAN.

Dowdall, James, martyr, date of birth unknown; executed for his faith at Exeter, England, 29 September, 1600. He was the Benedictine of Drogheda, in Ireland, and was, though several authorities, including Challoner, describe him as a native of Wexford. Further confusion is added by reason of the fact that another contemporary, James Dowdall, died a confessor. According to Rothe, however, the martyr belonged to Drogeda, and traded with England and the Continent. In the summer of 1598, when returning from France, his ship was driven by stress of weather onto the coast of Devonshire, and he was arrested by William Bourchier, Earl of Bath, who had him under examination. Dowdall publicly avowed that he rejected the queen's supremacy, and only recognized that of the Roman pontiff. The earl forwarded the examination to Sir Robert Cecil, and had Dowdall committed to Exeter jail. Whilst in prison he was tortured and put to the rack, but continued unchanged in his fidelity to the ancient faith. On June 9, 1599, the Earl of Bath wrote to Sir Robert Cecil for instructions in regard to James Dowdall, who had been detained in prison almost a year. Accordingly he was tried at the Exeter assizes, and was ordered to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. His name is included in the Apostolic Process of the Irish Martyrs whose cause is at present (1908) before the Congregation of Sacred Rites.

Roth, Analecta (Cologne, 1617-1619), Cardinal Moran ed. (Dublin, 1884); Bronson, Sacramen Cath. Vociola (Prague, 1699); Murphy, Our Martyrs (Dublin, 1899); Calendar of the MSS. of the Marquis of Salisbury (London, 1903).

W. H. GRATTON-FLOOD.

Dower (Lat. dowerium; Fr. doute), a provision for support during life accorded by law to a wife surviving her husband. Being for the widow being accorded by law, lower does not entail necessarily from the marriage, though at one time the marriage marriage portion such as the dow of the old Roman law, the French dot, or the English dowry. Dower is thought to have been suggested by the marriage gift which Tacitus found to be usual among the Germans. This gift he terms dos, but contrasts it with the dos of the Roman law, which was a gift on the part of the wife to the husband, while in Germany the gift was made by the husband to the wife (La
rousse, Grand dictionnaire universel, Paris, 1870, s. v. Doute). There was indeed in the Roman law what was termed donatio propter nuptias, a gift from the family of the husband, but this was only re-
quired if the dos were brought on the part of the wife. So too in the special instance of a widow (herself poor and undated) of a husband rich at the time of his death, an ordinance of the Christian Emperor Justinian secured her the right to a part of her husband's property, of which no disposition of his could deprive her.

But the general establishment of the principle of dower in the customary law of Western Europe, according to Maine (Ancient Law, 3rd Amer. ed., New York, 1887, 218), is to be traced to the influence of the Church, and to be included perhaps among its most arduous triumphs. Dower is an outcome of the ecclesiastical practice of exacting from the husband at marriage a promise to endow his wife, a promise retained in form even now in the marriage ritual of the Established Church in England. (See Blackstone, "Commentaries on the Laws of England", II, 134, note p.) In an ordinance of King Philip Augustus of France (1214), and in the almost contemporaneous Magna Charta (1215), dower is referred to. But it seems to have already become customary law in Normandy, Sicily, and Naples, as well as in England. The object of both ordinance and charter was to regulate the amount of the dower where this was not the subject of voluntary arrangement, dower by English law consisting of a wife's life estate in one-third of the lands of the husband "of which any issue which she might have had might by possibility have been heir" (Blackstone, op. cit., 131).

The Reformation period, a man who became a monk and made his religious profession in England was deemed civilly dead, "dead in law" (Blackstone, op. cit., Bk. II, 121); consequently his heirs inherited his land forthwith as though he had died a natural, instead of a legal, death. Assignment of his land would not have been possible until the natural death of such a religious. For only by his wife's consent could a married man be legally professed in religion. And she was not allowed by her consent to exchange her husband for dower. After the Reformation and the extinguishment of the English statute of 11 and 12 William III, prohibiting "papists" from inheriting or purchasing lands, a Roman Catholic widow was not held to be debarred of dower, for dower accruing by operation of law was deemed to be not within the prohibitions of the statute. In the curious disallow of old English law a Jewess born in England would be debarred of dower in land which her husband, having been an Englishman of the same faith and becoming converted after marriage, should purchase, if she herself remained unconverted.

There is judicial authority on the year 1310 for the proposition that dower was favoured by law (Year Books of Edward II, London, 1905, Vol. III, 189), and at a less remote period it was said to be with liberty one of three things which "the law favoreth." But an English statute of the year 1635 has inflicted the ininviable liability of dower by empowering husbands to cut off by deed or will their wives from dower. It was the law of dower unimpaired by statute, which according to the American commentator, Chancellor Kent, has been "with some modifications everywhere adopted as part of the municipal jurisprudence of the United States" (Commentaries on American Law, IV, 36). But while the marriage portion, dot, is, yet dower is not, known to the law of Louisiana, and it has now been expressly abolished in some other States and in some territories. The instances of legislative modifications are numerous and important.

Of dower (douaire) as it existed in the old French law no trace is to be found in the existing law of France. But brought to Canada from the mother country in pre-Revolutionary times, customary dower accruing by operation of law is yet recognized in the law of the former French Province of Quebec. The civil death which by English law seems to have applied to men only, might be by the French law incurred by women taking perpetual religious vows. A widow, therefore, thus entering into religion, would have some dower, although in some regions she was allowed to retain a moderate income. (See infra, op. cit.) And now by the law of Quebec a widow joining certain religious orders of the province is deemed civilly dead and undoubtedly would suffer loss of dower.


CHARLES W. SLOANE.

Dower, Religious (Lat. dos religioso). — Because of its analogy with the dower that a woman brings to her husband when she marries, the name "religious dower" has been given to the sum of money or the property that a religious woman, or nun (religiosa), brings, for her maintenance, into the convent where she desires to make her profession. It is not a question of the more or less generous donation of the young woman or her family either to the convent or to some of the good works that it carries on, nor of the amount paid in for the support of the postulant or novice until the time of her profession, but of a sum (usually a fixed one) set apart for the support of a religious who, by her profession, has become a member of the community.

The custom of religious dower was not in vogue in the ancient Church. Introduced occasionally for nuns under solemn vows (the only vows that existed in ancient times), it became gradually the rule in all communities, particularly in congregations under simple vows, these being now the most numerous. According to common ecclesiastical law, every convent had formerly to be provided, at the time of its foundation, with the resources necessary for the maintenance of a fixed number of nuns, not less than twelve. If a nun received gratuitously and without dower and, although in no wise prohibited from presenting the monastery with a portion of their property, were supported out of the revenue assigned to the monastery for this purpose. That is why the Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, c. III, De regul.) established in this regard the following rule: "Let only such a number [of religious] be determined, and henceforth maintained, as can be profitably supported, either by the proper revenue [of each house] or by the customary alms" [in the case of mendicant orders]. The determination of this number belongs to the bishop, who, if there be occasion, will act together with the regular superior (Gregory XIII, Constitution, Deo sacris, 15 Dec., 1572). The Council of Trent does not speak of religious dower. However, from the end of the sixteenth century the prescription relative to the fixed number of religious had fallen into disuse, and the convents came into use; and in the last two centuries. The first was the acceptance of "super-numerary" religious, that is of a larger number than the resources of the convent warranted; hence it was but just that the amount required for their maintenance should be demanded of them. The second reason to lay in the decrease of the resources of the ancient convents and in the absence of property for the many new houses founded towards the end of the sixteenth century. An evidence of the simultaneous existence of these two causes is found in the general decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, 6
Sept., 1604 (in Bizzarri, Collectanea, 260), ordaining that
the supernumerary religious should deposit a
dower equal to twice that of the others and amounting
to at least 400 écus (about $400). This was the mini-
mum, and each house was to set its own figure, to be
regulated according to circumstances. Though
postponed at the time of receiving the habit, the convent
did not acquire possession of the dower until the
ceremony of profession, and if the novice left before
being professed, it was restored to her (cf. Council of
Trent, Sess. XXV, cap. xvi). Dispensation from solemn
vows was, it may almost be said, unknown, and the obli-
gation of dower being not been provided for in the case
of a religious leaving her community; it was
the result of equity rather than of law. But since the
decree "Perpensis" of 3 May, 1902, which requires
of all religious under solemn vows a probationary
period of three years under simple vows, this
restitution has become a rule. Article X says: "The dower
established for each monastery should be deposited
before the profession of simple vows"; and Article XII
continues: "If a sister who has professed simple vows
retires from the monastery, either after being dis-
pensed from her vows by the Holy See or after sen-
tence of dismissal (before the solemn vows), the capital
of her dower is to be restored to her, but not the in-
terest."

Such is also the general rule for congregations under
simple vows. Stipulations concerning the dower are
very clearly set forth in the "Normæ," rules in use by
the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for
the approbation of religious under simple vows, pub-
lished 28 June, 1901, ch. vii, articles 91-94. Each
congregation of nuns should settle in its statutes the
dozer, equal in all cases, for the choir religious; it
should even establish a lesser dower (but the same
for each one) to be deposited by the lay, or assist-
ant, sisters. The superior cannot receive a religious
without a dower or with an insufficient dower, except
by permission of the bishop, if the congregation be
dioecesan, or by that of the Congregation of Reli-
gious, if the institute be approved by Rome.

The required dower must be duly pledged to the con-
gregation prior to the taking of the habit and must be
deposited shortly before the profession. Thus de-
posited, such a dower cannot be alienated, that is, it
cannot be used by the congregation in whatever way
it may deem fit, as, for instance, to meet building ex-
penses or discharge debts, but must be prudently and
advantageously invested. Even though the funds be
administered by the mother-house or the provincial,
the income from each dower must be given to the
house where the religious resides who brought in that
dozer. Although no longer the property of the nun, the
dozer becomes entirely the property of the institute
only at the death of the subject, for whom, until then,
it must remain set apart, so that, should a religious
withdrew from a community either on the expiration of
her temporary vows, or after a dispensation, or
finally on account of dismissal, the capital of her
dozer must be restored to her.

FERRIAR, Prompta Bibliotheca, s. v. Monasticæ, art. II; BATTANDIER, Etude canonique sur les constitutions des œuvres à
evots simples (Paris, 1850), nos. 135-146; BARTHE, Directoire
acte de l'organization des congrégations à évots simples (Marseilles,
1882), nos. 109, 114, 198, 214; PRUMMVER, Manuale juris ecclesi-
asticæ (Paris, 1897), II, 45.

A. BOUDINHON.

DOWLING, JOSEPH THOMAS. See Ottawa, Dio-
cese of.

DOWN. Down and Connor, Diocese of (Dunensis et Con-
nensis), in Ireland. A line drawn from Whitehouse
on Lough Neagh due west to the Clady River, thence
by the river itself to Muckamore and Lough Neagh,
marks the boundary between the Diocese of Down
and the Diocese of Connor. North of this line to the
sea and the Bann, including the greater part of the
County Antrim and a small portion of Derry, is the
Diocese of Connor. South of the line, the remainder
of Antrim, except the parish of Aghalee, belonging to
Dromore, belongs to the Diocese of Down, as also the
whole of the County Down, except the baronies of
Iveagh and part of Kincardine. The extent of the
United dioceses is 597,450 Irish acres (about 576 sq.
miles).

Each diocese was a collection of ancient sees. With-
in the limits of Down, and founded in St. Patrick's
time, there were: Raholp, founded by St. Tasseach,
Gortgrib by Vincel, Bright by Loarn, Mahee Island
by St. Mochay, Maghera by St. Donard. There were
also: Moville, founded by St. Finnan, and Bangor by
St. Comgall, the latter an abbey, but often ruled in
aftertimes by a bishop. St. Fergus is named as first
Bishop of Down. In ancient times the place was called
Dun Cetar, Cetar being one of the Red Branch
knights. Afterwards it was called Dun-da-Leth-
Glaisse, "the fort of the two half-chains." According
to tradition two young chiefs had long pined in King
Laegaire's prison. St. Patrick miraculously struck
off the chain which bound them, and the prisoners, thus
released, hastened to their father's residence at Dun
Cetar, flinging from them the pieces of the severed
chain; hence the new name. A further change occurred
after St. Patrick's death. Dying at Down (493), he
was buried at Down, which then contained no church.
Subsequently the remains of St. Brigid were brought
there from Kildare, as were some relics of St. Columba
from Iona. Meanwhile the ancient Dun Cetar had
become Downpatrick, a town overshadowing all the
neighbouring towns, the capital also of the Diocese of
Down, which in process of time absorbed all the sur-
rounding sees.

Like Down, Connor, founded in 480 by St. Macnissu,
was a collection of smaller sees. These were Kilroot,
Dumattulagh, Culfeightrin, Coleraine, Inispolen,
Army, and Rashee. The date of the founding of each
of these sees is uncertain, as also the dates of their
uniting, nor can a regular succession of bishops be
discovered. By the twelfth century all the sees had
ceded to exist except Connor. Its western boundary
was then the Roe; but by the Synod of Rath-Breasail
(1118), when the number and limits of the Irish dio-
ceses were fixed, the Bann was made the western
boundary of Connor, and Down was joined to it, but
only for a brief period. In 1124 St. Malachy became
Bishop of Connor, which was separated from Down.
The two dioceses were again united in 1134, when
Malachy became Archbishop of Armagh; but when he
resigned the primacy, in 1137, he became Bishop of
Down, again dividing the two sees. This separation
was recognized by the Synod of Kells (1152), and con-
tinued till 1411, when John Cely, Bishop of Down,
was deprived for having violated his vow of chastity.
Meanwhile the annals record the death of many dis-
}
both dioceses. It is further recorded that in 831 Connor was plundered by the Danes, and Down in 942; that in 1177 Downpatrick was captured by John de Courcy, who imprisoned the bishop; that in 1183 de Courcy turned the secular canons out of the cathedral and replaced them by Benedictine monks from Clonard. In 1184 the relics of St. Patrick, St. Brigid, and St. Columba were discovered there and reinterred in the church with great solemnity; that in 1185 a great battle was fought at Connor; and that the whole extent of the two dioceses suffered grievously during the invasion of Edward Bruce.

When John O'Neill, the first Great Duke of Ulster (1177-1214), died, the union of Down with Connor in 1411, and it did not finally take effect till 1451. Since that date both dioceses, recognized as one, have remained under the rule of one bishop. During the troubled times of the Reformation and the wars of the O'Neills, the Ulster counties suffered much, though the old Faith was still maintained. But the plantation of Ulster replaced the greater number of the Catholics by English Protestants and Scotch Presbyterians. Later on, in the seventeenth century, the tide of penetration rolled over Antrim and Down, with consequent destruction of Catholic property. The Penal Laws followed; and such was the combined effect of plantation and proscription that in 1670 in the whole of Down and Connor there were but 2500 Catholic families. For nearly sixty years subsequently the diocese was ruled by vicars. When at length the pressure of Penal legislation was removed Catholicism revived rapidly. In the period from 1810 to 1840 no less than forty new Catholic churches were built. The progress thus made under Dr. Crotty (1825-1845) and Dr. Denyer (1835-45) was continued under Dr. Dorrian (1865-86) and Dr. MacAllister (1886-95); nor did any of his predecessors show greater energy and zeal than Dr. Henry, whose death occurred with such tragic suddenness early in 1908. During the nineteenth century splendid churches were built at Newtownards, Hollywood, Ballymoney, and Belfast, and on every side visible signs of Catholic progress appeared.

This prosperity is largely due to the rapid growth of Belfast. Situated on the shores of Belfast Lough, it was occupied in the sixteenth century only by a strong castle, then in the hands of the O'Neills of Clannaboy. From them it passed at the close of the century to the British Government, and in 1693 the castle and land adjoining were granted by King James to Sir Arthur Chichester. He laid out and planted a small town, which, in 1696, was made a corporation by royal charter. Its growth was slow, and during the seventeenth century it was entirely overshadowed by the neighbouring town of Carrickfergus. About 1700, Belfast had a population of 2000, and a good deal of trade; in 1757 a population of 8000. Henceforth its rise was rapid and continuous. Its population in 1811 was 174,400; in 1881, 208,422; in 1901, 255,960; and in 1911, with an enlarged city area, 348,876. It sends four members to Parliament, and is ruled by a lord mayor, fifteen aldermen, and forty-five councillors. In commerce and shipping, in trade and manufactures, it is the first city in Ireland. Catholicism has more than kept pace with the general advancement of the city. In 1708 there were but seven Catholics in Belfast, and not till 1785 was there a Catholic church. Belfast is now the episcopal seat, with ten city parishes, a diocesan seminary, and many educational and charitable institutions. Among the remarkable men of the diocese the following may be mentioned: St. Macnisse, the patron saint of Connor, and St. Malachy, the patron saint of Down; St. Tassagh, who attended St. Patrick in his last illness; St. Comgall, who founded the monastery of Bangor; St. Finian, founder of Moone; St. Colman Elia, founder of Muckamore in Antrim; St. Mochay, Bishop of Nendrum; St. Donard, Bishop of Magherna; St. Dohonha, Bishop of Connor. In the sixteenth century the notorious Miles Magrath was Bishop of Down and Connor; and in the next century the martyrputed Cornelius O'Devany, and the fighting bishop, Heber MacMahon, who also met a martyr's fate.—Statistics (1908): Parishes, 60; secular clergy, 167; regular clergy, 21; churches, 114; colleges, 2; monasteries & convents, 16; total Catholic population (1901), 164,693; total population of all creeds, 671,266.

_OLAVERTY, A Historical Account of the Diocese of Down and Connor (Dublin, 1894-40);._

_Recent Antiquities of Down, Connor and Dromore (Dublin, 1847);_ BRADY, _Episcopal Succession_ (Kilmarnock, 1876); LAMBE, _Eccelesiastical History of Ireland from the Year 226_ (London, 1822); HEALY, _Lives and Writings of St. Patrick_ (Dublin, 1865); MEHAN, _Irish Hymnody_ (Dublin, 1872);_ BRISTOW, _History of Belfast_ (London, 1877-80); Irish Catholic Directory.

E. A. D'ALTON.

**DOWNES (alias Bedingfeld, Mountford and Mumford), Thomas, son of Thomas Downes of Bodney in Norfolk.** In 1617, d. 21 December, 1678. His mother was Mary, daughter of John Bedingfeld of Redfield in Suffolk. He was educated at St. Omer, but completed his studies at the English College at Valladolid, and entered the Society of Jesus in January, 1639. From the novitiate he was sent to the college of the English Province at Liége, but went for his theology to Pont-à-Mousson and was professed of the four vows 16 January, 1656. In 1671 he was chaplain to the Duke of York, afterwards James II. When his uncle, the Duke of York, set sail for Canada, he asked for "Father Mumford" as confessors on board his flagship. During an encounter between the two ships Father Downes won for himself a great reputation by exposing himself for many hours to a heavy fire while ministering to the wounded and dying. In 1679 he fell a victim to the infamous Oates plot; was arrested and died at Windsor but intended to be intercepted, and purporting to have been written by the provincial and Fathers of the Society. He handed the letters to the Duke of York who showed them to the king. The
latter was convinced of the fraud, and testified openly to Father Downes's innocence, but was unable to protect him from the malice of the plotters who succeeded in getting him arrested and sent to the Gatehouse prison where he died.


J. M. STONE.

Downside Abbey, near Bath, Somersetshire, England, was founded at Douai, Flanders, under the patronage of St. Gregory the Great, in 663 by the Venerable John Roberts, first prior, and some other English monks who had received the habit and taken vows in the Spanish Benedictine Congregation. In 1611 Dom Phillip de Caverel, Abbot of Saint Vaast's at Arras, built a monastery for the community in Douai, and consequently is revered as its founder. For some years the foundation was embroiled in attacks from without, and also in disputes as to a union with other English Benedictines, all of which were settled in 1633 by the Bull “Plantata” of Urban VIII.

From the first a school or college for lay pupils, sons of English Catholic gentry, has been an integral part of the institution. This undertaking, conducted on traditional English public school lines, has always absorbed much of the energies of the community, whose other chief external work has consisted in supplying various missions or parishes in England. When Charles II established for his queen a Catholic chapel royal at St. James’s palace, the community to serve it was supplied from St. Gregory’s at Douai, and certain relics and church-plate then presented are still in existence at Downside. On the outbreak of the French Revolution the school was disbanded and the monks put in prison, where they remained nearly two years. At length in March, 1795, they were allowed to proceed to England where an asylum was supplied by Sir Edward Smythe, first Baronet, a former pupil, who lent his Shropshire seat of Acton Burnell to his old masters for use as a monastery and school. In 1814 the establishment was moved to Mount Pleasant, Downside, a small manor-house with sixty-six acres of land, bought for £7000, largely the savings of the community for this purpose, and many of the buildings now in use were purchased by the community at that time. In 1823 Dr. Baines, Vicar Apostolic of the Western District, proposed to the community that they should abandon the monastic state and become a kind of diocesan seminary under himself. This extraordinary suggestion being rejected, the bishop applied to the Holy See for the suppression of the monastery on the ground of some alleged flaw in its canonical erection; after much litigation the pope decided in favour of the monks on every point. Since then the foundation has increased steadily in size and importance, new buildings being added in 1826, 1833, and almost continually since 1870. In 1833 Pope Leo XIII raised the priory to abbacy, the forty-fifth prior, Dom Edmund Ford, being elected first abbot, on whose resignation in 1866, Dom Cuthbert Butler was chosen to succeed him.

Six monks of St. Gregory’s have died martyrs for the Catholic Faith and are already pronounced Venerable, viz. Dom George Gervaise, martyred 1608; Dom John Roberts, the first prior, 1610; Dom Maurus Scot, 1612; Dom Ambrose Barlow, 1641; Dom Philip Powell, 1646; and Brother Thomas Pickering, 1679. Besides these the community have given to the Church three archbishops, Dom Bede Folding and Dom Bede Vaughan, the first two archbishops of Sydney, New South Wales; and Dom Bernard Ullathorne, first Bishop of Birmingham and titular Archbishop of Carthage, well known as an ascetical writer. Also six bishops, Dom Philip Ellis, Dom Laurence York, and Dom Gregory Sharrock, all three successively Vicars Apostolic of the Western District; more recently, Dom Placid Morris, Vicar Apostolic of Mauritius, and for many years assistant to Cardinal Winnington, Dom Joseph Brown, first Bishop of Newport and Menevia; and Dom Henry Davis, Bishop of Maitland, New South Wales. From many other notable names may be mentioned Dom Serenus Cressy, author of the “Church History of Britain”; Dom John Huddlestone, who was instrumental in saving Charles II after Worcester and reconciled him to the Church in his death-bed; the Abbots Sweeney, the well-known preacher; Dom John Davis Vaughan, founder of the Abbey of Fort Augustus, N. B.; Dom Aidan Gasquet, the historian, Abbot President of the English Benedictines and also head of the Pontifical Commission for the revision of the Vulgate. Among the alumni of St. Gregory’s School, though not monks in the community, were Bishop Charles Walmesley, who consecrated Dr. Carroll the first Bishop of Baltimore, U. S. A.; John Stevens, editor of Dugdale’s “Monasticon”; Henry Carey, author of “God save the King”; Sir John Day, one of the best known English Carlists; and Bishop Patrick J. Donahue, of Wheeling, U. S. A.

The abbey buildings now consist of a monastery for about fifty monks; school buildings for 1340 boarders; guest-house, the original building bought in 1814; and the abbey church, for exterior view of which see The...
DOXOLOGY

Catholic Encyclopedia, I, 14. The last-named building consists at present of transept, choir, and fifteen side chapels only; it is 230 feet long, and 70 feet high internally. Even in its unfinished state it ranks as one of the finest modern Gothic buildings in England. It is the tomb of the Irish martyr, venerable Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh. The community numbers eighty-four choir monks; there are no lay brothers. About half the monks work on the twenty-two missions or parishes in various parts of England which are dependent on the abbey. Besides the school attached to the monastery, hand schools at Ealing, London, W., and at Gorey, Co. Wexford, Ireland; a house of studies for its monks at Cambridge University and another for students in London, near the British Museum. The "Downside Review", a periodical in its twenty-eighth year, devoted chiefly to local, monastic, and liturgical interests, and in which are many articles of value, is published every four months. The "Downside Masses" and "Downside Motets" indicate the abbey's interest in the revival of polyphonic music; a similar interest in Christian art being shown in the "Downside Prints", a series of small devotional pictures reproduced from ancient masters. The Abbey Church of St. Albans, and the cathedral priories of Canterbury, Bath, Coventry, and Norwich. The arms of Downside are: Or a cross moline gules; the abbot's seal bears the effigy of Bl. Richard Whiting, martyr to the faith. The last abbot of the neighbouring Abbey of Glastonbury is WELDON, Chronological Notes on English Congregations O.S.B. (privately printed, Worcester, 1881); TAYLOR, English Bishops of St. Benedict (London, 1897); H. R. B. Ho- lycross, Guide to Downside Abbey Church (London, 1905); Illustrated articles in Christian Art, I, 135; Architectural Re- view, XXII, 40; Downside Review, I—XXVIII, many articles passim.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

DOXOLOGY.—In general this word means a short verse praising God and beginning, as a rule, with the Greek word Δέκα. The custom of ending a rite or a hymn with such a formula comes from the Synagogue (cf. The Prayer of Manasses: tibi est gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen.) St. Paul uses doxologies constantly (Rom., xi, 36; Gal., i, 5; Eph., ii, 21; etc.). These early examples are addressed to God the Father alone, or to Him through (θαυμά) the Son (Rom., xxvi, 27; Jude, 25; I Cem., xlii; Mart. Polyc., xx; etc.) and in (εἰς) or with (οὗ), the Holy Ghost (Mart. Polyc., xiv, xxii, etc.). The form of baptism (Matt., xxviii, 19) had set an example of naming the three Persons in parallel order. Especially in the fourth century, as a protest against Arian subordination (since heretics appealed to these prepositions; cf. St. Basil, "De Spir. Sancto", ii—v), the custom of using the "Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost", became universal among Catholics. From this time we must distinguish two doxologies, a greater (doxologia maiores) and a shorter (minor). The greater doxology is the Gloria in Excelsis Deo (q.v.) in the Mass. The shorter form, which is the one generally referred to under the name "doxology", is given and is continued by an answer: "and it is in this effect that this glory shall last for ever. The form, els τοῦ αἰώνα τῶν αἰώνων, is very common in the first century (Rom., xxvi, 27; Gal., i, 5; I Tim., i, 17; Heb., xiii, 21; Peter iv, 11; I Cem., xx, xxxii, xxxviii, xliii, xiv, etc.; Mart. Polyc., xxii, etc.). It is a common Hebrewism (Tob., xxiii, 23; Ps. 1xxxvi, xliii, repeated in the Apocalypse: i, 6, 18; xiv, 11; xiii, 8; etc.) meaning simply "for ever". The simple form, els τοῦ αἰώνα, is also common (Rom., xi, 36; Doctr. XII Apost., ix, x; in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, passim). Parallel forms are: els τοῦ μεγάλου αἰώνα (Mart. Polyc., xiv); καὶ γένεσ

GLOSSARY

elis γενέσ (ibid.); etc. This expression was soon enlarged into: "now and ever and in ages of ages" (cf. Heb., xiii, 8; Mart. Polyc., xiv, etc.). In this form it occurs constantly at the end of prayers in the Greek Liturgy of St. James (Brightman, Eastern Liturgies, pp. 31, 32, 33, 34, and as the last doxology of psalms, though not so invariably as with us. The second form is occasionally slightly modified and other verses are sometimes introduced between the two halves. In the Latin Rite it seems originally to have had exactly the same form as in the East. In 529 the Second Synod of Vaison (Vaison in the province of Avignon) says that the additional words, Sic est erat in principio, are used in Rome, the East, and Africa as a protest against Arianism, and orders them to be said likewise in Gaul (can. v.). As far as the East is concerned the synod is mistaken. These words have never been used in any Eastern rite and the Greek councils complained of their absence. Attached to the prayer, the tituli of the Abbey of Glastonbury are: De rebus eccl., xxv. The explanation that sicut erat in principio was meant as a denial of Arianism leads to a question whose answer is less obvious than it seems. To what do the words refer? Everything in the form now understands gloria as the subject of erat; "As it [the glory] was in the beginning, so is it now and shall He be for ever." The text usually takes clear allusion to the first words of the Fourth Gospel, and the sentence is obviously directed against Arianism. There are medieval German versions in the form: "Als er war im Anfang." The doxology in the form in which we know it has been used since about the seventh century, all over Western Christendom, except in one corner. In the Mozarabic Rite the formula is: "Gloria et honor Patri et Filio et Spiritui sancto in saecula saeculorum" (so in the Missal of this rite; see P. L., LXXV, 109, 119, etc.). The Fourth Synod of Toledo in 635 ordered the use of the form (can. xxv). The modern, medieval tradition is founded on a spurious letter of St. Jerome (in the Benedictine edition, Paris, 1700, V, 415) that Pope Damasus (366—384) introduced the Gloria Patri at the end of psalms. Cassian (died c. 435) speaks of this as a special custom of the Western Church (De instit. con., II, viii). The use of the shorter doxology in the Latin Church is this: the two parts are always said or sung as a verse with response. They occur always at the end of psalms (when several psalms are joined together as one, as the sixty-second and sixty-sixth and again the one hundred and forty-eight, one hundred and forty-ninth, and one hundred and fifty-first). At Lauda, the Gloria Patri occurs only once at the end of the group; on the other hand each group of sixteen verses of the one hundred and eighteenth psalm in the day Hours has the Gloria (except on occasions of mourning. For this reason (since the shorter doxology, like the greater one, Gloria in Excelsis Deo, is naturally a joyful chant) it is left out on the last three days of Holy Week; in the Office for the Dead its place is taken by the verses: Requiem aeternam, etc. Et lux perpetua, etc. It also occurs after antiphons, except that the Benedictine has its own doxology (Benedictus patri Patrem, Benedictus Deus, etc.). The alternative one left in the Roman Rite, etc. In the Mass it occurs after three psalms, the "Judica me" at the beginning, the fragment of the Introit-Psalm, and the "Lavabo" (omitted in Passiontide, except on feasts, and at requiem Masses). The first part only
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DOYLE occurs in the *responsoria* throughout the Office, with a variable answer (the second part of the first verse) instead of "Sicut erat," the whole doxology after the "Deus in aditorium;" and in the *proces* at Prime; and again, as a one verse, at the end of the *invitatoria* at Mattins. At those places it is left off from the Office for the Dead and at the end of Holy Week. The Gloria Patri is also constantly used in extraliturgical services, such as the Rosary. It was a common custom in the Middle Ages for preachers to end services with it. In some countries, Germany especially, people make the sign of the cross on the first part of the doxology, considering it as chiefly a profession of faith.

ERMESIDUS, Dissertatio historica de veteri christiana solemnitate (Hamburg, 1792); (1696); A SIEHELS, Commentarius ad doxologiae solemnem Gloriae Patri verba: Sicut erat in principio in his Missala (1752); BONA, Rerum liturgicarum libri duo (Cologne, 1774), II, 471; THALHOFER, *Handbuch der kath. Liturgik*, I, 460 sq.; IDEM in Augsburger Pastoralblatt (1883), 280 sq.; RIESCH, Lehrbuch der Liturgik, I, 355 sq.; KRAU, Real-Enzyk., I, 377 sq.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

DOYLE, JAMES WARREN, Irish bishop: b. near New Ross, County Wexford, Ireland, 1786; d. Carlow, 1834. He belonged to a family, respectable but poor, and received his early education at Clonlough, at Rathconlogue, and later at the Augustinian College, New Ross. Shortly after 1800 he joined the Augustinian Order and was sent to Coimbra in Portugal; and there, at the university, first manifested his great intellectual powers. In the university library he read everything, Voltaire and Rousseau among the rest. As a consequence his faith became unsettled; but his vigorous intellect soon asserted itself, and subsequently he became the fearless champion of the Church in which he was born. During the French invasion he did serynt work at Coimbra, and accompanied the English to Lisbon as interpreter, and such was the impression he made at the Portuguese Court that he was offered high employment there. He declined the offer, however, and, returning to Ireland in 1808, was ordained priest the following year. Then for eight years he taught logic at the Augustinian College, New Ross. In 1817 he became professor at Carlow College, and two years later the priests of Kildare and Leighlin placed him *dignissimus* for the vacant see. Their choice was approved at Rome, and in 1819, Doyle became a bishop that date the effects of the Penal Laws were still visible in the conduct of the Catholics. Even the bishops, as if despairing of equality and satisfied with subjection, often allowed Protestant bigotry to assail with impunity their country and creed. This attitude of timidity and acquiescence was little to Dr. Doyle's taste, and over the signature of "J. K. L." (James, Kildare and Leighlin) he vigorously repelled an attack made on the Catholics by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin. He also published an extremely able pamphlet on the religious and civil principles of the Irish Catholics; and a series of letters on the state of Ireland, in which the inequities of the Church Establishment, the executions of the landlords, the corrupt administration of justice were lashed with an unparrying hand. The clearness of style, the skilful marshalling of facts, the wide range of knowledge astonished all. And not less remarkable was his examination before two Parliamentary committees in London. Seeing his readiness and resource, the Duke of Wellington remarked that Doyle examined the committees rather than was examined by them. He joined the Catholic Association and wrote regularly to that body, and when Clare, Doyle addressed him a public letter hoping "that the God of truth and justice would be with him." After Emancipation these two great men frequently disagreed, but on the tithe question they were in accord, and Doyle's exhortation to the people to hate tithe as much as they loved justice became a battle-cry in the tithe war. Meantime nothing could exceed the bishop's zeal in his diocese. He established confraternities, temperance societies, and parish libraries, built churches and schools, conducted retreats, and ended many abuses which had survived the penal times. He also worked unceasingly against the then incessant war on secret societies. He died young, a martyr to faith and zeal.

FIDELPATTER, Life and Times of Dr. Doyle (Dublin, 1880); MACDONAGH, Bishop Doyle (London, 1896); Magazine of the Order of the Irish Society (London, 1895); Letters on the State of Ireland, by J. K. L. (Dublin, 1825); Evidence Taken Before the Select Committee of the Houses of Lords and Commons, 1825-6 (London, 1825).

E. A. D'ALTON.

DOYLE JOHN, b. in Dublin, Ireland, 1797; d. in London, 2 Jan., 1808; English portrait-painter and caricaturist. This clever artist studied under Gabrielli, and Comerford, the miniature-painter. He came to London in 1821 and started as a portrait-painter, but gave his attention to producing caricatures in 1827 or 1828, and developed his well-known signature, "H. B.," by means of two sets of initials "J. D." placed one above the other. In 1829 he commenced his famous series of drawings which he continued to produce until 1851, caricaturing in brilliant style all the political movements of the day. They differ completely from the caricatures which preceded them, notably those of Rowlandson and Gillray, inasmuch as they are marked by reticence, courtesy, and a sense of good breeding. They are extraordinarily clever and at times stinging in their bitter epigrammatic quality; but Thackeray underestimated their power when he spoke of them as "genteeel" and said that they would "only produce a smile and never a laugh." There are some six hundred of them in the British Museum, and taken altogether they form a most interesting and graphic representation of the political history of England for the times. Doyle retired from professional work seventeen years before his death. He preserved his incognito to the very last and few people were aware of the fact that the initials on the caricatures formed his signature. He produced several pencil sketches of well-known personages and made use of his studies in this way in his caricatures, but the sketches themselves constitute in several instances the most life-like representations of the persons in question which exist.

FODEN, English Caricature (1888); FODEN, Puzzles (1874); BENSON, Drawings in the British Museum (1900); DOBSON in Dict. Nat. Biog., s. v.; BRYAN, Dict. of Painters and Engravers, II, 47.

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

DOYLE, RICHARD, English artist and caricaturist, b. in London, September, 1824; d. there 11 December, 1883. The second son of John Doyle (q. v.), he inherited much of his father's talent and exceeded the elder Doyle in skill and in power as a draughtsman. From a very early age he amused himself with making drawings. He prepared an account of the Eglinton Tournament when he was but fifteen, and at the age of sixteen commenced his famous journal, now preserved in the British Museum. The journal is a manuscript book containing many small sketches in pen and ink, executed with skill and brilliance, and marked by power of observation and by a sense of humour hardly equalled and certainly not exceeded in later years. This extraordinary work was reproduced in facsimile in 1885 with an introduction by J. H. Pollen, and is a remarkable proof of Richard Doyle's precociousness as an artist. In 1843 he drew "Punch" and contributed to the staff of that paper till 1820. He produced many cartoons, but his name will be especially remembered from the fact that he designed the cover for "Punch" which has continued in use down to the present time. He also wrote for "Punch" a series of articles entitled "Manners and Customs of ye English" A
very devout Catholic, he resigned his position on the staff of the paper in 1850 in consequence of its hostility to what was termed "papal aggression," and devoted the remainder of his career to preparing drawings for book illustration and to painting in water-colour. His chief series of illustrations were the "King of the Golden River," "In Fairyland," and "The Foreign Tour of Brown, Jones and Robinson." His water-colour drawings were marked by much poetic feeling, and were executed in harmonious low-toned schemes of colour. His genius has been well described as "kindly, frolicsome, and sportive." His life was full of imagination and delighted in romantic fancy, while his caricatures are exquisitely drawn, amusing and graceful, lacking perhaps the strength of his father's works but far exceeding them in charm and in quality of sentiment. There are many of his drawings in the British Museum, and some of his sketch-books are in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge.

The Month (London, March, 1884); Everett, English Caricaturists (London, 1886); Benson, Drawings in the British Museum (London, 1890); Dobson, in Dict. Nat. Bio., s. v.

George Charles Williamson.

Drach, David Paul, convert from Judaism, b. at Strasburg, 6 March, 1791; d. end of January, 1868, at Rome. Rosenthal's "Convvertiten bild" (III, 48) prefaces the autobiography of Drach with the following words: "The conversion of this learned Jewish proselyte is undoubtedly one of the most important conversions witnessed by the grace of God during this century in France and became the source of salvation to many of his coreligionists." This conversion, affecting one who enjoyed the highest esteem as an author and a learned rabbi, produced a most profound influence on all the honest and earnest minds of the rising generation and inspired them to do the more serious problems of life. His endeavours to lead his coreligionists to the fountain of truth, to the acknowledgment of Jesus as the real and true Messiah, crystalized in numerous writings and were blessed by God. Herein lies the net result of this scholar's conversion.

Drach received his first instruction at the hands of his father, a renowned Hebraist and Talmudic scholar, whose linguistic talents the son inherited. At the age of twelve Drach entered the first division of the Talmudic school in Edendorf near Strasburg. This course was completed in one year, and entered the second division of the Talmudic school in Bischheim in the following year. He graduated in eighteen months and then matriculated in Westphala to qualify as a teacher of the Talmud. When only sixteen years of age he accepted the position of instructor at Rappoltsweiler, remaining there three years; afterwards he followed the same profession in Colmar. Here the ambitious youth devoted himself zealously to the study of secular sciences to which he had already seriously applied himself while prosecuting his Talmudic studies. Having obtained the rather unwilling permission of his father, he went to Paris, where he received a call to a prominent position in the Central Jewish Consistory and at the same time fulfilled the duties of tutor in the household of a distinguished Jew. The marked result of this method of teaching induced even Christian families to entrust their children to his care. It was under these circumstances that he received the first impulse towards a change of his religious views which ultimately resulted in his conversion. He writes: "Stirred by the edifying examples of Catholic piety before me and by the consciousness of my own salvation, the tendency towards Christianity, born in earlier life, acquired such strength that I resisted no longer." He now applied himself studiously to patristical theology and specialized in the study of the Septuagint with a view towards ascertaining the truth of the unanimous reproach of the Fathers, viz. that the Jews had falsified the Hebrew text. These studies resulted in his unquestioned belief in the Divinity and Messiahship of Jesus Christ. On Maundy Thursday, 1825, he renounced Judaism in the presence of Archbishop Quellen. On the following (Holy) Saturday, and on Easter morning received his first Holy Communion and the Sacrament of Confirmation. Two daughters and an infant son were also baptized. His wife, the only member of the family who adhered stanchly to the old faith, abducted the children. They were returned, however, after two years.

After a few years Drach went to Rome, where he was appointed librarian of the Propaganda (1827), which office he held at his death. Among the many converts who trace their conversion to the influence of Drach's example are the Libermann brothers; Franz Maria Paul Libermann was especially indebted to the influence of Drach for his sound advice and active assistance in the establishment of the "Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary." Of Drach's numerous writings the following deserves particular mention: Lettres d'un rabbin converti aux Israélites, ses frères (Paris, 1848). He wrote, moreover, "Du divorce dans l'Eglise" (Paris, 1846), and published the "Bible de Venise," with annotations (Paris, 1827-1833) in 27 volumes octavo. He remodelled the Hebrew-Latin Dictionary of Gesenius, and published a Catholic Hebrew-Chaldaic dictionary of the Old Testament (ed. Migne, Paris, 1848). He wrote, moreover, "De l'Harmonie entre l'Eglise et la synagogue" (Paris, 1844); and "La Cabale des Hebreux" (Rome, 1861).

Paul Augustin, son of the preceding, b. 12 Aug., 1817; d. 20 Oct., 1865; canon of Notre-Dame and exlegate of importance. He studied at the Propaganda College in Rome, and in 1846. We owe to him a large French Bible commentary (La Sainte Bible, Paris, 1869) in which he himself wrote the Pauline Epistles (1871), the Catholic Epistles (1879), and the Apocalypse (1879). Rosenthal, Conversations, III, 48; Gruber in Kirchenez., III, 2011; Houter, Nomenclator; Peters, Life of the Ven. Servant of God, Franz Maria Paul Libermann, Ger. tr. Müller (Stuttgart, 1889).

N. Scheid.

Drachma (Gr. δραχμή), a Greek silver coin. The Greeks derived the word from ἄθροισις, "to grip," "to take a handful"; cf. ἄθροισμα, manipulus, "a handful." Thus the term originally signified a handful of grain (Liddell and Scott; Riemh, "Handwörterbuch"; Smith, "Dict. of Antiq."); but in Vigouroux, "Dict. de la Bible," the term is derived from darag-mana, the name of a Persian coin equivalent to the Hebrew דָּרָג, daragmemon. The Persian word darag, Assyrian darku, means "degree," "division." Thus the words darag-mana and drachma would signify a part of a mina. The darag-mana was also called a Daric because it was first struck by the emperor Darius Hystaspis. The drachma contained six obols. It was the fourth part of a stater, the hundredth part of a mina, and the six-thousandth part of a talent. The precise value of the drachma differed at various times. The two principal standards of currency in the Grecian states were the Attic and the Æginetan. The Attic drachma had the greater circulation after the time of Alexander the Great. It's weight was about 66 grains, its value was a little less than twenty cents (nine pence, three farthings), and its size was about that of a quarter. On the one side it had the head of Minerva, and on the reverse her emblem, the owl, surrounded by a crown of laurels. The Æginetan drachma weighed about 92 grains and was twice the weight of the second Attic drachma. It was current in the Peloponnese (Corinth excepted, Riemh, "Handwörterbuch") and in Macedonia until Alexander the Great. The drachma is mentioned in the Old Testament (II Macabees,
DRAONITUS

xii, 43), when Judas sends 12,000 drachmas to Jerusalem that sacrifices may be offered for the dead. In the New Testament (Luke, xv, 8, 9), Christ used the word in the parable of the woman that has ten drachmas (D. V. "groats") and loses one.

RUBETRUS, PERTINAX IN VIT., DE LA BIBLE, s. v. DRACHME: BARNTON IN DIET. CHRIST. ANTIG., s. v. MONEY; KENNEDY IN HASE, DIET. OF THE BIBLE s.v. MONEY; WEX, METROLOGIE GRECQ ET ROMAINE (Paris, 1880).

C. VAN DEN BIESSEN.

Dracnonius, BLOSSIUS ÁMILIV, a Christian poet of the fifth century. Dracnonius belonged to a distinguished family of Carthage and was the pupil of a man of much more distinguished name, Pelissonus. He was called clarissimus (most illustrious), won the favour of the proconsul Pacideius, and led a prosperous life by means of inherited riches and the income of his law practice until he incurred the ill will of the Vandal king, Gunthamund. The cause of this misfortune seems to have been the expression of sentiments of Romano-Byzantine patriotism; for these utterances Dracnonius suffered a long imprisonment. Nothing more is known of his history except that he was still alive when Thrasamund ascended the throne in 496.

His works are the "Romules", three books on God ("Deus""); and a poem entitled "Satisfactorius." The latter two were written in prison; the first-mentioned is a collection of pieces composed at various times and written in the style of rhetorical school-exercises. Thus, one of these poems represents a rich man and a poor man as enemies; as a reward for the exploits of the rich man his statue is erected in the public square and accorded the right of sanctuary. Later, in recompense for additional services, the rich man asks for the head of the poor one, whereupon the latter flees to the statue for safety and a formal process ensues. In another poem Achilles deliberates as to whether or not he shall sell the body of Hector. Dracnonius deals with themes of his own day, as in the eulogy on his former teacher, and the "Epithalamia" for two couples who were friends, his style is occasionally less conventional. The writings forming the "Romules" contain but little suggestion of a Christian poet; on the other hand, the "Satisfactorius" and the "De laudibus Dei" manifest an ardent and sometimes eloquent faith. The "Satisfactorius," written about 490, was intended to be instrumental in obtaining the royal pardon; the "De laudibus Dei", produced between 486 and 496, is a recital of God's benefits. The first book of the "De laudibus Dei" has for its theme a description of the creation; the chief theme of the second is the Incarnation and the Redemption; it also contains vehement attacks on Arianism; the third compares, by appropriate examples, the hope of the Christian who denies himself in order to love God with the cheerless prospect of the pagan who counts on no future reward. This poem, like the others, is full of ideas taken from other sources; the episodes drawn from the Bible, profane history, and mythology are as varied as the textual reminiscences of the Latin poets, both classical and pagan. However, the excellent pupil of Pelissonus was not a thorough master of Latin diction and prosody; his writings give frequent evidence in their form of the surrounding barbarism.

The collection named "Romules" is incomplete. Particularly when the two contain a small poem on the nut and the other on the origin of the rose; perhaps, further, the "Orestis tragedie", which is a called tragedy, though in reality it an epic poem of some thousand verses, wherein the author follows a unique ancient version of the myth; finally, though with characteristic industry, the "De laudibus Dei" (Perdica's Malady). The subject of this little poem of 290 hexameters is interesting from the point of view of folklore. Perdica, a student of Athens, has neglected the worship of Venus and by way of revenge this goddes inspires him with a guilty love for his mother, Castalia. Perdica falls into a decline and his physicians are unable to understand his ailment, but Hippocrates, who ascertains that Perdica's heart beats more violently when Castalia approaches, recognizes the real nature of the malady. There is no remedy for the grave and Perdica hangs himself (see Rohde, Der griech. Roman, p. 54). The works of Dracnonius were not known in their real form until 1791 and 1873. His Christian poems were very popular in the sixth and seventh centuries. They were revised by Eugenius, Bishop of Toledo (d. 657), but these revisions made great changes in the author's statements. What Eugenius omitted he altered and he corrected the doctrine of Dracnonius. The latter had said that God deliberately created good and evil at the same time (Satisfactorius, 15); Eugenius made him say that God tolerated evil. It was in this recession that both the Christian poems were known until 1791. The larger part of the secular poems of Dracnonius were first published in 1873.


PAUL LEJAY.

Drane, Auguste Theodosia, in religion Mother Francis Raphael, O.S.D.; b. at Bromley near London, in 1823; d. at Stone, Staffordshire, 29 April, 1894. Her parents were both Protustants, her father being managing partner in an East India mercantile house. Her remarkable natural gifts were developed by wide reading at a very early age. In 1837 she moved with her family to Babbocombe, Devonshire, where she read much of the early literature of the Oxford Movement. Burnet's "History of the Reformation," she declared, was the real cause of her conversion. It was not, however, till 1847 that she grew uneasy as to her religious beliefs, whereupon she consulted Keble and Pusey, but without satisfaction. The influence of Maskell, then Vicar of St. Mary Church, helped her more and she confided to him a scheme called "Ideal of a Religious Order." He told her that such an order existed in the Catholic Church, naming the Third Order of St. Dominic. This made a profound impression on her mind and gradually she was drawn to the Church. She was received at Tiverton, 3 July, 1850, and in 1852 entered the Third Order of St. Dominic at Clifton. On 8 Dec., 1853, she was professed at the new convent of Stone, Staffordshire, and was there employed in teaching and in writing various books, meanwhile making great spiritual progress. In 1860 she was appointed mistress of novices, but in 1866 became mistress of studies instead, thus obtaining more leisure for writing. In 1872 she became prioress under her friend, Mother Imelda Poole, and on the death of the latter in 1881 succeeded her as provincial (25 Nov., 1881), thus taking charge of the whole congregation and its convents. In 1887 she was elected the Third Order of St. Dominic at Clifton. Drane was well known in the religious world and her books were much read. She was a fine writer and had a gift of narrative power which enabled her to make a large impression on her contemporaries. Her works include: "The Morality of Tractarianism" (1860), published anonymously, "Catholic Legends and Stories" (1857), "Knights of St. John" (1858), "Three Clergymen, Wykeham, Waynflete and More" (1859); "Historical Tales" (1862); "Tales and Traditions" (1862); "History of England for Family Use" (1864);
dreams recorded in the annals of King Asshurbanipal. From these documents we learn that Asshur appeared in a dream to Gyges, King of Lydia, and said to him: "Embrace the feet of Asshurbanipal, King of Assyria, and thou shalt conquer thy enemies by his name." Asshurbanipal then sent to the Assyrian ruler to narrate this dream and pay him homage, and henceforth succeeded in conquering the Kimmians. Another passage relates that, in the course of an expedition against Elam, as the Assyrian troops were afraid to cross the Titi River, Istar of Artaba appeared to them in their sleep and said: "Go before Asshurbanipal, the king whom my hands have made." Encouraged by this vision, the army crossed the river ("West, As. Inschr.", vol. III; G. Smith, "Hist. of Asshurbanipal"). The Divinely sent dream might also at times foreshow some coming event. Moreover, its meaning was not always clear and might be shrouded in symbols, or, if conveyed through oral communication, wrapped up in figures of speech. In either case, the knowledge of the significance of the dream would depend on the interpretation. And as most dreams portend no clear message, the task of unfolding dream symbols and figures gradually grew into an art, more or less associated with soothsaying. Elaborate rules were laid down and handbooks compiled for the guidance of the priests in explaining the portent of the visions and symbols perceived by the inquirer in his sleep.

Many such manuals have been found in Assyria and Babylonia, the contents of which enable us to understand the principles followed in dream-interpretation. From Dan., ii, 2 sqq., it would seem that the paterim, or dream-interpreters, might be called upon even to discharge the perplexing task of recalling dreams forgotten by the dreamer. The instance here recorded may, however, be more typically illustrative of the context distinctly intimates that this task, impossible "except to the gods", yet imposed upon the Babylonian diviners by a whim of the king, was beyond the acknowledged attributions. Most of the Egyptian magic books likewise contain instructions either to procure or to explain dreams. These incantations had to be recited according to fixed cantillations, and the soothsayer's art consisted in knowing them thoroughly, copying them faithfully, and applying them properly. Side by side with this religious view of dreams, which regarded them as the expression of the will of the god, there existed the superstitious view, according to which all dreams were considered as omens. Assuming "that things causally connected in thought are causally connected in fact" (Jevons), people blindly believed that their dreams had a bearing on their own fate, and eagerly strove to discover its significance.

Like the Eastern peoples, the Greeks and the Romans attached a religious significance to dreams. Of this belief many traces may be found in classical literature. Homer and Herodotus thought it natural that the gods should send dreams to men, even to deceive them, if needs be, for the accomplishment of their higher ends (Agamemnon's dream). The same indications may be found also in the works of the dramatists (e.g. Clytemnestra's dream in the "Agamemnon" of Eschylus). Plato, whilst regarding it as inconceivable that a god should deceive men, acknowledged less that dreams may come from the gods (Tim., cxvi, xliv). Aristotle was similarly of the opinion that there is a divinatory value in dreams (De Divin. per somn., ii). The teaching of the Stoics was along the same lines. If the gods, they said, love man and are his protectors, then of course they might be expected to disclose their purposes to man in sleep. Finally, in Greece and Rome, as well as in the East, the popular views of dreams went a great deal farther and developed into superstition. It was in accordance with these views, and to gratify the cravings which they
created, that Daldianus Artemidorus compiled his "Oneirocritica", in which rules were laid down whereby any one could interpret his own dreams.

In the light of the beliefs and practices of the ancient peoples, we are better able to judge the belief and practice recorded in the Bible. That God made man into communication with man through dreams is asserted in Num., xiii, 6, and still more explicitly in Job, xxxii, 14 sqq.: "God speaketh once, ... By a dream in a vision by night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, and they are sleeping in their beds; then he openeth the ears of men, and teacheth them what they are to learn." As a matter of fact, dream-revelation through dreams occurs frequently in the Old and in the New Testament. In most of the cases recorded the dream is expressly said to come from God; of this description are, e.g., the dreams of Abimelech (Gen., xx, 3); of Jacob (Gen., xxviii, 12; xxxi, 10); of Solomon (III K., iii, 5-15); of Nabuchodonosor (Dan., ii, 19); of Daniel (Dan., vii, 1); of Joseph (Matth., i, 20; ii, 13); of St. Paul (Acts, xxiii, 11; xxvii, 23), unless we should interpret these passages as referring to visions granted to the Apostles while awake. God is said to appear Himself only in a few instances, as in the case of Abimelech, to Jacob, to Solomon, and to Daniel, if, as is generally admitted, the "Ancient of days", spoken of in this connexion, should be understood to be God; in other instances He is said to speak through an angel, as in the dreams narrated by St. Matthew and St. Paul. The Bible records other dreams, which, though prophetic, are not distinctly said to come from God (Gen., xxvii, 6; xI, 5; xii, 1; Judges, vii, 13; II Mach., xv, 11). It appears, however, from the circumstances and from their prophetic import, that their Divine origin cannot be doubted; at least their interpretation is declared (Gen., xi, 8) to "be to God". Accepting the historical truth of these facts, there is no reason indeed why God should not use dreams as a means of manifesting His will to man. God is omniscient and all-powerful, and He loves man; He may, therefore, in order to disclose his purposes, choose natural as well as supernatural means. Now dreaming, as a natural psycho-physiological phenomenon, has undoubtedly its laws, which, however obscure they may be to man, are established by God, and obey His bidding. But since man may be easily deceived, it is needful that God in using natural causes should supply such evidences as will make His intervention unmistakable. Sometimes these evidences are manifested to the dreamer, at other times to the interpreter, if one be necessary; but they will never fail. The analogy of the foregoing reasons with those which brought forward by theologians to prove the possibility of revelation is readily perceived. In fact, there is here more than a mere analogy; for communication by dreams is but one of the many ways God may select to manifest His designs to man; there is between them a relation of species to genus, and one could not deny either without denying the possibility of a supernatural order.

All the dreams actually recorded in Holy Writ came unsought. Some scholars infer from the words of Saul (I K., xxviii, 15): "God is departed from me, and would not hear me, neither by the hand of prophets, nor by dreams", that the practice of deliberately seeking supernatural dreams was not approved of by God. The words just quoted, however, do not necessarily imply such a meaning, but may as well be interpreted of unsought prophetic dreams. Still less can it be asserted that the Israelites would seek prophetic dreams by resorting to a well-known sanctuary and sleeping there. The two instances adduced in connection with them are the dream of Jacob at Bethel (Gen., xxviii, 12-19) and that of Solomon at Gabaon (III K., iii, 5-15), do not bear out such an affirmation. In both cases the dream, far from being sought, was unexpected; moreover, with regard to the former, it is evident from the narration that Jacob was quite unaware beforehand of the holiness of the place he slept in. His inference on the next morning as to its sacredness was inspired by the object of the dream, and his conduct in this circumstance seems even to betray some fear of having unknowingly defiled it by sleeping there.

It should not be concluded from the above remarks that there were no errors with regard to dreams and dream-interpretation in the minds of individual Israelites. Like their neighbours, they had a tendency to consider all dreams as omens, and attach importance to their interpretation. This tendency was constantly held in check by the more enlightened, and more religious part of the nation. Besides the prohibition to "observe dreams", embodied in the Law (Lev., xix, 26; Deut., xviii, 10), the Prophets, from the eighth century B. C. onwards, repeatedly warned the people against giving "heed to their dreams which they dream" (Jer., xxviii, 3). "Dreams follow many cares", says Ecclesiastes (v, 2); and Ben Sirach wisely adds that "dreams have deceived many, and they have failed that put their trust in them" (Eccles., xxxiv, 7). This was, according to II Par., xxxiii, 6, one of the faults which brought about the downfall of Manasses. Above all, the Israelites were ever on their guard to explain every dream in every manner against trusting in the pretended dreams of false prophets: "Behold, I am against the prophets that have lying dreams, saith the Lord" (Jer., xxiii, 32; cf. Zach., x, 2, etc.). From these and other indications it appears clear that the religious Israelites were kept pure from superstition connected with dreams. True, a mere glance at the respective dates of the above-quoted passages suggests that the zeal of the prophets was of little avail, at least for certain classes of people. The evil opposed by them continued in every age and even after the Exile. But it is scarcely necessary to remark how unjust it would be to hold the Jewish religious responsibility for the abuses of individual persons. Neither did there exist at any time in Israel a class of diviners making it their business to interpret the dreams of their countrymen; there were no soothsayers among the temple-officials, nor later around the synagogues. The very few dream-interpreters spoken of in the Bible, as Joseph and Daniel, were especially commissioned by God in exceptional circumstances. Nor did they resort to natural skill or art; their interpretations were suggested to them by the Divine Intellect enlightening their minds: "interpretation belongs to God", as Joseph declared to his fellow-prisoners. Undoubtedly there were among the people some soothsayers ever ready to profit by the curiosity of weaker and credulous minds; but as they possessed no authority and as they were condemned both by God and by the higher religious consciousness of the community, they practised their art in secret.

That certain dreams may be caused by God seemed to be acknowledged without controversy by the early fathers of the Church and the ecclesiastical writers. This opinion they based mainly on Biblical authority; occasionally they appealed to the authority of classical writers. Agreeably to this doctrine, it was admitted likewise that the interpretation of supernatural dreams belongs to God who sends them, and who must manifest it either to the dreamer or to the interpreter. The divine intervention in man's dreams is an exceptional occurrence; dreaming, on the contrary, is a most common fact. We may inquire, therefore, how the official guardians of the Faith viewed ordinary and natural dreams. In general they held that the prohibitions and warnings of the Old Testament, and denounced in particular the superstitious tendency to consider dreams as omens. It may suffice in this connexion to recall the names of St Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Gregory the Great, whose teaching on the
question at issue is clear and emphatic. A few, however, held opinions somewhat at variance with the traditional view. Among them the most noteworthy is Symposius of Cyrene (about 370-413), who is the author of a very strange treatise on dreams. Starting from a Platonic anthropological trichotomy—emanation from certain archetypical hypostases of Plato and Plotinus, he attributed to the imagination a manifestly exaggerated role. Above all the arts of divination, the lawful use of which he did not seem to doubt, he extolled dreaming as the simplest and surest mode of prophesying. We know that he had accepted the episcopal only on the condition that he might continue to hold certain favourite philosophic ideas; and it is reasonable to suppose that his theories on dreams were included in the compact. Medieval theologians added to the reasonings of their predecessors a more careful, and to some extent more scientific, study of the phenomena of sleep; but they found no reason to depart from the moral principles contained in the writings of the Fathers. Sufficient here to quote St. Thomas Aquinas, who summarizes the best teaching of the Schoolmen. To the query: Is divination through dreams unlawful?—he replies: The question consists in determining the cause of dreams, and examining whether the same may be the cause of future events, or at least come to the actual knowledge of them. Dreams come sometimes from internal, and sometimes from external, causes. Two kinds of internal causes influence our dreams: one and which is such as such images remain in a sleeper's fantasy as were dictated upon by him while awake; the other found in the body: it is indeed a well-known fact that the actual disposition of the body causes a reaction on the fancy. Now it is self-evident that neither of these causes has any influence on individual events; and dreams may be the effects of a twofold external cause. This is corporeal when external agencies, such as the atmospheric conditions or others, act on the imagination of the sleeper. Finally dreams may be caused by spiritual agents, such as God, directly, or indirectly through his angels, and the devil. It is easy to conclude thence what chance there is to know the future from dreams, and when divination will be lawful or unlawful (11-12, Q. 95, a. 6). Modern theologians, whilst profiting by the progress of psychological research, are of the opinion that dreams are supernatural in their origin, and consequently the possibility of dream-interpretation depending on supernatural communications. As to ordinary dreams, they readily grant that, because the imaginative faculties of man acquire sometimes a keenness which they do not possess otherwise, it is possible in such cases to conjecture with a certain degree of probability some future events; but in all other cases, by far the most common, it is useless and illogical to attempt any interpretation. As a matter of fact dreams are now—we speak of civilized peoples—seldom heeded; only very ignorant and superstitious persons ponder over the "dictionary of dreams" and the "keys to the interpretation of dreams" once so much in favour. "As idle as a dream" has become a proverb expressive of the popular mind; and the indicating sufficiently that there is little need nowadays to revive the last. Enrons enacted in past ages against divination through dreams.

DRECHSEL

DRECHSEL (also DREXELUS or DREXEL), JEREMIAH, poetical writer, b. at Augsburg, 13 August, 1581; entered the Society of Jesus 27 July, 1608; d. at Munich, 19 April, 1638. He was professor of humanities and rhetoric at Augsburg and Dillingen, and for twenty-three years court preacher to the Elector of Bavaria. His writings enjoyed an immense popularity. Chief among them are his "Considerationes in Lumen Eternitatis" (Munich, 1620), of which there were nine editions; in addition to these he published 3200 copies in Latin and 4200 in German. It was also translated into English (Cambridge, 1632; Oxford, 1661; London, 1710 and 1714) and into Polish, French, and Italian. His "Zodiacus Christianus" or "The Twelve Signs of Predestination" (Munich, 1622), is another famous book, but there seem to have been an edition anterior to this; in 1642 eight editions had already been issued and it was translated into several European languages. "The Guardian Angel's Clock" was issued first at Munich, 1622, and went through seven editions in twenty years; it was also translated extensively. "Nietzs seu Triumphata conscientia" (Munich, 1624) was dedicated to the sodalist of a dozen or more cities which he names on the title page; "Trium vagus" was printed in the same year and place; "Heliotropium" or "Conformity of the Human with the Divine Will" came out in 1627; "Death of the Magistrate" bears the date of 1627. His fancy for odd titles shows itself in other books also. Thus there are the "Gymnasium of Patience"; "Orbis Phaeon, hoc est de universis vitis Linguarum". The only work he wrote in German was entitled "Tugendtspregel oder Kleinodschutz" (Munich, 1636). He has also a "Catholic Politecum"; "Rosicrucianism virtutum"; "Rhetorica Cœlestis"; "Gazophylacium Christi". There are in all thirty-four such books. Other works are: "Res bellicae expediitionis Maximilliani" (1620), and some odes and sermons.

DREXEL, bibliographia de c. de J., 1646-55; Sommervogel, Bibl. de la c. de J., III, 181 sqq.

T. J. CAMPBELL

Dresden, the capital of the Kingdom of Saxony and the residence of the royal family, is situated on both sides of the Elbe, which is here crossed by five bridges, and is surrounded by pleasing heights. Including the suburbs which now form a part of it, the city contained (1 December, 1905) 510,996 inhabitants, of whom 462,108 were Evangelical Lutherans, 43,929 Catholic, 4,079 Catholics, 3451 Jews, etc. Dresden is the residence of the vicar Apostolic for Saxony, and is the seat of the Catholic ecclesiastical consistory and of the vicarial court. In 1907 there were in Dresden 24 ecclesiasties, including the vicar apostolic, who is a titular bishop, 7 other bishops, and 1 military chaplain. Dresden has 6 Catholic parish churches, of which 2 are only chapels, 1 garrison church, which is also used for Protestant worship, the church attached to St. Joseph's Institute, built in 1746, and 6 chapels. The most important of these edifices is the court church, one of the finest Rococo structures of Germany. It was built by the Italian master-builder, Gaetano Chiaveri, in the years 1739-51, for Frederick Augustus II (1733-63). The church has a finely painted ceiling, a high altar with altar-painting by Raphael Mengs, and valuable silver ornamentation; since 1823 the body of the royal family have been buried in the crypt. Among the other churches should be mentioned the parish church of Dresden-Neustadt, built, 1852-58, in Romanesque style and containing finely painted windows, and the chapel in the royal palace.

The Catholic schools of Dresden consist of a pro gymnasium with 4 ecclesiastical teachers and about 70 scholars, 1 middle-class school with nearly 300 scholars, and 5 district schools with 3300 pupils. For girls there are also St. Joseph's Institute, founded in 1746 by Maria Josepha, wife of King Augustus III, to give poor Catholic girls food, clothing, and instruction.
and the institution for noble young ladies, founded in 1761 by Freiherr von Burkersroda, in which Catholic young women of noble birth receive a home and an education. As houses of male orders are forbidden throughout Saxony, Dresden has only convents of female congregations; these are: 2 houses of Grey Sisters who have charge of a hospital, St. Joseph's Institute, a home for servants, 2 kitchens for the poor, etc.; 1 convent of the Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo, which conduct the Amalia home and a boarding home for working-women. Among the Catholic societies of Dresden should be mentioned: the Catholic Press Association, the Teachers' Association, 2 workingmen's societies, the People's Association (Volkverein) of Catholic Germany, the journeyman's society (Gesel-
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Hersfeld laid claim to Dresden; in 1319 the city finally came into the possession of the margraves. Margrave Wilhelm I made Dresden his place of residence; he enlarged the castle, granted the rights of a city to the old settlement called Alt-Dresden (Old Dresden) on the right bank of the Elbe, and founded there in 1404 a monastery of Hermits of St. Augustine. The intention of this ruler to establish a cathedral chapter in Dresden was not, however, carried out. In 1449 the city was besieged by the Hussites and badly damaged. Among the most remarkable events of the following period was the presence at Dresden of St. John Capistran, who in 1452 preached repentance here with great success.

When the lands of the House of Wettin were divided
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lenverein) which carries on a boarding home, the Merchants' Association, 3 associations for youths, 2 societies of St. Charles Borromeo, the Catholic Casino, and 20 religious societies and brotherhoods. The only Catholic daily newspaper for Dresden and Saxony is the "Sächsische Volkszeitung".

Dresden was originally a village of the Sorbs, who in the sixth century settled on both sides of the Elbe. In the tenth century the territory was conquered by the Germans, and the Diocese of Meissen (see MEISEN) was erected in 968 for the conversion of the pagan Sorbs. The first church of Dresden, the church of Our Lady, was built about 1080. Towards the end of the twelfth century the Germans made a settlement, not far from the Sorbs, which is first mentioned in a deed of 1206 and is spoken of as a city as early as 1216. This new settlement, which gradually absorbed the other, received many privileges and rights from Margrave Heinrich the Illustrious (1230-88). The edifices still existing, which were founded in the time of this ruler are: the St. Maternus infirmary, the St. Bartholomew infirmary, the Franciscan monastery, the church of which forms part of the present Protestant church of St. Sophia, and the church of the Holy Cross, which in 1234 received a piece of the True Cross and consequently became a great resort for pilgrims. After the death of Heinrich, besides the Margrave of Meissen, both the Bishop of Meissen and the monastery of in 1485 between the two brothers, Albrecht and Ernst, Dresden was included in the possessions of Albrecht, to whose successors it has ever since belonged. Soon after this, in 1491, a great fire laid waste the city, burning to the ground the church of the Holy Cross and 270 houses, but the town recovered quickly. The city developed rapidly under Duke George the Bearded (1500-39), who was a strong opponent of the religious innovations of Luther. Soon after his death, however, his brother Heinrich introduced the Reformation into Dresden (1539). The monasteries of the Franciscans and Augustinians were suppressed; twenty-seven altars of the church of the Holy Cross were destroyed and the paintings were removed; the vessels of gold and silver were taken from the churches by the council, and the holding of Catholic church services was soon after this entirely forbidden.

During the reign of Duke Maurice, who attained the electoral dignity, the two towns were consolidated in 1550; in the time of Maurice and his successors Dresden became one of the most beautiful cities of Germany. After the sufferings of the Thirty Years War Dresden was adorned by its rulers, Johann Georg, Augustus the Strong, and Frederick Augustus II, with fine edifices and numerous treasures of art, so that it competed with Paris in its attractions. The Seven Years War brought intense misery to the city, the population of which fell from 65,000 to the fourth part of
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this number. Scarcely had the place recovered when the Napoleonic Wars with their enormous burdens, to which hunger and disease were added, again brought the greatest suffering on the city. After the Wars of Liberation the development of the city steadily progressed until it was interrupted again by the Revolution of 1849 which led to the erection of barricades and to bloody strife. Since then there has been a constant and rapid growth of the city, which rivals the other great centres of the German Empire in elegance and beauty and in the activity of its industries and commerce.

After the introduction of the Reformation into Dresden Catholicism could not exist openly. Catholics were forbidden to settle in it even as late as 1820; the few Catholics who lived there could only hear Mass in the chapel of the imperial embassy. This oppressed condition of the Catholics was not much improved when Augustus the Strong in 1697 became a convert; he gave the chapel of the hunting castle Moritzburg for Catholic worship, and in 1708 the court church of the Holy Trinity was consecrated; but public church services were still forbidden to Catholics. It was not until 1780, with the Concordat of 11 December, that the Catholics of Saxony were granted the same freedom of worship as the Lutherans and that the Catholic and Protestant subjects of the king received the same civil and political rights. Since this date the Catholic Church in Dresden has increased, though slowly, as the justification of the principle of the unimpaired supremacy of the church family, is strongly Protestant and has little toleration for the Church; thus, for example, the founding of monasteries is forbidden by the Constitution of 1831. The losses of the Church in Dresden annually exceed the conversions more than tenfold.

DREYES, LEBRECHT BLÜCHER, poet, b. at Hamburg, Germany, 12 September, 1816; d. at Feldkirch, 19 Dec., 1870. The famous Prussian General Blücher was his baptismal sponsor, whence his name. At fifteen he wrote German and Latin poems faultless in rhyme and metre. Four years later he submitted a good-sized volume of poems to the critical judgment of A. von Chamisso and Gustav Schwab, and both expressed favourable opinions. This was followed shortly by another volume entitled "Lyrische Anklänge" (Lyric Melodies), and although these "melodies" were largely on the music of his favourite authors, Chamisso, Uhland, Heine, Rückert, Schwab, and others, they were not devoid of a sweetness all their own. His studies in jurisprudence were prosecuted during the three succeeding years and rewarded by the degree of doctor of laws summa cum laude, failed to extinguish the love of his favourite study of poetry. Another volume, entitled "Vigilien" (Vigils), fulfilled the earlier promises of this child-phenomenon. About this time, however, the seamy side of life pressed itself on him, troubled growing space with financial difficulties in the young lawyer's family. Hitherto, although a strict Protestant, his entire religion had been summed up in the word poetry. Impending poverty destroyed this rather roseate view. His mental and bodily troubles, however, were more or less dissipated by his reception into the Catholic church on Candlemas Day, 1846. A subsequent appointment as notary raised him above immediate want. It was during these darker periods that he was most prolific as an author. In 1843 he had already published anonymously a third volume of poems "Schlichte Lieder" (Unpretentious Songs) embodying his battle-songs, "Lieder eines Hanseaten". Precedous to this, when unhampered by the dread of poverty, he had written (1868) the two-act comedy "Der Lebensretter" (The Life-Saver) inscribing it: "A manuscript printed for (improved) private theatricals".

The change of view involved in his conversion brought him two advantages, a loftier conception of his literary work and an enlarged circle of friends. His "Lieder der Kirche" (Church Hymns) paved his way to becoming a model translator of hymns (2d ed., 1868). He also dedicated his virile pen to the cause of religion in his native town by writing a "History of the Catholic Congregations in Hamburg and Altona". He likewise translated the "Nachtgallenlied" by the Pseudo-Bonaventura and St. Rembert's Life of St. Thomas Aquinas, Apostle of Clergy. He undertook the thankless task of editing (1867) the important periodical of the history of his native city in the "Annuaire Missionis Hamburgensis 1589-1781". About this time he revised and republished his own poetical works. This work was made easy for him by the advice of his wife who had become a friend. Meantime he had become the father of a happy family, and to secure for his promising son a good education he determined to remove to Feldkirch in the Vorarlberg. To compensate for the loss of his friend von Eichendorff he gained a new one, the poet Father Gall Morel. The most distinguished of his children is his son, Dr. G. Drevet, editor of the "Analecta hymnica mediæ ævi", a vast collection of medieval hymnology, which has already reached its fiftieth volume.

DREYFUS, LEON, Convitsbilder (autobiography). I, 636-638; KREITEN, Lebrecht Drevet, ein Lebensbild (Freiburg in Br. 1907); SCHEID, Dichterstimmern der Gegenwart (1903). N. SCHEID.

Drevet Family, The, were the leading portrait engravers of France for over a hundred years. Their fame began with Pierre, and was sustained by his son, the celebrated Imbert, and his nephew, Charles-Drevet, the Elder, b. at Loire in the Lyonnais in 1663; d. in Paris, 1738, was the son of Estienne Drevet, a man of excellent family, and began his studies with Germain Audran at Lyons, continuing them with Gérard Audran in Paris. So rapid was his progress, so quickly did he imitate and assimilate knowledge, and with such precision and delicacy did he manage the graver, that in 1696 he was made court engraver. In 1707 he was admitted to membership in the Académie des Beaux-Arts, his reception picture being an engraving of Robert de Cotte.

Bargues' portraits were held in high favour at the end of the seventeenth century and Drevet was the first to encounter and surmount the difficulties of translating into black and white the natural appearance of texture and materials which the brilliant oils readily presented. He was an excellent draughtsman, and he dressed flesh and fabrics, the flash of jewels and the shimmer of steel, with painter-like realism, surpassing all his predecessors in these effects. With all his elegance of detail he produced an harmonious ensemble, combining artistic feeling with skilful technique. Although his work with the burin was like that of the great Nanteuil, he attained to a style of his own. Previous engravers sacrificed much to make the head prominent, but Drevet made everything salient, though never violently so. Always engraving after oil-paintings, Drevet was at times uneven, but this was because the originals were uneven. Orders
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poured in upon him faster than he could fill them, and throughout his life he had command of every important work produced in France. His engravings were mainly the portraits of distinguished people. Among his many superb plates a portrait of Colbert (1700) marks the apex of his art; and next in point of excellence come the portraits of Louis XIV and Louis XV, both after Rigaud. Other celebrated works of his are a Crucifixion, after Coypel, and a portrait of Charles II of England. During the last years of his life Drevet worked with his son and they produced plates together.

Pierre-Imbert Drevet, called the Younger Pierre, was born in Paris, 1697; died there, 1739. His father, the elder Drevet, gave him such assiduous instruction that at the age of thirteen he produced a superb little plate which indicated his future eminence. At first he engraved a few Lebrun plates, but he soon developed a style of his own, spontaneous, sincere, and brilliant. Under his facile, soft, and skilful hand, every detail was rendered, every shade of colour and every variety of texture. The result was always an harmonious unit. He was his father's constant companion and worked with unwearying patience with him. In 1723 Pierre-Imbert finished his portrait of Bossuet after Rigaud (see Catholic Encyclopedia, II, s. v. Bossuet), "perhaps the finest of all the engraved portraits of France" (Lippman). In 1724 the portrait of Cardinal Dubois was engraved. Both of these are treated broadly and freely, show magnificent handling of draperies, and possess exquisite finish. The great plate of Adrienne Lecouvreur (1730) and that of Samuel Bernard are by many authorities ranked with the Bossuet. For Bernard's portrait Rigaud himself made the drawing, a most unusual event in eighteenth-century engraving. Besides his masterly portraits, Pierre-Imbert produced many religious and historical plates, chiefly of Coypel. A sunstroke (1726) resulted in intermittent imbecility, and the talented and hardworking master—the last of the pure-line men—had thirteen years of such madness before his death. He kept on engraving, however, until the end. He was a member of the Académie de Peinture and the king assigned him apartments in the Louvre. Among his pupils were François and Jacques Château and Simon Vallée.

The following are among his principal works: "Presentation of the Virgin", after Le Brun; "Presentation in the Temple", after L. Boullongne; portraits of the Archbishop of Cambrai (after Vivien); and René Puelle, his last work, after Rigaud.

Claude Drevet, a French engraver, b. at Lyons, 1705; d. in Paris, 1782. He was a nephew and pupil of Pierre the Elder and at first followed the traditions of the two Pières, forming about him a coterie of engravers who endeavoured to keep alive their great traditions. Later he became very hard and precise with the graver, and his work lost all its artistic and painter-like quality, everything being sacrificed for a brilliant technic. Nevertheless, many of his plates possess great charm and delicacy. Claude seemed indifferent to his art and produced but little compared with the other members of the family. When Pierre-Imbert died, his rooms in the Louvre were given to Claude, who proceeded to squander nearly all the money left him by his uncle and his cousin.

He engraved portraits of Henri Oswald, Cardinal d'Auvergne, after Rigaud, and of De Vintimille, Archbishop of Paris, also after Rigaud.

FRANK-DOYNET, Les Drevet (Paris, 1878); Pawlowsky, Catalogue raisonné: DREV, French Engravers and Draughtsmen of the 17th Century (London, 1892); Lippman, Engraving and Etching (New York, 1906); Pessety, Les Lignes gravées de mémoire, II, 139.

Leigh Hunt.

Drexel, Francis Anthony, banker, b. at Philadelphia, U. S. A., 20 June, 1824; d. there 15 Feb., 1885. He was the oldest son of Francis Martin Drexel, a Tyrolese by birth, and by profession a portrait-painter and musician, who in 1837 turned his attention to finance, and founded the house of Drexel & Co. in Philadelphia with connections with the firms of J. S. Morgan & Co. of New York, and Drexel, Harjes & Co. of Paris. Associated with him were his sons Francis Anthony, Anthony Joseph, and Joseph William. Francis Anthony began his financial career at the age of thirteen, and at his father's death in 1863 became the senior member of the firm, and was recognized as one of America's foremost financiers. The house of Drexel & Co. was in the public estimation unalterably associated with the strictest integrity and the most boundless liberality. At critical periods it came generously to the support of the public credit. Francis A. Drexel's giving fortune did not alienate him from religion or harden his heart against the appeals of charity. He remained to the end poor in spirit, and regarded his vast wealth merely as a Divinely lent instrument for doing good. In his exercises of piety and his copious distribution of charities, he was ably seconded by his second wife, Emma Bouvier Drexel, who died before him. His children by his first wife, who was Hannah J. Langstroth, were Elizabeth, who died 26 September, 1890, and was the wife of Walter George Smith, of Philadelphia, and Katharine, who entered religion and founded the congregation of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament for Indians and Coloured People (see Catholic Encyclopedia, II, p. 599). Another daughter, Louise, wife of Edward Morrell, was the only child of his second marriage. In his will Mr. Drexel followed the Biblical injunction of bequeathing a tithe ($1,500,000) of his great estate to religious and charitable purposes, with the further proviso that in case his daughters should leave no issue, the entire estate should be distributed among the institutions specified in the will. His daughters continued to walk in the footsteps of their father. Among their own benefactions, Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Morrell founded the St. Francis Industrial School at Eddington, Pennsylvania. The Francis A. Drexel Chair of Moral Theology in the Catholic University of America was founded by his daughters in honour of Mr. Drexel.

James F. Loughlin.

Drey, Johann Sebastian von, professor of theology at the University of Tubingen, b. 15 Oct., 1777, at
Küllingen, in the parish of Röllingen, in the then ecclesiastical principality of Ellwangen; d. 19 Feb., 1853. The parish priest of Röllingen, an ex-Jesuit, noting the boy's talents, instructed him in the elements of Latin, and persuaded his parents to send him, in 1787, in spite of their extreme poverty, to the gymnasium of Ellwangen. There he lived partly on the charity of the townpeople and partly by tutoring, especially in Latin, mathematics, and physics. He studied theology, 1797-1799, at Augsburg; after 1799 he lived in the diocesan seminary at Pfaffenhofen and was ordained in the summer of 1801. During his five years as a student in his native place, Drey studied the then paramount philosophy of Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, and the philosophical erudition which he acquired in this study appears clearly in his scientific works. His position, from 1806, as professor of philosophy of religion, mathematics, and physics in the Catholic academy at Rottweil, formed a good preparation for his subsequent academic career.

When in 1812 King Frederick I of Württemberg founded the University of Ellwangen as a Catholic national university for his recently acquired Catholic territory, Drey was called to lecture there on dogmatics, history of dogma, apologetics, and introduction to theology. There he published two Latin dissertations: "Observavit quaedam et illustrandam Justini M. de regno millenario sententiam" (1814), and "Dissertatio historico-theologica originem et viessitutinem exomologeseos in ecclesiis catholicae ex documentis ecclesiasticis illustrans" (1815), the latter of which was denounced to Rome, but without serious consequences for its author, at least for the time being.

When King William I (1817) incorporated the University of Ellwangen with the old national University of Tubingen as its Catholic faculty of theology, Drey with his colleagues, Gratz and Herbst, joined the staff of the new school and founded (1819), together with them and his new colleague, Hirscher, the "Theologische Quartalschrift" of Tubingen, still flourishing; he took a prominent part in its publication and wrote for it a number of essays and reviews. In the same year he published: "Kurze Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie mit Rücksicht auf den wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt und das katholische System". An effort to make Drey first bishop of the newly founded Diocese of Rottenburg failed, among other reasons because of the distrust with which he was regarded in Rome owing to his above-named work on confession. Somewhat as a compensate the first position at the cathedral was reserved for him, which, however, he never filled. In 1832 appeared his "Neue Untersuchungen über die Konstitutionen und Konnones der Apollinaris"; a work of such thoroughness that only recent investigations, especially those of von Funk, have gone beyond it. After convalescing from a severe illness, he was relieved from his office as teacher of dogmatic theology (1838). Just then his principal work, in three volumes, appeared: "Die Apologetik als wissen schaftliche Nachweisung der Gottesliheit des Christentums in seiner Erscheinung" (1838-1847). Still comparatively robust, though well advanced in years, Drey was pensioned in 1846, almost against his will; he continued, however, to write for Wetzler and Welte's "Kirchenlexikon" and for the "Theologische Quartalschrift" of Tubingen. With Mohler, Drey was the founder of the so-called Catholic School of Tubingen. Like Mohler, Hefele, and von Funk, he was a truly critical historian. But Drey also gave to the systematic theology of this school its peculiar stamp, equi-distant from Traditionalism and Rationalism, recognizing on the one hand the objective facts in the history of Revelation and the tradition from generation to generation, maintaining on the other the rights of our natural reason and of philosophical speculation, with all due loyalty to dogma. Kuhn and Schulte happily followed in the path marked out by Drey.

**Theologische Quartalschrift, XXXV (1853), 340 sqq., LXXX (1898), 18 sq.**

**Johann Baptist Sagmüler.**

**Dromore, Diocese of (Dromorensis, and in ancient documents Dromorennsis), one of the eight suffragans of Armagh, Ireland. It includes portions of the counties of Down, Armagh, and Antrim, and contains eighteen parishes, of which two, Newry and Clonallon, are mensal parishes. It takes its name from Dromore (Drumore, great ridge), a small town in the north-west of County Down, sixty-three miles north of Dublin, twenty-five miles east of Armagh, and fourteen miles south-west of Belfast, which is built on the same river, the Lagan. The See of Dromore was founded in the sixth century by St. Colman (called also Mo-cholomce), one of themany holy men (more than a hundred) bearing that name in the calendars of Irish saints. From a prophecy said to have been uttered by St. Patrick, sixty years before, Archbishop Henry ("Life and Writings of St. Patrick", p. 394) infers that St. Patrick claimed no immediate spiritual jurisdiction over the territory of I'veagh which forms mainly the Diocese of Dromore, but willed that territory be reserved for a bishop of the native race of Dal-Arde—namely, St. Colman, who founded his see there about the year 514, some sixty years after St. Patrick founded the See of Armagh. Dromore has had its own independent jurisdiction ever since. The old cathedral of Dromore, which had been taken by the Protestants, was burnt down by the Irish insurgents in 1611, and rebuilt by Bishop Taylor twenty years later: but it has been far surpassed by the Catholic church recently erected. The seat of the cathedral, however, was transferred some two hundred years ago to Newry, the largest town of County Down, and a place of great historical interest, situated at the head of Carlingford Lough. In this town, when the severity of the Penal Laws began to be felt, on the latter half of the eighteenth century, the Catholics built in a retired suburb a very plain church which is still in use; but just before Catholic Emancipation an edifice worthy of the name of cathedral was begun in 1825 and completed by Dr. Michael Blake (1833-1860).
who had been Vice-General of Dublin and the restorer of the Irish College at Rome. This cathedral was greatly enlarged and beautified by Bishop Henry O'Neill, who succeeded Bishop McGavern in 1901.

Under Dr. McGavern’s predecessor, Dr. John Pius Leavy, O.P. (1850–1900), a Dominican priory was founded on the Armagh side of Newry, and a very handsome church erected. The Poor Clares, who went to Newry from Harold’s Cross, Dublin, in 1830, were for many years the only nuns north of the Boyne. The Sisters of Mercy founded a convent at Newry in 1855, and have now flourishing establishments in Lurgan, Rostrevor, and Warrenpoint. There is a large diocesan college at Violet Hill near Newry which is under the patronage of St. Colman. To this patron saint of the diocese and its first bishop, besides the church at Drumore already referred to, are dedicated the parish churches at Tullyglass, Kilvarin, in the parish of Magheralin, and Barranmore near Rathfriland in the parish of Drumgath. Few ecclesiastical antiquities have survived the ravages of time, war, and heresy. Abbey Yard in Newry marks the site of the Cistercian abbey founded in the year 1141 by St. Bernard of Clairvaux, St. Mauclerc O’Morgart, and endowed in 1157 by Maurice O’Lochlainn, King of All Ireland. It is called in the annals Monasterium de Viridii Ligno—a name given to Newry from the yew-tree said to have been planted there by St. Patrick, the Irish name being Niubar (and sometimes Newkin-tragh, the head or horn of the strand”) which is located Irigion or Virginiua, but more commonly as above Viride Lignum. There are the ruins of an old church half a mile east of Hilltown. In the adjoining parish of Kilbroney (church of St. Bronach, a virgin saint of the district) half a mile north-east of Rostrevor is a graveyard with the venerable ruins of a church, an ancient stone cross, and a little to the west St. Bridget’s well. Imbedded in a tree in this graveyard, a very antique bell was found about a hundred years ago and is now carefully preserved.

The first Protestant Bishop of Drumore was John Tod, on whom it was bestowed in commendam in 1666, while he was at the same time Bishop of Down and Connor. It was an unfortunate beginning; for the Protestant historian, Sir James Ware, says Tod was degraded for intemperance and poisoned himself in prison in London. Two of his successors distinguished themselves more creditably: Jeremy Taylor, who was bishop of these three dioceses from 1661 to 1667, an eloquent preacher and a writer of genius, and Thomas Percy, Bishop of Dromore from 1752 to 1801, whose “Reliques of Ancient Poetry” had a great and enduring influence on English literature.

There are 18 parishes, 42 churches, and 53 priests, a diocesan seminary and a convent of Dominicans at Newry; also 5 convents of Sisters of Mercy, one of Poor Clares, and a college of the Christian Brothers (Newry). The Catholic population is (1905), 43,014; non-Catholic, 71,157.

O’HARLON, Lives of the Irish Saints (Dublin, s. d.), VI, 224; WARE, HARRIS, Antiquities of Ireland (Dublin, 1739–45); Macinnes, Erland, A Brief Compendium of English, Scottish, and the Roman Tongues (Rome, 1783), 1, 206; Archbold, Monasticism Hibernicum, ed. Moran (Dublin, 1872), 1, 285; Hardy, Life and Rule of St. Patrick (Dublin, 1800), 324, 498; REVEA, DOWN, and DROMORE (Dublin, 1847), 303; O’LEARY, Bishops of Down and Connor (Dublin, 1895), 369.

DROSTAN

Drostan (Drustan, Dystan, Thrystan), Saint, a Scottish abbot who flourished about A.D. 600. All that is known of him is found in the “Breviary Aberdeenense” and in the “Book of Deir”, a 12th century MS. now in the University Library of Cambridge. These two accounts do not agree in every particular. He appears to have belonged to the royal family of the Scotti, his father’s name being Coisgrach. Showing signs of a religious vocation he was entrusted at an early age to the care of St. Columba, who trained him and gave him the monastic habit. He accompanied that saint when he visited Aberdour (Aberdeen) in Buchan. The Pictish ruler of that country gave them the site of Deir, fourteen miles farther inland, where they established a monastery, and when St. Columba returned to Iona he left St. Drostan there as abbot of the new foundation. On the death of the Abbot of Dalquhonngael (Holywood) some few years later, St. Drostan was chosen to succeed him. Afterwards, feeling called to a life of greater seclusion, he resigned his abbacy, went farther north, and became a hermit at Glenesk. Here his sanctity and poverty attracted to him, and many miracles are ascribed to him, including the restoration of sight to a priest named Symon. After his death his relics were transferred to Aberdour and honourably preserved there. The “Breviary of Aberdeen” celebrates his feast on 15 December. The monastery of Deir, which had fallen into decay, was rebuilt for Cistercian monks in 1213 and so continued until the Reformation.


MATTHEW RUSSELL.

DROSTAN

DROSTE-VISCHERING

Clemens August von, Archbishop of Cologne, b. 21 Jan., 1773, at Münster, Germany; d. 19 Oct., 1845, in the same city. Besides attending the University of Münster, he had as private tutor the well-known church historian Theodore Katerkamp (d. 1834). At an early age he was introduced into the circle of learned men that gathered around Baron von Fürstenberg and the refined Princess Amelia von Gallitzin, where he imbibed the thoroughly Catholic principles which characterized him while Archbishop of Cologne. After completing his studies he began, in June, 1796, an extensive educational journey under the direction of Katerkamp, through Germany, Switzerland, and Italy, returning to Münster in Aug., 1807. The following year, on 14 May, he was ordained priest by his brother Caspar Maxilian, then Auxiliary Bishop of Münster. In accordance with the wish of the aged Baron von Fürstenberg, Vicar-General and Administrator of the Diocese of Münster, the cathedral chapter elected Clemens August as his coadjutor on 18 Jan., 1807, and when Fürstenberg resigned six months later, Clemens August became his successor. As administrator he founded in 1808 an independent congregation of Sisters of Mercy, the so-called Klemens-Schwestern, who, though practically confined to the Diocese of Münster, numbered 81 houses and 1126 members in 1904. When in 1813 Münster became part of Napoleon’s monarchy, the emperor appointed Baron von Spiegel as Bishop of Münster without the knowledge of the pope, but after Napoleon’s fall the pope restored Clemens August to his former office in March, 1815. Under Prussian rule the administrator repeatedly came into conflict with the Government on account of his attitude towards mixed marriages and the supervision of the theological studies. When by agreement between the Holy See and the Prussian Government the dioceses of Prussia were again supplied with bishops, Clemens August, who was not persona grata to the Prussian Government, withdrew from public life and devoted himself to works of piety and charity. He remained in seclusion even after being canonized Auxiliary Bishop of Münster with the titular See of Calama in 1827.

After the death of Baron von Spiegel, the incumbent of the metropolitan See of Cologne, the Prussian Government, to the surprise of Catholics and Protestants alike, desired Clemens August as his successor. 
This unexpected move on the part of the Government was intended to conciliate the Catholic nobility of Westphalia and Rhinen Prussia as well as the Catholic clergy and laity, who began to lose confidence in the faintheartedness of the Government and justly protest against the open favoritism shown to Protestants in civil and ecclesiastical affairs. The Catholic chapter of Cologne, which had become accustomed to act as a passive instrument in the hands of the Government, elected Clemens August as Archbishop of Cologne on 1 Dec., 1833. He received the papal confirmation on 1 Feb., 1839, and was solemnly enthroned at the Palatine Chapel on the 14th of the same month, Bishops Minister, on 29 May. Soon after this he came into conflict with the adherents of Hermes (d. 1831), whose doctrines (see HERMEN AND HERMENIANSM) had been condemned by Pope Gregory XVI on 26 Sept., 1835. When many professors at the University of Bonn refused to submit to the papal Bull, Clemens August refused the imprimatur to their theological magazine, forbade the students of theology to attend their lectures, and drew up a list of anti-Hermetic theses to which all candidates for ecclesiastical ordination and all pastors who wished to be transferred to non-Catholic churches were obliged to swear adherence. Government was angered because the archbishop had enforced the papal Bull without the royal approbation, but gave him to understand that he would allow him free scope in this affair, provided he would accede to its demands concerning mixed marriages. Before Clemens August became involved with the Government, he had become asked by an agent of the Government whether, if he should be set over a diocese, he would keep in force the agreement regarding mixed marriages, which was made "in accordance with the papal Brief of 25 March, 1839", by an Archbishop von Spiegel and Minister Bunsen on 19 June, 1834. Clemens August did not then know in what this agreement consisted, and misled by the words "in accordance with the papal Brief", answered in the affirmative. After becoming archbishop he discovered that the agreement in question, far from being in accordance with the papal Brief, was in some essential points in direct opposition to it. The papal Brief forbade Catholic priests to celebrate mixed marriages unless the Catholic training of the children was guaranteed, while in the agreement between von Spiegel and Bunsen no such guarantee was required. Under these circumstances it was the plain duty of the archbishop to be guided by the papal Brief, and all attempts of the Government to the contrary were futile. His conscientious devotion to duty finally caused the Government to have recourse to the most drastic measures. Advised by Minister Bunsen, Frederick William III ordered the arrest of the archbishop. The order was carried out in all haste and secrecy on the evening of 20 Nov., 1837, and Clemens August was transported as a criminal to the fortress of Minden. If the Government thought it could overawe the Catholics of Prussia by thus trampling under foot the religious liberty of its subjects, it speedily discovered its mistake. The Bishops of Minden and Paderborn, fired by the example of Clemens August, recalled the assent they had formerly given to the agreement, while Martin von Dunin, the Archbishop of Gnesen and Poven, was imprisoned at Kolberg for the same offense that had sent Clemens August to Minden. In an allocation of 10 Dec., 1837, Pope Gregory XVI praised the course of the Archbishop of Cologne and solemnly protested against the action of the Government. The slanderous "Darlegung", or exposé, in which the Government attempted to defend its course by accusing the archbishop of treason, was refuted by Joseph Gœres in his great apologetical work "Athanassius", and a declaration of the true state of affairs was published at Rome by order of the pope. The Government saw its mistake and the archbishop was set free on 22 April, 1839. He was permitted to retain the title of Archbishop of Cologne, but, in order to uphold the authority of the State in the public eye, was prevailed upon to select a coadjutor in the person of Johann von Geissel (q. v.), Bishop of Speyer, who had been most kindly received by the pope and the Curia. The cardinalate, which was offered him by the pope, he refused, and returned to Minden in October. Clemens August is the author of a few ascetical and ecclesiastico-political works. The most important is an exposition of the rights of Church and State entitled "Ueber den Frieden unter der Kirche und den Staaten", published at Minden in 1843.

Michael Ott.

Druidism.—The etymology of this word from the Greek drwos, "oak", has been a favourite one since the time of Pliny the Elder; according to this the druids would be the priests of the god or gods identified with the oak. It is true that the oak plays an important part as the sacred tree among the ancient Aryans of Europe, and this etymology is helped out by the Welsh word for druid, viz. derwodd. But there is a difficulty in equating the synonymous Irish draoi and Welsh derwodd. Probably the best-substantiated derivation of this word is from the root weud, "to know", and the intensive prefix dru-. According to this etymology, the druids would be the "very wise and learned ones". But this, like the others, is merely a conjecture, and it has been surmised that the word as well as the institution was not of Celtic origin. Although the druids are mentioned with more or less fullness of account by a score of ancient writers, the information to be derived from their statements is very meagre, and very little of it is at first hand. Even Cesar, who probably came more in contact with the druids than any other writer, does not seem to have ever heard of this people, either in fact or in this general. With the ancient writers the word druid had two meanings: in the stricter sense it meant the teachers of moral philosophy and science; in the wider sense it included the priests, diviners, judges, teachers, physicians, astronomers, and philosophers of Gaul. They formed a class apart and kept the people, who were far inferior to them in culture, in subjection. They were regarded as the most just of men, and disputes both public and private were referred to them for settlement. Thus their influence was much more a social than a religious one, in spite of the common opinion that they were exclusively a priestly class or Gaulish clergy. They enjoyed certain privileges, such as exemption from military service and the payment of taxes; and the ancient authors are unanimous in speaking of the great honours which were shown them. Above all, the druids were the educators of the nobility. Their instruction was very varied and extensive. It consisted of a large number of verses learned by heart, and we are told that sometimes twenty years were required to complete their course of study. They held that their learning should not be consigned to writing. They maintained the written literature of sacred songs, formulae of prayers, rules of divination and magic, but of all this lore not a verse has come down to us, either in their own language or in the form of translation, nor is there even a legend that we can call with certainty druidical. Pomponius
Mela is the first author who says that their instruction was secret and carried on in caves and forests. It is commonly believed that the druids were the stubborn champions of Gaulish liberty and that they took a direct part in the government of the nation, but this is an hypothesis which, however probable, is not supported, for the early period at least, by any text or by the statement of any ancient author. "The principal point of their doctrine," says Caesar, "is that the soul does not die and that after death it passes from one body into another." But, as is well known, the belief in the immortality of the soul was not peculiar to the teachings of the philosophers of Gaul. Just what was the nature of that second life in which they believed is not quite clear. Some of the Greek authors, struck by the analogy of this doctrine with that of Pythagoras, believed that the druids had borrowed it from the Greek philosopher or from one of his disciples. The practice of human sacrifice, which has often been imputed to the druids, is now known to have been a survival of a pre-druidic custom, although some members of the druidic corporation not only took part in, but presided at, these ceremonies. Nor has it been proved that the druids had gods of their own or had introduced any new divinity or rites into Gaul, with the exception perhaps of the Dispater, who, according to Caesar, was regarded by the druids as the head of the nation, and who may have owned his origin to their belief. The druids, in addition to teaching, which was their most important occupation, seem to have been content to preside over the traditional religious ceremonies and to have acted as intermediaries between the gods, such as they found them, and men. It is certain that they had a philosophy, but it is very unlikely that their doctrines had penetrated into the great mass of the population.

Although the only positive information we possess on the druids is to the effect that their institution existed in Gaul and Britain between the years 53 B.C. and A.D. 77, there is evidence to show that it must have existed from a much earlier time and lasted longer than the limits fixed by these dates. It seems reasonable to suppose that the influence of the druids was already at its decline when Caesar made his campaigns in Gaul, and that to them was due the civilization of Gaul in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. We may affirm that references to the druids and signs of the existence of their institution, in the germ at least, are found which would date them as early as the third century B.C. With the Roman conquest of Gaul the druids lost all their jurisdiction, druidism suffered a great decay, and there is no reason to believe that it survived long after A.D. 77, the date of the last mention of the druids as still in existence. The opening of the schools of Marseilles, Bordeaux, and Lyons put an end to their usefulness as teachers of moral philosophy; and if some of them remained scattered here and there in Gaul, most of them were obliged to emigrate to Britain. The Emperors Tiberius and Claudius abolished certain practices in the cult of the druids, their organization, and their assemblies, but their disappearance was gradual and due as much to the romanization of the land as to any political measure or act of violence or persecution on the part of Rome. Yet there can be no doubt that Rome feared the druids as teachers of the Gallo-Roman youth and judges of trials. In Gaul in the third century of the Christian Era there is mention of women who predicted the future and were known as druidesses, but they were merely sorcerers, and we are not to conclude from the name they bore that druidism was still in existence at that late date. According to Caesar, it was a tradition in Gaul in his time that the druids were of British ori-
gin and that it was to Great Britain that they went to make a thorough study of their doctrine, but the authors of antiquity throw very little light on the institution and practices of Druidism in the island of Britain.

Druillettes.

Druillettes were the Society of Jesus at Quebec, and it is from this that the name of the order is derived. In 1648, they entered the new city of Quebec, and were soon followed by other Jesuits. They were the first Catholic missionaries in Canada, and their work was of great importance in the development of the country.
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From here he was appointed to take charge of a lodging-house for boys which the St. Vincent de Paul Society had opened some time previously. The caring for homeless and destitute children appealed to him specially, and he volunteered to take up the direction of the establishment, which had languished until then. Under his sympathetic and prudent management success was at once assured. He started St. Joseph's Union for the support of the institution and soon extended its membership all over the world. The first location of the lodging-house became inadequate to the needs and he purchased land at Great Jones Street and Lafayette Place and built an imposing structure which was opened as the Mission of the Immaculate Virgin in December, 1881. In the following year a farm was bought on Staten Island, and Mount Loretto, the country-place of the Mission, where trade schools and other buildings were built, their care being given to a community of Franciscan Sisters. These buildings cost more than a million dollars and were large enough to care for 2000 destitute children annually; at his death, which occurred after a very short illness, Father Drumgoole left them entirely free of debt. He accomplished all this without any great personal talents apart from a simplicity and earnestness of charity that won him friends everywhere. He had singular success in managing boys, and, like his great prototype, Don Bosco, he believed and said that it was all due to his rule: "in looking after the interests of the child it is necessary to cultivate the heart."


Mallick J. Fitzpatrick.

DRURY, ROBERT, VENERABLE, Martyr (1567-1607), was born of a good Buckinghamshire family and was married into the English College at Reims, 1 April, 1588. On 17 September, 1590, he was sent to the new College at Valladolid; here he finished his studies, was appointed to a priest and returned to England in 1593. He laboured chiefly in London, where his learning and virtue made him much respected among his brethren. He was one of the so-called confessors, and Drury probably did not know of it. He died a martyr at Tyburn, 26 February, 1606-7. A curious contemporary account of his martyrdom, entitled "A true Report of the Arraignment of a Popish Priest named Robert Drumgoole," has been reprinted in the "Harleian Miscellany," calls him a Benedictine, and says he was a Benedictine. But this "habit" as described proves to be the cassock and cap worn by the secular clergy. The writer adds, "There were certain papers shown at Tyburn which had been found about him, of a very dangerous and traitor-
ous nature, and among them also was his Benedictine faculty under seal, expressing how great was his subject's allegiance, and how ready they were to render to Caesar the things that were Caesar's, so that they might permit to yield to the successor of Peter that obedience which Peter himself might have claimed under the commission of his apostles, and so to distinguish between their several duties and obligations as to be ready on the one hand "to spend their blood in defence of her Majesty", but on the other "rather to lose their lives than infringe the lawful authority of Christ's Catholic Church." This bold repudiation of the pope's depos-

DRUSILLA

Druzy, daughter of Herod Agrippa I, was six years of age at the time of her father's death at Cæsarea, A.D. 44. She had already been betrothed to Ephiphanes, the son of Antiochus, King of Commagene. Herod had stipulated that Ephiphanes should embrace the Jewish religion. The prince finally refused to abide by his promise to do so, and the brother of Drusilla, Herod Agrippa II, gave her in marriage to Azizus, King of Emess, who, in order to obtain her hand, consented to be circumcised. It was shortly after this marriage, it would appear, that Felix, the Roman procurator of Judea, met the beautiful young queen. This meeting took place under the auspices of Herod Agrippa II, for we can gather from Josephus that Benvene, the elder sister, whose jealousy the Jewish historian mentions as an explanation of Drusilla's conduct, lived with her brother at this time. Felix was struck by the great beauty of Drusilla, and determined to make her his wife. In order to per-
Drusipara, a titular see in Thrace Prima. Nothing is known of the ancient history of this town, which, according to Ptolemy, III, 11, 7, and Iúner, 40, 11, was situated on the route from Adrianople to Byzantium. Under Maximian, St. Alexander suffered martyrdom there (Acta Sanctorum, May, III, 17). In the time of Emperor Mauritius the city was captured by the Khakan of the Ivars, who burned the church and despoiled the relics of the martyr (Theophylact Simocatta, VII, 14, 15). Drusipara was first at an episcopal see, suffragan of Heraclea (Lequien, Opusc. Hist. Eccl., I, 1131, etc.). In the eighth and ninth centuries it became an independent archbishopric, which must have been suppressed during the Bulgarian incursions. In two "Notitiis Episcopatuum" Mesene appears as a later name for Drusipara; at Mese in 1565 died the wife of the famous Grand Duke Notaras (Ducas, Hist. Byz., 12). Mesene is to-day a small village, with 500 inhabitants, east of Karashil in the vilayet of Adrianople.

S. PÉTRIDES.

Druys (Lat. Druzus), Jean, thirteenth Abbot of Parc near Louvain, Belgium, b. at Compiegne, near Triermont, d. 25 March, 1385. He studied successively at St-Trond, Liège, Namur, and Louvain, and entered the Abbey of Parc in 1387. Or- dained priest, he was sent to the Norbertine College at Louvain and obtained his licentiate in 1396. Recalled to the abbey, he was made sub-prior and pro- fessor of theology to the young religious at the abbey, chaplain to Abbot Ambrisse Louts at the Refuge, which the abbey possessed at Brussels during the troublous times at the end of the sixteenth century, and at the death of Abbot Louts his successor. Four years later he was appointed vicar-general to the Abbot-General of Prémontré, and was later named by Archduke Albert a member of the States of Brabant and of his private council. The University of Louvain having suffered much from the religious and political disturbances of the time, Druys was appointed, with a layman, visitor to the university, with full power to reform abuses, a task which was not completed until 1617. He was also made visitor to the University of Damp (1616) and to the Celestine monastery at Héverlé. In addition he restored and enlarged his own abbey, which had suffered much from the vandalism of the soldiers, and provided better educational advantages for his religious. At the general chapter held at Prémontré in 1629, Abbot Druys was commissioned to revise the statutes of the order and conform them to the prescriptions of the Council of Trent, a revision which was approved at the general chapter of 1630. Druys prefixed a preface, "Predafatio ad omnes candidissimi et canonici ordinis religiosos", which Foppens characterizes as longam, piam, erudition. He had a tree of the saints of the order made by the skilful engraver, C. Mallery. He also published a small work entitled "Exhortatio ad candidi ordinis religiosos". Abbot Druys was appointed by the general chapter of 1630 to bring back several abbeys of Spain into union and observance, but was unsuccessful. While on this mission he conferred with Philip IV on the sad state of affairs in Brabant. A ring presented to him by this monarch is preserved at Parc, as is also a letter from Henrietta Maria, Queen of England.

Martin Geuden.

Drzubicki, Caspar, ascetic writer, b. at Sierady in Poland, 1589; entered the Society of Jesus, 20 August, 1609; d. at Posen, 2 April, 1622. After some years of teaching he became master of novices, and subsequently rector of the colleges of Kalisz, Ostrog, and Posen. He was twice provincial and was in the seventh and tenth general congregations of the order. Almost all his works are posthumous and have been drawn from his "Opera Ascetica". It has been found impossible to arrange them in chronological order. Among them are a brief discourse of the Society assigned to a writer in the "Cronica Academy" (1632); books of meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ, some in Polish, some in Latin; "The Tribunal of Conscience", translated into English for the "Quarterly Serial", edited by the English Jesuits (London, 1885); and "Propositiones Sacrae" (Ingolstadt, 1736). There are also "Considerations for Every Sunday and Feast of the Year" (Kalisz, 1779); "The Sacred Heart, the Goal of Hearts" (Angers, 1885), translated for the English "Messenger", probably by Father Dignam (1890); "Exercises for Novices" (Prague, 1890); "The Religious Vows" (Posen, 1890), translated into Spanish and found in the Library of Guadalajara, Mexico; "Solid Jesuit Virtue" (Prague, 1896); "Lapis Lydus" (Mainz, 1875), translated into French by the Redemptorist Father Ratti (Paris, 1889) and into German by the Benedictine Grübler (Salzburg, 1740). A complete list of Drzubicki's works occupies twelve volumes in Sommervogel.

De Backer, "Bibl. de la c. de J., I, 1593-64, III, 2149; Sommervogel, "Bibl. de la c. de J., III, 2149".

T. J. Campbell.

Druzes, a small Mohammedan sect in Syria, notorius for their opposition to the Maronites, a Catholic people dwelling on the slopes of the Lebanon. Their name is derived from El-Doray, the proper name of a Persian at the court of El Hakim in Egypt (about A.D. 1015). They subsequently repudiated all connexion with this Mohammed Ibn Ismail el-Doray, and styled themselves Unitarians or Mumah-helmin, on account of the emphasis they lay on the unity of God. Their history begins with the capture of El Hakim in the Wady el-Temsa after his flight from Egypt. This Persian had had the audacity to read to a large multitude gathered in a mosque a book tending to prove that El Hakim, the mad Fatimite caliph, was an incarnation of God. Escaping from the crowd, who were enraged at this blasphemy, he fled to the valley between Hermon and the Southitis, and with the support of his master preached his doctrine to these mountain people, already given to Batenite doctrines and therefore predisposed to accept a further incarnation of the Deity. He was soon superseded by another Persian, Hamzeh Ibn Ahmed El Hady, who assumed the real founder of the sect as author of its sacred books. After the assassination of El Hakim, Hamzeh wrote a treatise to prove that El Hakim had not really died but only disappeared to test the faith of his followers. This disappearance and ulti-
mate return of El Hakim are cardinal points of the Druze faith to-day. The sacred books of the Druzes, successfully hidden from the world for eight centuries, have since the middle of the last century found their way into European libraries. They are written in Arabic and affect the style of the Koran. They consist of six volumes containing 111 treatises of a controver-sial character or explanatory epistles to individual persons. Each book takes its name from the first treatise. Their speculations strongly reflect their Persian origin.

The Druze doctrine concerning God is characterized by its abstraction from all divine attributes; these, it declares, would imply limitation in the Supreme Being. God, however, manifested Himself first in the Universal Mind, then in the Universal Soul, and again in the Word. These three form the first great manifestation. The second great manifestation began with the residence of the Universal Mind in Adam for a thousand years; after which Enoch took his place, and in turn was followed by the Seven Ministers, Noe, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, Ibn Ismail; the seventh is unknown. God appeared ten times in human form, for the last time in El Hakim. The Druzes teach a distinction between Jesus, the son of Joseph, and the Christ. Christ instructed Jesus, but finally Jesus disobeyed Christ and was crucified in consequence. Christ, who was concealed under the form of one of the Disciples of Jesus, stole the body of Jesus from the grave and gave out the report that Christ had risen, in order that the true Druzes might be concealed for awhile in the religion of Jesus. The Druzes are firm believers in the transmigration of souls, and this transmigration will never end; after the Judgment Day death it will continue, but will be painless for the saved, who will live to the age of 120 years, and whose souls will forthwith be reborn and re-enter a life of peace and pleasure. The Druzes are unshakably convinced that the whole of China is peopled with adherents of their religion. The Judgment Day, or rather the golden age for the Druzes, will be at hand when the Christians wax greater than the Mohammedans, some nine hundred years after the disappearance of El Hakim. Then the Christians, aided by the King of Alavsinia, a sort of Antichrist called ‘The Antagonist’, will march against the Qaaba in Mecca. The hosts of Christ and Mohammed will meet, but only to be both overcome by 2,000,000 Chinese Druzes. All Muslims and Christians will both be reduced to everlasting slavery, and the Unitarians will reign forever. The Druze religion contains seven moral precepts: veracity, love of the brethren, forsaking of idolatry, repudi-ation of devils, acknowledgment of God’s unity at all times, secrecy in religion, and resignation to the will of God.

The Druzes are divided into two main classes: the Ukkal, or initiated, and the Juhhal, or unininitiated; amongst the former, the Iwayid profess the strictest Druze principles. They meet on Thursday evenings for worship, which consists almost exclusively in reading their sacred books. They often comply with the outward observances of Islam and even make pretence of being Mohammedans, but they are officially designated as unbelievers. They live mostly in the Lebanon, but are also found in the Hauran and in the districts near Damascus; their total number is estimated at 100,000 or a few thousand at the most. Encouraged by Turkish authorities, the Druzes in 1858 attacked the Catholic Maronites, and are said to have massacred some ten thousand of them. The massacres were stayed mainly through English and French intervention.

D R Y B U R G H

(Druze Woman (In Bridal Dress))

Dryburgh Abbey, a monastery belonging to the canons of the Premonstratensian Order (Norbertine or White Canons), situated four miles south-east of Melrose, Scotland. It was founded about 1150 by Hugo de Morville, Constable of Scotland, who brought a community from Alnwick in Northumberland. The situation is beautiful, a wooded promontory, around the three sides of which sweeps the River Tweed. The church was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. The monastery was burnt to the ground by Edward II, who encamped in the grounds when retreating from Scotland in 1322, but it was restored under Robert I, who himself contributed largely. At the Dissolution it was created a temporal lordship, and conferred by James VI on the Earl of Mar, who made it over to his third son, ancestor of the Earl of Buchan. It has again come into the hands of the last-named family in recent times by purchase.

The general style of the existing remains of Dryburgh is Early English, with some older (Norman) work. Of the church only the western gable, the east end of the transept, and part of the choir remain; but considerable portions of the conventual buildings have been preserved, including the refectory, with a beautiful rose window. James Stuart, of the Darnley family, is buried under the altar; and various members of the Buchan family are interred in the choir. The principal object of interest to visitors is the tomb of Sir Walter Scott, in St. Mary’s Aisle (part of the north transept). Sir Walter’s maternal ancestors, the Halliburtons, at one time owned Dryburgh. His wife and eldest son are also interred here.

D R Y D E N

Dryden, John, poet, dramatist, critic, and translator; b. 9 August, 1631, at Oldwinkle All Saints, Northamptonshire, England; d. at London, 30 April, 1700. He was the son of Esmers dryden (or Dri- den), and Mary Pickering. He was a member of the Royal Society Pickering. Esmers Dryden was the son of Sir Eruus Dryden, and was a justice of the peace under Cromwell. On both sides Dryden’s family were of the Parliamentary party. He received his early education at King’s College at Westminster and while there his first published work appeared. This was a tragedy contributed in 1649 to the "Lachrymae Musarum", a collection of tributes in memory of Henry, Lord Hastings. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, 18 May, 1650, being elected to a scholarship on 2 October. He graduated as Bachelor of Arts, January 1653-4, and after inheriting from his father a small estate worth £600 annually, he returned to Cambridge, living there until 1655. The "Heroic Stanzas" on the death of Oliver Cromwell, his first important work (1658), are smooth and vigorous, and while laudatory,
are not nearly so. There is no attack on royalty and no mention of Cromwell's religion. Dryden always was in favour of authority and of peace from civil strife, and consequently when disorders broke out upon Cromwell's death, he, with the rest of the nation, welcomed the return of Charles II. He celebrated the king's return with his poem of "Aurengzebe" (1661), in which he already showed his mastery of the rhymed couplet. Then followed his poems on the "Coronation" (1661); "To Lord Clarendon" (1662); "To Dr. Charleton" (1663); "To the Duchess of York" (1665); and "Almon Mirabilis" (1667). His great prose "Essay on Dramatick Poesie" appeared in 1668. Meanwhile, in 1662, Dryden had been elected to the Royal Society, and on 1 December, 1663, he was married to Lady Elizabeth Howard, eldest daughter of the Earl of Berkshire.

In 1662 he began his dramatic career with "The Wild Gustant", a comedy of humours, influenced by Spanish sources. In 1665 appeared "The Rival Ladies", a tragicomedy, also from a Spanish model. To this Dryden prefixed the first of the famous prefaces in which he laid down his principles of dramatic criticism. "The Indian Emperor", a heroic play, his first original drama, appeared in 1665. In 1667 he produced "The Maiden Queen", a comedy in which some blank verse is seen alongside of the rhymed couplet and prose; "Sir Martin Mar-all", a prose comedy based on "L'Etourdi" of Molière; and an adaptation of "The Tempest" with Davenant. "The Mock Astrologer" (1668) was an imitation of "Le feint astrologue" of Thomas Corneille, influenced by Molière's "Des Espions". About this time Dryden entered into an agreement with the King's Theatre Company. According to this he was to produce three plays a year, for which he was to receive one and one-quarter shares out of a total of twelve and three-quarters. In the winter of 1668-9, "Tyrannic Love, or the Royal Martyr", a rhymed heroic tragedy, was played, and in 1670 his greatest heroic tragedy, the first and second parts of "Almanzor and Almahide, or the Conquest of Granada".

Dryden was given the degree of M.A. by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1668; in 1670 he was made poet laureate and royal historiographer, which brought him an annual income of £200. In 1671 he was satirized in "The Rehearsal", a play written by Buckingham, Butler, and others, "Marriage à la Mode", a comedy in prose and rhyme, was played in 1672, as well as "The Assignment, or Love in a Nunnery", a prose comedy, interspersed with a little blank verse. "Amorvosa" (1673) was a prose tragedy on the subject of the Dutch outrages, and "The State of Innocence" (1674) was an unsuccessful attempt to treat the theme of Paradise Lost. "Aurengzebe" (1674) is a rhymed tragedy in which the run-on lines show a tendency toward blank verse, which becomes triumphantly placed in the next play, "All for Love" (1678). This is Dryden's masterpiece, a play based on the story of Anthony and Cleopatra which he wrote to satisfy his own standards. It is a play worthy of comparison with Shakespeare's "Anthony and Cleopatra", surpassing it in unity of time and motive, and in the part of Pentheus adding one of the great characters of the English drama. "Limberham" (1678), a prose comedy, was unsuccessful and was withdrawn from the theatre. After the production of "Othello", a tragedy in blank verse written in collaboration with Lee in 1679, Dryden seems to have quarrelled with the King's Company, and his next play, "Trogus and Cressida", (1679), an adaptation in blank verse and prose of Shakespeare's play, was produced by the Duke's Company. With the "Spanish Friar" (1693) he closed for a time his dramatic career. He had in the meantime suffered as well as profited by his fame. The Earl of Rochester, suspecting that Dryden had aided Lord Mulgrave in his attack on Rochester in the "Essay on Satire", caused Dryden to be beaten by hired ruffians as he passed through Rose Street, Covent Garden, while returning from Wallis's house to his own house in Gerrard Street. It is characteristic of the unfair attitude taken by Dryden's enemies that this cowardly assault was held by them to reflect upon his character.

In November, 1681, Dryden began, in the first part of "Absalom and Achitophel", the series of satires in the rhymed couplet which placed him at the head of English satirical poets. "Absalom and Achitophel" was the most important literary expression of the party which prevented the exclusion of the Duke of York from the succession to the throne. It is also one of the greatest of English satires, especially in its portraiture of the characters of Monmouth and the Earl of Shaftesbury, both of whom the author has represented allegorically in the title of the poem. Then followed, in March, 1682, "The Medal", an assault upon Shaftesbury. These poems occasioned many attacks on Dryden, and to one of them, the "Medal of John Bayes" by Thomas Shadwell, Dryden replied, in October, 1682, by "Mac Flecknoe", a vigorous satire which dismissed Shadwell as the "best great prophet of tautology". In November, 1682, appeared the second part of "Absalom and Achitophel" in which Nathan is elevated. In "Religio Laici" (1682) Dryden presented an argument for the faith of the Church of England, and in 1685, on the death of Charles II, he wrote an ode called "Threnodia Angustissima". In 1684 at Charles's request he had also translated "The History of The League" from the French of Marmontel. Dryden's position at the death of Charles was not an enviable one. His income from play-writing had ceased, his pensions were not regularly paid, though they were continued by James II, and as soon as his appeal for some of the arrears, which amounted to £1000 in 1683, he had received £75 and an agreement as collector of customs of the port of London, the emoluments of which office are not known. He was converted to Catholicism in 1686. This step was the natural outcome of his investigation into theology,
Dryden's position in the history of English literature is one of supreme importance. He brought the rhymed couplet as a means of satire to a brilliancy and a point never surpassed before or since his time; as a close and logical reasoner in verse he has never been equalled. As a dramatist he did much good work, and in some cases, as in "All for Love," or "Don Sebastian," he achieved supreme distinction as a lyrist. He has left many exquisite songs and at least two of the finest odes in the language. As a translator and adaptor he ranks high, while as a prose writer he not only produced a body of criticism which established itself as one of the greatest of English critical work, but he also clarified English prose and marked the way for future development. As a man, he shared the faults of his time, but the scandals heaped upon him by his enemies have fallen away under critical examination, and the impression remains of a brave, honest Englishman, earnest in every cause he championed, who loved to praise those who befriended him, and who could suffer reverses in silence and dignity. The standard edition of Dryden's works is that edited by Walter Scott in 18 volumes in 1808 and re-edited by George Saintsbury (Edinburgh, 1892-93). For lives of Dryden, see Samuels, Dryden in English Men of Letters Series (1881); Christie, Memoir in Globe Edition of Dryden's Poems (London, 1870); Ivory in Dictionary of National Biography (Paris, 1882, 5th ed., 1883); Collins, Memoir in The Satires of Dryden (London, 1893). See also Ker in Introduction to The Writings of John Dryden (Oxford, 1901). The Conversion to the Roman Catholic Faith in Publications of the Modern Language Association of America (June, 1907), new series, XV, Pt. II: Delamiére, Le public et les hommes de lettres en Angleterre au dix-huitième siècle (Paris, 1883).

Charles Dryden, eldest son of John Dryden the poet, b. at Charlton, in Wiltshire, England, in 1665 or 1666; d. in 1704. He was educated at Westminster, and elected to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1683, but could not enter, being barred by his father's debts to the second volume of his father's Miscellany. He left Cambridge in 1685, and entered into the seventh satire for the translation of Juvenal in 1692. He then went to Italy and became chamberlain to Pope Innocent XIV, coming back to England in 1697 or 1698. He was drowned in the Thames and was buried at Windsor, 20 August, 1704.


Dry Mass. See Mass.

Dualism (from Lat. duo, two), like most other philosophical terms, has been employed in different meanings by different schools.—First, the name has been used to denote the religious or theological system which would explain the universe as the outcome of two eternally opposed and coexisting principles, conceived as good and evil, light and darkness, or some other form of conflicting powers. We find this theory widely prevalent in the East, and especially in Persia, for several centuries before the Christian Era. The Zend-Avesta, ascribed to Zoroaster, who probably lived in the sixth century B.C. and is supposed to be the founder or reformer of the Medo-Persian religion, explains the world as the outcome of the struggle between Ormuzd and Ahriman. Ormuzd is infinite light, supreme wisdom, and the author of all good; Ahriman is the principle of darkness, and the cause of evil. In the third century after Christ, Manes, for a time a convert to Christianity, developed a form of Gnosticism, subsequently styled Manichaeism, in which he sought to fuse some of the elements of the Christian religion with the dualistic creed of Zoroastrianism (see MANICHAEISM). Christian philosophy, expounded with minor differences by theologians and philosophers from St. Augustine downwards, holds generally that physical evil is the result of the necessary limitations of finite created beings, and that moral evil, which alone is evil in the true sense, is a consequence of the creation of beings possessed of
free wills, and is tolerated by God. Both physical and moral evil are to be conceived as some form of privation or defect of being, not as a positive entity. Their existence is thus not irreconcilable with the doctrine of theistic monism.—Second, the term dualism is employed in opposition to monism, to signify the view that the existing universe contains two radically distinct kinds of being or substance—matter and spirit, body and mind. This is the most frequent use of the name in modern philosophy, where it is commonly contrasted with monism. But it should not be forgotten that dualism in this sense is quite reconcilable with a monism of all things. The theistic doctrine of creation gives a monistic account of the universe in this sense. Dualism is thus opposed to both materialism and idealism. Idealism, however, of the Berkeleian type, which maintains the existence of a multitude of distinct substantial minds, may, along with dualism, be described as pluralism.

Historically, in Greek philosophy as early as 500 B.C., we find the Eleatic School with Parmenides as their chief, teaching a universal unity of being, thus exhibiting a certain affinity with modern German monism. Being alone exists. It is absolutely one, eternal, and unchanging. There is no relinquishing of being. Seeing changes and plurality of beings are mere appearances. To this unity of being Plato opposed an original duality—God and unproduced matter, existing side by side from all eternity. This matter, however, was conceived as indeterminate, existing with God, and governed by necessity, in contrast with mind which sets according to plan. The order and arrangement are due to God. Evil and disorder in the world have their source in the resistance of matter which God has not altogether vanquished. Here we seem to have a trace of the Oriental speculation. Again there is another dualism in man. The rational soul is a spiritual substance distinct from the body within which it dwells, somewhat as the charioteer in the chariot. Aristotle is dualistic on many important topics. The contrast between the fundamental conceptions of matter and form—of a potential and an actualizing principle—runs through all branches of his system. Necessarily coeval with God, Who is pure actuality, there has existed the passive principle of matter, which in this sense, however, is mere potentiality. But further, also, with God Who is the Prime Mover, there have also existed from all eternity the World moved by God. In his treatment of cognition Aristotle adopts the ordinary common-sense view of the existence of individual objects distinct from our perceptions and ideas of them. Man is an individual substantial being resulting from the confluence of the two principles—form (the soul) and matter.

Christians rejected all forms of a dual origin of the world which erected matter, or evil, or any other principle into a second eternal being coexistent with God, and taught the monistic origin of the universe from one, infinite, self-existing spiritual Being. Being proceeded from God, and not God from Being. The unfamilial conception of free creation, however, met with considerable opposition in the schools of philosophy and was abandoned by several of the earlier heretics. The neo-Platonists attempted to lessen the difficulty by emanative forms of pantheism, and also by inserting intermediate beings between God and the world. But the former method implied a materialistic conception of God, while the latter only postponed the difficulty. From the thirteenth century, through the influence of Albertus Magnus and William of St. Thomas Aquinas, the philosophy of Aristotle, though subjected to some important modifications, became the accredited philosophy of the Church. The dualistic hypothesis of an eternal world existing side by side with God was of course rejected. But the conception of spiritual being as opposed to matter received fuller definition and development. The distinction between the human soul and the body which it animates was made clearer and their separability emphasized; but the ultra-dualism of Plato was avoided by insisting on the intimate union of soul and body to constitute one substantial being under the name of mind.

The problem of dualism, however, was lifted into quite a new position in modern philosophy by Descartes (q.v.). Indeed, since his time it has been a topic of central interest in philosophical speculation. His handling, however, of the two distinctions, the one epistemological, the other metaphysical, brought this out. The mind and substance in a cogitans stand in the external world, and in a causal relation to the changes within the body. What is the precise nature of each of these relations? According to Descartes the soul is res cogitans. Its essence is thought. It is simple and unextended. It has nothing in common with the body, but is connected with it in a single point, the pineal gland in the centre of the brain. In contrast with this, the essence of matter lies in extension. So the two forms of being are utterly disparate. Consequently the union between them is of an accidental or extrinsic character. Descartes thus approximates the monism of character to the theory of chimeras. Soul and body are really two merely allied beings. How then do they interact? Real reciprocal influence or causal interaction seems impossible between such disparate things. Gualter and other disciples of Descartes were driven to invent the hypothesis of occasional uncausally or totally and Divinity according to which it is God Himself who effects the appropriate change in either body or mind on the occasion of the corresponding change in the other. For this system of miraculous interferences Leibniz subverted the whole theory of monism and Divinity according to which God has coupled pairs of bodies and souls which are destined to run in parallel series of changes like two clocks started together. The same insoluble difficulty of psycho-physical parallelism remains on the hands of those psychologists and philosophers at the present day who reject the doctrine of the soul as a real being capable of acting on the body which it informs. The ultra-dualism of Descartes was immediately followed on the Continent by the pantheistic monism of Spinoza, which identified mind and matter in one infinite substance of which they are merely "mod-2s."

The cognitional question Descartes solves by a theory of knowledge according to which the mind immediately perceives only its own ideas or modifications. The belief in an external world corresponding to these ideas is of the nature of an inference, and the guaranteeing of this inference or the construction of a reliable bridge from the subjective world of thought to the objective world of material being, was thenceforth the main problem of modern philosophy. Locke similarly taught that the mind immediately apprehends only its own ideas, but he assumed a real external world which corresponds to these ideas, at least as regards the primary qualities of matter. Berkeley, accepting Locke's assumption that the mind immediately cognizes only its own ideas, raised the question: What grounds have we for believing in the existence of a material world corresponding to these ideas? He concludes there are none. The external cause of these ideas is God Who awakens them in our minds by regular laws. The dualistic opposition between mind and matter is thus got rid of by denying an independent material world. But Berkeley still postulates a multitude of real substantial minds distinct from each other and apperceive God. This is the idealistic pluralism. Hume carried Berkeley's scepticism a step further and denied the existence of permanent spiritual substances, or minds, for grounds similar to those on which Berkeley rejected material substances. All we know to exist are ideas of greater or
less vividness. Kant repudiates this more extreme scepticism and adopts, at least in the second edition of his chief work, a form of dualism based on the distinction of phenomena and noumena. The mind immediately perceives only its own representations. These are innate memory-images; the cause of these phenomenal representations, are beyond our power of cognition. Fichte rejected things-in-themselves outside the mind, and reduced the Kantian dualism to idealistic monism. The strongest and most consistent of the defenders of dualism in modern philosophy have been the Schott School, including Reid, Stuart, and Hamilton. Among English writers in more recent times Martineau, McCosh, Miavart, and Carse have carried on the same tradition on similar lines.

The problem of dualism, as its history suggests, involves two main questions: (1) Does there exist a material world outside of our minds and independent of our thought? (2) Supposing such a world to exist, how does the mind attain to the cognition of it?—The former question belongs to epistemology, the latter to metaphysics.

It is true that dualism is ultimately rejected by the materialist, who reduces conscious states to functions or "aspects" of the brain: but objections from this standpoint will be more suitably dealt with under materialism and monism. The idealist theory since Berkeley, in all its forms, maintains that only our own states or representations, and that what we suppose to be an independent material world, is, in the last analysis, only a series of ideas and sensations plus belief in the possibility of other sensations. Our conviction of the objective reality of a vivid consistent dream is analogous to our conviction of the validity of our waking experience. Dualism affirms, in opposition to all forms of idealism, the independent extramental reality of the material world. Among its chief arguments are the following: (1) Our belief in the existence of other minds is an inference from our own states. Consequently the denial of an external material world involves the rejection of all evidence for the existence of other minds, and lands the idealist in the position of "Solipsism". (2) Physical science assumes the existence of a material world, existing when unperceived, possessing various properties, and exerting various powers according to definite conditions. Astronomy, for example, describes the movements of heavenly bodies moving in space of three dimensions, attracting each other with forces inversely proportional to the square of the distance. It postulates the movement and action of such bodies when they are invisible as well as when they are visible through long periods of time and over vast areas of space. From these assumptions it deduces future positions and foretells eclipses and transits many years ahead. Observations carried out by subsequent generations verify the predictions. Were there not an extramental world whose parts exist and act in space and time, it could not be mirrored by our cognitions and ideas, such a result would be impossible. The branches of science dealing with sound, light, heat, and electricity are equally irreconcilable with idealism. (3) The teachings of physiology and psychology bear particularly absurd in the idealist theory. What, for instance, is meant by saying that memory is dependent on modifications in the nervous substance of the brain, if all the material world, including the brain, is but a collection of mental states? (4) Psychology similarly assumes the extramental reality of the human body in its account of the growth of the senses and the development of perception. Were the idealist hypothesis true its language would be meaningless. All branches of science thus presuppose and confirm the dualistic view of common sense.

Granted, then, the truth of dualism, the psychologicaquestion emerges: How does the mind come to know the material world?—Broadly speaking there are two answers. According to one the mind immediately perceives only its own representations or ideas and from these it infers external material objects as present. And the other, which holds a mediate cognizance of the non-ego, as the inferred cause of a representation immediately apprehended, he terms hypothetical dualism or hypothetical realism. The doctrine of immediate or presentative perception is that adopted by the great body of the Scholastic philosophers and is enshrined in the dictum that the idea, concept, or mental act of apprehension is non id quod percipitur sed medium quae percipi est—nor that which is perceived but the medium by which the object itself is perceived. This seems to be the only account of the nature of knowledge that does not imply to idealism.

The history of the subject confirms this view. But affirmation of the mind's capacity for immediate perception of the non-ego and insistence on the distinction between id quod and id quod percipitur, do not dispose of the whole difficulty. Modern psychology has become genetic. It is posits that the material world is the growth and development of cognition from the simplest and most elementary sensations of infancy. Analysis of the perceptive processes of a later age, e.g. apprehension of size, shape, solidity, distance, and other qualities of remote objects, proves that operations seemingly instantaneous and immediate may involve the activity of memory, imagination, judgment, reasoning, and subconscious contributions from the past experience of other senses. There is thus much that is indirect and inferential in nearly all the perceptual acts of mature life. This should be frankly admitted by the defender of natural dualism, and the chief psychological problem for him at the present day is to sift and discriminate what is immediate and direct from what is mediate or representative in the admittedly complex cognitive operations of normal adult life.

DuBlin (Dublinum): ArchiCoe e of (Dublinensis), occupies about sixty miles of the middle eastern coast of Ireland, and penetrates inland about forty-six miles, including all the County of Dublin, nearly all of Wicklow, and parts of Kildare and Wexford, with the exception of the Counties of Limerick and Leitrim. Dublin is divided into the City and County. It covers an area of 629,277 statute acres.

Ptolemy, who flourished in the first half of the second century, on his famous map places Eblana civitas under the same parallel of latitude as the present city of Dublin. The first mention of Dubhlinn appears in the "Annals of the Four Masters", under date of 291, where the name, which in English signifies a black pool, is quoted as that of a river on the bank of which a battle was fought by the King of Ireland against the Leinstermen. A river still empty into the Liffey at Dublin, now known as the Foddle River, but formerly designated the Pool
or Pole, clearly a survival of the earlier Black-Pool. The natives distinguished the locality as AthCloth, i.e., "The Ford of Hurdles", from the wicker bridge or ford by which the great road from Tara was conducted across the Liffey into Uídallán (South County Dublin and Wicklow). In so, when Aulaf (Old) the Dane invaded Ireland and subjected all the contending tribes of Danes, he erected a fortress on the triangle of elevated land formed by the confluence of the Dubhlinn with the Liffey, a site now occupied by Dublin Castle. This fortress, taking its name from the river over which it stood, was immediately selected and consecrated bishop for the Dublin district. To him, regarded as the Apostle of Ireland, the See of Dublin looks as to its founder. His first visit after brief landings at Wicklow, Malahide, and Holmpatrick, was to his old slave-master in the northern parts of the country. But so soon as he was able to gather the bishops of Leoghaire, King of Ireland, to preach the Gospel throughout the land, he visited every part of the island and made innumerable converts. At Kilkenny, in the Dublin Diocese, he established a bishop, and another at Lusk, while there are few parishes in the diocese that do not lay claim to a visit from him. Soon after his death in 492, the monastic system, which Patrick had himself partly initiated, became the settled form of ecclesiastical organization in Ireland. The number of tribes into which the country was divided, and the fierce inter-tribal jealousy that prevailed at all times, rendered this system the most desirable. Each tribe had its own monastic establishment with a portion of the tribe lands set apart for its endowment, and in most of these centres a bishop was to be found, frequently (but not necessarily) the ruler of the community. It was in such establishments that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was centred. In this way we must mention from time to time of bishops at Kilconly, Lusk, Swords, Finglas, Glendalough, Taney, Clondalkin, Castledermot, and Bray. We have no existing records and but scant traditions of any monastic establishment known as Dublinable, but a tribe did lie scattered along the valley of the Combe, and who may have taken its name, as did the Danish fortress later on, from the Dubhlnna which meandered through its midst. The old church-dedications, which were certainly Celtic, of Patrick, Bridget, Kevin, and Mac-Thomas, among their neighbours, would point to such a conclusion. Such a tribe would undoubtedly have had its monastery with its resident bishop. If this surmise be correct, it would help to explain a list of bishops given in Harris's edition of Ware's "Antiquities of Ireland", and described as Bishops of Dublin; whilst from the inevitable practice they all seem to have adopted, of embarking in some foreign missionary enterprise, they can scarcely be regarded as diocesan bishops in the accepted sense of the term, i.e., as prelates sedevacant to their sees.

The first of these bishops that we meet with is St. Livinus. He travelled into Belgium, where he converted many, and was at length crowned with martyrdom, 12 November, 665, in which month his feast is celebrated. To him succeeded Disibod, who being driven out by violence went to Germany, and after forty years' labour in the neighbourhood of Disibodenberg, having lived there as a hermit, died a hermit and was buried about 675. St. Wiro is next. He emulated the example of Livinus and passed over into Gaul. There, at the request of Pepin, he established himself about 700 at Roemond in Holland, where a portion of his relics is preserved under the high altar of the cathedral dedicated to him. St. Gualafer is mentioned as bishop in Scandinavian Dublin in the ninth century, but of his life nothing is known except that he baptized and instructed his successor, who figures more conspicuously. St. Rumold was certainly Irish-born, and is reputed to have been some time Bishop of Dublin. He cherished an ardent desire for martyrdom, and setting out for Rome there received the pope's blessing. On his return journey he preached at Mechin with great zeal and success. Having had occasion to rebuke certain public sinners, he met at their hands the longed-for martyrdom. He is the patron of Mechin, whose splendid cathedral is dedicated to him, and his relics are preserved in a sumptuous silver shrine. St. Sebulus, who died in 785, is given by some writers as "Bishop of Dublin", by others as "Abbot of Dublin". In all probability he filled both offices. In or about 790 there is mention of Cornius as bishop. Ware could learn nothing about him. D'Alton says he was a missionary Bishop when Gregory, King of Scotland, besieged and captured Dublin.

**Danish Period.**—The year 815 is commonly assigned as the date when Scandinavian invaders began to make permanent settlements in Ireland. They were succeeded by more piratical expeditions. They landed, plundered, and departed. But that year Turgesius and his followers came to stay. The "Annals of the Four Masters" tell us that in 849 the Dubhgoill or "black foreigners" arrived at AthCloth and made a great slaughter of the Finngoll or "white foreigners". Shortly after, the former gained a still more decisive victory. Finally in 852 Aulaf (Old) invaded Ireland, "and all the foreign tribes submitted to him". Thus was founded the Danish city and kingdom of Dublin. Aulaf was succeeded by Ivar in 870, and as the latter was at the same time King of Northumbria, this dual sovereignty of the Danish kings of Dublin was with occasional brief interruptions maintained throughout a period of nearly a century and a half. Paganism was of course the cult of these rude Norsemen. They sedulously practised the worship of Thor and Woden, and thus during a great portion of their prolonged rule in Dublin its Christian history becomes a blank, varied at intervals by doleful recitals of the burning and plundering of celebrated monasteries, such as Glendalough, Lusk, Swords, Clondalkin, etc. The first of the Danish kings to embrace Christianity was Sitra, who was baptised in England, and married a daughter of Alfred in 925. But he very soon abjured the Faith, abandoned his wife, and died a pagan. His son, however, Aulaf Curann, on visiting England, was there converted in 943, and received at baptism by King Edmund. He remained firm in the Faith, and going to Iona on a pilgrimage in 947, died there "after penance and a good life". It was the conversion of this Aulaf and his family, aided by the efforts of Northumbrian monks whom he had brought over with him, that led to the conversion of the Danes of Dublin which chroniclers assign to 948.

The great victory won by King Brian Boru on the plain of Clontarf in 1014 broke for ever the power of the Danes in Ireland, but it did not dispossess them of Dublin. Their kings continued to rule there for a century and a half; nevertheless, the completeness of the victory, together with the civilizing effects of
Christianity, disposed the contending races to more friendly intercourse, and enabled Celt and Dane henceforward to live together in comparative peace. In 1038, little more than twenty years after the battle of Clontarf, we find another King Brian (11) at Dublin, who, seeing that the subjects had all become Christians, was moved to organize the Church on a proper hierarchical basis. Wherefore in that year he founded and endowed a cathedral dedicated to the Holy Trinity (since Queen Elizabeth's time appropriated to Protestant worship and known as Christ Church). To much in his cathedral he had a bishop appointed and consecrated; with this first bishop of the Danish Christians in Dublin, the See of Dublin may be said to have been formally founded. Having received their Christianity from Northumbria, the Danes looked to Canterbury for their spiritual government, and had their first bishop, Donatus, consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Except in faith and general discipline they were in no way identified with the rest of Christian Ireland.

Donatus died in 1074 and was succeeded by Patrick, who bore commendatory lettersto Lanfranc and was consecrated by him in St. Paul's, London. After ruling the diocese for about ten years he perished at sea in 1084. Donat O'Haingly, evidently an Irishman, came next. He wasa Benedictine monk in Lanfranc's monastery at Canterbury. By consent of the king and of the clergy of Dublin, he was consecrated by Lanfranc in 1085; he died of the plague in 1095. To him succeeded his nephew Samuel O'Haingly, a Benedictine monk of Glendalough. As the bishop of Meath, he was consecrated at Winchester by Saint Anselm on the Sunday after Easter, 1096, and died in 1121. It was to this prelate that St. Anselm administered the sharp rebuke for having removed the monks from his church, from which we may infer that it was at this period that a chapter of secular canons was established in the cathedral, its clergy having been previously monastic. Gregory was chosen as successor. He is described as a wise man and well skilled in languages. He was consecrated at Lambeth by Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Twelfth-Century Reforms.—During Gregory's incumbency great and far-reaching changes were wrought in the ecclesiastical organization of Ireland. Up to this time, except in the Danish towns of Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick, the old system of centring jurisdiction in the monastery of the dean with a bishop resident, almost universally prevailed, but Gillebert (Gilbert), Bishop of Limerick, who had travelled much, and had made the acquaintance of St. Anselm, received a strong letter from the latter exhorting him to do his utmost, in union with the Irish bishops, to reform certain abuses and bring the system of ecclesiastical government more into conformity with the religious practice of Christendom. Whereupon Gillebert having received legatine powers from Paschal II convoked a synod which met at Rath-Breasail in 1118. At this synod the number of sees was fixed at twenty-four, Dublin excluded. Glendalough, the church founded by St. Kevin in the sixth century, was definitely erected into a diocese, but the Danish See of Dublin was ignored, or if referred to, it is described as being in the Diocese of Glendalough, for the latter came up to the very walls of Dublin and surrounded them on all sides. St. Malachy, consecrated Bishop of Armagh about 1127, followed up the work of Gillebert, and, on the occasion of a journey to Rome, besought Innocent II to constitute the Bishops of Armagh and Cashel metropolitans and transmit the pallium to them. Before his request could be fully considered, Malachy on a second journey fell sick on the way, and died at Clairvaux in the arms of St. Bernard (1148). The object of his journey, however, was not lost sight of, and in 1151, Eugene III commissioned Cardinal Paparo to proceed to Ireland and establish there four metropolitans, giving him the palliums with which each was to be invested. The cardinal on his arrival convoked a general synod at Kells in 1152. At this synod Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, were created archiepiscopal sees, with canonical jurisdiction over their suffragans, and each of the new archbishops received the pallium. In this way Gregory became the first Archbishop of Dublin, by him were given to him as suffragans the Sees of Kildare, Ossory, Leighlin, Ferns, and Glendalough. In a document drawn up by the then Archbishop of Tuam, in 1214, the cardinal is described as finding on his arrival in Ireland, a bishop dwelling in Dublin, who at the time exercised his episcopal office without

in the walls. "He found in the same diocese another church in the mountains, which likewise had the name of a city [Glendalough] and had a certain story of its beginnings. But he delivered the pallium to Dublin which was the best city and appointed that the diocese [Glendalough] in which both these cities were should be divided, and that one part thereof should fall to the metropolitans. This secured the North County Dublin known as Fingall, from Glendalough Diocese and annexed it to Dublin. Thus was the Church in Ireland reorganized in strict hierarchical form, and all dependence upon Canterbury was brought to an end.

Archbishop Gregory died in 1161 and was buried in the Holy Trinity Cathedral. To him succeeded Lorcan (latinized Laurence) O'Toole, son of Muriartach, Prince of Uimaile. His mother was an O'Byrne, so that he was Irish of the Irish. Entrusted at an early age to the care of the Bishop of Glendalough he grew up a pious and exemplary youth and eventually became a monk there. When but twenty-five years old he was elected abbot and a few years later bishop of the see. This choice, however, he successfully withstood. But his resistance did not long avail him. As soon as the See of Dublin was vacated both clergy and people turned their eyes on the Abbot of Glendalough and would not be refused. He was consecrated in Dublin cathedral by Gelasius of Armagh in 1162. His first act was to induce the canons of his chapter to become canons regular according to the rule of the priory of Arosaia. He himself assumed the religious habit with them and scrupulously conformed to the rule. He was indefatigable in his work and boundless
in his charity. In 1167 he attended a great convention held at Athboy at the request of King Roderic O’Connor, and helped there to enact several decrees affecting ecclesiastical discipline. In the following year the ill-starred Dermot MacMurrough set out for England to negotiate the betrayal of his country. In 1169 the first expedition of the Anglo-Normans landed in Ireland, and Wexford and Waterford soon fell before them. They then marched on Dublin, and in this expedition Strongbow was joined by the army of Dermot. Haseulf, the Danish king, made a sturdy defence, but eventually the city was captured and Haseulf and his followers escaped to their ships. In 1171 they returned with a number of Norwegians collected at Orkney and the Isles, and attacked the eastern gate of the city. St. Laurence implored King Roderic to come to their aid; the latter did assemble an army, but their operations were ineffectual, and the grip of the Norman fastened on Dublin, never again to be relaxed. King Henry II of England landed this same year, and received at Dublin the fealty of most of the native princes. Thenceforward Ireland became an appanage of the English Crown.

Early in the following year a synod was held in Cashel by order of Henry, at which Laurence assisted and where among other disciplinary regulations, the system of tithes was introduced, as is commonly believed. With the aid of Strongbow and other Norman chiefs he was enabled to enlarge and beautify Christ Church, i.e. Holy Trinity Cathedral, and the transepts and one bay of the choir remain to this day evidences of his work. In 1177 Cardinal Vivian arrived in Ireland as papal legate, summoned a meeting of bishops and abbots, and meditated obedience to the conquerors. In 1179 Archbishop Laurence went to Rome to attend the Third General Council of the Lateran under Alexander III. The pope received him with marked kindness, took his see under his protection, confirmed its possessions, and extended its boundaries on the south as far as Bray. He also appointed him legate in Ireland. Some time in 1180 the archbishop again crossed to England for the purpose of interviewing King Henry in the interests of his people, but Henry had no wish to see him and fled into Normandy. Laurence, nothing daunted, quickly pursued him, but had severely landed on the Norman coast when he fell seriously ill. He asked to be brought to the community of Clone Regular established at Eu, and there died peacefully 14 November, 1180. He was canonized by Honorius III in 1223, and his relics, being transferred, were placed over the high altar in a costly shrine where they are still devoutly venerated. His feast is celebrated in Dublin each recurring 14 November with great pomp and solemnity, and a parish church in that city is specially dedicated to him.

Norman-English Archbishops.—With the passing of St. Laurence, the Irish character of the newly constructed hierarchy, as far as Dublin was concerned, was brought to a premature close. The conquerors brought with them a colony of Bristol men and settled them in Dublin, and they brought all their feudal privileges and customs, prominent among which was the right of the English monarch to nominate to vacant sees within his dominion, this with the concurrence of the Holy See. In the exercise of this prerogative, Henry II named John Comyn, an Englishman, as successor to Laurence. Henceforward, for full four centuries, the see was occupied by an unbroken line of twenty-five archbishops, all Englishmen, born, bred, and benefited in England. Comyn proceeded to Rome where he was first ordained priest, and then consecrated bishop, by Lucius III at Velletri. He did not take up his residence in Dublin until 1184. The king conferred additional lands upon him to be held in barony tenure, by virtue of which he became a Lord of Parliament. In 1185 he received Prince John on his landing in Ireland, and in the same year the Diocese of Glendalough was united to Dublin; this union, however, was not to take effect until after the death of the governing bishop, William Piro. In 1190 he assembled a provincial synod in Christ Church cathedral at which several important canons were enacted. In 1190 he undertook the work of building a new church just outside the city wall. He erected it on the site of an old Celtic church dedicated to St. Patrick, but preserved the original dedication and dedicated it with great solemnity on Patrick’s Day, 1191. In connexion with this church he founded and endowed a collegiate chapter of thirteen canons and erected an episcopal residence close by, which became known as St. Nepleuche’s.

Archbishop Comyn died in 1212 and was succeeded by Henry de Loundres, Archdeacon of Stafford. Two years later William Piro, Bishop of Glendalough, died, whereupon the union of the sees promised by King John took place. De Loundres’s principal work was the conversion of the collegiate chapter established by his predecessor in connexion with St. Patrick’s, into a cathedral chapter, with four dignities and an increased number of prebendaries. This change presented the singular spectacle of a city having two cathedrals, with two chapters, one monastic, the other secular, an arrangement which led to a good deal of friction and gave much trouble to succeeding archbishops. In 1228 de Loundres was succeeded by Archbishop Luke, brought over from London. Flourishing as he did in the period of cathedral building, we need not be surprised to learn that he caught the infection, and practically re-erected St. Patrick’s as we have it today, and put the nave to Christ Church as we see it in its restored condition. It is scarcely necessary to go through nominating the series of English bishops who filled the see during the medieval period. Suffice it to mention, that as most of them held some government post, such as lord chancellor, or lord treasurer, in conjunction with the archbishopric, their spiritual influence was thereby rendered obnoxious to the native clans of the O’Byrnes and O’Tooles, when they shook off the English yoke during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Holy See, not to leave the natives without episcopal care, was compelled to provide a bishop for them, titularly of Glendalough, and the rubricelle in the Vatican Library furnish a list of six such bishops who presided over the mountainous region of the diocese well into the reign of Henry VIII.
his religious vagaries into Ireland. He kept the see vacant for nearly a year, and then filled it without any reference to the pope, by the appointment of George Browne. Browne had been provincial of the suppressed Augustinian Hermitage in England, and was the bond slave of Henry, ready to do his master’s biddings. He was consecrated by Cranmer, 19 March, 1535-6, and took up his residence in Dublin in August, 1536. The antecedents of Browne and the schismatical char-

acter of his appointment did not recommend him to the Dublin clergy. He complained of their resistance to his injunctions and was compelled to send round his own servants in order to cancel the pope’s name in the service-books. A sharp warning from the king stirred him up to more demonstrative action, and forthwith he had all holy relics preserved in Christ Church cathedral, including St. Patrick’s crosier known as the “Staff of Jesus”, gathered into a heap and burned. He co-operated only too gladly in the suppression of all the religious houses, in changing the prior and convent of Christ Church into a secular dean and chapter, and in the total suppression of St. Patrick’s chapter. Under Edward VI he introduced that monarch’s new liturgy, as found in his first “Book of Common Prayer”, into the cathedral, and finished by taking a wife.

With the accession of Queen Mary all things Catholic were restored, and Browne, being convicted of being a married bishop, was deposed. The queen filled the vacant see by nominating Hugh Curwen, Dean of Hereford, yet another Englishman, and the royal nomination was confirmed at Rome. She also re-established the dean and chapter of St. Patrick’s. While the queen survived, unhappily not long, Curwen behaved as a Catholic; but on the accession of Elizabeth, he was ready to worship the rising sun, to accept her royal supremacy and Act of Uniformity, and eventually to transfer to the See of Oxford as its Protestant bishop. This apostasy, coupled with the severe persecution of Catholics which continued through the whole of Elizabeth’s reign, left the See of Dublin without a Catholic bishop for full forty years. The compensations were, however, a firm and faithful clergy and people, and a long roll of martyrs and confessors.

Era of Persecution.—Some attempt was made by the Holy See to provide a bishop in 1585 by appointing a certain Donald or Donatus, but he did not live to take possession, and not until 1600 was his successor appointed in the person of Matthew d’Oviedo, a Spanish Franciscan. Though he came to Ireland, he dared not set foot in his diocese, but governed it through vicars-general, three of whom successively ended their days in prison. Finally about 1611 d’Oviedo returned to Spain and resigned the see, being succeeded by Dr. Eugene Matthews, transferred from Clough. Dr. Matthews laboured hard and in most difficult times. In 1615 he called a provincial synod in Kil-
rrogative of nominating to vacant sees; the claim being admitted, he named Peter Creagh, Bishop of Cork, as Archbishop of Dublin. Dr. Creagh was an exile in France, and was obliged to govern through a vicar-general. He went himself as auxiliary to the Bishop of Strasburg where he died in 1705. Of the six archbishops who filled the see in the seventeenth century, two could never set foot in the diocese, two died in exile, and two in prison. When the penal laws commenced their ferocious career (1708) Ireland was reduced to a single bishop, the Bishop of Dromore, and he was confined in Newgate Prison, Dublin. The new hierarchy sprang from his prison cell. Therein was consecrated (1707) Dr. O'Rorke, Bishop of Killala, and once established in the Apostolic office, he imposed hands on the newly chosen Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Edmund Byrne, parish priest of St. Nicholas.

The population and extent of Dublin had been steadily increasing ever since the Restoration, and new quarters had grown up. Dr. Byrne's first care was to erect these into parishes. To him owe their origin St. Mary's, St. Paul's, and St. Andrew's. In 1710 the oath of abjuration, aimed against the Stuarts, but full of other objectionable matter, raised a new storm of persecution, and Dr. Byrne for a time was forced to hide with his relatives in Killare. With

varying vicissitudes he continued to rule the diocese until his death in January, 1723-4. He was succeeded by Dr. Edward Murphy, transferred from Killare. This archbishop continued to date his letters, according to the well-known formula of hunched bishops: e loco refuge nostris, i.e. from our place of refuge. He died in 1729 and was followed by Dr. Luke Egan, translated from Meath, who died in 1734, and had for his successor Dr. John Linegar, a native of Dublin, who lived until 1757, when his coadjutor Dr. Richard Lincoln, also a native of the city, succeeded him. In 1763 he died, and was followed by Dr. Patrick Fitzsimon who governed the see until 1770, when Dr. John Carpenter succeeded. With him may be said to commence the modern history of the diocese, for he was the first of the archbishops, since Archbishop Alan's time, who left behind him, carefully compiled, detailed records of the diocese. He died on 29 October, 1790.

RESTORATION OF CATHOLIC LIFE.—With a rapidity extraordinary for that time, Dr. John Thomas Troy, a Dominican, was transferred 9 December, 1786, from Osuna to the Archdiocese of Dublin. For thirty-seven years he governed the Church of Dublin well and wisely. He witnessed the first assertion of Catholic rights, took part in the foundation of Maynooth College, and laid the foundations stone of the metropolitan church in Marlborough Street, which still does duty as pro-cathedral. Archbishop Troy saw the beginnings of the Christian Brothers and the restoration of the Jesuits, while churches and schools multiplied under his eyes. He died in 1821 and was buried in the vaults of the new metropolitan church not yet quite ready for use.

His coadjutor, Dr. Daniel Murray, a native of Wicklow, succeeded him. Educated in Salamanca, he was an eloquent, cultured, and pious ecclesiastic, deputed by his papal predecessor "the ambassador of Ireland." To him belong the completion of the pro-cathedral, the founding of the Irish Sisters of Charity, and the communities of Loretto. He witnessed the achievement of Catholic Emancipation in 1829, the wonderful career of the Liberator, Daniel O'Connell, of the great temperance movement under Father Mathew, and the establishment of a system of national (primary) education of which he himself was appointed a commissioner. The awakening of a nation and of a church to a new life and increased responsibilities was accomplished in his time. He died in 1852 regretted by all, and was buried in the Marlborough Street vaults, where in the church above them, a beautiful kneeling statue by Sir Thomas Farrell, adorns the northern transept. Archbishop Murray was followed by Dr. Paul Cullen (q. v.), then Archbishop of Armagh, who in June, 1852, was solemnly consecrated in the cathedral of Dublin. He founded the diocesan seminary and the Mater Misericordiae Hospital. He inaugurated innumerable new churches, colleges, and schools, and became the recognized champion of Catholic education all the world over. In 1866 he was made cardinal—Ireland's first cardinal. In 1870 he took a distinguished part in the Vatican Council, and in 1875 presided over the National Synod of Maynooth. In 1878 he went to Rome to assist at the conclave which elected Leo XIII, but arrived late, and in October of that year passed to his reward. He is interred in the crypt of the college chapel at Clonliffe, a fine marble statue perpetuates his memory in the pro-cathedral.

In October, 1878, Dr. Edward McCabe, consecrated assistant bishop in 1877, was raised to the archiepiscopal office. His administration was short. In 1882 Pope Leo conferred on him the dignity of cardinal. Never in very robust health, he died in February, 1883. He was interred at Glasnevin where a handsome mausoleum is erected to his memory. In July, 1885, the Most Rev. William J. Walsh was appointed to succeed him.

STATISTICS.—The status of the diocese (1908) is as follows: archbishop 1; bishop (of Canea) 1; parishes, 71; parish priests, 70; administrators, 4; curates etc., 190; in diocesan seminary, 9; chaplains, 21; secular clergy, 293; regular clergy, 247; public churches, chapels, and oratories, 193; convents, 93. Catholic population (Vital Statistics of 1908), 407,514; non-Catholic population, 112,983; total, 520,012.

The religious orders are very well represented in Dublin by houses of Augustinians, Capuchins, Carmelites, Dominicans, Franciscans, Holy Ghost Fathers, Jesuits, Lazarists, Marists, Oblates, and Passionists. Dublin is the residence of the Superior General of the Irish Christian Brothers and the seat of their novitiate. Numerous sisterhoods, both within and without the city (Sisters of Charity, Mercy, Loretto, Dominican, Presentation, Carmelite, Holy Faith, Sacred Heart, Poor Clares, Assumption, Bon Secours, Poor Servants, Heart of Mary, etc.) devote themselves to the usual works of education and charity (hospitals, orphanages, asylums for the aged poor, for the blind, and for deaf-mutes of both sexes, industrial schools, homes, refuges, lunatic asylums, etc.).

The Catholic University of Ireland, founded in 1854, consists since 1882 of the following (6) colleges located for the most part in the environs of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth; University College, St. Stephen's Green (Jesuits); University College, Blackrock (Holy Ghost Fathers); St. Patrick's College, Carlow; Holy Cross College, Clonliffe; and the School of Medicine, Dublin. Each of these colleges retains its
own independent organization. (For the history of this university see Cullen; MacHale; Newman; Ireland.) Other colleges are conducted by the Jesuits (Belvedere College), the Holy Ghost Fathers (Rathmines), the Carmelites (Terenure), and the Lazarists (Castleknock). The Holy Cross College (Clonliffe) is the diocesan college or seminary for aspirants to the priesthood. For the ecclesiastical seminary of St. Patrick's, Maynooth, see Maynooth College.

By the New Universities Act passed in 1908, the official existence of the Catholic University of Ireland was brought to a close. This Act suppressed the Royal University of Ireland, and created two new universities in Ireland, both strictly undenominational. One had its seat in Belfast, and absorbed the Queen's College already existing there; the other had its seat in Dublin, with a new college founded there, and absorbing the Queen's Colleges in Cork and Galway. The new Colleges of Dublin, Cork, and Galway, although undenominational under the Act, principally preserve Catholic interests, Dublin University (Trinity College) being left undisturbed and mostly frequented as well as governed by members of the Protestant Church. The Archbishop of Dublin is nominated, though not ex officio, a member of the Senate of the new university having a seat in Dublin, and also a member of the Statutory Commission charged by the Crown with the duty of revising and approving of the statutes of the several colleges comprised in the university.

GILBERT, Creede Miki (Dublin, 1897); Idem. History of the City of Dublin (Dublin, 1880); W. Harris, Antiquities of Ireland (Dublin, 1764); O'AKIN, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin (Dublin, 1838); Moran, History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin (Dublin, 1864); Davis, The Life of the Abbé de Fontenelle (Paris, 1864); Bliard, Collections on Irish Church History (Dublin, 1861), SHEARMAN, Life of Patrick (Dublin, 1870); Waldron, A Secular History of Dublin (Dublin, 1844); Reports 20th, 23rd and 24th, Public Records in Ireland (Dublin, 1818, 1891, and 1892; Lewis, Topographical Dictionary of Ireland (3 vols., Dublin, 1839) I. 525-85.

Nicholas Donnelly.

Dubno. See Mostar.

Dubois, Guillaume, French cardinal and statesman, b. at Bruy, in Limousin, 1656; d. at Versailles, 1723. He was the son of an honourable physician and received his first education from the Fathers of the Christian Doctrine in his native place, whence he went in 1672, as beneficiary, to the College Saint-Michel in Paris. He had been engaged some nine years in private teaching when he was appointed (1683) sub-preceptor to the Duke of Chartres, nephew of Louis XIV, the full tutorship following four years later. When the Duke of Chartres became Duke of Orléans (1700), Dubois was made his secretary. During the regency of Philippe d'Orléans he rose in rapid succession to the high positions of state councillor (1716), secretary of foreign affairs (1717), Archbishop of Cambrai (1720), cardinal and surintendant des postes (1721), member of the Conseil de Vérence, and soon after, ministre principal (1722). The French Academy admitted him the same year and the Assembly of the French Clergy elected him president in 1723, the year of his death.

Owing to his humble birth, his stanch opposition to Jansenism, and his bold reversal of the aristocratic regime prevalent under Louis XIV, Dubois was disliked by the noblemen of his day. As the protectors of contemporary libels and Saint-Simon's memoirs, historians of France have long repeated against him such charges as corrupting the morals of his pupil, accepting money from England, seeking, though unworthy, ecclesiastical dignities, etc. The publication by révérends of Dubois's Memoirs, and concordance with the careful study of contemporary documents by Seilhae, Wiesener, and Bliard.—For the diplomatic papers preserved in the archives of the French, English, and Spanish foreign offices—have thrown a new light on the subject and partly verified the words of Fontenelle at the time of the reception of Cardinal Dubois into the French Academy: "Les siecles suivants en sauront davantage, fiez-vous à eux". Far from catering to his pupil's wantonness, Dubois did what he could to check it, and his Plan d'éducation pour la des Chartres shows a competent and conscientious tutor. The expediency of his foreign policy, resulting in the Triple Alliance of France, England, and Ireland against Spain, like the contrary policy of Cardinal de Bernis, must be largely a matter of opinion. In so far as Dubois was concerned, it was the best way of serving the interests of France and counteracting the intrigues of Alberoni. Stair and Stanhope had a high regard, almost amounting to admiration, for the minister of France, charge that bribery was resorted to is untrue. That Dubois was not set against the natural amity between France and Spain was shown later, when, after Alberoni's fall and the restoration of peace, he successfully negotiated the treaty of 1721 and the marriage of Louis XV with the Infanta and that of the Prince of the Asturias with Mlle de Montpensier. Dubois's career as a churchman is not above reproach. While there is no foundation for the oft-repeated assertion of his secret marriage, his gross license, and notorious impity even at the hour of his death, still it cannot be denied that he sought and used ecclesiastical dignities principally as props to his political prestige. Tonsured at the age of thirteen he bethtough himself of sacred Orders only in his old age, when, as a cardinal, the long coveted and long denied red hat, he asked for the Archbishopric of Cambrai merely as a stepping stone to the cardinalate.

The "Mémoires du cardinal Dubois" published by P. Lacroix (Paris, 1829) are apocryphal. His genuine writings were edited by Séverine. "Mémoires inédits du cardinal Dubois" (Paris, 1815).

Saint-Simon, Memoirs, ed. Cheruel (Paris, 1858), with remarks of Chéreau; Relations de Saint-Simon et de l'Abbé Dubois, in Rev. Hist., 1845, 140; Seilhae, l'Abbé Dubois, prononcement inédité du cardinal Dubois" (Paris, 1815).
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DUBOIS, Jean-Antoine, French missionary in India, b. in 1765 at St. Remèze (Ardeche); d. in Paris, 17 Feb., 1818. The Abbé Dubois was a director of the Se-
minary of the Foreign Missions, a member of the Royal Societies of Great Britain and Paris, and of the Literary Society of Madras. At the outbreak of the French Revolution he went to India to preach Christianity to the natives, whose favour he soon won by his amiability and patience. For their instruction he composed ele-ments on Christian doctrine which were of general commendation. Though he remained thirty-
two years in that arduous field, his labours were all fruitless and he returned convinced that the conver-
sion of the Hindus with the deep-rooted prejudices of centuries was impossible under the existing conditions.
This opinion which he broached in "Letters on the
State of Christianity in India," etc. (London, 1825),
was vigorously attacked in England. Two Anglican
ministers, James Hough and H. Townley, published,
refutation of his letters, to which the abbé rejoined in
a letter of much gravity and moderation. It found
its way into the "Bulletin des Sciences," May, 1825,
and the first volume of the "Asiatic Journal" (1841).
Besides these letters he wrote: "Description of the
Character, Manners and Customs of the People of
India, and of their Institutions, religious and civil"
(London, 1816). This work was bought by the East
India Company for twenty thousand francs and
printed at their expense. The author published an
enlarged edition in French under the title "Moeurs,
institutions, et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde"
(Paris, 1825, 2 vols.), which is considered the best
and most complete work on the subject. "Exposé de
quelques-uns des principaux articles de la théologie
des Brahmes" (Paris, 1825); "Le Pantécha-tantra ou
les secrets de l'Inde," fables du Brabman Wichnu-Syri
(Paris, 1826). Abbé Dubois was also one of the collabora-
tors of the "Bulletin Universel des Sciences" of
the Baron de Férussac.

Journal Asiatique (1841), I, 468; Bibl. des Contemp., Journal des Sciences, 1825; Bulletin des Sciences, 1826; Journal des Sciences, VII, April, 1851; Journal des Sciences, VIII, Vol. IV, no. 3; Vol. V, no. 258; Vol. VIII, no. 92; Revue Encyclopé-
dique, 1828; Annales de la Mission Oblat., 1828;
1, 135–147; 2, 491, 116; (1828), II, 366; (1828), I, 764; Bibl. Univ. (Paris, 1852), VIII, 358.

Edward P. Spillane.

Dubbob, John, third Bishop of New York, educator and missionary, b. in Paris, 24 August, 1764; d. in
New York, 20 December, 1842. His early education was received at home until he was prepared to enter the
College of St. Pierre at Besançon, where he had for fellow-stu-
dents Louis-Antoine Bugué and Jean-Baptiste Durand. Ordained priest in the Oratorian Seminary of St. Malo-
rie, 22 Sept., 1787, by Archbishop de Juigné, of Paris, he was appointed an assistant to the cure of St-Sulpice, and chaplain to the Sisters of Charity (Hospice des Petites Maisons). Forced to leave France, he fled to America in 1793, where he was ordained in 1788 and entered the Company of Saint Sulpice. He was superior of the seminary of Issy when the French Revolution broke out, and retired at first to Bordeaux. In 1794 he emigrated to the United States where he was welcomed by Bishop Carroll. He was president of Georgetown College from 1786 to 1799. After an unsuccessful trip to Havana where he attempted to open a school, he returned to Baltimore and became the first superior of Saint Mary's College.

On 18 August, 1812, he was appointed Apostolic Admin-
istrator of the Diocese of Louisiana and the Flori-
das to succeed Bishop Perenquy. He was consecrated (1801) to the archiepiscopal See of Guatemala. The position was by no means an easy one and Father Du-
bourg was forced, at the beginning of his administra-

P. J. Hayes.

DUBOIS, Louis-Guillaume-Valentin, second
Bishop of Louisiana and the Floridas, Bishop of Mont-
auan, Archibishop of Besançon, b. at Cap Français,
Santo Domingo, 16 February, 1766; d. at Besançon,
Besançon, 12 December, 1832. Ordained priest in the
Oratorian Seminary of St-Maloire, 22 Sept., 1787,
by Archbishop de Juigné, of Paris, he was appointed an
assistant to the cure of St-Sulpice, and chaplain to the Sisters of Charity (Hospice des Petites Maisons).
Forced to leave France, he fled to America in 1793, where
he was ordained in 1788 and entered the Company of Saint Sulpice. He was superior of the seminary of Issy when the French Revolution broke out, and retired at first to
Bordeaux. In 1794 he emigrated to the United States
where he was welcomed by Bishop Carroll. He was
president of Georgetown College from 1786 to 1799. After
an unsuccessful trip to Havana where he attempted to
open a school, he returned to Baltimore and became the
first superior of Saint Mary's College.

On 18 August, 1812, he was appointed Apostolic Admin-
istrator of the Diocese of Louisiana and the Flori-
das to succeed Bishop Perenquy. He was consecrated
(1801) to the archiepiscopal See of Guatemala. The
position was by no means an easy one and Father Du-
bourg was forced, at the beginning of his administra-

P. J. Hayes.
tion to take up his residence outside New Orleans. However, he gradually overcame his opponents. On 23 January, 1815, on the threshold of the New Orleans cathedral, he bestowed on General Jackson the laurels of victory.

That was a satisfactory way the affairs of the diocese Father Dubourg proceeded to Rome where he consecrated Bishop of Louisiana and the Floridas, 24 September, 1815. He returned to America in 1817 and took up his residence in St Louis where he founded a theological seminary and college at “The Barren Ground” which he transferred to the present site in 1833. He was a benefactor of the University of St Louis. The Religious of the Sacred Heart simultaneously opened their first American convent, St. Charles’s Academy (1818), and soon after a second one at Florissant. These institutions gave a great impulse to religion in what was then known as Upper Louisiana. The bishop visited yearly the southern part of his diocese, and when Bishop Rosati was appointed his coadjutor, New Orleans became again his residence.

In 1820 Bishop Dubourg went to Europe. He was a brilliant and learned man, but was reluctant to enforce his authority against the clergymen who continued to oppose him, before he tendered his resignation of the See of New Orleans (November, 1820), thinking that another incumbent would be more successful.

He was not, however, allowed to live in retirement, but was transferred, 2 October, 1826, to the Diocese of Montana; then on 12 February, 1833, he was appointed to the archiepiscopal See of Besançon. Archbishop Dubourg was one of the first patrons and benefactors of the Propagation of the Faith, but was not, as has been said, its founder. This society was organized at a meeting held at Lyons in the presence of the Bishop Dubourg, the vicar-general of the See of Besançon, but the chief rôle in its creation is due to a pious woman of Lyons, Pauline-Marie Jardin (q. v.).

Dubrique, History of the Catholic Church in the United States (New York, 1890), III, passim; Idem, The History of the Catholic Church in the United States (New York, 1888); Graeco, L’Evéque de la Propagation de la Foi (Paris); A Member of the Order of Merit, Essays Educational and Historical (New York, 1899); Merc, Vie de M. Emery (Paris).

CÉLESTIN M. CHAMON.

Dubric (DYFRIQ, DUBRIQUE), Saint, bishop and confessor, one of the greatest of Welsh saints; d. 612. He is usually represented holding two crosiers, which signify his jurisdiction over the Sees of Caerleon and Llandaff. St. Dubric is first mentioned in a tenth-century MS. of the “Annales Cambriae”, where he died in the year 612, and which is also in the earliest life of the saint that has come down to us. It was written about 1133, to record the translation of his relics, and is to be found (in the form of “Lectiones”) in the “Liber Landavensis”. It may contain some genuine traditions, but as it appeared at least five hundred years after St. Dubric’s death, it cannot claim to be historical. According to this account he was the son (by an unnamed father) of Eurdill, a daughter of Pheia Claforw, prince of the region of Erygyn (Erehenfield in Herefordshire), and was born at Madely on the River Wye. As a child he was noted for precocious intellect, and, at the time of his manhood was already known as a scholar throughout Britain. He founded a college at Henllan (Hentland in Herefordshire), where he maintained two thousand clerics for seven years. Thence he moved to Mochros (perhaps Mocas), on an island, and farther up the Wye, where he established an abbey. Later on he became Bishop of Llandaff, but resigned his see and retired to the Isle of Bardsey, off the coast of Carmarvonshire. Here with his disciples he lived as a hermit for many years, and here he was buried. His body was translated by Urban, Bishop of Llandaff, to a tomb before the Lady-altar in “the old monastery” of the cathedral city, which afterwards became the cathedral church of St. Peter.

A few years after the “Liber Landavensis” was written, there appeared the “Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth, and this romance is the source of the later and more elaborate legend of St. Dubric, which describes him as “Archbishop of Caerleon” and one of the great figures of King Arthur’s court. Benedect of Gloucester and John de Tinnouth (as adapted by Capgrave) developed the fictions of Geoffrey, but their accounts are of no historical value. There is no record of St. Dubric’s canonization, “Liber Landavensis” designates his death to 11 November, but he was also commemorated on 4 November. The translation of his body which, the same authority assigns to 23 May, is more usually kept on 29 May.

Dubucq, See Ragusa.

Dubuque, Archdiocese of (Dubuqueensis), established, 28 July, 1837, created an archbishopric, 1893, comprises that part of Iowa, U. S. A., north of Polk, Jasper, Poweshiek, Iowa, Johnson, Cedar, and Scott, and east of Kossuth, Humboldt, Webster, and Boone Counties; an area of 15,094 sq. miles. The city is beautifully situated on the Mississippi River. The noble bluffs that rise 300 feet above the river; many of these eminences are crowned with Catholic institutions and fine residences. The city is named after Julien Dubuque, a Canadian, who lived there from 1788 to 1811, mining lead and trading with the Indians. His grave was marked by a cross and recently has been adorned with a rugged round tower of native limestone.

The first white men to visit Iowa were the Jesuit Marquette and the Franciscan Hempen. Later the missionaries sent from Quebec laboured among the Indians of Wisconsin and Iowa, and kept alive the Faith among the scattered pioneers. Iowa became United States territory by the Louisiana Purchase, and in 1833, after treaty with the Indians, was opened to settlement. The lead mines at Dubuque attracted many, the fertile prairies many more, and the population increased rapidly. The earliest Catholic settlers were French, German, and Irish, coming directly from their native lands or from the Eastern States; soon the whole State was dotted with thriving villages and prosperous farms. The attitude of non-Catholics has been uniformly friendly; the coming of a priest and the building of a church were generally met with favour and even with generous contributions. At present the Catholic people of the Archdiocese of Dubuque are about equally divided between agricultural and urban pursuits, and hold a prominent position in social, business, and religious life. The principal parishes outside of the city of Dubuque presided over by irremovable rectors are Clinton, Cedar Rapids, Independence, Marshalltown, Waterloo, Dyersville, Mason City, Lansing, Ackley, Cascade, New Vienna, and Waukon.

The Diocese of Dubuque was created in 1837 by division of that of St. Louis, and embraced the area north of Missouri to Canada, and east of the Mississippi to the Missouri. One priest, a zealous Dominican, Samuel Mazzuchelli, ministered to a scattered population of less than 3000; three churches had been built; St. Raphael’s at Dubuque, one at Davenport,
and one at Sugar Creek, Lee County. To-day in that same territory the Church numbers nearly 1,000,000 souls with two archbishops, a score of bishops, and thousands of priests and religious workers.

Bishops.—(1) Pierre-Jean-Mathias Loras, the first bishop, was born at Lyons, France, 30 December 1742, the son and heir of Pierre Mathias Loras, renowned for his services to the Jacobins during the Revolution. Matthis, who had as a school-mate the Blessed Curé d’Ars, was ordained priest 12 November, 1815, and for years was superior of the seminary of Largentière. His zeal led him in 1829 to Mobile, Alabama, U.S.A., where he laboured as pastor of St. Stephen’s until 1837. Consecrated Bishop of Dubuque, at Mobile, 10 December, 1837, by Bishop Portier of Mobile, he familiarized himself by letters with the needs of his diocese, and went to France for priests; he returned 21 April, 1838, with six men of heroic mould, whose names are inseparably linked with the Catholic North-West. Joseph Crétin, who in 1834 was consecrated first Bishop of St. Paul, A. Ravoux, a noted Indian missionary, J. A. M. Pelamourgue, the patriarch-priest of Davenport, L. Caltier, R. Pirotet, and J. Cusse, pioneer priests of Minnesota. At Dubuque the bishop was received, 19 April, 1839, with great joy by the people. His administration was marked by piety, zeal, and providential prudence. He multiplied his priests, encouraged immigration from the crowded cities of the East, welcomed the Trappists and various orders of sisters, chose and purchased tracts of land in the wilderness, that are now flourishing parishes. He was constantly engaged in the motions and preaching missions. By personal example and formation of societies, he advanced the cause of temperance. In his work the generosity of the people was supplemented by contributions from France. In October 1840 he received the Order of the Holy Faith of Lyons, he acknowledged a gift of $100,500 for his diocese. In 1850 St. Bernard’s diocesan seminary was opened, which flourished for five years; among its students was Henry Cosgrove, who became Bishop of Davenport. In 1854 Bishop Loras visited Ireland and France in quest of priests. In 1858 he requested and obtained as coadjutor the Rev. Clement Smyth, superior of the Trappist community at New Mellary. Bishop Loras died at Dubuque, 20 February, 1858. Where he found one priest and a scattered little flock, he left 48 priests with 60 churches and $4,000 Catholics.

(2) Clement Smyth was born 24 February, 1818, at Finner, County Clare, Ireland; educated at Trinity College, Dublin, he entered the Cistercian Order and was ordained, 29 May, 1841. He was sent to the United States and founded New Mellary monastery, twelve miles from Dubuque, on land donated by Bishop Loras. He was consecrated, 3 May, 1857, by Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis. Bishop Smyth was a man whose deep piety and boundless charity won the devotion of priests and people. He held a synod whose canons remained unaltered till 1902. Under him immigration continued, but owing to hard times and the Civil War, not much progress was made in church-building, but the spiritual edifice was strengthened. At his death, 22 September, 1865, there were 90,000 Catholics in Iowa.

(3) Bishop Smyth was succeeded in 1866 by the Rev. Rt. Rev. John Hennessy, born 20 August, 1825, in the County Limerick, Ireland. He entered Carondelet seminary near St. Louis, and was ordained in 1850. He became president of the seminary, and in 1858 was sent to Rome as representative of Archbishop Kenrick. From 1860 to 1866 he was pastor of St. Joseph, Missouri. As a priest he manifested an example of piety, learning, and eloquence, and was consecrated by Archbishop Kenrick, at Dubuque, 30 Sept., 1866. Bishop Hennessy received many priests from Germany and Ireland, and in 1873 founded St. Joseph’s College and Theological Seminary in Dubuque. Existing parishes were systematically divided, and he directed his energies especially to Christian education. Wherever possible schools were built, and heroic sacrifices were made that every Catholic child should be educated by Catholic teachers. Considerable and continued opposition was encountered by some Catholics on account of political reasons, but also because they considered the preference an attack on the public schools. The wisdom of the bishop was shown by the generous condition of the parochial schools, which at the time of his silver Jubilee showed 12,257 pupils enrolled. Bishop Hennessy assisted at the Vatican Council, and was prominent in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. In 1893 he was made first Archbishop of Dubuque, with Davenport, Omaha, Wichita, and Sioux Falls as suffragans. His death occurred 1 March, 1900.

(4) The Most Rev. John J. Keane, titular Archbishop of Damascus and formerly Bishop of Richmond, Virginia, and Rector of the Catholic University of America, was named to succeed Archbishop Hennessy, 24 July, 1900. Archbishop Keane was b. 12 Sept., 1839, at Ballisodar, Co. Donegal, Ireland; ordained 2 July, 1866, at Baltimore; consecrated bishop at Baltimore 25 August 1879. His episcopate in 1902, 1905, and 1908, applied the Baltimore Plan to local conditions. Conferences of the clergy were held semi-annually in every deanery. Complete annual reports from every parish were made through the chancery. His zeal for total abstinence founded an archdiocesan union, and in the field of education he encouraged postgraduate courses for priests, doubled the faculty and buildings of St. Joseph’s College, the preparatory seminary of the archdiocese, which now enrolls 300 classical students, established a missionary band of diocesan priests, sent the Sisters of the Good Shepherd and the Sisters of the Order of St. Joseph to the Brothers of Mary. Thus with indefatigable zeal he continued the work of his predecessors. In 1902 the western portion of the archdiocese was erected into the new Diocese of Sioux City.


The Sisters of Charity of the B. V. M. went to Dubuque in 1841 from Philadelphia, with 17 members, and the house is now located there and they conduct two academies and eleven schools in various centres, besides having sent communities to four other states. The Sisters of Mercy located in 1868 in Davenport, and now have independent houses at Dubuque, Cedar Rapids, and Independence. The Presentation Nuns arrived from Ireland in 1875, and have 20 members. The Visitation Nuns conduct an academy in Dubuque: their number 31 members. The Sisters of St. Francis came from Westphalia, Germany, and 320 of them are employed in schools throughout Iowa. Other sisters—enlargements represented in the archdiocese are Third Order of St. Dominic, Franciscan Sisters of the Temple, Presentation, Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, M. C. School Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of the Holy Ghost, Sisters of the Holy Humility of Mary, and the School Sisters of Notre Dame.
DUCIO

STATISTICS.—Official reports for 1908 give these figures: 222 diocesan and 9 regular priests; 165 parish churches; 63 mission churches; 50 chapels (in religious institutions); 1 college for men with 380 students; 25 academies for the higher education of young women attended by 400; 96 parochial schools with 25,000 pupils; 1 orphanage with 225 inmates; 7 hospitals each accommodating from 30 to 150 patients; one industrial home with 50 inmates; one home of the Good Shepherd. Catholic population, 111,112 in a total of 693,400. About 630 sisters of religious communities are engaged in teaching; and about 130 are in hospitals and other charitable work.

Duc, Fronton du (called in Latin Deceus), a French theologian and Jesuit, b. at Bordeaux in 1558; d. at Paris, 25 September, 1624. At first he taught in various colleges of the Society and wrote for the Jesuits the "Histoire tragique de la mort de Domnus, autrement d'Orléans" (Nancy, 1581), which was acted at Pont-a-Mousson before Charles III. Duke of Lorraine. At a later date he took part in the theological discussions of the age and is the author of "Inventaire des fautes, contradictions, fautes allégées, et des fautes de la vie et de la mort, de la Sainte Eucharistie, par les théologiens de Bordeaux" (Bordeaux, 1599-1601). This is one of many refutations of the treatise on the Eucharist issued in 1598 by the Huguenot theologian Du Plessis-Mornay. The Protestant publicist made a reply to which Fronton du Duc rejoined in 1602.

At the suggestion of Casaubon, Henry IV contemplated the publication of manuscripts of the royal library. The clergy of France decided to confide the revision of the Greek Fathers to the Jesuits, and Fronton du Duc was chosen by the Society to labour on this project. Accordingly he published the works of St. John Chrysostom (Paris, 1669-24) and a "Bibliotheca veterum Patrum" (Paris, 1624, 2 vols. in folio). The "Bibliotheca" contains a large number of the Greek Fathers with Latin translations (see the list in Vol. II, 345), and serves as a supplement to the great collection of Margarin de la Bigne known as "Sacra Bibliotheca Sanctarum Patrum." After the death of Fronton du Duc there was issued an edition of Nicephorus Callistus (Paris, 1630, 2 vols. in folio) which he had undertaken. This edition follows a Vienna manuscript that had belonged to the library of Matthias Corvins; its publication had been delayed by a series of curious complications in which the political schemes of Richelieu were involved. Fronton du Duc had also occupied himself with the Greek texts of the Bible and had begun a revision of the text, but this was not completed. Librarian from 1604 of the Collège de Clermont at Paris, he reorganized the library, which had been scattered during the period in which the Jesuits had been obliged to abandon the school. While holding this position he also taught (1615-23) at the Jansenist college.

ODIN, in NICHEM, Mémoire pour servir à l'historie des hommes illustres de la république des lettres (Paris, 1751), X, 143; SOMMERVOGEL, Bibliothèque de la c. de J. (Paris, 1897), III, 233-49.

PAUL LEJAY.

Duce, Charles Dufresne, historian and philologist, b. at Amiens, France, 15 Dec., 1610; d. at Paris, 1688. His father, who was a magistrate, had him educated by the Jesuits at Amiens, and the young man afterwards studied law at Orléans and was admitted to the Bar before the Parliament of Paris, 11 Au-
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gust, 1631. But the legal profession failing to satisfy him, he returned to Amiens, married there in 1638 and in 1645 purchased the position of Treasurer of France held by his father-in-law. Obliged to leave Amiens in 1668 on account of the plague, he settled in Paris, where he died. Neither his official duties nor his family cares (he was the father of ten children) prevented him from following scholarly pursuits. Conversant with many languages, he was consulted on all sides, and he obtained much information through his correspondence. His unremitting energy was largely expended on the history of France and that of Constantinople. To insure a solid basis for his researches, he began by mastering the languages of ten centuries, a task which was unceasing in his efforts to increase his knowledge of Byzantine Greek and Low Latin.

Two great and useful works were the outcome of this preparation and even yet suffice to secure the scholarly reputation of their author; they were the "Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ latinitatis" (Paris, 3 vols. fol. 1678; new edition with addenda by Dom Carpentier, Paris, 7 vols., 1840-1850; 10 vols., 1882-1887), and the "Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ latinitatis" (Paris, 2 vols., 1688). Chief among his other works are: "Histoire de l'Empire de Constantinople, et de Constantin de Dourmas, et de Constant d'Orléans, et de Constantin d'Amiens" (Paris, 1657, 1 vol. fol.); "Traité historique du chef de Saint Jean-Baptiste" (Paris, 1666, 4to); "Histoire de Saint Louis" (Paris, 1668, 2 vols. fol.); "Historia Byzantina" (Paris, 1680, 2 vols. fol.), editions of the Byzantine historians, notably of Zonaras (Paris, 1680, 2 vols. fol.); and the "Chronicon Pusehale" (Paris, 1689, 1 fol.). He left many manuscripts which, after being widely scattered, were collected toward the middle of the eighteenth century by his grand-nephew Dufresne d'Aubigny and are now nearly all preserved in the National Library, Paris. From these have been compiled the "Histoire de la Ville d'Amiens" (published by Hardouin at Amiens, 1840) and "Les familles d'outre-mer" (published by Rey in the "Documents inédits de l'Histoire de France," Paris, 1869).

BAILLIERE, Épitaphe de vitæ et morte C. Du Cange ad Eva, Renaudotum (Paris, 1688), reprinted as preface to the Chronicon Pushehale: NICHEM, Mémoires pour servir à l'historie des hommes illustres (Paris, 1727-1745), V, notice des chroniques et écrits de M. Du Cange in Journal des Savants (October-December, 1749); and DUFRESNE, Mémoire historique sur les manuscrits de M. Du Cange (Paris, 1761).

PAUL LEJAY.

Duccio di Buoninsegna, painter, and founder of the Siennese School, b. about 1255 or 1260, place not known; d. 3 August, 1319. About this time Sienna was at the zenith of her political power. She had just defeated Florence on the field of Montaperti (4 September, 1260), and an era of marvellous development followed this conquest. Then was begun the huge task of building the cathedral, where, in 1266, was commenced the incomparable pulpit sculptured by Nicholas of Pisa, and it was under these flourishing conditions that Duccio received his artistic education. However, he owed nothing to the Gothic style nor to the naturalistic Renaissance of Nicholas of Pisa; he allied himself exclusively with Byzantine tradition. Duccio has been called the "Last of the Greeks," and his genius consisted in giving exquisite expression to the refined sentiment of the masters of Byzantium, discovering its original meaning despite the barbaric, hideous imitations made by a degenerate school.

Duccio is first mentioned in 1278, when he was engaged upon minor work, such as painting the covers of the archives and the tablettes (memorandum-books) of the Bicherna, one of them for the year 1293 now in the Industrial Museum of Berlin. But his great work at this time was the famous "Madonna de' Rucellai"—one of the most illustrious specimens of Italian painting—preserved at Florence in a side-
chapel of Santa Maria Novella and, on the authority of Vasari, so long considered one of Cimabue's masterpieces. But that the painting was Duccio's is now beyond question, as Milanesi has published the text of a contract drawn up for this picture, 15 April, 1285, between the artist and the rectors of the Confraternity of the Annunciation of Padua. Although still hieratical and archaic, Duccio's "Madonna," when compared, for instance, with that of Guido of Siena, painted in 1221 and shown to-day in the Palazzo Publico of Siena, seems fully to deserve its celebrity. But it was in 1311 that Duccio achieved his principal work, the glory of which is destined to remain traditional, the great reredos for the high altar of the Siena cathedral. This panel, removed in the fifteenth century, may now be seen in the museum of the Opera del Duomo. The day of its installation was observed as a public feast; shops were closed and bells were rung and the people of the city, carrying lighted candles, solemnly escorted the picture from the artist's residence at the Porta Stalloreggi to the cathedral. This painting was indeed a national masterpiece and in this regard is comparable only to the reredos by Van Eyck in Flemish painting. The two sides represent the Twenty-six Scenes of the Gospels. The back contains twenty-six scenes from the life of Jesus between the entry into Jerusalem and the Ascension. The steps, now taken apart, were decorated with twenty other scenes representing Christ's childhood, and His miracles, and the life of the Virgin. In fact, the theme was the same as that treated by Giotto in 1305 in the Arena of Padua. But Duccio consulted Byzantine formularies only, and his compositions resemble the famous miniatures of the "Evangelistarium" of Rossano, or those of the great Benedictine school of Mont' Amiata. However, apart from his perfect taste in color and composition, Duccio excelled in the essentially Greek elegance of his portrayal of ordinary life. He abounds in genre pictures as pure as some of the selections in the Anthology. The scene of "Peter before the High-Priest," the dialogue of the holy women with the angel at the Sepulchre, and the "Pilgrims of Emmaus," are models of poetic conception expressed in a familiar, true-to-life, lyric fashion. On the front of the great panel is the "Madonna Maestà" (Majesty), which is in reality the "Madonna de' Ruecellai" more amply, richly, and harmoniously developed. Never did Byzantine painting attain greater plasticity of expression. But here the form is animated by a new sentiment, a tenderness that manifests itself in the distich engraved on the step of the Virgin's throne:

MATER SANTA DEI, SIS CAUSA SENIS REQUEI
SIS DUCIO VITA, TE QUA PINXIT ITA.

(Holy Mother of God, give peace unto Siena; obtain for me that, as I have painted Thee so fair, I may live eternally.)

Duccio painted only frame (and panel) pictures and, without doubt, miniatures, and hence the oblivion into which he fell in a country where monumental painting alone is glorified. Nevertheless his is the first of the great names in Italian painting. He preceded Giotto by a score of years and had the honour of founding an original Sicilian school at a time when the Sicilian painters were of no account in Florence; since, in 1285, it was to him that the Florentines had to have recourse. And the most magnificent work of the Sicilian School, the "Maestà" by Simone di Martino, in the Palazzo Publico (1315) is but an enlargement of Duccio's. His type of beauty and his poetic idea were indelibly impressed upon this charming generation of late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Duccio seems to have been gay and light-hearted. In 1313 he was imprisoned for debt and at another time fined for refusing to mount guard. Some of his lesser works are preserved in various collections in the Siena Museum, the National Gallery, London, and at Windsor."

---

**MILANERI, Documenti per la storia dell'arte senese (Siena, 1854), I; CHOWN AND CAVALCABILE, Storia della pittura in Italia, 12th ed., Florence, 1899; VI; LANTON, Duccio, History of Siena (London, 1902); VENTURI, Storia dell'arte Italiana (Milan, 1907); V; FORTE, Duccio in Gazette des Beaux-Arts (Feb. and Sept., 1899); LANTON, Duccio: Il Pittore (Bollettino senese di storia patria, 1898); LANTON, Duccio in Monthly Review (Aug., 1893); RUTHERFORD, Lectures on the National Gallery (London, 1901); LOUIS GILLOT.**

**DUCHESE, PHILIPPINE-ROSE, founder in America of the first houses of the Society of the Sacred Heart, b. at Grenoble, France, 29 August, 1769; d. at St. Charles, Missouri, 18 October, 1852. She was the daughter of Pierre-François Duchese, an eminent lawyer. Her mother was a Périer, ancestor of Casimir Périer, President of France in 1854. She was educated by the Visitation Nunns and received its dispersion under the Reign of Terror, vainly attempted the re-establishment of the convent of St.-Marie-d'en-Haut, near Grenoble, and finally, in 1804, accepted the offer of Mother Barat to receive her community into the Society of the Sacred Heart. From early childhood the dream of Philippine had been the apostolate of souls: heathen in distant lands, the neglected and poor at home. Nature and grace combined to fit her for this high vocation; education, suffering, above all, the guidance of Mother Barat trained her to become the pioneer of her order in the New World. In 1818 Mother Duchese set out with four companions in the missions of America. Bishop Dubourg welcomed her to New Orleans, whence she sailed up the Mississippi to St. Louis, finally settling her little colony at St. Charles. "Poverty and Christian heroism are here," she wrote, "and the riches of priests in this land." Cold, hunger, and illness; opposition, ingratitude, and calumny, all that came to try the courage of this missionary, served only to fire her lofty and indomitable spirit with new zeal for the spread of truth. Other foundations followed, at Florissant, Grand Côteau, St. Louis, Missouri, and the annals in 1826 by Leo XII recognized the good being done in these parts. She yearned to teach the poor Indians, and old and broken as she was, she went to labour among the Pottowatomies at Sugar Creek, thus realizing the desire of her life. Called by the recitals of Father De Smet, she turned her eyes towards the Rocky Mountain missions; but Providence led her back to St. Charles, where she died. Thirty-four years of mission toil, disappointment, endurance, self-annihilation sufficed, indeed, to prove the worth of this valiant daughter of Mother Barat. She had opened the way, others followed in it; and the success hidden from her eyes was well seen later by the many who rejoiced in the rapid spread of her order over North and South America. Sincere, intense, generous, austere yet affectionate, endowed with large capacity for suffering and work, Mother Duchese's was a stern character that needed and took the moulding of Mother Barat. Preliminary steps for her beatification have already been taken.**

**BAYLARD, Histoire de la Mère Duchesse (Paris, 1876); tr. FELLERSTON (Roehampton, 1890); L'Assomption de la Vierge Duchesse (Roehampton, 1890); CONNELLY, Rev. Mother Duchesse in the Month (London, 1898); SCI, Rev. Mother Philippine Duchesse in The Messenger (London, 1890).**

**CATHERINE M. LOUTH.**

**Duckett, JAMES, VENERABLE, MARTYR, b. at Gilfords in the parish of Skelsmergh in Westmoreland, England, date uncertain, of an ancient family of that county; d. 9 April, 1601. He was a bookseller and publisher in London. His godfather was the well-known martyr James Ludlow. He was a man of strong convictions. He seems, however, to have been brought up a Protestant, for he was converted while an apprentice in London by reading a Catholic book lent him by a friend. Before he could be received into the Church he was twice imprisoned for not attending the Protestant service,**
and was obliged to compound for his apprenticeship and leave his master. He was finally reconciled by a venerable priest named Weekes who was imprisoned in the Gatehouse at Westminster. After two or three years he married a Catholic widow, but out of his two years of married life, no less than nine years he spent in prison, owing to his zeal in propagating Catholic literature and his wonderful constancy in his new-found faith. His last apprehension was brought about by Peter Bullock, a bookbinder, who betrayed him in order to obtain his own release from prison. Both house and shop were searched on 4 March, 1601, Catholic books were found there, and Duckett was at once thrown into Newgate. At his trial, Bullock testified that he had bound various Catholic books for Duckett, which the martyr acknowledged to be true. The jury found him not guilty, but Judge Popham at once stood up and bade them consider well what they did, for Duckett had had bound for him Bristowe's "Motives", a controversial work peculiarly odious to Anglicans on account of its learning and elegance. The jury thereupon reversed their verdict and brought in the prisoner guilty of felony. At the same time three priests, Father Page, Tichborne, and Watkinson, were sentenced to death. Bullock did not save himself by his treachery, for he was conveyed in the same cart with Duckett to Tyburn, where both were executed, 19 April, 1601. There is an account, written by his son, the Prior of the English Carthusians at Nieuport (Ch. D.) of James Duckett's martyrdom. On the way to Tyburn he was given a cup of wine; he drank it and desired his wife to drink to Peter Bullock, and freely to forgive him. At the gallows his last thoughts were for his betrayer. He kissed him and implored him to die in the Catholic Faith.

John Duckett, Venerable, Martyr, probably a grandson of Venerable James Duckett, b. at Underwen in the parish of Sedbergh, Yorkshire, in 1603; d. 7 September, 1644. He was ordained priest in 1639 and afterwards went to Paris where he studied three years in the College of Arras. He had an extraordinary gift of prayer, and while yet a student would spend whole nights in contemplation. On his way to the English mission, he spent two months in spiritual exercises, under the direction of his uncle, the Carthusian prior at Nieuport. He laboured for about a year in Durham, and was taken near Whisingham on his way to Tyburn, 2 July, 1644. The place to which tradition declares to be that of his arrest is now marked by a tall stone cross. Carried to Sunderland, he was examined by a Parliamentary Committee of sequestrators, and placed in irons. He confessed his priesthood and was thereupon sent up to London with Father Ralph Corbie, S. J. (q. v.), who had been arrested about the same time near Newcastle-on-Tyne. They were committed to Newgate, and edified the crowds of Catholics who flocked to see them by their joyousness, their sanctity, and their longing to suffer for Christ. A reprise for one of them having been obtained, each refused to take it for him. On his way to execution, Duckett astonished all by his supernatural joy, comforting those who wept for him, he said smiling: "Why weep you for me who am glad at heart of this happy day?" His jailers even were so struck by his good looks that they exclaimed "an angel dies for this man dies for a good cause!" He suffered with Father Corbie, at Tyburn. In a farewell letter to the Bishop of Chalcedon, he wrote on the eve of his martyrdom: "I fear not death, nor I contemn not life. If life were my lot, I would endure it patiently; but if I will receive it joyfully, for that Cause which is my life, and death is my gain. Never since my receiving of Holy Orders did I so much fear death as I did life, and now, when it approacheth can I faint?"


Du Coudray, Philippe-Charles-Jean-Baptiste-Tronson, soldier, b. at Reims, France, 8 September, 1738; d. at Philadelphia, U. S. A., 11 September, 1777. He was educated for the army and showed great merit as an engineer. He was adjutant-general of artillery and considered one of the best military experts in France when, in 1776, he volunteered to go to America to assist the colonists in their revolt against England. Silas Deane and Benjamin Franklin, the American agents, promised him a commission as major-general with command of the artillery. This stipulation gave great offence to the officers already attached to the army when he arrived from France, in May, 1777, with twenty-nine other officers and twelve sergeants of artillery. Several of the more prominent threatened to resign. As a compromise he was made inspector-general 11 August, 1777, with the rank of major-general, and assigned to command the works along the Delaware. On 11 Sept., 1777, he was drowned while crossing the Schuylkill River at Philadelphia, the horse on which he was seated becoming frightened and dragging him overboard. Congress gave him an official funeral and attended his requiem Mass, 18 Sept., 1777, in St. Mary's church. This was one of the few occasions on which Congress was officially present. The Mass during the Revolution, the others being the requiem on 8 May, 1750, for Don Juan de Miraalles, the agent of the Spanish Government, and the Te Deums on 4 July, 1779, and 4 November, 1781, all being celebrated at St. Mary's, Philadelphia. Du Coudray was buried in St. Mary's churchyard, but the grave is now unknown.

Griffin, Catholics and the American Revolution (Ridley Park, Pennsylvania, 1907); Cyclopedia of Am. Biol., s. v.; Sheaff, Catholic Church in the Western States (2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1888); Historical Register of the Officers of the Continental Army (Washington, 1883).

Thomas F. Meehan.

Ducrue, Francis Bennon, missionary in Mexico, b. at Munich, Bavaria, of French parents, 10 June, 1721; d. there 30 March, 1779. He became a member of the Society of Jesus in 1758, and ten years later was sent to California, where he laboured zealously until the expulsion of the order in 1767. When that unfortunate event took place, Ducrue was the superior of all the California missions. He submitted uncomplainingly to the decree of expulsion and even cooperated with the royal commission in enforcing its provisions. The Jesuits were allowed to leave only their clothing and a few books; this was all the wealth they carried away from California after seventy years of work in its missions. Ducrue eventually returned to his native land. He wrote in Latin "A Journey from California through the district of Mexico to Europe in the year 1767", which was translated into German for the "Nachrichten von verschiedenen Ländern des spanischen Amerika" of Christoph von Murr (Halle, 1809, 2d pt., p. 489-530). H. H. Bancroft regards this as "a standard work on the subject so far as California is concerned" (Works, XV, 175). He left also a "Relation of the Expulsion of the Society of Jesus from Mexico and in particular from California in 1767". This document is likewise found in Murr (vol. XII, p. 217-276), and was translated into French and published by Fr. Carayon in his "Documents Inédits" (Paris, 1876). Murr also gives some interesting specimens of the language of California, which were communicated to him by Ducrue.

Sommervogel, Bibl. de la c. d e. J., III, 253, and Supplement; Michaud, Biog. Univ. (Paris, 1892), XI, 419; Caratouy, Documents Inédits (Paris, 1875); De Bancro, Notices de la c. d. J., 1, 1677; Bancroft, North Mexico States and Texas (San Francisco, 1854), I, 476, 478; Glueck, California and Its Missions (San Francisco, 1884), I, ch. xii, 279.

Edward P. Spillane.
DUDIK

DUDIK, BERG FRANCISCUS, Moravian historian, b. at Kojetin near Kremnitz, Moravia, 29 January, 1815; d. as abbot and titular bishop at the monastery of Raigern, 18 January, 1890. After studying at the philosophical school at Brunn he attended the University of Olmütz. In 1830 he entered the Benedictine Order and in 1840 was ordained priest at Raigern. From this latter date until 1854 he taught first the classical languages and then history at the gymnasium of Brunn. In 1855 he became Privatdozent for historical research at the University of Vienna; in 1859 he was appointed historiographer of Moravia, and in 1865 was made a member of the Academy of Sciences of Vienna. For purposes of historical research he went in 1851 to Sweden, in 1852 to Rome, in 1870 to France, Belgium, and Holland, in 1874 to Russia, a country which he later repeatedly visited. Between the years 1855 and 1859 he established at Vienna the main historical library of the Teutonic Order. Dudik was a prolific writer and diligent investigator; his works have a lasting value on account of the sources from which he drew. His chief works in chronological order are: "Geschichte des Benediktinerstiftes Raigern" (2 vols., Brunn, 1840; 2nd ed., Vienna, 1869); "Mährische Geschichtsquellen" (Brunn, 1850); "Forschungen in Schweden für Mährisches Geschicht" (Brunn, 1852); "Umb Romanum" (2 vols., Vienna, 1855); "Des Herzogtums Troppau ehemalige Stellung zur Markgrafschaft Mähren" (Vienna, 1857); "Waldeistins Korrespondenz" (Vienna, 1863-66); "Waldeists von seiner Entbehrung bis zur abermaligen Ubernahme des Armeekommandos" (Vienna, 1858); "Des hohen Deutschen Ritterordens Münzsammlung in Wien" (Vienna, 1858, a special edition with 22 copper plates); "Riendlen des Deutschen Ritterordens" (Vienna, 1860); "Die morabische Geschichte im Könige Galien Godebernden" (Vienna, 1867); "Erinnerungen aus dem Feldzug in Italien 1866" (Vienna, 1867); "Preussen in Mähren in Jahre 1742" (Vienna, 1869); "Schweden in Böhmen und Mähren 1640-1660" (Vienna, 1879); "Die Christliche Entwicklung der Buchdruckerkunst in Mähren von 1380 bis 1623" (Brunn, 1879).

Dudik's most important publication is: "Mährisches allgemeine Geschichte" (12 vols., Brunn, 1880-89); it treats the history of Moravia up to 1590. Volumes VIII-X, which give an account of Moravia during the period of the Hungarian dynasty, have been translated into Czech. He also published several papers in the transactions of the Academy of Sciences; in vol. LIV appeared: "Korrespondenz Ferdinands II. mit seinen Beichtvateins Becanus und Lamorinaun" in Revue bénédictine, VII, 179.

PATRICK SCHLAGER.

Duel (duellum, old form of bellum).—This word, as used both in the ecclesiastical and civil criminal codes to-day, generally signifies every contest with deadly weapons which takes place by agreement between two persons on account of some private quarrel. Thus a contest with weapons is essential to the conception of a duel. Further, the contest must take place by agreement, and the weapons used must be capable of inflicting deadly wounds. Although generally demanded by custom, similarity of weapons is not essential, neither are wounds mortal, seconds, etc. Finally, it is essential to a duel that it take place on account of some private matter, such as wounded honour. Consequently the customary duel of to-day differs from those public duels which took place for some public reason by the arrangement of the authorities, as the conflict between Caesar and his Parthian, etc. Between two armies there is no higher court than the appeal to arms; therefore war must decide, and there may be instances in which it is allowable to substitute for a battle between two armies a contest between two persons selected for the purpose.

History.—Duelling was unknown to the civilized nations of antiquity. The contests of the Roman gladiators were not, like the duels of to-day, a means of self-defence, but bloody spectacles to satisfy the curiosity and cruelty of an effeminate and degenerate populace. On the other hand the customs of duelling existed among the Gauls and Germans from very early times, as Diodorus Siculus (Biblioth. histor., Lib. V, ch. xxviii), Velleius Paterculus (Histor. rom., I, cxxxviii), and others relate. The duel is, therefore, undoubtedly of heathen origin, and was so firmly rooted in the customs of the Gauls and Germans that it persisted among them for a long time after the Roman conquest. The oldest known law of Christian times that permitted the judicial duel is that of the Burgundian King Gundobald (d. 516). With few exceptions the judicial duel is mentioned in all old German laws as a legal ordeal. It rested on a twofold conviction. It was believed, first, that God could not allow the innocent to be defeated in a duel; hence it was held that the guilty party would not dare primarily to appeal to the judgment of God in proof of his innocence and then enter upon the fight under the weight of perjury; the fear of Divine wrath would discourage him from this. And secondly, the Church would not permit a law to exist which was not consonant to the spirit of God and the Gospel. It was not therefore an appeal to the judgment of God; it was rather that the Church could not, as the Bishop of Tyre, permit the defeat of the innocent. The pope also at an early date took a stand against duelling. In a letter to Charles the Bald, Nicolas I (868-87) condemned the duel (monomachia) as a temptation of God. In the same century his example was followed by the popes Alexander II and Alexander III, Celestine III, Innocent III and Innocent IV, Julius II, and many others. In addition to the judicial, non-judicial combats also occurred, in which men arbitrarily settled private grudges or sought to revenge themselves. The tournaments, especially, were often used to satisfy revenge; on account of this misuse the Church early issued ordinances against the excesses committed at tournaments, although these were not always obeyed. The more the judicial combat fell into disuse, the more the old instinct of the Germanic and Gallic peoples, by which each man sought to gain his rights with weapon in hand, showed itself in personal contests and at tournaments. From the middle of the fifteenth century duelling over questions of honour increased so greatly, especially in the Romanic countries, that the Council of Trent was obliged to enact the severest penalties against it. It decreed that "the detestable custom of duelling which the Devil had originated, in order to bring about at the same time the ruin of the soul and the violent death of the body, shall be entirely uprooted from Christian soil" (Sess. XXIV, De reform., c. xix). It pronounced the severest ecclesiastic penalties against those princes who should permit duelling between Christians in their territories. According to the council those who take part in a duel are ipso facto excommunicated, and if they are killed in the duel they are to be deprived of Christian burial. The seconds and those who advised or encouraged the duel or received the weapon in hand, are also excommunicated. These ecclesiastical penalties were at a later date repeatedly renewed and even in parts made more severe. Benedict XIV decreed that duellists should also be denied burial by the Church, even if they did not die on the duelling ground and on the spot. All modern penal duels, whether judicial or private, are substantially in force to-day. Pius IX in the "Constitutio Apostolica Sedis" of 12 October, 1869, decreed the penalty of excommunication against "all who fight duels, or challenge to a duel or accept such challenge; as well as against all who are necessary
to the duel or who in any way abet or encourage the same; and finally against those who are present at a duel as spectators [de industria spectantes], or those who permit the same, or do not prevent it, whatever their rank, even if they are kings or emperors'.

Like the Church, the State also took steps against the evil of duelling. In 1608 an edict against the practice was issued by Henry IV of France. Whoever killed his opponent in a duel was to be punished with death; severe penalties were also enacted against the sending of a challenge and the acceptance of the same. Unfortunately, the Emperor of Austria-Francisco I.-against this edict, was generally pardoned. In 1626, during the reign of Henry's successor, Louis XIII, the laws against duelling were made more stringent and were strictly carried out. Notwithstanding these measures the custom of duelling increased alarmingly in France. The great number of French noblemen who fell in duels about the middle of the seventeenth century, is shown by the statement of the contemporary writer Théophile Raynaud that within thirty years more men of rank had been killed in duels than had been killed in any war. Olier, the founder of the Congregation of Saint-Sulpice, with the aid of Vincent de Paul, formed an association of distinguished noblemen, the members of which signed the following obligation: "The undersigned publicly and solemnly make known by this declaration that they will refuse every form of challenge, will for no cause whatever enter into a duel, and will thereby give proof that they detest duelling as contrary to reason, the public good, and the laws of the State, and as incompatible with salvation and the Christian religion, without, however, relinquishing the right to avenge in every legal way any insult offered them as far as the position and birth make such action necessary." Louis XIV aided these efforts at reform by the severe enactment against duelling which he issued early in his reign. For a long time after this duelling was infrequent in France.

In other countries too severe measures were taken against the constantly spreading evil. In 1681 the Emperor Leopold I forbade the fighting of duels under the severest penalties; Maria Theresa ordered not only the challenger and the challenged but also all who had any share in a duel to be beheaded, and in the reign of the Emperor Joseph II duellists received the punishment of pillaging and accepting a command in the army. Frederick the Great of Prussia also tolerated no duellists in his army. The present penal code of Austria makes imprisonment the punishment of duelling; the penal code of the German Empire commands confinement in a fortress. The penalty is, without doubt, entirely insufficient and constitutes a form of privilege for the person who kills his adversary in a duel. Theoretically these penal laws are also applicable to the respective armies, but unfortunately in the case of officers they are not carried out; indeed, up to the present time, an officer who refuses to fight a duel in Germany and Austria is in danger of being dismissed from the army. In 1896 when, in consequence of the fatal issue of a duel, the Reichstag by a large majority called upon the Government to proceed by all the means in its power against the practice of duelling, as opposed to the criminal code, the emperor issued an order on 1 January, 1897, which established courts of honour to deal with disputes in the army concerning questions of honour. Unfortunately the decree leaves it open to the court of honour to permit or even to command a duel to take place. Furthermore, on 15 January, 1896, General von Einen, President of the Army, stated: "The law of 1 January, 1897, which was in force when the duel was still in force, and Chancellor von Buelow added to this: "...the corps of army officers can tolerate no member in its ranks who is not ready, should necessity arise, to defend his honour by force of arms". In the army, as a result of this principle, a conscientious opponent of duelling is constantly exposed to the danger of being expelled for refusing to fight. In England duelling is almost unknown, and no duel has occurred, it is said, in the British army for the last eighty years. English jurisprudence contains no special ordinances against duelling; but the wounding and killing of another are punishable according to common law. On the Continent also public opinion on the subject of duelling seems to be gradually changing. The demand for the abolition, even in the army, of this abuse is growing louder and louder. Some years ago, at the instance of the Infante Don Francisco of Bourbon, an anti-duelling league was formed in order to carry on systematically the opposition to duelling. A preliminary convention, held at Frankfort-on-the-Main in the spring of 1901, issued an appeal for support in its struggle against this evil. In a few weeks a thousand signatures were received, mostly those of men of influence from the most varied ranks of society. A convention to draw up a constitution met at Cassel 11 January, 1902, and Prince Carl zu Lowenstein was elected president. A committee was also appointed to direct affairs and to conduct the agitation. The French government has made proposals to the king of Prussia that he should establish a permanent bureau at Leipzig. Concerning the aims of the league the declaration subscribed by the members states the following: "The undersigned herewith declare their rejection, on principle, of duelling as a custom repugnant to reason, conscience, and civilization, as a violation of laws and the common good of society and the State."

Wrongfulness of Duelling.—After what has been said above there can be no doubt that duelling is contrary to the ordinances of the Church and of most civilized countries. By the anti-duelling league or by the decrees of the Council of Trent plainly indicated that duelling was essentially wrong and since then theologians have almost universally characterized it as a sinful and reprehensible course of action. However there were always a few scholars who held the opinion that cases might arise in which the unlawfulness of duelling could not be proved with certainty by mere reason. But this opinion has not been tenable since Pope Benedict XIV in the Bull "Detestabimur" of the year 1752 condemned the following propositions: (1) "A soldier or officer who would be blameless and not liable to punishment for duelling or accepting a challenge would be considered as having committed an act of cowardice and unworthy of esteem, and unfit for military duty, were he not to send a challenge or accept such, and who would for this reason lose the position which supported him and his family, or who would be obliged to give up forever the hope of obtaining advancement." (2) "Those persons are excusable who to defend their honour or to escape the contempt of men accept or send a challenge when they know positively that the duel will not take place but will be prevented by others." (3) "A general or officer who accepts a challenge through fear of the loss of his reputation and his position does not come under the ecclesiastical punishment decreed by the Church for duellists." (4) "It is permissible under the natural conditions of man to accept or send a challenge in order to save one's fortune, when the person who was attacked by any cause would be rewarded by such a duel." (5) "This permission claimed for natural conditions can also be applied to a badly guided state in which, especially, justice is openly denied by the remissness or malevolence of the authorities." Like his predecessors, Leo XIII in his letter "Pastoralis officii", of 12 September, 1891, to the German bishops, laid down the following principles: From two points of view the Divine law forbids a man as a private person to wound or kill another, excepting when he is forced to it by self-defence. Both natural reason and the inspired Holy Scriptures proclaim this Divine law."
The intrinsic reason why duelling is in itself sinful and reprehensible is that it is an arbitrary attack on God's right of ownership as regards human life. Only the owner and master of a thing has the right to destroy it or expose it to the danger of destruction. But man is not the owner and master of his life. It belongs, instead, entirely to his Creator. Now man can only call that his property and treat it as such which is intended in the first instance for his benefit, so that he has the right to exclude others from the use of the same. Man, however, is not created primarily for himself but for the glory and service of God. Here below he is to serve his Creator and Lord as long as the Lord wills and thus attain his own salvation. For this end God has given man life, maintains it for him, and has bestowed on him the instinct of self-preservation. But if man is not the master of his life, he has not the right to expose it at pleasure to destruction or even deliberately to seek such danger. In order rightfully to expose the life to danger there must be a justifiable reason, and even then the risking of life is only permissible, not the end to be sought in itself. What is said of one's own life applies also to the life of one's fellow-man. Every man has the right to defend himself from an unlawful attack on his life, even if it cost the life of the assailant; this is a requirement of public safety; but apart from such defence no man has the right as a private individual to injure the life of his fellow-man or at pleasure to expose his own to similar danger. For this end cannot, however, be attained by duelling, as the result of it is as a rule a dishonourable exposure of his own life and that of his fellow-man, consequently is guilty of a wrongful assumption of the right of God, the Lord of life and death. To make this clear it is only necessary to examine the pretexts used to justify duelling, and what is the same, to look into the aims sought to be attained by this custom. One of the principal reasons given in justification of duelling is the obtaining of satisfaction. A man is insulted or injured in reputation, and in order to obtain satisfaction challenges the defamer. But besides the offence against civil law seeking to establish one's rights with weapons, thus evading the authority of the State, a duel is totally unsuited to the attainment of satisfaction and in addition is wrongful. Satisfaction consists in the offender withdrawing his insult and treating the offended person with respect and honour. This end cannot, however, be attained by duelling, as by the same weapons that injure the opponent one's own party is also subjected to the same weapon. When the one who has given the provocation accepts the challenge he does not thereby withdraw the insult; he intends, rather, to maintain it by weapons and shows himself, moreover, ready to add other and greater wrongdoing to the first, inasmuch as he may severely wound or even kill the challenger. Moreover, who would allow to the man whom he wishes to compel to make good a wrong the same chance of victory as to himself, i.e. who would give the offender the opportunity to add to the wrong he has already done an even more heinous injury? Yet this is what the challenger does in granting his adversary the same weapon with the same damage for success as he claims for himself.

Another reason offered in justification of duelling is self-defence. The duellist desires to avoid the loss of the honor of his peers and thus to retain his office and his income, or, as is said, to defend his honour and his social position. It is unfortunately only too true that to-day the conscientious opponent of duelling, especially in the army, must often suffer great losses. Nevertheless duelling cannot be justified as self-defence. Honour and the respect of others rests on the same weapons. Moreover, the use of arms is often the only method of preserving the use of arms, nor in a duel is there any actual vindication of these. The duel implies that the honour of the challenger has already been injured, and consequently that this injury is an accomplished fact; besides, the duel takes place according to agreement, so that it is not a case of self-defence against sudden attack. But the word self-defence is used in a broader sense. According to the prejudices existing in certain circles, the person who does not answer an insult by a challenge or who declines a challenge is held to be dishonourable and cowardly; thus it may be that a legal position is thus placed in a worse plight, from its very nature, a duel is an unsuitable and illicit method of preserving or rehabilitating honour. Look at the duel from the point of view of the person injured. He must, it is said, send a challenge because he has been insulted. Two cases, however, are here possible. Either his moral character and good name have been attacked, or the specific charge of cowardice has been made against him. If the former be the case, the duel is manifestly unsuited to defend the injured man's honour. A duel can never prove that the person attacked is a man of honour, is not a simpleton, has not committed adultery, or the like. A man without character or morals can be just as skilful in handling weapons as his honourable opponent. If the quarrel hinges on the charge of cowardice, a duel is apparently a proper means of disproving the same. But in this instance the challenger directly endangers his life in order to prove that he is not such. Consequently he cannot say that he only suffers his life to be endangered, he deliberately seeks this danger in order to show his courage. And, according to our former statements, this is to dispose of one's life unlawfully. It cannot be said in reply that the injured man merely intends to rehabilitating his honour. That is certainly the final aim of the duel, but first and direct aim is to prove one's courage by fighting the duel. Is it permissible, however, to risk one's own life and that of one's fellow-man merely as a means of proving one's courage? If this be correct, it would be equally permissible to enter a lion's cage, because, if a man, if public opinion demanded such proof of personal bravery. Hence it follows that the duel is not in reality a proper means to demonstrate one's courage, for true courage is a moral virtue which is not blind and foolhardy, but exposes itself to danger only if reason demand it. What has been said of the injured party is applicable also to the party giving the provocation, the one who is challenged. If he has acted unjustly he should as a man of honour offer reparation; that is his duty, and the refusal to perform this duty plainly gives him no right to fight a duel with his opponent. If he be wrong the right to refuse the challenge. The only ground for which a challenge might be accepted would be fear of the accusation of cowardice; that this reason is, however, not tenable has already been shown. It is surely the basest cowardice to do, through fear of being accused of want of courage, what sober reflection would lead any man of sense to condemn as immoral and wrong.

The conclusion necessarily to be drawn from the above is: whoever is killed in a duel is indirectly guilty of self-murder, because he has for no justifiable reason risked his life, and whoever slays his adversary in a duel is guilty of it the same as if he had taken the risk of causing death without any right to do so; this holds true even though he did not directly intend his opponent's death. The above applies not only to duels undertaken by private individuals of their own free will, but also to duels fought on account of personal grievances by order of State authorities. Those in authority have not the right to dispose at their pleasure of the life of the subject. Should a dispute be laid before them, they should examine the matter judicially and punish the guilty party. If the guilt cannot be proved the accused should be acquitted; in such a case there is no right to command a duel and thus expose the innocent to the same peril as the guilty. This has all the more force, as duels often take place on account of wrongs which are not to-day punished with death by civil law.
Duffy, Sir Charles Gavan, politician and author, b. at Monaghan, Ireland, 12 April, 1816; d. at Nice, France, 9 Feb., 1903. Educated in his native town, he contributed, at an early age, to the "Northern Herald", and in 1836 joined the staff of the Dublin "Morning Register" of which he shortly afterwards became sub-editor. In 1839, being appointed editor of the newly established Uster Catholic paper, "The Vicar of Belfast", he went to Belfast, where he resided till 1842. Going to Dublin in the summer of that year, he met two young barristers, Thomas Davis and John Dillon, and in conjunction with them he founded "The Nation", the first number of which appeared in October. Duffy was editor, Dillon and Davis were proprietors, and what with the ability of editor and contributors, the freshness and vigour of style, and the manly and militant tone adopted on public questions, the paper soon became a power. Its whole-hearted support of Repeal filled the meetings and the coffers of the Repeal Association, and O'Connell gratefully recognized its assistance. People also noted its influence, and when O'Connell was executed in 1844, Duffy was with him in the dock and subsequently his fellow-prisoner in Kilmainham. Later, in the struggles between the Young and the Old Ireland, Duffy took sides with the former against O'Connell, and was one of those who helped to found the Irish Confederation. He specially resented O'Connell's alliance with the Whigs, as he did the intolerance and presumption of John O'Connell. The failure of the Repeal movement, the horrors of the famine, and the death of O'Connell weakened his faith in national action, and for a time, in 1849, he advocated revolutionary measures. The Government, in consequence, seized his paper and threw Duffy into prison; but, though tried four times in succession, the prosecution failed, owing chiefly to the great ability of his lawyer, Isaac Butt. In the revived "Nation", in 1849, Duffy reverted to constitutional agitation, and with Lucas and others established in 1850 the Tenant League, which at the general election of 1852 returned forty members of parliament pledged to Tenant Right and Independent Opposition. Duffy himself being returned for New Ross, County Wexford. The treachery of the place-hunters, Reagh and Sadlier, soon wrecked the party, and, when Lucas died, Duffy in despair resigned his seat and left for Melbourne, Australia, where he arrived early in 1856. Though determined to avoid politics, he was induced to enter the Victorian Parliament, where his abilities made him at once a prominent figure. He filled in succession the position of minister of public works and minister of public lands, and for a brief period was prime minister. Ultimately he became speaker, receiving also the honour of knighthood. Though he reached without any difficulty, without denying either his country or faith, or ever failing to defend them when assailed. He consistently championed the labourers and the farmers against the capitalists and the squatters, and when he left Victoria in 1880 the whole colony regarded him as one of the ablest and most useful of its public men. His last years were devoted to writing several valuable historical works: "Young Ireland" (Dublin, 1884); also his "Four Years in Irish History" (London, 1885); "The League of North and South" (London, 1880); and "My Life in Two Hemispheres" (London, 1890).}

Duhamel, Jean-Baptiste, a French scientist, philosopher, and theologian, b. at Vire, Normandy (now in the department of Calvados), 11 June, 1624; d. at Paris, 6 August, 1706. He began his studies at Chartres and completed them at Paris. In 1642, being only eighteen years of age, Duhamel published an explanation of the work of theodosius called "Sphères", to which he added a treatise on trigonometry. The following year he entered the Congregation of the Oratory, which he left ten years later to take charge of the parish of Neuilly-sur-Marne. Resigning this position in 1663, he became chancellor of the church of Bayeux. When Colbert founded the Académie des Sciences (1666), he appointed Duhamel its first secretary. Duhamel held this office until 1697, when he resigned and, upon his own recommendation, was succeeded by Fontenelle. With Colbert's brother, the marquis de Rossy, he went, in 1666, to Madrid, where he represented France at the peace negotiations, and later to England, where he came in touch with the foremost scientists, especially with the physicist Boyle.

Duhamel's works are "Philosophia moralis christiana" (Angers, 1652); "Astronomia physica" (Paris, 1659); "De meteoris et frequentibus" (Paris, 1663); "De consenso veteris et nove philosophia" (Paris, 1665), a treatise on natural philosophy in which the Greek and scholastic theories are compared with those of Descartes; "De corporum affectionibus" (Paris, 1670); "De mente humana" (Paris, 1672), "De corpore animali" (Paris, 1673); "Philosophia vetus et nova ad usum scholae accommodata" (Paris, 1678). This last work, composed by order of Colbert as a textbook for colleges, ran through many editions. He also published: "Theologia speculativae et practicae" (7 vols., Paris, 1695), abridged in five volumes for use as a textbook in seminaries (Paris, 1694); "Regalae et Academica historia" (Paris, 1698; enlarged edition, 1701); "Institutiones biblice" (Paris, 1698), in which are examined the questions of the authority, integrity, and inspiration of the Bible, the value of the Hebrew text and of its translations, and the interpretation, Biblical geography, and chronology; "Biblia sacra Vulgata editionis" (Paris, 1705), with introductions, notes, chronological, historical, and geographical tables. In his choice of opinions, Duhamel shows great impartiality and unbiased judgment. His admiration for empirical science does not make him despise the speculations of his predecessors, but he examines and criticizes both sides carefully, tries to reconcile them, and, if this be impossible, gives his own opinion. Bruere, in his history of philosophy, calls him "vir et judex laude clarissimus et memoriam copia celeberrimus". Fontenelle praises his noble character and his disinterestedness; his charity, which "was exercised too frequently not to be known, notwithstanding his care to conceal it"; his humility, which was not only on his lips, but was "a feeling based on science itself".

Duhig, James, see Rockhampton.

Dukhobortsy. See Russia.

Dulcin (Dolcino). See Apostolic.

Du Lhut (Duluth), Daniel Greysonol, Sieur d. at Saint-Germain-en-Laye about 1640; d. at Montreal, 26 Feb., 1710. He first served in the French army, becoming a lieutenant in 1657 and a gendarme of the King's Guard in 1664. He also took part in the campaign in Flanders and fought at the battle of Senig in 1674. During that year he went to Canada, whither he had been preceded by several members of his family, amongst them his cousins, the Tontys. At first he settled in Montreal, but in 1678 left for the West accompanied by his brother, La Tournet, and six soldiers. In 1679 he took possession of the Sioux country in the name of the King of France. He also explored Lake Superior and the high inland plateau where the Mississippi, the Red River, and the St. Lawrence rise, erected the fortified post of Kaministikquin (now Fort William) and afterwards built Fort La Tourette on Lake Nipigon. Du Lhut was the first Canadian to explore the West and it was his privilege to save Father Hennepin from captivity when this famous Recollect missionary, having become separated from La Salle's expedition, was wandering about in the wilderness near Saint-Antoine. On account of his intrepidity, Du Lhut had great influence over the savages and won their confidence. He later went to France, where he served as a lieutenant at the siege of Port royal in 1689, then was commissioned to explore the region of the Great Lakes, and finally was put in command of Fort Frontenac. Here, in 1707, he was succeeded by Tonty, his cousin. He died three years later and was buried in the church of the Recollets at Montreal.

Du Lhut was one of the most dauntless pioneer range-rovers (coureurs de bois) in Canada during the French regime. For thirty years he succeeded in keeping the country to the west of the Great Lakes under French control. Notwithstanding that he had every chance of becoming wealthy, he died poor and Governor Vaudreuil testified to his having been a very upright man. The Society of Duluth, Minnesota, takes its name from him. Du Lhut wrote accounts of his journeys (1676–1678), but unfortunately they have been lost; however, we have a plan that he designed for a chain of posts to be erected for the purpose of keeping the lake route clear of savages and thus facilitating communication between Canada and the western and southern parts of the continent (1683–95). This plan was published by Marny (Découvertes et Établissements, V, 3–72). In the Library of Congress at Washington may also be found extracts from his account of Detroit.

Duluth, Diocese of (Duluthensis), established 3 Oct., 1889, suffragan of the Archdiocese of St. Paul, Upper Minnesota, U.S., comprises the counties of Beltrami, Carlton, Cass, Clay, Clearwater, Cook, Crow, Hubbard, Itasca, Kittson, Lake, Marshall, Norman, Pine, Polk, Roseau, Red Lake, Mahnomen, Koocheching, and St. Louis, in the State of Minnesota, an area of 30,139 square miles. The first Catholic to visit that region, who were the French fur-traders who, under Grosseilliers, are recorded as having shipped furs from there in 1660. Daniel Greysonol Du Lhut, the French officer, adventurer, and fur-trader after whom the city is named, was there in 1679. After a varying existence as trading post and frontier settlement Duluth was incorporated as a town in May, 1857. The first priest in Minnesota was the famous Father Hennepin, who in 1680 was a prisoner among the Siouxs. He explored the Mississippi and at St. Paul named the falls in honour of St. Anthony, writing a glowing description of them in 1683. Wandering missionaries made frequent visits to the Indian tribes and scattered Catholics of the region down to 1839, when the Rev. Joseph Cretin (q. v.), a zealous French priest, began an active and successful missionary career.

The Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore (1849) recommended to Rome the erection of a new see at St. Paul for the Territory of Minnesota and the appointment of Father Cretin as its first bishop, which plan was carried out. Father Cretin had been in the territory for some time, trying to revive the old Indian missions and evangelize the Canadian voyageurs who went there for the fur trade. The numerous Indians roaming in the wilderness had nearly forgotten the doctrines of Christianity preached to their ancestors by the Recollets and Jesuits more than a century before, but they were still anxious to have the “blackrobes” come among them once more. In 1857 the Vicariate Apostolic of Northern Minnesota was established, and these two divisions of the whole State continued until 4 May, 1888, when St. Paul was raised to the rank of an archdiocese with the four suffragan sees of Duluth, Winona, Jamestown (now Fargo), and St. Cloud, the last-named being the result of the Vicariate of Northern Minnesota. Duluth, the see city, was within these old limits of the vicariate. In 1866 the few Catholics there were brought together by a visiting missionary. They numbered only about two dozen families in 1870, and Father John Chebul, an Austrian by birth, attended them as a mission from Superior and built the first frame church for their use. Other priests of the formative period were Fathers G. Keller, a German, J. B. M. Génin, a French Oblate, Joseph Buh, Charles Verwyst, Joseph Staub, Christopher Murphy, and G. J. Goebel.

The Rev. James McGolrick, a member of the
council of Bishop Ireland of St. Paul and rector of the church of the Immaculate Conception, Minneapolis, was nominated as the first bishop of the new see and consecrated at St. Paul, 27 Dec., 1880. He was born 1 May, 1841, at Borrisokane, County Tipperary, Ireland. He founds in organic chemistry. With Bousinault he studied the composition of water and of the atmosphere. With Stas he investigated the composition of carbon dioxide, and later his memoirs on hydrogen and the amide compounds brought him at once into the first rank among the chemists of the nineteenth century.

In 1829 he founded the Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures with Pécout, Lavallée, and Olivier. Brilliant lecture courses in the Sorbonne won him further renown. He replaced Thénard as professor at the École Polytechnique, was professor at the Sorbonne and dean of the faculty of sciences.

Aspo a very poor speaker, by practice and study he acquired eloquent powers that brought him great celebrity. Dumas also became professor at the École de Médecine, a position he resigned in favour of Wurtz, one of his most distinguished pupils. His scholars included such illustrious men as H. Sainte-Claire Deville, Wurtz, Debry, Pastier, and others. Turning his attention to politics, Dumas was elected a deputy from the department of Nord in 1849; among the proposed laws in which he was interested were various ones treating the receiving of money, stamped paper, forgery of public acts, taxes on salt, sugar, etc. In 1851 he was appointed minister of agriculture and commerce by Louis Napoleon, and after the coup d'état was made minister. From 1832 he was a member of the Institute, being elected to the Academy of Sciences, and in 1868 he was made a perpetual secretary; in 1878 he became a member of the French Academy. In 1888-89 he carried on an animated controversy as to the nature of the elements with Despretz; in the course of the discussion Dumas' energetic methods in attacking his opponent's views excited some criticism. His abandonment of chemical research for politics was considered a misfortune by the scientific world, as he ceased his brilliant investigations when in the very prime of his powers.

Dumas was a consistent Catholic, and remained true to his faith all his life. When it was necessary, he never hesitated to defend Christianity against the attacks of materialism. Examples of his views in this regard may be found in his various addresses, as: "Traité de chimie appliquée aux arts" (8 vols., 1828-45); "Précis de chimie physique et médicale"; "Leçons sur la philosophie chimique" (1837); "Essai de statique chimique des êtres organisés" (1841), the last work written in collaboration with Bousinault. Besides the publications just mentioned there were numerous papers in scientific
journals and in the transactions of the Academy of Sciences. A list of his papers was published in the "Catalogue of Scientific Papers of Royal Society, London".

MATIGNON, L'OEUVRE DE JEAN-BAPTISTE DUMAS (1848); Dictionnaire Larousse, a. v.

T. O'CONNOR SLOANE.

**Dumetz, Francisco, date of b. unknown; d. 14 Jan., 1811.** He was a native of Mallorca (Majorca), Spain, where he entered the Franciscan Order. In May, 1790, he went to Mexico with forty-eight other Franciscans to join the famous Franciscan missionary college of San Fernando in the City of Mexico. On volunteering for the Indian missions, he was sent to California in October, 1770. Sailing from San Blas, Jalisco, with ten friars in January, 1771, he reached Monterey in May and was assigned to Mission San Diego. In May, 1772, he was transferred to Mission San Carlos, and in May, 1782, was appointed for Mission San Buenaventura, where he continued his unostentatious labours for the Indians until August, 1797, when he was directed to found Mission San Fernando. Father Dumetz remained there from its founding on 8 Sept. to the end of 1805, except during 1803 and 1804 when apparently he resided at San Gabriel. From January, 1806, to the time of his death, Father Dumetz was stationed at San Gabriel. His remains were transferred in the mission church on 15 January, 1847. Dumetz was the last of the pioneer friars who did so much for California, where he toiled without interruption for forty years.

**Dumetz, Francois de.** See GALLOWAY.

**Dumont**, HUBERT-ANDRÉ, Belgian geologist, b. at Liége, 15 Feb., 1809; d. in the same city, 28 Feb., 1857. When only twenty years old he received the gold medal of the Academy of Brussels for his "Description géologique de la province de Liége". This memoir marked an important advance in stratigraphical geology. In 1835 he was made professor in mathematical and physical science and in the same year was appointed professor of geology and mineralogy at the University of Liége. He held this position until his death, serving also for a time as rector of the university. His native city has erected a statue in his honour. He was a devout Catholic and one of his friends entered the Society of Jesus. His principal achievement was his geological map of Belgium, the preparation of which engaged his attention for a number of years. The first edition was issued in 1849. Later and more complete editions followed, the last being "La carte géologique de la Belgique et des contrées voisines représentant les terrains qui se trouvent en dessous du limon hesbayen et du sable campanien au 1:40,000".

Dumont's work, together with that of Gosselet on the palaezoic rocks of Belgium, served as a foundation for a subsequent research in that region. The formation in 1848 had divided the Terrains Ardennois into the Devilien, Revinien, and Schienien groups, the Terrain Rheinan into the Gedinnen, Cobletzien, and Ahrien groups, and the Terrain Anthraxisfere into the Elfelden, Condruisen, and Houiller groups. This classification, though based on purely local considerations, was an excellent one both from a lithological and a stratigraphical point of view. He did not, however, deem it necessary to make any extended comparison between the subdivisions which he had distinguished in Belgium and similar groups in other countries. It was his opinion that the same fauna never extended over the whole earth, so that extreme caution was necessary in establishing a parallel between widely separated rocks on the basis of fossils contained in them. Besides the works already mentioned, Dumont was the author of a number of papers characterized by careful observation and great clearness. Among them are: 'Notizia di una nuova specie di phosphate ferroso' (Bull. of the Acad. of Belgium, 1827); "Observations sur la constitution géologique des terrains tertiaires de l'Angleterre comparés à ceux de la Belgique" (Ibid., XIX); "Mémoire sur les terrains triasique et jurassique de la province de Luxembourg" (Mém. de l'Acad., XV); "Étude sur les terrains ardennais et rhénviens de l'Ardennais et du Brabant" (Ibid., XXII).

**Dunstan**, ANDRE DUMONT, SA VIE ET SES TRAVAIL (Liége, 1858); L'ACTION DU PEUPLE ENFRONT DE DUMONT (Brussels, 1858); ZITTEL, HISTORY OF GEOLOGY AND PALAEONTOLOGY (London, 1901); KLEINEN, DAS CHRISTENTUM U. DIE VERTEILER DER NEUERN NATURWISSENSCHAFT (Freiburg, 1904).

**HENRY M. BROCK.**

**Dumolin (or DUMOLIN; latinized MOLINUS), CHARLES, French jurist, b. at Paris in 1500; d. there 27 December, 1566.** He was a descendant of a noble family related to Anne Boileyn, the mother of Elizabeth of England. The life of Dumolin was full of vicissitudes. After taking the degree of Doctor of Law, he first lectured on that subject at Orléans in 1531, and afterwards became advocate of the Parliament of Paris (the highest court of France). He soon abandoned this position, devoted himself exclusively to the study of law, and gained a great reputation by his works on jurisprudence. He liked to call himself the jurisconsult of France and Germany. It is related that he said, "Ego qui nemini cedo nec a nemine docteri possum" (I yield to no one nor is anyone able to teach me). His hatred for the papacy led him into apostacy. In 1542 he embraced Calvinism, but soon passed over to Lutheranism. His violent attacks on the papacy compelled him to seek refuge in Germany. In 1553 he lectured on law at Tübingen, and afterwards at Strasburg, Dôle, and Besançon; returning to Paris in 1557, he was soon obliged to quit that city and went successively to Orléans and Lyons. From 1564, he resided again in Paris; on his death-bed he abjured his heresy and was reconciled to the Church. The following are his principal works upon civil law: "Commentarii in consuetudines Præsen- sianæ"; "Extricatio labyrinthi dividui et individui"; "Tractatus de eo quod interest". His chief work on canon law is a critical edition of the "Decree of Gratian" with the gloss, accompanied by notes (postilla). Amongst his other works may be mentioned, "Commentarius ad editionem Henrici II. contra parvas datas et abusus curiae Romanae" (1532); "Concilium sui partis et Concilii de Trenta, receptione or rejet d'icelui" (1564), which work caused him to be cast into prison; "Consilium super cons- modis et incommodi novissimae sectae Jesuicetanum" (edited 1604). His "Opera omnia" were published in three volumes at Paris, in 1612; the best edition, however, is that of Paris, 1681, in five volumes.

**DUROZIEZ, VIE DU CHARLES DUMOULIN (Paris, 1864); PRAT, HISTOIRE DE l'UNIVERSITE DE PARIS ET VEUIE DU JOURNALISTE CHARLES DUMOULIN. L'INFLUENCE DE DUMOULIN SUR LA LEGISLATION FRANCAISE (Revue critique de législation et de jurisprudence, IV, 1858, sqq., V, 1859, sqq., 306 sqq.; DUVIVIER, CHARLES DUMOULIN et le concile de Trente en Belgique Judiciaire, xxiv, 716 sqq.)**

**A. VAN HOVE.**

**Dunbar**, WILLIAM, Scottish poet, sometimes styled the "Chauver of Scotland", born c. 1460; died c. 1529(). He graduated B.A. at St. Andrews University in 1511. Educated for the Church, according to his own statement he became a Franciscan novice and, as such traversed the whole of England, preached in various towns, and crossed over for a time to Picardy in France. About 1490 he returned to Scotland and entered the service of James IV, who employed him on various embassies to Paris and elsewhere, and settled...
a small pension on him. He celebrated James's marriage to Margaret of England by his well-known poem "The Thrissal and the Rois" (The Thistle and the Rose, 1503), symbolizing the union between the two kingdoms. The poet received gifts in money from the kinship of his other poems on other occasions, such as the dedication of his first Mass in 1504, but though he often petitioned both the king and queen for a benefice (limiting his wishes, as he said, to a small country kirk covered with feather) he never obtained one, and seems always to have lived in poverty. The best known of his other poems was the "Golden Large," an allegory illustrating the victory of love over reason; a "Dance" (of the seven deadly sins), a work of much gloomy power; and many other pieces, somewhat humorous and disfigured by the coarseness of the time, others of a religious and ascetic type. A few were printed during his lifetime; and in 1834 an admirable edition of his complete works was published, edited by Dr. David Laing. In 1511 Dunbar is mentioned among Queen Margaret's train on one of her journeys; but nothing is heard of him after 1513, the year of the battle of the Flodden. Laing conjectures that he must have died at that fight, but other writers suppose he had to survive until about 1520.

Laing, Works of Dunbar, with biography and notes (Edinburgh, 1834; supplement (1876)

Dunboyne Establishment. See St. Patrick's College (Maynooth).

Dunchad (Dunchad, Duncad, Donatus), Saint, confessor, Abbot of Iona; date of b. unknown, d. in 710. He was the son of Granmuadhach and grandson of Maelcobba of the house of Conall Gulban. He is first heard of as Abbot of Killochuir on the coast of S. E. Ulster (perhaps Killough, County Down). There is considerable dispute as to the year in which he became Abbot of Hy Iona). The "Annals of Ulster" first mention him in that capacity under the year 706 (really 707); but Conamhail was abbot from 704 to 710. It may be that St. Dunchad was coadjutor to Conamhail (the phrase is principatum tenuit). Or perhaps there was some schism in the monastery over the paschal question, for though St. Dunchad is said to have ruled from 710 till 717, in 713 the death of "St. Durbaine Foda, Abbot of Ia" is recorded by the "Annals of the Four Masters," and the same authority relates the appointment of "Faelchu, son of Durbaine" to the abbeacy in 714. It was this Faelchu who was really abbot from 712 to 724. It is possible, however, may have been really coadjutors to St. Dunchad, or priors, or even bishops, for there were certainly bishops in Iona at that period, and the phrase employed is cathedra in obtinuit. However this may be, the paschal controversy was settled at Iona by the adoption of the Roman usage, while St. Dunchad was abbot. This took place at the instance of St. Egbert, a Northumbrian priest, who had been educated in Ireland. He came to Iona in 716, and was at once successful in persuading the community to abandon the Celtic Easter and tenure.

Dunedin, Diocese of (Dunedinen) comprises the provincial district of Otago (including the Otago part, Southland, and Stewart Island, as well as other adjacent islands). The diocese contains the most picturesque lake and fiord scenery in New Zealand. Its area is about 24,000 sq. miles, of which some 4000 sq. miles are fields, and 2940 forest. This part of New Zealand was visited (perhaps discovered) by Captain Cook in 1770. Beyond a few traders, there was, however, no white population in the Otago provincial district till 1840, when some families settled on land at Waitakouaiti. In 1848 the district was first colonized systematically and on a considerable scale by the Otago Association, under the auspices of the Free Church of Scotland. It was desired to retain the province as a Free Kirk reserve, and the immigration in New Zealand was at first resisted. The last barriers of religious exclusiveness were, however, swept away by the rush of population that flowed into the province from all parts of Australia when, in 1861, rich gold was discovered at Gabriel's Gully and elsewhere. The new conditions thus brought about led to a rapid development of the mineral, pastoral, agricultural, and forest resources of Otago. All New Zealand formed part of the Vicariate Apostolic of Wellington, which was erected in 1835. The first vicar, Dr. Pompllier, arrived in the country, with the pioneer (Marist) missionaries, in 1838. All New Zealand remained within its spiritual charge till 1848. From 1848 till 1869 the territory now comprised in the Diocese of Dunedin was included in the episcopal See of Wellington. In the latter year the Diocese of Dunedin was established. Its first bishop was the Right Rev. Patrick Moran, translated thither from the Cape of Good Hope, 3 December, 1869; d. 22 May, 1895. He was succeeded by the Right Rev. Michael Verdon, consecrated 3 May, 1899. In 1849 he accompanied Pesant, and visited and instructed the native villagers and a few white (Catholic) whalers at Otakou and Moeraki. Up to 1859, however, there was no Catholic church or school or resident priest in the whole southern province, and only about ninety scattered Catholics, who, when visited, on foot, by the aforesaid Marist, Father Petitjean. Early in the gold-rush of the sixties, another devoted Marist missionary, Father Moreau, was appointed resident priest in Dunedin, with charge of the whole province. He built, at Dunedin, the first Catholic church and presbytery in that province. In the arrival of Bishop Moran, in 1871, Father Moreau and a few of his fellow-religious
Dunfermline, Abbey of, in the south-west of Fife, Scotland. Founded by King Malcolm Canmore and his queen, Margaret, about 1070, it was richly endowed by him and his sons, and remodelled as a Benedictine abbey by his successor, David I, who brought with him twelve monks from Canterbury. The monastic buildings, which were of such extraordinary and splendid size that three sovereigns and their retinues might (says Matthew Paris) have been lodged there together, were burned down by Edward I of England in 1304, but were afterwards restored. The Abbey of Dunfermline and its priory of Melrose were still to be seen within the ruined walls of the Lady chapel, and were repaired and enclosed by order of Queen Victoria. Dunfermline Abbey was one of the richest Scottish houses, owning almost all Western Fife, as well as property in other counties. It possessed, within its own domain, the civil and criminal jurisdiction equal to that of the Crown. The church succeeded Iona as the burial-place of kings, and was thus the Westminster Abbey of Scotland. Besides Malcolm and Margaret, David I and Robert Bruce, with his queen and daughter, were inlaid there. After the Dissolution, the property passed through the hands of the Pitcairn family, Lord Gray, and von Earl of Dunfermline, to the Marquises of Tweeddale. The splendid church was deserted in 1560 by the Reformers, all but the nave, which were restored for Presbyterian worship. It is a fine example of Gothic architecture, with a beautiful western doorway. The remains of the church and palace are now Crown property.

Innes, Regist de Dunfermlin (Bannatyne Club, 1841); Chalmers, Historical and Statistical Account of Dunfermline (Edinburgh, 1814); Henderson, Royal Tombs at Dunfermline 1856; and Annals of Dunfermline (Glasgow, 1879); Mercer, History of Dunfermline (Dunfermline, 1858); Dugdale, Monast. Angliae, VII, 1522-1554.
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churches, and discharged faithfully the other duties of his pastoral ministry. In the exercise of these duties he came into conflict with the Prussian Government on the question of mixed marriages. The conditions laid down by Benedict XIV (1740–58) in the Constitution “Magnae nobilitatis” (20 June, 1748), by which marriages between Catholics and members of other Christian denominations became lawful, had been well observed in Catholic Poland. But in a treaty concluded in 1768 with various European powers the Prussian Government undertook to enforce another order of things. Mixed marriages were not to be celebrated; male children born of such marriages were to be brought up in the religion of their father, the female offspring in that of the mother. The marriage was to be blessed by the ecclesiastical minister, under whose jurisdiction the bride was; if a Catholic priest should refuse to solemnize the marriage, the minister of the other party was to officiate. Similar provisions were contained in the code of Prussian law extended to Prussian Poland in 1797. By a royal decree of King Frederick William III (1797–1840), 21 Nov., 1803, they were further modified in an anti-Catholic sense: all the children of mixed marriages were to be raised in the religion of the father.

Such legislation was unquestionably hostile to Catholic interests. It often happened, therefore, that Catholic priests blessed mixed marriages without first requiring the usual promise concerning the free exercise of religion for the Catholic party and the education of all offspring in the Catholic faith. The bishops were silent; both priests and bishops seemed to believe that they must endure what they could not prevent. Penalties were inflicted by the Government on all priests who refused to bless mixed marriages contracted without any of the above conditions. The Catholic conscience was quite in accordance with them. “Litteris altero abhino” of Pius VIII (1829–30), 25 March, 1830, forbidding priests to bless a mixed marriage if no promise were given relating to the education of the children in the Catholic faith. In case of such refusal Pius VIII agreed to tolerate a passive assistance (assistenta passiva) on the part of the priest. Realizing the harm done to the Catholic religion by the lax practice observed so far, Archbishop Von Dunin resolved to break with it. In January, 1837, he requested from the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs in Berlin permission to publish the Brief of Pius VIII. This, or at least his letter to the clergy on the same, was sent directly to Frederick William III, 26 Oct., 1837, was similarly treated. Determined not to betray his high office he sent an instruction to his priests, 30 Jan., 1838, in which he inculcated the principles of the Church relating to mixed marriages; soon after (27 Feb.) he suspended ipso facto any priest of his diocese who should henceforth bless a mixed marriage without previous assurance as to the Catholic education of the offspring. The king was notified of these acts, 10 March, 1838. While the instructions of the archbishop were well received throughout his diocese, the Government was highly indignant and sought by all means to render them ineffectual. They were declared null and void; the archbishop was asked to recall them, and finally (in July, 1838) a regular trial was commenced against him in the Court of Posen, to which, however, he was never brought, owing to the circumstances of the case. In the midst of this struggle he received much consolation from the unimpeachable support of his clergy, and from an Allocution in his favour by Gregory XVI, 13 Sept., 1838. At the conclusion of his trial in 1839 he was summoned to Berlin, where he arrived 5 April, and an attempt was made to have him recant; finally the sentence of the court proclaiming his deposition from office, inability ever to hold one, and a confinement of six months in a fortress, was read to him. He appealed directly to the king for clemency, but nothing was changed except that he was detained in Berlin instead of being sent to a fortress.

Meanwhile the archbishop began to think of the needs of his diocese, and being unable to obtain permission to return, he departed secretly from Berlin and arrived in Posen, 4 October. In less than two days, during the night of 5–6 Oct., he was arrested and taken to the fortress of Kolberg, where he remained until the death of Frederick William III (7 June, 1840). After his departure many measures were put in motion; the bells and the organs remained silent during the celebration of the Holy Mysteries; on all Sundays and feast days public prayers were said for the speedy return of the archbishop; and both the clergy and the nobility of Posen made several fruitless attempts to obtain his release. With the accession of the peaceful king, Frederick William IV (1840–61), matters changed. On 3 Aug., 1840, Von Dunin was set free, and on the 5th of the same month he arrived in Posen amid the rejoicing of his faithful flock. According to an agreement reached with the Government he issued a pastoral letter, 25 Aug., in which his previous instructions were somewhat modified, except in so far as, however, to Catholic principle. He recommended his clergy not to insist absolutely on the fulfillment of the usual conditions required for mixed marriages, but at the same time to abstain from all active participation in such marriages, if the usual promises were not given. No mention was made of any punishment in the case of contravention. Later on (21 Feb., and 26 Sept., 1842) he issued new instructions relating to the manner of dealing in confession with the husband or wife of a mixed marriage. The priests were directed to be indulgent towards those who tried their best to influence their children in favor of the Catholic faith, and to distinguish them from those who were altogether careless in the discharge of this sacred duty. With this the whole controversy ceased. Archbishop Von Dunin did not long survive these conflicts. His memory is held in respect for his unwavering loyalty to Catholic principles, and for his courage, frankness, and prudent moderation displayed in their defence.

Dunkeld, Diocese of (Dunkeldensis), in Scotland, constituted, as far back as the middle of the ninth century, the primatial see of the Columban Church by King Kenneth Mac Alpine, who rebuilt there the church and monastery founded by King Constantine (afterwards destroyed by the Danes), and translated thither St. Columba’s relics. The first occupant of the see is styled in the Annals of Ulster (A. D. 865) Bishop of Fortrenn, the name by which the kingdom of the Southern Picts was then known. He was also Abbot of Dunkeld, with jurisdiction, formerly enjoyed by Iona, over the other Columban monasteries in Scotland. The seat of the primacy was, however, subsequently transferred to Abernethy, and then to St. Andrews, and Dunkeld became subject to lay abbots, from one of whom, Crinan, sprang Malcolm III and his successors on the throne of Scotland. The see was united to the Diocese of Moray further north, erected Dunkeld into a cathedral church and replaced the Columban monks by a chapter of secular canons. The new bishopric included a great part of what afterwards became the Dioceses of Argyll and Dunblane, and retained its jurisdiction over various churches retaining old Columban foundations. The Abbeys of Iona remained, as heretofore, subject to the ancient prima-
tial See of Dunkeld, until Iona became the seat of the Bishop of the Isles at the end of the fifteenth century. About the same time Dunkeld (together with Dunblane, Galloway, and Argyll) became a suffragan of the newly-constituted Archibishopric of Glasgow; but during the pontificate of Archbishop Foreman of St. Andrews (1529-1532) it was restored to the metropolitan province. Thirty-five bishops occupied the See of Dunkeld from its foundation in 1107 until the extin-
tion of the ancient hierarchy in the sixteenth century. Of this line of prelates the most distinguished were James Kennedy (1438-1440), illustrious for his birth, learning, and piety, who was translated after two years at Dunkeld, to the Bishopric of St. Andrews; the famous post-precate Gavin Douglas (1516-1521), who died in exile in England; and John Hamilton (1515-1547), who succeeded the murdered Cardinal Beaton at St. Andrews, and closed his troubled career on the scaffold at Stirling in 1371. The last pre-
Reformation Bishop of Dunkeld was Robert Crichton (nephew of a former occupant of the see), who survived until 1586.

For close on three centuries, the Diocese of Dun-
kleed, like the other Scottish bishoprics, remained vac-
ant. The sixteenth century and the seven-teenth were restored in 1685 by Pope Friday XIII by his Bull, "Ex suprema apostolatus apice". The diocese, as then reconstituted, is one of the suffra-
gen sees of the archiepiscopal province of St. An-
drews, and includes the counties of Perth, Forfar, Clackmannan, Kinross, and the northern part of Fife. Superiority of the see, as exercised by three bishops: George Rigg (d. 1877); James G. Smith (transferred to St. Andrews in 1900); and the Right Rev. Angus Macfarlane, consecrated 1901. The bish-
op's pro-cathedral is in Dundee, the residence of the Diocesan Archdeacon, and the church of the see, St. Mary's, erected in a pro-
vost and eight canons. The total number of secular priests in the diocese (1908) is 35; regulars (Redemptorists), 12. The missions and chaplaincies number 17, the churches, chapels, and stations 31, and the parochial schools 15. There are two societies of men (Redemptorists and Marists), four convents of women (Sisters of Mercy, Little Sisters of the Poor, Ursulines, and Sisters of Charity), and the Catholic insti-
tutions comprise a home for aged poor, a house of mercy for servants, and a working girls' home. The Catholic population of the diocese is estimated to be rather more than 30,000. The old cathedral of Dun-
kleed, beautifully situated on the Tay amid wooded hills, was erected between 1220 and 1500. The build-
ing was much damaged in the reign of Robert II, and suffered later at the hands of the Earl of Buchan, styled the "Wolf of Badenoch". It fell partly into the ruins in the sixteenth century, since when the choir has been used for Presbyterian worship. The Duke of Atholl, the owners of the building, have spent a good deal on its preservation and repair, and an ex-
tensive restoration of the choir was carried out in 1908, chiefly at the cost of Sir Donald Currie. There is now no Catholic church or resident priest in the vil-
 league of Dunkeld.
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Duns Scotus, John, surmised Doctor Subtilis, d. 8 Nov., 1308; he was the founder and leader of the fa-
mous Scotish School, which had its chief representatives among the Franciscans. Of his antecedents and life very little is definitely known, as the contemporary sources are silent about him. It is certain that he died rather young, according to earlier traditions at the age of thirty-four years (cf. Wadding, Vita Scotii, in vol. I of his works); but it would seem that he was somewhat older than this and that he was born in 1270. The birth-place of Scotus has been the subject of much discussion, and so far no conclusive argument in favour of any locality has been advanced. The surname Scotus by no means decides the question, for the name was given to Scotchmen, natives of northern England. The other name, Duns, to which the Irish attach so much importance, settles nothing; there was a Duns also in Scotland (Ber-
wick). Moreover, it is impossible to determine whether Duns was a family name or the name of a place. Appeal to supposedly ancient local traditions in behalf of Ireland's claim is of no avail, since we can-
not ascertain just how old they are; and their age is the pivotal point. This discussion has been strongly tinged with na-
tional sentiment, especially since the beginning of the sixteenth century. Scotland produced as prominent Irish Franciscans like Mauritius de Portu (O'Fihely), Hugh Carvell, and Luke Wadding had rendered great service by editing Scotus's works. On the other hand, the English have some right to claim Scotus; as a professor for several years at Oxford, he belonged at any rate to the English province; and neither his writings nor his lifelong activity after his death was any other view as to his nationality proposed. It would not, however, be forgotten that in those days the Franciscan clerics in Scotland were affiliated to the English province, i.e. to the See of Canterbury. It would not there-
fore be amiss to regard Scotus as a native of Scotland or as a member of a Scottish cleric. In any case it is high time to eliminate from this discussion the famous entry in the Merton College MS. (no. 39) which would make it appear that Scotus was a member of that college. And therefore a native of Northern England. The statutes of the college excluded monks; and as Scotus became a Franciscan when he was quite young, he could not have belonged to the college previous to joining the order. Besides, the entry in the college register is under the date of 1455, and consequently too late to be estimated.

The case is somewhat better with the entry in the catalogue of the library of St. Francis at Assisi, under date of 1381, which designates Duns Scotus's commentary on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard as "magistri patris Johannis Scotii de Ordine Minorum, qui et Doctor Subtilis nuncupatur, de provincia Hibـicieus" (the work of master John Scotus of the Franciscan Order, known as the subtle doctor, from the province of Ireland). This, though it furnishes the strongest evidence in Ireland's favour, cannot be regarded as decisive. Since Scotus laboured during several years in England, he cannot, simply on the strength of this evidence, be assigned to the Irish province. The li-

permission only to eight; among those who were refused was “Ioannes Dous”. It is quite certain, too, that he went to Paris about 1301 and that there he was at first merely a Bachelor of Arts, for the general of the Franciscans, Gonsalvus de Vallevbuna, wrote (1301 or 1308) he was sent to present John Scotus at the university for the doctor's degree. The general's letter mentions that John Scotus had distinguished himself for some time past by his learning ingenique subtilissimo. He did not teach very long in Paris; in 1304 or 1308 he was sent to Cologne, probably as a professor at the university. There he died, and was buried in the monastic of the Minorites. At the present time (1908) the process of his beatification is being agitated in Rome on the ground of a cultus immemorabilis.

Duns Scotus's writings are very numerous and they have often been printed; some, in fact, at a very early date. But a complete edition, in 12 folio volumes, was published only in 1639 by Wadding at Lyons; this, however, included the commentaries of the Scotists, Lyttenus, Poncupo, Cavelli, and Hiquescus. A reprint of Wadding's edition, with the treatise “De perfectione statum” added to it, appeared 1891-93 at Paris (Vives) in 46 vols. 4to. Whether all the writings contained in these editions are by Duns Scotus himself is doubtful: it is certain, however, that many changes and additions were made by later Scotists. A critical edition is still wanting. Besides these printed works, some others are attributed to Scotus, especially commentaries on books of Scriptue. The printed writings deal with grammatical and scientific, but chiefly with philosophical and theological, subjects.

Of a purely philosophical nature are his commentaries and questiones on various works of Aristotle. These, with some other treatises, are contained in the first seven volumes of the Paris edition. The principal work of Scotus, however, is the so-called “Opus Oxoniense”, i.e. the great commentary on the “Sentences” of Peter Lombard, written in Oxford (vols. VIII.-XXI). It is primarily a theological work, but it contains many treatises, or at least digressions, on logical, metaphysical, grammatical, and scientific topics, so that nearly his whole system of philosophy can be derived from this work. Volumes XXII.-XXIV contain the “Reportata Parisiensia”, i.e. a smaller commentary, for the most part theological, on the “Sentences”. The “Queestiones Quodlibetales”, chiefly on theological subjects, one of his most important works, and the above-mentioned essay, “De perfectione statum” can be derived from this work. Volumes XXII.-XXIV contain the “Reportata Parisiensia”, i.e. a smaller commentary, for the most part theological, on the “Sentences”. The “Queestiones Quodlibetales”, chiefly on theological subjects, one of his most important works, and the above-mentioned essay, “De perfectione statum” can be derived from this work. Volumes 18 and 19 contain the “Reportata Parisiensia”. It is a remarkably comprehensive commentary, covering all the important topics in philosophy, and presenting Scotus's views on them in a clear and concise manner. The work is divided into two parts, the first dealing with metaphysics and the second with the doctrine of God. In the first part, Scotus discusses the nature of being, existence, causality, and the relationship between the mind and the body. In the second part, he deals with the attributes of God, the concept of eternity, and the problem of the existence of God. The work is extensively annotated, and contains many references to the works of other philosophers, such as Aristotle, Aquinas, and Ockham. It is a valuable source for understanding Scotus's thought and its influence on later generations of philosophers.
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tinctio formalis is intermediate between the distinctio rationis tantum, or the distinction made by the intellect alone, and the distinctio reais, or that which exists in reality. The former occurs, e.g., between the definition and the thing defined, the latter, within the realm of created reality, between things that can or cannot be separated separately by Divine omnipotence, as, e.g., between the different parts of a body or between substance and accident. A thing is "formally distinct" when it is such in essence and in concept that it can be thought of by itself, when it is not another thing, though with that other so closely united as to be inseparable, just because the accident is not identical with the substance. But it has no subsistence of its own, since it is not a thing existing by itself, but inheres in the substance as its subject and support; it is not an independent being. Moreover, only actually existing things can be in the form of God, Who is infinitely real and existent with existence. In the state of mere identity or possibility, before their realization, things have an essence, an ideal conceivable being, but not an actual one; else they could not be created or annihilated, since they would have had an existence before their creation and since being is in itself true and good, only those things are really good and true which actually exist. If God, therefore, by an act of His free will gives existence to the essences, He makes them by this very act also true and good. In this sense, it is quite correct to say that according to Scotus things are true and good because God so wills. By this assertion, however, he does not deny that things are good and true in themselves. They have an objective being, and hence also objective truth and goodness, because they are in the likeness of God, Who being good and true, can make being and truth that imitate. At the same time, in their ideal being they have no existence, and in their essence, too, they are only imitations. The ideas of them are not produced by the Divine free will, but by the Divine intellect, which, without the co-operation of God's will, recognizes His own infinite essence as imitable by finite things, and thus of necessity conceives the ideas. In this ideal state God necessarily wills the things, since they cannot but please to Him as images of His own essence. But from this it does not follow that He must will them with an effective will, i.e., that He must realize them. God is entirely free in determining what things shall come into existence.

God alone is absolutely immaterial, since He alone is absolute and perfect actuality, without any potentiality for becoming other than what He is. All creatures, angels and human souls included, are material, because they are changeable and may become the subject of death. But from this it does not follow that souls and angels are corporeal; on the contrary, they are spiritual, physically simple, though material in the sense just explained. Since all created things, corporeal and spiritual, are composed of potentiality and actuality, the same materia prima is the foundation of all things; and therefore all things have a corporeal and spiritual substratum, a common material basis. This materia, in itself quite indeterminate, may be determined to any sort of thing by a form—a spiritual form determines it to a spirit, a corporeal form to a material body. Scotus, however, does not teach an extreme Realism: he does not attribute to the universals or abstract essences, e.g., genus and species, an existence of their own, independent of the individual beings in which they are realized. It is true, he holds that materia prima, as the indeterminate principle, can be separated from the canons, or the determining principle, at least by Divine omnipotence, be said to separate the one from the other, just as in the Holy Eucharist He keeps the accidents of bread and wine in existence, without a substance in which they inhere. It is no less certain that Scotus teaches a plurality of forms in the same thing. The human body, e.g., taken by itself, without the soul, has its own form, the forma corporis. It is transmitted to the child by its parents and is different from the rational soul, which is infused by God himself. The forma corporis gives the body a sort of human form, though quite imperfect, and remains after the rational soul has departed from the body in death until decomposition takes place. Nevertheless, it is the rational soul which is the essential form of the body or of man; this constitutes with the body one being, one substance, one person, one man. With all its faculties, vegetative, sensitive, and intellectual, it is the immediate substance, whether in the body in existence, only one soul in man, but we can distinguish in it several forms; for conceptually the intellectual is not the same as the sensitive, nor is this identical with the vegetative, nor the vegetative with that which gives the body, as such, its form; yet all these belong for- mally to the same essence, to the same essence, to the essence of man, the visible soul. Scotus also maintains a formal distinction between the universal nature of each thing and its individuality, e.g., in Plato between his human nature and that which makes him just Plato—his Platonicity. For the one is not the other; the individuality is added to the human nature and it constitutes the human individual. In this sense the property or difference, or the accidens, is the principium individualitatis. Hence it is clear that there are many points of resemblance between matter and form on the one hand and universal natures and their individualizations on the other. But Scotus goes far from taking extreme Realism. According to his view, matter can exist without form, but not the universal essence without individuation; nor can the different forms of the same thing exist by themselves. He does not maintain that the uniform matter underlying all created things is the absolute being which exists by itself, independent of the individuals, and is then determined by added forms, first to genera, then to species, and lastly to individuals. On the contrary, materia prima, which according to him can exist without a form, is already something individual and numerically determined. In reality there is no materia without form, and vice versa. The materia which God created had already a certain form, the imperfect form of chaos. God could create matter by itself and form by itself, but both would then be something individual, numerically different, though not specifically, different from the matter and other forms of the same kind. This matter, numerically different from other matter, could then be united with a form, also numerically different from other forms of the same kind; and the result would be a compound individual, numerically different from other individuals of the same kind. The individualized matter and compound we get by abstraction the idea of a universal matter, a universal form, a universal compound, e.g., of a universal man. But by themselves universal matter and universal form cannot exist. The universal as such is
a mere conception of the mind; it cannot exist by itself, it receives its existence in and with the individual; in and with the individual it is multiplied, in and with the individual it loses again its existence. Even God cannot separate in man the universal nature from the individual, or the human soul the intellect, or the sensitive part, without destroying the whole. In reality there are only individuals, in which, however, we can by abstraction formally separate both the abstract human nature from the individuality and the several faculties from one another. But the separations and distinction and formation of genera and species are mere processes of thought, the work of the contemplating mind.

The psychology of Scotus is in its essentials the same as that of St. Thomas. The starting-point of all knowledge is the sensory or outer experience, to which must be added the inner experience, which he designates as the ultimate criterion of certitude. He lays stress on induction as the basis of all natural sciences. He denies that sense-perception, and a fortiori intellectual knowledge, is merely a passive process; moreover, he asserts that not only the universal but also the individual is perceived directly. The adequate or intellectual knowledge is not the species in the material, but being in its universality. In the whole realm of the soul the will has the primacy since it can determine itself, while it controls more or less completely the other faculties. The freedom of the will, taken as freedom of choice, is emphasized and viewed from St. Thomas's point of view. In the contemplation of God, the will is not necessitated, but determines itself freely. This doctrine does not imply that the will can decide what is true and what is false, what is right and what is wrong, nor that its choice is blind and arbitrary. Objects, motives, habits, passions, can exert a great influence, and incline it to choose one thing rather than another. Yet the final decision remains with the will, and in so far the will is the one complete cause of its act, else it would not be free. With regard to memory, sensation, and association we find in Scotus many modern views.

System of Theology.—It has been asserted that according to Scotus the essence of God consists in His will; but the assertion is unfounded. God, He holds, is the ens infiniatum. It is true that according to him God is infinite in Himself and as the infinite God by Father and Son are not based upon a natural instinct, so to say, but upon God's own free choice. Every will is free, and therefore God's will also. But His will is so perfect and His essence so infinitely good, that His free will cannot but love it. This love, therefore, is at once free and necessary. Also with regard to created things Scotus emphasizes the freedom of God, without however, falling into the error of merely arbitrary, unmotivated indeterminism. It has been asserted, too, that according to Scotus, being can be attributed univocally to God and creatures; but this again is false. Scotus maintains that God is the evil per essentiam, creatures are entia per participationem— they have being only in an analogical sense. But from the being of God and the being of creatures, a universal idea of being can be abstracted and predicated univocally of both the finite and the infinite; otherwise we could not infer from the existence of finite things the existence of God, we should have no proof of God's existence, as every syllogism would contain a quaternio terminorum. Between God's essence and His attributes, between the attributes themselves, and then between God's essence and the Divine Person, there is a formal distinction along with real identity. For conceptually Divinity is not the same as wisdom, intellect not the same as will; Divinity is not identical with paternity, since Divinity neither begets, as does the Father, nor is begotten, as is the Son. But all these realities are formally in God and their distinction is not annulled by His infinity; on the other hand it remains true that God is only one. The process constituting the Blessed Trinity takes place without regard to the external world. Only after its completion the three Divine Persons, as one principle, produce by their act an infinite species. But quite apart from this process, God is independent of the world in His knowledge and volition, for the obvious reason that dependence of any sort would imply imperfection.

The cognition, volition, and activity of the angels is more akin to ours. The angels can of themselves do all things; they do not need any external grace, though in fact they receive such from God. The devil is not necessarily compelled, as a result of his sin, always to will what is evil; with his splendid natural endowments he can do what in itself is good; he can even love God above all things, though in fact he does not do so. Sin is only in so far an infinite offence of God as it leads away from Him; in itself its malice is no greater than is the goodness of the opposite virtue.

In his Christology, Scotus insists strongly on the reality of Christ's Humanity. Though it has no personality and no subsistence of its own, it has its own existence. The union of human and divine natures is not the same as the human individual, but is the ens idiomatum are explained in accordance with the doctrine of the Church, with no leaning to either Nestorianism or Adoptionism. It is true that Scotus explains the influence of the hypostatic union upon the human nature of Christ and upon His work differently from St. Thomas, in that in Scotus's view the human nature of Christ, it does not of itself impart to the Humanity the beatific vision or impeccability. These prerogatives were given to Christ with the fullness of grace which He received in consequence of that union. God would have become man even if Adam had not sinned, since He willed to manifest His humanity and the world should be united with Himself by the closest possible bond. Scotus also defends energetically the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. All objections founded on original sin and the universal need of redemption are solved. The merits of Christ are infinite only in a broader sense, but of themselves they are entirely sufficient to give adequate satisfaction to the Divine justice; there is no deficiency to be supplied by God's mercy. But there is needed a merciful acceptance of the work of Christ. He himself states that Christ by the operation of the Holy Ghost has been given to be an example of this humanity and the world should be united with Himself by the closest possible bond. The sacraments give grace of themselves, or ex opere operato, if man places no obstacle in the way. The essence of the Sacrament of Penance consists in the absolute remission; but this is of no avail unless the sinner repent with a sorrow which springs from love of God; his doctrine of attrition is by no means lax. As to his eschatology it must suffice to state that he makes the essence of beatitude consist in activity, i.e., in the love of God, not in the beatific vision; this latter is only the necessary condition.

In ethics Scotus declares emphatically that the morality of an act requires an object which is good in its nature, its end, and its circumstances, and according to the dictate of right reason. It is not true that God's free will decide arbitrarily what is good and what is bad; he only asserts that the Commandments of the second table of the Decalogue are not in such strict sense laws of nature as those of the first table; because God cannot grant a dispensation from the laws of the first, whereas He can dispense from those of the second, as in fact He did when He com-
manded Abraham to sacrifice his son. But the precepts of the second table also are far more binding than the other positive laws of God. In the present order of things God cannot permit manslaughter universally, taking the property of others, and the like. They regard objects, but under no circumstance the individual. Absolutely speaking, man should direct all his actions towards God; but God does not require this, because He does not wish to burden man with so heavy a yoke. He obliges man only to observe the Decalogue; the rest is free. Social and legal questions are not treated by Scotus as indifferent acts of the individual; he, however, contains sound observations on these subjects.

**Relation between Philosophy and Theology.**

—Scotus does not, as is often asserted, maintain that science and faith can contradict each other, or that a proposition may be true in philosophy and false in theology and vice versa. Incorrect, also, is the statement that he attaches little importance to showing the harmony between scientific knowledge and faith and that he has no regard for speculative theology. Quite the contrary, he proves the dogmas of faith not only from authority but, as far as possible, from reason, by the same means he uses for the demonstration of philosophical propositions. Facts which have God for their author and yet can be known by our natural powers, especially miracles and prophecies, are criteria of the truth of Revelation, religion, and the Church. Scotus strives to gain as thorough an insight as possible into the true nature of God, to disclose the truth to establish truth upon truth, and from dogma to prove or to reject many a philosophical proposition. There is just as little warrant for the statement that his chief concern is humile subjection to the authority of God and of the Church, or that his tendency a priori is to deposit scientific knowledge and to reduce speculative theology into doubt. Scotus simply believes that many philosophical and theological propositions can be proved which other Scholastics consider incapable of demonstration. He indeed lays great stress on the authority of Scripture, the Fathers, and the Church; but he also attaches much importance to natural knowledge and the intellectual capacity of the mind of angels and of men, both in this world and in the other. He is inclined to widen the range of attainable knowledge. He sets great value upon mathematics and the natural sciences and especially upon metaphysics. He rejects every unnecessary recourse to Divine or angelic intervention or to miracles, and demands that the supernatural and miraculous be limited as far as possible even in matters of faith. Dogmas he holds to be explained in a somewhat softened and more easily intelligible sense, so far as this may be done without diminution of their substantial meaning, dignity, and depth. In Scripture the literal sense is to be taken, and freedom of opinion is to be granted so far as it is not opposed to Christian Faith or the authority of the Church. Scotus was much given to the study of mathematics, and for this reason he insists on demonstrative proofs in philosophy and theology; but he is no real sceptic. He understands by our sense, internal and external, and by the authority together with reason, can furnish us with absolute certainty and evidence. The difficulty which many truths present lies not so much in ourselves as in the objects. In itself everything knowable is the object of our knowledge. Reason can never recognize the existence of God and many of His attributes, the creation of the world out of nothing, the conservation of the world by God, the spirituality, individuality, substantiality, and unity of the soul, as well as its free will. In many of his writings he asserts that mere reason can come to know the immortality and the creation of the soul; in others he asserts the direct opposite; but he never denies the so-called moral evidence for these truths.

Theology with him is not a scientific study in the strictest sense of the word, as are mathematics and metaphysics, because it is not based on the evidence of science but on authority. It is a practical science because it pursues its practical end: the possession of God. But it gives the mind perfect certainty and unchangeable truths; it does not consist in mere practical, moral, and religious activity. Thus Scotus is removed from Kant and the modern sceptics, not by a single line of thought, but by the whole range of his philosophical speculation. Scotus is no precursor of Luther; he emphasizes ecclesiastical tradition and authority, the freedom of the will, the power of our reason, and the co-operation of grace. Nor is he a precursor of Kant. The doctrine of primary of the will and the practical character of theology has quite a different meaning in his mind from what it has in Kant’s. He valores metaphysics highly and calls it the queen of sciences. Only as a very subtle critic may he be called the “Kant of the thirteenth century.” Nor is he a precursor of the Modernists. His writings contain many entirely modern ideas, e.g. the stress he lays on free will in scientific and also in religious matters, upon the separateness of the objective world and of thought, the self-activity of the thinking subject, the dignity and value of personality; yet in all this he remains within proper bounds, to the Modernists, and to the humanists, it asserts very forcibly the necessity of an absolute authority in the Church, the necessity of faith, the freedom of the will; and he rejects absolutely any and every monistic identification of the world and God. That he has so often been misunderstood is due simply to the fact that his teaching has been viewed from the standpoint of modern thought.

Scotus is a genuine Scholastic philosopher who works out ideas taken from Aristotle, St. Augustine, and the preceding Scholastics. He is universally recognized as a deep thinker, an original mind, and a sharp critic; a thoroughly scientific man, who without personal bias proceeds objectively, stating his own doctrines with modesty and with a certain reserve. It has been asserted that he did more harm than good to the Church, and that by his destructive criticism, his subtleties, and his barbarous terminology he prejudiced rather than helped the natural science. He inculcated the truth that the study of dogmas, the study of literal sense, and a thorough knowledge of the unchangeable truths of the faith of the Church and the authority of the Church, are necessary in order to understand the dogmas. These accusations originated to a great extent in the insufficient understanding or the false interpretation of his doctrines. No doubt his diction lacks elegance; it is often obscure and unintelligible; but the same must be said of many earlier Scholastics. Then too, subtle discussions and distinctions which to this age are meaningless, abound in his works; yet his researches were occasioned for the most part by the remarks of other Scholastic philosophers, especially by Henry of Ghent, whom he attacks perhaps even more than he does St. Thomas. But the real spirit of scholasticism is perhaps in no other Scholastic so pronounced as in Scotus. In depth of thought, in which after all is the important thing, Scotus is not surpassed by any of his contemporaries. He was a child of his time; a thorough Aristotelian, even more so than St. Thomas; but he criticizes sharply even the Scholastics and his commentators. He tries always to explain them favourably, but does not hesitate to differ from them. Duns Scotus’s teaching is orthodox. Catholics and Protestants have charged him with sundry errors and heresies, but the Church has not condemned a single proposition of his; on the contrary, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which he so strongly advocated, has been declared a dogma.

**Muller, Biographisches über D. Scotus (Cologne, 1881).**

**Programm. Little, The Great Fracis in Oxford (Oxford, 1892).**

**Squirl, Renan. Hist. litt. de la France (1869), XXV, 404-**
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DUNSTAN, SAIN T, archbishop and confessor, one of the greatest saints of the Anglo-Saxon church; b. near Glastonbury on the estate of his father, Heorstan, a West-Saxon noble. His mother, Cyneethryth, a woman of saintly life, was miraculously forewarned of the sanctity of the child within her. She was in the church of St. Mary on Candlemas Day, when all the lights were suddenly extinguished. Then the candle held by Cyneethryth was so suddenly relit and all present lit their candles at this miraculous flame, thus foreshadowing that the boy "would be the minister of eternal light" to the Church of England. In what year St. Dunstan was born has been much disputed. Osbern, a writer of the late eleventh century, fixes it at "the first year of the reign of King Aethelstan", i.e. 924-5. This date, however, cannot be reconciled with other known dates of St. Dunstan's life and involves many obvious absurdities. It was rejected, passages by Milhius of Lindern; but on the strength of "two manuscripts of the Chronicle" and an entry in an ancient Anglo-Saxon paschal table, Dr. Stubbs argued in its favour, and his conclusions have been very generally accepted. Careful examination, however, of this new evidence reveals all three passages as interpolations of about the period, when Osbern was writing, and there seem to be very good reasons for accepting the opinion of Milhius that the saint was born long before 925. Probably his birth dates from about the earliest years of the tenth century.

In early youth Dunstan was brought by his father and committed to the care of the Irish scholars, who then frequented the desolate sanctuary of Glastonbury. We are told of his childish fervour, of his vision of the great abbey restored to splendour, of his nearly fatal illness and miraculous recovery, of the enthusiasm with which he absorbed every kind of human knowledge, and of his manual skill. Indeed, throughout his life he was noted for his devotion to learning and for his mastery of many kinds of artistic craftsmanship. With his parents' consent he was tonsured, received minor orders, and served in the ancient church of St. Mary. So well known did he become for devotion and learning that he is said to have been summoned by his uncle Athelm, Archbishop of Canterbury, to enter his service. By one of St. Dunstan's earliest biographers we are informed that the young scholar was introduced by his uncle to King Aethelstan, but there must be some mistake here, for Athelm probably died about 923, and Aethelstan did not come to the throne till the following year. Perhaps there is confusion between Athelm and his successor Wulfhelm. At any rate the young man soon became so great a favourite with the king as to excite the jealousy of his kinsfolk at court. They accused him of studying heathen literature and magic, and so wrought on the king that St. Dunstan was ordered to leave the court. As he quitted the palace his enemies attacked him, beat him severely, bound him, and threw him into a filthy pit (probably a cesspool), treading him down in the mire. He managed to crawl out and make his way to the house of a friend, whence he journeyed to Winchester and entered the service of Bishop Aethelhah the Bald, who was his relative. The bishop endeavoured to persuade him to become a monk, but St. Dunstan was at first unwilling, whether he had a vocation to a celibate life. But an attack of swelling tumours all over his body, so severe that he thought it was leprosy, which was perhaps some form of blood-poisoning caused by the treatment to which he had been subjected, changed his mind. He made his profession at the hands of St. Aethelhah, and returned to live the life of a hermit at Glastonbury. Against the old church of St. Mary he built a little cell only five feet long and two and a half feet deep, where he studied and worked at his handicrafts and played on his harp. Here the devil is said (in a late eleventh-century legend) to have tempted him, and to have been seized by the face with the saint's tongs.

While Dunstan was living thus at Glastonbury he became the trusted adviser of the Lady Aethelfræd, King Aethelstan's niece, and at her death found himself in control of all her great wealth, which he used in...
later life to foster and encourage the monastic revival. About the same time his father Heorstan died, and St. Dunstan inherited his possessions also. He was now become a person of much influence, and on the death of King Aethelstan in 940, the new king, Eadmund, summoned him to his court at East Anglia, to which period he is said to have returned from Fontevraud Abbey. Again the royal favour roused against him the jealousy of the courtiers, and they contrived so to intrigue the king against him that he fled him deprrt from the court. There were then at Cheddar certain envons from the “Eastern Kingdome”, by which term many meaneth either East Anglia or the south-west of England. To these St. Dunstan applied, imploring them to take him with them when they returned. They agreed to do so, but in the event their assistance was not needed.

For, a few days later, the king rode out to hunt the stag in Mendip Forest. He became separated from his attendants and followed a stag at great speed in the direction of the Cheddar cliffs. The stag rushed blindly over the precipice and was followed by the hounds. Eadmund endeavoured vainly to stop his horse; then, seeing death to be imminent, he remembered his harsh treatment of St. Dunstan, and his heart was changed at that moment; his horse was stopped on the very edge of the cliff. Giving thanks to God, he returned forthwith to his palace, called for St. Dunstan and bade him follow, then rode straight to Glastonbury. Entering the church, the king first blessed the altar, then, taking St. Dunstan by the hand, he gave him the kiss of peace, led him to the abbot’s throne and, seating him thereon, promised him all assistance in restoring Divine worship and regular observance.

So Dunstan at once set vigorously to work at these tasks. He had to re-create monastic life and to rebuild the abbey. That it was Benedictine monasticism which he established at Glastonbury seems certain. It is true that he had not yet had personal experience of the stricter Benedictinism which had been revived on the Continent, such as Cluny and Fécamp. Probably, also, much of the Benedictine tradition introduced by St. Augustine had been lost in the pagan devastations of the ninth century. But that the Rule of St. Benedict was the basis of his restoration is not only definitely stated by his biographers, but the saint himself, in his Stiftsgeschichte, enunciated its observance with the nature of his first measures as abbot, with the significance of his first buildings, and with the Benedictine prepossessions and enthusiasm of his monastic character. And the presence of secular clerks as well as of monks at Glastonbury seems to be no solid argument against the monastic character of the revival. St. Dunstan’s first care was to erect the church of St. Peter, rebuild the cloister, and re-establish the monastic enclosure. The secular affairs of the house were committed to his brother Wulfwine, “so that neither himself nor any of the professed monks might break enclosure”. A school for the local youth was founded and soon became the most famous of its time in England. But St. Dunstan was not long left in peace. Within two years after the appointment King Eadmund was assassinated (946). His successor, his brother Eadwig, appointed Abbot of Glastonbury guardian of the royal treasure and records, and entrusted much of the government of the realm to his hands. The policy of Dunstan was supported by the queen-mother, Eadgifu, by the pri-mate, Oda, and by the East Anglian party, at whose head was the great thane, Aelfwine. Aethelstan, the white king”.

It was a policy of unification, of conciliation of the Danish half of the nation, of firm establishment of the royal authority. In ecclesiastical matters it favoured the spread of regular observance, the rebuilding of churches, the moral reform of the secular clergy and laity, the extirpation of heathendom.
That same evening he was offered the hospitality of a neighbouring abbot.

On his return from Rome Dunstan at once regained his position as virtual ruler of the kingdom. By his advice Aelfstan was appointed to the Bishopric of Lindsey; and by this appointment that of Worcester. St. Aethelwold, the Abbot of Abingdon, was appointed to the See of Winchester. With their aid and with the ready support of King Eadgar, St. Dunstan pushed forward his reforms in Church and State. Throughout the realm there was good order maintained, and the respect for law and order grew. In the north, a navy guarded the shores from Danish pirates. There was peace in the kingdom such as had not been known within memory of living man. Monasteries were built; in some of the great cathedrals monks took the place of the secular canons; in the rest the canons were obliged to live according to rule. The parish priests were compelled to live chastely and to fit themselves for their office; they were urged to teach their parishioners not only the truths of the Catholic Faith, but also such handicrafts as would improve their position. So for sixteen years the land prospered.

In 975 the seal was put on St. Dunstan's stateShip by the solemn coronation of King Eadgar at Bath by the two Archbishops of Canterbury and York. It is said that for seven years the king had been forbidden to wear his crown, in penance for violating a virgin living in the care of the nunneries of Wilton. That some severe penance had been laid on him for this act at St. Dunstan's command, but it is said that in 961 and Eadgar wore no crown till the great day at Bath in 973. Two years after his crowning Eadgar died, and was succeeded by his eldest son Eadward. His accession was disputed by his stepmother, Aelfthryth, who wished her own son Aethelred to reign. But, by the consent of St. Dunstan, Eadward was chosen and crowned at Winchester. But the death of Eadgar had given courage to the re-actionary party. At once there arose a determined attack upon the monks, the protagonists of reform.

Throughout Mercia they were persecuted and deprived of their possessions by Aelfthryth, the ealdorman. Their cause, however, was supported by Aethelwine, the ealdorman of East Anglia, and the realm was in serious danger of civil war. Three meetings of the Witan were held to settle these disputes, at Kyrtington, at Calne, and at Amesbury. At the second place the bill (solarium) was rejected. The third sitting gave way, and all except St. Dunstan, who eluded to a beam, fell into the room below, not a few being killed. In March, 978, King Eadward was assassinated at Corfe Castle, possibly at the instigation of his stepmother, and Aethelred the Redless became king.

His coronation on Low Sunday, 978, was the last action of state in which St. Dunstan took part. When the young king took the usual oath to govern well, the priate addressed him in solemn warning, rebuking the bloody act whereby he became king, and predicting the misfortunes that would surely fall on the realm. But Dunstan's influence at court was ended. He retired to Canterbury, where he spent the remainder of his life. Thrice only did he emerge from this retreat: once in 980 when he joined Aelfthryth of Mercia in the solemn translation of the relics of St. Dunstan from the inanimate grave at Wareham to a splendid tomb at Shaftesbury Abbey; again in 984 when, in obedience to a vision of St. Andrew, he persuaded Aethelred to appoint St. Aelfheah to Winchester in succession to St. Aethelwold; once more in 998, when he induced the king, by a promise of 100,000 marks of silver, to desist from his persecution of the See of Rochester.

St. Dunstan's life at Canterbury is characteristic; long hours, both day and night, were spent in private prayer, besides his regular attendance at Mass and the Office. Often he would visit the shrines of St. Augustine and St. Ethelbert, and we are told of a vision of angels who sang to him heavenly canticles. He worked ever for the spiritual and temporal improvement of his people, building and restoring churches, establishing schools, judging suits, defending the poor and the orphan, and ever speaking in protest for purity. He practised, also, his handicrafts, making bells and organs and correcting the books in the cathedral library. He encouraged and protected scholars of all lands who came to England, and was unwearied as a teacher of the boys in the cathedral school. There is a sentence written by his friend, that shows us the old man sitting among the lads, whom he treated so gently, and telling them stories of his early days and of his forebears. And long after his death we are told of children who prayed to him for protection against harsher teachers, and whose prayers were answered. On the vigil of Ascension Day, 988, he was warned by a vision of angels that he had but three days to live. On the feast itself he pontificated at Mass and preached three times to the people: once at the Gospel, a second time at the benediction (then given after the Pater Noster), and a third time after the Angelus. On the next day he announced his impending death and bade them farewell. That afternoon he chose the spot for his tomb, then took to his bed. His strength failed rapidly, and on Saturday morning (19 May), after the hymn at Matins, he caused the clergy to assemble. Mass was celebrated in his presence, then he received the Extreme Unction and the Holy Viaticum, and expired as he uttered the words of thanksgiving: "He hath made a remembrance of his wonderful works, being a merciful and gracious Lord: He hath given food to them that fear Him." They buried him in his cathedral; and when that was done the walls of the church were translated with great honour by Lanfranc on a tomb on the south side of the high altar in the new church. The monks of Glastonbury used to claim that during the sack of Canterbury by the Danes in 1012, the saint's body had been carried for safety to their abbey; but this claim was disproved by Archbishop Warham, by whom the tomb at Canterbury was opened in 1508 and the holy relics found. At the Synod of Winchester in 1029, St. Dunstan's feast was ordered to be kept solemnly throughout England on 19 May. Until his fame was overshadowed by that of St. Thomas à Becket, he was the favourite saint of the English people. His shrine was destroyed at the Reformation. Throughout the Middle Ages he was the patron of the goldsmiths' guild. He is most often represented holding a pair of smith's tongs; sometimes, in reference to his visions, he is shown with a dove hovering near him, or with a troop of angels before him.

worth Paulyer (London, 1908); Toko, Notes on the Accepted
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Bishop’s The Rosary. Payot, Wilkins, Concilia & Conques 
Britannicæ (London, 1837); Kemblè, Codex diplomaticus &vii Saxonicæ (London, 1839-40); Liebmann, Unerzogene anglo-
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Dupanloup, Félix-Antoine-Philibert, Bishop of Orléans, France, b. at Saint-Félix, Savoie, 2 June, 1802; d. at Lacombe, Isère, 11 October, 1878. His mother, Anne Decharme, to whom he was devotedly devoted, gave him his early education. The better to screen his future from the disgrace of his illegitimate birth, she took him when only seven years old to Paris where, by dint of work and privations, she succeeded in keeping him for some time at the Collège Sainte-Barbe. After various attempts in other direc-
tions, Félix chose the ecclesiastical career, studying grammar at the Petite Communauté, humanities at the preparatory seminary of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet, philosophy at Issy, and theology at Saint-Sulpice. Or-
dained priest 18 Dec., 1825, he went as curate to the Madeleine where he founded the famous Catholiche de 
du N.-S. of Paris and the Académie de St-Hyacinthe, 
the nun being entrusted with the religious education of 
the Duc de Bordeaux and of the Prince of Orlé-
s. The novelty and success of his catechizing methods drew upon him the ill will of his pastor. Transferred to Saint-Roch (1834), he soon won a reputa-
tion as superior of the preparatory seminary of Saint-Nicolas (1837-45), as he completely transformed the institution that admission into it was eagerly sought by members of the 
best families of France. “During those few years,” 
says Pauline, herself a pupil of Saint-Nicolas (Souve-
nement de France) “the old house of the rue 
St-Victor became the school in France which sheltered 
the greatest number of historical or well-known names.” At Saint-Nicolas Dupanloup was truly the 
ideal educator later described in his famous book: “La 
honneur de la France...” Wherever as a priest he was 
in his professional work, he did not completely give up the 
direction of souls. Through one of his penitents, 
Pauline de Périgord, he brought about the conversion of 
Talleyrand (1838). A course in sacred eloquence 
which he had brilliantly inaugurated at the Sorbonne 
was continued after the enthral lecturer, over the 
excitement occasioned by the lecturer’s severe 
criticism of Voltairre and Villemain’s unwillingness to 
conform. In 1844, in connexion with the Ville-
main educational bill, which was scarcely more satisfac-
tory to the Catholics than its numerous predecessors, 
Dupanloup advocated a bill of Montalembert and 
Ravignan that long struggle for liberty of education which resulted in the loi 
Dufallus. It was at his 
suggestion that Ravignan wrote “De l’existence et de l’institut des Jésuites,” in order to put down the still 
average bughbear of the hommes noirs called up by Bére-
gus. How actively supported in the 
formation of the Committee for the Defence of Relig-
ious Liberty, and when later Thiers spoke in favour of 
average unacceptable educational bill, Dupanloup 
write-in reply “Des associations religieuses,” a pamph-
let which became later the book “De la pacification reli-
(gious). A difference of views with Archibishop 
Ffrench, in connexion with the above-mentioned pom-
ptoms and the direction of Saint-Nicolas, ended in 
Dupanloup’s transfer from the seminary to a canonicate 
at Notre-Dame, 1845.

The four years of his canonicate were by no means years of leisure. In spite of his increasing activity in 
confessional and pulpit, he found time for public inter-
est. The elections of 1846 sent to the French Parlia-
ment some 150 deputies friendly to liberty of educa-
tion, and for these Dupanloup wrote “L’état de la 
question”, a moderate but clear assertion of Catholic 
claims. As the Salvandy project of 1847 fell short of 
these claims, he again published a series of pamphlets, 
“Du nouveau projet de loi”, “Des petits-séminaires,” 
among others; and the better to control public opinion 
he undertook the work of a Catholic daily paper, 
finally purchasing “L’ami de la religion”. In 1848 
when Falloux, yielding to Dupanloup’s persuasion, 
accepted a portfolio under President Louis Napoleon, he 
appointed a commissioner to draft an educational bill, 
and made Dupanloup a member. Dupanloup’s cour-
tesy and undeniable competence of over to the Cath-
olic view such men as Thiers and Cousin, thus insur-
ing the enactment of 1850. “He made me minister 
to my will”, said Falloux speaking of Dupanloup; “I have made him bishop against his will.” Ap-
pointed to the See of Orleans, he took possession of it 
Dec., 1849, and during the twenty-eight years of 
his episcopate showed incredible activity. His ad-
ministration min-
utely described by 
Cochard, touched on 
very vital interest of the 
diocese: the holding of synods, parish visitations, organ-
ization of cérémones and petits-
sermon plenaries along 
the lines adopted in 
Paris, development of charitable 
works, encouragement of ecclesiasti-
cal studies among priests, completion 
of the cathedral of Ste-Croix, in-
troduction of the Roman Liturgy, etc. Still his en-
ergy was not ex-
hausted. Wherever the interests of religion were at 
stake, he gave them vigorous support. In the question 
of the classics he stood for the broader view and entered 
upon a lively discussion with Louis Veullot. Profiting 
by his membership in the French Academy, to 
which he was elected May, 1834, Dupanloup pre-
vented the award of the prix Bodin to Taine’s “History of 
English Literature” and opposed the admission of Littré 
into that body. The reorganization of “Le Cor-
respondant”, with Falloux, Poisset, Cochin, and de 
Broglie at its head, was also largely his work. The 
Pucelle d’Orléans (Jeanne d’Arc) found in him an ar-
dent champion; twice he pronounced her panegyric at 
Orléans, and it was he who introduced in Rome the 
cause of her beatification and raised the first funds 
towards a new monument in her honour.

Dupanloup was always held in high esteem by 
the French people. In 1862, on the occasion of one of the 
periodical Irish famines, he preached a charity sermon 
in the Church of St-Roch at Paris, which netted the 
sum of thirty thousand francs. The grateful Irish 
returned this with interest during the Franco-Prussian 
war when they remitted to the eloquent Bishop of Orlé-
s the sum of two hundred thousand francs in res-
ponse to his appeal for the needs of France. On the 
occaion of the centenary (1875) of Daniel O’Connell, 
whom he had always admired and often praised pub-
licly, Dupanloup was formally invited by the centen-
ary authorities to take part in the celebration. Though 
too ill at the time to accept the honourable in-
vitation, he wrote in reply two letters, memorable for 
their eloquence, to the Lord-Mayor of Dublin and to 
Cardinal McCabe, and which were printed in “Le 
Monde” 9 and 10 Aug., 1875 (Lagrange, Vie de Du-

During these years, however, were directed towards the defence of the Holy See, menaced in its independence by the ambition of the Emperor of Savoy and the ill-disguised connivance of Napoleon III. Salomon says (Mgr Dupanloup, p. 58): "For eight years, he did not lay down his arms. From Villafraanca to Mentana, he never took off his breast-plate." During this phase of his life, besides endeavouring to enlist pontifical zouaves and to increase the Pope's prestige, he wrote the "Protestation" against the impending spoliation of the pope; the "Lettre à un catholic" in the brochure "Le pape et le congrès;" "La souveraineté pontificale," in which he cited a declaration made by Cousin in favour of the temporal power of the pope; two other pamphlets, one against the Convention of 15 Sept., 1864, and the other in defence of the Enechial of 8 Dec. and of the Syllabus; several letters to Ratari, Minghetti, etc. The Vatican Council and the Franco-Prussian War exhibit Dupanloup in two different lights. At the council he was the leader of that minority which for political reasons stood, if not against the papal infallibility itself, at least against the opportuneness of its definition. The papal Bull of indiction, in which no mention was made of infallibility, he welcomed with joy and triumph. Addressed to his flock, this dignified pastoral letter; but when the Catholic sentiment, voiced by such organs as the "Civiltà Cattolica" and the "Univers," began to petition for the definition, he appended to his pastoral letter certain observations which, by making known in advance the position he intended to take, involved him in a controversy with Louis Veuillot. Once in Rome he never swerved from his position but used all the resources of his fiery nature to win others over to its views. It was he who, on the eve of the final vote, advised the minority to vote neither place nor non-place, but to abstain and withdraw. That he appealed to the secular arm and threatened the council with diplomatic intervention has been both asserted and denied. This much is vouched for by Ollivier, then minister of Napoleon III: "No bishop of the minority, Dupanloup or other, ever demanded the evacuation of the pontifical territory: Le Correspondant (Paris, 1892), LAGRANGE, Vie de Mgr Dupanloup (Paris, 1883; 4th ed., 1894); SALOMON, Mgr Dupanloup, Hommages de l'Eglise au XIXe siécle (Paris, 1867); VI. COCHARD, Dupanloup in L'Economie franqaise (1865-1905) (Paris, 1911); M. M. DE MAURIER, Revue de Littérature (Paris, 1892); JULIET, L'Eglise de France sous le troisième république (Paris, 1897); GRIMAUD, Liberté d'enseignement en France (Paris, 1907); V. DUFOUR, "Mgr Dupanloup, le vitre du Vatican" (Paris, 1879). See also É. VEUILLOIS, Louis Veuillot (Paris, 1901); LEGRAND, Vie de M. Memard (Paris, 1895-1901); FONTENERY, Vie du R. P. Xavier de Ravanign (Paris, 1860); LEDON, Vie du R. P. Lacroix (Paris, 1902)."
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Duperron, Jacques-Davy, theologian and diplomat, b. 25 Nov., 1556, at St-Lô (Normandy), France; d. 5 Sept., 1618, at Batignolles, a suburb of Paris. His parents were Calvinists and on account of persecution sought refuge in Switzerland soon after his birth. Having received a thorough literary, scientific, and philosophical education, he applied himself to the study of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, especially St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, and in 1577 or 1578 was converted to the Catholic faith. He enjoyed the favour and confidence of King Henry III, to whom he had been presented in 1576, and later that of Henry IV. The latter's conversion was to a great extent due to Duperron's instructions and influence, and his abdication from heresy was obtained from the pope by Duperron and Cardinal d'Ossat (1589).

While in Rome for that purpose, Duperron was consecrated (1589) a cardinal by Pope Sixtus V, and in 1591 was appointed bishop of the diocese of Orléans. He left for France in 1593, and next year was appointed metropolitan of Paris, and in 1595 was created a cardinal. He was one of the ablest French bishops of his day. He repeatedly refused higher positions. In many things a conservative and even a legitimist, he was one of the first who thought of appealing, in behalf of the Catholic cause, to common law and public liberties before a generation no longer able or willing to recognize the Divine right of the Church. The criticisms passed on him by Catholics of a different school were more than offset by numerous papal Briefs of encouragement and letters of approval from all parts of the world. A man of action, he was also a prolific writer. A complete list of his writings is given by Lagrange, his biographer. Some of his polemical pamphlets have already been noticed. In his educational writings Dupanloup enumenates some of the most important principles which are generally accepted. Among these he places the notion of education as a process of developing mental activity instead of injecting knowledge into the mind, and his insistence on the duty of the teacher to respect the freedom of the pupils and to cultivate in them a spirit of honour. He advocates physical education by means of games, and warns against the danger of forcing precocious children. Education, he holds, is intellectual, moral, religious, and physical; but it is essentially one, and to neglect any of its purposes would be fatal.

His more important works are:—catechetical: "L'œuvre par excellence" (1869); educational: "L'éducation en général," "La haute éducation intellectuelle" (1865), "La femme studieuse" (1869), and "Lettres sur l'éducation des filles" (1878); historical: "Vie de Mgr Berderies" (Paris, 1864); oratorical: "Précis de la sagesses de Jean-Pierre de Ramey" (1850), and "La dédicace de l'Amer" (1862), and St. Vincent de Paul (1865); funeral oations of Père de Ravanign (1858), the volunteers (1860), Mgr Menjaud (1861), and Lamorcere (1866); pastoral: "Lettres pastorales et mandements" (in the archives of the episcopal palace of Orléans).
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ists. On 4 May nine passages were examined concerning
which the commission decided against Duplessis. The
latter's real or feigned sickness and his departure prevented
further meetings.

Duperron was created a cardinal in 1604. The same
year he went to Rome, and was invited to assist at the
meeting of the Congregatio de Auxiliis which Clement
VIII had summoned to end the discussions on grace
and freedom. Meanwhile he took an important part in
the election of Leo XI and Paul V. The decision of
Paul V not to condemn the Molinistic system was due
largely to Duperron's advice. Duperron became Arch-
bishop of Paris in 1619. He stopped the publication of
the decisions of the Parliament condemning one of Bellar-
mine's works, and defended the latter's thesis on the
pope's infallibility and supremacy over councils. At a
synod held at Paris (1612) he condemned the work "De
ecclesiastica et politica potestate" by Edmond Richer,
synode of the Sorbonne. In 1614-15, at the meeting of
the States General at Paris, he urged, against the Third
Estate, the acceptance of the decrees of the Council
of Trent on discipline and reform. Duperron's knowledge
and eloquence were so great that Pope Paul V said of him:
"Let us pray that God may inspire Duperron,
for he will persuade us of what he believes," as he
believed all truths considered necessary by the first
Christians. In his answer Duperron treats of the charac-
teristics of the Catholic Church, of some articles which
the king did not look upon as essential, the
preservation and integrity of the doctrine and disci-
pline of the Church, the Eucharist as a sacrament and
a sacrifice, the invocation of the Saints, the use of
Latin, translation of Holy Scripture, etc. The third
volume contains various works among which are a
treatise on vocation, the Acts of the Fontainebleau
conference, a refutation of the work of Tillet on
Apostolic traditions, some moral and spiritual
truths, and poems both Christian and profane. Dup-
eron's secretary, César de Ligny, wrote "Ambassades
et négociations du cardinal Duperron" (Paris, 1618).
Under the title of "Terroniensis," remarks on theo-
logical, political, and literary subjects were published
by Christophe du Puy from the notes of his brother,
who had been with Duperron for a long time.

FERRER, Le cardinal Duperron (Paris, 1879); de BURROWS,
Vie du cardinal Duperron (Paris, 1788); DUPIN, Nouvelle histo-
riothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques (Paris, 1715, XVII, 26; Riss,
Die Convention de la Réformation (Freiburg, 1809), II, 226,
441, 334; Galles chrétiennes (2d ed., Paris, 1750), XI, 612,
XII, 96; Sandel in Kirchenlexicon, IV, 36.

C. A. DUBRAY.

DUPIN (also Du Pin), LOUIS-ELIES, theologian, b. 17 June, 1657, of a noble family in Normandy; d. 6 June, 1719. His mother, a Vicar, was the niece of Marie des Moulins, grandmother of the poet Jean Ra-
cine. At the age of twenty Dupin accompanied Ra-
cine who made a visit to Nicole for the purpose of
becoming reconciled to the gentlemen of Port Royal.
But, while not hostile to the Jansenists, Dupin's intel-
lectual attraction was in another direction; he was
the disciple of Launoy, a learned critic and a Galilean.
Dupin took his Doctorate in Theologicals at the Sorbonne, and
received there the degree of bachelor in 1680, and of
doctor in 1684.

From the beginning of his studies he had accumulated
notes on the works and teachings of the Fathers.

In 1686 there appeared the first volume of the "Nou-
velle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques," covering
the first three centuries. In it Dupin had treated
simultaneously biography, literary criticism, and the
history of dogma; in this he was a pioneer leading far
ahead of his time. Behind him all previous efforts, Catholic or Prot-
esteran, which were still under the influence of the Scholastic
method. He was also the first to publish such a col-
lection in a modern language. Unfortunately he was
young and worked rapidly. In this way errors crept
into his writings and his productions were violently
attacked. Mathieu Petit-Didier, a Benedictine, pub-
lished an anonymous booklet of "Remarques sur la
bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques de M. Du Pin" (Paris, 1691),
and this was followed by two other vol-
umes to which the author's name was appended
(Paris, 1692 and 1696). Dupin answered him in his
fifth volume and Petit-Didier replied in the fore part
of his second volume of "Remarques". Petit-Didier's
observations were often inspired by contemporaneous
prejudice. Thus Dupin had placed in the fourth cen-
tury, to which indeed he rightly belongs, St. Macarius
the Egyptian. Petit-Didier discovered Semipelagian-
ism in this author's works, in reality ideas expressed
by many before St. Augustine, but from the prior
base of his dogmas. The criticism of Dupin concluded that Macarius should
come after Pelagius and St. Augustine (II, 198).

A more formidable enemy appeared in Bossuet, who,
during a public thesis at the College of Navarre in
1692, condemned the audacity of the critic. Dupin
answered him and Bossuet appealed to the civil au-
thority, denouncing Dupin to Chancellor Boucherat
and to Archbishop de Harlay. Bossuet simply enu-
merated the points that he disagreed in the "Biblio-
thèque" concerning original sin, purgatory, the can-
onicity of the Sacred Scriptures, the eternity of hell's
penal torments, the immortality of the soul, the adora-
tion of the Cross, grace, the pope and the
bishops, Lent, divorce, the celibacy of the clergy, tra-
tition, the Eucharist, the theology of the Trinity, and
the Council of Nicea. He demanded a censure and a
retraction.

Like Petit-Didier Bossuet would not admit that any of
the Greek or Latin Fathers differed from St. August-
ine on the subject of grace, nor that this matter could
be called subtle, delicate, and abstract. Between Du-
pin and Bossuet there was a still wider difference.

The liberty M. Dupin takes of so harshly condem-
n ing the greatest men of the Church and God's cri-
not be tolerated" (Bossuet, Oeuvres, XXX, 513).
On the other hand Bossuet strongly contended that
heretics could not be too severely dealt with: "It is
dangerous to call attention to passages that manifest
the firmness of these people without also indicating
wherein this firmness has been overrated; otherwise
they are credited with a moral steadfastness which elicits
sympathy and leads to their being excused"
(op. cit., XXX, 633).

Dupin submitted but was nevertheless condemned
by the Archbishop of Paris (14 April, 1696). He
contended his "Bibliothèque," which he put out in
the month after his death (10 May, 1757), though other works
of his were condemned at an earlier date. He had also
to suffer the censure of Richard Simon (Paris, 1730,
4 vols.). Simon and Dupin had similar views and
methods so that when Bossuet was writing the "Dé-
fense de la Tradition et des Saints Pères" (which did
not appear, however, until 1741), he included both in
his invective against the "hauts critiques" who in-
clined to rabbinism and the errors of Socinians.
Although Dupin smoked favourably of Arnauld and
signed the "Cate de conscience," he was not a Jansen-
iste. On these matters he rather shared the position
of Launoy who "had found no fault with either
both Semipelagian and Jansenist" (Bossuet, Oeuvres,
XXX, 509). Dupin was pre-eminently a Galilean. It
was probably on this account that Louis XIV had him
exiled to Châtellerault, on the occasion of the “Cas de conscience”. Dupin retracted and returned, but his chair in the College of France was irretrievably lost. Later Dubois, who aspired to the cardinalate and sought therefore the favour of Rome, made similar accusations against Dupin. Dupin was on friendly terms with Wake, the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, who hoped for a union of the two Churches. The correspondence was looked on with suspicion, and in 1718 the regent had Dupin’s papers seized. This act led to calumnies against the writer, who really had had no other aim than the reconciliation of the separated Anglicans. A similar purpose animated the “Mémoires” he presented to Peter the Great during the latter’s residence in France. Dupin died shortly after.

Besides the “Nouvelle bibliothèque éschatologique” (38 vols. 8vo with tables), the “Remarques” by Pet- tit-Dièler, and the “Critique” by R. Simon reprinted in Holland (19 vols. 4to), Dupin edited the works of Gerson (Paris, 1703), Optatus of Mileve (Paris, 1700), the Psalms with annotations (1691), and published “Notes sur le Pentateuque” (1701), an abridgment of “L’histoire de l’Eglise” (1712), “L’histoire profane” (1714–1716), “L’histoire de l’Apostolique de Tyane” (1705, under the name of M. de Clairac), a “Tract de la puissance ecclésiastique et temporelle”, a commentary on the Four Articles of the clergy of France (1707), the “Bibliothèque universelle des historiens” (1716), numerous works and articles on theology, reprints of former works, etc. Dupin was no pedant. Étienne Jeanne de Choiseul, temporary who saw him, said: “In the morning he would grow pale over books and in the afternoon over cards in the pleasant company of ladies. His library and adjoining apartment were marvellously well kept.”

Dupin, Pierre-Charles-François, known as Baron Charles Dupin, a French mathematician and economist, b. at Varzy, Nièvre, 6 October, 1784; d. at Paris, 18 October, 1855. In 1773, at the age of thirteen, he entered the École polytechnique, and after three years of successful studies under the famous Monge, he received the degree of naval engineer. He then served in that capacity in the navy and showed so much ability that he was later appointed inspector-general of the navy. In 1813 he published a pamphlet, “Développement de géométrie pour faire suite à la géométrie pratique de Monge” (Paris, 1813), containing many new and brilliant theorems, the most important of which were one relating to the indicatrix of curved surfaces and another on orthogonal surfaces.

He was elected to the Academy of Sciences in 1818. The next year Dupin received a professorship at the Conservatoire des arts et métiers; during this period he wrote various pamphlets on scientific topics, such as: “Applications de géométrie et de mécanique à la marine” (Paris, 1826); “Diverses leçons sur l’industrie, le commerce, la marine” (Paris, 1825), and also numerous memoirs for the Academy of Sciences, which were highly spoken of. Notwithstanding his brilliant prospects as a mathematician, he soon preferred to devote himself to political economy. “Voyages en Bretagne dans le temps de 1819” (6 vols., Paris, 1820–1824), which were the result of a personal inquiry into the commerce and industry of England, placed him in the foremost rank of statisticians. In his “Carte de la France éclairée” (Paris, 1824), he was the first to use different colours to show the development of education in various parts of France. Charles X gave him the title of baron in 1824. Dupin gradually turned to politics and for forty years was a member of legislative assemblies. Under the Restoration, in spite of the honour bestowed on him by the Bourbons, he sided with the Liberals and took his seat at the Left of the Chamber; when the Monarchy of Charles X was established, and finally with the Right, under the Republic of 1848. He rallied to the Second Empire and was appointed senator by Napoleon III. In his political career he showed himself a man of ability, of great industry and activity, and never failed to assert his Catholic convictions. Although a less brilliant man than his brother the Elder Dupin, he may have a more lasting reputation on account of his discoveries in geometry.


Louis N. Delamarre.

Du Plessis d’Argentré. See Argentré.

Duplex (Double). See Calendar.

Duplication of Mass. See Liturgy.

Duponceau, Peter Stephen, jurist and linguist, b. at St-Martin de Re, France, 3 June, 1760; d. at Philadelphia, U. S. A., 1 April, 1844. Educated in a Benedictine college, he exhibited a marked taste for languages, and in 1777 accompanied Baron Steuben to America, serving as his secretary in the Revolutionary army, with rank of captain, until compelled by ill-health to resign in 1781. He settled in Philadelphia, studied law, and was admitted to the Bar. Throughout a long life he was identified with public affairs and was also author or translator of a number of legal or historical treatises, but his fame rests chiefly upon his studies of the native American languages at a period when ethnology was as yet hardly recognized as a science. Most of his linguistic papers appeared in volumes of the American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia), of which he was a member from 1791 and president from 1827 until his death. His memoir on the grammatical system of the Indian languages (Mémoire sur le système grammatical des langues de quelques nations Indiennes de l’Amérique du Nord) won the Volney prize of the French Institute in 1835.

Desalmon, Public History, Commemoration of Peter S. Duponceau (Philadelphia, 1844); Pilling, Bibliography of Algonquian Languages (Washington, 1889).

James Mooney.
estantian. The Concordat, which Duprat himself negotiated with Leo X at Bologna, did away with the schismatical principles of the "Pragmatic Sanction"; on the other hand, by causing the appointment of the French hierarchy to rest on royal nomination instead of the old canonical elections, he vastly improved the civil power and easily abused authority over Church affairs. Duprat's uncompromising attitude towards Protestantism was dictated both by his political sense and his orthodoxy. The wiles of Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin did not deceive him; even so the well-known Protestant sympathies of Louis Henri d'Anjou, the Duchess of Etampes, and the Minister du Bellay failed to move him. The Sorbonne and the Parliament were instructed to exclude the writings of the innovators; in 1534 the posting of subversive pamphlets at the door of the royal apartments cost the perpetrators their lives. Duprat left no writings, but took a leading part in the compilation of the "Coutumes d'Auvergne"; he also did much to encourage the renovation of letters.

(2) Guillaume, son of the foregoing, b. at Issoreau, 1507; d. at Beaugregard, 1560. Appointed Bishop of Clermont in 1529, he led a serious and saintly life, and was known by the leading part he took in the last sessions of the Council of Trent as well as by his patronage of the Jesuits. Not only did he receive in his diocese, where they were put in charge of the colleges of Bollom and Mauriac, but, in face of much opposition, he helped them financially and in other ways to found in Paris the College of Clermont, so-called after Duprat's episcopal city.

DUPRAT. Vie d'Antoine Duprat (Paris, 1857); HANOTTEAU, Études historiques sur les XVIIe siècles (Paris, 1880); IDEM, recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs (Paris, 1888), I. BAUDILLARRE, Quatre cent ans de concordat (Paris, 1900); FOURNIER, Guillaume Duprat in Etudes religieuses, 1904.

J. F. SOLIER.

DUPUYTREN, DURAND

DUPUYTREN, Guillaume, Baron, French anatomist and surgeon, b. 6 October, 1777, at Pierre-Butiffre, a small town in the Limousin, France; d. in Paris, 8 February, 1835. His parents were so poor that he received his education at the Collège de la Marche through charity. By competitive examination he gained the position of professor in anatomy at the newly established École de Médecine, Paris, when he was but eighteen. In 1803 he was appointed assistant surgeon to the Hôtel-Dieu. In 1811 he became professor of operative surgery, and in 1815 professor of surgical surgery at the École de Médecine and assistant surgeon to the Hôtel-Dieu. He was indefatigable in his devotion to his profession and had one of the largest surgical practices of all time. He amassed a fortune estimated at $1,500,000. He succeeded in accomplishing all this in spite of a consumptive tendency against which he had to battle all his life and which finally carried him off. In his will he endowed the chair of anatomy at the École de Médecine and established a home for physicians in distress. A curious contraction of the fascia of the palm of the hand, which cripples the fingers, is called after him, and the anatomical museum of the École de Médecine bears his name. The most important of his writings is his treatise on artificial anus. He published also a treatise on gunshot wounds and clinical lectures on surgery. Dupuytren was not an original investigator in surgical subjective views, but he was an excellent observer and a great worker, who knew how to adopt and adapt others' ideas very practically.

VIDAL DU PUYTREN, Essai Hist. (Paris, 1835); LARRY, Discours à l'inauguration de la Statue de G. Dupuytren (Paris, 1868).

JAMES L. HANDLEY.

Duquesnoy, François (called also François Flamand, and in Italy Il Flamingo), b. at Brussels, Belgium, 1594; d. at Leghorn, Italy, 12 July, 1646. Duquesnoy was the son of an excellent Dutch sculptor from whom he received his first lessons. At an early age he carved the figure of justice on the portal of the chancellerie at Brussels, and two angels for the entrance of the Jesuit church of that city. In 1619, at the age of twenty-five, he was sent by the Archduke Albert to study in Italy, and there in the course of many years, executing various works of importance, to him we owe the handsome baldachin over the high altar in St. Peter's, the colossal statue of St. Andrew with his cross, also in St. Peter's, and the Santa Susanna in the church of St. Maria di Loreto. In the cathedral of Ghent he executed his famous tomb for Bishop Triest, a good work in its own style. Duquesnoy was a contemporary of Bernini and a friend of Le Pousain, who recommended him to Cardinal Richelieu. The sculptor was about to start for Paris when death overtook him at Leghorn. It is reported that he was poisoned by his own brother, Jérôme, who was also a clever sculptor (b. 1612; burned for unnatural crime, 24 Oct., 1654). François is famous for his beautiful sporting children in marble and bronze, his ivy carvings for drinking-cups, etc. The figure known to the populace of Brussels as the "Manneken" is commonly attributed to him.

LÖRKE, History of Sculpture (tr. London, 1872); CLEMENT, Sculpture (New York, 1885).

M. L. Handley.

Duran, Narcisco, b. 16 Dec., 1776, at Castellon de Ampurias, Catalonia, Spain; d. 1 June, 1846. He entered the Franciscan Order at Gerona, 3 May, 1792, volunteered for the Indian missions, was incorporated into the Franciscan Missions, College of San Fernando in the City of Mexico, and in 1806 came to California. He was assigned to Mission San José and toiled there among the Indians until April, 1833, when he retired to Mission Santa Barbara. As early as 1817 Father Sarrié, the comisario prefecto, recommended Duran for higher offices. Father Padre, the comisario prefecto in 1829, likewise held him worthy and capable of any office. Towards the end of 1824 the College of San Fernando elected him presidente of the missions, which post he held with the exception of one term (1828-1831) until 1838. From 1844 till his death in 1846 he again held this office, and from 1837 to 1843 he was also comisario prefecto of the Fernandinos, i.e. Franciscans subject to the college in Mexico, who were in charge of the missions in Southern California. During the troublous times of the secularization and sale of the missions it was Father Duran who fought the pillagers step by step, though in vain, and fearlessly unmasked the real aims of the despilers. His numerous letters to the Government on the subject are masterpieces of close reasoning, pungent sarcasm, and unanswerable argument. Governor Figueroa recommended the exile of Father Duran, but the Mexican Government allowed him to remain unmolested at Mission Santa Barbara until his death. Six weeks previous to this the dying Bishop of Californi had appointed Father Duran vicar-general, and for a month he held the office of administrator of the diocese. His body was placed in the vault beneath the sanctuary of the mission church. He was, almost the last survivor of the Fernandinos, and for virtue, learning, and missionary zeal ranks with the most brilliant of his predecessors.

Records of Mission San José; Archives of the Archbishop of San Francisco; Archives of Mission San Diego. History of California (San Francisco, 1866), III-V; ENGLERT, The Franciscans in California (Harbor Springs, 1897); CLINCH, California and Its Missions (San Francisco, 1869), I-II; ZEPHRIN ENGELHARDT.

Durand de Maillane, Pierre Joussaint. See Gallicanism.

Durand Ursin, a Benedictine of the Maurist Congregation, b. 20 May, 1682, at Tours; d. 31 Aug., 1771, at Paris. He took vows in the monastery of
Durandus (Durantii, Durantius), William, canonist and one of the most important medieval liturgi- cal writers; b. about 1237 at Piuminum in the Diocese of Béziers, Provence; d. at Rome, 1 Nov., 1296. He was called "Speculator" from the title of one of his works, "Speculum Judiciale". He studied law at Bologna under Bernard of Parma and then taught it at that university. He was appointed archdeacon by the pope's uncle, Clement IV (Guy Pouques, 1263-1268, also a Provençal) summoned Durandus to Rome, ordained him subdeacon, and gave him titular canopies at Beauvais and Chartres. He was then attached to the papal curia as Auditor generalis causarum sacri palati. He accompanied Gregory X (1271-1276) to the Second Council of Lyons (1274) and, as the pope's secretary, drew up its decrees. In 1279 he was made dean of Chartres, but did not reside there. At about the same time he went to Romagna as papal governor and succeeded in subduing a rebellion under Guy of Montefeltro. He destroyed Guy's fortress della Riga and established it in place of the town of Urbino. In 1286 he was elected bishop by the chapter of Mende (Mimaut) in the province of Narbonne, but did not go into residence till 1291. Meanwhile his diocese was administered by his nephew, William Durandus the younger. In 1295 he was again in Italy (see Beneventum, Italy) in the honor of Romagna and Acone, where the Ghibellines were again in rebellion. He refused the pope's offer to make him Archbishop of Ravenna, came to Rome, and died there. There is no reason to suppose that Durandus belonged to any religious order, though he has been claimed by both the Dominicans and the Austin Canons. He is buried at Rome in Santa Maria Sopra Minerva, where a long epitaph tells the story of his life and gives a list of his works.

Of these works the most famous is the "Rationale diali et ordinari of officiorum" (ed. by Fust and Schoeffer at Mainz, 1459, and reprinted frequently, at Ulm by John Zainer, 1473; latest ed. at Naples, 1839). It was written in 1286. Its eight books contain a detailed account of the laws, ceremonies, customs, and mystical interpretation of the Roman Rite. Book I treats of the church, its altars, bells, churches, churchyards, etc.; II of the ministers; III of vestments; IV of the Mass; V of the canonical hours; VI of the Proprium Temporis; VII of the Proprium Sanctorum; and VIII of the astronomical calendar, manner of finding Easter, Epacts, etc. Durandus's "Rationale" is the most important medieval treatise of its kind; it is an em- standard authority for the ritual of the thirteenth century and for the symbolism of rites and vestments. The allegorical explanation of vestments, for instance, as signifying virtues or the garments worn by Christ in His Passion, is taken from its third book. Other works are "Speculum Legatum" (first ed. enlarged into "Speculum Judiciale" (four books), a treatise on the canonical rights of legates and the forms of canonical processes (first ed. at Strasbourg in 1473; Frankfort, 1668); "Breviarium, sive Reper- torium juris canonic" (Rome, 1474); "Glosser et textuum juris canonici" (Paris, 1519), both commentaries on the decretals, arranged in the same order; and "Commentarius in canones Concilii Lugudunensis II" (Fano, 1569, with a life of the author by Simon Majolus), a semi-official exposition of the canons of the Second Council of Lyons. Durandus's epitaph also mentions a "Pontificale", which is now lost. For works wrongly attributed to him see Schulte (op. cit. infra.), II, 155-156.

DURANDUS, William, the Younger, d. 1328, canonist, nephew of the famous ritualist and canonist of the same name (with whom he is often confounded). He was at first archdeacon of Mende, Languedoc, under his uncle and was appointed bishop of that see by Boniface VIII, in 1296, after the uncle's death. He was present at the Council of Vienne in 1311-1312. The pope (John XXII, 1316-1334) and the King of France (Charles IV, 1316-1328) appointed him to the Sudan Orphan (1326-1360) at Brusa, to obtain more favourable conditions for the Latins in Syria. He died on the way back, in Cyprus (1325). He wrote, by command of Clement V (1305-1314), a work: "Tractatus de modo concilii generalis celebrandi et de corruptis in ecclesiis reformandis", in three books. It is a treatise on the canonical process of summoning and holding general councils, gathered from approved sources with many quotations and illus- trations from the Fathers and from church history, together with attacks on various attacks on conciliar traditions that were common in the fourteenth century among ecclesiastical persons. The first edition was printed at Lyons in 1351, then again at Paris by Philip Probus, a canonist of Bourges, in 1545, and dedicated to Pope Paul III (1538-1540) as a help towards the Council of Trent. Other editions, 1571, etc.

ADRIAN FORTESSCUE.
Durandus was a philosopher and theologian, b. at Saint-Pourçain, Auvergne, France; d. 13 September, 1332, at Meaux. He entered the Dominican Order at Clermont and obtained the doctor's degree at Paris in 1313. John XXII called him to Rome to be his Master of the Sacred Palace, where he expanded the Scriptures. In 1318 he was consecrated Bishop of Le Puy-en-Velay and was transferred to Meaux in 1326. He is known as Doctor Resolutissimus owing to his strenuous advocacy of certain opinions novel to the Schoolmen of his day. His writings include comments on the Sentences, (Paris, 1308); "De origine jurisdictionum" (Paris, 1506); and a treatise on the condition of holy souls after their separation from the body. His nominalism was so much opposed to the contemporary philosophic realism that the third period of Scholasticism is made to begin with him. He rejects both the sensible and the intelligible species, introduced, he says, to explain sense-perception, as also the active intellect. He denies the principle of individuation as distinct from the specific nature of the individual. In theology he argues for a separation of natural knowledge from that of revelation, and, although he accepts the triple perfections of Christ, he insists that Christ could be present in the Eucharist with the substances of bread and wine remaining. Throughout, Durandus shows admirable submission to the corrective precepts of the Church, the exercise of which was not unnecessary. By order of John XXI, the treatise "De statu animarum" was examined and was found to contain eleven errors.

Durandus of Troarn, French Benedictine and ecclesiastical writer, b. about 1012, at Le Neubourg near Evreux; d. 1089, at Troarn near Sen. Affiliated from early childhood to the Benedictine community of Mont-Saint-Catherine and of Saint-Vandrill, he was made abbot of the newly founded Saint-Martin of Troarn by William, Duke of Normandy, in whose esteem he stood on a par with Lanfranc, Anselm, and Guibert Vitalis, calling him "episcopus contus et dogmatia doctor pertissismus." Of his achievements in sacred music we know nothing beyond that mention, but we have his "Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini." (P. L., CXLIX, 1357) against Berengarius. The ninth and last part of it contains precious historical information about the heresies. In Durandus' mind Berengarius is a figurist pure and simple, after the manner of Scotus Eriugena, whose now lost book he is said to have possessed and used. In the rest of his book Durandus follows Paschasius, whom he somewhat emphatically styles Divinitus sacramentorum auator, and he states his discussion upon whom he borrows both his patristic apparatus and his theological views. Turnel, however, notes that Durandus quotes new texts of Bede, Amalarius, Pulbert de Chartres, and St. John Chrysostom. His presentation of the Eucharistic dogma is frankly Ambrosian, i.e., he maintains with Paschasius and Gerbert the conversion of the bread and wine into the identical body and blood of Christ, thus excluding the Augustinian theory of the Presentia spiritalis still held by some of his contemporaries and contributing to prelude the Fourth Lateran Council by the 1215 texts. Durandus explains with skill the Augustinian text, chiefly in the "De doctrinæ christianæ" and the "Letter to Boniface", misused by Berengarius; but in the last analysis he appeals to the argument of authority already used by Guinmond (P. L., CXLIX, 1415). This is to say, he also wears the garb of the learned. A few years of composition, fails at times to clearly bring out his thought. Hence he may appear obscure to the unlearned and even become a source of error. If perchance he should have erred in so great a mystery, we should then bethink ourselves of the Apostolic saying: 'But though an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which you have received, let him be anathema'" (loc. cit., 1413). Durandus wrote also against Berengarius a poem of 900 verses, of which twenty-five preface the above treatise and thirteen are quoted from Mabillon's "Artis Antiquae," which is also being unpolished. Migne (loc. cit.) appends to the "Liber" two epistles composed by Durandus, one for Abbot Abbad and the other for the Countess Mabile. (See Berengarius of Tours.)

Durango (Durangum), Archbishopric of, located in northwestern Mexico. The see was created 28 Sept., 1620, seventy-two years after the Friars Diego de la Cadena and Gerónimo de Mendoza had established the San Juan Bautista de Analco mission in the valley of the Sierra Madre. The city of Durango was founded in 1534 by the Spanish captain Ibarra, and served at once as a centre for numerous missionaries, whose efforts to convert the natives were so successful that under Philip III the Diocese of Guadalajara was divided by Paul V, and Durango was raised to episcopal rank. The first bishop, Gonzalo Hernández y Hermosillo, devoted much time to the evangelization of the Indians. In 1582 the Diocese of Durango included New Mexico (Santa Fe), Chihuahua, and Sonora; eventually these were made independent sees. Durango was made an archdiocese by Leo XIII (23 June, 1891), and now includes all the State of Durango and part of Zacatecas, with Sonora, Chihuahua, and Sinaloa for suffragans. The first archbishop was Vicente Salinas. Among the remarkable bishops of the see were the scholarly Goeres, to whom the city owes its canons; the famous writer Le gaspi, who began the cathedral that was finished and consecrated by Antonio Zubiría y Escalante, and lately decorated anew by Archbishop Santiago Zubiría y Manzanera. The Catholic press is represented by "El Domingo," and the "Boletin Eclesiastic." Besides the Escuelas Guadalupanas there are two colleges, the Colegio Guadalupano and a College of the Brothers of Mary. The territory of the diocese is quite mountainous and is watered by a few streams, but is well adapted for grazing. There are many rich mines of gold, silver, and iron. In 1900 the population of the State of Durango was 307,274, that of the city 31,922. The latter, known also as Guadiana and Ciudad de Victoria, stands picturesquely at 6,700 feet above sea-level, and has important industries and a large trade in cattle and leather.


Reginaldo Guereca.
ST. PETER AND ST. JOHN—ST. PAUL AND ST. MARK
ALBRECHT DÜRER, PINAKOTHEK, MUNICH
DURAZZO, Archdiocese of (Dyrrachischen), in Albania, situated on the Adriatic, has a good port, and is the chief town of a sandjak in the vilayet of Scutari; the population is about 9000. According to Appian it was founded by a barbarian king, Epidamnus, after whom it was called Epidamnium; it then became the name of Dyrrachium, from Dyrrachius, nephew of a daughter of Epidamnus, to whom was due its port. According to Thucydides and Strabo it was more probably a colony of Corcyra. It was one of the causes of the Peloponnesian War. Conquered by the kings of Illyria, when attacked by the Romans, it surrendered to the latter and received from them many privileges. Its port was important for communication with Greece. Cicero and Pompey in their disgrace took refuge at Dyrrachium. When towards the end of the fourth century the empire was divided into two parts, the city fell to the Eastern Empire. The Byzantine emperors made it a strong fortress, and Anastasius I was born there. After the seventh century it was the centre of a theme; in 1011 its governors received the title of dukes. Under Michael the Paphligonian (1034–1041) it was occupied by the Bulgarians; in 1042 it was retaken by the Greeks. In 1204 it was captured by Robert Guiscard, who deposed Alexius Comnenus under its walls; at the death of Robert it fell again into the power of the Greeks, who held it till the capture of Constantinople by the Latins (1204). From 1206 to 1294 it belonged to the despots of Epirus. It was then conquered by the Angevin kings of Naples, who gave it as a fief to princes of the family; the descendants of these rulers kept the title of "Duras" even when they no longer held the city. The effective lordship passed to the Thopias about the middle of the fourteenth century. In 1373 the city was occupied by the Balsas of the Zetta, in 1386 by the Venetians, and finally, in 1501, by the Turks.

The church of Durazzo is the most ancient in Albania. According to local tradition the first bishop of the country was St. Cesarius, one of the Seventy Disciples. St. Astius, his successor, is said to have suffered martyrdom under Trajan about A.D. 100. A list of the Greek bishops is in Lequien (Oriens Christianus II, 240–247), but it is very incomplete. Durazio is even yet a metropolis for the Greeks. Under Eugenius, who attended the Council of Ephesus, 431, it was the metropolis of Epirus Nova or Illyricum. The see, long disputed between the Greeks, the Bulgarians, and Serbs, remained finally in the hands of the first named. Its bishops, who as early as 519 had sided with Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, against Pope Hormisdas, followed the schism of Michael Cerularius in the eleventh century. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, after the Latin conquest of Constantinople, a Latin see was established there (1209). The Latin succession was often interrupted, on account of political changes; the actual (1905) archbishop is the fifty-second of the list (Lequien, III, 950–954; Gams, I, 407; II, 57; Eubel, II, 81). The see is subject to several removals; after the Turkish conquest the archbishops transferred it to Corbina (1509), then to Canovia; to-day they reside at Delbenisti. Durazio had originally but one suffragan, Cerneum or Tzernemum, site unknown. Later it had Prisca, Coneya, and Canovia. To-day Alessio one is subject to the Archbishop of Durazzo, but his power over it has been so limited by Propaganda that he may be considered an archbishop without a suffragan.

There are in the archdiocese about 250,000 inhabitants and about 180,000 are Musulmans (Turks and chiefly Albanese), 95,000 Greeks or Grecized Albanians, 14,000 Catholics (Albanian, except a few Italians and Austrians). There are also at Elbassan about 150 recently converted Greeks. The diocese has no seminary, but some students are sent to the seminary of Scutari. It has 20 priests, of whom 13 are secular priests, 22 parishes, 46 churches or chapels, 39 stations, 5 schools for boys and 1 for girls (the latter conducted by Sisters of Charity of Agram). Franciscan friars have charge of several parishes.

FARLATI, Illyricum sacrum, VII, 335–384; DEGRAUDE, Souvenirs de la haute Albanie (Paris, 1901), 179–183; Missiones Catholicæ (Rome, 1907), 132.

L. PETTIT.

Durbin, Elisea John, the "patriarch-priest of Kentucky", b. 1 Feb., 1800, in Madison Co., in that State, of John D. Durbin, son of Christopher Durbin, pioneer, and Patience Logsdon; d. in 1887 at Shelbyville, Kentucky. In 1816 he was sent to the preparatory seminary of St. Thomas, in Nelson Co., where he spent about four years of manual labour and study under such distinguished missionaries as David Flaget, Felix de Andreis, and Joseph Rosati; thence he went to the near-by Seminary of St. Joseph, at Bardstown, where, in 1821–1822, he had as instructor Francis Patrick Kenrick, later Bishop of Philadelphia and Archbishop of Baltimore. He was ordained priest in Bardstown, by Bishop David, 21 Sept., 1822. Early in 1824 Bishop Flaget entrusted to him the pastoral care of western and south-western Kentucky, about thirty counties, with an area of over 11,000 square miles, nearly one-third of the State. Then began a missionary career of over sixty years, spent in the United States, and that subsequently won for him the names of "Apostle of Western Kentucky" and "Patriarch-Priest of Kentucky". Union County was the centre of his mission. From it he journeyed on horseback over his vast territory, erected churches, established stations, formed congregations, and visited isolated families. In the beginning duty called him beyond his mission proper into Indiana, and once a year to Nashville, Tennessee. He traversed his extensive and sparsely settled mission incessantly for over sixty years, his churches, stations, and the rude homes of his poor flock his only abiding places. Occasionally a communication from him would appear in the press, and then only in defence of truth or outraged justice. When he did write, he wrote cogently and elegantly. Enfeebled by age, his sturdy constitution gave way in 1884, when his bishop, yielding to his entreaties, assigned him the small mission at Princeton, Kentucky. After a stroke of paralysis he was given, in 1885, the chaplaincy of an academy, at Shelbyville, Ky., where he died.

The Catholic Advocate (Louisville, 1860–1867); The Record (Louisville, 1879–1887); WEBB, Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky (Louisville, 1884); HOWLETT, Historical Tribute to St. Thomas' Seminary (St. Louis, 1906); LOGSDON, Life of Rev. Charles Nerinchka (Cincinnati, 1880).

Louis G. DEPPEN.

Dürer, Albrecht, celebrated painter and engraver, b. at Nuremberg, Germany, 21 May, 1471; d. there, 6 April, 1528. Dürer left his native city, then famous for its commerce, learning, and art, but three times in his life. His first journey was undertaken after he had completed his apprenticeships both to his father, a goldsmith, and to the painter and engraver Wohlgemuth; on this occasion he travelled through Germany and visited at Colmar and Basle the family of the recently deceased Schongauer; in 1505–07 he spent some time in Venice; in 1520–52 he went to the Netherlands, visiting especially Antwerp.

First Period: To 1505. — After the earliest works of his youth (portraits, Madonnas, coats-of-arms, landscape-sketches) he set up in 1494 a studio of his own. In the same year he married Agnes Frey but they had no children. Among his Nuremberg friends the learned humanist Willibald Pirckheimer held the first place. Besides great advancement in learning, Dürer owed to Pirckheimer the happiness of a lifelong friendship

V.—14
and the acquaintance with classical antiquity which he occasionally drew upon in his work. Dürer's art, however, with its sources in the German Middle Ages, remained essentially German; the influence of the art of Italy and the Netherlands was merely supplementary. In his own country there were few chances for mural paintings; but the demand for altar-pieces and portraits was all the greater. His woodcuts were eagerly sought after by the general public, his engravings on copper by connoisseurs. Among his fine compositions are: the Baumgartner altar-painting, the central panel of which represents the Adoration of the Christ Child, the wings, the donors as Sts. George and Eustachius; the "Lamentation of Christ", in which the pathos is noteworthy; and the remarkable picture of himself (1500). These are preserved in the Old Pinakothek in Munich. The portrait of himself just mentioned is greatly idealized as is also that of a lady of the Furlinger family. On the other hand, in the "Prodigal Son" and in his drawings, Dürer seeks to elevate his naturalism by

sweet simplicity, depth of feeling, and grandeur of conception. The "Adoration of the Magi" in the Uffizi at Florence will bear comparison, at least for German taste, with the masterpieces of Italy and the Netherlands. Dürer's woodcuts have a quality entirely their own; though without colouring, they yet produced the effect of colour. The "Apocalypse" (15 cuts) is distinguished by its daring fancy and grandeur of conception. The most striking of the series are: the "Four Riders", the "Angels of the Epiphany", the "Battle of the Angels with the Dragon". To the same period belong, for the most part, the powerful "Larger Passion" (7 later 12, cuts) as well as the beautiful "Life of the Virgin" (16, later 20, cuts), in which the scenes from the life of the Holy Family in Egypt have the sweetness of a charming idyll. Mention should be made of the so-called "Green Passion" in the Albertina Museum at Vienna, a series of twelve drawings with the pen on green paper, also of the "Smaller Passion" of a later date in 37 woodcuts, and of the 17 copperplate engravings on the same subject. For the fifth time the artist came back to the Passion of Christ eight years before his death; a few sketches are to be found in the Uffizi at Florence and in the Albertina at Vienna. Wood and copperplate engraving were brought to great perfection by Dürer; the latter, and etching as well, by his own work; the

former by his directions to the wood-engravers who carried out his designs.

Second Period: 1505 to 1520.—In the "Festival of the Rosary", painted in Venice for German merchants residing there, he competes, not unsuccessfully, with the Italian colourists, though it may be said that colour was not his strong point. The painting (Abbey of Strahow, Prague) is damaged, but a good copy is preserved in the Imperial Museum at Vienna. An oil-painting of the same period, "Christ on the Cross", and other works that followed, e.g. "Adam and Eve" (Madrid and Florence), show that Dürer's trip to Italy and the acquaintance made there with Giovanni Bellini were not without profit to his art; but Dürer's nationality and the independence of his genius are always evident. Another work much admired was the so-called Heller altar-piece, destroyed at Munich in 1674 by fire. Valuable studies for this picture and an indistinguishable copy are still extant. One of the finest examples of German art is the "Adoration of the Trinity" or "All Saints" (1511). Placed beside the "Disputa" of Raphael or the Sistine paintings of Michelangelo pro-
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**Madonna and Child (1512)**
Imperial Museum, Vienna

**Portrait of Himself (1500)**
Old Pinakothek, Munich

**Hieronymus Holzschuher (1520)**
Royal Museum, Berlin
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magnes, Sigismund, and Albrecht of Brandenburg; further, the marginal drawings, displaying great fancy and humour, made for Maximilian’s “Prayer Book”, and the “Triumphal Arch of Maximilian” belong to the same time. Later, Dürrer worked also on the “Triumphal Arch of Maximilian”, and the large “Triumphal Car”, for the emperor.

Third Period: 1520 to 1528.—Admirable sketches for “St. Jerome with the Skull”, lately discovered by Anton Weber in Lisbon, give ample proof of the artist’s diligence during his stay in the Netherlands. The strike of lead on the head of the saint very likely that of an Old Man” in the Albertina. After his return to Nuremberg, Dürrer painted a noteworthy “Head of Christ” and portraits of Pirkheimer, Erasmus, and Holzschuher. His last work of importance (1526) was the “Four Apostles”, Peter with John, and Paul with Mark; these paintings, which are now in Munich, are much admired for the individuality of character expressed by the figures and the fine treatment of the drapery.

From the inscription under these pictures, despite the fact that Peter is represented as holding the keys of heaven, and from other circumstances that prove his identification, some have wished to infer that towards the end of his life Dürrer became attached to the doctrines of Luther. But even the protestants Van Ey, A. W. Becker, C. Kinkel, and others, do not share in this opinion, and M. Thausing, the great Dürrer scholar, has now rejected it. No doubt many well-disposed persons of the time saw the necessity for ecclesiastical reform and hoped that it would be hastened by Luther’s stand. But they were deceived and acknowledged it, as Pirkheimer did for himself and his friend: “I confess that in the beginning I believed in Luther, like our Albert of blessed memory...but an apologist, the situation has become worse.”

In the years 1525–27, Dürrer wrote three books: on geometry, the proportions of the human figure, and the art of fortification.

SINGER, Versuch einer Dürrer Bibliographie in Studien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte (1660); CONWAY, Literary Remains of Albrecht Dürrer (Cambridge, 1889); COWGILL, Albrecht Dürrer, a Study of his Life and Works (London, 1897); KNAUCKUS, A. Dürrer (6th ed., 1899), tr. DODGSON (London, 1900); WEBER, A. Dürrer (3rd ed., Ratisbon, 1903); Collection of drawings by LEHMANN (4 vols.); of woodcuts, LÜTZOW; of copperplates and etchings, LÜTZOW and SOLODA; of letters and diaries, THAUSING.

G. GIETMANN.

Durham (Dunelm), Ancient Catholic Diocese of (Dunelmensis).—This diocese holds a unique position among English bishops. Owing to its geographical position on the Scottish border, the successive bishops were led to assume constitutional and political functions in addition to their spiritual office. Consequently their rights and privileges were peculiar and extensive; and even to this day the Anglican Bishop of Durham has precedence over all other English prelates except those of Canterbury, York, and London.

The diocese is the linear continuation of the Anglo-Saxon See of Lindisfarne, founded by St. Aidan in 635, when he came from the monastery of Iona at the request of St. Oswald, King of Northumbria, to evangelize that newly-conquered heathen kingdom. He built his monastery on the Island of Lindisfarne, now Holy Island, off Northumbria. Thus Northumbrian Christianity was of Celtic origin and followed the Celtic use as to the observance of Easter and other matters. But in the south the Roman use prevailed and conflict became inevitable. The controversy arose in the time of St. Colman, the third bishop, and was settled in 641 at the Synod of Whitby when the Roman use was adopted. Shortly after, St. Colman was slain, and the see was transferred to York, with St. Wilfrith as bishop.

In 678, St. Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, cut off from it two new sees, one for the Lindseywars of Lincolnshire and the other for Bernicia. In 680 the Bernician see was subdivided into the Dioceses of Lindisfarne and Hexham, while finally a separate bishopric was created for the Southern Picts. So that when St. Cuthbert (q. v.) became Bishop of Lindisfarne the diocese was only a fragment of what it had been under St. Aidan. In the ninth century, when the Danes reigned the Northern part of Hexham ceased to have a separate existence, and about 820 was merged in that of York. In 875, Eardulf, Bishop of Lindisfarne, was driven from his see, and taking the body of St. Cuthbert, he with his monks fled from the Danes. After wandering seven years they found a resting place at Chester-le-Street (882); and from here Eardulf and his eight immediate successors ruled the see. In 965 Bishop Aldhelm again found himself defenceless before the Danes and fled with St. Cuthbert’s body to Ripon. When peace was restored, he was returning to Chester-le-Street when miraculous signs were given that the body of the saint was to remain at Dunholm, the place where the city of Durham now stands. A stone chapel was built to receive St. Cuthbert’s body and Aldhelm began a great church where the cathedral now is, which was finished and consecrated in 999. In this way Aldhelm became the first Bishop of Durham.

The following is the list of bishops with the dates of their accession. Those marked thus (†) held the office of Lord Chancellor:

Bishops of Lindisfarne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishop</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Aidan</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Finan</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Colman</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuda</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Eata</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cuthbert</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Eadbert</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadfrid</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ethelwold</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chester-le-Street

Cuthiward, 900
Tilred, 915
Villred, 928
Uhtregd, 944

Bishops of Durham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishop</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldhelm came to Durham</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmund, 1021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadred, 1041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egelric, 1042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egelin, 1056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walcher, 1071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William de S. Carlef</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td>1096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rannulf Flambard, 1099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td>1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galfrid Rufus, 1133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy and translation of Cunin, 1140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William de S. Barbara</td>
<td>1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh de Pudsey, 1153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip de Pictavia (el. 1195, cons. 1197)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td>1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard de Maris, 1217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td>1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Poor, 1228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy</td>
<td>1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas de Farman, 1241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Durham

Walter de Kirkham, 1249
Robert de Stechill, 1260
Robert de Insula, 1274
Antony Beck, 1283
Richard de Kellow, 1311
Lewis de Beaumont, 1318
Richard de Bury, 1333
Thomas de Hatfield, 1345
John Fordham, 1382
Walter Skirlaw, 1388
Thomas Langley (afterwards Cardinal), 1406
Robert Neville, 1438
Laurence Booth, 1457
William Dudley, 1476
Vacancy, 1493
John Sherwood, 1485
Richard Fox, 1494
William Sever, 1502
Vacancy, 1505
Christopher Bainbridge (afterwards Cardinal), 1507
Vacancy, 1508
Thomas Rutter, 1509
Thomas Wolsey (already Cardinal and Abp. of York), 1523
Cuthbert Tunstall, 1530

The Cathedral.—The first Norman bishop, Walcher, was murdered by the people in 1080, and was
suceeded by William de S. Carilef, who began the present cathedral, the foundation being laid 29 July, 1093. He also replaced the secular cathedral clergy by Benedictine monks from Jarrow and Wearmouth. The situation of the cathedral is remarkable, as it stands high on the cliff overlooking the river, and the building itself is most imposing, with its noble proportions, and what Dr. Johnson called its appearance of "rocky solidity and of indeterminate size". Bishop Carilef died shortly after beginning it; but the building was carried on with energy by the next bishop, the infamous Rannulf Flambard. He built the nave and aisles and the lower part of the west front, and in 1104 the shrine of St. Cuthbert was transferred to the new cathedral. In 1143 the see was usurped by William Cummin, chancellor of the King of Scotland, local survival of the old Northumbrian Kingdom. According to another view it was conferred by grant of some king, Alfred or, more plausibly, William the Conqueror. There is, however, no historical trace of any such grant, and recent research makes it more probable that it is a development of immunities granted to the Bishopric of Durham before the Conquest the bishops held large endowments of land known as the patrimony of St. Cuthbert, Terra or patrimonium Sancti Cuthberti. Therefore the diocese possessed large franchise or immunity both as against the sovereign power of the King of England and as the local rights of the Earl of Northumbria. Thus the bishopric was not included in Domesday Book, and even at the time of the Conquest the county of Durham was governed by the bishop with almost complete local independence. These extensive rights were strengthened by the fact that the bishops frequently had to repel Scottish invasions, by their own forces and at their own expense, which fostered both the military and financial independence of the palatinate. The strong local feeling of Northumbrian independence also prevented the formation of any firm ties with the English sovereigns, until the masterful policy of Henry II brought Durham into submission to the central government. But this subordination was exceedingly limited even then, and the bishopric escaped the deprivation of its privileges which befell many other franchises at that time. This was due to Bishop Hugh de Pudsey, who was the king's cousin and personal friend, and who took care that the see went on to obtain the charters necessary to safeguard the liberties of his see.

These were most considerable. First, the bishop had within the bishopric every right that the king had in the country: Quoiquid regis habeat extra episcopus habeat intra. He was therefore the head of the local government, with appointment of all civil officers. The bishop's writ, not the king's, ran within the bishopric, and the "Bishop's peace" was regarded as different from the "King's peace" until the time of Henry VIII. Offenders and law-breakers were tried in the bishop's court, and if necessary punished by his officials. Forfeitures for treason and forfeitures of war were both his right, and he could create corporations, and erect fairs and markets. He did not, however, have the right of making treaties with foreign powers, though instances of attempted secret treaties with Scotland are not wanting. The bishop had their own mint, and their coinage bears their initials on the reverse of each coin. From the feudal point of view the bishop was very strong, as he was the universal landlord, and all land was held mediately or immediately of him and not of the king. From this followed his rights of wardship, rights to all mines and to treasure-trove, as well as his extensive forest rights. At law he could stay procedure against offenders, grant pardons and even suspend the application of a statute. He had courts of common law, equity, and admiralty, besides his spiritual courts; and he regulated the relations between the latter and the temporal courts.

Thus, in theory, the bishop was as a king in his bishopric, but in practice his power was limited by the sovereign. In some instances the king actually infringed upon his rights, and in other cases this conflict of jurisdiction. Up to the end of the thirteenth century the episcopal power developed in every way, then followed a period during which the kings somewhat unwillingly tolerated the position, for the sake of the convenience of having what amounted to a buffer state between England and Scotland, and also because it was difficult to solve a problem so beset with complications both ecclesiastical and feudal. Although it is sometimes stated that the bishops had a council in the nature of a parliament, it is becoming increasingly clear that we have
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here a confused tradition of two separate bodies—the assembly and the council. The assembly (communitas) was practically the same gathering as the shiremoot in other counties. It raised money by taxation at the request both of the king and of the bishop, and sometimes for its own purposes. But it was not a legislative assembly, since all general legislation applied to the palatinate, although Durham was not represented in Parliament till the time of the Stuarts. When Acts were not intended to apply to Durham express exemption was stated. The council was in origin a feudal body, chosen from the bishop's immediate followers and officials, the functions entrusted to it being the general administration of the palatinate, financial affairs, and the duty of advising the bishop. The judicial courts of the palatinate arose out of this body. Much of the civil and judicial independence of the palatinate was destroyed by the Act of Resumption passed in 1536, at the will of Henry VIII. By this act the bishop's semi-regal power was abolished.

Galilee Chapel, Durham Cathedral

The see at this time was held by Cuthbert Tunstall, the venerable prelate who was the last Catholic bishop and who lived to witness the suppression of monasteries, the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536), and finally the surrender of Durham Abbey (1540), which involved the spoliation of St. Cuthbert's shrine. During the reign of Edward VI he was imprisoned and an Act of Parliament was passed dissolving the bishopric and forming it into a county palatine. After the brief reign of Mary's reign, Bishop Tunstall was deprived of his see by Elizabeth, July, 1559. With his death in confinement, on 18 Nov., the line of Catholic bishops ended. Ten years later during the "Rising of the North" the Catholics seized Durham cathedral, restored the altar, and publicly celebrated Mass, thus making it the last of the old English cathedrals in which Mass has been said.

In the bishopric there were six collegiate churches, Auckland, Darlington, Chester-le-Street, Lanchester, Norton, and Staindrop. The Benedictines held Durham Abbey, with the dependent houses of Jarrow, Wearmouth, and Finchale. There were Augustinians at Hexham and Brinkburn; Cistercians at Newcastle, and Premonstratensians at Blanchland. Durham College (now Trinity), at Oxford, was greatly protected and helped by various bishops and priors of Durham, and possibly was originally a Durham foundation. The arms of the see are: azure, a cross between four lions rampant, or. The mitre over the arms is encircled by a ducal coronet.

The Historical Works of Symeon of Durham in B. S. (1882-1883), the chief authority for the history of the see down to 1155. Subsequent events are recorded by Geoffrey of Coldingham, Liber de Statu Ecclesie Dunelmensis (1152-1212); Robert de Greydan, Historia de Statu Ecc. Dunelm. (1214-1336); William de Chandler, Continuatio Historiae Dunelmensis—all three ed. by Raine and pub. by Socites.
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tically that of the North of England (corresponding in all its main points to that of York), with a few local modifications such as one would expect to find in a great and flourishing monastic church. The treatise begins with a description of the famous nine altars (ed. Surtees Soc., p. 7). All the great paschal candlestick was reserved in a silver pelican hung over the High Altar. It should be noted that a pelican in her piety was assumed as his arms by Richard Fox (Bishop of Durham, 1494–1502) and was constantly introduced into monuments built by him (so at Winchester and at Corpus Christi College, Oxford). The large paschal candle was conspicuous and splendid feature of Easter ritual at Durham; and it the rite of the paschal candle are described in chapter xvi (ed. cit., p. 10). The Office for Palm Sunday does not differ from that of Sarum and the other English uses (ed. cit., p. 179). On Maundy Thursday there was a procession with St. Cuthbert's relics. A special feature of the Good Friday service was the crucifix service, performed by monks from inside a statue of Our Lady, for the Creeping to the Cross. On the same day the Blessed Sacrament was enclosed in a great statue of Christ on a side altar, and the candles were burned before it. On the Holy Saturday service in the Durham Missal is given on pp. 185–187 of the Surtees Society edition. The monks sang the "Miserere" while they went in procession to the new fire. When the paschal candle is lit they sing a hymn, "Inventor rotuli," which is repeated each time. There are only five Prophecies, and then follow the litanies. When "Omnes Sancti" is sung those who are to serve the Mass go out. The word Accenditur is said and the candles are lighted. It is repeated three times; at the third repetition the bishop comes out to begin the Mass. The bells (Anglus, rex, eleison, the Gloria, and the Alleluia. Between three and four o'clock in the morning of Easter Day the Blessed Sacrament was brought in procession to the high altar, while they sang an antiphon, "Christus resurgens ex mortuis, iam non moritur," etc. Another verse that is repeated each time. There are only five Prophecies, and then follow the litanies.

When "Omnes Sancti" is sung those who are to serve the Mass go out. The word Accenditur is said and the candles are lighted. It is repeated three times; at the third repetition the bishop comes out to begin the Mass. The bells (Anglus, rex, eleison, the Gloria, and the Alleluia. Between three and four o'clock in the morning of Easter Day the Blessed Sacrament was brought in procession to the high altar, while they sang an antiphon, "Christus resurgens ex mortuis, iam non moritur," etc. Another verse that is repeated each time. There are only five Prophecies, and then follow the litanies.

Throughout the year the chapter Mass was sung at nine o'clock, Vespers at three p.m. On Thursdays, except in Advent, Septuagesima, and Lent, on St. Cuthbert was sung in choir (ed. cit., p. 191). On Fridays there was a "Jesus-Mass" (a votive mass of St. Cuthbert was sung in choir (ed. cit., p. 220). This was also the custom at York, Lincoln, Lichfield, and Salisbury. On St. Cuthbert's Day (20 March) there was, naturally, a great feast and his relics were exposed. Chapter xvi (ed. cit., p. 16) describes the following names of benefactors (Liber Vitae) that was kept on the high altar, chapter xxi the forms for giving sacred to armed persons. They had to use the knocker, still shown to visitors, and, when they were received, to wear a black gown with a yellow cross of St. Cuthbert on the left shoulder (ed. cit., p. 10). No woman was allowed to approach the saint's tomb beyond a line of blue marble traced on the floor. To explain this, chapter xviii tells a legend about a king's daughter who falsely accused him and was eventually swallowed up by the earth. In the "Galilee" was a chapel of Our Lady for women (ch. xxii, ed. cit., p. 42). When a monk died his body was carried to St. Andrew's chapel, two monks watched before it all the time; after the dirge and the requiem Mass was celebrated in the sanctuary with a chalice of wax laid on the breast (ch. xxiii). Priors were buried in the Abbey choir (xxxvi), and choristers in the sanctuary (xxxvii). (See DURHAM, DIocese of.)

The Anglo-Saxon Rituale ecclesiae Dunelmensis is published (from the MSS. at Durham) by the SURTEES SOCIETY (vol. X, 1838), and was re-edited with a key in his Old English Texts (1865). The Ancient Monuments, Ritae, and Customs of the Metropolitan Church of Durham is a treatise on the Durham Ritual in a MS. of 1020 in the library at Durham (MSS. Bl. 11, fol. 5 and a MS. of 1656 belonging to Sir John Lawson, Bart., of Tatham Hall, Catterick (Pepys' friend). The edition of the Surtees Society has been printed (vol. CVII, Rituales, of 1898). Other editions are: one curtailed and modernized by Davies (London, 1872); Hunter, Durham Cathedral as it was before the dissolution of the monasteries (Durham, J. Ross for Mrs. waggon, 1733); reprinted, Durham, 1785); and Sanders, The Antiquities of the Abbey or Cathedral Church of Durham (Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1767). The Durham Obituary Register, 1688 to 1819, was added by Raines for the Surtees Society (vol. XXXI, 1856) and the Liber Vitae Ecclesiae Dunelmensis, from a ninth-century MS., by S. C. White for the same society (vol. XII, 1843). The Surtees Society Catalogue (pp. 38, 115) gives a Durham Canon Missae, bound up with a psalter, hymnary, and journal, of 1384 and Part of the Ms. (ed. Mortimer). The British Museum (Ms. 5289) is printed in vol. CVII of the Surtees Society (pp. 172–174). Occasionally the Durham Rite will be found in Rock, Church of our Fathers, ed. Hart and Freire (4 vols., London, 1904), and in Waddington E. T. Littledoll The Old Service-books of the English Church (London, 1904).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

DURROW (Irish Dearmghall, Plain of the Oaks), SCHOOL OF, is delightfully situated in the King's County, a few miles from the town of Tullamore, St. Columbia, who loved to build in close proximity to oak-groves, because of their natural beauty, as well as to pomp of their Druidic associations found here, as in Derry, a site just after his heart. It was freely given to him by Aedh, son of Brendan, lord of the soil, in 535, and the saint lost no time in founding his monastery, which, with more or less constant personal supervision, he ruled till 668. When, in that year, either as a matter of penance, or as Adamnan says, "of choice for Christ's sake," he became an exile in the wilds of Scotland, he appointed a most estimable monk, Cormac Ua Lethlain, to take his place. But owing to the jealousies that existed between the northern and the southern tribes, especially on the Canterbury, Cormac Ua Lethlain was put within the office of prior, and so he fled from the monastery, leaving in charge a first cousin of Columba, Laisren by name, who, acceptable to both sides, governed the institution with conspicuous success. Duroe, durrow is a gaelic verb (X) meaning to write a letter since its establishment as a famous school, at one time being seconded second to none in the country. The Venerable Bede styles it Monasterium nobile in Hibernia, and, at a later period, Armagh and itself was called the "Universities of the West." It will be ever noted for the useful and admirable practice of copying manuscripts, especially of the Sacred Scriptures, which had become quite a fine art amongst the masters and disciples there. Columba himself, who was an expert scribe, is generally credited with having written with his own hand the incomparable copy of the Four Gospels now known as the Book of Durrow, a great book every page of which is the result of exquisite workmanship, charming the mind as well as the eye with its intricate and highly ornamental details. An entry on the back of one of the folios of this remarkable book, which is now to be seen in Trinity College, Dublin, prays for a "remembrance of the books, Columba, who wrote this evangel in the space of twelve days."

Columba dearly loved Duroe. It held a place in his affections next to his own Derry, and while in Iona he manifested the tenderest interest in everything that concerned its welfare. When he was urging Cormac Ua Lethlain to return to the monastery there, ...
he recounted for him the manifold beauties of that "city devout, with its hundred crosses, without blemish, and without transgression", and added, "I pledge thee my unerring word, which may not be impugned, that death is better in reproachless Erin than life forever in Alba."

Du Ruyt, like Derry, and to rest, was frequently ravaged by the Danish invaders, but its complete devastation was left for the fierce Norman invader, Hugh de Lacy. In 1186 he began the building of a castle for himself out of the stones of the dismantled monastery, but the axe of an Irish laboring man cut him short in the unholy work in the church and the school are long since gone; not a stone of the original building may now be found. There are, however, still to be seen at Durrow a churchyard, probably marking the ancient site, a Celtic cross, and a holy well, which will serve to keep the name and the fame of St. Columba fresh in the minds of the people forever.

ADAMAN, Life of Columba, ed. Rev. F. Healy (Dublin, 1877; also by Fowler (London, 1905); Life in the Book of Lismore; HEALY, Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars (Dublin, 1906); GILBERT, Facsimiles of Irish National MSS. Whitley Stokes in Anecdota Oxoniensia (Oxford, 1890).

JOHN HEALY.

Dutch Guiana. See Guiana.

DUTY. —The definition of the term duty given by lexicographers is: "something that is due;" "obligatory service;" "something that one is bound to perform;" or "something to which a person is inclined." In this sense we speak of duties inherent in our nature; and, in general, the sum total of these duties is denoted by the abstract term in the singular. The word is also used to signify that unique factor of consciousness which is expressed in the following definitions by "obligatory," "bound," "ought," and "arrestable." Let us consider the term in consciousness. When, concerning a contemplated act, one forms the decision "I ought to do it," the words express an intellectual judgment. But unlike speculative judgments, this one is felt to be not merely declaratory. Nor is it merely preferential; it asserts itself as imperative and magisterial. It is accompanied by a feeling impelling one, sometimes effectually, sometimes ineffectually, to square his conduct with it. It presumes that there is a right way and a wrong way open, and that the right is better or more worthy than the wrong. All moral judgments of this kind are particular applications of a universal judgment which is postulated in each of them: right is to be done; wrong is to be avoided. Another phenomenon of our moral consciousness is that we are aware from our consciousness that nature has constituted a hierarchical order among our feelings, emotions, and desires. We instinctively feel, for example, that the emotion of reverence is higher and nobler than the sense of humour; that it is more worthy of us as rational beings to find satisfaction in a noble drama than in watching a dog-fight; that the sentiment of benevolence is superior to that of selfishness. Furthermore we are conscious that, unless it has been weakened or atrophied by neglect, the sentiment attending moral judgments asserts itself as the highest of all; awakens in us the feeling of reverence; and demands that all other sentiments and desires, as motives of action, shall be reduced to subordination to the moral judgment. When action is conformed to this demand, there arises a feeling of self-appropriation, while an opposite course is followed by a feeling of self-reproach. Starting from this analysis we may easily understand the theory of duty according to the ethics of the Catholic Church.

DUTY IN CATHOLIC ETHICS. —The path of activity proper and congenial to every being is fixed and dictated by the nature which the being possesses. The cosmic order which pervades all the non-human universe is predetermined in the nature of the innumerable variety of things which make up the universe. For man, too, the course of action proper to him is dictated by the constitution of his nature. A great part of his activity is, like the entire movements of the non-human world, under the iron grip of determinism; there are large classes of vital functions, over which he has no volitional control; and his body is subject to the physical laws of nature. And in the non-human world, he is himself the master of his action over a wide range of life which we know as conduct. He is free to choose between two opposite courses; he can elect, in circumstances innumerable, to do or not to do; to do this action, or to do that other which is incompatible with doing it. Does, then, his nature function by conduct? Is every form of conduct equally congenial and equally indifferent to human nature? By no means. His nature indicates the line of action which is proper, and the line which is abhorrent to it. This demand of nature is delivered partly in that hierarchical order which exists in our feelings and desires as motives of action; partly through the reflective reason which decides what form of action is consonant with the dignity of a rational being; comprehensively, and with immediate practical application to action, in those moral judgments involving the "ought." This function of reason, aided thus by good and practical experience, we call conscience (q. v.).

We have now reached the first strand of the bond which we know as moral obligation, or duty. Duty is a debt owed to the natural nature of which the spokesman and representative is conscience, which at each moment demands the satisfaction of justice. But is this the be-all and the end-all of duty? The idea of duty, of indebtedness, involves another self or person to whom the debt is due. Conscience is not another self, it is an element of one's own personality. How can one be said, except through a figure of speech, to be indebted to oneself? Here we must take into consideration another characteristic of conscience. It is that conscience in a dim, indefinable, but very real way, seems to set itself over against the rest of our personality. Its intimations awake, as no other exercise of our reason does, feelings of awe, reverence, love, fear, shame, such as are called forth in us by other persons, and by persons only. The universality of this experience is testified to by the expressions men commonly employ when speaking of conscience; they call it a voice, a judge; they say that they must answer to conscience; they speak of conscience as a teacher, as one's own master. Their attitude towards it is as to something not completely identical with themselves; its whole genesis is not to be accounted for by describing it as one function of life. It is the effect of education and training, some say. Certainly education and training may do a great deal to determine our feelings and desires, but in conscience there is another self implicated beyond ourselves. But the quickness with which the child responds to his instructor or educator on this point proves that he feels within himself something which confirms his teacher's lesson. Ethical philosophers, and conspicuously among them Newman, have argued that to him who listens reverently and obediently to the dictates of conscience, they inevitably reveal themselves as emanating, originally, from "a Supreme Governor, a Judge, holy, just, powerful, all-seeing, retributive." If, however, we accept Newman's view as universally true, we must admit that, as is generally asserted and believed, many men obey conscience and love righteousness, who nevertheless, do not believe in a personal, moral ruler of the universe. Why may not the most uncompromising their admit that the moral ruler according to Catholic ethics has implanted in our nature is powerful enough successfully to discharge its function, at least in occasional cases, without fully unfolding its implications? One of the leading Unitarian moralists has eloquently expressed this opinion. The profound sense of the authority and even sacredness of the moral law is often conspicuous among men whose
thoughts apparently never turn to superhuman things, but who are penetrated by a secret worship of honour, truth and right. Were this noble state of mind brought out of its impulsive state and made to unfold its implicit contents, it would indeed reveal a secret human sanctions for the authority of righteousness. But it is undeniable that that authority may be felt where it is not seen—felt as if it were the mandate of a Perfect Will, while yet there is no overt recognition of such a Will: i.e., conscience may act as human, before it is discovered to be divine. To the agent himself, its whole history may seem to lie in his consciousness and his visible social relations; and it shall nevertheless serve as his oracle, though it be hid from him Who it is that utter its. (Martineau, A Study of Religion, Introduction, p. 21.) Nevertheless it must be admitted that such persons are comparatively few; and they, too, testify to the implication of another self in the intimations of consciousness; for they, as Ladd says, “personify the conception of the sum-total of ethical obligations, they are fain to spell the words with capitals and swear allegiance to this purely abstract conception. They hypothesize and defy an abstraction as though it were itself existent and allow a command from him. If moral judgments can claim no higher origin than one's own reason, then under close, severe inspection they must be considered as merely preferential. The portentous magisterial tone in which conscience speaks is a mere delusion; it can show no warrant to the authority which it pretends to exercise. When, under stress of temptation, a man who believes in no higher legislator than conscience, finds arising in his mind the inevitable question, Why am I bound to obey my conscience when my desires run in another direction? he is in perilously tempted to adjust his moral code to his inclinations; and the device of spelling duty with a capital will prove but a slender support to it against the attack of passion.

Reason solves the problem of duty, and vindicates the sanction of the law of righteousness by tracing the law to its source in God, the sovereign order and expression of the Divine Will, so, likewise, is the moral law which is expressed in the rational nature. God wills that we shape our free action or conduct to that norm. Reason recognizing our dependence on the Creator, and acknowledging His ineflable majesty, power, goodness, and sanctity, teaches us that we owe Him love, reverence, obedience, service, and, consequently, we owe it to Him to observe that law which He has implanted within us as the ideal of conduct. This is our first and all-comprehensive duty in which all other duties have their root. In the light of this truth conscience explains itself and is transfigured. It is the accredited representative of the Eternal; He is the original Imponent of moral obligation; and disobedience to conscience is disobedience to Him. Infraction of the moral law is a crime higher than human nature for the subject of it is designated by calling it sin. The sanctions of conscience, self-approbation, and self-reproach, are reinforced by the supreme sanction, which, if one may use the expression, acts automatically. It consists in this, that by obedience to the law of perfection, and compass our supreme good; while, on the other hand, the transgressor condemns himself to miss that good in the attainment of which alone lies the happiness that is incorruptible. To obviate a possible misapprehension it may be remarked here that the distinction between right and wrong hangs not upon any arbitrary decree of the Divine Will. Right is right and wrong is wrong because the prototype of the created order, of which the moral law forms a part, is the Divine Nature itself, the ultimate ground of all truth intellectual and moral.

Duties and wanders. We have already touched upon the main weakness of the Kantian theory, which is to treat conscience as autonomous. Another mistake of Kant is that in his system duty and right are made coterminous. A moment’s reflection is sufficient to perceive that this is an error. There are only two actions good which one can do, and which it would be highly praiseworthy to perform, yet which no reasonable person, however rigorous his ideal of conduct might be, would say one is bound to perform. Duty and right are two concentric circles. The inner one, duty, embraces all that is to be observed under penalty of failing to live rationally. The outer contains the inner, but, stretching far beyond, permits an indefinite extension to the paths of virtue that lead to consummate righteousness and sanctity. Every philosophic system which embraces as one of its tenets the doctrine of determinism thereby commits itself to the denial of the existence of moral obligation. Duty implies that the subject of it possesses the power to observe the law, or to disobey, and the power to choose between these alternatives. What reproach can a determinist mentor logically address to one who has committed a wrong action? "You ought not to have done so." The culprit can reply: "But you have taught me that I must do no action that no one can act otherwise than he does. So, under the circumstances in which I found myself, it was impossible for me to refrain from the action which you condemn. What, then, can you mean by saying that I ought not to have acted as I did? You reproach me; as well reproach a tiger for having eaten his own or a volcano for having ruined a village."

With regard to the existence of duty every form of pantheism, or monism, logically finds itself in the camp of determinism. When man is looked upon as one with the Infinite, his actions are not really his own, but belong properly to the Universal Being. The part assigned to him, in his activities, is similar to that played by a carbon burner in relation to the electric current generated by a dynamo. The Divine power passing through him clothes itself with only a seeming individuality, while the whole course of action, the direction which it takes, and the results in which it culminates, belong to the Supreme Being. If this were true, then lying, debauchery, theft, murder were equally as worthy as truthfulness, chastity, honesty, benevolence; for both would be equally manifestations of the one universal Divinity. Then a classification of conduct into two opposite categories might still be made from the standpoint of results; but the idea of moral worth, which is the very core of the moral life and the first postulate of duty, would have vanished. Hedonism of every shade—epicurean, utilitarian, egoistic, altruistic, evolutionist—which finds its basis in the "greatest happiness" principle and makes pleasure and pain the discriminating norm of right and wrong, is unable to vindicate any authority for duty, or even to acknowledge the existence of moral obligation. No combination of impulses, if they are estimated from the merely biological or purely empirical standpoint, can, by any juggling of words, be converted into a moral hierarchy. The hedonist is doomed to find all his endeavours to establish the basis of the moral order terminate in "is", but never in "ought"; in fact, but never in an ideal. Berkeley has nicely summed up the situation of the problem of duty: "All that is meant by saying we ought to do an action is that if we do not do it we shall suffer."

Pleasure, say the epicurean and the egoist, is the only motive of action; and actions are good or bad
accordingly as they produce a surplus of pleasure over pain, or contribute to or diminish welfare. Then, we ask, must I always pursue what seems to me the most pleasurable or the most remunerative? If the answer is yes, we are again landed in determinism. If the reply is no, we are at a loss what I ought to do. As I have to do what produces the most happiness, then I ask, why ought I to choose the course which produces most happiness or pleasure if I prefer to do otherwise? To this question the epicurean and the egoist have no answer. Besides, the most pleasurable conduct may be one that is not reasonable, because it is injurious to some one else. Here the egoist is compelled to hand the difficulty over to the altruist. The latter endeavours to dispose of it by pointing out that the object of good conduct is not merely the agent’s own happiness, but that of everybody concerned. But again, why am I bound to take into account the welfare of others? and the altruist is silent. The evolutionist of the Spencerian type intervenes with a ponderous theory that in gauging the measure in which actions produce welfare or diminish it, not merely the immediate, but also and more especially remote results only, he then proceeds to show, that, as a hereditary consequence of our ancestors’ experience that remote results are more important than immediate, we have come to fancy that remote results have a certain authoritative- ness. Also, from unpleasant experiences of our ancestors it is a tendency to impose very stringent conditions upon actions, to think too of the external penalties which were attached to such actions. These two elements, blending into one, give rise, we are told, to the feeling of moral obligation. So the common conviction that moral obligation has really any binding authority is a more delusion. Spencer is bold enough to draw the inevitable corollary of this doctrine which is that our sense of duty and moral obligation is transitory and destined to disappear. Ethical writers of the “independent morality” schools have devised a beautifully simple way of escaping from the embarrassment of accounting for the validity of moral obligation. They ignore the subject altogether and refer the disappointed inquirer to the metaphysician. Ethics, they blandly declare, is a descriptive, not a normative science; hence that imposing array of works professing to treat scientifically of morals, yet calmly ignoring the real chief factor of the moral life.

Historic Development of the Idea of Duty.—To trace the development of the concept of duty would be to review the history of the human race. Even in the lowest races there is to be found some moral code, however crude and erroneous. Another universal fact is that the race has, everywhere and always, placed morals under a religious, or quasi-religious, sanction. The savage, in a measure corresponding to his crude moral and intellectual development, witnesses to this universal impulse by observing invariable customs because he believes them to have some sanction higher than that of his fellow tribesmen or their chief. The great nations of antiquity, Chinese, Chaldean, Babylonian, Egyptian, saw in their deities the source or sanction of their moral codes—at least until the religious and the moral ideal became thus confused. In Greece the religious and moral ideas were intimately associated, until religion proved false to its trust. The same phenomenon is found in the Aryan race of India and Persia, while the Semitic peoples, especially the Jews, always continued to look to religion for the reason of their moral conduct. In Greece and Rome, law and religion were intimately associated, until religion proved false to its trust. The same phenomenon is found in the Aryan race of India and Persia. When classic poets among the gods the vices of men, the ancient tradition continued to be vindicated by the poets, and by some of the philosophers. The magnificent testimonies of the Greek tragic poets, of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero to the superhuman origin of the moral law and duty need not be quoted here. But when religious tradit-
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lost its force and philosophy became the guardian of morality, a conflict of rival schools, none of which possessed sufficient authority to make its tenets prevail with the mass of the people, was the inevitable result; and as religious faith declined, the tendency to a non-religious basis for duty became more pronounced. The consequence was that the idea of duty faded; and systems arose, which, like our present day “independent morality,” had no place for moral obligation.

The unity of the moral and religious ideal was re-established and rendered perfect by Christianity. The Gospel vindicated the origin of the Duty as the development of the idea according to the purposes of the Divine. It was declared that its fulfillment constituted the very essence of religion. This idea has been the chief motor force to raise the Western world out of the moral chaos into which decaying paganism had dragged it. The doctrine that every man is an immortal being created by God to be united with Himself in an endless existence, provided that he observe the law of righteousness, in which God’s will is expressed, sets forth the dignity of man and the sacredness of duty in their full nobility. The wickedness of moral delinquency reveals itself in this, that it is a sin against the Most Holy idea formerly known to antiquity outside the Hebrew people. The Christian religion brought out more clearly and taught with the authority of God, the code of the natural law, much of which unaided reason developed only in hesitating accents and without the authority of God. Of the old idea of the nature of moral duty. The Christian was taught that the fulfillment of duty is the one supreme concern of life to which all other interests must be made to bow, and that its fulfillment is enforced by the most tremendous sanctions conceivable. The Gospel gave a satisfactory solution to the anomaly of a moral principle which both united and separated us from the computers of the moral world.

The State, too, is placed on a firmer basis, since Christian doctrine teaches that it draws the warrant of its existence not from force, or a mere consensus of human wills, but from God. Finally, the Christian law of love correlates the outer circle of righteousness with the inner one of strict duty. Love of God becomes the adequate motive for striving after the highest personal sanctity; love of our neighbour for the widest exercise of benevolence far beyond the limits of strict duty. In the person of the Master, Christianity offers us to the flawless Exemplar of the moral ideal, the perfect conformity of will and action to the Divine Will. His example has proved potent enough to inspire with heroic loyalty to duty “the millions who, countless and nameless, the stern hard path have trod.” The moral and perpetual obligations of our civilization have been developed and maintained by the efficiency of the Christian idea of duty. Contemporary conditions furnish unmistakable indications that these standards become debased and discredited when they are torn from the ground whence they sprang.

Duties.—The obligation of living according to our rational nature is the parent of all particular duties. These are generally divided into three groups—(1) duties to God, (2) duties towards ourselves, and (3) duties to others.—(1) To God, the Supreme Master of the universe, our Creator, the All Holy, All Good, we owe honour, service, obedience, and love. These
duties are comprehended under the general term religion. Since He is Truth itself, we owe it to Him to believe whatever He has revealed to us in a supernatural manner; to worship Him in the way which, in revelation, He has taught us is most pleasing to Him; and to obey the authority which He has constituted. Reverence due to Him forbids all profanity and blasphemy of Him or whatever is sacred to Him. Lying is an offence against His Divine nature, which is Truth itself. These generic duties cover all the specific duties that we owe to God, and embrace, besides, those duties which devolve upon us as members of — (2) Our duties towards ourselves may all be included under one principle: life, the goods of person, mental and physical, have been given to us in trust, with the obligation of using them to obtain our supreme good and end. Hence we may not destroy them, or abuse them as if we were independent master of them. Therefore suicide, abuse of our faculties, mental or physical, exposing our life or health to danger without a reasonable motive, are prohibited; as also are all actions incompatible with the reverence that we owe to our moral nature. We are bound to strive for the development of our intellect and temporal goods as far as these are necessary to the fulfillment of the moral law. As duty is a debt to some one other than ourselves, we cannot, strictly speaking, use the term duties to ourselves. They are due to God; they regard ourselves.—(3) All our duties towards others are explicitly contained in the Christian precept: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." God wills the welfare of all men; hence the obligation of making His will the rule of life binds me to will their welfare, and to order my conduct towards them with a due respect to the rational nature which they possess, and to the obligations which that nature imposes on them. The application of this principle gives birth to duties towards the minds and wills of others (prohibition of scandal and lying); to the lives of others (prohibition of murder, etc.); to their good reputation (prohibition of insult, detraction, or defamation of character). As material goods are necessary to us in order to live according to the rational law, evidently God in imposing moral obligation wills also that we have at our disposal the means necessary to fulfill our duty. Hence arises that moral control over things which is called "duty." The needs of a moral life require that some things should be permanently under our control; hence the rights of ownership. Now a right in one person is nugatory unless others are bound to respect it. So to every right there is a corresponding duty.

Thus far we have sketched the line of duty incumbent on each one towards others as individuals. Besides these there are social duties. The primary society, the family, which is the unit of civil society, has its foundation in our nature; and the relations which constitute it give rise to two groups of rights and correlative duties — conjugal and parental. Besides the family, a wider, broader, association of man with his fellows is needed, generally speaking, in order that he may develop his life with all its needs and potencies, in accordance with the dictates of reason. God has intended man to live in civil society, and man becomes the subject of duties and rights with regard to the society of which he is a member. The society, too, acquires a moral unity or personality which is also the subject of rights and duties. This system of social rights and duties has for its pivot the right possessed by the society to impose laws which constitute a binding obligation. This right, called the authority, is derived from the natural law, ultimately from God. For, since He wills civil society as a means for the due development of human nature, He wills that authority without which it cannot exist. As the lower animals cannot be the subject of rights we do not owe them any duties; but we owe duties to God in their regard (see Ethics; Law: Obligation).

**Duvergier de Hauranne (or Du Verger). Jean (also called Saint-Cyrain) from an abbey he held in commendam, one of the authors of Jansenism, at Guayenne, France, 1611; d. in Paris, 1643. After studying the humanities in his native place, and philosophy at the Sorbonne, he went to Louvain, not to the university but to the Jesuit college, where he graduated, 1604, with a brilliant thesis admired by Justus Lipsius. His acquaintance with the future theologian of the Jansenists, Jean-Baptiste de Jussieu, at the Sorbonne, and a Commoner of the Jansenist family, humid of the Baisant Jacques, himself a disciple of Scaliger and an enthusiastic humanist, received him as a friend, appointed him to a canonry and the priory of Bonneville, and later, 1620, resigned in his behalf the Abbey of Saint-Cyrain-en-Bremme. The new commendatory prelate resided little in his abbey. In 1622 he returned definitively to Paris, the metropolis affording him better opportunities of his plans. During the years 1617-1635 an assiduous correspondence was kept up between Duvergier and Jansen, of which there remain only "Lettres de Jussieu à Duvergier de Hauranne," seized at the time of Saint-Cyrain's incarceration. These letters, wherein conventional epigrams are used, constantly mention the affaire principale, projet, cabale, that is, first and foremost, the composition of the "Augustinian" by Jansen, Saint-Cyrain employing himself to enlist patrons for the so-called Augustinian system (see Jansenism). For greater security the two innovators momentarily discussed the progress of their joint work. One of these meetings probably gave rise to the much-debated "Projet de Bourg-Fontaine." In his "Relation juridique de ce qui s'est passé à Poitiers touchant la nouvelle doctrine des Janséniens," Poitiers, 1655, Filleau stated on the authority of one of the conspirators that six persons had secretly met in 1621 at the chartreuse of Bourg-Fontaine, near Paris, for the purpose of overthrowing Christianity and establishing desism in its stead. The names of the conspirators, initially baffled by Filleau, were given in full by Bayle (Dict., s. v. "Arnauld"). The Jansenists always protested against this story. Arnauld called it a "diabolical invention," and Pascal ridiculed it in his "Seizième lettre à un provincial." The Jesuit Father Sauveur's argument in his "Réalité du projet de Bourg-Fontaine démonstrée par l'exécution,"
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(Paris, 1715) was refuted by D. Clémenet in "La vérité et l'innocence victorieuses de la calomnie ou huit lettres sur le projet de Bourg-Fontaine" (Paris, 1738). Although Clémenet's book was burned by order of the Parliament of Paris, still it never was answered. Guet's remark that "the adepts of Jansenism passed insensibly from the tenets of Saint-Cyr and Montgerton to atheism and the worship of reason" (Civilisation en Europe, Lec. xil) may apply to some of the later Jansenists, but the charge of rationalism is obviously untenable when brought against the Jansenists of the first generation. Tripped up of unsupported details and deductions, Filliet's naive "la vie and sauvage" arguments show what is borne out by the letters of Jansenius and other documents of the time, a covert yet definite purpose, as early as 1621, to deeply modify the dogmas, moral practices, and constitution of the Church. St. Augustine being made responsible for such changes.

As noticed above, Duvergier's share was to win high influence in favour of the religious revolution. While at Poitiers he met Richelieu, de Condren, and Arnauld d'Andilly. At Paris he sought out such men as Vincent de Paul, founder of the Congregation de Minimes, Olier, founder of Saint-Sulpice, Bérulle, superior of the French Oratory; Tariisse, superior of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur; Bourdoise, superior of Saint-Nicolas, and many more. It cannot be denied that these men were at first attracted by Saint-Cyr's affectation asceticism, but when they understood his true aim they resented from him. The terse expression applied in the Roman Breviary to St. Vincent de Paul, Sensit simul et exhorruit (he shuddered on hearing), could be said of them all, with the exception of Bérulle and Arnauld d'Andilly. Bérulle never shared the errors of Duvergier and Jansen, but, being indebted to these two for the establishment of the French Oratory in the Netherlands, he failed to detect their real purpose and gave them a hold on his order which they never released. Owing to his Gallicanism and strong prejudices against the Jesuits, Arnauld d'Andilly fell an easy prey to Saint-Cyr's wiles and deceptions, and even brought with him the whole Arnauld family, along with the Bernardine nuns of Port-Royal (q. v.). Adroitly and persistently Saint-Cyr pushed his way into this celebrated monastery, id.d, in 1636, he became its sole director. Not content with his innovations and rigourous zeal eagerly accepted by the nuns, but Port-Royal became the centre of Jansenism, drawing a host of ecclesiastics, lawyers, writers, etc., all vying with one another to place themselves under the "spiritual domination" of the Abbé de Saint-Cyr. His incredible success and nefarious work are well described by M. Sépet (in Rev. des quest. hist., xlv, 534): "Taking advantage of the moral enthusiasm aroused by the religious awakening, an ardent and sombre sectarian, Saint-Cyr undertook to win souls over for the proud doctrine of absolute predestination to everlasting Damnation, and to put an end to this system of rigourism to which the initiated easily accommodated themselves, while simple-hearted folk like Pascal risked life and reason in its practice."

Saint-Cyr was at the summit of his influence when a pamphlet sent him (1638) to the dnr of Vincennes. His incarneration has been variously explained both by friends and enemies. Richelieu gave the true reason when he said: "Saint-Cyr is more dangerous than six armies. If Luther and Calvin had been arrested when they began to dogmatize, much mischief would have been spared the nations."

(See Marandé, "Inconvenients d'état procédant du Jansénisme", Paris, 1653.) Jansenists writers unduly insist on the rigour of Saint-Cyr's captivity. As a matter of fact, he was given liberty enough to receive his friends, to read the first printed copy of "Augustinus", to collaborate with Antoine Arnauld on the "Fréquente Communion", published in 1643, to write his "Théologie familière" and the voluminous "Lettres chrétiennes et spirituelles", and even to make new recruits. In 1645, after Richelieu's death, Saint-Cyr recovered his liberty and returned in triumph to Port-Royal. The triumph, however, was clouded by the announcement that the "Augustinus" had been condemned at Rome. When the author heard of the condemnation he angrily protested that "Rome was going too far and ought to be taught a lesson"; a stroke of apoplexy, however, carried him off before he could execute his threat. Pierre de Pons, parish priest of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas, was incriminated by Rapin (Hist. du Jans., p. 305), testified that Saint-Cyr died while being anointed, but had asked for neither absolute nor Viaticum, notwithstanding a certificate to the contrary, delivered by Mulse, when imported and bixed by the Jansenists.

Saint-Cyr was a prolific writer. His manuscripts, seized at the time of his arrest, formed no less than thirty-two thick folios. Amid the numerous writings ascribed to him by the "Dictionnaire des livres Jansénistes" (Antwerp, 1755), it is difficult to distinguish his genuine works, for he generally wrote anonymously, or under a false name, and intermixed them with others. Apart from two frivolous pamphlets written by Duvergier in his youth, "Question royale" (Paris, 1699), an apology for suicide under certain circumstances, and "Apologie pour . . . de Rochepeaux" (Poitiers, 1615), a thesis in which he shows that bishops have a right to use arms, his principal works are: (1) "Sommes des fautes du P. Garasse" (Paris, 1626), with several additional pamphlets in support of it; the book itself was a vile attack on the Jesuits on occasion of a somewhat inaccurate book written by one of them, Father Garasse; (2) "Petrus Aurelius de hierarchia ecclesiastica" (Paris, 1631), written in collaboration with Duvergier's nephew, Barcoas, and others. This book purports to be a defence of Richard Smith, vicar Apostolic in England, against the alleged machinations of the English Jesuits; in fact it aims at winning over to the Jansenist error the Catholic hierarchy whose prerogatives it exaggerates to the detriment of the Roman See. The scientific portion of it is taken from the "De republica christianæ" (1617) of the apostate Mare Antonio de Dominis; the rest consists mainly of a kind of storm-centre, was clouded by Father Garasse, and the clergy of France, taken by surprise, paid the expenses of the book but later ordered Saint-Marthe's eulogy of Duvergier expunged from the "Gallia Christiana". (3) "Chapelet secret du très Saint-Sacrement" (Paris, 1632), a series of Quietist remarks on the attributes of Christ. This booklet, having become a kind of storm-centre, was at once repudiated by Saint-Cyr who nevertheless wrote several tracts in its defence. (4) "Théologie familière" (Paris, 1642), a series of theological devotional tracts, the Jansenists' catechism, teeming with errors on nearly every subject, condemned by the Holy Office on 23 April, 1656. (5) "La collaboration nes et spirituelles" (Paris, 1645); another series (Paris, 1774). Bossuet calls them dry and over-wrought (spiritualité sèche et alambiquée). With the "Théologie familière" they exhibit a fair specimen of Saint-Cyr's galimatias and obscure asceticism. Saint-Cyr's writings were collected in his "Oeuvres" (Lyons, 1679).

Besides a mass of unreliable Jansenist memoirs, e. g. by Lancelot (Utrecht, 1738), Du Fossé (Utrecht, 1729), Arnauld d'Andilly, etc. (Utrecht, 1754), and J. P. A. de M. Du Verger de Hamme, ed. Guérin (Cologne, 1702); Saint-Cyr in Dict. des Jansénistes, ed. Migne (Paris, 1847); Rapin, Hist. du Jansénisme (Paris, 1865); Irem,

J. F. SOLlier.

Duvernay, Ludger, a French-Canadian journalist and patriot, b. at Vercheres, Quebec, 22 Jan., 1795; d. at Burlington, 29 Nov., 1852. A printer by trade, he founded and edited successively at Three Rivers, Quebec, "La Gazette des Trois-Rivières" (1817), "Le Constitutionnel" (1823), and "L'Argus" (1826). In 1827, with A. N. Morin, he founded in Montreal "La Minerve", one of the prominent papers of French Canada. He was imprisoned (1852) for protesting with Dr. Daniel Tracey, editor of the "Vindicatore", against the arbitrariness of the Legislative Council. A medal was presented him in acknowledgment of his devotedness to the public good. Duvernay's chief title to fame is the foundation of the Society of St. John the Baptist (1834). The choice of the Prefect for the patron saint of the French-Canadians accorded with a time-honoured tradition mentioned in the essay "Relations" (1646) as contemporary with the beginning of New France and inherited from the mother country. The maple leaf, now accepted by Canadians of every origin, was chosen as the national emblem and the motto adopted by Duvernay was: "Notre langue, nos institutions et nos lois". Elected for Lachenaie in 1837, he was forced to leave the country for participating in the Canadian Rebellion, and he took up his residence at Burlington, Vermont, where he founded "Le Patriote Canadien" (1840). The union of the two Canadas having been voted by the British Parliament and the principle of representative government adopted, peace was restored and political exiles were allowed to return. Duvernay began again the publication of "La Minerve", in which he extolled the introduction of responsible government, and criticized the Act of Union, destitute of its authors, to absorb Lower Canada. Duvivier, Molier, 1838; Le Jour. de Quebec (Dec. 1822); Chouinard, Fête Nat. des Canad. fran. (Quebec, 1831).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Dyck, Antoon (Antong Van Dyck), usually known as Sir Anthony Van Dyck, Flemish portrait-painter, b. at Antwerp, 22 March, 1599; d. in London, 9 December, 1641. This great painter was the seventh child of a family of twelve, being the son of Frans Van Dyck, merchant in silk, linen, and kindred materials, and of Maria, daughter of Dirk Cuypers and Catharina Connex. While still a boy he was placed, on the advice of Jan Brueghel, as a pupil in the studio of Hendrick Van Balen, who had been a pupil of Rubens. The youth artist's development as a painter was rapid, for it is recorded that at the age of fourteen he painted a portrait of an old man, and a lawsuit in 1600 revealed the fact that he was over quite a youth a series of heads exceedingly well painted. A proof of his skill is the fact that in 1618, before he was twenty, he was admitted to the freedom of the guild of St. Luke in Antwerp, an unusual distinction for a youthful painter. The tradition that Van Dyck was apprenticed to Rubens or was over his pupil must be dismissed. Investigations have proved that he was regarded as a master in his art when he was introduced to the studio of Rubens. Here Van Dyck made one of the group of young men who assisted the master in his decorative works, which it would have been quite impossible for him to complete by himself.

In 1620, at the request of the Countess of Arundel, Van Dyck appears to have come to England and to have received commissions from James I for which he was paid in February, 1621. After executing these orders he returned to Antwerp and then determined to visit Italy, leaving in October, 1621, and remaining abroad for five years. He spent some time at Genoa, moved on to Rome, and then visited Florence; from here he went to Bologna, and later by way of Mantua to Venice. After this he was at Milan and finally in 1625 in Rome. The records of this journey remain in the famous "Chatsworth Sketch Book". His life in Rome was unsatisfactory, for he made many enemies, and soon left the Eternal City and settled in Genoa, where he was exceedingly popular. His portraits of the great nobility of Genoa rank among the finest in the world and form a magnificent and unrivalled series. In 1624 he visited Palermo, painting the portrait of Emmanuel of Savoy, Viceroy of Sicily, and some church pictures, but returned to Genoa and in 1626 left for Antwerp, probably on account of some complications with regard to the division of his father's estate. He visited Aachen and is believed to have gone on to Paris, while tradition states that he made a second visit to England. However, nothing definite is known of his movements until 1630 when he was at The Hague, and shortly afterwards back in his native town. Another tradition, which speaks of the rivalry between Rubens and Van Dyck, has to be discredited. Mr. Lionel Cust and others have shown that the two painters were not only on terms of equal respect and cordial friendship existed between them.

In 1632 Van Dyck went again to England and was graciously received by Charles I. He appears to have passed into the king's service immediately, as a warrant was issued on 21 May, 1632, for the payment of
an allowance to him, and a residence given him in Blackfriars. He had also a summer residence in the palace of Eltham, was knighted on 5 July, presented with a chain and medall of great value, and granted a pension of £200 a year to be paid quarterly. From the moment of his royal connexion his success was assured as a portrait-painter in England. The king and queen sat to him frequently, and he was overwhelmed with commissions. In 1634–5 he received a pressing invitation to visit the court at Brussels and accepted it, but in 1638 he was back at Antwerp and in the same year returned to London, taking again his position as portrait-painter to Charles I and to Henrietta Maria. Of the king he painted no less than thirty-six portraits and about twenty-five of Queen Henrietta Maria, but perhaps the most beautiful works executed for the royal family were those in which he depicted the children of the royal pair. To this period belong the wonderful portraits of the English aristocracy to be found in so many of the great English houses. He prepared a scheme for decorating the walls of the banqueting-house at Whitehall, the sketches for which still exist, but the royal exchequer could not afford the work. In 1640 he returned to Antwerp. Rubens having left and Van Dyck was acknowledged the head of the Flemish School and entertained with great magnificence. He was disposed to settle permanently at Antwerp, but first went to Paris, desiring to obtain the commission to decorate the gallery of the Louvre. The commission, however, given to French artists and Van Dyck returned to London for a while, later on in the year, however, visiting Antwerp and Paris, and then coming back to London. When he arrived his health was in a critical condition, and despite the attentions of the royal physician he died at his house in Blackfriars eight days after his wife had given birth to a daughter. He was buried in St. Paul's Cathedral, and a monument was erected to his memory by order of the king, but the grave and monument perished with the cathedral in the great fire of 1666.

In the opinion of Van Dyck he is the greatest artist of Europe after Titian, and in works of decorative splendour perhaps only rivalled by Rubens. He was a man of luxurious and somewhat indolent habits, ambitious, proud, sensitive, and quick to take offence. In his portraits the elegance of the composition, the delicacy of the handling of the head, the purity of his colouring, and the strong lifelike quality of expression give him the very highest position, and he is one of the few painters whom all critics have placed in the front rank. In a consideration of his art the brilliant and vigorous etchings must not be overlooked.

DYMPNA

Dympna (Dymnpa), Saint, virgin and martyr. The earliest historical account of the veneration of St. Dympna dates from the middle of the thirteenth century. Under Bishop Guy I of Cambrai (1238–47), Pierre, a canon of the church of Saint-Aubert at Cambrai, wrote a "Vita" of the saint, from which we learn that she had been venerated for many years in a church at Gheel (province of Antwerp, Belgium), which was dedicated to her. The author expressly states that he has drawn his biography from oral tradition. According to the narrative Dympna, the daughter of a pagan king of Ireland, became a Christian and was secretly baptized. After the death of her mother, who was of extraordinary beauty, her father desired to marry her to a very beautiful girl but she preferred a religious life with the priest Gerebernus and landed at Antwerp. Then they went to the village of Gheel, where there was a chapel of St. Martin, beside which they took up their abode. The messengers of her father, however, hearing of this, destroyed the chapel. Their mother took herself thither and renewed her offer. Seeing that it was in vain, he commanded his servants to slay the priest, while he himself struck off the head of his daughter. The corpses were put in sarcophagi and entombed in a cave, where they were found later. The body of St. Dympna was buried in the church of Gheel and the bones of St. Gerebernus were transferred to Xanten. This narrative is without any historical foundation, being merely a variation of the story of the king who wanted to marry his own daughter, a motif which appears frequently in popular legends. Hence we can only treat it as if it was the history of the St. Dympna and the time in which she lived. That she is identical with St. Damhna of Ireland cannot be proved. There are at Gheel fragments of two simple ancient sarcophagi in which tradition says the bodies of Dympna and Gerebernus were found. There is also a decorative brick, said to have been found in one of the sarcophagi, bearing two lines of letters read as Dympna. The discovery of this sarcophagus with the corpse and the brick was perhaps the origin of the veneration. In Christian art St. Dympna is depicted with a sword in her hand and a lettered devil at her feet. Her feast is celebrated 15 May, under which date she is also found in the Roman martyrology.

From time immemorial, the saint was invoked as patroness against insanity. The Bollandists have published numerous accounts of miraculous cures, especially between 1604 and 1668. As a result, there has long been a colony for lunatics at Gheel; even now there are sometimes as many as fifteen hundred, whose relatives invoke St. Dympna for their cure. The insane are treated in a peculiar manner; it is only in the beginning that they are placed in an institution for observation; later they are given to the good works of the inhabitants, take part in their agricultural labours, and are treated very kindly. They are watched without being conscious of it. The treatment produces good results. The old church of St. Dympna in Gheel was destroyed by fire in 1849. The new church was consecrated in 1852 and is still standing. Every year on the feast of the saint and on the Tuesday after Pentecost numerous pilgrims visit her shrine. In Gheel there is also a fraternity under her name. For an interesting account of Gheel, see Mrs. Byrne, "The City of the Simple" (London, 1889).
DYNAMISM

Dynamism, a general name for a group of philosophical views concerning the nature of matter. However, they may be in other respects, these all views agree in making matter consist essentially of simple and indivisible units, substances, or forces. Dynamism is sometimes used to denote systems that admit only matter and extension, but also determinations, tendencies, and forces intrinsic and essential to matter. More properly, however, it means exclusive systems that do away with the dualism of matter and force by reducing the former to the latter. Here we shall limit ourselves to this strict form of dynamism, first, indicating its chief advocates and its characteristic positions, secondly, comparing these in order to see the points of agreement and of difference.

I. We have but a vague and incomplete knowledge of the doctrines held by the Pythagorean School, but it seems that they may rightly be considered as at least the forerunners of modern dynamism. From a premetaphysical viewpoint the Pythagoreans, imbued with a mathematical spirit and accustomed to mathematical methods, came to look upon the principles (δύναμις) of numbers as the principles of things themselves, to assert that the elements (ἄτομα) of numbers were also the elements of reality, and that the whole heaven was a number. Various geometrical figures are but different combinations of numbers, the unit being a point; from points are formed lines, from lines, surfaces, and from surfaces, solids; and geometrical figures are the very substance of things. Hence, finally, "physical bodies are composed of numbers." Among the Arabphilosophers, the Mu'tazilim were atomists. The atom is the only substance, and all atoms are perfectly identical in nature. The identity, however, is not of a positive, but of a merely negative character, for these primitive elements of matter are mere simple substances and nothing else. They have no determinations, but the points of the points, however, no weight, no shape, no quantity, no extension. The atom is an indivisible and simple substantial point, the necessary subject of all accidents or determinations, and incapable of existing without them. Leibniz's doctrine is a reaction against both the material mechanicism of Descartes and the substantial monism of Spinoza. The essence of matter cannot be extension. The laws of mechanics cannot themselves be understood without using the notion of force. Moreover, "a substance is a being capable of action," and "what does not act does not deserve the name of substance." Hence substance implies unity and individuality, and the real substance cannot be the "material" atom (phyle de matière). Having extension, such an atom is composed of parts and divisible without limit; it has no real unity. The elements which compose material substances are simple substances, and "material" atoms (atoms de substance), simple and without parts. They are called monads. Bodies are "multitudes" and "aggregates," and the simple substances are units and elements. As they have no parts, monads have neither extension, nor shape, nor possible divisibility. They are the true atoms of nature, and a word, the elements of things." Since it is impossible for two beings to be perfectly alike, every monad is different from every other. Monads have no external, but only an internal, activity, which is twofold: perception and apposition. All monads are, in various degrees, representations of the whole universe, but this representation or perception becomes clearly conscious (apprehension), and is accompanied with attention, memory, and reflection, only in higher monads. Apperception is the activity of the internal principle by which the passage from one perception to another is effected. The more relative perfectness of the monads depends upon the degree of clearness of their perceptions. Some unite to form an organism whose centre of unity is a higher monad or soul. This system is completed by the supposition of a pre-established harmony. The order and harmony of the world are the result not of an interaction between monads, but of a pre-determined plan out of the Creator who has endowed them with their power of internal evolution. In the main, Christian Wolff reproduced and systematized Leibniz's theory.

According to Boscovich (q. v.), "the first elements of matter are points absolutely indivisible and without any extension. They are spread throughout an immense vacuum in such a way as to be always at some distance from one another. The distance may increase or decrease indefinitely, but can never disappear completely without a compensation of the points themselves, for contact between them is impossible." (The Phil. Trans. no. 79, p. 232.) There be no continuous extension. The elements are all homogeneous, and, by their numbers, distances, arrangements, activities, and relationships produce the diversity of material substances. They have no perception and no apperception. According to their distances, forces may have a determinate tendency to diminish or increase, the interval that separates them. This very determination Boscovich calls force, attractive in the former case, repulsive in the latter. The law of these forces is the following: if the distance between them is infinitesimal, they are repulsive, and the more so in the proportion as the distance is smaller. However, although remaining always very small, is increased a little, the repulsive force becomes first less intense, then null, and at a still larger distance is changed into an attractive force. This attraction again, with the increase of distance, goes on augmenting, till it becomes again null, and changes into a repulsion, which, in turn, by the same gradual process, becomes attraction. Such changes may be repeated several times, but only while the distance, though increasing, remains infinitesimal. At greater distances the force is exclusively attractive. To explain the interaction of the monads Leibniz admits the possibility of a Divinely pre-established harmony and even of occasionalism.

In his pre-critical period, Kant admitted physical monads, that is, simple and indivisible substances. His later views may be summed up as follows: matter is divisible without limit, but not actually divided into separate atoms. Matter is what fills up a space, and to fill up a space is to defend it against any mobile which should try to penetrate it. Hence matter is essentially resistance and force. It is not impenetrable, in the absolute or mathematical sense of the Cartesians, but in a relative sense and in varying degrees; it may be compressed and condensed. There are two distinct forces, repulsion and attraction. The former is the primary constituent of matter, since by it other things are excluded from the space it occupies. It produces the exclusion, and, without it, matter could not be attributed to a geometrical point. However, attraction is also essential to the occupancy of an assignable space, for otherwise matter would be scattered without limit. Repulsion can act only by contact; attraction may also act at a distance. From these two forces Kant derives all the properties of matter. It is, however, remembered that this theory is not in contradiction of the phenomenon only, the noun men being inaccessible to our mind. This idealistic feature was carried still further by the German Transcendentalists; among them Schelling proposes a view the main lines of which agree with that of Kant. In more recent times,
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Herbert, Lotze, von Hartmann, Renouvier, to mention only a few names among many, also hold dynamic theories modified by their special points of view and philosophical systems. To these may be added some Catholic philosophers, e.g. the Sulpanian Branchereau, and the Jesuits Carbonnelle and Pii. Among scientists, Ampère, Cauchy, Faraday, and others are also in favour of dynamism. Faraday's theory is substantially the same as that of Bosovitch. That theory, namely, that "atoms . . . are mere centres of forces or powers, not particles of matter in which the powers themselves have "a great advantage over the more usual notion". "A mind just entering on the subject may consider it difficult to think of the powers of matter independent of a separate something to be called the matter, but it is certainly far more difficult, and indeed impossible, to think of or imagine that matter independent of the powers. Now the powers we know and recognize in every phenomenon of the creation, the abstract matter in none; why, then, assume the existence of that of which we are ignorant, which we cannot conceive, and for which there is no philosophical necessity?" (A Speculation touching Electric Conduction and the Nature of Matter, pp. 290, 291).

To-day there is a tendency to substitute the concept of energy for that of force. Hence Professor Ostwald's "energetic theory". Matter is to be looked upon as a complex of energies arranged together in space. The collective matter resolves itself into that of these energies, so that the manifestations of energy are all we know of the external world. Energy is the common substance, for it is that which exists in space and time; it is also the differentiating principle of whatever exists in space and time. Recent scientific discoveries, especially in the field of radio-activity, strengthen philosophical reason and lead to a more specific dynamism. The atom (q. v.) can no longer be considered as being what its name implies, namely indivisible. Atoms of different chemical elements are spheres of positive electrification enclosing a number of corpuscles, all homogeneous, having identical properties, and negatively electrified. Some physiologists still attribute to these corpuscles a real, though infinitesimal, extension; they admit a nucleus or carrier of the electric charge, and this nucleus alone is what we call matter. But this is denied by others for whom the carrier has nothing material; they hold that the mass and inertia of the corpuscle is identical with the self-induction of the electric current, and the mass results from the velocity of the current. It has been calculated that the whole mass and inertia of the corpuscle are accounted for by its electrical charge alone and its velocity. Hence the name "electron" given to the corpuscle; it is the ultimate unit of so-called matter. This is known as the electronic theory of matter.

II. The preceding outline shows that the term dynamism, like all other general names of philosophical systems, is very vague, and applies to a number of what are called homogeneous manifestations nothing material; commonly they are considered as being what we call matter. But this is denied by others for whom the carrier has nothing material; they hold that the mass and inertia of the corpuscle is identical with the self-induction of the electric current, and the mass results from the velocity of the current. It has been calculated that the whole mass and inertia of the corpuscle are accounted for by its electrical charge alone and its velocity. Hence the name "electron" given to the corpuscle; it is the ultimate unit of so-called matter. This is known as the electronic theory of matter.

DYSIBOD. See DISIBOD, SAINT.
Eadfrid, Bishop of Lindisfarne. See Cuthbert, Saint; Lindisfarne Gospels.

Eadmer, precentor of Canterbury and historian, b. 1064 (?); d. 1124 (?). Brought up at Christ Church ab infantes, he became after St. Anselm's consecration, in 1079, his intimate companion. After Anselm's death he was his chief occupation was writing. He had made notes of the saint's doings and discourses and of the affairs in which he had been engaged, and from these he compiled his chief works, the "Historia Novorum" and the "Vita S. Anselmi" (ed. M. Rule, 1884, in Rolls Series). Eadmer's "Opuscules" comprise verses on Sts. Dunstan and Edward, the lives of Sts. Wilfrid, Osuo, Dunstan, Oswald, Bregwin (printed in Wharton, Anglia Sacata). Of his theological works the most noteworthy is the "De conceptione Sancte Mariæ", a tract of much importance for the development of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (see Thurston's ed., Freiburg, 1904, and "The Month", July and August, 1904, for the discussion of the date of his death). In 1113 he was elected to the See of St. Andrews, but by refusing to be ordained except by the Archbishop of York, he put an insuperable bar to his own promotion.

Notices of this important writer are found in all treatises on English and on ecclesiastical writers. Besides the works cited above, see: Liiermann, Ungezähle anglo-normannische Geschichtsquellen (Strasbourg, 1879); Paschen, Eadmer (Paris, 1892).

J. H. Pollien.

Eanbald, the name of two Archbishops of York.

Eanbald I, date of birth unknown; d. 10 August, 796. Most of his life was probably spent in the monastery of York. As one of the officials in the monastery, he, conjointly with Alcuin, superintended the rebuilding of the minster. Albert, in his declining years, chose Eanbald to be his coadjutor and successor. He succeeded to the archbishopric in 782 (some say 778). His first care was to obtain the pallium and Alcuin went to Rome to bring it; on his return Eanbald was solemnly confirmed in his office. He lived in troubous times. Nevertheless Eanbald carried on the School of York and treasured its great library. In August, 791, he consecrated Baldulf Bishop of Whithorne. His last public act was on 25 June, 796, when he crowned Eadulf King of Northumbria. He died at the monastery of Etete or Edete. His body was taken to York and buried in the minster.

Eanbald II, date of birth unknown; d. 810 or 812. He received his education in the famous School of York where he was Alcuin's pupil. On the death of Eanbald I he was chosen his successor. On 8 Sept., 797, having received the pallium from Rome, he was solemnly confirmed in the archbishopric.

He assisted Ethelard, Archbishop of Canterbury, to recover the prerogatives of which he had been despoiled by Offa. In 798 he assembled his clergy in synod at Pinchenheale (Fincnhale, near Durham) and there enacted a number of wise regulations relating to the ecclesiastical courts and the observance of Easter. Some think he was the author of a volume of decrees and that he was the first to introduce the Roman Ritual in the church of York.

Law, particularly in the paschal lamb, which was eaten towards evening of the 14th of Nisan. In fact, the Jewish feast was taken over into the Christian Easter celebration; the liturgy (Exsultet) sings of the passing of Israel through the Red Sea, the paschal lamb of fire, etc. On the part, however, of the Jewish feast, the Christians would have celebrated the anniversary of the death and the Resurrection of Christ. But for such a feast it was necessary to know the exact calendar date of Christ's death. To know this date was very simple for the Jews: it was the day after the end of the first month, the 15th of Nisan, of their calendar. But in other countries of the vast Roman Empire there were other systems of chronology. The Romans from 45 B.C. had used the reformed Julian calendar; there were also the Egyptian and the Syro-Macedonian calendar (see Calendar). The foundation of the Jewish calendar was the lunar year of 354 days, whilst the other systems depended on the solar year. In consequence the first days of the Jewish months and years did not coincide with any fixed days of the Roman solar year. Every fourth year of the Jewish system had an intercalary month. Such a month was inserted in order to adjust the scientific method or some definite rule, but arbitrarily, by command of the Sanhedrin, a distant Jewish date can never with certainty be transposed into the corresponding Julian or Gregorian date (Ideler, Chronologie, I, 570 sq.). The connexion between the Jewish and Christian Pasch explains the movable character of this feast. Easter has no fixed date, like Christmas, because the 15th of Nisan of the Semitic calendar was shifting from date to date on the Julian calendar. Since Christ, the true Paschal Lamb, had been slain on the very day when the Jews, in celebration of the Passover, immediately after the figure the lamb, the Jewish Christians in the Orient followed the Jewish method, and commemorated the death of Christ on the 15th of Nisan and His Resurrection on the 17th of Nisan, no matter on what day of the week they fell. For this observance they claimed the authority of St. John and St. Philip.

In the rest of the empire another consideration predominated. Every Sunday of the year was a commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ, which had occurred on a Sunday. Because the Sunday after 14 November was the historical day of the Resurrection, at Rome this Sunday became the Pasch. Hence the first Sunday after Easter was celebrated in Rome and Alexandria on the first Sunday after the first full moon after the spring equinox, and the Roman Church claimed for this observance the authority of Sts. Peter and Paul. The spiritual Pasch in Rome fell on 25 March; in Alexandria on 21 March. At Antioch Easter was kept on the Sunday after the Jewish Passover. (See Easter Controversy.) In Gaul a number of bishops, wishing to escape the difficulties of the paschal computation, seem to have assigned Easter to a fixed date of the Roman calendar, celebrating the death of Christ on 25 March, His Resurrection on 27 March (Marinus Dumiensis in P. L., LXXII, 47–51), since already in the third century 25 March was considered the day of the Crucifixion (Computus Pseudocyprianus, ed. Lersch, Chronologie, II, 61). This practice was of short duration. Many calendars of the Middle Ages contain these same dates (25 March, 27 March) for purely historical, not liturgical, reasons (Grotorfend, Zeitrechnung, II, 46, 60, 72, 106, 110, etc.). The Montanists in Asia Minor kept Easter on the Sunday after 6 April (Schmidt, Osterfesteuberechnung in der antiken Kirche). The Council of Constance (325) decreed that the Roman practice should be observed throughout the Church. But even at Rome the Easter term was changed repeatedly. Those who continued to keep Easter with the Jews were called Quartodecimans (14 Nisan) and were excluded from the Church (see Quartodecimans). The computus paschalis, the method of determining the date of Easter and the dependent feasts, was of old considered so important that Durandus (Rit. div. off., 8, c. i) declares a priest unworthy of the name who does not know the computus paschalis.

The movable character of Easter (22 March to 25 April) gives rise to inconveniences, especially in modern times. For decades scientists and other people have worked in vain for a simplification of the computus, assigning Easter to the first Sunday in April or to the Sunday nearest to the 7th of April. Some even wish to put every Sunday to a certain date of the month, e.g. beginning with Sunday after Easter (Pascha) on a Sunday, etc. [See L. Günther, "Zeitschrift Weltall" (1903); Sandhage and P. Dueren in "Pastor bonus" (Trier, 1906); C. Tondini, "L'Italia e la questione del 'caldario' " (Florence, 1905).]

The Easter Office and Mass.—The first Vespers of Easter are connected now with the Mass of Holy Saturday, because that Mass was formerly celebrated in the evening (see Holy Saturday); they consist of only one psalm (exulvi) and the Magnificat. The Matins have only one Nocturn; the Office is short, and busy with the reconciliation of sinners, and the distribution of alms, which were given plentifully by the rich on Easter Day. This peculiarity of reciting only one Nocturn was extended by some churches from the octave of Easter to the entire paschal time, and soon to all the Paschal period and the entire ecclesiastical year. This observance is found in the German Breviaries far up into the nineteenth century ("Brev. Monaster," 1830; Bäumer, "Brevier," 312). The octave of Easter ceases with None of Saturday and on Sunday the three Nocturns with the Matins and Vespers of Easter Day are omitted. Many churches, however, during the Middle Ages and later (Brev. Monaster., 1830), on Low Sunday (Dominica in Albis) repeated the short Nocturn of Easter Week. Before the usus Romane Curiae (Bäumer, Brev., 319) was spread by the Franciscans over the entire Church the eighteenth (or twenty-four) psalms of the regular Sunday Matins were, three by three, distributed over the Matins of Easter Week (Bäumer, 301). This observance is still one of the peculiarities of the Carmelite Breviary. The simplified Breviary of the Roman Curia (twelfth century) established the custom of repeating the first three psalms of each of the following days: Pascha, March (Monday—Thursday), the first day of the octave, to Saturday, the first day of the second octave, to Sunday, the first day of the third octave. From the ninth to the thirteenth century, in most dioceses, during the entire Easter Week the two precepts of hearing Mass and of abstaining from servile work were observed (Keller, Heortologie, 17); later on this law was limited to certain days (Monday and Tuesday), and, since the end of the eighteenth century, to Monday only. In the United States even Monday is no holiday of obligation. The first three days of Easter Week are doubles of the first class, the other days semi-doubles. During this week, in the Roman Church, through immemorial custom the hymns are omitted, or rather were never inserted. The ancient ecclesiastical Office contained no hymns, and out of respect for the great solemnity of Easter and the ancient jubilus "Hae Dies", the Roman Church did not touch the old Easter Office by the new, but kept the old. Hence the Easter Office of the Eastern Church consists only of psalms, antiphons, and the great lessons of Matins. Only the "Victimae Paschali" was adopted in most of the churches and religious orders in the Second Vespers. The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Offices use the Ambrosian hymn "Vexilla regni passus ille" in Lauds and Vespers, the Monastic Breviary, "Ad cænum Agni providi" at Vespers, "Chorus novæ Jerusalem" at Matins, and "Aurora lucis rutilat" at Lauds. The Monastic Breviary has also three Nocturns on Easter Day. Besides the hymns the chapter is omitted and the Little Hours have no antiphons; the place of the hymns,
The Masses of Easter Week have a sequence of dramatic character, "Victima paschali", which was composed by Vipo, a Burgundian priest at the courts of Conrad II and Henry III. The present text is derived from the longer Preface of the Gregorian Sacramentary. The "Communicaentes" and "Hanc igitur" contain references to the solemn baptism of Easter Eve. To the "Benedicamus Domino" of Lauds and Vespers and to the "Ite Missa est" of the Mass two alleluias are added during the entire octave. Every day of the Easter Mass; an old MS. Spanish missal of 855 contains three Masses for Easter Sunday; the Gallican missals have two Masses for every day of the week, one of which was celebrated at four in the morning, preceded by a procession (Migne, La Liturgie Catholique, Paris, 1863, p. 952). In the Gelasian Sacramentary every day of Easter Week has its own Preface (Probst, Sacramentarien, p. 226).

To have a correct idea of the Easter celebration and its Masses, we must remember that it was intimately connected with the solemn rite of baptism. The processional acts connected with the liturgical services were habits which made the cere- monies transferred to the morning hours of Holy Saturday. This change, however, did not produce a new liturgical creation adapted to the new order of things. The old baptismal ceremonies were left untouched and have now, apparently, no other reason for preservation than their antiquity. The gap left in the liturgical services after the solemnities of the night had been transferred to the morning of Holy Saturday was filled in France, Germany, and some other countries by a twofold new ceremony, which, however, was never adopted in Rome. "First, there was the commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ. At midnight, before Matins, the clergy in silence entered the dark church and removed the cross from the sepulchre to the high altar. Then the candles were lit, the doors opened, and a solemn procession was held with the cross through the cloister or cemetery. Whilst the procession moved from the altar to the door, the beautiful old antiphon, "Cum rex gloriae", was sung, the first part softly (humili ac depressa voce), to symbolize the sadness of the souls in limbo; from "Adveniunt desiderabilia" the singers raised their voices in jubilation whilst the acolytes rang small bells which they carried. The full text of this antiphon, which has disappeared from the liturgy, follows:

Cum rex gloriae Christus inermem debellatus intraret; et chorus angelicus ante faciem ejus portas principum tollit praecipitam, sanctorum populumque sanctorum in corpore victum vocem victoriae clamabat diœces: Adveniunt desiderabilia, quae spectabilissimum in tenebris, ut educerentur noce neque vinculatos de clausuro. Te nostra vocabant suspiria, ut larga requirantem lamento, tu facias eum spes desperati, magna consolatio in tormentis.

When the procession returned, in many churches the "Attolite portas" (Ps. xxiii) was sung at the door, in order to symbolize the victorious entry of Christ into limbo and hell. After the procession Matins were sung. In later centuries the Blessed Sacrament took the place of the cross in the procession. The ceremony is, with the approval of the Holy See, still held in Germany on the eve of Easter with simpler ceremonies, in the form of a popular devotion. Second, the visitation of the Sepulchre. After the third lesson of the Nocturn two clerics, representing the holy women, went to the empty sepulchre where another cleric (angel) announced to them that the Saviour was risen. The two then brought the message to the choir, whereupon two priests, impersonating Peter and John, ran to the tomb and, finding it empty, showed to the people the body laid in the grave. Then the choir sang the "Te Deum" and the "Victima paschali". In some churches, e. g. at Rouen, the apparition of Christ to Mary Magdalen was also represented. Out of this solemn ceremony, which dates back to the tenth century, grew the numerous Easter plays. (Nord-Amerikanisches Pastoralblatt, April, 1907, p. 149, has a lengthy list of these two events.) The Easter plays in the beginning used only the words of the Gospels and the "Victima paschali"; in the course of development they became regular dramas, in Latin or vernacular verses, which contained the negotiation between the vender of unguents and the three women, the dialogue between Pilate and the Jews asking for soldiers to guard the Sepulchre, the contest of Peter and John running to the tomb, the risen Saviour appearing to Magdalen, and the descent of Christ into hell. Towards the end of the Middle Ages these plays became more widely used, and they were filled with long, beautiful, and solemn speeches of salve-dealers, Jews, soldiers, and demons (Creizenach, Gesch. des neun Dramas, Halle, 1893).

The procession combined with the solemn Second Vespers of Easter Sunday is very old. There was a great variety in the manner of solemnizing these services. The service commenced with the Kyrie Eleison, sung as in the Easter Mass, even sometimes with the corresponding trope lux et origo boni. After the third psalm the whole choir went into procession to the baptismal chapel, where the fourth psalm, the "Victima paschali", was sung; thence the procession moved to the great cross at the entrance to the sanctuary (choir), and from there, after the fifth psalm and the Magnificat were sung, to the empty sepulchre, where the services were concluded. The Carmelites and a number of French churches, e. g. Paris, Lyons, Besançon, Bayeux, Laval, have, with the permission of the Holy See, retained these solemn Easter Vespers since the re-introduction of the Roman Breviary. But they are celebrated differently in every diocese, very much modernized in some churches. At Lyons the Magnificat is sung three times, at Cologne and Trier the solemn Vespers of Easter were abolished in the nineteenth century (Nord-Amerikanisches Pastoralblatt, April, 1907, p. 50). Whilst the Latin Rite admits only commemorations of saints in Lauds, Mass, and Vespers from Wednesday in Easter Week and excludes any commemoration on the first three days of the week, the Greek and Russian Churches transfer the occurring Offices (canons) of the saints from Matins to Complin during the entire octave, even on Easter Sunday. After the Anti-passio (Low Sunday), the canons and other canticles of Easter are continued in the entire Office up to Ascension day, and the claims of the saints take only the second place in Matins. Also the Greeks and Russians have a solemn procession at midnight, before Matins, during which they sing at the door of the church Ps. lviii, repeating after each verse the Easter antiphon. When the procession leaves, the church is dark; when it returns, hundreds of candles and coloured lamps are lit to represent the splendour of Christ's Resurrection. After Lauds all those who are present give each other the Easter kiss, not excluding even the beggar. One says: "Christ is risen"; the other answers: "He is truly risen", these words being repeated during Easter time. A similar custom had, through the influence of the Byzantine court, been adopted at Rome for a time. The greeting was: Sierret Dominus vere; R. Et apparuit Simoni. (Maximinianus, Princ. Sax., Præfect. de liturg. Orient., 1, 114; Marteau, De
antiq. Eed. rit., c. xxy. 5.) The Armenian Church during the entire time from Easter to Pentecost celebrates the Resurrection alone to the exclusion of all feasts of the saints. On Easter Monday they keep All Souls’ Day, the Saturday of the same week the Dedication of St. John, the Sunday after the founding of the first Christian Church on Sion and of the Church in general, the fifth Sunday the Apparition of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem, then on Thursday the Ascension of Christ, and the Sunday after the feast of the great Vision of St. Gregory. From Easter to Ascension, he fast nor do they stain from meat (C. Tondini de Quaragni. Calendrier de la Nation Arménienne). In the Mozarabic Rite of Spain, after the Pater Noster on Easter Day and during the week the priest intones the particularus “Regnum” and sings “Vicet Leo de Tribu Juda radix David Alleluja”. The people answer: “Qui sedes super Cherubim radix David. Alleluja” This is sung three times (Missale Mozarab.). In some cities of Spain before sunrise two processions leave the principal church; one with the image of Mary covered by a black veil; another with the Blessed Sacrament. The procession move on in silence every woman wearing a predetermined place; then the veil is removed from the image of Mary and the clergy with the people sing the “Regina Celi” (Guéranger, Kirchenjahr, VII, 166). For the sanctuary at Emmaus in the Holy Land the Holy See has approved a special feast on Easter Mon of the Cana of the laboris manifestation. D. N. I Chr. Hours, Titul. Eccles. dupl. I Cl., with proper Mass and Office (Cal. Rom. Seraph. in Terre S. Custod., 1907).

**Peculiar Customs of Easter Time.**—1. *Ritus Paschalis.*—This strange custom originated in Bavaria in the fifteenth century. The priest inserted in his sermon funny stories which he would cause his hearers to laugh (Ostermärlein), e.g. a description of how the devil tries to keep the doors of hell locked against the descending Christ. Then the speaker would draw the moral from the story. This Easter laughter, giving rise to grave abuses of the word of God, was prohibited by Clement X (1670-1676) and in the eighteenth century by Maximilian III and the bishops of Bavaria (Wagner, De Ritus Paschali, Königsberg, 1705; Linsemeier, Predigt in Deutschland, Munich, 1886).

2. *Easter Eggs.*—Because the use of eggs was forbidden during Lent, they were brought to the table on Easter Day. Coloured red top eggs. This custom is found not only in the Latin but also in the Oriental Churches. The symbolic meaning of a new creation of mankind by Jesus risen from the dead was probably an invention of later times. The custom may have its origin in paganism, for a great many pagans customs, celebrating the return of spring, gravitated to Easter. The egg is the emblem of the germinating life of early spring. Easter eggs, the children are told, come from Rome with the bells which on Thursday go to Rome and return Saturday morning. The sponsors in some countries give Easter eggs to their god-children. Coloured eggs are used by children at Easter in a sort of game which consists in testing the strength of the shells (Krauss, Real-Encyklopädie, s. v. El). Both coloured and uncoloured eggs are used in some parts of the United States for the Easter egg race. The children stand in a line, and the first ones take a single egg and put it in a basket. Then they start running, and the one, who first brings all the eggs to the basket, is the winner. This is called Easter egg race. In France handball playing was one of the Easter amusements, found also in Germany (Simrock, op. cit., 575). The ball may represent the sun, which is believed to take three leaps in rising on Easter morning. Bishops, priests, and monks, after the strict discipline of Lent, used to play ball during Easter week (Beleth, Expl. Div. off., 120). This was called libertas Decem-brica, because formerly in December the masters used to play ball with their servants, maids, and shepherds. The ball game was connected with a dance, in which even bishops and abbots took part. At Auxerre, Provins, etc., the dance was performed to the strains of the “Vietme paschal”. In England, also, the game of ball was a favourite Easter sport in which the municipal corporation engaged with due parade and dignity. And at Bury St. Edmunds, in recent years, the game was kept up with great festivity. After the game the dance a banquet was given, during which a homily on the feast was read. All these customs disappeared for obvious reasons (Kirchenlex., IV, 1414).

3. *In France handball playing was one of the Easter amusements, found also in Germany (Simrock, op. cit., 575). The ball may represent the sun, which is believed to take three leaps in rising on Easter morning. Bishops, priests, and monks, after the strict discipline of Lent, used to play ball during Easter week (Beleth, Expl. Div. off., 120). This was called libertas Decemberica, because formerly in December the masters used to play ball with their servants, maids, and shepherds. The ball game was connected with a dance, in which even bishops and abbots took part. At Auxerre, Provins, etc., the dance was performed to the strains of the “Vietme paschal”. In England, also, the game of ball was a favourite Easter sport in which the municipal corporation engaged with due parade and dignity. And at Bury St. Edmunds, in recent years, the game was kept up with great festivity. After the game the dance a banquet was given, during which a homily on the feast was read. All these customs disappeared for obvious reasons (Kirchenlex., IV, 1414).

4. **On the eve of Easter the homes are blessed (Rit. Rom., tit. S. c. iv) in memory of the passing of the angel in Egypt and the signing of the door-posts.**
with the blood of the paschal lamb. The parish priest visits the houses of his parish; the papal apartments are also blessed on this day. The room, however, in which the pope is found by the visiting cardinal is blessed by the pontiff himself (Moroni, Dizionario, s. v. Pasqua).

10. The Greeks and Russians after their long, severe Lent make Easter a day of popular sports. At Constantinople the cemetery of Perse is the noisy rendezvous of the Greeks; there are music, dances, and all the pleasures of an Oriental popular resort; the same custom prevails in the cities of Russia. In Russia anyone can enter the bellies on Easter and ring the bells, a privilege of which many persons avail themselves.

Duchene, Orig. du Culte Chrét. (Paris, 1889); Hellner, Hortologia (Freiburg im Br., 1906); Probst, Die altesten romanischen Sacramentaren und Ordines (Münster, 1862); Guéranger, Das Kirchenjahr, Ger. tr. (Mainz, 1878), V. 7; Kraus, Real-Encyk.; Bertrand, Coeurs de Lettres Romaines, Histoire, Calendrier Mésis Évé (London, 1852); Kirchenlehr, IX. col. 1121-41; Niessen, Calendarium utroque Eucharisti (Innsbruck, 1897); Monto, La Légende Catholique (Paris, 1853); Binterim, Denkwürdigkeiten (Mainz, 1853); Grotefend, Jahr von der Erstellung in die Chronologie (Freiburg, 1899); Bach, Die Ostberechnung (Freiburg, 1907; English translation as The Computation of the Easter Festival (London, 1909); Schwartz, Christliche und judische Ostertafeln (Berlin, 1905); Sela, Das Osterrecht in der Apostolic Erhebung (Freiburg, 1906); Dusek, Die neue Ostberechnung (Prague, 1800); Ruck, The Church of Our Fathers (London, 1905); IV: Albers, Festtag des Herrn und seiner Heiligen (Paderborn, 1889).

FREDERICK G. HOLWEECK.

EASTER CONTROVERSY.—Ecclesiastical history preserves the memory of three distinct phases of the dispute regarding the proper time of observing Easter. It will add to clearness if we in the first place state what is certain regarding the date and the nature of the controversies.

FIRST PHASE.—The first was mainly concerned with the lawfulness of celebrating Easter on a weekday. We read in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V. xxiii): "A question of no small importance arose at that time (i.e. the time of Pope Victor, about A.D. 190). The disciples of all Asia, as from an older tradition, held that the fourteenth day of the moon, on which day the Jews were commanded to sacrifice the lamb, should always be observed as the feast of the life-giving pasch [Δι' της τεταρτης Πασχαλίας], contending that the fast should extend on that day from day to day, week by week, as it might happen to be. However it was not the custom of the churches in the rest of the world to end it at this point, as they observed the practice, which from Apostolic tradition has prevailed to the present time, of terminating the fast on no other day than the first of the Resurrection of Our Lord. The bishops and assemblies of bishops were held on this account, and all with one consent through mutual correspondence drew up an ecclesiastical decree that the mystery of the Resurrection of the Lord should be celebrated on no other day but the Sunday and that we should observe the close of the paschal fast on that day only." These words of the Father of Church History, followed by some extracts which he makes from the controversial letters of the time, tell us almost all that we know concerning the paschal controversy in its first stage. A letter of St. Irenæus is among the extracts referred to, and the diversity of practice regarding Easter had existed at least from the time of Pope Sixtus (c. 120). Further, Irenæus states that St. Polycarp, who, like the other Asiatics, kept Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, whatever day of the week that might be, following the tradition which he derived from St. John the Apostle, came to Rome c. 150 about this very question, but could not be persuaded by Pope Anicetus to relinquish his Quartodeciman observance. Nevertheless he was not debarred from communion with the Roman Church, and St. Irenæus, while condemning the Quartodeciman practice, nevertheless reproaches Pope Victor (c. 190-99) with having excommunicated the Asiatics too precipitantly and with not having followed the moderation of his predecessor. The question thus debated was therefore primarily whether Easter was to be kept on a Sunday, or whether Christians should observe the fast of the Jews, the fourteenth of Nisan, which might occur on any day of the week. Those who kept Easter with the Jews were called Quartodecimans or τυπονούντες (observers); but even in the time of Pope Victor this usage hardly extended beyond the Churches of Asia Minor. After the pontiff and churchmen the Quartodecimans seem to have gradually dwindled away. Origin in the "Philosophumena" (VIII. xxvii) seems to regard them as a mere handful of wrong-headed nonconformists.

SECOND PHASE.—The second stage in the Easter controversy centres round the Council of Nicea (A. D. 325). Granted that the great Easter festival was always to be held on a Sunday, and was not to be coincident with a particular phase of the moon, which might occur on any day of the week, a new dispute arose as to the determination of the Sunday itself. It was now the text of the decree of the Council of Nicæa (c. 1875), settled, or at least indicated a final settlement of, the difficulty has not been preserved to us, but we have an important document inserted in Eusebius's "Life of Constantine" (III., viii sq.) The emperor himself, writing to the Churches after the Council of Nicea, enjoins them to adopt its conclusions and other things: "At this meeting the question concerning the most holy day of Easter was discussed, and it was resolved by the united judgment of all present that this feast ought to be kept by all and in every place on one and the same day. And first of all it appeared an unworthy thing that in the observance of this most holy feast we should follow the practice of the Jews, who have impiously defiled their hands with enormous sin . . . for we have received from our Saviour a different way . . . And I myself have undertaken that this decision should meet with the approval of your Sugerites in the hope that your Wisdoms will gladly admit that practice which is observed at once in the city of Rome and in Africa, throughout Italy and in Egypt . . . with entire unity of judgment." From this and other indications which cannot be specified here (see, e.g., Eusebius, "De antiquitis evang." pp. 59-58) we learn that the dispute now lay between the Christians of Syria and Mesopotamia and the rest of the world. The important Church of Antioch was still dependent upon the Jewish calendar for its Easter. The Syrian Christians always held their Easter festival on the Sunday after the Jews kept their Pasch. On the other hand at Alexandria, and seemingly throughout the rest of the Roman Empire, the Christians calculated the time of Easter for themselves, paying no attention to the Jews. In this way the date of Easter as kept at Alexandria and Antioch did not always agree for the Jews, upon whom Antioch depended, adopted very arbitrary methods of intercalating embolismic months (see Calendar, Vol. III., p. 158) before they celebrated Nisan, the first spring month, on the fourteenth day of which the paschal lamb was killed. In particular, we learn that they had observed the fast of the Christians of Rome and Alexandria declared they were negligent) of the law that the fourteenth of Nisan must never precede the equinox (see Schwartz, Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln, pp. 133 sqq.). Thus Constantine in the letter quoted above protests with horror that the Jews had claimed the Pasch in one year, meaning that two Paschs sometimes fell between one equinox and the next.

The Alexandrians, on the other hand, accepted it as a first principle that the Sunday to be kept as Easter Day must necessarily occur after the vernal equinox, then identified with 21 March of the Julian year. This
was the main difficulty which was decided by the Council of Nicea. Even among the Christians who calculated Easter for themselves there had been considerable variations (partly due to the difference of the lunar cycle adopted, partly to a divergent reckoning of the equinox). In the Council of Arles, it had been laid down that in future Easter should be kept \textit{uno die et uno tempore per omnem orbem}, and that to secure this uniformity the pope should send out letters to all the Churches. The Council of Nicea seems to have extended further the piece of laid down. As already stated, we know not its exact words, but we may safely infer from scattered notices that the council ruled: (1) that Easter must be celebrated by all throughout the world on the same Sunday; (2) that this Sunday must follow the fourteenth day of the paschal moon; (3) that this moon was to be accounted the paschal moon whose fourteenth day followed the spring equinox; (4) that some provision should be made, probably by the Church of Alexandria as best skilled in astronomical calculations, for determining the proper date of Easter and communicating it to the rest of the world (see St. Didymus on the Immovable Easter Sunday, \textit{Nig.}, p. 126, and Migne, Pat., \textit{Nig.}, p. 1055). This ruling of the Council of Nicea did not remove all difficulties nor at once win universal acceptance amongst the Syrians. But to judge from the strongly worded canon i of the Council of Antioch (a. d. 341; see Hefele-Lberer, "Concilies", I, 711), as also from the language of the later Syrian Canons (see Schmid, Oesterfrage, p. 63), the Syrian bishops loyally co-operated in carrying into effect the decision of the Council of Nicea. In Rome and Alexandria the lunar cycles by which the occurrence of Easter was determined were not uniform. But it was decided that the council of the hundred-and-twelve-year cycle, as laid down by Hippolytus, adopted an eighteen-year cycle, but neither gave satisfactory results. Alexandria adhered to the more accurate nineteen-year cycle of Meton. But it seems to be clearly established by the most recent researches (see Schwartz, op. cit., pp. 28-29) that the lunar cycles were never understood to be more than aids towards ascertaining the correct date of Easter, also that where the calculations of Rome and Alexandria led to divergent results, compromises were made upon both sides and that the final decision was always laid with accepted ecclesiastical authority.
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recognized, the moon according to which Easter is calculated is not the moon in the heavens nor even the mean moon, i.e., a moon travelling with the average motion of the real moon, but simply the moon of the calendar. This calendar moon is admittedly a fiction, though it departs very little from the actual astronomical facts; but in following the simple rule given for the dependence of Easter upon the moon of the calendar, uniformity is secured for all countries of the world. According to this rule, Easter Sunday is the first Sunday which occurs after the first full moon (or more accurately after the first fourteenth day of the moon) following the 21st of March. As a result, the earliest possible date of Easter is 22 March, the latest 25 April.

The bibliography of this subject is vast, and most ecclesiasticological works are largely confined to it. For purposes of the text and notes of REUFLE-LECLEROQ, Connotations, I, 133-151 and 450-458, supply all that is necessary; though LECLERQ refers to the article Compt. pascal in the Dictionnaire d'Archeologie lui for fuller treatment.

Among the more important contributions to the subject the following may be named: KÜCHER, Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie (Leipzig, 1880); IDID IN NEROs ABANDONED, at the Roman Church, in the Chronologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit (Berlin, 1897), 110-165; SCHMID, Der Osterfreirat auf dem ersten allgemeinen Konzil von Nica (Vienna, 1905); LÖHR, Die Osteraufscheren in den katholischen Inseln (Staatsbib., 1904); HELDENDORF, Der Paschastreif der alten Kirche (1860); SCHMIDT, Christliche und katholische Ostertage der Bistomm (St. Peter, 1861); the Abhandlungen of the Gottingen Academy: this is a work of the very highest importance; SCHMIDT, Die Paschale, in the Zeitschrift f. kathol. Theologie (1870); DUCHESNE, Histoire de l'Eglise, I, 199-201; KÖNNER, Hebräische Liturgie (1906); DUCHESNE, in Revue des Questions Historiques, 27, 646-699; WICKERIN in Journal of Philology (1900), 137-151. See also the bibliography given under CHRONOLOGY, GENERAL, AND DOMINICAL LETTER.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Easter among the Jews. See Passover.

Easter Candle. See Candles.

Easter Communion. See COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

Easter Confession. See COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH.

Easter Cycle. See Calendar, Christian; Easter.

Easter Churches. I. Definition of an Eastern Church. An accident of political development has made it possible to divide the Eastern Church, in the first place, into two great halves, Eastern and Western. The root of this division is, roughly and broadly speaking, the division of the Roman Empire, made first by Diocletian (284-305), and again by the sons of Theodosius I (Arcadius in the East, 395-408; and Honorius in the West, 395-423), then finally made permanent by the establishment of a rival empire in the West (Charles the Great, 800). The division of Eastern and Western Churches, then, in its origin corresponds to that of the empire. Western Churches are those that either gravitate around Rome or broke away from the Reformation. Eastern Churches depend originally on the Eastern Empire at Constantinople; they are those that either find their centre in the patriarchate of that city (since the centralization of the fourth century) or have been formed by schisms which in the first instance concerned Constantinople rather than the Western world. Another distinction, that can be applied only in the most general and broadest sense, is that of language. Western Christians till the Reformation were Latin; even now the Protestant bodies still bear unmistakably the mark of their Latin ancestry. It was the great Latin Fathers and St. Augustine (c. 354) who, most of all, who built up the traditions of the West; in ritual and canon law the Latin or Roman school formed the West. In a still broader sense the East may be called Greek. True, many Eastern Churches know nothing of Greek; the oldest (Nestorians, Armenians, Abyssinians) have never used Greek liturgically nor for their literature; nevertheless they too depend in some sense on a Greek tradition. Whereas our Latin Fathers have never concerned themselves with the doctrine of the schoolmen or canonists, they believe in the influence of Greek; for Greek theologians are still concerned about controversies carried on originally in Greek and settled by Greek synods. The literature of those that do not use Greek is formed on Greek models, is full of words carefully chosen or composed to correspond to some technical Greek term, even of Greek derivatives. The root of the distinction is, then, in the basis of the Church: that a Western Church is one originally dependent on Rome, whose traditions are Latin; an Eastern Church looks rather to Constantinople (or, as a friend or an enemy) and is rather to Constantinople. The point may be stated more scientifically by using the old division of the patriarchates. Originally (e.g., at the Council of Nicea, A. D. 325, can. vi) there were three patriarchates, those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. Further legislation formed two more at the expense of Antioch: Constantinople in 381 and 481; Jerusalem in 491. In any case the Roman patriarchate was always enormously the greatest. Western Christendom may be defined quite simply as the Roman patriarchate and all Churches that have broken away from it. All the others, with schismatical bodies formed from them, make up the Eastern half. But it must not be imagined that either half is in any sense one homogeneous and archaic body; in fact, from the first there is a great number of important schisms) rather than to the Reformations. To find a time when there was one Eastern Church we must go back to the centuries before the Council of Ephesus (431). Since that council there have been separate schismatical Eastern Churches whose number has grown steadily down to our own time. The Nestorian heresy left a permanent Nestorian Church, the Monophysite and Monothelitae quarrels made several, the reunion with Rome of portions of every Rite further increased the number, and quite lately the Bulgarian schism has created yet another; indeed it seems as if two more in Cyprus and Syria, are being formed at the present moment (1908).

We have now a general criterion by which to answer the question: What is an Eastern Church? Looking at a map, we see that, roughly, the division between the Roman patriarchate and the Christian world, that runs down somewhat to the east of the River Vistula (Poland is Latin), then comes back above the Danube, to continue down the Adriatic Sea, and finally divides Africa west of Egypt. Illyricum (Macedonia and Greece) once belonged to the Roman patriarchate, and Greater Greece (Southern Italy and Sicily) was intermittently Byzantine. But both these lands eventually fell back into the branches that surrounded them (except for the thin remnant of the Uniat Italo-Greeks). We may, then, say that any ancient Church east of that line is an Eastern Church. To these we must add those formed by missionaries (especially Russians) from one of these Churches. Later Latin and Protestant missions have further complicated the tangled state of the ecclesiastical East. Their adherents everywhere belong of course to the Western portion.

II. Catalogue of the Eastern Churches. It is now possible to draw up the list of bodies that answer to our definition. We have already noted that they are by no means all in communion with each other, nor have they any common basis of language, rite, or faith. All are covered by a division into the great Churches, the Plays, the Eastern Churches, the Monophysite Churches. The original Monothelitae are now all Uniates, and lastly the Uniat Churches corresponding in each case to a schismatical body. Theologically, to Catholics, the vital division is between Catholic Uniates, on the one hand, and schismatics or
heretics, on the other. But it is not convenient to start from this basis in cataloguing Eastern Churches. Historically and archaeologically, it is a secondary question. Each Uniat body has been formed from some of the schismatical ones; their organizations are consequently those of the respective corresponding schismatical body, and has an organization modelled on the same plan. In faith a Uniat Armenian, for instance, is joined to Uniat Chaldees and Copts, and has no more to do with schismatical Armenians than with Nestorians or Abyssinians. Nor does he forget this fact. He knows quite well that he is a Catholic in union with the Pope of Rome, and that he is equally in union with every other Catholic. Nevertheless, national customs, languages, and rites tell very strongly on the superficies, and our Uniat Armenian would certainly feel very much more at home in a non-Uniat church of his own nation than in a Uniat Coptic. Outwardly, the bond of a common language and common liturgy is often more apparent than what everyone knows to be the essential and radical division of a schism. Indeed these Uniat bodies in many cases still faintly reflect the divisions of their schismatical relations. In one case it is between Orthodox and Jacobites still remains as a not very friendly feeling between the different Uniat Churches in this case Melkites and Catholic Syrians. Certainly, such feeling is a very different thing from formal schism, and the leaders of the Uniat Churches, as well as all the other schismatical bodies, are at all their well-wishers, earnestly strive to repress it. Nevertheless, quarrels between various Uniat bodies fill up too large a portion of Eastern Church history to be ignored; still, to take another instance, anyone who knows Syria knows that the friendship between Melkites and Maronites is not enthusiastic. It will be seen, then, that for purposes of tabulation we cannot conveniently begin by cataloguing the Catholic bodies on the one side and then classing the schismatics together on the other. We must arrange these Churches according to their historic basis and origin: first, the largest of the schismatical Churches: then, the bodies on each side of these, the corresponding Uniat Church formed out of the schismatics in later times.

A. Schismatical Churches.

1. The first of the Eastern Churches in size and importance is the great Orthodox Church. This is, after that of the Catholics, considerably the largest body in Christendom. The Orthodox Church now counts about a hundred millions of members. It is the main body of Eastern Christendom, that remained faithful to the decrees of Ephesus and Chalcedon when Nestorianism and Monophysitism cut away the national Churches in Syria and Egypt. It remained in union with the West till the great schism of Photius and then that of Cerularius, in the ninth and eleventh centuries. In spite of the short-lived reunions made by the Second Council of Lyons (1274) and the Council of Florence (1439), this Church has never been divided since. The "Orthodox" (it is convenient as well as courteous to call them by the name they use as a technical one for themselves) originally comprised the four Eastern patriarchates: Alexandria and Antioch, then Constantinople and Jerusalem. But the balance between these four patriarchates was upset when the Church of Cyprus was taken away from Antioch and made autarchal (i.e. extra-patriarchal) by the Council of Ephesus (431). Then, in the fifth century, came the great upheavals of Nestorianism and Monophysitism, of which the result was that enormous numbers of Syriatics and Egyptians fell away into schism. So the Patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem (this was always a very small and comparatively unimportant centre), and Alexandria, losing most of their subjects, inevitably sank in importance. The Moslem conquest of their lands completed their ruin, so that they became merely the merest shadows of what their predecessors had once been. Meanwhile, while Constantinople, by the presence of the emperor, and always sure of his favour, rose rapidly in importance. Itself a new see, neither Apostolic nor primitive (the first Bishop of Byzantium was Metrophanes, in 329), it succeeded so well in its ambitious career that for a short time after the great Eastern schism it seemed to the uninitiated as if the new See of New Rome would take the same place over the Orthodox Church as did his rival the Pope of Old Rome over Catholics. It is also well known that it was this insatiable ambition of Constantinople that was chiefly responsible for the schism of the ninth and eleventh centuries. The Turkish conquest, strangely enough, still further strengthened the power of the Byzantine patriarch, inasmuch as the Turks acknowledged him as the civil head of what they called the "Roman nation" (Rum millet), meaning thereby the whole Orthodox community of whatever patriarchate. For about a century Constantinople enjoyed this sacred high place by a long course of degrading intrigue could for a little time justify in the Orthodox world his usurped title of Ecumenical Patriarch. Then came his fall; since the sixteenth century he has lost one province after another, till now he too is only a shadow of what he once was, and the real power of the Orthodox body is in the new independent national Churches with their "holy Synods"; while high over all looms the shadow of Russia. The separation of the various national Orthodox Churches from the patriarchate of Constantinople forms the only important chapter in the modern history of this body. The principle is always the same. More and more has the idea obtained that political modifications should be followed by the Church, that is to say that the Church of an independent State must be itself independent of the patriarch. This by no means implies real independence for the national Church; on the contrary, in each case the much severer rule of the Government is substituted for the distant authority of the Ecumenical Patriarch. Outside the Turkish Empire, in Russia and the Balkan States, the Orthodox Churches are independent, each for the most part of all Christian bodies. The process began when the great Church of Russia was declared autocephalous by the Czar Feodor Ivanovitch, in 1589. Jeremias II of Constantinople took a bribe to acknowledge its independence. Peter the Great abolished the Russian patriarchate (of Moscow) and set up a "Holy Governing Synod" to rule the national Church in 1721. The Holy Synod is simply a department of the government through which the czar rules over his Church as absolutely as over his army and navy. The independence of Russia and its Holy Synod have since been copied by each Balkan State, and after it had been settled that the independence did not mean schism its first announcement is naturally very distasteful to the patriarch and his court. He often begins by excommunicating the new national Church root and branch. But in each case he has been obliged to give in finally and to turn to its help. He has been "Sister in Christ" in the Holy Synod that has displaced his authority. Only in the specially difficult and bitter case of the Bulgarian Church has a permanent schism resulted. Other causes have led to the establishment of a few other independent Churches, so that now the great Orthodox communion consists of sixteen independent Churches, each of which (except
The Churches are (1) The Great Church, that is, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, that takes precedence of the others. It covers Turkey in Europe and Asia Minor, with only four metropolitan bishops. Outside this territory the Patriarch of Constantinople has no jurisdiction. He still has the position of civil head of the Roman Church throughout the Turkish Empire, and he still has not the power to interpret his authority, or the jurisdiction he possesses, as a sort of ecclesiastical jurisdiction—by his action at this moment in Cyprus—but in modern times especially each attempt is at once met by the most pronounced opposition on the part of the other patriarchs and national Churches, who answer that they acknowledge no head but Christ, no authority but the seven Ecumenical Synods. The Ecumenical Patriarch, however, keeps the right of alone consecrating the chrism (myron) and sending it to the other Orthodox Churches, except in the cases of Russia and Romania, which prepare it themselves. Bulgaria gets her consecration from the Russian, (Greek Russian) Patriarch. This is a question of consecrating her own myron, and there seems no doubt that Antioch will do so also when the present stock is exhausted. So even this shadow of authority is in a precarious state.

(2) Alexandria (covering all Egypt as far as it is ruled by the Holy Synod, excepting only four metropolitan bishops.) (3) Antioch, extending over Syria from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, as far as any Orthodox lives far or East, touching the Great Church along the frontiers of Asia Minor to the north and to the south, with twelve metropolitan sees and two or three titular bishops with no patriarchal curia. (4) Jerusalem, consisting of Palestine, from Haifa to the Egyptian frontier, with thirteen metropolitan sees. (5) Cyprus, the old autocephalous Church, with an archbishop whose succession (1908), after eight years, lends the whole Orthodox world, and three suffragans. Thus come the new national Churches, arranged here according to the date of their foundation, since they have no precedence. (6) Russia, (independent since 1589). This is enormously the preponderating partner, about eight times as great as all the others put together. The Holy Synod consists of thirteen metropolitan sees (Kiev, Moscow, and Petersburg), the Exarch of Georgia, and five or six other bishops or archimandrites appointed at the tsar's pleasure. There are eighty-six Russian dioceses, by which added missionary bishops in Siberia, Japan, North America, etc. (7) Carlowitz (1656), formed of Orthodox Serbs in Hungary, with six suffragan sees. (8) Czernagora (1765), the one independent diocese of the Black Mountain. (9) The Church of Sinai, consisting of one monastery recognized as independent of Jerusalem in 1872. The hegumen, is an archbishop. (10) The Greek Church (ki 30): thir two sees under a Holy Synod on the Russian model. (11) Hermannstadt (Nagy-Szoben, 1864), the Church of the Viaks in Hungary, with three sees. (12) The Bulgarian Church under the exarch, who lives at Constantinople. In Bulgaria are eleven sees with a Holy Synod. The exarch, however, claims jurisdiction over all Bulgars anywhere (especially in Macedonia) and has set up rival exarchal metropolitans against the patriarchal ones. The Bulgarian Church is recognized by the Pope and by Russia, but is excommunicate since 1872, by the Great Church and is considered schismatic by all Greeks. (13) Carlowitz (1873), for the Orthodox in Austria, with four sees. (14) Servia (1879), the national Church of that country, with five bishops and a Holy Synod. The Servs in Macedonia are now agitation to add two more sees (Tskub and Monastir) to this Church, at the further cost of Constantinople. (15) Rumania (1884), again a national Church with a Holy Synod and eight sees. (16) Herzegovina and Bosnia, organized since the Austrian occupation (1850) as a practically independent Church with a vague recognition of Constantinople’s primacy.

This ends the list of allied bodies that make up the Orthodox Church (see Fortescue, “Orthodox Eastern Church”, x, 278-337). Next come, in order of date, the old heretical Eastern Churches.

2. The Nestorians are now only a pitiful remnant of what was once a vast Church. It had before the heresy from which they have their name, been a flourishing Christian community in Chaldea and Mesopotamia. According to their tradition it was founded by Addai and Mari (Addeus and Mary), two of the seventy-two Disciples. The present Nestorians count Mar Mari as the first Bishop of Ctesiphon and predecessor of their patriarch. In any case this community was originally subject to the Patriarch of Antioch. As his vicar, the metropolitan of the twin-cities of Seleucia and Ctesiphon (on either side of the Tigris, north-east of Babylon) bore the title of catholics. One of these metropolitan sees was present at the Council of Nicea in 325. The great empire of this Church from Antioch led in early times to a state of semi-independence that prepared the way for the later schism. Already in the fourth century the Patriarch of Antioch waived his right of ordaining the catholics of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and allowed them to be ordained by his own suffragans. This in great importance of the right of ordaining, as a sign of jurisdiction throughout the East, this fact is important. But it does not seem that real independence of Antioch was acknowledged or even claimed till after the schism. In the fifth century the influence of the Christian East of the Persian Empire, and that of Nestorius’ at Edessa spread the heresy of Nestorius throughout this extreme Eastern Church. Naturally, the later Nestorians deny that their fathers accepted any new doctrine at that time, and they claim that Nestorius learned them rather than they forced him ("Nestorius es secus est, non ipsi Nestoriurn. Ebed-Jesus of Nisibus, about 1300. Assemani, “Bibl. Orient.”, III, 1, 355). There may be truth in this. Theodore and his school had certainly prepared the way for Nestorius. In any case the rejection of the Council of Ephesus (431) by these Christians in Chaldea and Mesopotamia produced a schism between them and the rest of Christendom. When Bahaus, himself a Nestorian, became catholics, in 498, there were practically no more Catholics in those parts. From Ctesiphon the Faith had spread across the border into Persia, even before that city was conquered by the Persian king (224). The Persian Church, then, always depended on Ctesiphon and shared its heresy. From the fifth century this most remote of the Eastern Churches has been cut off from the rest of Christendom, and till modern times was the most separate and forgotten community of all. Shut out from the Roman Empire (Zenon closed the school of Edessa in 489), but, for a time at least, protected by the Persian kings, the Nestorian Church flourished around Ctesiphon, Nisibis (where the school was reorganized), and throughout Persia. Since the schism the catholics occasionally assumed the title of patriarch. The Church then spread towards the East and sent missionaries to India and even China. A Nestorian inscription of the year 751 has been found at Singan Fu in China (J. Helr, S.J., "Prolegomena zu einer neuen Ausgabe der nestorianischen Inschrift von Singan Fu", in the "Veröfentlungen des VII. internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses", Vienna, 1886, pp. 37 seq.). Its greatest extent was in the eleventh century, when twenty-five metropolitans obeyed the Nestorian patriarch. But since the end of the fourteenth century it has gradually sunk to a very small sect, first, because of a fierce
persecution by the Mongols (Timur Leng), and then through internal disputes and schisms. Two great schisms as to the patriarchal succession in the sixteenth century led to a reunion of part of the Nestorian Church with Rome, forming the Unit Cha'ldian Church, numbering there about 150,000 Nestorians living chiefly in highlands west of Lake Urumiah. They speak a modern dialect of Syriac (Maclean, "Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac", Cambridge, 1895; Noldeke, "Grammatik der neusyrischen Sprache", 1868). The patriarchate descends from the Syriac bishops of Edessa, and is divided into seven provinces, each of which is ruled by a bishop.- Another form of Nestorianism is that of the Family of Mamas: each patriarch bears the name Simon (Mar Shimun) as a title. Ignoring the Second General Council, and of course strongly opposed to the Third (Ephesus), they only acknowledge the First Nicene (325). They have a Creed of their own (Hahn, "Bibliothek der Symbole", p. 74), formed from an old Antiochene Creed, which does not contain any trace of the particular heresy from which their Church is named. Indeed it is difficult to say how far any Nestorians now are conscious of the particular teaching condemned by the Council of Ephesus, though they still honour Nestorius' Theodoret, of Mopsuestia, one of the elder heretics as saints and doctors. The patriarch rules over twelve other bishops (the list in Silber Nag, "Verfassung", p. 267). Their hierarchy consists of the patriarch, metropolitans, bishops, choripiscopi, archdeacons, priests, deacons, subdeacons, and readers. There are also many monasteries. They use Syriac liturgically written in their own (Nestorian) form of the alphabet. The patriarch, who now generally calls himself "Patriarch of the East", resides at Koehanah, a remote valley of the Kurdish mountains by the Zab, on the frontier between Persia and Kurdistan. He has an unlimited jurisdiction over his people, though he does not receive a berat from the Sultan. In many ways this most remote Church stands alone; it has kept a number of curious and archaic customs (such as the perpetual abstinence of the patriarch, &c.) that separate it from other Eastern Churches almost as much as from those of the West. Lately the Archbishop of Canterbury's mission to the Nestorians has aroused a certain interest about them in England.

All the other separated Eastern Churches are formed by the other great heresy of the fourth century, Monophysitism. There are first the separate Churches of Egypt, Syria, and Armenia.

3. The Copts form the Church of Egypt. Monophysitism was in a special sense the national religion of Egypt. As an extreme opposition to Nestorianism, the Egyptians believed it to be the faith of their hero St. Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). His successor, Dioscorus (444-55), was deposited and excommunicated by the Council of Chaledon (451). From his time the Monophysite party gained ground very quickly among the native population, so that soon it became the expression of their national feeling against the Greek (Melchite, or Melkite) garrison and government officials. Afterwards, at the Moslem invasion (641), the opposition was so strong that the native Egyptians threw in their lot with the conquerors against the Greeks. The two sides are still represented by them. At present there are about 150,000 Monophysites in the whole country.

The Monophysites are sometimes called Jacobites here in Syria; but the old national name Copt (Gr. "Agyptos") has become the regular one for their Church as well as for their nation. Their patriarch, with the title of Alexandria, succeeds Dioscorus and Theodoret, a fanatical Monophysite bishop, who resided at Cairo, ruling over thirteen dioceses (Silber Nag., p. 289) and about 500,000 subjects. For him, too, the law is perpetual abstinence. There are many monasteries. The Copts use their own language liturgically and have in it a number of liturgies all derived from the original Greek rite of Alexandria (St. Mark). But Coptic is a dead language, so much so that even most priests understand very little of it. They all speak Arabic, and their service books give an Arabic version of the text in parallel columns. This Church is, on the whole, in a poor state. The Copts are mostly illiterate, and living in the most miserable state of poverty and ignorance. And the clergy will not, on the same conditions. Lately there has been something of a revival among them, and certain rich Coptic merchants of Cairo have begun to found schools and seminaries and generally to promote education and literature. They are still making inroads on the advantages among their nation. One of these, M. Gabriel Lahib, who is editing their service-books, promises to be a scholar of some distinction in questions of liturgy and archæology.

4. The Church of Abyssinia, or Ethiopia, always dependent on Egypt. It was founded by St. Frumentius, who was ordained and sent by St. Athanasius in 326. So Abyssinia has always acknowledged the supremacy of the Patriarch of Alexandria and still considers its Church as a daughter-church of the See of St. Mark. The same causes that made Egypt Monophysite affected Abyssinia equally. She naturally, almost inevitably, shared the power and the name of the mother Church. So Abyssinia is still Monophysist and acknowledges the Coptic patriarch as her head. There is now only one bishop of Abyssinia (there were once two) who is called Abuna (Our Father) and resides at Adea (the old see was Axum). He is always a Coptic monk consecrated patriarch. He is sent by the Coptic patriarch. It does not mean, however, that there is now much communication between Cairo and Adea, though the patriarch still has the right of deposing the Abuna. Abyssinia has about three million inhabitants, nearly all members of the national Church. There are many monks and an enormous number of monasteries, who have the same political privileges as the monks of the Roman Church, practically without any previous preparation or examination. The Abyssinians have liturgies, again, derived from those of Alexandria in the old (classical) form of their language. The Abyssinian Church, being the religion of a more than half barbarous people, cut off by the sea from all relations with any other Christian body except the poor and backward Copts, is certainly the lowest representative of the great Christian family. They have gradually mixed up Christianity with a number of pagan and magical elements, and are specially noted for strong Jewish tendencies and their strict observance of the forbidden food of the Church. The Abyssinian Church, being the religion of a more than half barbarous people, cut off by the sea from all relations with any other Christian body except the poor and backward Copts, is certainly the lowest representative of the great Christian family. They have gradually mixed up Christianity with a number of pagan and magical elements, and are especially noted for strong Jewish tendencies and their strict observance of the covenant containing the Ten Commandments.

Lately Russia has developed an interest in the Abyssinians and has begun to undertake schemes for educating them, and, of course, at the same time, converting them to Orthodoxy, and the Church of Christ.

5. The Jacobites are the Monophysites of Syria. Here, too, chiefly out of political opposition to the imperial court, Monophysitism spread quickly among the native population, and here, too, there was the same opposition between the Syrian Monophysites in the country and the Greek Melkites in the cities. Severus of Antioch (518-18) was an ardent Monophysite. After his death the Emperor Justinian (527-63) tried to cut off the succession by having all bishops suspect of heresy locked up in monasteries. But his wife Theodora was herself a Monophysite; she removed the ordinations of the Orthodox patriarch Theodore and James. It is from this James, called Zanzalos and Baradai (Jacob Baradaius), that they have their name ("Iqobite", "Jacobite"); it is sometimes used for any Monophysite anywhere, but had better be kept for the national Syrian Church. James was joined two Coptic bishops, who with him ordained a whole hierarchy, including one Sergius of Tellas as Patriarch of Antioch. From this Sergius the Jacobite patriarchs descend. Historically, the Jacobites of Syria are the national Church of their country, as much as the Copts in Egypt; but they by no means form so exclusively the religion of the native popula-
tion. Syria never held together, was never so compact a unity as Egypt. We have seen that the Eastern Syrians expressed their national, anti-Imperial feeling by adopting the extreme opposite heresy, Nestorianism, which, however, had the same advantage of not being the religion of Caesar and his enemies. Among the Western Syrians, too, there has always been a lack of cohesion. They had in Monophysite times two patriarchates (Antioch and Jerusalem) instead of one. In all quarrels, whether political or theological, whereas the Copts move like one man for the cause of Egypt and the “Christian Pharaoh”, the Syriacs were divided among themselves. There have always been many Melkites in Syria, and the Jacobites were never an overwhelming majority. Now they are a small minority (about 50,000) dwelling in Syria, Mesopotamia, Kurdistan. Their head is the Jacobite Patriarch of “Antioch and all the East”. He always takes the name Ignatius and dwells either at Diarbekir or Mardin in Mesopotamia. Under him, as first of the metropolitans, is the Maphrian, a prelate who was originally set up to rule the Eastern Jacobites as a rival of the Nestorian catholics. Originally the maphrian had a number of special rights and privileges that distinguish him from the independent metropolitans. Now he has only precedence of other metropolitans, a few rights in connexion with the patriarch’s election and consecration (when the patriarch dies he is generally succeeded by the maphrian) and the title “Maphrian and Catholicoi of the East”. Besides these two, the Jacobites have seven metropolitans and three other bishops. As in all Eastern Churches, there are many monks, from whom the bishops are always taken. The Syrian Jacobites are in communion with the Copts. They name the Coptic patriarch in the Liturgy, and the rule is that each Syrian patriarch should send an official letter to his own bishop of Alexandria and Constantinople to announce his succession. This implies a recognition of superior rank which is consistent with the old precedence of Alexandria over Antioch. At Mardin still linger the remains of an old pagan community of Sun worshippers who in 1762 (when the Turks finally decided to apply to them, too, the extermination that the Koran prescribes for pagans) preferred to hide under the outward appearance of Jacobite Christianity. They were, therefore, all nominally converted, and they conform to the laws of the Jacobite Church, but in the main do not receive all sacraments and be buried. But they only marry among themselves and every one knows that they still practise their old pagan rites in secret. There are about one hundred families of these people, still called Shamisjah (people of the Sun).

6. The Malabar Christians in India have had the strangest history of all these Eastern Churches. For, having been Nestorians, they have now veered round to the other extreme and have become Monophysites. We hear of Christian communities along the Malabar coast (in Southern India from Goa to Cape Comorin) as early as the sixth century (Silbernagl, op. cit., 317; see also German, “Die Kirche der Thomaschristen”, quoted below). They claim the Apostles St. Thomas as their founder (hence their name “Thomas-Christs”, or “Christians of St. Thomas”). In the first period they were dependent on the Catholics of Sciljeia-Ctesiphon, and were Nestorians like him. They are really one of the many missionary churches founded by the Nestorians in Asia. In the sixteenth century the Portuguese succeeded in converting a part of this Church to union with Rome. A further schism among these Unias led to a complicated situation, of which the Jacobite patriarch took advantage by sending a bishop to form a Jacobite Malabar Church. There were then three parties among them: Nestorians, Jacobites, and Unias. The line of Nestorian metropolitans died out (it has been revived lately) and nearly all the non-Union Thomas-Christs may be counted as Monophysites since the eighteenth century. But the Jacobite patriarch seems to have forgotten them, so that after 1751 they chose their own hierarchy and were an independent Church. In the nineteenth century, after they had been practically rediscovered by the English, the Jacobites in Syria tried to reassert their authority over Malabar by sending out a metropolitan named Athanasius. Athanasius made a considerable disturbance, excommunicated the hierarchy he found, and tried to reorganize this Church in communion with the Syrian patriarch. But the Rajah of Travancore took the side of the national Church and forced the Jacobites to separate. Since then the Thomas-Christs have been a quite independent Church whose communion with the Jacobites of Syria is at most only theoretic. There are about 70,000 of them under a metropolitan who calls himself “Bishop and Gate of all India”. He is always named by his predecessor, i.e., each metropolitan chooses a coadjutor with the right of succession. The Thomas-Christs use Syriac liturgically and describe themselves generally as “Syrians.”

7. The Armenian Church is the last and the most important of these Monophysite bodies. Although it makes a fuss in faith with the national Church of Syria, it does not in communion with them (a union arranged by a synod in 726 came to nothing) nor with any other Church in the world. This is a national Church in the strictest sense of all: except for the large Armenian Uniat body that forms the usual pendant, and for a very small number of Protestants, Armenia is entirely Catholic and it has no members who are not Armenians. So in this case the name of the nation and of the religion are really the same. Only, since there are the Uniates, it is necessary to distinguish whether an Armenian belongs to them or to the schismatical (Monophysite) Church. This is because of the disturbance it is usual to call the Gregorian Armenians—after St. Gregory the Illuminator—another polite concession of form on our part akin to that of “Orthodox” etc. Quite lately the Gregorian Armenians have begun to call themselves Orthodox. This has no meaning and only confuses the issue. Of course each Church thinks itself really Orthodox, and Catholic and Apostolic and Holy too. But one must keep technical names clear, or we shall always talk at cross purposes. The polite convention throughout the Levant is that we are Catholics, that people in communion with the “Catholic Patriarch” are Orthodox, and that Monophysite Armenians are Gregorian. They should be content with what is an honourable title to which we and the Orthodox do not of course think that they have really any right. They have no real right to it, because the Apostles of Armenia, St. Gregory the Illuminator (296), was no Monophysite, but a Catholic in union with Rome. The Armenian Church was in the first period subject to the Metropolitan of Cæsarea; he ordained its bishops. It suffered persecution from the Persians and was an honoured branch of the great Catholic Church till the sixth century. Then Monophysitism spread throughout Armenia from Syria, and in 527 the Armenian patriarch, Nestes, in the Synod of Dvin, formally rejected the Council of Chalcedon. The schism became quite manifest in 552, when the primate, Abraham I, excommunicated the Church of Georgia because it refused to accept it. From that time on the national Armenian Church has been isolated from the rest of Christendom; the continual attempts at reunion made by Catholic missionaries, however, have established a considerable body of Armenian Uniates. The Armenians are a persecuted people and widely dispersed. They are found not only in Armenia, but scattered all over the Levant and in many cities of Europe and America. As they always bring their Church with them, it is a large and important community, second only to the Orthodox in size among Eastern Churches. There are about three mil-
lions of Gregorian Armenians. Among their bishops four have the title of patriarch. The first is the Patriarch of Etchmiadzin, who bears as a special title that of catholicoi. Etchmiadzin is a monastery in the province of Erivan, between the Black and the Caspian Seas. This, however, is not Uniat, for the title does not give one half to the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople. It is the cradle of the race and their chief sanctuary. The catholicoi is the head of the Armenian Church and to a great extent of his nation too. Before the Russian occupation of Erivan he had unlimited jurisdiction over all Gregorian Armenians and was something very like an Armenian pope. And even since he resides under the shadow of Russia, and especially since the Russian Government has begun to interfere in his election and administration, the Armenians of Turkey have made themselves nearly independent of him. The second rank belongs to the Patriarch of Constantinople. They have had a bishop at Constantinople since 1307. In 1461 Mohammed II gave this bishop the title of Patriarch of the Armenians, so as to rivet their loyalty to his capital and to form a millet (nation) on the same footing as the Rum millet (the Orthodox Church). This patriarch is the person responsible to the Porte for the affairs of the Armenians. He has the same rank as his Orthodox rival, and now uses the jurisdiction over all Turkish Armenians that formerly belonged to the catholicoi. Under him, and little more than titular patriarchs, are those of Sis in Cilicia (a title kept after a temporary schism in 1460) and Jerusalem (whose title was abolished in the eighteenth century). The Armenians have seven dioceses in the Russian Empire, two in Persia, and thirty-five in Turkey. They distinguish archbishops from bishops by an honorary precedence only and have an upper class of priests called Vartapets, who are celibate and provide all the higher offices (bishops and patriarchs are always of their rank). There are, of course, as in all Eastern Churches, many monks. In many ways the Armenian (Gregorian) Church has been influenced by Rome, so that they are among Eastern schismatists the only one that can be described as at all latinized. Examples of such influence are their use of unleavened bread for the Holy Eucharist, their vestments (the mitre is almost exactly the Roman one), etc. This appears to be the result of opposition to their nearer rivals, the Orthodox. In any case, at present the Armenians are properly more Roman in character than Greek Church and betoken the success of the East. They are disposed for reunion with any other of these communions. Their Monophysitism is now very vague and shadowy—as indeed is the case with most Monophysite Churches. It is from them that the greatest proportion of Uniates have been converted.

This brings us to the end of the Monophysite bodies and to the end of all schismatical Eastern Churches. A further schism was indeed caused by the Monothelite heresy in the seventh century, but the whole of the Church then formed (the Monarite Church) has been for many centuries reunited with Rome. So Monarites have their place only among the Uniates.

We have, then, as schismatists Eastern Churches, first, the great Orthodox Church, then one Church formed by the Nestorian heresy and five as the result of Monophysitism (those of the Copts, Abyssinians, Jacobites, and Chaldeans). The last groups, corresponding to each of these is a Uniat Church, with one additional entirely Uniat community (the Maronites).

B. Uniat Churches.—The definition of a Uniat is: a Christian of any Eastern rite in union with the pope: i.e., a Catholic who belongs not to the Roman, but to an Eastern Church. They differ from the Catholics in that they are in communion with Rome, and from Latins in that they have other rites. A curious, but entirely theoretic, question of terminology is: Are Milanese and Mozarabic Catholics Uniates? If we make rite our basis, they are. That is, they are Catholics who do not belong to the Roman Rite. The point has sometimes been urged rather as a catch than seriously. As a matter of fact, though, it is superficially less obvious than rite, is patriarchate. Uniates are Catholics who do not belong to the Roman patriarchate. So these two remnants of other rites in the West do not constitute Uniat Churches. If in the patriarchate, or any rite following it, it is the case, they are at least Roman Catholic. Their history is Christian, not only Roman Catholic, but also Eastern. Among and one, the great Gallican Church, with her own rite, was always part of the Roman patriarchate; so are Milan and Toledo. This, however, raises a new difficulty; for it may be urged that in that case the Italo-Greeks are not Uniates, since they certainly belong to the Roman patriarchate; and also since, for the same reason, they have done so legally. But the constitution of these Italo-Greek Churches was originally the result of an attempt on the part of the Eastern emperors (Leo III., 717-741; and see "Orth. Eastern Church", 45-47) to follow them from the Roman patriarchate and join them to that of Constantinople. Although the attempt did not succeed, the descendents of the Greeks in Calabria, Sicily, etc., have kept the Byzantine Rite.

They are an exception to the rule, invariable in the East, that rite follows patriarchate, and are an exception to the general principle about Uniates too. As they belong to their own, in this ground it may well be denied that they form a Uniat Church. An Italo-Greek may be best be defined as a member of the Roman patriarchate in Italy, Sicily, or Corsica, who, as a memory of older arrangements, is still allowed to use the Byzantine Rite. With regard to the funda-
ental question of their own nature it is said, however, that is no longer purely geographical. A Latin in the East belongs to the Roman patriarchate as much as if he lived in the West; Latin missionaries everywhere and the new dioceses in Australia and America count as part of what was once the patriarchate of Western Europe. So also the Melkites in Lachin, Marseilles, and Paris belong to the (Uniat) Byzantine patriarchate, though, as foreigners, they are temporarily subject to Latin bishops.

A short enumeration and description of the Uniates will complete this picture of the Eastern Churches. It is, in the first place, a mistake (encouraged by Eastern schismaties and Anglicans) to look upon these Uniates as a sort of compromise between Latin and the other rites, or between Catholics and schismaties. Nor is it true that they are Catholics to whom grudgingly they leave their church and betoken the failure of the schism. On the contrary, they are a national customs. Their position is quite simple and quite logical. They represent exactly the state of the Eastern Churches before the schisms. They are entirely and uncompromisingly Catholic in our strictest sense of the word, quite as much as Latins. They accept the whole Catholic Faith and the authority of the pope as head of the Catholic Church, as did St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom. They do not belong to the pope's patriarchate, nor do they use his rite, any more than did the great saints of Eastern Christendom. They have their own rites and their own patriarchs, as had their fathers before the schism. Nor is there any idea of compromise or concession about this. The Catholic Church has never been identified with the Western patriarchate. The pope's position as patriarch of the West is as distinct from his spiritual rights as is his to the pope's of Rome. It is no more necessary to belong to his patriarchate in order to acknowledge his supreme jurisdiction than it is necessary to have him for diocesan bishop. The Eastern Catholic Churches in union with the West have always been as much the ideal of the Eastern Church Universal as the Latin Church. If some of those Eastern Churches fall into schism, that is a mis-
fortune which does not affect the others who remain faithful. If all fall away, the Eastern half of the Church disappears for a time as an actual fact; it remains as a theory and an ideal to be realized again as soon as they, or some of them, come back to union with Rome.
This is what has happened. There is at any rate no certain evidence of continuity from time before the schism in any of these Uniat Churches. Through the bad time, from the various schisms to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there are traces, isolated cases, of the Latins, the Western missionaries, or the Greeks, or the Remnants of the East surrounding the West; but it cannot be claimed that any considerable body of Eastern Christians have kept the union throughout. The Maronites think they have, but they are mistaken; the only real case is that of the Italo-Greeks (who have never been schismatic). Really the Uniat Churches were formed by Catholics, such as with the West; but it cannot be claimed that any considerable body of Eastern Christians have kept the union throughout. The Maronites think they have, but they are mistaken; the only real case is that of the Italo-Greeks (who have never been schismatic).

2. The Chaldees are Unians converted from Nestorianism. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries a complicated series of Eastern and Western controversies the Nestorians led to not very stable unions of first one and then another party with the Holy See. Since that time there has always been a Uniat Patriarch of the Chaldees, through several times the person so appointed fell away into schism again and had to be replaced by another. The Chaldees are said now to number about 70,000 souls (Silbernagl, op. cit., 351; but Werner, 'Orbis Terr. Cath.', 166, gives the number as 33,000). Their primate lives at Mosul, having the title of Patriarch of Babylon. Under him are two archbishoprics and ten other sees. There are monasteries and several important convents. Five of the Nestorians are very similar to the Nestorian ones by the Dominicans at Mosul. Most of their canon law depends on the Bull of Pius IX, 'Reversurus' (12 July, 1867), published for the Armenians and extended to the Chaldees by 'Quo Synodali' (31 Aug. 1869). They have some students at the Propaganda College in Rome.

3. The Uniat Copts have had a vicar Apostolic since 1781. Before that (in 1442 and again in 1713) the Coptic patriarch had submitted to Rome, but in neither case was there any union of long duration. The number of Copts of this Rite has increased very considerably of late years, Leo XIII in 1895 restored the Uniat patriarchate. The patriarch lives at Cairo and rules over about 20,000 Catholic Copts.

4. The Abyssinian Church had many relations with Rome in past times, and Latin missionaries built up a considerable Uniat Abyssinian Church. But repeated persecutions and banishment of Catholics prevented this community from becoming a permanent one with a regular hierarchy. Now that the Government is tolerant, some thousands of Abyssinians are Unians. They have an Apostolic vicar at Keren. If their numbers increase, no doubt they will in time be organized under a Uniat Abuna who should depend on the Uniat Coptic patriarch. Their liturgy, too, is at present in a state of disorganization. It seems that the Monophysite Abyssinian books will need a good deal of revision before they can be used by Catholics. Meanwhile the priests ordained for this rite have a translation of the Roman Missal in their own language, an arrangement that is not meant to be more than a temporary expedient.

5. The Catholic Syrian Church dates from 1781. At that time a number of Jacobite bishops, priests, and lay people, who had agreed to reunion with Rome, elected one Ignatius Girwe to succeed the dead Jacobite patriarch, George III. Girwe sent to Rome asking for recognition and a pallium, and submitting in all things to the pope's authority. He was then deposed by those of his people who clung to Jacobitism, and a Jacobite patriarch was elected. From this time there have been two rival successions. In 1850 the Catholic Syrians were acknowledged by the Turkish Government as a separate millet. The Uniat patriarch, with his See at Antioch, now has his See at Damascus. Under him are three archbishoprics and six other bishoprics, five monasteries, and about 25,000 families.

6. There is also a Uniat Church of Molobar formed by the Synod of Damiran in 1599. This Church, too, has passed through stormy periods; quite lately, since
the Vatican Council, a new schism has been formed from it of about 30,000 people who are in communion with neither the Catholics, nor the Jacobites, nor the Nestorians, nor any one else at all. There are now about 200,000 Malabar Uniates under three bishops: Apollonic (at Trichur, Changanacherry, and Ernakulam).

7. The Uniat Armenians are an important body numbering altogether about 130,000 souls (Silbernagl, 344). Like their Gregorian countrymen, they are scattered about the Levant, and they have congregations in Russia and Italy. There have been one or more or less temporary reunions of the Armenian Church since the fourteenth century, but in each case a rival Gregorian party set up rival patriarchs and bishops. The head of the Catholic Armenians is the Uniat Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople (since 1839), in whom is joined the patriarchate of Cilicia. He always takes the name Peter, and rules over three titular archbishops and fourteen sees, of which one is Alexandria and one Isphahan in Persia (Werner, 151; Silbernagl, 346). After much dispute he is now recognized by the Porte as the head of a separate millet, and by his representatives before the Uniat bodies that have as yet no political organization. There are also many Uniat Armenians in Austria-Hungary who are subject in Transylvania to the Latin bishops, but in Galicia to the Armenian Archbishop of Lemberg. In Russia there is an Armenian Uniat Society, and immediately after the Mehitartists (founded by Mechitar of Sebaste in 1711) are an important element of Armenian Catholicism. They are monks who follow the Rule of St. Benedict and have monasteries at San Lazaro outside Venice, at Vienna, and in many towns in the Balkans, Armenia, and Russia. They have missions in all the Levant, schools, and presses that produce important liturgical, historical, and theological works. Since 1869 all Armenian Catholic priests must be celibate.

8. Lastly, the Maronite Church is entirely Uniat. There is much dispute as to its origin and the reason of its separation from the Syrian national Church. It is certain that it was formed around monasteries in the Lebanon founded by a certain John Maro in the fourth century. In spite of the indignant protests of all Maronites (Assemani, "Sisl. Orient.," II, 291 sq.; J. Duhoux, "Histoire du Mon. Maronites du Liban, leur constance perseverance dans la Foi catholique," etc.), there is no doubt that they were separated from the old See of Antioch by the fact that they were Monothelites. They were reunited to the Roman Church in the twelfth century, and then (after a period of wandering) since 1216, when their patriarch, Jeremias II, made his definite submission, they have been unswervingly faithful, alone among all Eastern Churches. As in other cases, the Maronites, too, are allowed to keep their old organization and titles. Their head is the Maronite Patriarch of Antioch and all the East, successor to Monothelite rivals of the old line, who, therefore, in no way represents the original patriarchate (Duchesne, "Origines du culte chrétien," second ed., p. 65, note). He is also the civil head of his nation, although he has no biret from the sultan, and lives in a large palace at Bkerki in the Lebanon. He has under him all the general titular bishops. There are many monasteries and convents. The present law of the Maronite Church was drawn up by the great national council held in 1786 at the monastery of Our Lady of the Almond Tree, at Sidlat-al-Luizer in the Lebanon. There are about 300,000 Maronites in the Lebanon and scattered along the Syrian coast. They also have colonies in Egypt and Cyprus, and numbers of them have lately begun to emigrate to America. They have a national college at Rome.

This completes the list of all the Eastern Churches, whether schismatist or Uniat.

In considering their general characteristics we must first of all again separate the Uniates from the others. Uniates are Catholics, and have as much right to be so treated as Latins. As far as faith and morals go they must be numbered with us; as far as the idea of an Eastern Church may still be maintained and the state of opposition to the Holy See, they repudiate it as strongly as we do. Nevertheless, their position is very important as being the result of relations between Rome and the East, and as showing the terms on which reunion between East and West is possible.

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES.—Although these Churches have no communion among themselves, and although many of them are bitterly opposed to the others, there are certain broad lines in which they may be classed together and contrasted with the West.

The first of these is their national feeling. In all these groups the Church is the nation; the vehement and often intolerant ardor of what seems to be their religious conviction is always really national pride and national loyalty under the guise of theology. This strong national feeling is the natural result of their geographical circumstances. For centuries, ages, various nations have lived side by side and have carried on bitter opposition against each other in the Levant, Syria, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the Balkans; they have never had one homogeneous population speaking one language. From the beginning, nationalism in these parts has been a question not to the Pope, but of a community held together by its language, striving for supremacy with other communities. The Roman nation accentuated this. Rome and then Constantinople was always a foreign tyranny to Syrians and Egyptians. And already in the fourth century they began to accentuate their own nationalism, crushed in politics, by taking up an anti-imperial form of religion, by which they could express their hatred for the Government. Such an attitude has characterized these nations ever since.

Under the Turk, too, the only possible separate organization was and is an ecclesiastical one. The Turk even increased the confusion. He found a simple and convenient way of organizing the subject Christians by taking their religion as a basis. So the Porte recognizes each sect as an artificial nation (millet). The Orthodox Church becomes the "Lebanese Maronite nation" (millet), inheriting the name of the old Empire. Then there were the "Armenian nation" or (Ermeni millet), the "Coptic nation," and so on. Blood has nothing to do with it. Any subject of the Porte who joins the Orthodox Church becomes a Roman and is submitted politically to the ecclesiastical patriarch; a Jew who is converted by Armenians becomes an Armenian. True, the latest development of Turkish politics has modified this artificial system, and there have been during the nineteenth century repeated attempts to set up one great Ottoman nation. But the effect of centuries is too deeply rooted in the opposition between Islam and Christianity too great, to make this possible. A Mohammedan in Turkey, whether Turk, Arab, or negro, is simply a Moslem, and a Christian is a Roman, or Armenian, or Maronite, etc. Our Western idea of separating politics from religion, of being on one hand loyal citizens of our own country and on the other, as a quite distinct thing, members of some Church, is unknown in the East. The millet is what matters; and the millet is a religious body. So obvious does this identification seem to them that till quite lately they applied it to us. A Catholic was (and still is) to a "French Christian," a Protestant an "English Christian"; in speaking French or Italian, Levantines constantly use the word nation for religion. Hence it is, also, that there are practically no conversions from one religion to another. Theology, dogma, or any kind of religious conviction counts for little or nothing. A man
keeps to his millet and hotly defends it, as we do to our fatherlands; for a Jacobite to turn Orthodox would be like a Frenchman turning German.

We have noted that religious conviction counts for little. It is hard to say how much any of these bodies (Monophysite) are due even sometimes what was once the cardinal issue of their schism. The bishops and more educated clergy have no doubt a general and hazy idea of the question—Nestorians think that everyone else denies Christ’s real manhood, Monophysites that all their opponents’ “divide Christ.” But what stirs their enthusiasm is not the metaphysical problem; it is the controversy of their religious and political rights. For the most part, this controversy is a question of the faith of their fathers, the heroes of their “nation” who were persecuted by the other millets, as they are to-day (for there everyone thinks that everyone else persecutes his religion). Opposed to all these little mild (plural of millet) there looms, each decade mightier and more dangerous, the West, Europe, Frenigistan (of which the United States, of course, forms part to them). Their lands are overrun with Frenigs; Frengi schools tempt their young men, and Frengi churches, with eloquent sermons and attractive services, their women. They frequent the schools of the West; for the Levantine has discovered that arithmetic, French, and physical science are useful helps to earning a good living. But to accept the Frengi religion means treason to their nation. It is a matter of course to them that we are Catholics or Protestants, those are our millets; but an Armenian, a Greek, or a Serb does not feel that his nation does not exist. He can hardly accept this argument, quotation of Scripture, texts of Fathers, accounts of Church history, break in vain. Your opponent listens, as perhaps even mildly interested, and then goes about his business as before. Frenigs are very clever and learned; but of course he is more so. His words are true, or whatever it is. Whole bodies move (as Nestorian dioceses have lately begun to go), with Russian Orthodoxy, and then every member moves too. One cleaves to one’s millet whatever it does. Certainly, if the heads of any body can be persuaded to accept reunion with Rome, the rank and file will make no difficulty, unless there be another party strong enough to proclaim that those heads have deserted the nation.

The second characteristic, a corollary of the first, is the intense conservatism of all these bodies. They cling fanatically to their riles, even to the smallest custom—because it is by these that the millet is held together. Liturgical language is the burning question in the Balkans. They are all Orthodox, but inside the Orthodox Church there are various millets—Bulgars, Vlachs, Serbs, Greeks, whose bond of union is the language used in church. So one understands the uproar made in Macedonia about language in the liturgy; the revolution among the Serbs of Skup in 1891, when their new metropolitan celebrated in Greek (Orth. Eastern Church, 3261); the ludicrous scandal at Monastir, in Macedonia, when they fought over a dead man’s body and got the whole town aghast because some wanted him to be buried in Greek and some in Rumanian (op. cit., 334). The great and disastrous Bulgarian schism, the schism at Antioch, are simply questions of the nationality of the clergy and the language they use.

It is then that the great difficulty in the way of reunion is this question of nationality in theology. Theology counts for very little. Creeds and arguments, even when people seem to make much of them, are really only shibboleths, convenient expressions of what they really care about—their nation. The question of nature and person in Christ, the Filioque in the Creed, azyme bread, and so on do not really stir the heart of the Eastern Christian. But he will not become a Frenig. Hence the importance of the Unit Churches. Once for all these people will never become Latins, nor is there any reason why they should. The wisdom of the Holy See has always been to restore union, to insist on the Catholic Faith, and for the rest to leave each millet alone with its own native hierarchy, its own language, its own rites. When this is done we have a Unit Church.

IV. ROME AND THE EASTERN CHURCHES.—The attempts at reunion from the 12th century (as of Michael Cerularius (1054)). Before that Rome was little concerned about the older Nestorian and Monophysite schisms. The conversion of these people might well be left to their neighbours, the Catholics of the Eastern Empire.

Naturalistically, in those days the Greeks argued about this conversion in the most disastrous way possible. It was the government that tried to convert them back along the most impossible line, by destroying their nationalities and centralizing them under the patriarch of the imperial city. And the means used were, frankly and crudely, persecution. Monophysite conventicles were broken up by imperial soldiers. Monophysite bishops banished or executed. Of course this confirmed their hatred of Caesar and Caesar’s religion. The East, before as well as after the great schism, did nothing towards pacifying the schismatics at its gates. Only quite lately has Russia taken a more reasonable and conciliatory attitude towards Nestorians and Frenigs and Abyssinians, who are outside her political power. Her attitude towards people she can persecute may be seen in her abominable treatment of the Armenians in Russia. It was, in the first instance, with the Orthodox that Rome treated with a view to reunion. The Second Council of Nicaea (1267) and the Council of Florence (1438–39) were the first efforts on a large scale. And at Florence were at least some representatives of all the Eastern Churches; as a kind of supplement to the great affair of the Orthodox, reunion with them was considered too. None of these represented the body of those who remain, important facts. They (the union of Florence especially) were preceded by elaborate discussions in which the attitudes of East and West, Orthodox and Catholic, were clearly compared. Every question was examined—the primacy, the Filioque, azyme bread, purgatory, celibacy, etc. The Council of Florence has not been forgotten in the East. It showed Eastern Christians what the conditions of reunion are, and it has left them always conscious that reunion is possible and is greatly desired by Rome. And on the other hand it has been used as an invaluable precedent for the Roman Court. The attitude of the Holy See at Florence was the only right one: to be quite unsparing in the question of faith and to concede everything else that possibly can be conceded. There is no need of uniformity in rites or in canon law; as long as practices are not absolutely bad and immoral, each Church may work out its own development along its own lines. Customs that would not suit the West may suit the East very well; and we have no right to quarrel with such customs as long as they are not forced upon us. So, at Florence, in all these matters there was no attempt at changing the old order. Each Church was to keep its own liturgy and its own canon law as far as that was not incompatible with the Roman primacy, which is de fide. The very decree that proclaimed the primacy added the clause, that the pope guides and rules the whole Church of God “without prejudice to the rights and privileges of other patriarchs.” And the East was to keep its married clergy and its leavened bread, was not to say the Filioque in the Creed, nor use solid statues, nor do any of the things they resist as being Latin. This has been the attitude of Rome ever since. Many popes have published decrees, Encyclicals, Bulls that show that they have nor forgotten the very idea of the Churches cut off from us by these schisms; in all these documents consistently the tone and attitude are the same. If there has been any latinitizing movement among Uniates, it has sprung up among themselves; they have
occasionally been disposed to copy practices of the far richer and mightier Latin Church with which they are united. But all the Roman documents point the other way. If any Eastern customs have been discouraged or forbidden, it is because they were obviously abuses and innovations, or practices to the prejudice of the Roman Rite, and to the disgrace of the Church. But in this case, too, the criterion was not conformity with the Roman Rite, but purification from supposed (sometimes mistakenly supposed) false doctrine. That the Maronite Rite is so latinized is due to its own clergy. It was the Maronites themselves who insisted on using our vestments, our ozone bread, our communion under one kind, till these things had to be recognized, because they were already ancient customs to them prescribed by the use of generations.

A short survey of papal documents relating to the Eastern Churches will make these points clear. Before the most important of these documents was Benedict XIV's Encyclical "Allatæ sunt" of 2 July, 1755. In it the pope is able to quote a list of his predecessors who had already cared for the Eastern Churches and their rites. He mentions acts of Innocent III (1198-1216), Honorius III (1216-27), Innocent IV (1243-54), Alexander IV (1254-57), Gregory X (1271-76), Nicholas III (1277-80), Eugene IV (1431-47), Leo X (1513-21), Clement VII (1523-34), Pius IV (1559-65), all to this effect. Gregory XIII (1572-85) founded at Rome colleges for Greeks, Maronites, Armenians. In 1602 Clement VIII published a decree allowing Eastern Rites to be preserved in their rite in Latin churches. In 1624 Urban VIII forbade the Armenians to become Latins, and Clement IX, in 1669, published the same order for Uniat Armenians ("Allatæ sunt", 1). Benedict XIV not only quotes these examples of former popes, he confirms the same principle by new laws. In 1742 he had re-established the Russian Church and the Byzantine Rite after the national Council of Zamosc, confirming again the laws of Clement VIII in 1595. When the Melkite Patriarch of Antioch wanted to change the unchanging Liturgy in his Rite, Benedict XIV answered: "The ancient churches of the Greek Church must be kept unaltered, and your priests must be made to follow them" (Bullarium Ben. XIV., Tom. 1). He ordains that Melkites, who, for lack of a priest of their own Rite, had been baptized by a Latin, should not be considered as having changed to our use: "We forbid absolutely that any Catholic Melkites who follow the Greek Rite should pass over to the Latin Rite" (ib., cap. xviii). The Encyclical "Allatæ sunt" forbids missionaries to convert schismatics to the Latin Rites; when they become Catholics they must join the corresponding Uniat Church (XI). In the Bull "Etsi pastoralia" (1742) the same pope orders that there shall be no precedence because of Rite. Each prelate shall have rank according to his own position or the date of his ordination, and mixed dioceses, if the bishop is Latin (as in Southern Italy), he is to have at least one half French, a quarter Latin. Most of all did the last two popes show their concern for Eastern Christendom. Each by a number of Acts carried on the tradition of conciliation towards the schismatical Churches and of protection of Uniat Rites. Pius IX, in his Encyclical "In Suprema Petri" (1846), again assuaged the fears of quasi-Ordinaries that we will keep unchanged your liturgies, which indeed we greatly honour!; schismatic clergy who join the Catholic Church are to keep the same rank and position as they had before. In 1853 the Uniat Rumanians were given a bishop of their own Rite, and in the Allocution made on that occasion, as well as in the one to the Armenians on 2 February, 1854, he again insists on the same principle. In 1860 the Bulgars, disgusted with the Phanar (the Greeks of Constantinople), approached the Catholic Armenian patriarch, Hasun; he, and the pope confirming him, promised that there should be no latinizing of their Rite. Pius IX founded, 6 January, 1862, a separate department for the Oriental Rites as a special section of the great Propaganda Congregation. Leo XIII in 1888 wrote a letter to the Armenians (Paterna chartusis) in which he exhorts the Gregorians to reunions, always on the same basis. Between this pope and his immediate pupil, perhaps the most important of all documents of this kind, is the Encyclical "Orientalium dignitas ecclesiastri" of 30 November, 1894. In this letter the pope reviewed and confirmed all similar acts of his predecessors and then strengthened them by yet severer laws against any form of latinizing the East. The first part of the Encyclical quotes examples of the care of former popes for Eastern Rites, especially of Pius IX; Pope Leo remembers also what he himself has already done for the same cause—the foundation of colleges at Rome, Philippopolis, Adrianople, Athens, and St. Ann. He commands that the Eastern Rites should be exactly observed in the consecration of their clergy. He praises these venerable Eastern liturgies as representing most ancient and sacred traditions, and quotes again the text that has been used so often for this purpose, circumdata varietate traditionum. The Constitutions of Benedict XIV against latinizers are confirmed; and new and most severe laws are promulgated: any missionary who tries to persuade a Uniat to join the Latin Rite is ipso facto suspended, and is to be expelled from his place. In colleges where boys of different Rites are educated there are to be priests of each Rite to administer the sacraments. In case of need one may receive a sacrament from a priest of another Rite; but for communion it should be, if possible, at least one who uses the same kind of bread. No length of use can prescribe a change of Rite. A woman in marrying may conform to her husband's Rite, but if she becomes a widow she must go back to her own.

In the Encyclical "Præclaræ gràtulætionis", of 20 June, 1894, that has been often described as "Leo XIII's testament", he again turned to the Eastern Churches and invited them in the most commendable and the gentlest way to come back to communion with us. He assures schismatics that no great difference exists between their faith and ours, and repeats once more that he would provide for all their customs without narrowness (Orth. Eastern Church, 434. 435). It was this letter that called forth the unpardonably offensive answer of Anthimos VII of Constantinople (op. cit., 435-438). Nor, as long as he lived, did Leo XIII cease caring for Eastern Churches. On 11 June, 1895, he wrote the letter "Unitas christianæ" to the Caesars, and on 24 December of the same year he restored the Uniat Coptic patriarchate. Lastly, on 19 March, 1895, in a motu proprio, he again insisted on the reverence due to the Eastern Churches and explained the duties of Latin delegates in the East. As a last example of all, Pius X in his Allocution, after the now annual solemn celebration of the Feasts to which his presence on 12 February, 1908, again repeated the same declaration of respect for Eastern rites and customs and the same assurance of his intention to preserve them (Echoes d'Orient, May, 1908, 129-31). Indeed this spirit of conservatism with consecration of rite and the increase of liturgical knowledge, so that there is reason to believe that whatever unintentional mistakes have been made in the past (chiefly with regard to the Maronite and Uniat Armenian rites) will now gradually be corrected, and that the tradition of the most entire acceptance and recognition of other rites
in the East will be maintained even more firmly than in the past.

On the other hand, in spite of occasional outbursts of anti-papal feeling on the part of the various chiefs of those Churches, it is certain that the vision of unity is beginning to make itself felt very widely in the East. One of the first place, education and contact with Western Europeans inevitably breaks down a great part of the old prejudice, jealousy, and fear of us. It was a Latin missionary who said lately: "They are finding out that we are neither so vicious nor so clever as they had thought." And it is with this intercommunication and growing hope of regeneration for their own nations by contact with the West. Once they realize that we do not want to eat them up, and that our mild is safe, whatever happens, they cannot but see the advantages we have to offer them. And with this feeling goes the gradual realization of something larger in the way of a Church than their own mild. Hisberto, it was difficult to say what the various Eastern schismatics understood by the "Catholic Church" in the creed. The Orthodox certainly always mean their own communion only ("Orth. Eastern Church", 366-370); the other smaller bodies certainly hold that they alone have the true faith; every one else—especially Latins—is a heretic. So, presumably, for them, too, the Catholic Church is only their own body. But this is passing with the growth of knowledge of other countries and a juster sense of perspective. The Nestorian who looks at a map of the world can hardly imagine that his sect is the only and whole Church of Christ. And with the apprehension of larger issues there comes the first wish for reunion. For a Church consisting of mutually excommunicate bodies is a monstrosity that is rejected by everyone (except perhaps some Armenians) in the East.

When the conviction has spread that they have everything to gain by becoming members of a really universal Church that union with Rome means all the advantages of Western ideas and a sound theological position, and that, on the other hand, it leaves the national spirit untouche, un-latinized, and only the stronger for so powerful an alliance, then indeed the now shadowy and remote issues about nature and person in Christ, the entirely artificial grievances of the Filioque and our azyme bread will easily be buried in the dust that has gathered over them for centuries, and Eastern Christians may some day wake up and find that there is nothing to do but to register again a union that ought never to have been broken.

**Easterwine, (or Esterwine), Abbot of Wearmouth, was the nephew of St. Benedict Bishop; b. 650, d. 7 March, 686. Descended from the noblest stock of Northumbria, as a young man he led the life of a soldier in the army of King Ecgfrid. When twenty-four years old he gave up the soldier's profession to become a monk in the monastery of Wearmouth, then ruled over by St. Benedict Bishop. He is described as a noble youth, conscious for his humility and bodily activity, but with infinite gentleness; a most exact observer of rules, he loved to perform the lowliest work. He was ordained priest in the year 679, and in 682 St. Benedict appointed him abbot of Wearmouth as coadjutor to himself. As superior "when he was compelled to repro\fe a fault, it was done with such tender sadness that the culprit felt himself incapable of any new offence which should bring a cloud over the benign brightness of that beloved face". In the year 680 a deadly pestilence overspread the country; it attacked the community at Wearmouth and the youthful abbot was one of its victims. He bade farewell to all, the day before he died, and passed away on 7 March, when only thirty-six years old. St. Benedict was absent in Rome at the time of his death and Sigfried was chosen by the monks as his successor. Easterwine is not known to have been the author of any works.**

**Easton, Adam, Cardinal, b. at Easton in Norfolk; d. at Rome, 15 Sept. (according to others, 20 Oct.), 1397. He joined the Benedictines at Norwich. He probably accompanied Archbishop Langham to Rome and, being a man of learning and ability, obtained a post in the Curia. He was made Cardinal-priest of the title of St. Cecilia by Urban VI, probably in Dec., 1381. On 7 March, 1381 or 1382, he was nominated Dean of York. In 1385 he was imprisoned by Urban on a charge of conspiring with five other cardinals against the pope and was deprived of his cardinalate. The next pope, Boniface IX, restored his cardinalate 18 Dec., 1389, and for a time Easton returned to England, where he held a prebend in Salisbury cathedral, which he subsequently exchanged for the living of Heygham in Norwich. He wrote many works, none of which are extant, and it is stated he has composed the Office for the Vigil of Our Lady.**

**East Syrian Rite. See Syrian Rite.**

**Eata, Saint, second Bishop of Hexham; date of birth unknown; d. 26 October, 656. Whether this disciple of St. Aidan was of the English, or of the abo-**
original Pictish race, there is no means of judging. As early as 651 he was elected Abbot of Melrose, which was then within the metropolitan jurisdiction of York. With the increase of the Christian population in northeastern Britain, the spiritual government of a territory so large as that which was then called Northumbria became too heavy a charge for one see; accordingly, in 678 Archbishop Theodore constituted Bernicia (that part of the Northumbrian realm which lay to the north of the River Tees) a suffragan diocese and consecrated Eata its bishop. The new diocese was to have two sees: one at Hexham and the other at Lindisfarne, at the two extremities of what is now the County of Northumberland. Eata was to be styled "Bishop of the Bernicians". This arrangement lasted only three years, and the See of Hexham was then assigned to Trumbert, while Eata kept Lindisfarne. In 684, after the death of Trumbert, St. Cuthbert was elected Bishop of Hexham, but when the latter expressed a desire to remain in his old home rather than to remove to the more southern see, Eata readily consented to exchange with him, and for the last two years of his life occupied the See of Hexham, while Cuthbert ruled as Bishop at Lindisfarne. Like most of the bishops of the see of the English Church, St. Eata was canonized by general repute of sanctity among the faithful in the regions which he helped to Christianize. His feast is kept on 26 October, the day of his death.

EBBO

Ebbo (Ebo), Archbishop of Reims, b. towards the end of the eighth century; d. 20 March, 851. Though born in German parts, he was educated at the court of Charlemagne who gave him his liberty. After his elevation to the priesthood he became librarian of Louis le Débonnaire and was his councillor in the government of Aquitaine. When Louis became emperor he appointed Ebbo archbishop of the vacant See of Reims in 847, on the suggestion of the emperor, he went to Rome in 822, in order to obtain permission from Pope Paschal I to preach the Gospel to the Danes. The pope not only gave his sanction but also appointed Ebbo papal legate for the North. In company with a certain Haltigar, probably the one who wrote the Historia Regum Francorum (Paris, 1824), 199-223; MANN, The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages (London and St. Louis, 1906), II, 216 sqq., and passim; HASSEK, Coniectanea Hdbch Frieburg im Breisg., 1871, passim; HAUCK, Kirchengeschichte Deutschland, Leipzig, 1900, II, 670 sqq. et passim; SIMON, Der römische Bischofs- und Kaisertitel im Mittelalter, 7th ed. (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1904), § 326, et passim.

Michael Ott.

EBENDORFER

Ebenendorf, Thomas, German chronicler, professor, and statesman, b. 12 August, 1385, at Hasselbach, in Upper Austria; d. at Vienna, 8 Jan., 1464. He made his higher studies at the University of Vienna, where, in 1412 he was appointed Bishop of Cambrai; in 1414 he received the degree of Doctor of Arts. Until 1427 he was attached to the Faculty of Arts and lectured on Aristotle and Latin grammar. After 1419 he was also admitted to the theological faculty as cursus biblicus. In 1427 he was made licentiate and in 1429 master of theology; soon after he became dean of the theological faculty, in which body he was a professor until his death. Three several times, 1423, 1429, and 1445 he was rector of the University of Vienna; he was also canon of St. Stephen's, and engaged in the apostolic ministry as preacher and as pastor of Perchtoldsfeld and of Falkenstein near Vienna. He ranks high among the professors of the University of Vienna in the fifteenth century. In the struggles which it had to sustain he championed the rights and interests of the university with zeal and energy. He represented the university at the Council of Basle (1432-34), took an active part in all its discussions, and was one of the delegates sent by the council to Prague to confer with the Hussites. From 1440 to 1444 he was sent to various cities as ambassador of Emperor Frederick III. He disapproved of the attitude of the Council of Basle towards both pope and emperor, and eventually withdrew from it. Under his advocacy of the rights of the Vienna University, coupled with the attacks of his opponents he lost the favour of the emperor, who saw in him a secret enemy. In 1451 and 1452 he was in Italy and went to Rome where he obtained from the pope a confirmation of the privileges of the University of Vienna. In the war
between Frederick III and Albert of Brandenburg he tried to act as mediator but only fell into greater disfavour with Frederick. His last years were clouded by the disturbances of the years 1401–1463 during which Austria had much to suffer from the Bohemian king, George of Podiebrad, and from internal conflicts.

Ebenendorf is one of the most prominent chroniclers of the fifteenth century. His “Chronicon Austriae” is a dull but frank and very detailed history of Austria to 1463. From 1400 on it is an indispensable source of Austrian history (ed. Pez in “Scriptores rerum Austriacarum continens lib. II” Leipzig, 1725, 693–986; in this edition all of Book I and part of Book II were omitted). His account of the Council of Basle appears in the “Diarium gestorum concilii Basilensis pro reductione Bohemorum” (ed. Birk in Monumenta concilii Basilensic, Scriptores, I, Vienna, 1875, 701–783). He wrote also a history of the Roman popes, “Chronica regum Romana”. Books VI and VII, which are of independent value as sources, were edited by Pribram in the “Mitteilungen des Institutes für österreichische Geschichtsforschung”, third supplementary volume (Innsbruck, 1900–04), 387–949. Many of his writings are as yet uncritical in among them commentaries on Biblical books, sermons, “Liber de schismatibus”, “Liber Pontificum Romanorum” (see Levinson, “Thomas Ebendorfer Liber Pontificum” in “Mitteilungen des Institutes für österreichische Geschichtsforschung”, XX, 1899, 60–90).

AEBHARD, Gesch. der Wiener Universität (Vienna, 1865), 491–535; ZEILLER, Thomas Ebendorfer als Geschichtsschreiber in Österreich Mitte und Neuzeit (Munich, 1884), III, 799–810; Allgemeine deutsche Biographie (Leipzig, 1877), v.; HÜTTER, Nomenclator (Innsbruck, 1866), II, 682 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

EBERHARD, MATTHIAS, Bishop of Trier, b. 15 Nov., 1815, at Trier (Germany), d. there 30 May, 1876. After successfully completing the gymnasium course of his native town, he devoted himself to the study of theology, was ordained in 1839, and soon after made assistant at St. Castor's in Coblenz. In 1842 Bishop Arnoldi made him his private secretary, and, at the end of the same year, professor of dogmatics in the seminary of Trier. From 1849 to 1862 he was director of the seminary and also preacher at the cathedral. In 1850 he became a member of the council; from 1852 to 1856 he was representative of his fellow-citizens in the Prussian Lower Chamber, where he joined the Catholic section. On 7 April, 1862, he was preconized as auxiliary Bishop of Trier; after Arnoldi's death he was proposed for the episcopal see, but the Prussian Government acknowledged him only after the death of Arnoldi's successor, Pellrath, 16 July, 1867. Having chosen St. Charles Borromeo for his ideal, he spared no exertion, on the one hand, to make his clergy learned, zealous, devout, and thoroughly cultured, and on the other to cultivate a truly Christian and religious spirit in the people. To attain this double end, he bestowed very great care upon his seminary and demanded a conscientious observation of its rules on the pastoral conferences and the annual retreat. In the parishes he insisted on the instruction in Christian doctrine and on the giving of missions, took care that religious associations were established, especially among the youths and men, and tried to found everywhere good libraries for the people. At the Vatican Council he appeared several times as a speaker, he belonged to the minority of the bishops, who considered the definition of the pope's infallibility as inopportune for the time being; but as soon as the matter had been decided, he published the constitution at once. When, in the beginning of the seventies, the Prussian Government wished to fetter bishops and priests by its ecclesiastico-political legislation, Bishop Eberhard unflinchingly defended the rights of the Church and thus became one of the first victims of the so-called Kulturkampf. At first he was fined an exorbitant sum, but since he could not pay it, he was retained in the prison of Trier from 6 March to 31 December, 1874. New persecutions began after he had been dismissed; the flourishing institutions which belonged to the Church were closed and the appointment of priests was made impossible; the grief at the unhappy condition of his diocese accelerated his death. He is the author of a dissertation “De tituli Sedis Apostolicae ad insigniandam sedem Romanam usu antiquo ac in singulis” (Trier, 1846). His sermons, masterpieces of oratory, were edited after his death by Ditseh in 6 vols. (Trier, 1877–1883; Freiburg, 1894–1900). MÜLLER, Matthias Eberhard (Würzburg, 1874); KRAFT, Matthias Eberhard (Trier, 1878); DITSCHEID, Matthias Eberhard im Kulturkampf (Trier, 1900).

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Eberhard of Ratisbon (or Salzburg; also called Eberhardus altahensis), a German chronicler who flourished about the beginning of the fourteenth century. Hardly anything is known of his life; the only positive facts are obtained from documents of the years 1294–1305, which show that within this period he was active as a magister, Augustinian canon, and archdeacon. He is the author of a chronicle that seems to have been written with the election of Rudolf of Habsburg and extends to 1305. He desired to give an account of Bavarian history only, but was unable to fully execute this intention. In reality he describes more or less fully events occurring outside of Bavaria that seem to him of importance. The value of the chronicle is increased by the greater detail with which he treats the last five years, and in this part are also added important letters which serve to make the narrative more life-like. There is no doubt that the work was influenced by Hermann, the celebrated Abbot of Niederaltaich, the founder of a new and brilliant period of annalistic writing and to whom is due a wonderful development in the art of historical writing in Bavaria during the latter half of the thirteenth century. The “Annales” of Eberhard were formerly held to be a direct continuation of Hermann's chronicle, but in the introduction to his edition of the “Annales” Jaffé has disproved this hypothesis. Eberhard's chronicle is, rather, an independent work, connected with its continuations (the so-called “Continuatio Altahensis” and the “Continuatio Ratisponensis”) only by their occasional paraphrases of what Eberhard has said or by information they occasionally give to his statements. In the earliest history of “Annales” is that of H. Canisius in his “Lectiones antiques”, I, 307–358. An improved edition was published by Böhmer, “Fontes”, II, 526–583, and another by Jaffé in “Mon. Germ. Hist., Scriptores”, XVI, 502–605.


PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

EBIONITES.—By this name were designated one or more early Christian sects infected with Judaistic errors.

The word Ebionites, or rather, more correctly, Ebionites, “Ebionites”, is a transliteration of the Aramaic אֶבְיוֹנִי, meaning “poor men”. It first occurs in Irenæus, Adv. Haer., I., xxvi, 2, but without designation of meaning. Orig. (C. Celsum, II, 1; De Princ., IV, i, 22) and Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, xxxii) refer the name of the sects to the poverty of their understanding, or to the poverty of the Law to which they clung, or to the poor opinions they held concerning Christ. This, however, is obviously not the historic origin of the name. Other writers, as Tertullian (De Præser., xxiii; De Caném Chr., xiv, 18), Hippolytus (cf. Pseudo-Tert., Adv.
EBIONITES

Hær. III, as reflecting Hippolytus's lost "Syntagma")
and Epiphanius (Hær. xxx, xxxi), derive the name of the sect from a certain Ebion, its supposed founder. Eph. 
epiphanius even mentions the place of his birth, a hamlet
called Cochabe in the district of Bashan, and relates that
he travelled through Asia and even came to Rome. Of modern scholars Hilgenfeld has main-
tained the historical existence of this Ebion, mainly
on the ground of some passages ascribed to Ebion by
St. Jerome (Comm. in Gal., iii, 11) and by the author of
a compilation of patristic texts against the Monothelites.
But these passages are not likely to be genuine. Ebion, otherwise unknown to history, is probably only an invention to account for the name
Ebionites. The name may have been self-imposed by those
who gladly claimed the beatitude of being poor in
spirit, or who claimed to live after the pattern of the
first Christians in Jerusalem, who laid their goods at
the feet of the Apostles. Perhaps, however, it was
first imposed by others and is to be connected with
the notorious poverty of the Christians in Palestine
(cf. Gal., ii, 10). Recent scholars have plausibly
maintained that the term did not originally designate
a particular sect, but merely the orthodox Christians
of Palestine who continued to observe the Mosaic Law.
These, ceasing to be in touch with the bulk of the
Christian world, would gradually have drifted away from the standard of orthodoxy and become
formal heretics. A stage in this development is seen
in Irenaeus's "Dialogue of the Heresies" (iv, xxxvi)
chapter xlvii (about a.d. 140), where he speaks of two
sects of Jewish Christians estranged from the Church;
whom he observes the Mosaic Law for themselves,
but do not observe observance thereof from others;
and those who hold it of universal obligation. The
later form of this system is Pantheism, a middle way
between the former St. Justin would hold communion, though not
all Christians would show them the same indulgence.
St. Justin, however, does not use the term Ebionites,
and when this term first occurs (about a.d. 175) it
designates a distinctly heretical sect.

The doctrines of this sect are said by Irenaeus to be
like those of Cerinthus and Carpocrates. They
denied the Divinity and the virginal birth of Christ;
they clung to the observance of the Jewish Law;
they regarded St. Paul as an apostate, and only used a
Common (or Jewish) Gospel to St. Matthew (Adv. Hær., i, xxvi,
2; III, xxxii, 2; IV, xxx, 4; V, 1, 9, 10; 3, 10;
and trines are similarly described by Hippolytus (Philos.,
VIII, xxii, X, xviii) and Tertullian (De carne Chr.,
xiv, 18), but their observance of the Law seems no
longer so prominent a feature of their system as in the
account given by Irenaeus. Origen is the first (C.
Cels. V, i, xi) to mark a distinction between two classes
of Ebionites, a distinction which Eusebius also gives
(Hist. Eccl., III, xxvii). Some Ebionites accept, but
others reject, the virginal birth of Christ, though all
reject His pre-existence and His Divinity. Those
who accepted the virginal birth seem to have had
more exalted views concerning Christ and, besides
observing the Sabbath, to have kept the Sunday as a
memorial of His Resurrection. The milder sort of
Ebionites were probably fewer and less important than
their stricter brethren, because the denial of the virgin
birth is generally only attributed to them. (Origin, Hom.
in Luc., viii, xvi.) St. Epiphanius calls the more hereti-
ical section Ebionites, and the more Jewish-minded,
Nazarenes. But we do not know whence St. Ep-
iphanius obtained his information or how far it is reli-
able. It is very hazardous, therefore, to maintain, as
is sometimes done, that the distinction between
Nazarenes and Ebionites goes back to the earliest
days of Christianity.

Besides these merely Judaistic Ebionites, there ex-
isted a later Gnostic development of the same heresy.
These Ebionite Gnostics differed widely from the
main schools of Gnosticism, in that they absolutely
rejected any distinction between Jehovah the De-
urge, and the Supreme Good God. Those who regard
this distinction as essential to Gnosticism would even
object to classing Ebionites as Gnostics. But on the
other hand the general character of their teaching is
unmistakably Gnostic. This can be gathered from the
Pseudo-Clementines and may be summed up as
follows: Matter is eternal, and an emanation of the
Deity; nay it constitutes, as it were, God's body.
Creation, therefore, is but the transformation of pre-
existing material. God thus 'creates' the Universe by
the instrumentality of His wisdom which is de-
scribed as a "demiurge," an "emanation," or "produc-
ting the world. But this Logos, or Sophia, does not constitute a different person, as in Christian
theology. Sophia produces the world by a successive
evolution of syzygyes, the female in each case preceding
the male but being finally overcome by him. This
universe is, moreover, divided into two realms, that
of good and that of evil. The Son of God rules over
the realm of the good, and to him is given the world
to come, but the Prince of Evil is the prince of
this world (cf. John, xiv, 30; Eph., i, 21; vi, 12).
These passages mention a Son of God to be born,
but not the ordinary "Christ" or "Messiah." Those who
were born were, however, not only a "demiurge,"
but a creature, yet not equal to, nor even to be compared with, the Father (ἀυτοκεφαλὴν 
οὐκ ὄντα— "Hom.," xvi, 16). Adam was the bearer
of the first revelation, Moses of the second, Christ of
the third and perfect one. The union of Christ with
Judaism is involved in the "Logos" or "The Word"
knowledge (gnosis), by believing in God the Teacher,
and by being baptized unto remission of sins. Thus
he receives knowledge and strength to observe al
the precepts of the law. Christ shall come again to tri-
umph over Antichrist as light dispels darkness. The
particularism of Gnosticism with its Pagan Dualism, Judaism, and Christianity fused together, and here and there
reminds one of Mandaic literature. The "Recogni-
tions," as given us in Rufinus's translation (revision?),
come nearer to Catholic teaching than do the "Homi-
lies."

Amongst the writings of the Ebionites must be
mentioned (a) their Gospel. St. Irenaeus only states
that they used the Gospel of St. Matthew. Eusebius
modifies this statement by speaking of the so-called
Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was known to
Hegesippus (Eus. Hist. Eccl., IV, xxx, 8), the later
Jerome, De vir. ill., 7, and Clem. Alex. (Strom., II, ix,
45). This, probably, was the slightly modified Ara-
maic original of St. Matthew, written in Hebrew
characters. But St. Epiphanius attributes this to the
Nazarenes, while the Ebionites proper only possessed
an incomplete, falsified, and truncated copy thereof
(Adv. Hær., xxxix, 9). It is probably identical with
the Gospel of the Twelve.

(b) Their Apocrypha: "The Circuits of Peter" (περιαπό 
πέτρου) and Acts of the Apostles, amongst
which the "Ascents of James" (ἀσάρχοι Ιακώβος).
The first-named books are substantially contained
in the Clementine Homilies under the title of Clement's
"Compendium of Peter's itineraries sermons", and also
in the "Recognitions" ascribed to the same. They
form an early Christian didactic novel to propagate
Ebionite views, i.e. their Gnostic doctrines, the
supremacy of James, their connexion with Rome, and
their antagonism to Simon Magus. (See Clemen-
tines.)

(c) The Works of Symmachus, i.e. his translation
of the Old Testament (see Versions of the Bible;
Symmachus the Exegete) and his "Interpretation"
against the canonical Gospel of St. Matthew. The
latter work, which is totally lost (Eusebius, Hist.
Eccl., VI, xvi; Jerome, De vir. ill., iv), is probably
identical with "De distinctione preceptorum", mentioned
by Ebed Jeu (Assenian, Bibli. Or., III, 1).

(d) The book of Elcesait and the "Hidden Power"
(οὐσία), purporting to have been written about A.D. 100
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and brought to Rome about A.D. 217 by Alciatiades of Apumae. Those who accepted its doctrines and its new baptism were called Elchasites. (Hipp, "Philos.," IX, xiv-xvi; Epiph., "Haer.," xiv, 1; iii, 1.)

Of the history of this sect hardly anything is known. It received not only a strong influence in the East and none at all in the West, where they were known as Symmachiani. In St. Epiphanius's time small communities seem still to have existed in some hamlets of Syria and Palestine, but they were lost in obscurity. Further east, in Babylonia and Persia, their influence is probably traceable amongst the Mandaeans, and it is suggested by Ulthorn and others that they may be brought into connexion with the origin of Mohammedianism.


Ebner, the name of two German mystics, whom historical research has shown to have been in no wise related.

(1) Christina, b. of a patrician family on Good Friday, at Nuremberg, 1277; d. at Engelthal, 27 December, 1535. From her mother she inherited a deeply religious spirit, which early manifested itself in a firm resolve for prayer and mortification. Hardly had she made her First Communion when her parents accorded her a desire, which she had expressed since her seventh year, of entering the Dominican convent at Engelthal in the vicinity of Nuremberg. At the end of her year of novitiate she was stricken with a dangerous illness, which reappeared three times annually from her thirteenth to her twenty-third year. Each year, for the remainder of her life, she suffered a relapse of this mysterious sickness. Christina did not, however, on this account relax her penitential practises, nor fail in her duties as superior, to which she had been early elected. In her thirteenth year she began to enjoy frequent visits from the Master, from whose words she drew light and counsel for her own direction. As a result she was misunderstood by all save her confessor, Father Konrad of Füssen (O.P.), at whose request she in the Advent of 1317, she began to write a diary of her spiritual experiences in chronological order. After an introduction in which she reviews in a simple, unaffected manner the whole history of her life till 1317, this touching piece of mystical literature is carried on till 1533. She speaks of herself as the third person as von dem menschen. Most of this diary was written by her own hand save when she dictated on account of illness. It is preserved, in a complete version of the fifteenth century, in a manuscript (cod. 90) at Nuremberg. Excerpts are to be found also at the same place (cod. 81, 91), at Stuttgart (cod. 90), and Medilingen. We learn from this source that Christina played an important part by her prayers in the settlement of the difficulties arising from the riots at Nuremberg in 1518; from the earthquake of the same year: the Black Death; the Flagellants' processions, and the long imprisonment of the local domain at Liesenhof between Louis the Bavarian and the Holy See. She also tells us of the absence of a director from the removal of Konrad to Freiburg in 1324 till 1331, when Henry of Nördlingen visited her and gave her advice sufficient for the remainder of her life. The treatise "Von der genaden," the Stuttgart Literatur, published over her name in 1871 is probably not her work.

(2) Margaretha, b. of rich parents at Donauwörth, 1291; d. 20 June, 1351. She received a thorough classical education in her home, and later entered the Dominican convent at Maria-Medingen near Dillingen, where she was solemnly professed in 1306. In 1312 she was dangerously ill for three years, and subsequently for a period of nearly seven years she was most of the time at the point of death. Hence she could exercise her desire for penance only by abstaining from wine, flesh, and only. On the occasion of a return from home, whether she had gone during the campaign of Louis the Bavarian, her nurse died, and Margaretha grieved insensibly, until Henry of Nördlingen assumed her spiritual direction in 1332. The correspondence that passed between them is the first collection of this kind in the German language. At his command she wrote her own hand, containing all her revelations and intercourse with the Infant Christ, as also all answers which she received from Him even in her sleep. This diary is preserved in a manuscript of the year 1353 at Medelen. From her letters and diary we learn that she never abandoned her adhesion to Louis the Bavarian, whose soul she learned in a vision had been saved.


THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.

Eccehlinia, abraham. See Abraham Eccehlinia.

Ecclesiarch. See SACHRITAN.

Ecclesiastes (Sept. Ecclesiastes, in St. Jerome also Conisator, "Preacher") is the name given to the book of Holy Scripture which usually follows the Proverbs; the Hebrew Qoheleth probably has the same meaning. The word preacher, however, is not meant to suggest a congregation nor a public speech, but only the solemn announcement of sublime truths (נְטֵנַי, passive נטני, Lat. congregare, I (III), K., vii, 3; נטני, in publico, palem, Prov., v, 11; xxvi, 26; נטני to be taken either as a feminine participle, and would then be either a simple abstract noun, praecomium, or in a poetic sense, nova dangers, or must be taken as the noun, like the proper nouns for similar formation, Ecd., i, 55, 57; corresponding to its use, the word is always used as masculine, except vii, 27). Solomon, as the herald of wisdom, proclaims the most serious truths. His teaching may be divided as follows.

Introduction.—Everything human is vain (i, 1-11); for man, during his life on earth, is more transient than all things in nature (i, 1-7), whose unchangeable course he admires, but does not comprehend (i, 8-11).

Part I.—Vanity in man’s private life (i, 12-iii, 15): man is human wisdom (i, 12-14); vain are pleasures and pomp (i, 12-17); St. Gregory of Tours has added the proof that all things are immutably predestined and are not subject to the will of man (iii, 1-15). Then, rhetorically exaggerating, he draws the conclusion: "It is not better to enjoy life’s blessings which God has given, than to waste your strength uselessly?" (iii, 24-20). In this first part, the reference to the writer himself, the self-acccusation, on account of the excessive luxury described in III Kings, x, is placed in the foreground. Afterwards, the author usually prefacces his meditations with an "I saw", and explains what he has learned either by personal observation or by other sources, and on what he has meditated. Thus he says—

Part II.—Sheer vanity also in civil life (iii, 16-13); vain and cheerless is life because of the iniquity which reigns in the halls of justice (iii, 16-22) as well as in the intercourse of men (iv, 1-3). The strong expressions
in iii, 18 sqq., and iv, 2 sq., must be explained by the writer's tragic vein, and this does credit to the writer, who, speaking as Solomon, deplores bitterly what has often enough happened in his kingdom also, whether through his fault or without his knowledge. The deepest rule of the king was described in advance by Samuel, and Solomon cannot be cleared of all guilt (see below). But even the best prince will, to his grief, find by experience that countless wrongs cannot be prevented in a large empire. Qoheleth does not speak of the wrongs which he himself has suffered, but of those which he has prevented. Other of life's vanities consist in the fact that mad competition leads many to fall into idleness (iv, 4-6); a third causes many a man to turn and greed to shun society, or even to lose a throne because his unwisdom forbids him to seek the help of other men (iv, 13-16). Qoheleth then turns once more to the three classes of men named: to those who groan under the weight of injustice, in order to exhort them not to sin against God by murmuring against Providence, for this would be tantamount to dishonouring God in His temple, or to breaking a sacred vow, or to denying Providence (iv, 17-5, 8); in the same way he also turns the counsel to the wise (v, 9-10) and describes the miseries of the supposed foolish king (vi, 1-6). A long oratorical amplification closes the second part (vi, 7-5, 10). The immutable predestination of all things in a world which must be taught man contentment and modesty (vi, 7-7, 1, Vulg.). A serious life, with all frivolity, is in vain (vii, 2-3). Instead of passionate outbreaks (vii, 8-5, 15), he recommends a golden mean (vii, 16-23). Finally, Qoheleth inquires into the deepest and last reason of "vanity" and finds it in the sinfulness of woman; he evidently thinks also of the first woman, through whom the will of God (apart from man) turned the world (vii, 24-30). In this part, also, Qoheleth returns to his admonition to enjoy in peace and modesty the blessings granted by God, instead of giving oneself up to anger on account of wrongs endured, or to avarice, or to other vices (iii, 22; v, 17 sq.; vii, 5).

Part III begins with the question: "Who is as wise as the wise man?" (In the Vulg., these words have been wrongly placed in chap. vii.) Qoheleth here gives seven or eight important rules for life as the quintessence of true wisdom. Submit to God's "the king's") will (viii, 1-5). If you observe that there is no end to all earth, content yourself "easy" (viii, 9-15). Do not attempt to solve all the riddles of life by human wisdom; it is better to enjoy modestly the blessings of life and to work according to one's strength, but always within the narrow limits set by God (viii, 16-17, 12. In the Vulg. ad alii miserebread us accepta.) In this "seige" of your city (by God) seek help in true wisdom (ix, 13-13, 15). It is always most important not to lose your temper because of wrongs done to you (x, 14-15). Then follows the repetition of the advice not to give oneself up to idleness; sloth destroys countries and nations, therefore work diligently, but leave the success to God without murmuring (x, 16-16, 6). Even amid the pleasures of life do not forget the Lord, but think of death and judgment (xi, 7-13, 8).

In the epilogue Qoheleth again lays stress upon his appointment as a teacher of wisdom, and declares that the pith of his teachings is: Fear God and keep the Commandments; for that is the whole man. In the above analysis, as must be expected, the writer of this article has been guided in some particulars by his conception of the difficult text before him, while he has placed much more importance on the same. Many critics do not admit a close connexion of ideas at all. Zapletal regards the book as a collection of separate aphorisms which form a whole only externally; Bickell thought that the arrangement of the parts had been totally destroyed at an early date; Siegfried supposed that the book had been supplemented and enlarged in strata; Luther assumed several authors. Most commentators do not expect that they can show a regular connexion of all the "sayings" and an orderly arrangement of the entire book. In the above analysis an attempt has been made to do this kind of work which, apart from historical sense, is not always to be expected.

Several parts must be taken in the sense of parables, e.g. what is said in ix, 14 sqq., of the siege of a city by a king. And in viii, 2, and x, 20, "king" means God. It appears to me that iv, 17, is not to be taken literally; and the same is true of x, 5 sqq. Few will have the patience to take xi, 1 sqq., figuratively. Chap. xii must conclude every one of the writer's thoughts with the fact in Qoheleth's style, "There is a time for everything", carried no deeper meaning than the words disclose at first sight. The strongest guarantee of the unity and sequence of thoughts in the book is the theme, "Vanitas vanitatum", which emphatically opens it and is repeated again and again, and (xii, 8) with which it ends. Furthermore, the constant repetition of vidit or of similar expressions, which connect the arguments for the same truth; finally, the sameness of verbal and structural forms of the writer's thought, with its hyperbolical language, from beginning to end. In order to reconcile the apparently conflicting statements in the same book or what seem contradictions of manifest truths of the religious or moral order, ancient commentators assumed that Qoheleth explained the course of the world. Modern commentators, on the other hand, have sought to remove these discrepancies by omitting parts of the text, in this way to obtain a harmonious collection of maxims, or even affirmed that the author had no clear ideas, and, e.g., was not convinced of the spirituality and immortality of the soul. But, apart from the statement that we cannot admit erroneous or varying views of life and faith in an inspired writer, we regard frequent alterations in the text or the proposed form of a dialogue as poor makeshifts. It suffices, in my opinion, to explain certain hyperbolical and somewhat paradoxical turns as results of the bold style and the tragic vein of the writer. If our explanation is correct, the chief reproach against Qoheleth—viz. that against his orthodoxy—falls to the ground. For iii, 17; xi, 9; xii, 7-14, point to another life as distinctly as can be desired, we cannot take it, 19-21, as a denial of immortality, and it is evident that in his whole book the author deplores only the vanity of the mortal or earthly life; but to this may be truly applied (if the hyperbolical language of the tragic mood is taken into consideration) whatever is said there by Qoheleth. We cannot find fault with his comparing the mortal life of man and his death to the life and death of the beast (in vv. 19 and 21 נפוג should always be taken as "breath of life"). Again, iv, 2 sq., is only a hyperbolical expression; in like manner Job (iii, 3) curses in his grief the day of his birth. True, some allege that the doctrine of immortality was altogether unknown to early antiquity; but even the Saviour (Luke, xx, 37) added the testimony of Moses for the resurrection of the dead and was not contradicted by his adversaries. And ix, 5 sq. and 10, must be taken in a similar sense. Now, in2ishing all things earthly to the resurrection, the very tendency of his book, Qoheleth admits the spirituality of the soul; this follows especially from xii, 7, where the body is returned to the earth, but the soul to God.

Sometimes Qoheleth also seems to be given to fatalism; for in his peculiar manner he lays great stress on the immutability of the laws of nature and of God's universe. But he considers this immutability as dependent on God's will (iii, 14; iv, 2; vii, 14 sqq.). Nor does he deny the freedom of man within the limits set by God; otherwise his admonitions to fear God, to work, etc. would be meaningless, and man would not have brought evil into the world through his own fault (vii, 23 sq.)
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29. Heb.) Just as little does he contest the freedom of God's decrees, for God is spoken of as the source of all wisdom (ii, 26; v, 5). His views of life do not lead to Qoheleth to stoical indifference or to blind hatred; on the contrary he shows the deepest sympathy with the misery of the suffering and earnestly deprecates oppression and sin. In contentment with one's lot, in the quiet enjoyment of the blessings given by God, he discerns the golden mean, by which man prevents the vagaries of passion. Neither does he thereby recommend a kind of epicureanism. For the ever-recurring phrase, "Eat and drink, for that is the best in life," is only a type of wisdom which recalls man from all kinds of excesses. He recommends not idle, but moderate enjoyment, accompanied by incessant labour. Many persist in laying one charge on Qoheleth's door, viz., that of pessimism. He seems to call all man's efforts vain and empty, his life aimless and futile, and his lot deplorable. It is true that a sombre mood prevails in the book, that the author chose as his theme the description of the sad and serious sides of life: but is it pessimism to recognize the evils of life and to be impressed with them? Is it not rather the mark of a great and profound mind to be appalled by the more bitterly the scene of trouble and earthly, and, on the other hand, the peculiarity of the frivolous to ignore the truth? The colours with which Qoheleth paints these evils are indeed glaring, but they naturally flow from the poetical-oralatorical style of his book and from his inward agitation, which lifts him to the heights of language. "I will return to the Book of Job and in certain psalms. However, Qoheleth, unlike the pessimists, does not inveigh against God and the order of the universe, but only man. Chap. vii, in which he inquires into the last cause of evil, closes with the words, "I have found, that God made man right, and he hath entangled himself with an infinity of questions [or phantasms]" His philosophy shows us also the way in which man can find a modest happiness. While severely condemning exceptional pleasures and luxury (chap. ii), it counsels the enjoyment of those pleasures which God prepares for every man (viii, 15; ix, 7 sqq.; xi, 9). It does not purloin, but incites activity (ix, 10; x, 18 sqq.; xi, 1 sqq.). It stays him in his afflictions (v, 7 sqq.; vii, 5; x, 4); it consoles him in death (iii, 17; iv, 1); it discovers at every step how necessary is the fear of God. But Qoheleth's grief seems to be his inability to find a direct, smooth answer to life's riddles; hence he so frequently deplores the insufficiency of his wisdom; on the other hand, besides wisdom, commonly so called, i.e. the wisdom resultant from man's investigations, he knows another kind of wisdom which soothes, and which he therefore recommends again and again (vii, 12, 19; Heb. viii, 1; ix, 17; xii, 9-14). It is true, we feel how the author wrestles with the difficulties which beset his inquiries into the riddles of life; but he overcomes them and offers us an effective consolation even in extraordinary trials. Extraordinary also must have been the occasion which led him to compose the book. He introduces himself from the beginning and repeatedly as Solomon, and this forcibly recalls Solomon shortly before the downfall of the empire; but we know from the Scriptures that this had been prepared by various premonitions and had been foretold by the infallible word of the prophet (see below). We must picture to ourselves Solomon in these critical times, how he seeks in this sore trial by the wisdom which is a relief at all times; submission to the immutable will of God, the true fear of the Lord, undoubtedly must now appear to him the essence of human wisdom.

As the inspired character of Ecclesiastes was not settled in the Fifth Council, but only solemnly reaffirmed against Theodore of Mopsuestia, the faithful have always found elucidation and consolation in this book. Already in the third century, St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, in his paraphrase, then Gregory of Nyssa, in eight homilies, later Hugh of St. Victor, in nineteen homilies, set forth the wisdom of Qoheleth as truly celestial and Divine. Every age may learn from his teaching, but happiness must not be looked for on earth, not in his wisdom, nor in luxury, not in royal splendour; that many afflictions await everybody, in consequence either of the iniquity of others, or of his own passions; that God has put him up within narrow limits, lest he become overweening, but that He does not deny him a small measure of happiness if he does not seek things that are above him" (vii, 1, Vulg.), if he enjoys what God has bestowed on him, in the fear of the Lord and in salutary labour. The hope of a better life to come grows all the stronger the less this life can satisfy man, especially the man of high endeavour. Now Qoheleth does not intend this doctrine for an individual or for one people, but for mankind, and he does not prove it from supernatural revelation, but from pure reason. This is his cosmopolitan standpoint, which Kuenen rightly recognized; unfortunately, this commentator wished to conclude from this that the book originated in the far-off Solmnic times. Kuenen refuted the universal application of the meditations contained therein, to every man who is guided by reason, is unmistakable.

The Author of the Book.—Most modern commentators are of the opinion that Qoheleth's style points not to Solomon, but to a later writer. About this the following may be said:

(1) As a matter of fact, the language of this book differs widely from the language of the Proverbs. Some think that they have discovered many Aramaicisms in the text. "What can we say on this point?" (chap. vii, 12) cannot be gainsaid that Solomon and a great, if not the greatest, part of his people understood Aramaic. (We take the word here as the common name of the dialects closely related to the Biblical Hebrew.) Abraham and Sara, as well as the wives of Isaac and Jacob, had come from Charad; it is therefore probable that the language of that country was preserved, beside the language of Palestine, in the family of the Patriarchs; at any rate, in Moses' time the people still used Aramaic expressions. They exclaim (Ex., xvi, 15) "Hitherto we were as journeying in Egypt; but now, remained 12. A large portion of David's and Solomon's empire was peopled by Arameans, so that Solomon reigned from the Euphrates to Gaza [I (III) K., v, 4, Heb.; II Sam. (K.), x, 19; cf. Gen., xv, 18]. He was conversant with the science of the "sons of the East" and exchanged with them his wisdom (I K., v, 10-14, Heb.). But, as Palestine lay along the commercial routes between the Euphrates and Phenicia, the Israelites, at least in the north of the country, must have been well acquainted with Aramaic. At the time of King Ezechias even the officials of Jerusalem understood Aramaic (Is., xxxvi, 11; II K., xix, 14). Solomon could therefore assume, without hesitation, a somewhat Aramaic speech, if reason or mere inclination moved him. As a skilful writer, he may have intended, especially in his old age, and in a book whose style is partly oratorical, partly philosophical, partly poetical, to enrich the language by new turns. Goethe's language in the second part of "Faust" differs greatly from the first, and introduces many neologisms. Now Solomon seems to have had a more important reason for it. As it lay in his very character to remove the barriers between pagans and Israelites, he may have had the conscious intention to address this book, one of his last, not only the Israelites but his whole people; the Aramaic colouring of his language, then, served as a means to introduce himself to Aramaic readers, who, in their turn, understood Hebrew sufficiently. It is remarkable that the name of God, Jehovah, never oc-
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curs in Ecclesiastes, while Elohim is found thirty-seven times; it is more remarkable still that the name Jah
dehad been omitted in a quotation (v, 3; cf. Deut., xxiii, 21). Besides, nothing is found in the book that
could not be known through natural religion, without the aid of revelation.

(2) The Aramaisms may perhaps be explained in
still another way. We probably possess the Old Testa
ment, not in the original wording and orthography,
but in a form which is slightly revised. We must un
questionably distinguish, it seems, between Biblical
Hebrew, an unchanging literary language and the
conversational Hebrew, which underwent constant
changes. For there is no instance anywhere that a
spoken language has been preserved for some nine
hundred years so little changed in its grammar and
vocabulary as the language of our extant canonical
books. Let us, for an instance, compare the English,
French, or German of nine hundred years ago with
those languages in their present form. Hence it seems
exceedingly daring to infer from the written Hebrew
the character of the spoken language, and from the
style of the book to infer the date of its composition.
Its literary language, on the contrary, which is a dead
language and as such essentially un
changeable, it is reasonable to suppose that in the
course of time its orthography, as well as single words
and phrases, and, perhaps here and there, some formal
elements, have been subjected to change in order to be
more suitable to later readers. But Ecclesiastes was received into the canon in some such later
edition. The Aramaisms, therefore, may also be
explained in this manner; at any rate, the supposition
that the time of the composition of a Biblical book
may be deduced from its language is wholly question
able.

(3) This is a fact admitted by all those critics who
ascibe Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles, portions
of Isaiah and of the Pentateuch, etc., to a later period,
without troubling themselves about the difference of
style in these books.

(4) The eagerness to find Aramaisms in Ecclesiastes
is also excessive. Expressions which are commonly
regarded as such are found now and then in many other
books. Hitzel thinks that he has found ten Arama
isms in Genesis, eight in Exodus, five in Leviticus, four
in Numbers, nine in Deuteronomy, two in Josue, nine
in Judges, five in Ruth, sixteen in Samuel, passim in
the Psalms, and several in Proverbs. For this there may
be a twofold explanation: Either the descend
ants of Abraham, a Chaldean, and of Jacob, who dwelt
twenty years in the Land of Canaan, and whose sons
were almost all born there, have retained numerous
Aramaisms in the newly acquired Hebrew tongue, or
the peculiarities pointed out by Hitzig and others are
no Aramaisms. It is indeed astonishing how accu
rately certain critics claim to know the linguistic
peculiarities of each of the numerous authors and of
every period of a language of which but little literature
is left to us. Zöckler affirms that almost every verse of
Qoheleth contains some Aramaism (Komm., p. 115);
Grotius found only four in the whole book; Hengstenberg admits ten; the opinions on this point
are so much at variance that one cannot help noticing how little imagination is left to us. But
peculiar or strange expressions are at once called
Aramaism; but, according to Hävernick, the Book of
Proverbs, also, contains forty words and phrases
which are often repeated and which are found in no
other book; the Canticle of Canticles has still more
peculiarities. On the contrary the Book of
Agesus, Zacharias, and Malachias are without any of
those peculiarities which are supposed to indicate so
late a period. There is much truth in Griesinger's
words: "We have no history of the Hebrew lan
guage".

(5) Even prominent authorities adduce Aramaisms
which are shown to be Hebraic by clear proofs or man
fest analogies from other books. There are hardly
any unquestionable Aramaisms which can neither be
found in other books nor regarded as Hebraisms,
which per chance have survived only in Ecclesiastes
without a detailed demonstration. (See Griesinger's
Commentary, pp. 23-31). We repeat here Weisse's
words: "Only the language remains as the principal
argument that it was written after Solomon; but how
fallacious in such cases is the merely linguistic proof,
nor need be mentioned after what has been said.

It is alleged that the conditions as described in
Ecclesiastes do not agree with those of the time of
Solomon. True, the author, who is supposed to be
Solomon, speaks of the oppression of the weak by
the stronger, or one official by another, of the denial
of right in the courts of justice (iii, 16; iv, 1; v, 7 sqq.;
vi, 9 sq.; x, 4 sqq.). Now many think that such
things could not have happened in Solomon's reign.
But it surely did not escape the wisdom of Solomon
that oppression occurs at all times and with every
people; the glaring colours, however, in which he
describes them originate in the tragic tone of the
whole book. Besides, which was the time of
Solomon, after his death, of oppressing his people, and
his son confirms the charge (I (III) K., xii, 4 and 14);
moreover, long before him, Samuel spoke of the despotism of the future kings (I Sam. K., viii, 11 sqq.). Many miss
in the book an indication of the past sins and the subse
quent repentance of the people, or it is possible that
Ecclesiastes was written at a later period. But if these
readers considered vii, 27-29, they could not help
seeing that Solomon's discourses were held at
women's intrigues and their consequences; if obedience
towards God is inculcated in various ways, and if
this (xii, 13) is regarded as man's sole destination, the
readers saw that the converted king feared the Lord;
in chap. ii sensuality and luxury are condemned so
vigorously that we may regard this passage as a su
cient expression of repentance. The openness, how
ever, with which Solomon accuses himself only heightens
the impression. This impression has at all times
been so strong, precisely because it is the experienced,
rich, and wise Solomon who brands the sinful aspira
tions of men as "vanity of vanities". Again, what
Qoheleth says of himself and his wisdom in xii, 9 sqq.,
cannot sound strange if it comes from Solomon, espec
ially if the passages he makes the fear of the Lord the
essence of wisdom. The passages iv, 13; viii,
10; ix, 13; x, 4, are considered by some as referring
to historical persons, which seems to me incorrect; at
any rate, indications of so general a nature do not
necessarily point to definite events and persons.
Other commentators think they have discovered traces of Greek philosophy in the book; Qoheleth
appears to be now a sceptic, now a stoic, now an epic
rean; but these traces of Hellenism, if existing at all,
are nothing more than remote resemblances too weak
to serve as arguments. (Cheyne (Job and Solomon)
sufficiently refuted Tyler and Plumptre. That iii, 12,
is a linguistic Graecism, has not been proved, because
the common meaning of δύναται έρωτάσθαι is retained by many
commentators; moreover, in 11 Sam. (K.), xii, 18,
δύναται έρωτάσθαι means 'to be sorry'; the verb, therefore,
is translated by έσται· and

As all the other internal proofs against the author
ship of Solomon are not more convincing, we must
listen to the voice of tradition, which has always attrib
uted Ecclesiastes to him. The Jews do not know the
Prophetic school by Solomon, but objected to the recep
tion, or rather retention, of the book in the canon;
Hillel's School decided definitely for its canonicity and
inspiration. In the Christian Church Theodore of
Mopsuestia and some others for a time obscured the
tradition; all other witnesses previous to the sixteenth
century favour the Solomonic authorship and the in
spiration. The book itself bears testimony for Solomon, not only by the title, but by the whole tone of the discussion, as well as in i, 12; moreover, in xii, 9, Qoheleth is expressly called the author of many proverbs. The ancient never so much as suspected that here, as in the Book of Psalms, Solomon only Jun. 4, 1913.

On the other hand, the attempt is made to prove that the details do not fit Solomon, and to contest his authorship with this single internal argument. The reasons adduced, however, are based upon textual explanations which are justly repudiated by others. Thus Hengstenberg sees (x, 16) in the king, "a man whose allusiveness is entirely that of Peretz Grätz, to Herod the Idumæan; Reusch rightly maintains that the writer speaks of human experiences in general. From ix, 13-15, Hitzig concludes that the author lived about the year 200; Bernstein thinks this ridiculous and opines that some other historical event is alluded to. Hengstenberg regards this passage as nothing more than a parable; on this last view also, the translation of the Septuagint is based (it has the subjunctive; ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς, "there may come a king"). As a matter of fact, Qoheleth describes only what has happened or may happen somewhere, in the sun's "right time; he does not speak of political situations, but of the experience of the individual; he has in view not his people alone, but mankind in general. If internal reasons are to decide the question of authorship, it seems to me that we might more justly prove this authorship of Solomon by much more right from the remarkable passage about the snares of woman (vii, 27), a passage the bitterness of which is not surpassed by the warning of any ascetic; or from the inanimate spirit of Qoheleth for wisdom; or from his deep knowledge of men and things. Considering everything we have seen, it is decisive to look for another author; on the contrary, the reasons which have been advanced against this view are for the great part so weak that in this question the influence of fashion is clearly discernible.

The time of the composition of our book is variously set down by the critics who deny the authorship of Solomon. Every period from Solomon to 200 has been suggested by them; there are even authorities for a later time; Grätz thinks that he has discovered a proof that the book was written under King Herod (40-4 B.C.). This shows clearly how little the linguistic criterion and the other internal arguments are to lead to an agreement of opinion. If Solomon wrote Ecclesiastes towards the end of his life, the sublime tone of the book is easily explained; for the joggers of God (II Kings, 11 sq.) which then came upon him would naturally move him to sorrow and repentance, especially as the breaking up of his kingdom and the accompanying misery were then distinctly before his eyes (see vv. 29 sqq.; 10). Amid the sudden ruin of his power and splendour, he might well exclaim, "Vanity of vanities!" But as God had promised to correct him "in mercy" (II Kings, vii, 11 sq.), the supposition of many ancient writers that Solomon was converted to God becomes highly probable. Then we also understand why his last book, or one of his last, consists of three thoughts: the vanity of earthly things, self-acquiescence, and emphatic appeal to obey the immutable decrees of Providence. The last was well suited to save the Israelites from despair, who were soon to behold the downfall of their power.

There is an unmistakable similarity between Ecclesiastes and the Canticle of Canticles, not only in the pithy shortness of the composition, but also in the emphatic repetition of words and phrases, in the boldness of the language, in the obscure construction of the whole, and in certain linguistic peculiarities (e.g. the use of the relative καθά). The loose succession of sententious thoughts however, reminds us of the Book of Proverbs, whence the epilogue (xii, 9 sqq.) expressly refers to Qoheleth's skill in parables. In the old lists of Biblical books, the place of Ecclesiastes is between Proverbs and the Canticle of Canticles: Sept., Talmud (Baba Bathra xiv, 2), Orig., Mel., Conel., Lact. (with others), etc., also in the Hexapla. Its position is different only in the Masoretic Bible, but, as is generally admitted, for liturgical reasons.

As to the contents, the critics attack the passages referring to the judgment and immortality: iii, 17; xi, 9; xii, 7; furthermore the epilogue, xii, 9 sqq., especially verses 15, 11; also some other passages. Bickell has expressed the opinion that the whole of the book, while being stitched and completely confused; his hypothesis found few advocates, and Euringer (Masorah hexaplera des Qoheleth, Leipzig, 1890) maintains, in opposition to him, that books had not at that early date taken the place of rolls. There is not sufficient evidence to assume that the text was written in verse, as Zapletal does.

Owing to its literalism, the translation of the Septuagint is frequently unintelligible, and it seems that the translators used a corrupt Hebrew text. The Septuagint and the Coptic translation follow the Septuagint. The Greek text, though translated from the Hebrew, is evidently also dependent on the text of the Septuagint. This text, with the notes of Origen, partly forms the Greek and Syriac Hexapla. The Vulgate is a shrift translation made by Jerome from the Hebrew and far superior to his translation from the Greek (in his commentary). Sometimes we cannot accept his opinion (in vi, 9, he most likely wrote quid cupias, and in viii, 12, ex eo quod protector). (See the remnants of the Hexapla of Origen in Field, Oxford, 1875; a paraphrase of the Greek text in St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, Migne, X, 987.) The Chaldean paraphrase is useful for commenting the Masoretic text, though it is without value. The commentary of Olympiodorus is also serviceable (seventh century, M., XClII, 477) and Eumenius, "Catena" (Verona, 1532). A careful translation from the Hebrew was made about 1400 in the "Graeca Veneta" (ed. Gebhardt, Leipzig, 1875).

In the Latin Church important commentaries were written, after the time of Jerome, or whom many depend, by Bonaventura, Nicol. Lyranus, Deriva, the Catholicus, and above all, D. Pinerus (seventeenth cent.), Malaise, H. Bouyer, A. LaRue, and Bossuet.

Modern Catholic commentaries: Schäfer (Freiburg im Br., 1870; Oxford, 1872); Matis (Paris 1871; R. Migne Paris, 1877); Giebhard (Paris, 1890); Zapletal (Freiburg, Switzerland, 1890).

Protestant commentaries: Zickler, tr. Taylor (Edinburgh, 1872); Bullock, in Speaker's Commentary (London, 1878); Commentary on the Bible (London, 1881); Wright, Trisé (London, 1882); Zöpf and Thiele (Hamburg, 1892); Hoffmann (Chur, 1893); Walsheber (Freiburg im Br., 1893).

G. GEBHARDT.

Ecclesiastical Art.—Before speaking in detail of the developments of Christian art from the beginning down to the present day, it seems natural to say something in regard to the vexed question as to the source of its inspiration. It would not be possible here to treat adequately all the various theories which have been propounded, but the essentials of the controversy may be given in a few words. Afterwards there will be some mention of the principal works which Christian art has brought to us and a setting forth of the influence of the Catholic Church in stimulating and directing that artistic spirit which for so many centuries it alone was destined to keep alive.

Origin of Christian Art.—There has been much discussion of late years as to the influences which were predominant in the development of early Christian art. Professor Wickhoff in a striking essay (Roman Art, tr., 1900) has contended that in the first century after Christ a distinctively Roman style was evolved both in painting and sculpture, the salient features of which he characterizes as impressionist or "illusionist". He marks several stages in the growth of this
style, and claims for it especially the creation of what he calls the "continuous" method of composition, i.e. a method by which several successive stages of the same history are depicted together in a single painting. Further, he contends that this Roman style was adopted by the Christian artists and that, though obscured and weakened, it pervaded the Roman world and maintained its identity throughout the Middle Ages, until eventually it quickened again into fuller life under the stimulus of the Renaissance. This view, an exaggeration of the Romanist hypothesis which long held the field, has been severely criticized by many competent authorities and notably by Strzygowski ("Orient oder Rom," 1901, and "Kleininsien", 1903), who attributes the predominant influence in the development of Christian art to the recrudescence of purely Oriental feeling. This, as he maintains, had always survived at Byzantium, Antioch, and Alexandria, and it became operative once more when the Greco-Roman artistic tradition at Rome had exhausted itself after the effort of a few centuries. Though Strzygowski may go too far when he claims that even the art of the Romanized provinces like Gaul or from the East directly to Rome, it seems highly probable that his contention is in substance accurate enough. It is significant that Professor André Michel in the monumental "Histoire de l'Art" (1905)—distinguishes his support to the theory that the Christian art of the Middle Ages was Roman rather than Romanesque, and of its origin. To him no doubt must be assigned the prevalence of the basilica type of church and the first effective conception of the possibilities of stone vaulting. But the transference of the seat of government by Honorius in 404 from Rome to Ravenna and the confusion that arose in the Western Roman Empire, the religious changes and the consequent development of art. If Rome was at all times the seat of the papacy, the vicars of Christ had at not this early date acquired any preponderating influence in the social and civil affairs of the Western world, while more than a hundred years after this, beginning with the seventh century, no less than thirteen pontiffs who succeeded in succession the chair of St. Peter were of Greek or Syrian origin. But what is perhaps most important of all, the Latin stock who occupied what was once the great city, but what now became a provincial town, was morally and intellectually effete. The motive power for such a development was to come from outside. The impetuous energy of the Teutonic tribes of the North was full of latent possibilities for the arts of peace, when that energy was once diverted from the strenuous occupations of a time of war. Once again, "Greco-empire victorem cepit"); but it was Greece enriched this time with the inheritance of Antioch, Ephesus, and Alexandria, while the culture that now travelled west and north found ultimately a more responsive soil than it had ever met with in Latium. In its adoption by Gothic, Franks, and Saxons, the art of Byzantium lost its rigidity, and something of its formalism. It was a living germ which soon developed an independent growth, and long before the Renaissance once more directed the minds of men to classic models, not only architecture and sculpture, but the arts of the painting and the plastic. Thus, and the first Christian founder was full of vigorous life and promise throughout all Western Europe.

The earliest specimens of decoration employed for a Christian purpose are found in the Roman catacombs. In the most ancient examples of all, the private chambers used for Christian interment and that, though obscure, there is decoration indeed, but it is only in a negative sense that it can be called Christian art, for while the abundant frescoes seen in the cemetery of Domitilla and notably in the cubicleum of Ambelius exclude such pagan elements as would be unseemly, the character of the painting is in every respect the counterpart of the ornamentation of the contemporary private houses buried at Pompeii. There is nothing distinctively Christian. Perhaps the frequent recurrence of the vine as a principal element in the scheme of decoration may have been meant to suggest the thought of the Eucharist, but is there any doubt that this is doubtful. Symbolism occurs early, but it can only be recognized with confidence in the more public cemeteries of the second century, e.g. that of St. Callistus; here, under the influence of the "Discipline of the Secret", it is hardly wrong to recognize the true beginnings of a distinctively Christian art. But the art in a most marked degree was rather the more frequent use of such pagan decoration familiar at the period. It seems constantly to be forgotten by those who discuss this subject that it was the deliberate object of the early Christian, during the ages of suspicion and persecution, to exclude from their places of sepulture all that would by its conspicuousness or strangeness attract the notice of the casual pagan intruder.

No wonder that the theme of the Good Shepherd is introduced again and again in the fresco decorations of the early catacombs. This is no indication, as rationalists have pretended, of an idolatrous mythology, but the very likeness of the beardless Good Shepherd to the type of the pagan Hermes Kriphorus—a likeness, however, which is never so exact as to lead to real confusion—constituted its recommendation to those who wished to hide their faith from the presence of the pagans and the people around them. In the same way the Orante, or praying figure, symbolic of the Church or the individual soul, bore a general resemblance to the statues of Pietas, familiar enough to the ordinary Roman citizen, while the dove, which was to the Christian element of the grace of the Holy Ghost, had been distinguished by its pagan neighbour from the birds consecrated to Venus. The deeper mysteries of the Eucharist and of the other sacraments were still more artfully veiled in the frescoes of those early centuries. No doubt the fish was an object familiar enough in all kinds of pagan decoration, but this very fact rendered it most suitable for the purpose of the Christian when he wished to symbolize the marvellous workings of Christ (Γεννησίς Χριστοῦ Θεοῦ στὸν Σωτήρα—IX 892, the fish) in the waters of baptism. What again was more common in decoration than symbolic of banquetting scenes there was often utilized by the worshippers of Mithra—but these beasts depicted upon the walls of a sepulchral chamber had a far other and deeper significance for the Christian, who by some minute sign, the little cross, it may be, impressed upon the loaves of the fishes which decked the frugal board, was quick to discern the reference to the life-giving mystery of the Blessed Eucharist. There are also human figures and Biblical scenes, especially those connected with the liturgy for the departed—for example, the miraculous restorations of Jonah and Daniel and Lazarus—and in one or two isolated instances we may perhaps recognize a presentment of the Madonna; but the reference is always cryptic and only interpretable by the initiated. It was under these circumstances that the instinct of religious symbolism was developed when the art of the Church was yet in its infancy, but one tradition has also often utilized the same symbols from the early Christian decorative art at the ages throughout all the ages of the Church.

With the triumph of the Church under Constantine the necessity for the sedulous hiding of the mysteries of the Faith in large measure disappeared. From a.d. 313 to the end of the fourth century was the period of formation and development in Christian art, and it may be conspicuously recognized upon the walls of the Roman catacombs. Biblical scenes abound, and the figure of Christ, no longer so frequently as the beardless Good Shepherd, but crowned with a nimbus and sitting or standing in the attitude of authority, is fearlessly introduced. The nimbus is also extended to
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others beside Christ, for example to Our Lady and some of the saints. Sculpture again, though in the catacombs the traces it has left are relatively few, now for the first time becomes the helpmate of painting in the service of the Church. This is the age of the great Christian sarcophagi so wonderfully decorated, the figures of Christ and His Apostles and with biblical scenes still full of symbolic meaning. The old ways of the period of persecution had, it is plain, become not only familiar but dear to the body of the faithful. The allegorical method of representing the mysteries of the Faith did not disappear at once but though the triumph of the outline of the "chrism", or the Greek monogram of Christ, was universally held in honour and introduced into all Christian monuments and even into the coinage, the crucifix as a Christian emblem was as yet practically unknown. For more than a century the memory of the sacrifice of Calvary was recollected to the minds of the faithful only by some such device as that of a plain cross impressed with the figure of a lamb. The first representations of the figure of the Saviour nailed upon the Rood, as we see it upon the carved doors of Sta Sabina in Rome and in the British Museum ivory, belong probably to the fifth century, but for a long period after that this subject is very rarely found, and its occurrence in frescoes or mosaics is hardly recorded anywhere before the time of Justinian (527-565).

MOSAICS AND OTHER EARLY CHRISTIAN ARTS.—To find the facility of approach to the use of colour in the Roman Empire to anything like an important extent, we must look at the Roman pavements composed of myriads of tesserae, and representing in a flat and somewhat uninteresting manner mystic beings, extraordinary animals, fruits, flowers, and designs. Between these Roman pavements and one of the most archaic Christian art, that of mosaic, there is a very close connexion. It seems also possible that some of the early efforts of the art of the Christian Church are to be found in the decorations of gold on glass which have been discovered in the catacombs. Upon these glasses, dating from the third to the fifth century, are found representations of Christ and of the Apostles, as well as drawings in gold-leaf, partly symbolic and partly realistic, referring to the miracles of Christ, the emblems of the Seven Spirits, a future life, and the events narrated in the New Testament. Simple and archaic as these are, yet many of them have an original beauty. The primitive Church included within itself, not only the poor and humble, but persons of distinction, rank, and attainment, and it is clear from an examination of these drawings that some were executed by those who were in possession of considerable artistic skill, and who had been trained in a knowledge of Greek and Roman art. Contemporaneous with these, and earlier, are frescoes painted upon the walls of the catacombs, including portraits of the Apostles and of Christ, representations of the martyrs, naive pictures of the scenes from Holy Writ, and simple illuminatory symbolism. Then, between the fourth and tenth centuries, there is a long series of mosaics, in which for the first time strong evidence appears of a sense of colour. A few specimens of these mosaics adorn the catacombs, afterwards they are found in the oratories and places of worship of the primitive Church. It is speedily recognized that mosaic decorations possessed certain strong claims to attention, such as other methods of decoration lacked. While the artist himself must be responsible for fresco work, very much of the large mosaic decoration could be left to persons of subordinate position, and once the artist had drawn out the pattern and scheme which was to cover, for instance, the apse of the church, the actual manual labour of fitting in the tesserae could be done by workmen. Then, again, there was the quality of imperishability; the mosaic was permanent, an actual part of the structure which it decorated; it did not vary in

colour by reason of light or atmosphere, and could be cleansed from time to time. It was also capable of strong, broad effects, rendering it peculiarly suitable to positions at the end of a building, somewhat above the line of sight, and its colour could be made so emphatic and so brilliant that for centuries the hollows could be lit up by its luminous beauty. It is small wonder, therefore, that from the very earliest period the Church drew to itself the skilful workers in mosaic, and employed them, as can be seen by the wonderful remains at Ravenna, in Sicily, on Mount Athos, and notably at Rome, to decorate the interiors of the basilicas, and to set upon their walls the emblems of the Divine tragedy, of the sufferings of Christ and of His saints, or to represent in hieratic magnificence the figures of Christ in glory, or in benediction, so that the scenes might be well in sight of all the worshippers within the little churches.

From the representation of single figures at the end of the church, the work speedily spread to more elaborate adornment of the walls, and from the simplicity of a single emblem, a single figure, the artistic spirit was developed in pictorial effect. By means of symbols and miracles of Christ, or spread long triumphant processions of virgins, Apostles, martyrs, along the walls of the aisles and transepts of the larger churches. There is no city in Europe in which this earliest Christian art can be so well studied as at Ravenna. The place in its mosaics and paintings represents the four Books of the Gospels open upon four altars, and between them four thrones of dominion with crosses; these mosaics have never been restored, and are in the condition in which their makers left them. The huge font intended for baptism by immersion, which stands below them, is proof of their antiquity, but the actual inscription of dedication with its date still exists on the central metal cross surmounting the building. In the chapel of the archbishop in the archiepiscopal palace are mosaics of the fifth century made during the reign of Archbishop St. Peter Chrysologus, while in the tomb of the Empress Galla Placidia are mosaic decorations of her period; unfortunately, many of these latter works have been restored. The very finest mosaics in Ravenna, however, relate to the great heresy of Arianism. In the time of Theodoric, the old heresy was beginning once more to make itself felt. Arianism was no longer dead; Arians were fighting against the Church, and the Council of Nicæa and Constantinople had declared against it, and the Nicene doctrine had been confirmed, so that within the Church the heresy could no longer exist, but outside the Catholic Church there were still those who accepted it. When Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, came into power, Arianism became once more a force to be reckoned with, and the emperor erected a cathedral and a baptistery in Ravenna for his Arian bishops. It is in the church now called Sant’ Apollinare Nuovo, which was new more than a thousand years ago, that the great rhythm of the Arian church with its saints and virgins alluded to above exists; the greater part of it as it is at present was rebuilt and restored the church fourteen centuries ago. In the baptistery of the Arians, near by, the mosaics upon the roof were put in place practically at the same time as the church was completed, and there is not only, in mosaics, that Ravenna
illuminating primitive times, the period of the Middle Ages is one of enormous artistic importance, and it is an era in which the influence of the Church is practically paramount. To this period there does not belong any very long series of artistic objects relating exclusively to the life of the domestic. There was a form of art of domestic interest marked by artistic skill, there were objects of personal decoration, and for use in the home; but the choicest talent and the efforts of the most supreme genius were almost invariably given to the work of the Church, and even where the comparison is forced to domestic ornamentation, there is generally a religious element in the decorations and the use of religious symbolism. To this period belong the magnificent works in enamels, executed for church work. There are the tall pricket candlesticks, superb chasses and reliquaries, altar-crosses, crosiers, shrines, censers and incense boats, crucifixes, morses for copes, and medallions for sacred vessels, triptychs and polyptychs for use on the altar, plaques for book-covers, especially for the adornment of the Book of the Gospels, crosiers, basins, chalices, and book-binding in metal encrusted with jewels. The very first British enamels were executed in the fourth century, and the change from Arian heresy to Catholic truth, and the exquisite beauty of the mosaic work, the Church was able to make use of at that time. A little journey outside Ravenna to the church of Sant' Apollinare in Classe will enable the student to bring his study of early work and early sculpture down to the beginning of the seventh century, and bearing religious emblems of very early and inestimable importance, and still preserved in pictures of unprepared linen cloth, executed in a material similar to transparent water-colour, ascribed to a period antecedent to the third century. They chiefly purport to be representations of the features of Christ. The most notable of course is the one known as the Handkerchief of St. Veronica, preserved in the Vatican, and which none but an ecclesiastical of very high rank is allowed to examine closely. Although the most important, it is by no means the only example of such a picture. There are also a number, a third in the church of San Silvestro in Rome, and others in various parts of Italy. The metal work executed during the Ostrogothic occupation of Italy was often work commissioned by the Church for use in the ceremonies of the service, and figures of Christ and of the saints, ornaments for copes, chasses in which to put relics, and vessels for use at the altar, belonging to this period of primitive art, are the direct result of the teaching of the Church. As however, the religious feeling spread more and more, the desire arose among Christians to have artistic representations of the great events of the Faith in their houses, and it is possible that the beginnings of what we may term popular pictorial work arose in this way. The very early tempera paintings on wood of Eastern and Byzantine character, some of which are actually ascribed to the hand of the Apostle St. Luke himself, may very likely have been executed, not entirely for liturgical purposes, but for the adornment of the wealthier members of the community, at least, might have in their homes, in the privacy of their own oratories, some cherished representation of the Man of Sorrows Himself, or of some Apostle or saint from whom the owner was named, or towards whom he had some particular affection, that painting might be traced the beginning of the history of the icons, which are so important a feature in the life of the Eastern Church, and which adorn every house, in many cases being found in all the rooms occupied by the various members of the family.

Ecclesiastical Art in the Middle Ages.—Leav-
effect, groups of saints, sacred scenes, and religious symbols. On the chasubles, cope, albs, stoles, mani-oples, bureaus, veils, mitres, frontals, super-frontals, and altar-covers, pulls, bags, and panels of that period, are to be seen triumphs of artistic excellence, worked with exceeding beauty, and with a glorious richness of colour, by the hands of the faithful women of the day and designed by the men of supreme genius whom the Church had attracted to her side. Some of the very finest of this embroidery work was English, and references are found to the dignity of English embroidery in the lofty pan of the thirteenth century, as, St. Albans. Bishop of Sherborne, celebrated in verse the skilful work of the Anglo-Saxon embroideresses. Indeed, at one time, rather too much attention in the convents for women seems to have been given to this fascinating needlework, for a council held in 1747 recommended that the reading of books and psalm-singing by the nuns should receive greater attention, and that not quite so many hours should be spent in needlework. As early as 855, the Anglo-Saxon King Ethelwulf, when journeying to Rome took with him as presents silken vestments richly embroidered in gold, executed in England, and there are fragments of cloths and maniple, found in the tomb of St. Cuthbert (d. 687), which were produced under the auspices of the wife of Edward the Elder in 916 and placed in the saint's coffin. From that time down to the middle of the sixteenth century there was a constant demand for the work of the skilled embroideresses, and especially that section of art, so particularly suitable to ecclesiastical purposes, was one of perennial richness. It is well that some stress should be laid upon the question of embroidery, inasmuch as in the Middle Ages it was almost exclusively a branch of ecclesiastical art, and generally everything that could by any possibility be embroidered, especially in fine English embroidery previous to the fifteenth century, was executed for the Church. Enormous labour was given to the production of these beautiful vestments, and as an example it may be mentioned that a frontal presented to the Abbey of Westminster in 1271 took the whole labour of four women for three years and three-quarters. Lincoln Cathedral in the fourteenth century possessed over six hundred vestments in its sacristy, while the Abbey of Westminster had nearly very double as many, and the English embroideresses were far equal to those of Spain in the sumptuous manner in which they were supplied with vestments. There was therefore every possible necessity for the work, and no branch of art has a greater importance between the twelfth and the fifteenth centuries than this of embroidery. Fortunately, a sufficient number of the old vestments have come down to the present day to give a satisfactory idea of their importance and beauty, and the records and inventories of church goods prior to the sixteenth century afford still further information concerning this branch of art. The spirit of devotion which has ever given the instinct to decorate the house of God with the very finest works of which man is capable led to this lavish display of artistic genius in the service of the Catholic Church, but it must also be borne in mind that there were other, subordinate, even less important, work the Church, following its Divine Master, has always incited the importance of good works, and it has ever encouraged the faithful to give to its service of their best. If their skill was in metal-work, in embroidery, in carving wooden figures or wonderful choir-stalls, in stained glass, in fresco or mosaic, such skill was to be devoted to God's service, as the chosen instrument of the artist to lay upon the altar, symbol of his devotion to his faith. Even beyond that, there came the occasions in which the pennies for sin took the form of the devotion of artistic gifts to the work of the Church, and the other and very numerous cases in which this artistic labour was the constant employ-ment of those persons who had devoted their entire life to the religious career, in the various monastic houses belonging to the different orders. One further cause must not be overlooked, the fact that it was the Crown, the clergy, and the nobility who alone could command the means, the desires of the men of genius, the productions of the men of genius of the time, and that while the commissions given by the clergy would most certainly be for church purposes almost exclusively, those given by the Crown and the higher nobility were in almost all instances for exactly the same purposes. This for a double reason, for a double purpose. First, the desire to adorn the home beautiful had not yet arisen to any considerable extent, and secondly, there was every wish to make the private chapel or oratory, the public church or royal sanctuary, as beautiful as possible, both to carry out the instincts of the religious feeling and please those who held control of spiritual things, as well as to heap up a reward for good deeds which would have a corresponding equivalent in the future life and might serve as retribution for the deeds of violence that formed so integral a part of the life of these centuries.

The period under consideration was not so much one of portable pictures as of applied art, devoted to the interior decoration of the sacred buildings, and to every object having connexion with the service of the altar. One section of ecclesiastical art deserving special mention concerns almost exclusively the monastic choirs. Books of Hours, Missals, Brevearia, and Psalters, with an origin in the monastic houses of England, France, Germany, and Italy during the Middle Ages are now among the greatest artistic treasures of the world, and with regard to them there is one very striking fact which must never be overlooked. This does not relate exclusively to books of devotion, it belongs nearly as much to every work of art produced during this period, and it is the fact that these triumphs of skill are for the most part anonymous. In the period hardly any great names are recorded in connexion with such work. There is a wonderful series of artistic treasures, but signatures are scarcely ever seen. Here and there the name of an enameller is known, or perhaps the name of the place where he worked, occasionally the name of a wood-carver or a worker in stained glass is preserved and there are just a few cases in which the name of the monastic house producing the manuscript is known, but the instances are exceedingly few, and they occur, one might say, by accident rather than by intention. With respect to illuminations in books of devotion, one monk took up the task where the other had left it. Death caused no cessation of the self-imposed labour. The work must never die, and as in the present day great literary works are undertaken by the leading orders, in the full knowledge that to carry them out will extend far beyond the life of the writer who begins the undertaking, but that his successor will be equally able to continue the task, so in the earlier days the monks laboured in
their cloisters, each at his own work; each generation of monks in the footsteps of the former, hiding the individual identity in the name of the order and content, as the work was done for the greater glory of God, that while the work should remain, the monks themselves should be forgotten. This is the reason why it is striking in considering this period that the singleness of aim and devotion to duty which characterized these artists and led them to have no desire to perpetuate their own names, but simply to carry out to the best of their ability the allotted task for the glory of God and His church. The reason was that the dignity of personal labour was not fully realized, but the reason for this anonymity lies mainly in the facts already stated, that the work was religious work, that the aim was a religious aim, and that the identity of the person did not matter, so long as the Church was properly served by her faithful. There is one other aspect of the artistic work of the pre-Renaissance time to be alluded to. It is by no means confined to the pre-Renaissance period, but extends through the succeeding centuries, and it should extend to all the artistic labour of the present day, but it is especially a feature of the period under consideration. It is that determination which is never satisfied with the work which has been done, but which is always straining forward for finer and better work. It is that element of uniring energy and ever-quickening desire for perfection which has always characterized the greatest art-workers of the world, and it finds its earliest and perhaps its strongest development in this period.

The early Italian painters fall into two groups: the first, that which may be called the group of the miniaturists or illuminators, as, for example, Enrico, Berlinghieri, and Oleracea; the second of these painters, such as Margaritone, Spinello, Uccello, Cimabue, Dueto, Memmi, Lorenzetti, and the various early masters of the schools of Siena, Padua, and Verona. The predecessors of these artists, for the most part, worked without any reference to nature, under Byzantine influence, copying slavishly the methods fixed by the Greek Church. Their pictures, whether they illustrated scenes from the Sacred Writings, the legends of the Church, or the lives of the saints, were designed and painted according to fixed rules. Their work was inferior to that of the Byzantine workers in mosaic, but it was the same conception of art; the same way, in attitudes, compositions, types of face, folds of drapery, and even as regards colour, it was guided by the definite rules of tradition, so that the painter was little more than a mechanic. Still, despite what may be termed the ugliness of this particular school, there was a strong spirit of devotion exercising the minds of the artists, and they were able to put a certain amount of sympathy into their hard, angular productions, thus showing that their works were painted with religious sentiment, and with a desire to evoke that sentiment in others.

Margaritone was one of the first to break through the hard grime of rules, and although his work does not show any very striking advance upon that of his predecessors, yet in his pictures and in those of the earliest painters of Siena, we begin to find the desire to paint a Mother of God bearing some living image into a Mother of Man. There are a few things more striking towards tenderness and sweetness of countenance, a desire to represent raiment gently floating in easy curves, and a greater command of sentiment, together with a simplicity in story—telling, which marked this primitive school, and prepare the way for the more central treatment. Partly, of course, this was the period of the Renaissance. The great era of transition from the Middle Ages to modern times which is called the Renaissance may be divided into the three periods of the Early Renaissance, Full Renaissance, and Late Renaissance. Here again the influence of the Church is found just as strong and as definite as in the past. The growing desire to have magnificent churches created the necessity for other workers in art. The first years of this period give in Italy the earliest works known by name in fresco, and in portrait pictures, Cinabue, Orecagna, Giotto, and others.

Note 253. Things and places mentioned in this period of their "freedoms" and "liberties," are Assisi, Siena, Pisa, and other parts of Italy, is seen the beginning of the long list of painters whom the Church enlisted in her service. In bronze work Ghiberti produced the gates of the Baptistery of Florence, and with the appearance of Brunelleschi a new stage of art was introduced for ecclesiastical buildings arose. In this period belongs also the introduction of oil-painting, and here again, just as emphatically, the Church took the lead. The earliest printers were churchmen, belonging to a religious order, the earliest books those of religion—the first actual printed sheet being the Indulgence of Pope Nicholas V—followed by a long list of religious and liturgical works, Sacred Scriptures, and patristic literature. In the Low Countries the Van Eyck developed the methods of oil-painting and there arose a great school of artists, among whom were Van der Goes, Van der Weyden, Bouts, Crustus, Memling, and others, who carried the period under discussion.

In this period belongs also the introduction of oil-painting, and here again, just as emphatically, the Church took the lead. The earliest printers were churchmen, belonging to a religious order, the earliest books those of religion—the first actual printed sheet being the Indulgence of Pope Nicholas V—followed by a long list of religious and liturgical works, Sacred Scriptures, and patristic literature. In the Low Countries the Van Eyck developed the methods of oil-painting and there arose a great school of artists, among whom were Van der Goes, Van der Weyden, Bouts, Crustus, Memling, and others, who carried the period under discussion.

Towards the close of the Early Renaissance period is found the work in sculpture of Donatello and those of his school, Desiderio da Settignano, the Roscellini, Duccio, Verrocchio, the very and others, who were the finest and most important artists, and who have left their mark upon the history of Western sculpture. The most important works were altar-pieces, and in some cases all their paintings were of a religious character, while in others the paintings not religious were portraits of the various patrons who had commissioned the altar-pieces, or who had had their portraits painted by these artists; therefore the intimate connexion between art and the Church was just as close as ever.
turicchio, Francis, Albertinelli, and Fra Bartolomeo, almost exclusively religious painters, prepared those masterpieces of religious art to set upon the altars of the private chapels and great churches of the day, that are now among the treasured masterpieces of all time.

This era was also the period of that side by side with the Humanistic movement there was a strong religious one. In this religious movement art had its full share, and engaged in its tasks, not perhaps with the austere simplicity and singleness of aim which belonged to an earlier period, but still with a definite determination that the best products of artistic craftsmanship should be devoted to the service of God. There was, however, a growing desire that the home should be more beautiful and more luxurious. The decoration of churches was to be the sole aim of the artist, and he was finding other fields, but he was no longer to find work only in the churches. The period of the Renaissance marked a change in the character of religious art. The Church and the artist were in a state of equipoise.

The period of the Full Renaissance may be taken as lasting from 1450 to 1530, and here must be noticed the advent of a new movement in art, or rather a stronger exaltation of the work of the artist. The Venetian school, that took its rise in the earlier century with the great painters of the time, Titian, Palma, and Griselli, and that was to see its development at this time in the later Bellini, Giorgione, Titian, Paolo Veronese, and Tintoretto, the claims of colour gain a supremacy over the kindred branches of pictorial art. The Venetian school was the one in which brilliant colour attains to its apotheosis, and everything else subservient to it. The simplicity of aim which characterized such a man as Fra Angelico passed away, the devotional feeling that marked the works of Albertinelli and Fra Bartolomeo gave place to an overpowering desire for decoration as such, and in Venice, although the Church commissioned the great altarpieces, and the schemes of interior ornamentation for which these noble artists were responsible, it had to be content to accept Venetian tradition and to see religious scenes treated as gorgeous pieces of sumptuously coloured decoration. Although there might not be the simplicity of a past generation, yet there still existed in the artists the same desire to offer to the Church the greatest works of their genius. In this period of the Full Renaissance are found the work of Raphael and of Michelangelo; of Cloz, Malaspina, and Scorci; of Durer, Holbein, and Cranach; of Leonardo da Vinci, and of Correggio, while in applied arts there was immense industry and great development. The German metal-workers and goldsmiths prepared church vessels innumerable; Cellini and Caradosso produced ornamennts for church vestments; the screen and the waggoner for King's College Chapel, Cambridge, typified the ecclesiastical wood-carving of the time in England; while the stained-glass windows at King's College Chapel, in other churches, and in great churches show what was attained in this branch of ecclesiastical art.

The fall of Florence marked the close of the period of great art in that city, while the paintings and tapestry executed for Francis I at Fontainebleau, for Louis XII at Tours, and some sculpture done by Michelangelo for the Medici Chapel, all point out the enhanced power of the Humanistic movement and the destruction of that devotion to faith which had been so marked a feature of the earlier centuries. The epoch of the Late Renaissance, extending from 1500 to 1600, and overlapping that of the Full Renaissance, was still, however, distinguished by a considerable amount of earnest religious fervour in art. The painters of Perugia, of Luni, Gaudenzio Ferrara, with Leoni and del Sarto, Sodoma, Bronzino, and Peruzzi, are strong in this, but of the Spanish. The Iberian goldsmiths and iron-workers still certainly produced their famous grilles, jewels, maces, chalices, and crucifixes, while in needlework the finest workers of Castile were elaborating some of the most perfect examples of church vestments that have ever been produced. In bronze, the smelters of Aragon were casting superb church candelabra, and some of the weavers in France and England were producing tapestry decoration for churches; but the greater part of the Gobelin, Brussels, and Mortlake tapestry-weaving was for domestic use, the chief examples of the work done on domestic architecture, the potters on domestic pottery, and the painters and engravers upon work which cannot be termed religious. The names of certain men stand out, however, as representing persons of deep personal religion, who brought their own devotion to the execution of their work. The names of Cellini, Grotticelli, and the Behaimis, but the period of that supreme hold which the Church had maintained the art of the world, which she had initiated, developed, and encouraged, was passing away, never more to appear in its full fruition. Some reference should be made to the system under which during this time many of the great decorative schemes of Italian painting were executed. The encouragement which the Church gave to the Italian painters took various forms. It was permissible for an influential or a wealthy family to have allotted to it a small chapel in the large parish or own church, and the decoration of the chapel was left to the care of the family whose name it received. In some cases, these chapels were built onto the church, and in such instances an architect, a builder, a decorator, and an artist were all employed, and the Church gladly gave permission to the system of the church structure in order that the family might have a meeting-place and an opportunity to make an endowment for perpetual Masses for its deceased members. In cases where a new structure was not erected, a portion of the existing church was enclosed as a private chapel, perhaps in memory of a father, a mother, or some children, and a painter of repute was called in to devise a scheme of decoration for its walls, in which would be introduced the figures of saints to whom the deceased persons had been dedicated, or scenes from the lives of such saints; in many cases life-size figures of the saints were represented with the hanging figures of the donors of the chapel. There was no thought of an anachronism; it was considered perfectly right that representations of persons who had died but a few weeks or months before should be introduced into the scenes in which the saints of early church history were depicted. It then became the ambition of later members to add to the beauty of the family chapel as means allowed. The walls having been decorated, an altar-piece would be painted by another artist, while perhaps, following him, yet another would ornament the front of the altar, or craftsmen would be called in to paint the sacred service, or vestments and books for the priests. In this way these little chapels became shrines for artistic work, the productions of many hands, representing the desires of many persons to place the best work at the service of the Church, to act dutifully.
towards the family itself, and to make a suitable offering in recompense for crimes committed. Another course sometimes adopted was to call in two painters, rivals in their profession, to decorate different walls of a church, or the two sides of an altar-piece, or again, when some great addition was made to the fabric, account of an important event, such as the canonization of a local saint, or a marked interposition of Providence on behalf of the town, different influential persons in the place would undertake to be responsible for portions of the building, each calling in his own favourite painter, and in this way the work would be completed. Or it might be that an order desired to decorate a church dedicated to its patron saint, and the commission would be given to some notable artist, who perhaps was unable to complete the task, or who died before its completion. In such cases, others were called in to complete it, and in this way the fabric was beautified by various successive hands.

The number of definitely personal commissions which the sixteenth-century artist had was small, as even in the instances where a patron ordered a picture, it was generally an altar-piece for the family chapel, or even the decoration of something belonging to a trade guild to which he was attached, and this trade guild being nearly always a religious association, the commission came under the category of religious work. It is all this which marks the great distinction between art and craftsmanship previous to the sixteenth century, as regards its execution. In the period of Christianity to about 1260 in Italy, and about 1460 in Northern Europe, the dominant art is architecture, chiefly employed in the service of the Church, and the arts of painting and carving were only applied subordinately for its enrichment. During the Renaissance period these arts began to develop and detach themselves, to exist and strive after perfection on their own account, and while architecture still held an important position, it was no longer dominant; the arts which supplied the interior decoration of the building, and the objects needed in the service of the Church, ceased to be considered as subordinate, but were taking each its own high position under the guidance of workers of supreme genius. From this period, however, of the Full Renaissance, the great dignity of architecture began to diminish, as regards the ecclesiastical buildings, and architects devoted themselves almost exclusively to domestic and civic work. Architecture ceased to be personal, democratic, local, and became professional and more or less uniform throughout the whole of Europe, while it suffered severely because the design of such buildings as were produced in the sixteenth century was the work of others than the executant workmen. The same sort of difficulty was baffling the pictorial art and the arts of the craftsmen. The personal element was no longer the main strength of an art. The ecclesiastical side of the work was almost non-existent, and the crafts suffered by reason of the fact that the commercial element had entered into art, and the adornment of the house, the palace, and the person was considered of far greater importance than the adornment of the church, and the sacrifice of the life of the artist for the greater glory. It was a period when the art of the painter was being developed, and the artist was beginning to be considered as a professional person, and as such was to be paid for his work.

POST-RENAISSANCE PERIOD.—There are certain political explanations of this great change between the art of the sixteenth and the art of the seventeenth century. There were several forces at work which were hostile or indifferent to artistic development, such as the War, or the dynastic wars, the commercial wars, and the difficulties of the Reformation, and constitutional problems, while the grouping together of small towns into larger provinces and countries was doing away with the rivalry of the craftsmen in the smaller places, and permitting a spirit of greater uniformity in style to spread throughout a large section of Europe. Add to all these colonial expansion, huge enterprise, and great commercial prosperity, constantly broken into by ravaging wars, and the causes for the decay of that spirit of religious activity in art characterizing earlier periods are apparent. Spain and Italy were, in the seventeenth century, almost the only two countries in which any close connexion and the Church was kept up. England was troubled with the religious question, and struggling with great constitutional problems, while it had given itself over to the faith of the Reformed, and such art as it was producing was the great architectural triumph of Sir Christopher Wren in the rebuilding of his churches of London, and the various sections of craftsmanship concerned with the adornment of the house and the person. In Spain there were still some great goldsmiths at work, and some even greater workers in wrought iron, preparing the rejas for the Spanish cathedrals, while pictorial art was at its highest in that country, and its masterpieces, with the exception of those of the very greatest artist of all, Velazquez, were devoted to subjects suggested by the Church. Yet there had been no country in which the painter had been so tampered with traditional restrictions as in Spain. The very manner in which each saint was represented, which his or her clothing was to be painted, and the colouring which was to be applied to each garment, had been a matter of stern decree, it had needed the profound genius of a Velazquez to break through the traditional rules, and to open for his successors, and especially for Murillo, a period of great freedom. Commencing with such painters as Pantoja della Cruz and Vicente Carducci, the great Spanish School had produced the Ribaltas and Ribera, and then the majestic Velazquez. In Spain the only great painter to follow Velazquez was Murillo, but there were many other artists marked by distinction, excellence, and beauty, especially Zurbaran, Iriarte, Juan de Valdes, Alonso Cano, and Orrente. The seventeenth century was, in various countries of Europe, one of the important periods of artistic production, and although the Italian schools, the Realists, and the painters of the Second Revival were men whose productions at the present time are out of favour, yet they deserve more than a passing notice, while contemporary with them there are others who rank among the veritable giants of the artistic craft. The late Italian artists, such as Carracci, Caravaggio, Sassoferrato, Domenichino, Luca Giordano, Carlo Maratta, Guido Reni, Salvador Rosa, and others, show in their work melodramatic style, love of magnificent colouring, and intense shades. The draughtsmanship of these artists should cause their works to be more highly esteemed than they are at present, for they certainly represent an important epoch in the art history of the world, and one which must never be overlooked. Many of their works were altar-pieces painted for churches, or were intended for church decoration, but at the same time they were greatly influenced by the Humanistic movement, and by the eager desire to represent the stories of classical writers in pictorial effect. The commercial prosperity of Holland, at a time when other nations were lacking in material wealth, was one of the reasons for the existence of a veritable crowd of artists just at this time. The Church had ceased to commission pictures in Holland, and very seldom were stories, either from Holy Writ, or from the lives of the saints, represented by this school of artists. In dealing with the arts and crafts of the eighteenth century, a new and destructive factor which had hitherto been considered as of less importance, the “vogue of handcraft”, as has been well said, “passes now into invention”, and the commencement of a system now appears that was eventually to strike at the very roots of the manner in which supreme works of genius had been produced in the preceding centuries. It must also be noticed that, in painting especially, the artistic centre of gravity had shifted from Italy to
England, and to a lesser extent to France, and that Italy, Germany, Spain, and the Netherlands took but a very small share in the artistic development of the eighteenth century, instead of, as in preceding periods, being the great centres of development themselves. The reason of this was, in contradistinction to that of the Church, was not complete, and portraiture, whether concerning itself with the great decorative single figures or family groups of Reynolds and Gainsborough, or with the productions of the leading miniature painters, Cosway, Engleheart, Dublin, Smart, Horse, Wood, and others, far lower, was extensively applied to the multiplication of portraits of those persons who were able to afford to employ the artist, and who desired to possess and distribute to others such delightful representations as would adorn the home and the person. Ecclesiastical art, or art for the decoration of the church, had hardly any existence.

In England towards the middle of the nineteenth century a new movement having in it some of the instincts of earlier Italian art began to arise. The foremost artist of this new school was Sir Edward Burne-Jones, in the wonderful succession of poetic ideas which he presented, marked, in fancy, a fertility of inventiveness, tender witchery of inspiration, exquisite colour, and grace and harmony of line and grouping, he was able to develop the spirit of religious emotion to a far fuller extent than he himself had in itself, to identify the new art of the earlier and purer lines of thought in religion, to set faith free from the regulations of statecraft, and to rise from the dry, not monotony of a Grecian theology to something approaching closer to the fiery enthusiasm and the sumptuous ceremonial of the passionate faith of earlier days. The progress of this movement within the Protestant Church led to a considerable number of accessions to the Catholic Faith, but in the Church of its origin it worked a complete revolution. Once more there arose the determination that the house of God should be beautiful, and once again art, with all the various arts closely connected therewith, entered into the service of religion, very much in the manner they had done in preceding centuries. Tapestry workers, under the influence of William Morris and Burne-Jones, were set to work to prepare panels of glowing colour for the decoration of churches. The stained-glass painters, under the influence of these craftsmen, sought out old designs, originated new schemes of colour, and worked hard to discover old secrets of technic. The earlier schools of embroidery were studied, and all over the country women set to work to make vestments and to execute needlework of rare distinction and great beauty. A revival took place in the art of the metal-worker and in that of the stonemason. Many fine wrought-iron grilles were made, and the claim of the artist to prepare the design and to superintend the carrying out of its execution was once more considered by them as their right. Quite apart from the religious aspect of the movement, there was in this Oxford revival the origin of the effort towards greater refinement, greater beauty, and more attention to handicraft, which, commencing in the middle of the nineteenth century, has by no means reached its culmination in the early years of the twentieth.

One of the first and most important of the movements which aimed to break away from the artistic traditions of the eighteenth century took place in the early part of the nineteenth century in Germany, and was led by Overbeck. The Academy of Vienna, at the time that he entered it, was under the direction of Füger, a talented miniature painter, but a follower of the pseudo-classical school of David, and a firm believer in the tenets of those opinions, too conservative to vary from them in the least degree. Overbeck felt to the bone as a group of painters, that every noble thought was suppressed within the society that Christian art had been diverted and corrupted until nothing Christian remained in it. The differences between him and his followers and their fellow-students were so serious that the upholsterers of Overbeck and his friends were expelled from the academy, leaving Vienna, Overbeck journeyed to Rome, and in 1810, and remaining there for fifty-nine years. Here he was joined by such men as Witt, Cornelius, Schadow, with others of less importance; together they formed a school which was known as the Nazarenes, or the Church-Romantic painters. They built up a severe revival on simple nature and the serious art of the Umbrian and Bolognese painters, and although for a long time they laboured under great difficulties, yet, after a while, they were able to exert considerable influence, and their success led to memorable revivals throughout Europe. Overbeck, was a Catholic, as were several of his friends. He was noted for his purity of motive, of deep insight, and abounding knowledge, a very saintly person, and a perfect treasury of art and poetry, insomuch that his influence helped very largely to purify the art of his time. The movement from the original line of the previous century was. The Royal Academy in England late in the nineteenth century were not marked by the particular element of religious fervour distinguishing Overbeck, but were the result of a similar determination to return to nature, and understand the art of painting in the open air, for not only the adherence to realism, to choice and treatment of subject, but also the subordination of colour to tone gradation. These movements in England were, however, very much the result of the movement in France which had preceded them, and which was connected with the name of Millet.

In Catholic countries there are at least some signs that the old practice of enlisting the services of art for the purposes of religion may be developed, but the signals of an approaching movement are not very strong yet, and the Church has a good deal to learn with regard to decoration, to design, and to craftsmanship among the earlier periods of its history. Foremost among the signs of the new spirit must be placed the erection of the Westminster Cathedral at London, one of the most perfect buildings in England, erected after the truest and most careful study of the past and with every desire to give full play to the spirit of the present and to the original talent of its designer, while avoiding anything that could be called a slavish copying of the past. This building affords an example of the revived use of mosaic properly applied, in method following the work of Ravenna, and planned by a great artist, Bentley. It affords the most perfect scheme of interior decoration that could be conceived, and other countries of Europe the signs of progress are not quite so clear, but the Church which has fostered and encouraged art from its very birth has so many glorious examples in its midst of the great achievements of profound genius that it can only be a matter of time before its ancient use of the fine arts is revived. A close study of the past would enable the Church to once more set about the task of employing the craftsmen of the world to produce their finest work in the domain of ecclesiastical art.
the noblest of all the material arts. Even the needs of the liturgy itself are in a sense subsidiary to the needs of the faithful. *Sacramenta propriter hominum* is an old and sound saying. But, on the other hand, among the needs of the faithful must be reckoned, under normal circumstances, the adequate carrying out of the liturgy. It is, of course, perfectly true also that a church is not only a building in which we worship God, but also itself the expression of an act of worshipful homage. This, however, it ceases to be, at least in the highest degree, unless, as has been said, the aesthetic qualities of the building have been entirely subordinated to its primary purpose. It could only reflect to see that these preliminary remarks have a very practical bearing on modern church-building. There is always a danger lest we should be dominated by technical terms and conventional opinions about the merits of this or that style of architecture, derived from times and circumstances that have passed away; lest we should be led by sentiment or fashion, or mere lack of originality, to copy from the buildings of a bygone age without stopping to consider whether or how far the needs of our own day are those of the days when those buildings were raised. And the chief use of the study of the history of ecclesiastical architecture is not that it directs attention to a number of buildings more or less beautiful in themselves, but that it cannot fail to bring home to us that all true architectural development was inspired, primarily, by the desire to find a solution of some of the practical needs of the church.

Roughly speaking, all ecclesiastical architecture may be said to have been evolved from two distinct germ-cells, the oblong and the circular chamber. From the simple oblong chamber to the perfect Gothic cathedral the steps can be plainly indicated and admit of being abundantly illustrated from the actual course of architectural development in Western Europe (Brown, "From Schola to Cathedrals, passim"); while the links which connect the simple circular chamber with a gigantic cruciform domed church, like St. Peter's in Rome or St. Paul's in London, are still more obvious, though the actual course of development in the case of domed churches has been far less continuous and regular.

**The Origins of Ecclesiastical Architecture.** — That the first places set apart for Christian worship were rooms in private dwellings is admitted on all hands; but the art of making them well, and another of making them badly... Good architecture is the art of building beautifully and expressively; and bad architecture is the reverse. But architecture is the art of building in general” (Baring, *The Architecture of England*, 1). Since, however, the word building is apt to suggest, primarily, “the actual putting together of materials by manual labour and machinery”, it may be desirable to amend or restrict the definition given above by saying that architecture is the art of planning, designing, and directing buildings, and of directing the execution thereof (Bond, op. cit., 2). And in this art as in all others, including that of life itself, the fundamental principle should always be that of subordinating means to ends and secondary to primary ends. Where this principle is or has been abandoned or lost sight of, the work is indeed, or has been, a building which pleases the eye, but it must needs be also one which offends that sense of the fitness of things, which is the criterion of the highest kind of beauty. Now a church is, primarily, a building intended for the purpose of public worship; and in all sound ecclesiastical architecture this purpose should be at the very foundation of the building. To build a church for the adornment of “the man in the street”, who sees it from outside, or of the tourist who pays a passing visit, or of the artist, or of anyone else whatsoever except that of the faithful who use the church for prayer, the hearing of Mass, and the reception of the sacraments, is to commit a solecism in
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alike be served if the piers which support the dividing arch were projected inwards, somewhat beyond the side walls of the sanctuary; for the narrower the span the easier it would be to construct the arch, and to suspend a curtain from pier to pier. Thus, then, that rudimentary type of curb-chapel would be reached of which archaic examples still survive in England and Ireland. Mr. Scott notes that in many of our oldest English churches there are clear indications that the opening from the nave into the sanctuary was originally much narrower than it is at present. He further notes that in the persistent and thrusting type of nave-church which manifests itself throughout the history of English ecclesiastical architecture, may possibly be found a surviving indication of the very early introduction of Christianity into these islands (Scott, op. cit., 4).

The earliest improvement on the crude form of the oblong chamber with its rectangular annex, and one which may well have become usual even while the liturgy was confined to a single room in a private house, was to throw out a semi-apse at the end of the chamber opposite the door, or to select for the purposes of worship a room thus built. And this was certainly done, as appears from the earliest accounts, in Rome, as soon as the Christian communities began to possess separate buildings in which to hold their religious meetings. These buildings would be, in the eyes of the public and perhaps of the law, schola or guild-rooms; and for such buildings the former rest appears to have been that of a long oblong terminated by an apse (Brown, op. cit., 51 sqq.; cf. Lange, op. cit., 211 sqq.). In the apse, of course, was placed the seat of the bishop; round the walls on either side were the subsidein of the assistant clergy, while the altar stood beneath the arch built by the opening of the apse, or slightly in advance of it. On the hither side of the altar would be a space reserved for the clerics of inferior rank, and for the schola cantorum, as soon as an organized body of singers, under whatever name, came into existence. Outside the boundary of this space however it may have been marked, the general body of the faithful would have their place, and at the lower end of this chamber, or in some kind of ante-room or narthex, or possibly even in an outer court, would be placed the catechumens and—when ecclesiastical discipline was sufficient—of the penitents.

This particular form of the domestic church, removed by just one degree, architecturally speaking, from a quite primitive simplicity, deserves special attention. For there would seem to be good grounds for the assertion that it had become at least not uncommon, even within Apostolic times. In fact, as several writers on the subject have quite independently pointed out, the main feature of the arrangement would seem to be indicated in the New Testament itself. The visions recorded in the Apocalypse are, of course, Divine revelations; but, as the vision of Ezekiel was cast in the mould of the Jewish ritual, so also those of St. John may be reasonably thought to reflect the ritual of primitive Christianity (Scott, op. cit., 211 sqq.; Weiswecker in "Jahrh. f. deutsche Theol.", xxvi, 180 sqq.; Lange, op. cit., 298 sqq.). There we see the throne, with in the midst, with there sits One enthroned, of whom the Christian bishop is the representative; and with Him are four and twenty elders, who are "priests" (levites), ranged in a semicircle (rookoleante), twelve on either hand (Apoc., iv, 2, 4). Within the space bounded by these sides is a pavement of glass "like to crystal," (pavement of mosaic), and in the centre the altar (Apoc., iv, 6; vi, 9; vii, 3; ix, 13; xvi, 7). On the hither side of this are the one hundred and forty-four thousand "signed," or "sealed," who "sing a new canticle," and who incidentally witness to the very early origin of the schola cantorum, at least in some rudimentary form (Apoc., vii, 4; xiv, 1-3). Farther removed from the altar is that "great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and tribes, and peoples, and tongues," the heavenly counterpart of the corona fidei- dum (Apoc., vii, 9).

To columned aisles and columns there is indeed no allusion, but it is at least possible that in the mention of the outer court which is "given unto the Gentiles" we may find the earliest traces of the atrium or peristyles, which in later ages formed part of the precincts of a fully equipped basilica (Apoc., xi, 2; Scott, op. cit., 29). Moreover, in the scriptural Apocalypse visions certain details of internal arrangements which might perhaps have been thought to have been comparatively late development, appear to be clearly implied. Every one is aware that in the basilicas of the fourth and succeeding centuries the altar was surmounted by a baldachin, or ciborium; and it is hardly less certain that the ciborium was not merely a canopy, but that means of support for curtains which during certain portions of the Liturgy were drawn round the altar. Traces of these ancient curtains still survive in those which flank our modern altars, in our tabernacles, in the very name tabernacle. And also, curiously enough, in "those imitations of silken curtains that are cast in bronze,... which we see in the canopies of S. Maria Maggiore and St. Peter's" (Scott, op. cit., 29).

In addition to these canopy veils, however, we hear of the curtains which, when drawn close, concealed the entire sanctuary from view. In the East these have, of course, been replaced by the iconostasis: the formerly latticed but now usually solid; while in the West they are represented, not without some change of position, by our chancel screens, and may be thought to have found another modified survival in the Lentinian veil of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Now, whatever may be the case as regards the ciborium with its veils, there are clear indications in the Apocalypse that the transverse curtains were in use from Apostolic times. For the seer thrice makes mention of a "voice" which he heard, and which proceeded either "from the four horns of the golden altar" (Apoc., ix, 13), or "from the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony" (Apoc., xv, 5), or "from the throne" (Apoc., xvi, 17). From the first of these expressions it is plain that the altar, at the moment when the voice was heard, must have been shrouded from view, and from the last it appears that the throne was likewise within the space enclosed within the veil. As regards other ritual indications in the Apocalypse, it must be sufficient to mention here the "souls of the martyrs" beneath the altar, the temple, the opening of the sealed book, and the garbs, carefully distinguished, of the various classes of persons mentioned in the visions (Apoc., vi, 9; vii, 3; etc.).

THE BASILICA AND BASILICAN CHURCHES.—A great deal of conjecture has been expended on the question as to the genesis of the Roman basilica. (The question has been discussed at great length by Zetzner, Meesener, Kramm, von Bezold, and others.) For present purposes it may be sufficient to observe that the addition of aisles to the nave was so manifest a convenience that it might not improbably have been thought of, even had models not been at hand in the civil buildings of the Empire. The most suitable example that can be chosen as typical of the Roman basilica of the age of Constantine is the church of S. Maria Maggiore. And this, not merely because, in spite of certain modern alterations, it has kept in the main its original features, but also because it departs, to a lesser extent than any other extant example, from the type. The lateral colonnade is immediately surmounted by a horizontal entablature, with architrave, frieze, and cornice all complete. The monolithic columns, with their capitals, are, moreover, homogeneous, and have been cut for their position, instead of being, like those
of so many early Christian churches, the more or less incongruous and heterogeneous spoils of older and non-Christian edifices. Of this church, in its original form, no one—however decidedly its tastes may incline to some more highly developed system or style of architecture—will call in question the stately and majestic beauty. The general effect is that of a continuous perspective of lines of noble columns, carrying the eye forward to the altar, which, with its ciborium or canopy, forms so conspicuous an object, standing, framed, as it were, within the arch of the terminal apse, which forms its immediate and appropriate background.

The Old Romanesque is considered to be any of the other three chief basilicas of Rome (St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and the Lateran). Each of these, in addition to a nave of greater length and breadth, was furnished (as may still be seen in the restored St. Paul's) with a double aisle. This, however, was an advantage which was not unattended with a serious drawback from a purely artistic point of view. For a great space of blank wall intervening between the top of the lateral colonnade and the clerestory window was of necessity required in order to give support to the pent-house roof of the double aisle. In consequence, it so happened that it should not have occurred to the builders of those three basilicas to utilize a portion of the space thus enclosed, and at the same time to lighten the burden of the wall above the colonnade, by constructing a gallery above the inner arch of the arch for the height of the flat roof. Taking East and West together, we find among early and medieval basilican churches examples of all the combinations that are possible in the arrangement of aisles and galleries. They are (1) the single aisle without gallery, which is, of course, the commonest type of all; (2) the double aisle without gallery, as in the Thius basilicas; (3) the single aisle with gallery, as in St. Agnese; (4) the double aisle with single gallery, as in St. Demetrius at Thessalonica; and finally, as a crowning example, though of a later period, the double aisle surmounted by a double gallery, as in the Duomo at Werden.

These, however, are modifications in the general design of the building. Others, not less important, though they are less obviously striking, concern the details of the construction. Of these the first was the substitution of the arch for the half-column in the nave, and the second that of the pillar of masonry for the monolithic columns. The former change, which had already come into operation in the first basilica of St. Paul Without the Walls, was so obviously in the nature of an improvement in point of stability that it is no matter for surprise that it should have been almost universally adopted. Colonnaded and arcaded basilicas, as we may call them, for the most part older than the eleventh century, are to be found in the most widely distant regions, from Syria to Spian, and from Sicily to Saxony; and the lack of examples in South-western France, which were probably a destructive innovation of the Saracens and Northmen and to the building of new churches of a different type, in the eleventh and succeeding centuries, on the ruins of the old. The change from column to pillar, though in many cases it was no doubt necessitated by lack of suitable materials for the supply of ready-made masonry from pagan buildings was not inexhaustible—proved, in fact, the germ of future development; for from the plain square support to the recessed pillar, and from this again to the grouped shafts of the Gothic cathedrals of later times, the process can be quite plainly traced.

Mention should here be made of a class of basilican churches, in which as in S. Miniato, outside Florence, and in S. Zenone, Verona, pillars or grouped shafts alternate, at fixed intervals, with simple columns, and serve the purpose of affording support to transverse arches spanning the whole depth of the first story, it may be observed, to continuous vaulting.

Romanesque Types.—Something must now be said of the very important alterations which the eastern end of the basilican church underwent in the process of development from the Roman to what may conveniently be grouped together under the designation of “Romanesque types.” Whereas, however, the ground-plan of a Roman basilica, we pass from the nave and aisles to what lies beyond them, only two forms of design present themselves. In the great majority of instances the terminal apse opens immediately on the nave, with the necessary result, so far as internal arrangements are concerned, that the choir, as we should call it, was an enclosure, quite disconnected with the architecture of the building, protruding forwards into the body of the church, as may still be seen in the church of S. Clemente in Rome. In the few remaining cases, as well as in a few other instances, a transept was interpolated between the nave and the apse, affording adequate space for the choir in its central portion, while its arms (which did not project beyond the aisles) served the purpose implied in the terms senatorium and matroneum. Now it is not without reason that the church of Notre-Dame, architecturally speaking, simply an oblong hall, crossing the nave at its upper extremity, and forming with it a T-shaped cross, or crux immissa, but having no organic structural relation with it. But it was only necessary to equalize the breadth of transept and nave, so that their arms became a square, in order to give to this crossing a definite structural character, by strengthening the pieces at the four angles of the crossing, and making them the basis of a more or less conspicuous tower. And this was one of the most characteristic innovations or improvements introduced by the Romanesque builders of Northern Europe. In fact, however, before this stage of development was reached, the older basilican design had undergone another modification. For the simple apse, opening immediately into the transept, church builders of all parts of Europe had already in the eighth century substituted a projecting chamber, forming a fourth limb of the cross, which now definitively assumed the form of the crux commissa, by contrast with the crux immissa of the Roman basilica. The earliest example of a perfectly square crossing, in which a somewhat rudimentary tower appears to have been the minster of Fulda, built about A.D. 800. It was quickly followed by St. Gall (830), Hersfeld (831), and Werden (875); but nearly two centuries were to elapse before the cruciform arrangement, even in the case of more important churches, can be said to have gained general acceptance (Dehio and v. Bezold, Die kirchenbaukunst des abendlandes, I, 161).

The differences which have already been mentioned were, however, by no means the only ones which distinguished the Romanesque from the Roman transept. The transept of a Romanesque church, especially of those which were destined as monasteries, was provided with one or more apses, projecting from the east side of its northern and southern arms; and from this it appears, plainly enough, that the purpose, or at least a principal purpose, of the medieval transept, was to make provision for subsidiary altars and pulpits. A pair of transept apses, projecting eastwards, already makes its appearance at Hersfeld and Werden. At Bernay, Bossenerville (St-Georges), and Cerisy-la-Forêt (St-Vigor), each arm of the transept has two eastern apses, corresponding respectively to the aisle and to the projecting arm. The same arrangement is found also at Tarragona. At La-Cha-
rité—holy or ecclesiastical. The primary function of the church was worship, and many of its features were designed to facilitate this. The plan of Cluny itself was that of a cross with two transverse arms, each arm having two apses; of the eastern each had three, two projecting eastwards and one terminal. Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire had likewise a double transept, furnished on the same principle with six subsidiary apses.

Among English cathedrals—it may here be mentioned—that of Canterbury and Norwich have a single chapel projected from each arm of their respective transepts; and at Ely the “Galilee” porch, which has the form of a western transept, opens eastwards into two apsidal chapels, contiguous on either side to the main walls of the cathedral.

Far more important in their bearing on the later history of architecture than these developments of the transept were certain changes which gradually took place in connexion with the chancel. It is not unusual in Romanesque churches, to find the chancel flanked, like the nave, with aisles, terminating in apsidal or square-ended chapels. But in more central and later church, especially in France, the aisle is often carried round as an ambulatory behind the chancel apse; and when this is the case, the ambulatory most commonly opens into a series of radiating chapels. These are, in the earliest examples, entirely separate from one another, being sometimes three or four, but nothing in number. In later examples the number of chapels increases to seven or even nine; and they are then contiguous, forming a complete corona or chevet.

The first beginnings of this system go back to so early a period as the fifth century. De Rossi has argued, apparently on good grounds, that some early Roman, Italian, and African basilicas were furnished with an ambulatory round the apse. This form of design, however, was soon abandoned in Italy, and in the Romanesque pre-Gothic period it cannot be said to have been usual anywhere except in France, where it proved a seed rich with the promise of future developments. The earliest instance of its adoption there was almost certainly the ancient church of St Martin of Tours, as rebuilt by Bishop Perpetuus in A.D. 470. This edifice, as Quicherat has shown, had a semicircular ambulatory at the back of the altar, in which, a few years later, was placed the tomb of Perpetuus himself. From Tours the type seems to have passed to Clermont-Ferrand (Sts Vitalis and Agricola), and thence, many centuries later, to Orleans (St-Aignan, 1029).

Meanwhile, in 997, the church of St Martin had been rebuilt, and in the foundations of this edifice, which can still be traced, we find what is probably the earliest example of a chevet or corona of radiating chapels. It served, in its turn, in the course of the following century, as the model, in this respect, of Notre-Dame de la Couture at L-Omme (c. 1000), St-Remi at Reims (c. 1010), St-Savin at St-Savin (1020-30), the cathedral at Vannes (c. 1030), St-Hilaire at Poitiers (1019), and the abbey church at Cluny, as rebuilt in 1089. Shortly before 1100 the church of St Martin was once more rebuilt, on a scale of greater splendour, and once more the new building became the model for other churches, chief among which were those of St-Savin at Toulouse (1096), of Santiago at Compostela (c. 1105), and of the cathedral at Chartres (1112).

ROMANESQUE VAULTING.—The history of ecclesiastical architecture in Western Europe during the relatively short period which alone deserves to be regarded as one of more or less continuous and steady advance, and which extends, roughly speaking, from 1000 to 1300, may be described as the history of successive and progressive attempts to solve the problem, how best to cover with stone vaulting a basilican or quasi-basilican church, that is to say, a building of which the leading feature is a nave flanked with aisles and lighted with clerestory windows (Dehio and v. Bezold, op. cit., I, 296; Bond, op. cit., 6). It was the conditions of this problem, and the failure, more or less complete, of all previous attempts to solve it satisfactorily, and the intense desire of removing the so-called weakness of the western traditional or basilican architectural form, which led step by step to the development of the Gothic architecture of the thirteenth century in its unsurpassed and unsurpassable perfection.

The advantages of a vaulted, as compared with a timber, roof are so obvious that we are not surprised to find, dating from the tenth century or at latest from the beginning of the eleventh, examples of basilican churches with vaulted aisles (Viollet-le-Duc, Dict., I, 177). Indeed these first attempts at continuous vaulting would probably have been made much earlier but for the invasions of Saracens and Northmen, which delayed till that period the first beginnings of a steady development in ecclesiastical architecture, but which by their wholesale destruction of pre-existing buildings may be said to have prepared the way for that same development. The vaulting of the nave, however, in any church, and especially in the larger, the size, was a very different matter; and it was not until the eleventh century was well advanced that the problem was seriously faced.

And when at last it was definitely taken in hand, this was done under pressure of dire necessity. Everyone who is at all conversant with the history of medieval churches, or with the history of the cathedrals of Western Europe, must be aware how extremely frequent were the disasters caused by confinements (Dehio and v. Bezold, op. cit., I, 296), and it was natural enough that the church-builders of the later Middle Ages should aim at making their buildings, at least relatively, fire-proof. The simplest form which the vaulting of a rectangular chamber can take is, of course, the cylindrical barrel-vault; and this is, in fact, the form which was adopted in many of the earliest examples of vaulted roofs, especially in the south of France; a form, too, which was extensively used in Italy during the age of the Renaissance. But, though simplest alike in conception and in construction, the cylindrical barrel-vault is in fact the least satisfactory that could be devised for its purpose; and the objections which nullify against its employment are equally valid against those of the barrel-vault, in which the great stones are set in a pointed arch. Of these objections the chief is that the horizontal thrust of a barrel-vault is evenly distributed throughout its entire length. Theoretically, then, this thrust requires to be met, not by a series of buttresses, but by a continuous wall of sufficient thickness to resist the outward pressure at any and every point along the line. Moreover, the higher the wall, the greater is the thickness needed, assuming of course that the wall stands free, like the clerestory wall of an aisled church. Much, too, will depend on the coherence of the vaulting itself, and as the Romanesque church-builders were either at sea, accustomed with, or unable to use, the methods by which the Romans and the Byzantines respectively contrived to give an almost rigid solidity to their masonry, it is no matter for surprise that in two large classes of instances they should have been content to sacrifice either the clerestory or the aisles to the advantages of a vaulted roof and to the exigencies of stability. Of aisleless churches, indeed, we must forbear here to speak. But of an important group of buildings which German writers have designated Hallenkirchen (hall-churches) a word must be said, as they unquestionably played a part in preparing the way for the final solution of the problem of vaulting.

The most rudimentary form of hall-church is that in which the nave and aisles are roofed with three parallel barrel-vaults, those of the aisles springing from the same level as those of the nave. Examples
are found at Lyons (St-Martin d'Ainay), at Lesteppe, Civray, and Carcassonne (St-Nazaire) (Delio and v. Bezold, op. cit., Pl. 122, figs. 3–6). An improvement on this design, in view of the illumination of the nave, consists in giving to the vaulting of the aisles the form of a pointed arch, as at St-Savin, and from this it was but a step to the arrangement by which the rib-vault took the form of a simple quadrant, as at Parthenay-le-Vieux, Preuilly, and Font foirole. This method of quadrant vaulting, as Viollet-le-Duc and others have observed, provides a kind of continuous internal "flying buttress", though it is by no means certain that the lights may approximate the flying buttress. The architecture of Northern France was actually suggested by these Southern buildings (Viollet-le-Duc, Dict. I, 173). In point of stability, the hall-churches of the eleventh century leave nothing to be desired. Their great defect is want of light (Viollet-le-Duc, Dict. I, 176). And this defect almost equally affects a class of buildings which may be described as two-storied hall-churches, and which are found principally, if not exclusively, in Auvergne and its neighbourhood. These are furnished, like a few of the Roman basilicas and certain Byzantine churches, with a gallery, which is usually the clerestory. In these churches the thickness of the walls, but a chamber of equal dimensions with the aisle. This arrangement not only affords additional space, but also, by reason of the greater height of the edifice, might seem to facilitate the provision of a more liberal supply of light, unimpeded by neighbouring buildings. Its practical and aesthetic advantage is that, almost entirely, and by the negligence of the circumstance that, in this class of buildings, each bay of the gallery is subdivided by means of coupled or grouped arches, the additional obstructions offered to the passage of the light almost entirely counterbalanced the possible gain through additional fenestration. We say "the possible gain" because, in fact, the galleries of these churches are but sparingly provided with windows. In these churches (which to the English reader should be of special interest by reason of their affinity in point of construction to the Westminster cathedral) the aisle is usually cross-vaulted, while the gallery has a quadrant vault abutting in the wall of the nave just below the springing of the transverse arches. The most noteworthy examples are found at Clermont-Ferrand (Notre-Dame du Port), Issore (St-Paul), and Conques. To the same family belong moreover, the great church of St-Sernin at Toulouse, already mentioned, which is distinguished from those previously named by having a double aisle. At Nevers the church of St-Étienne resembles those at Clermont, Issore, and Conques, except that it is provided with a range of upper windows which break through the barrel-vaulting, somewhat after the fashion which afterwards became so common in Italy in churches of the Renaissance period.

The inherent shortcomings of the barrel-vault, especially when used as a roof for the nave of an aisled church, have been sufficiently illustrated. These disadvantages, so far as structural stability and fenestration are concerned, might indeed be overcome by adopting the system of a succession of transverse barrel-vaults, such as are seen in the unique instance of the church of St-Philibert at Autun. The reconstruction is, however, "ponderous and inelegant, and never came into general use" (Moore, Gothic Architecture, 42). The system of cross-vaulting, which has now to be considered, may be regarded as a combination of longitudinal with transverse barrel-vaulting, inasmuch as it may be described as consisting of a central barrel which is penetrated or intersected by a series of transverse vaults, corresponding of course to the successive bays or compartments of the nave. The advantages of cross-vaulting are threefold. In the first place the total amount of the outward lateral thrust is very greatly diminished, since one-half of it is now replaced by longitudinal thrusts, which, being opposed in pairs, neutralize one another. Secondly, all that is left of the lateral thrust, as well as the longitudinal thrusts, and the whole of the vertical pressure, instead of being distributed throughout the whole length of the building, is now collected and delivered safely to the summits of the transverse ribs or pillars. Thirdly and lastly, a perfectly developed system of cross-vaulting makes it possible so to heighten the clerestory windows that their archivolt shall reach the utmost interior height of the building, and so to broaden them that their width between reveal will be very closely connected with the width between column and column below. By these improvements (as ultimately realized in the perfected Gothic of the thirteenth century) the somewhat rudimentary design of the ancient Roman basilica may be said to have reached the highest development of which it is capable. The gradual development of cross-vaulting, it is to be observed, did not take place in those districts of Southern and Central France which had already become the home of the barrel-vault and to a less degree of the cupola, but first in Lombardy, then in Germany, and finally in Northern France and in the Low Countries. In these countries the early Romanesque timber-roofed basilian church had—

with local variations of course—reached a far more advanced stage than was ever attained in those regions in which the adoption of barrel-vaulting at a relatively early date had in a manner put a check on architectural developments. And this last-mentioned district is not the least interesting, inasmuch as, while the Romans, Romans and Romans, were less trammeled than those of Normandy by the traditions of a school. The comparative lack of important architectural monuments of an earlier date left them, say these writers, a more open field for their inventive enterprise (op. cit., I, 45). The simplest form of cross-vaulting is of course that which is formed by the intersection of two cylindrical barrel-vaults of equal span. And this, without the use of ribbed groining, was the method mostly adopted by the Roman builders in their civic edifices and in the case of a pillared or columned church, however, this method had its disadvantages. In particular, having regard to the dimensions of the aisle and its vaulting, the builders of Northern Europe had all but universally adopted the plan of so spacing the columns and pillars which flank the nave that the intervals between them should be one-half the width of the church. Now the only means by which an equal height could be given to vaults of unequal span was the use of the pointed arch; and so it came about that the pointed arch was adopted, not primarily for aesthetic reasons, but rather for constructive purposes. Such a reason is to be said of the use of ribbed groining. The medieval builders, who, as has been said above, possessed neither a tenacious mortar nor the command of an abundant supply of rough labour, and who therefore could not—even had they wished it—have adopted the massive crete masonry of the Romans, were driven by the very necessities of the case to aim at lightness in the construction of their vaults, and at the same time to design for stability not on the cohesion of the materials, but on the reduction of thrusts to a minimum, and on their skilful transmission to points where they could be effectively resisted. It was then,
plainly desirable to substitute for a vaulting of uniform thickness a framework of ribs on which a comparatively thin layer of stones (cut to the requisite curvature) could be laid, and as far as possible to lighten the whole construction by moulding the ribs and likewise the columns, which supported the weight of the superstructure. The principle of a frame of ribs at lightness of construction led to the elimination, as far as possible, of all masses of solid masonry above the columns and arches of the nave. This was done by the enlargement of the windows and the development of the triforium, till the entire building, with the exception of the side buttresses and of the spandrels below the triforium, became a graceful framework of grouped shafts and intersecting ribs (Moore, op. cit., 17). The final stage in the evolution of architecture of the pointed arch was not, however, reached, until, for the solid Romanesque buttresses, which rested on the vaulting of the aisles, and which were not only clumsy but often proved inadequate for their purpose, the genius of the Gothic builders hit upon the epoch-making device of the flying buttress. By means of this device the thrust of the main vaulting was not, indeed, as has been too often said, "met by a counter-thrust", but was thrown out to the solid buttress on one side of the church, with pinnacles, which were now built outwards to a great distance from the aisles, and the spaces between which were sometimes utilized, and might with advantage have been more often utilized, for a range of lateral chapels. (Bond, op. cit., 17; cf. Moore, op. cit., 20.) Among the objects of Gothic architecture, as we have already seen, was to achieve a lightness of structure without the support of columns. This object was, however, one that needs separate treatment, and for present purposes this very inadequate indication of some of the general principles involved in its development must suffice.

The Circular Church and its Derivatives.—It is true that at the outset of this article that all ecclesiastical architecture may be said to have been developed from two primitive germs, the oblong and the circular church. Of these very numerous churches, principally, but by no means exclusively, Eastern or Italian, which may be regarded as the products of the second line of development, we shall speak very briefly. That a circular church without any kind of annex was unsuitable for the ordinary purposes of public worship is plain enough. And the most obvious modification of this rudimentary form was to throw out a projecting sanctuary on one side of the building, as in St. George's Thessalonica, or in the little church of S. Tommaso in Limine, near Bergamo. It was hardly less obviously convenient to build a projecting porch or narthex on the opposite side, as in St. Elias's, also at Thessalonica, and to complete the cross by means of lateral projections, as in the sepulchral chapel of Galla Placidia at Ravenna. Thus it was that churches having the form of a Greek cross, as well as other varieties of what German writers call the Centralbau, may be said to owe their origin to a very simple process of evolution from the circular domed building. Among the almost endless varieties on the main theme may be here enumerated: (1) buildings in which a circular, or polygonal, or quadrilateral aisle, whether in one or more stories, surrounds the central space; (2) buildings in which, though the principal space is circular, and the whole is dominated by a central cupola, the ground-plan shows a rectangular outline, the cross being, as it were, "boxed" within a square; and (3) buildings in which one of the arms of the cross is considerably elongated, as in the Duomo at Florence, St. Peter's in Rome, and St. Paul's in London. The last-named modification, it is to be observed, had the effect of assimilating the ground-plan of those great churches, and of many lesser examples of the same character, to that of the Romanesque and Gothic cruciform buildings whose genealogical descent from the columned rectangular basilica is incontestable. Among ecclesiastical edifices of historical importance or interest which are either circular or polygonal, or in which the circular or polygonal centre predominates over all subsidiary parts of the structure, may be mentioned the Pantheon in Rome, St. Sergius at Constantinople, S. Vitale and St. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna, S. Lorenzo at Milan, and the great monasteries of Florence, Siena, and Pisa, and the churches of the Knights Templars in various parts of Europe. St. Luke's at Stiris in Phocis, besides being an excellent typical instance of true Byzantine architecture, affords a good example of the "boxing" of a cruciform building of the type of a Greek cross, by enclosing within the square space the space between the adiacent limits of the cross.

Practically, however, the full development of cruciform from circular buildings became possible only when the problem had been solved of roofing a square chamber with a circular dome. This has in some cases been done by first reducing the square to an octagon, by means of "squeezes" or "trompettes", and then raising the dome on the octagon, by filling in the obtuse angles of the figure with rudimentary pendentives or faced curving. But already in the sixth century the architect and builder of Santa Sophia had shown that the necessary conditions of a square, namely that it should be possible, by means of "true" pendentives, to support a dome, even of immense size, on four arches (with their piers) forming a square. The use of pendentives being once understood, it became possible, not only to combine the advantages of a great central dome with those of a cruciform structure, but to institute domical or barrel-vaulting over the limbs of the cross, as at S. Marco, Venice, S. Front, Périgueux, and S. Antonio, Padua, or even to employ domical vaulting for a nave divided into square bays, as in the cathedral at Angoulême and a later eleventh-century churches in Périgord, in S. Salvador at Venice, in the London Oratory, and with the difference that saucer domes are here employed) in the Westminster Cathedral. Nor should it be forgotten that in the nave of St. Paul's, London, the architect showed that domical vaulting is possible even when the bays of nave, instead of being square, are pronouncedly oblong. Indeed, if account be taken of the manifold disadvantages of barrel-vaulting as a means of roofing the nave of a large church, it may safely be said that the employment of some form of the dome or cupola is as necessary to the logical and structural perfection of the round arch as ribbed vaulting is to the logical and structural perfection of the architecture of the pointed arch.

Systems and Styles of Architecture in Relation to Modern Needs.—A word must now be said, in conclusion, as to the merits of the several systems and styles of architecture, more especially in relation to the needs of our own day. Of systems, indeed, there are in truth only three, the trabeate or that of which the horizontal lintel may be regarded as the generating element, and which of necessity postulates a timber roof; that of the round arch, which by virtue of the law of economy postulates, as has been said, the use of domical rather than barrel-vaulting; and that of the pointed arch, which, if carried to perfection, postulates ribbed grining and the use of the flying buttress. The second system, however, admits of two methods of treatment which are sufficiently distinctive to be classed as two "styles", viz. the neo-classical, or Renaissance, and the Byzantine, and which shall be particularized presently.

Now the trabeate system, or that of the timber roof, may be very briefly dismissed. In the great majority of cases we must, indeed, admit, if we are to afford such a covering for our churches; but no one would choose a wooden roof which could afford a vaulted building. Again, the various types of Romanesque architecture, with their imperfect and tentative methods of vaulting, though historically of great interest, should
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be regarded as finally out of court. On the other hand, of the Gothic architecture of the thirteenth century, as exemplified in the great cathedrals of Northern France and of Cologne, it may be quite fearlessly asserted: (1) that every single principle of construction employed therein, not only was the outcome of centuries of practical experience, in the form of successive retrogressive attempts to solve the problems of church vaulting; (2) that the great loftiness of these buildings was not primarily due (as has been sometimes suggested) to any mere "Emporastreben," or "upward-soaring" propensity, but was simply the aggregate result of giving the windows of the clerestory a height in suitable proportion to their width, and to the triforium a height sufficient to allow of the abutment of the aisle roof; and (3) that every subsequent attempt to modify, in any substantial particular, this perfected Gothic style, was of its nature retrogressive and decadent, as might be illustrated from the English Perpendicular and the Italian and Spanish varieties of Gothic architecture. Nevertheless it must be admitted that thirteenth-century Gothic, though perfect of its kind, has its limitations, the most serious of which—in relation to modern needs—is the necessarily reduced height of the nave. Then the arches of the Milan cathedral attempted to improve on his French predecessors by exceeding their maximum width of fifty feet, and to construct a Gothic building with a nave measuring sixty feet across, it was found impossible, as the building proceeded, to carry out the order without incurring the almost certain risk of a collapse, and hence it was necessary to depress the clerestory to its present stunted proportions. Now under modern conditions of life, especially in the case of a cathedral of first-class importance, a nave of far greater width is by all means desirable; and in order to achieve this greater width it is necessary with to fall back on the unsatisfactory compromise of Italian or Spanish Gothic, as illustrated in the cathedrals of Milan, Florence, or Gerona, or else to adopt the principle of the round arch, combined, by preference, with domical vaulting. This, as everyone knows, is what Mr. Bentley has done, with altogether conspicuous success, in the case of the Westminster Cathedral. Of the design of this noble edifice he is impossible to speak here. But it may be worth while to indicate one main reason for the choice of the Byzantine rather than the neoclassic or Renaissance treatment in the round-arch system. The principal difference between the two is this: that, whereas the neo-classical style, by its use of pilasters, treats every pier as though it were a cluster of huge, flat-faced columns, the Byzantine boldly distinguishes between piers and columns, and employs the latter exclusively for the purposes which the monolithic shafts are suited to fulfill, for instance the support of a gallery; while the piers in a Byzantine building make no pretence of being other than what they are, viz., the main supports of the vaulting. The Byzantine method of construction, as employed at Westminster, has the further advantage that it brings within the building the whole of the spaces between the buttresses, thereby at the same time increasing the interior dimensions and avoiding the awkward appearance of ponderous external supports. Nor is the Byzantine style of architecture suitable for a great cathedral alone; one may venture to be assured that a great experiment which has been tried at Westminster will be fruitful of results in the future development of ecclesiastical architecture.


HERBERT LUCAS.


I. Title.—The usual title of the book in Greek MSS. and Fathers is Σοφία Ἰσραήλ νεόν Σεφαρ, "the Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach," or simply Σοφία Σεφαρ, "the Wisdom of Sirach." It is manifestly connected with, and possibly derived from, the following sub-section which appears at the end of the subsequent enumerated Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus: "Wisdom (Hochmah) of Simeon, the son of Yeshuah, the son of Eleazar, the son of Sirah." Indeed, its full form would naturally lead one to regard it as a direct rendering of the Hebrew headings: Ἱσχιάν Χριστε Ἰσραήλ. Were it not that St. Jerome, in his prologue to the Solomonic writings, states that the Hebrew title of Ecclesiasticus was 'Mishle' (Parabol) of Jesus of Sirach. Perhaps in the original Hebrew the book bore different titles at different times: in point of fact, the simple name Ἱσχιάν is applied to it in the Talmud, while Rabbinic writers commonly quote Ecclesiasticus as Bēn Sīrāh. Among the other Greek names which are given to Ecclesiasticus in patristic literature, may be mentioned the simple title of Σοφία, "Wisdom," and the honorary designation Χρηστοφόρος σακχαρ, "all-virtuous sweetness." As might well be expected, Latin writers have applied to Ecclesiasticus titles which are derived from its Greek names, such as "Sapienza Sirach" (Rufinus); "Jesu filii Sirach" (Julianus), "Sapientia Jesu" (Codex Claromontanus); "Liber Sapientiae" (Roman MS.). It can hardly be doubted, however, that the heading "Parabola Solomonis," which is prefixed at times in the Roman Breviary to sections from Ecclesiasticus, is to be traced back to the Hebrew title spoken of by St. Jerome in his prologue to the Solomonic writings. Be this as it may, the book is most commonly designated in the Latin Church as "Ecclesiasticus," itself a Greek word with a Latin ending. This last title—not to be confounded with "Ecclesiastes" (Ecc.)—is the one used by the Council of Trent in its solemn decree concerning the books to be regarded as inspired and canonical; and one may fairly put forward the considerable esteem in which this didactic work was formerly held for the purpose of general reading and instruction in church meetings: this book alone, of all the deuterocanonical writings, which are also called Ecclesiastical by Rufinus, has preserved by way of pre-eminence the name Ecclesiasticus (Liber), that is "a church reading-book".

II. Contents.—The Book of Ecclesiasticus is preceded by a prologue which professes to be the work of the Greek translator of the original Hebrew and the genuineness of which is unquestioned. In this preface to his translation, the writer describes, among other things,
his frame of mind in undertaking the hard task of rendering the Hebrew text into Greek. He was deeply impressed by the wisdom of the sayings contained in the book, and therefore wished, by means of a translation, to place those valuable teachings within the reach of anyone, thereby elevating himself to the status of more perfect accord with the law of God. This was a most worthy object, and there is no doubt that in setting it before himself the translator of Ecclesiasticus had well realized the general character of the contents of that sacred writing. The fundamental thought of the author, Ecclesiasticus is that of wisdom understood and inculeated in inspired Hebrew literature; for the contents of this book, however varied they may appear in other respects, admit of being naturally grouped under the general heading of "Wisdom." Viewed from this standpoint, which is indeed universally regarded as the author's own standpoint, the contents of Ecclesiasticus may be divided into two great parts: chs. i-xiii, 14; and xiii, 15-1, 26. The sayings, which chiefly make up the first part, tend directly to inculcate the fear of God and the fulfillment of His commandments, wherein consists true wisdom. This they do by pointing out, in a concrete manner (as in xiv), the just man shall conduct himself in the manifold relationships of practical life. They afford a most varied fund of thoughtful rules for self-guidance "in joy and sorrow, in prosperity and adversity, in sickness and health, in struggle and temptation, in social life, in all circumstances with friends and enemies, with high, low, rich and poor, with the rich folk, the wise and the foolish, in trade, business, and one's ordinary calling, above all, in one's own house and family in connection with the training of children, the treatment of men-servants and maid-servants, and the way in which a man ought to behave towards his own wife and women generally" (Schürer). Together with these maxims, which resemble closely both in matter and form the Proverbs of Solomon, the first part of Ecclesiasticus includes several more or less long descriptions of the origin and excellence of wisdom (cf. iv, 12-22; v, 37; xvi, 29-33). The contents of the second part of the book are of a decidedly more uniform character, but contribute no less effectively to the setting forth of the general topic of Ecclesiasticus. They first describe at length the Divine wisdom as wonderfully displayed in the realm of nature (chs. 15-xxiii), and next illustrate the practical application of wisdom in the various walks of life, as made known by the history of Israel's worthies, from Enoch down to the high priest Simon, the writer's holy contemporary (xlv-1, 26). At the close of the book (1, 27-29), there is a short conclusion containing the author's subscription and the expression of his general purpose; and next, an appendix (ii) in which the writer returns thanks to God for His benefits, and especially for the gift of wisdom, and to which are subjoined in the Hebrew text recently discovered, a second subscription and the following pious ejaculation: "Blessed be the name of Xalweh from this time forth and for evermore."

III. ORIGINAL TEXT.—Until quite recently the original language of the Book of Ecclesiasticus was a matter of considerable doubt among scholars. They, of course, knew that the Greek translator's purpose was to state that the work was originally written in "Hebrew," Ἱςθαράδι, but they were in doubt as to the precise significance of this term, which might mean either Hebrew proper or Aramaic. They were likewise aware that St. Jerome, in his preface to the Solomonic writings, spoke of "a Hebrew original," but it is not clear whether it was truly a Hebrew text, or not rather a Syriac or Aramaic translation in Hebrew characters. Again, in their eyes, the citation of the book by rabbinical writers, sometimes in Hebrew, sometimes in Aramaic, did not appear decisive, since it was not certain that they came from a Hebrew original. And this was their view also with regard to the quotations, this time in classical Hebrew, by the Bagdad gaon Saadia of the tenth century of our era, that is of the period after which all documentary traces of a Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus practically died out of the one, living in more perfect accord with the law of God.

These, their chief argument for this was that the Greek version contains certain errors; for example, xxiv, 37 (in Gr., verse 27), "light" for "love" (אorate); xxv, 22 (Gr., verse 15), "head" for "neighbour" (אפק; cf. Jer. verse 18), "Tyrants" for "enemies" (אנאים); etc.; these are best accounted for by supposing that the translator misunderstood a Hebrew original before him. And so the matter stood until the year 1896, which marks the beginning of an entirely new period in the history of the original text of Ecclesiasticus. Since that time, much documentary evidence has come to light, and it tends to show that the book was originally written in Hebrew. The first fragments of a Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus (xxxix, 15-xl, 6) were brought from the East to Cambridge, England, by Mrs. A. S. Lewis; they were identified in May, 1896, and published in "The Expositor" (July, 1896) by S. Schechter, reader in Talmudic at Cambridge University. About the same time, in a box of fragments acquired from the Cairo geniza through Professor Sayce for the Bodleian Library, Oxford, nine leaves in Hebrew, (now callling them containing xi, 9-xlii, 11, were found by A. E. Cowley and Ad. Neubauer, who also soon published them (Oxford, 1897). Next followed the identification by Professor Schechter, first, of seven leaves of the same Codex (B), containing xxx, 11-xlii, 11; xxxi, 1b-xxxii, 5; xxxii, 11-xxxvii, 21; xxxiii, 30-xxxviii, 28b; xxxiv, 14b-15; xxxv, 1; and next, of four leaves of a different MS. (called A), and presenting iii, 6e-vii, 31a; vi, 36d-xvi, 26. These eleven leaves had been discovered by Dr. Schechter in the fragments brought by him from the Cairo geniza; and it is among matter obtained from the same source by the British Museum, that G. Margoliouth found and published, in 1899, four pages of the MS. B, containing xxxi, 12-xxxii, 1a; xxxvi, 21-xxxvii, 29. Early in 1900, I. Lévi published two pages from a third MS. (C), xxxvi, 29b-xxxviii, 1a, that is, a passage already contained in Codex B; and two from a fourth MS. (D), presently to be described, that is, a section already found in Codex A. Early in 1900, too, E. N. Adler published four pages of MS. A, viz. viii, 29-a; xi; and S. Schechter, four pages of MS. C, consisting of mere excerpts from iv, 28b-v, 15c, xxv, 11b-xxxvii, 25. Lastly, two pages of MS. D were discovered by Dr. M. S. Gaster, and contain a few verses of chapters, xviii, xix, xx, xxvii, some of which already appear in MSS. B and C. Thus by the middle of the year 1900, more than one-half of a Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus had been identified and published by scholars. (In the foregoing indications of the newly discovered fragments of the text, the above verses given are according to the numbering in the Latin Vulgate.) As might naturally be anticipated, and indeed it was desirable that it should so happen, the publication of these various fragments gave rise to a controversy as to the originality of the text therein exhibited. At a very early stage in that publication, scholars easily noticed that although the Hebrew language of the fragments was apparently classical, it nevertheless contained readings which might lead one to suspect its actual dependence on the Greek and Syriac versions of Ecclesiasticus. When measurements to determine whether, and if so, to what extent, the Hebrew fragments reproduced an original text of the book, or on the contrary, simply presented a late transliteration of Ecclesiasticus into Hebrew by means of the versions just named. Both Dr. G. Bickell and
Professor D. S. Margoliouth, that is, the two men who but shortly before the discovery of the Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus had attempted to retranslate small parts of the book into Hebrew, declared themselves openly against the originality of the newly found text. It may indeed be admitted that the efforts naturally entailed by their own work of translation had especially fitted Margoliouth and Bielkell for noticing and appreciating those features which even now appear to many scholars to tell in favour of a certain connexion of the Hebrew text with the Greek and Syriac versions. It remains true, however, that, with the exception of Israël Leévi and perhaps a few others, the most prominent Biblical and Talmudic scholars of the day are of the mind that the Hebrew fragments present an original text. They think that the arguments and inferences most vigorously urged by Professor D. S. Margoliouth in favour of his view have been disposed of through a comparison of the fragments published in 1890 and 1900 with those that had appeared at an earlier date, and through a close study of nearly all the facts now available. They readily admit in the MSS., thus far recovered, scribal faults, doublets, Arabisms, apparent transpositions on ancient versions, etc. But to their minds all such defects do not disprove the originality of the Hebrew text, inasmuch as they can, and indeed in a large number of cases must, be accounted for by the very late character of the copies now in our possession. The Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus belong distinctly to the earliest, to the seventh, century of our era, and by that late date all kinds of errors could naturally be expected to have crept into the original language of the book, because the Jewish copyists of the work did not regard it as canonical. At the same time these defects do not disfigure the whole of the text of Hebrew in which Ecclesiasticus was originally written. The language of the fragments is manifestly not rabbinic, but classical Hebrew; and this conclusion is decided by the comparison of their text with that of the quotations from Ecclesiasticus, both in the Talmud and in the Midrashim, which have already been referred to. Again, the Hebrew of the newly found fragments, although classical, is yet one of a distinctly late type, and it supplies considerable material for lexicographic research. Finally, the comparatively large number of the Hebrew MSS., recently discovered in only one instance, points to the fact that the work in its primitive form was often transcribed in ancient times, and thus affords hope that other copies, more or less complete, of the original text may be discovered at some future date. To render their study convenient, all the extant fragments have been brought together in a splendid edition, "Facsimiles of the Fragments hitherto recovered of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew" (Oxford and Cambridge, 1901). The metrical and strophic structure of parts of the newly discovered text has been particularly investigated by H. Grimm and N. Schlegel, whose results, in the least, indifferent, and by Jos. Knabenbauer, S.J., in a less venturesome way, and hence with more satisfactory results.

IV. Ancient Versions. It was, of course, from a Hebrew text comparatively free from errors that the grandson of the author of Ecclesiasticus rendered the book into Greek. This translator was a Palestinian Jew, who came to Egypt at a certain time, and desired to make the work accessible in a Greek dress to the Jews of the Dispersion, and no doubt also to all lovers of wisdom. His name is unknown, although an ancient, but little reliable, tradition ("Synopsis Sacra" in St. Athanasius's works) calls him Jesus, the son of Sirach. His literary qualifications for the task he undertook and carried out cannot be fully ascertained at the present day. He is commonly regarded, however, from the general character of his work, as a man of good general culture, with a fair command of both Hebrew and Greek. He was distinctly aware of the great difference which exists between the respective genius of these two languages, and of the consequent difficulty attending the efforts of one who aimed at giving a satisfactory Greek version of a Hebrew text. And therefore, in his prologue to the work, his reader's indulgence for whatever shortcomings they may notice in his translation. He claims to have spent much time and labour on his version of Ecclesiasticus, and it is only fair to suppose that his work was not only a conscientious, but also, a successful, rendering of the original Hebrew. One can but speak in this guarded manner of the exact value of the Greek translation in its primitive form, for the simple reason that a comparison of its extant MSS.—all apparently derived from a single Greek exemplar—shows that the primitive translation has been very often, and in many cases seriously, tampered with. The great uncials, the Vatican, the Sinaitic, the Ephraimitic, and possibly the Alexandrian, though comparatively free from glosses, contain an inferior text; the better form of the text seems to be preserved in the Venetus Codex and Codex Vaticanus, though these are not free from glosses. Undoubtedly, a fair number of these glosses may be referred safely to the translator himself, who, at times, added one word or even a few words to the original before him, to make the meaning clearer or to guard the text against possible misunderstanding. The great bulk of the Greek versions is, however, based on the above-revised, glossed, text of the Hebrew, and, again, the addition of the Book of Proverbs; they are expansions of the thought, or hellenizing interpretations, or additions from current collections of homiletic sayings. The following are the best-ascertained results which flow from a comparison of the Greek version with that of our Hebrew fragments. Sometimes, the corruptions of the Hebrew may be discovered by means of the Greek; and, conversely, the Greek text is proved to be defective, in the line of additions or omissions, by reference to parallel places in the Hebrew. At times, the Hebrew discloses considerable freedom of rendering on the part of the Greek translator; or enables one to perceive how the author of the version mistook one Hebrew letter for another; or, again, affords us a means to make sense out of an unintelligible expression in the Greek text. Lastly, the Hebrew text confirms the conclusions, reached in the Greek version, with which it is presented by the Syriac, Latin, and Armenian versions, over against the unnatural order found in all existing Greek MSS. Like the Greek, the Syriac version of Ecclesiasticus was made directly from the original Hebrew. This is well-nigh universally admitted; and a comparison of its text with that of the newly found Hebrew fragments should settle the point forever: as just stated, the Syriac version gives the same order as the Hebrew text for the contents of xxx-xxvii; in particular, it presents mistaken renderings, the origin of which, while inexplicable by supposing a Greek original as its basis, is easily accounted for through the reference to the text of the Hebrew fragments. But the Hebrew text from which it was made must have been very defective, as is proved by the numerous and important lacunae in the Syriac translation. It seems, likewise, that the Hebrew has been tampered with in a careless, and at times even arbitrary, manner. The Syriac version has all the less critical value at the present day, because it was considerably revised at an unknown date, by means of the Greek translation. Of all the other ancient versions of Ecclesiasticus, the Old Latin is the most important. It was made before St. Jerome's time, although the precise date of its origin cannot now be ascertained; and the holy doctor apparently revised its text but little, previously to its adoption into the Latin Vulgate. The unity of the Old Latin version, which was formerly doubted,
has been of late seriously questioned, and Ph. Thielmann, the most recent investigator of its text in this respect, thinks that chs. xiv-l are due to a translator other than that of the rest of the book, the former part being of European, the latter and chief part of African, origin. (See also the views of P. De Laplace, P. Sahatieh, E. G. Bengel, etc., namely, that the Latin version was made directly from the Greek, is now considered as altogether certain. The version has retained many Greek words in a latinized form: *eremos* (vi, 3); *eucharis* (vi, 5); *basta* (vi, 30); *oikion* (xx, 21); *zeuxis* (xx, 31); *diergeia* (vi, 11), *perderus*; etc., etc., together with certain Graecisms of construction; so that the text rendered into Latin was unquestionably Greek, not the original Hebrew. It is indeed true that other features of the Old Latin— notably its order for xxx-xxxxvi, which disagrees with the Greek translation, and agrees with the Hebrew text— seem to point to the conclusion that the Latin version was based immediately on the original Hebrew. But a very recent and critical examination of all such features in i-xiii has led H. Herkenne to a different conclusion; all things taken into consideration, he is of the mind that: “Nittura imperfecta legenda e vulgari greecum textum hebraicum alterius recensionis graece castigato.” (See also J. Knaebenauer, S.J., “In Ecclesiasticum,” p. 34 sq.) Together with graecized forms, the Old Latin translation of Ecclesiasticus presents many barbarisms and solecisms (such as *deomputior*, i, 13; *receptabilis*, ii, 1, 24; *receptabilis*, ii, 1, 24; *percer*, pericit, viii, 18; *xxxiii, 7; obductio*, ii, 2; *v*, 1, 10; etc.) which, to the extent in which they can be actually traced back to the original form of the version, go to show that the translator had a poor command of the Latin language. Apart from a fair number of expressions which certainly due to the translator, it may be inferred that, at times, he did not catch the sense of the Greek, and that at other times he was too free in rendering the text before him. The Old Latin version abounds in additional lines or even verses foreign not only to the Greek, but also to the Hebrew text. Such important additions—which often appear clearly so from the fact that they interfere with the poetical parallels of the book—are either repetitions of preceding statements under a slightly different form, or glosses inserted by the translator or the copyists. Owing to the early origin of the Latin version (probably the second century of our era), and to its intimate connexion with both the Greek and Hebrew texts, a good edition of its primitive form, as far as this form can be ascertained, is one of the chief things to be desired for the textual criticism of Ecclesiasticus. Among the other ancient versions of the Book of Ecclesiasticus which are derived from the Greek, the Ethiopic, Arabic, and Coptic are worthy of special mention.

V. Author and Date.—The author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus is not King Solomon, to whom, as St. Augustine bears witness, the work was sometimes ascribed “on account of some resemblance of style” with that of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles of Canticles, but to whom, as the same holy doctor says, “the more learned” (apparently among the church writers of the time) “know full well that it should not be referred.” (See also the City of God, ch. xxvii, ed. ch. xxvi.) Even the present day, the authorship of the book is universally and rightly assigned to a certain “Jesus,” concerning whose person and character a great deal has indeed been surmised but very little is actually known. In the Greek prologue to the work, the author’s proper name is given as Ἰσραηλ, and this information is confirmed by the subcriptions found in the original Hebrew: 1, 27 (Vulg. 1, 25); ii, 30. His familiar surname was Ben Sirah, as the Hebrew text and the ancient versions agree to attest. He is described in the Greek and Latin versions as “a man of Jerusalem” (I, 29), and internal evidence (cf. xxiv, 18 sqq.; I) tends to confirm the statement, although it is not found in the Hebrew. His close acquaintance with “the Law, the Prophets, and the other books delivered from the fathers,” that is, with the three classes of writings which make up the Hebrew Bible, is distinctly borne witness to by the prologue to the work (367 lines), in which the study of the Hebrew fragments has shown to be derived from the sacred books of the Jews, are an ample proof that Jesus, the son of Sirah, was thoroughly acquainted with the Biblical text. He was a philosophical observer of life, as can be easily inferred from the nature of his thoughts, and his manner of speech is steeped in the wider knowledge which he acquired by traveling much, and of which he, of course, availed himself in writing his work (xxv, 12). The particular period in the author’s life to which the composition of the book should be referred cannot be defined, whatever conjectures may have been put forth in that regard by some recent scholars. The data to which others have appealed (xxxi, 22 sqq.; xxxviii, 1-15; etc.) to prove that he was a physician are insufficient evidence; while the similarity of the names (Jason-Jesus) is no excuse for those who have identified Jesus, the son of Sirah, with Jason, an apostle of the first rank, on the basis of the ungodly and hellenizing high priest Jason (175-172 B.C.—concerning Jason’s wicked deeds, see II Mach., iv, 7-26).

The time at which Jesus, the author of Ecclesiasticus, lived has been the matter of much discussion in the past. But at the present day, it is justly given with tolerable precision. Two data are particularly helpful for this purpose. The first is supplied by the Greek prologue, where we read that the grandson of Jesus of Sirah came into Egypt ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ καὶ τοιούτῳ τῃ ἐκ τοῦ Ἐρυθροῦ Βασιλείῳ, not long after which he returned into Greece his grandfather’s work. The “thirty-eighth year” here spoken of by the translator does not mean that of his own age, for such a specification would be manifestly irrelevant. It naturally denotes the date of his arrival in Egypt with a reference to the years of the rule of the then monarch, the Egyptian Ptolemy Euergetes; and in point of fact, the Greek grammatical construction of the passage in the prologue is that usually employed in the Septuagint version to give the year of rule of a prince (cf. Aggaeus, i, 1; ii, 1, 10; Zach., i, 1, 7; vii, i; I Mach., xiii, 42; xiv, 27; etc.). There were indeed two Ptolemies of the same name: the elder Ptolemy III Ptolemy III Ptolemy VII Phiscon. But to decide which is the one actually meant by the author of the prologue is an easy matter. As the first, Ptolemy I, reigned only twenty-five years (247-222 b.c.), it must be the second, Ptolemy VII, who is intended. This latter prince shared the throne along with his brother (from 170 B.C. onwards), and afterwards ruled alone (from 145 B.C. onwards). But he was wont to reckon the years of his reign from the earlier date. Hence “the thirty-eighth year of Ptolemy Euergetes”, in which the grandson of Jesus, the son of Sirah, came to Egypt, was 132 B.C. This being the case, the translator’s grandfather, the author of Ecclesiasticus, may be regarded as having lived and written his work between forty and sixty years before (between 190 and 170 B.C.), for there can be no doubt that in referring to Jesus by means of the term Ἰσραηλ and of the definite phrase Ἰσραηλ ὁ Ἱεροσαλημ, the writer of the prologue designates his grandfather, and not a more remote ancestor. The second datum that is particularly available for determining the time at which the writer of Ecclesiasticus lived is supplied by the book itself. It has long been felt that since the son of Sirah could not have lived such a genuine glow of enthusiasm the idea that Jesus, the son of Onias, whom he praises as the last in the long line of Jewish worthies, he must himself have been an eyewitness of the glory which he depicts (cf. i, 1-16, 22, 23). This was, of course, but an inference,
and so long as it was based only on a more or less subjective appreciation of the passage, one can easily understand why many scholars questioned, or even rejected, its correctness. But with the recent discovery of the original Hebrew of the passage, there has come a new, and distinctly objective, element, which places practically beyond doubt the correctness of the inference. In the Hebrew text, immediately after its eulogium of the high priest Simon, the writer subjoins the following fervent prayer: "May His [i.e. Yahweh's] mercy be continually with Simon, and may He establish with him the covenant of Phinehas, that will endure with him and with his seed for ever and ever." (1, 24). Obviously, Simon was yet alive when this prayer was thus formulated; and its actual wording in the Hebrew implies this so manifestly, that when the author's grandson rendered it into Greek, at a date when Simon had been dead for some time, he felt it necessary to modify the text before him, and hence rendered it in the following general manner: "May His mercy be continually with us, and may He redeem us in His days." Besides thus allowing us to realize the fact that Jesus, the son of Sirach, was a contemporary of the high priest Simon, chap. ii, the Hebrew text affords us certain details which enable us to decide which of the two Simons, both high priests and sons of Onias and known in Jewish history, is the one described by the writer of the book. On the one hand, the only known title of Simon I (who held the pontificate under Ptolemy Soter, about 300 B.C.) was Ptolemy. Could we furnish a reason for the great enthusiasm which passed upon Simon in Eccles., i, 1, the surname "the Just." (cf. Josephus, Antiq. of the Jews, Bk. XII, chap. ii, 2, 3), whence it is inferred that he was a renowned high priest worthy of being celebrated among the Jewish heroes praised by the son of Sirach. On the other hand, such details given in Simon's pæan, as the facts that he repaired and strengthened the Temple, fortified the city against siege, and protected the city against robbers (cf. Eccles., i, 1-4), are in close agreement with what is known of the times of Simon II (about 200 B.C.). While in the days of Simon I, immediately after, the people were undisturbed by foreign aggression, in those of Simon II the Jews were sorely harassed by hostile armies, and their territory was invaded by Antiochus, as we are informed by Josephus (Antiq. of the Jews, Bk. XII, chap. iii, 3). It was also in the later time of Simon II that Ptolemy Philopater was prevented only by the high priest's prayer to God, from desecrating the Most Holy Place; he then started a fearful persecution of the Jews at home and abroad (cf. III Mach., ii, iii). It appears from these facts—to which others, pointing in the same direction, could easily be added—that the author of Ecclesiasticus lived about the beginning of the second century b.c. As a matter of fact, recent Catholic scholars, in increasing number, prefer this position to that which identifies the high priest Simon, spoken of in Eccles., i, with Simon I, and which, in consequence, refers the composition of the book to about a century earlier (about 280 B.C.).

VI. METHOD OF COMPOSITION.—At the present day, there are two principal views concerning the manner in which the writer of Ecclesiasticus composed his work; and it is difficult to say which is the more probable. The first, held by many scholars, maintains that an impartial study of the topics treated and of their actual arrangement leads to the conclusion that the whole book is the work of a single mind. Its advocates claim that, throughout the book, one and the same general purpose and doctrine can be easily discovered, viz.: the purpose of teaching the practical value of Hebrew wisdom, and that one and the same method in handling the materials can be readily noticed, the writer always showing wide acquaintance with men and things, and never citing any exterior authority for what he says. They affirm that a careful examination of the contents discloses a distinct unity of mental attitude on the author's part towards the same leading topics, towards God, life, the Law, wisdom, etc. They do not deny the existence of differences of tone in the book, but think that they are found in various paragraphs relating to minor topics; that the diversities of style noticed do not go beyond the natural experience; that the author very likely wrote at different intervals and under a variety of circumstances, so that it is not to be wondered at if pieces thus composed bear the manifest impress of a somewhat different frame of mind. Some of them actually go so far as to say that the whole compilation of Ecclesiasticus may at times have collected thoughts and maxims that were already in current and popular use, may even have drawn material from collections of wise sayings no longer extant or from unpublished discourses of sages; but they, each and all, are positive that the author of the book "was not a mere collector or compiler; his characteristic personality stands out too distinctly and prominently for that, and notwithstanding the diversified character of the apothegms, they are all the outcome of one connected view of life and of the world." (Harnack)

The second view maintains that the Book of Ecclesiasticus was composed by a process of compilation. According to the defenders of this position, the compilatory character of the book does not necessarily conflict with a real unity of general purpose pervading and connecting the elements of the work: such a purge proves, indeed, that the compiler had brought together all the elements for a common end, but it really leaves untouched the question at issue, viz., whether that one mind must be considered as the original author of the contents of the book or, rather, as the compiler of the sayings and sermons of others. According to this view, the individual sayings and maxims of one and the same general purpose of the work of the son of Sirach, and admitting likewise the fact that certain portions of Ecclesiasticus belong to him as the original author, they think that, on the whole, the book is a compilation.

Briefly stated, the following are the grounds for their position: In the first place, from the very nature of his work, the author was like "a gleaner after the grape-gatherers"; and in thus speaking of himself (xxiii, 10) he gives us to understand that he was a collector or compiler. In the second place, the structure of the work still betrays a complete compilatory character. The section (vi) is a real appendix to the book, and was added to it after the completion of the work, as is proved by the colophon in 1, 29 sqq. The opening chapter reads like a general introduction to the book, and indeed as one different in tone from the chapters by which it is immediately followed, while it resembles some distinct sections which are embodied in further chapters of the work. In the body of the book, ch. xxxvi, 1-19, is a prayer for the Jews of the Dispersion, altogether unconnected with the sayings in verses 20 sqq. of the same chapter; ch. xliii, 15-1, 26, is a discourse clearly separate from the preceding section by which it is immediately preceded; chs. xvi, 24; xxiv, 1; xxxiv, 16, are new starting-points, which, no less than the numerous passages marked by the address "my son" (i, 1; iii, 19; iv, 1, 23; vi, 18, 24, 33, etc.), and the regular addition of new topics, in the sections which is the more striking, the unity of the work. Other marks of a compilatory process have also been appealed to. They consist in the significant repetition of several sayings in different places of the book (cf. xx, 32, 33, which is repeated in xii, 17b, 18; etc.); in apparent discrepancies of thought and doctrine (cf. the differences of tone in chs. xvi, 24; xxy; xxix, 21-41; xl, 1-11; etc.); in certain topical headings at the beginning of special sections (cf. xxxi, 12; xli, 16; xlv, 1, in the Hebrew); and in an additional psalm or canticle found in the newly discovered Hebrew text, between li, 12, and li, 13: all of which are best accounted for by the use of several
smaller collections containing each the same saying, or differing considerably in their general tenor, or supplied with their respective titles. Finally, there seems to be an historical trace of the compilatory character of Ecclesiasticus in a second, but unauthentic, prologue to the book, which is found in the "Synopsis scholastica," another book, which is printed in the works of St. Athanasius and also at the beginning of Ecclesiasticus in the Complutensian Polyglot, the actual reduction of the book is ascribed to the Greek translator as a regular process of compilation of detached hymns, sayings, prayers, etc., which had been left him by his grandfather, Jesus, the son of Sirach.

VII. DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL TEACHING.—Before setting forth in a summary way the principal teachings, doctrinal and ethical, contained in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, it will not be amiss to premise two remarks which, however, elementary, should be distinctly borne in mind by anyone who wishes to view the doctrines of the son of Sirach in their proper light. First, it would be obviously unfair to require that the contents of this sapiential book should come fully up to the high moral standard of Christian ethics, or show in the clearest manner the distinction and separation of good and evil teachings embodied in the sacred writings of the New Testament or in the living tradition of the Church; all that can be reasonably expected of a book composed some time before the Christian Dispensation, is that it should stand forth substantially good, not perfect, doctrinal and ethical teaching. Nor is this requirement good logic and sound common sense demand that the silence of Ecclesiasticus concerning certain points of doctrine be not regarded as a positive denial of them, unless it can be clearly and conclusively shown that such a silence must be so construed. The work is marked by a great number of sayings which bear on all kinds of topics, and on that account, hardly ever, if ever at all, will a sober critic be able to pronounce on the actual motive which prompted the author of the book either to mention or to omit a particular point of doctrine. St. Jerome, in presence of a writer manifestly wedded to the national and religious traditions of the Jewish race, as the general tone of his book proves the author of Ecclesiasticus to have been, every scholar worthy of the name will readily see that silence on Jesus' part regarding some important doctrine, shows nothing so much as that of the writings, whether of the Ammons, the Jews, or the Messias, is not the reason whatever that the son of Sirach did not abide by the belief of the Jews concerning that doctrine, and, in reference to the special point just mentioned, did not share the Messianic expectations of his time. As can readily be seen, the two general remarks just made simply set forth elementary canons of historical criticism; and they would not have been dwelt on here were it not that they have been very often lost sight of by Protestant scholars, who, biased by their desire to disprove the Catholic doctrine of the inspired character of Ecclesiasticus, have done their utmost to depreciate the doctrinal and ethical teaching of this deutero-canonical book.

The following are the principal doctrinal doctrines of Jesus, the son of Sirach. According to him, as according to all the other inspired writers of the Old Testament, God is one and there is no God beside Him (xxxvi, 5). He is a living and eternal (god (xxvii, 18, 23; xviii, 18, 19); and although His greatness and mercy exceed all human comprehension, yet He makes Himself known to man through His wonderful works (xvi, 18, 23; xviii, 18, 19), which He produced by His Word of command, stamping them with all the marks of greatness and goodness (xlii, 15–xliii, etc.). Man is the choice handiwork of God, who made him for His glory, set him as king over all other creatures (xviii, 1–22), and will hold him accountable for His own personal deeds (xvi, 9–16), for while tolerating moral evil He reproveth and enables man to avoid it (xv, 11–21). In dealing with man, God is no less merciful than righteous: "He is mighty to forgive" (xvi, 12, and: "How great is the mercy of the Lord, and His forgiveness to them that turn unto Him" (xxviii, 28); yet none should presume that Divine mercy will at any time delay His wrath, "for His wrath shall come on a sudden, and in the time of vengeance He will destroy thee" (v, 6–9). From among the children of men, God selected for Himself a special nation, Israel, in the midst of which He wills that wisdom should reside (xiv, 13–16), and in the midst of which He offers a fervent prayer, replete with touching remembrances of God's mercies to the patriarchs and prophets of old, and with ardent wishes for the union and exaltation of the chosen people (xxxvi, 1–10). It is quite clear that the Jewish patriot who put forth this petition to God for future national quiet and prosperity, and who furthermore confidently expected that Elias's return would contribute to the glorious restoration of all Israel (cf. xlv, 10), looked forward to the introduction of Messianic times. It remains true, however, that in whatever way his silence be accounted, he does speak anywhere of the interposition of God in behalf of the Jewish people, or of the future coming of a personal Messiah. He manifestly alludes to the narrative of the Fall, when he says: "From the woman came the beginning of sin, and by her we all die" (xxxv, 30), and apparently counsels a similar original devotion from mankind in the two miseries and passions that weigh so heavily on "the children of Adam" (ix, 1–11). He says very little concerning the next life. Earthly rewards occupy the most prominent, or perhaps even the sole, place, in the author's mind, as a sanction for present actions (xvii, 1–22). He never speaks anywhere of a future life or of the miseries and passions that weigh so heavily on "the children of Adam" (ix, 1–11). As regards the underworld or Sheol, it appears to the writer nothing but a mournful place where the dead do not praise God (xvi, 32, 33). The central, dogmatic, and moral idea of the book is that of wisdom. Bén Sirã describes it under several important aspects. When he speaks of it in relation to God, he almost invariably invests it with personal attributes. It is eternal (1, 1), unsearchable (1, 6, 7), universal (xxiv, 6 sqq.). It is the formative, creative power of the world (xxiv, 3 sqq.). It yet is itself superior (1, 9; also in Greek: xcvii, 9), and is nowhere treated as a distinct, subsisting Divine Person, in the Hebrew text. In relation to man, wisdom is depicted as a quality which comes from the Almighty and works most excellent effects in those who love Him (xiv, 10–15). It is identified with the "fear of God" (4, 16), which should of course prevail in a special manner in Israel, and promote among the Hebrews the perfect fulfillment of the Mosaic Law, which the author of Ecclesiasticus regards as the living embodiment of God's will. It is a priceless treasure to the acquisition of which one must devote all his efforts, and the imparting of which to others one should never grudge (vi, 18–20; xx, 32, 33). It is a disposition of the heart which prompts man to practice the virtues of faith, hope, and love of God (ii, 8, 9), of trust and submission, etc. (ii, 18–23, x, 27, 37; etc.); which also secures the fear of God in this life (xxiv, 14–20; xxxvi, 37, 38, etc.). It is a frame of mind which prevents the discharge of the ritual law, especially the offering of sacrifices, from becoming a heartless compliance with mere outward
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Observances, and it causes man to place inward righteousness far above the offering of rich gifts to God (xxxv). As can readily be seen, the author of Ecclesiasticus inculcates in all this a teaching far superior to that of the Pharisees of a somewhat later date, and in no respect to that of the prophets and other proto-canonical writers before him. Highly commendable, too, are the numerous pithy sayings which the son of Sirach gives for the avoidance of sin, wherein the negative part of practical wisdom may be said to consist. His maxims against pride (iii, 30; vi, 21; xii, 24), covetousness (iv, 1; xi, 12-21), envy (xxx, 22-27; xxxvi, 22), impurity (ix, 1-13; xix, 1-3; etc.), anger (xviii, 1-4; x, 6), intemperance (xxxvii, 30-34), sloth (vii, 16; xii, 2), the sins of the tongue (iv, 30; vii, 13, 14; xi, 2, 3, i; 36-40; vi, 17, 16; xxviii, 15-27; etc.), evile company (xi, 31-36; xxxi, 14-18; etc.) display a close observation of human nature, stigmatize vice in a forcible manner, and at times point out the remedy against the social distemper. Indeed, it is probably no less a result of the success which Bén Sirà attained to in branding vice than of that which he obtained in directly inculcating virtue that his work was so willingly used in the early days of Christianity for public reading at church, and bears, down to the present day, the pre-eminent title of "Ecclesiasticus"

Together with these maxims, which nearly all bear on what may be called individual morality, the Book of Sirach contains valuable lessons relative to the various classes which make up human society. The natural basis of society is the family, and the son of Sirach supplies a number of pieces of advice especially appropriate to the domestic circle as it was then constituted. He would have the man who wishes to become the head of a family determined in the choice of a wife by her moral worth (xxxvi, 23-26; xi, 19-23). He repeated describes the precious advantages resulting from the possession of a good wife, and contrasts with them the misery entailed by the choice of an unworthy one (xxvi, 1-24; xxxvii, 17-30). The man, as the head of the family, he represents indeed as vested with more power than would be granted to him among us, but be does not neglect to point out his numerous responsibilities towards those under him: to his children, especially his daughter, whose welfare he might more particularly be tempted to neglect (vii, 25; xxiv), to his slaves, concerning whom he says: "Let a wise servant be dear to thee as thy own soul" (vii, 23; xxxii, 31), not meaning thereby, however, to encourage the servant’s idleness or other vices (xxxii, 25-30). The duties of children towards their parents are often and beautifully insisted upon (vi, 29, 30, etc.). The son of Sirach devotes a variety of sayings to the choice and the worth of a real friend (vi, 6-17; ix, 14, 15; xii, 8, 9), to the care with which such a one should be preserved (xxii, 25-32), and also to the worthless and dangers of the unfaithful friend (xxvii, 1-6; 17-24; xxxiii, 6). The author has no brief against those in power, but on the contrary considers it an expression of God’s will that some should be in exalted, and others in humble, stations in life (xxxiii, 7-13). He conceives of the various classes of society, of the poor and the rich, the learned and the ignorant, as placed inferior to that of the prophets and the holy men (xvii, 29). He would have a prince bear in mind that he is in God’s hand, and owes equal justice to all, rich and poor (v, 18; x, 1-13). He bids the rich give alms, and visit the poor and the afflicted (iv, 1-11; vi, 38, 39; xii, 1-7; etc.), for almsgiving is a means to obtain forgiveness (xxxvii, 6; xxxvi, 1-4). Charity of heart is in every way hurtful (xxxiv, 25-29). On the other hand, he directs the lower classes, as we might call them, to show themselves submissive to those in higher condition and to bear patiently with those who cannot be safely and directly resisted (vii, 1-15; ix, 18-21; xii, 1-8). Nor is the author of Ecclesiasticus anything like a misanthrope that would set himself up resolutely against the legitimate pleasures and the received customs of social life (xxxxi, 12-42; xxxii, 1 sqq.); while he directs severe but just rebukes against the parasite (xxix, 28-35; xi, 29-32).

Similarly, he has favourable words about the prophet (xxvi, 1-15), and about the dead (vii, 37; xxxviii, 16-24); and strong words of caution against the dangers which one inures in the pursuit of business (xxvi, 28; xxv, 1, 4; viii, 15, 16). Catholic authors are marked with an asterisk (*). Commentary: Calmar* (Venice, 1618); F. T. LeBars (Leipzig, 1890); Biswell* (New York, 1880); Lesesne* (Paris, 1850); Ecclesiasticus (London, 1888); J. F. Ralston* (Issy, 1899); Vlessing* (Tübingen, 1900-1901); Knabenbauer* (Paris, 1902).

Introductions to the Old Testament: Kautz* (Paris, 1882); Vigouroux* (Paris, 1886); Conso* (Paris, 1887); Lesesne* (Paris, 1890); König (Bohn, 1899); Cornhill (Freiburg, 1898); Strack* (Munich, 1888); Kaulen* (Freiburg, 1898); Gigot* (New York, 1906).


Eccleston, Samuel, fifth Archbishop of Baltimore, U. S. A., b. near Chestertown, Maryland, 27 June, 1801; and at Georgetown, D. C., 22 April, 1851. His father was Samuel Eccleston, an Episcopalian. After her husband’s death, Mrs. Eccleston married a Catholic gentleman named Seidell. She was brought under Catholic influences, and sent to St. Mary’s College, Baltimore, where she was converted. Entering St. Mary’s Seminary in 1819, he was ordained priest, 24 April, 1825. He went to Issey, France, for further theological studies, and, returning to Baltimore in July, 1827, was made vice-president, and two years later president, of St. Mary’s College. On 14 Sept., 1834, he was consecrated titular Bishop of Thermia, and coadjutor with the right of succession for Baltimore, and, upon the death of Archbishop Whitfield, 10 October, 1834, succeeded him as Archbishop of the metropolitan see. He became also administrator of Richmond, until Bishop Whelan’s appointment in 1841. During his term of office many new churches were erected. He contributed largely of his own means towards the building of the cathedral. To provide for German Catholics the Redemptorists were invited from Austria in 1841; the Brothers of the Christian Schools were introduced into the United States in 1846, establishing Calvert Hall School at Baltimore, and the same year the Brothers of St. Patrick took charge of a manual labour school (since discontinued) in that city. An important event was the ordination, 1 November, 1849, of St. Charles’s College, founded by the generosity of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Five provincial councils, the third to the seventh inclusive, were held at Baltimore under Archbishop Eccleston. (See Baltimore, Archdiocese of.)


J. P. W. McNeal.

Eccleston, Thomas of, thirteenth-century Friar Minor and chronicler, dates of birth and death unknown. He styles himself simply "Brother Thomas", and Bale seems to have been the first given him the title of "Eccleston". He appears to have entered the order about 1232-3 and to have been a student at Oxford between 1230 and 1240. After the latter year he was stationed at the convent in London, but he does not appear to have ever held any office in the order. He is very probably famous for his work "De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Anglia", which extends from the coming of the friars into England under Agnellus of Pisa, in 1224, up to about 1258, when the work was probably completed. Eccleston declares that he spent twenty-six years collecting material for his chronicle, most of the information it contains being derived from
personal knowledge or verbal communication, although he seems to have had access to certain written documents now lost. His "De Adventu" is a collection of notes rather than a finished work. He describes with extreme simplicity and vividness what has been called the heroic period of the Franciscan movement in England. In spite of the absence of dates and of any chronological sequence and of its tendency to extol the English province above all others, his chronicle is very valuable and is accurate and reliable in all that concerns the establishment and spread of the Friars Minor in England. Incidentally it throws some light on the trend of early Franciscan events and thought in general. Four MSS. of the "De Adventu", all of which go back to one lost archetype, are known to scholars. The chronicle has been often edited; in part by Brewer in the "Monumenta Franciscana" (Rolls Series, London, 1858); and by Howlett in the same series (1892); by the Friars Minor at Quaraecli (in Analecta Franciscana, I, 1885, 217-57); by Liebermann in the "Monumenta Germanica" (XXVIII, Hanover, 1885, 501-60). A critical edition of the complete text is much needed. There is an English translation of Echave's work by Father Cuthbert, O.S.P.C. (Friars and how they came to England" (London, 1905).


PASCAL ROBINSON.

Echard, Jacques, historian of the Dominicans, b. at Rouen, France, 22 Sept., 1644; d. at Paris, 15 March, 1724. As the son of a wealthy official of the king he received a thorough classical and secular education. He entered the Dominican Order at Paris and distinguished himself for his assiduity in study. When Jacques Quétif, who had planned and gathered nearly one-fourth of the material for a literary history of the Dominican Order, died in 1698, Echard was commissioned to complete the work. After much labour and extensive research in most European libraries this monumental history appeared in two quarto volumes under the title "Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum recensiti, nis his historici illustrati" etc. (Paris, 1721). Besides a sketch of Pignon and Salanc, and a list of each writer's works, with the dates and peculiarities of the various editions, Echard enumerates the unpublished, spurious, and doubtful works, with valuable indications as to their whereabouts. He displays throughout a keen, sane, and intelligent sense, which is highly praised by competent critics (Journal des Savants, LXIX, 574). A new and revised edition was prepared in 1908 by Rémi Coulon, O.P.

DAS PLEIE, Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte (1900), II, 165 seq.; MORTIER, "La Grande Encyclopædie," s. v. THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.

Echave, Baltasar de, painter, b. at Zumaia, Guipuzcoa, Spain, in the latter part of the sixteenth century; d. in Mexico about the middle of the seventeenth. As there was a painter of the same name, thought to be his son, he is known as Echave the Elder. He was one of the earliest Spanish artists to reach Mexico, arriving at about the same time as the end of the sixteenth century, as Sebastian Artiga and Alonso Vasquez. He was then a young man, and there is a tradition that his wife, also a painter, was his instructor. Echave, whose subjects religiously, had especial skill in composition, and his best works, which have much charm of colour and tenderness of treatment, are thought to recall those of Guercino for the galleries of the Order of San Carlos, in the City of Mexico, there are some of his best pictures, notably "The Adoration of the Magi", "Christ in the Garden", "The Martyrdom of San Antoniano", "The Holy Family", "The Visitation", "The Holy Sepulchre", "Saint Ann and the Virgin", "The Apparition of Christ and the Virgin to San Francisco", "The Martyrdom of San Ponziano", and "Saint Cecilia". In the church of San Jose el Real, generally known as the "Prospe" are several others, including "St. Isabel of Portugal", while he executed for the church of St. Thelma, above fifty altarpieces. In the cathedral is his "Candelaria" and a "San Sebastian", believed to be by his wife. Among the smaller paintings of Echave is one of San Antonio Abad with St. Paul, the first hermit. The artist also had a reputation as an author, among his works being one on the Biscayan language.

AUGUSTUS VAN CLEEF.

Echines, a titular see of Thessaly, Greece. Echines (IEXIVOS, also IEXIVOS) was situated on the northern shore of the Gulf of Lamia (Matalus Sinus). To-day it is a small village, Akhinos (AKXIV), of 500 inhabitants, in the valley of Phalara and the plain of Phthiotis. On the conical hill which rises above the village are the remains of the old walls. The city has been destroyed by earthquakes and rebuilt many times, particularly in 432 B.C. and in 423 A.D. Philip II of Macedon left it to the Malians, and Philip V took it from the Aetolians. It was fortified by Justinian. The see, mentioned in "Notitiae episcopatum" as late as the twelfth or thirteenth century, was a suffragan of Larissa. Three bishops are known: Theodore in 531; Peter in 451, and Aristotle in 560 (Lequevin, Orient Christians, II, 115).

LEAKE, Northern Greece (London, 1885), II, 80; PAULY-WISSOWA, Real-Encycl., s. v.

S. PrÉfiltrés.

Echternach, Abbey of (also Efternach, Lat. EPTERNACensis), a Benedictine monastery in the town of that name, in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and the Diocese of Trier. It was founded in 698 by St. Willibrord, an English monk of Ripon, who became the Apostle of Friesland and first Bishop of Utrecht. Although a bishop, he ruled the monastery as abbot until his death in 739. The abbey stood near the town on land given him for the purpose by St. Irmin, Abbess of Oeren and daughter of Dagobert II. It had many royal and other benefactors, including Pepin and Charlemagne, who conferred upon it great privileges. In 859 the monks were replaced by secular canons, as was so often the case with the early monasteries, but in 971 Emperor Otto I restored the Benedictine life there, bringing forty monks thither from the great Abbey of St. Maximin at Trier, one of whom, Ravenger by name, was made abbot. The monastery became very celebrated and was, during the Middle Ages, one of the most important in Northern Europe. It continued to flourish until the French Revolution, when it was suppressed, and the monks dispersed. The buildings put up by St. Willibrord were burnt down in 1017, and a new abbey was then erected. The church was Romanesque in style, but Gothic additions and alterations were made in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In 1797 it was sold and became a pottery manufactory, but in 1861 it was reacquired by the townspeople, through whose generosity and devotion it was restored and made a parish church. The reconsecration took place with great solemnity in 1895, and since that date the work of restoration and decoration has continued steadily. It is popularly called "the cathedral", though not the seat of a bishop. The conventual buildings, originally erected in 1017-31, have been frequently rebuilt and added to, and they were entirely modernized in 1732. At the suppression they became State property and have for many years served as a National Academy and Gymnasium. It was noted for a number of precious MSS. of very early date which it contained; some of them are now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris.

The Dancing Procession.—The Abbey of Echternach owes much of its fame, especially in modern times,
to the curious “dancing procession” which takes place annually on Whit Tuesday, in honour of St. Willibrord. The cult of the saint may be traced back almost to the date of his death, and the stream of pilgrims to his tomb in the abbey church has never ceased. The Emperor Lothair, Conrad, and many other nobles that would have been in Europe in the time of the saint may be numbered amongst them. The tomb stands before the high altar, and has been recently entirely renewed. On it is a recumbent effigy of the saint, and amongst other relics preserved there are a mitre, crozier, and chasuble said to have been used by him. The origin of the procession cannot be traced with certainty. Authentic documents of the fifteenth century speak of it as a regular and recognized custom at that time, but for earlier evidence there is only tradition to depend upon. The legend is that in 1417, when a pestilence raged amongst the cattle of the neighbourhood, the symptoms of which were a kind of trembling or nervous shaking followed by speedy death, the people thought that by imitating these symptoms, more or less, whilst imitating the intercession of St. Willibrord, the evil might be stayed. The desired result was obtained, and so the dancing procession of the saint’s tomb became an annual ceremony. Nowadays it is made an act of expiation and penance on behalf of afflicted relations and especially in order to avert epilepsy, St. Vitus’s dance, convulsions, and all nervous diseases. The function commences at nine o’clock in the morning at the bridge over the river, when a sermon is preached by the abbot of the monastery; after this the procession moves towards the basilica, through the chief streets of the town, a distance of about 14 kilometres. Three steps forward are taken, then two back, so that five steps are required in order to advance one pace. The result is that it is well after midday before the last of the dancers has reached the church. They go four or five abreast, holding each other by the hand or arm. Many bands accompany them, playing a traditional melody which has been handed down for centuries. A large number of priests and religious also accompany the procession and not infrequently there are several bishops as well. On arrival at the church, the dance is continued around the tomb of St. Willibrord, when litanies and prayers in his honour are recited, and the whole concludes with Benedictinism of the Blessed Sacrament. Though curious and even somewhat ludicrous, the people perform it in all seriousness and as a true act of devotion. It usually attracts to Echternach a great concourse of tourists as well as pilgrims, and as many as ten thousand people generally take part in it. The procession took place annually without intermission until 1777. Then, on account of some abuses that had crept in, the music and dancing were forbidden by the Archbishop of Trier, and in 1786 Joseph II abolished the procession altogether. Attempts were made to revive it ten years later but the French Revolution effectively prevented it. It was recommenced, however, in 1802 and has continued ever since. In 1826 the Government tried to change the day to a Sunday, but since 1830 it has always taken place on Whit Tuesday, as formerly.

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Eck von Messebrunn, JULIUS, Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, b. 18 March, 1545, in the Castle of Messebrunn, Spessart (Bavaria); d. 13 Sept., 1617, at Würzburg. Descended from an ancient family in the service of the archbishops of Mainz, he received a good education in the schools of that city, also at Louvain, Douai, Paris, Angers, Pavia, and Rome; it was in Rome that he became a licentiate of canon and civil law. In 1567 he entered on his duties as canon of Würzburg, an office to which he was appointed in 1554; in 1570 he became dean of the cathedral chapter, and in 1573, at the age of twenty-eight, even before his ordination to the priesthood, he was appointed Prince-Abbot of the Augustinian monastery of Heiligenkreuz. After Mephisto had combined to bring the diocese into a sad state. Deeply in debt and poorly administered, it had an almost entirely Protestant population. The clergy, in point of virtue and learning, were for the most part unequal to their task, and the cathedral chapter was adverse to any ecclesiastical reform. During the first ten years of Eck’s government the attempt to unite the Abbey of Fulda and the Bishopric of Würzburg, after the deposition of the Prince-Abbot Balthasar von Dernbach, caused much confusion. This was due to the youthful ambition of Eck and not, as some wish to interpret it, a sign of any anti-Catholic sentiments on his part. From the outset he endeavoured to carry out a thorough ecclesiastical restoration. For this reason he encouraged, as far as possible, the Jesuits and promoted their beneficent ministry. In the same spirit he conceived the idea of founding an academy at Würzburg. In 1590 he laid the foundation of the University of Würzburg, and despite all difficulties it was solemnly opened (2 Jan., 1582) and became a model for all similar Counter-Reformation institutions. Under the Jesuits it flourished, grew rapidly, and furnished the see with the priests and officials needed to counterbalance the growing influence of the Jesuits in the state. The bishop was now able to take decisive steps against Protestantism. He banished all Lutheran preachers from his territory and removed all priests who were unwilling to observe the rules of their office. The public officials had to be Catholics, and none but Catholic teachers could be appointed. He began, moreover, courses of careful instruction for non-Catholics, and to some extent threatened them with penalties and even with banishment. Within three years about 100,000 returned to the Catholic Church. Public worship was also improved by the introduction of new devotions, processions, and the establishment of confraternities. Bishop Eck restored ruinous monasteries or devoted their revenues to the erection of new parishes and to the building of three hundred new churches. The tapering towers of these churches, called after the bishop “Julius towers”, still preserve his memory. His most beneficial and lasting endowment, after the university, is the Julius Hospital, which he founded with the endowment of the abandoned monastery of Heiligenethal. By skilful administration he improved the decadent economic conditions of his ecclesiastical states, reduced taxes, perfected the administration of justice, and established many primary schools. In a word, he proved himself one of the most capable rulers of his time. Not only in his own diocese did he display an extraordinary and varied activity, but as the founder and soul of the Catholic League, he exercised a decisive influence on the future of Germany.

Buchinger, Julius Eck von Messebrunn (Würzburg, 1833); Wegel in Allgemeine deutsche Biographie, XIV, 671-84; PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Eck (Eckius), JOHANN, theologian and principal adversary of Luther, b. 3 Nov., 1440, at Würzburg, in Saxonia; d. 10 Feb., 1543, at Ingolstadt. His family name was Maier, and his father, Michael Maier, was for many years magistrate in the town, the latinized name of which, Eckius or Eccius, was adopted after 1505 by Johann. His uncle, Martin Maier, pastor at Rothenburg, received him in his house (1495) and educated him. In 1498, when he was twelve years old, he was admitted to the Heidelberg University; thence he went in 1499 to Tübingen where he received the degree of Master of Arts in 1501; then to Cologne and in 1502 to Freiburg in the Breisgau. After his graduation in the faculty of arts
he began the study of philosophy and theology, took courses at the same time in jurisprudence, physics, mathematics, and geography, joined the Humanistic movement, and in addition to Latin, learned Hebrew and Greek. Among his instructors at the university was a distinguished scholar. His uncles withdrew his allowance and Eck was obliged to earn his livelihood as a tutor while continuing his studies. In 1505 he was appointed rector of the *Artistenburse zum Pfou*, i.e. principal of the hall for students in arts at Freiburg, and received the degree of Bachelor of Theology. He lectured on the "Sentences" in 1506, was promoted to the licentiate in 1509; and in 1510, when twenty-four years old, he received the degree of Doctor of Theology. He had been ordained to the priesthood in 1508 with a papal dispensation from the age requirement. Shortly after graduating as doctor, he was invited (1510) by the Dukes of Bavaria to the professorship of theology in Ingolstadt. He was appointed pro-chancellor of the university in 1512, and during his professorate of thirty-two years filled repeatedly the offices of dean, pro-rector, and rector; he also served as pastor and was appointed canon in Eichstätt. At Freiburg and during his earlier years at Ingolstadt, his literary activity was not only in theology but also in other departments of science, as is evidenced by his writings which have been preserved partly in print and partly in MS. He engaged in geographical research and published a series of philosophical works, some of which were to serve as textbooks in the faculties of arts at Ingolstadt. In these writings he attempts to combine in a rational synthesis the advantages of the older philosophy with those of the new. His principal theological work during this period, entitled "Chrysopassus", treats of predestination with special reference to the dogmas of grace and free will which became, in consequence of Luther's outbreak, the centre of sharp discussion. The tenor of this treatise, written when its author was only twenty-eight years old, evinces both confidence and modesty.

Luther's appearance, and especially the Disputation at Leipzig (1519), formed the turning-point in Eck's intellectual development and in his activity as a theologian. Thenceforth he is a prominent figure in the history of that period. With a clear insight into the meaning of Lutheranism, he was the first to champion the cause of Catholic teaching against Protestant errors. He became Luther's most skilful, unctiring, and thoroughly equipped theologian. The rest of his life was spent in conflict with the Reformers in Germany and Switzerland. He defended the Catholic Church, its doctrines and its institutions, in his writings, in public debates, in his speeches at the diets, and in his diplomatic missions. For the betterment of ecclesiastical life and the spread of genuine reform he laboured earnestly by preaching to the people and by insisting on the scientific education of the clergy. As a reply to Luther's "theses" he wrote his "Obelisc", originally intended solely for the use of Eichstätt. Both Luther and Karlstadt answered bitterly and then it was agreed to submit the points at issue to the test of a public debate, which was held in Leipzig, 27 June-15 July, 1519. Eck came off victorious, exposed Luther's heresy, and won over as a loyal adherent to the Catholic standard, George, Duke of Saxony. During the same year he published several essays attacking the tenets of Luther, and grew steadily in prominence as an authority on theological questions. In 1520 he visited Rome to report on the condition of affairs in Germany and to secure the condemnation of Luther's heresy. He appealed on the matter of the papal legates, Leo X. was appointed prothonotary Apostolic, and was charged as papal legate, along with the two other legates, Alexander and Caracciolo, to carry out in Germany the provisions of the Bull "Exsurge Domine", which excommunicated Luther and condemned his 41 theses. The execution of this mandate was beset with difficulties on every side. Eck, through his "Epistola ad Carolum V" (1521), admonished Emperor Charles to enforce the papal bann. In the same year he went other prelates at the bazaar. His uncles, for whom he acted as counsellor in ecclesiastical affairs, and made a third visit to Rome in 1523. Meanwhile (1522) he had induced the Bavarian dukes to publish an edict in defence of the Catholic Faith. While in Rome he procured for the dukes, among other papal privileges, the right of enacting, independently of the bishops, decrees for the moral reform of the clergy; and furthermore the right to appropriate, for use against heretics and Turks, a fifth part of all church revenues.

Eck in the meantime combated Lutheranism by his letters and essays. Between the years 1522 and 1526 he published eight voluminous treatises against Luther. Through his influence the University of Ingolstadt retained its strictly Catholic attitude and strenuously opposed the rising Protestant institutions. Eck had also a considerable share in organizing the "Catholic Federation". Founded 5 June, 1524, by the leaders in Church and State for the purpose of preserving the Catholic faith and enforcing the Edict of Worms. He also defended in numerous essays the traditional doctrines of the Church against Zwingli and his adherents, and participated in the religious discussion in Baden (1526). When the Protestants, at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, promulgated the "Augsburg Confession", defining their religious views, Eck headed the Catholic champions upon whom the refutation of the articles in this confession devolved. Together with Wimpina and Coelius he represented the Catholic party at the conference (16 Aug.) between Catholic and Lutheran theologians relative to the "Confession" and its "Confutatio"; and as theologian he served on the sub-committee which canvassed the results of the conference. Zwingli also had presented at Augsburg a Confession of Faith and this Eck alone refuted. Eck then drew up 404 heretical theses upon which he challenged the Protestant theologians to public debate. The challenge was not accepted; the only answer from the Protestant party was a torrent of abuse. In the negotiations relative to the Council of Trent, Eck was consulted by the emperor, Charles V, as well as by the pope, Paul III, and was charged with the latter with preparing the latter's work. At the religious disputation in Worms (1540), Eck again appeared as the chief Catholic representative and debated with Melanchthon on the issues involved in the "Augsburg Confession". This discussion was continued during the Diet of Ratisbon (1541) to which, besides Eck, the emperor delegated as spokesmen on the Catholic side, Julius Pfug and Gropper. Eck maintained clearly and decisively the Catholic position, and quite disapproved the "Ratisbon Interim". He also went on a mission to England and the Netherlands in the interest of the Catholic cause.

In 1529 the bishops of Denmark invited Eck and Coelius to the discussion at Copenhagen; but neither appeared. Eck fully deserved the prominence gained by him during the struggle against Protestantism. He was the most distinguished theologian of the time in Germany, the most scholarly and courageous champion of the Catholic Faith. Frank and outspoken in his opinions, he was also inspired by a sincere love of truth; but he showed none the less an intense self-consciousness and the jovial bluntness of speech which characterized the men of that day. His adversaries, lampooning him publicly, taxed him with the papal legates and the papacy. The nature of the writings published against Eck and the readiness of the Protestants to calumny their victorious opponents, arouse strong suspicion as to the truth of these accusations and make them, so far as the evi-
dence goes, altogether improbable. In rebuttal it should be noted that Eck received the last sacraments with exemplary piety, and that his funeral in the Frauenkirche at Ingolstadt was marked by great solemnity.

As a writer Eck was prolific. His most important works are: "Loci communes adversus Lutherum et alios hostes ecclesiae" (Arguments against Luther and Other Enemies of the Church), printed first in 1525, 45th edition in 1576; essays on the Primacy of Peter, Penance, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Purgatory, etc. He also published many polemical writings against Luther, Zwingli, Bucer, and other leaders of the new religious movements. He compiled the results of the numerous disputations in which he participated and the sermons he preached on various subjects. In 1539 he published a German version of the Scriptures, translating the Old Testament from the original and adapting Erasmus' translation of the New Testament. Eck, however, was able as a theologian than as a stylist. He also published a collection of most of his writings prior to 1535 entitled "Opera Johannis Eckii contra Lulderum in 5 partes" (Ingolstadt, 1530-1535). In this edition parts I-11 are his polemical writings on the Primacy, Penance, etc. against Luther; parts III-IV, his reports of the debates and his polemics against Zwingli, Karlstadt, and Bucer; also the "Loci Commmunes", part V (4 vols.), his Latin sermons.

Wiedemann, Dr. Johann Eck (Ratisbon, 1865), with list of Eck's works: BRÜCHER in Allgemeine deutsche Biographie (Leipzig, 1877). P. 592-602; GÜNTHER, Johann Eck als Geolog in Forschungen zur Kultur- und Literaturgesch. (Munich, 1894), II, 140-192; SCHNITZER, Dr. Johann Eck u. das Historisch-politische Klüster (1871), CVIII, 324 sq., 372 sq., 473 sq., 1570 sq., 659 sq., 793 sq.; BAUCH, Die Anfänge des Humanismus in Ingolstadt (Munich, 1901); GUNTHER, Johann Eck als Junger Gelehrter in Reformationsgesch. Studien u. Texte (Müller, 1906), I.

J. P. KIRCH.

Eckart, Anselm, missionary, b. at Bingen, Germany, 4 August, 1721; d. at the College of Polstok, Polish Russia, 29 June, 1809. Entering the Society of Jesus at nineteen, he was sent as a missionary to Brazil. Two years after his arrival in that country, he and his brethren were seized on felons and carried to Portugal, where they languished in prison till death released them or till the king, in whose name it was all done, was summoned by his own judge. Father Eckart was confined for eighteen years in the underground dungeons of Almeida and St. Julian. He was afterwards able of his own sufferings and those of his companions in prison. Upon the death of Joseph I of Portugal in 1777, Pombal fell into disgrace, and those of his victims who survived were released from their loathsome dungeons. The Society of Jesus, which had been suppressed four years earlier by the Brief of Clement XIV, had continued to exist in Russia. Father Eckart applied for readmission, and for thirty-two years following had the consolation of hearing the habit of the proscribed order. After filling the office of master of novices at Dünaburg, he was sent to the College of Polstok, where that venerable confessor of Jesus Christ, the last survivor, perhaps, of the cruelties of Pombal, preserved in extreme old age the same vigour of soul which had sustained him in the missions and in captivity. He died full of days and merits in the eighty-eighth year of his age and the same day after his admission to the Society.


EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Eckhart (Eckert, Eckbert), Abbot of Schönau, b. in the early part of the twelfth century of a distinguished family along the Middle Rhine; d. 28 March, 1184, in the Abbey of Schönau. He was for a time canon in the collegiate church of Sts. Cassius and Florentius at Bonn. In 1155 he became a Benedictine at Schönau in the Diocese of Trier, and in 1166, after the death of the first abbot, Hildegard, he was elected at the head of the foundations. In the same year, he was enzeal, he preached and wrote much for the salvation of souls and the conversion of heretics. The Cathari, then numerous in the Rhineland, gave him especial concern. While a canon at Bonn he often had occasion to debate with heretics, and after his monastic profession, was invited by Archbishop Rainald of Cologne to debate publicly with the leaders of the sect in Cologne itself. His chief works are: "Sermones contra Catharos" with extracts on the Manicheans, from St. Augustine (P. L., CXCV); "De Laude Crucis" (ibid.); "Soliiloquium seu Meditations" (ibid.); "De Beatam Virginem Deiparam serva panezenuous" (ibid., CLXXXIV); "De sancta Elisabetha virginine", a biography of his sister, a Benedictine nun and a famous visionary and mystic (see Elizabeth of Schönau); a portion of which is in P. L., CXCV, also in Acta SS.' June, IV, 501 sqq. (ed. Palmé, 1897). A complete edition of his works is found in printed works.

SCHNEIDER in Kirchensen, E. v. Egbert: HUTNER, Namenliste (Innsbruck, 1889); IV; CHWALIB, Bibl. der (Paris, 1905), k. v.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEPFER.

Eckhart, Johann Georg von (called Ecard before he was ennobled), German historian, b. at Duningen in the principality of Kalenberg, 7 Sept., 1664; d. at Würzburg, 9 Feb., 1730. After a good preparatory training at Schulpforta he went to Leipzig University. A man of great culture, whose first teacher was Walther, he went at first, as the desire of his mother, to study theology, but soon turned his attention to philology and history. On completing his course he became secretary to Field-Marshal Count Fleming, the chief minister of the Elector of Saxony; after a short time, however, he went to Hanover to find a permanent position. Owing to his extensive learning he was soon useful to the famous historian Leibniz, who, in 1694, took Eckhart as assistant and was, until death, his large-hearted patron and generous friend. Through the efforts of Leibniz Eckhart was appointed professor of history at Halle in 1708, and in 1714 he was summoned to Halle. After the death of Leibniz he was made librarian and historiographer of the royal family of Hanover, and was soon after ennobled by Emperor Charles VI, to whom he had dedicated his work "Origines Austriace", for reasons which have never been clearly explained. When he gave up his position, in 1723, and fled from Hanover, perhaps on account of debt, to the Benedictine monastery of Corvey, and thence to the Jesuits at Cologne, where he became a Catholic. Not long after this the Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, Johann Philipp von Schönborn, appointed Eckhart his librarian and historiographer. In his work Eckhart was influenced by the new school of French historians, and gave careful attention to the so-called auxiliary sciences, above all to diplomacy; he also strove earnestly to follow a strictly scientific method in his treatment of historical materials. Together with Leibniz he considered as a founder of the critical school of historical writing. Besides the help he rendered Leibniz, of whom he prepared an affectionately respectful obituary (in Murr, "Jurnal für Kunstgeschichte", VII), he issued a number of independent works. His chief work, written as professor at Helmstedt, is his "De etymologico lingue germanicae hactenus impensis" (Hannover, 1711), a literary and historical study of all works bearing on the investigation of the Teutonic languages. At Hanover he compiled a "Corpus historiae medi aevi" (Leipzig, 1723), in two volumes; at Würzburg he published the "Commentarii de rebus
Francie Orientalis et episcopus Wireberghensis’ (17,29), also in two volumes, an excellent work whose rich materials are treated with scientific exactness.

**Patricius Schlagel.**

**Eckhart** (Eckard, Eccard), **Johann, Meister** (the Master), Dominican preacher, theologian, and mystic, b. about 1260 at Hochheim, near Gotha; d. in 1327 at Cologne. He made his philosophical and theological studies in the Dominican Order. Although a profound mystic he was also an able man of affairs, admirably manifesting the spirit of his order by uniting throughout his career great activity with contemplation. After a period of teaching he was made, in 1298, prior of the Dominican convent at Erfurt and vicar-provincial of Thuringia. Two years later he began to lecture at Paris, where in 1302 his order gave him the degree of Master of Sacred Theology. In the following year he was elected provincial of the Province of Saxony, to which office he was re-elected in 1307, when he was also appointed vicar-general of Bohemia and was also to reform its canons. His term of office having expired in 1311, he again took a professorial chair at Paris, whence he went in 1314 to teach at Strasbourg. After three years he was made prior at Frankfort. He finally returned to the schools in 1320, when he was made first professor of his order at Cologne, where he remained until his death. Eckhart’s activity was also displayed in the pulpit, of which he was an illustrious ornament, and by his writings in the form of treatises and sermons. As a preacher he disdained rhetorical flourish and avoided oratorical passion; but he effectively employed the simple art of man and gave remarkable effect to his hearty sympathy. Using pure language and a simple style, he left us in his sermons specimens of the beautiful German prose of which he was a master. In these sermons, really short catechetics, we find frequent citations from such writers as Seneca and Avicenna, as well as from the theologians and Fathers. His discourses are directed to the intellect rather than to the will and are remarkable for their depth of mystical teaching, which only those who were advanced in the spiritual life could fully appreciate. His favourite themes are the Divine essence, the relations between God and man, the promises and gifts of the human soul, and the acts of creation. These and kindred subjects he develops more at length in his treatises, which partake of the catechetical character of his sermons. In his sayings he presents them in short and pithy form. Although the writings of Eckhart do not present a connected and studied system, they reveal the mind of the philosopher, the theologian, and the mystic. The studies of Henry Denifle, O.P., while showing Eckhart to have been less of a philosopher than he was supposed to be, show also that he was a scholastic theologian of very superior merit, although not of the first order. He followed the teaching of Albert the Great and of St. Thomas Aquinas, but departed from their Scholastic method and form. Some opponents of Scholasticism, admiring his aphorisms and originality of method, have pronounced him to be the greatest thinker before Luther. And there have been Protestants who called him a Reformer. It was, however, as a mystic that Eckhart excelled. He is held by many to have been the greatest among the German mystics, and by all to have been the father of German mysticism. To Tauler and Suso he gave not only ideas but also a clear, simple style, possessed of a kindness like that of his own. Although he frequently quotes from the writings of the Pseudo-Areopagite and of John Scottus Eriugena, in his mysticism he follows more closely the teaching of Hugh of St. Victor.

The very nature of Eckhart’s subjects and the untechnicality of his language were calculated to cause him to be misunderstood, not only by the ordinary hearers of his sermons, but also by the Schoolmen who listened to him or read his treatises. And it must be added that some of the conclusions and treatises were Beghardic, quietistic, or pantheistic. But although he occasionally allowed harmful sentences to proceed from his lips or his pen, he not unfrequently gave an antidote in the same sermon and treatises. And the general tenor of his teaching shows that he was neither a Beghard, nor a quietist, nor a pantheist. While at Strasbourg, although he had no relations with the Beghards (q.v.), he was suspected of holding their mystical pantheism. Later, at Frankfort suspicion was cast upon his moral conduct, but it was evidently groundless; for, after an investigation ordered by the Dominican general, he was appointed to a prominent position at Cologne. Finally the charge was made at a general chapter of his order, held at Venice in 1325, that some of the German brethren were disseminating dangerous doctrine. Father Nichlaus, O.P. of Strasbourg, having been ordered by Pope John XXII in 1319 to make an investigation, declared in the following year that the works of Eckhart were orthodox. In January, 1327, Archbishop Heinrich of Cologne undertook an independent inquiry, whereupon Eckhart and Father Nichlaus appealed to Rome against his action and authority in this matter. But this next to the last work of the Dominican church in Cologne, Eckhart repudiated the unorthodox sense in which some of his utterances could be interpreted, retracted all possible errors, and submitted to the Holy See. His profession of faith, repudiation of error, and submission to the Holy See of his condemned propositions was declared by Pope John XXII in the Bull “Dolen tes refurmi” (27 March, 1329), by which the pontiff condemned seventeen of Eckhart’s propositions as heretical, and eleven as ill-sounding, rash, and suspected of heresy (Denninger, Echterhron, no. 428 sqq.; Hertzheim, Con. Germ., IV, 631).

The entire works of Eckhart have not been preserved. Pfeiffer in “Deutsche Mystiker des 14. Jahrhunderts” (1857). II, has given an incomplete edition of his sermons. Additions have been made by Siever in “Zeitschrift für deutsche Alterthümer,” XV, 373 sqq.; Wackernagel in “Altdutsche Predigten” (1876), 156 sqq.; and in “Altdutsche Predigten” (1875). Bech in “Germania,” VIII, 223 sqq., X, 391 sqq.; Jundt in “Histoire du Panthéisme” (1875), 231 sqq. is a translation in High German by Landauer, “Meister Eckharts mystische Schriften” (1903). Eckhart’s Latin works bore the title “Opus Tripartitionum.” In the first part (Opus propozitum) there are over one thousand theses, which are explained in the second part (Opus questionum), and proved in the third part (Opus expositionum). Of these only the three prologues are known. Denifle discovered also a portion of the third part, part of an explanation of Genesis, a commentary on Exodus, Sirach, xxiv, Wisdom, and other fragments.

---

**A. L. McMahon.**

**Eckhel**, Joseph Hillarius, German numismatist, b. 13 January, 1737, at Enzesfeld near Pottenstein, in Lower Austria, where his father, Johann Anton Eckhel, was steward to the Prince of Montecuccoli; d. 16 May, 1798. In 1745 he was sent to study in Vienna,
in 1751 was admitted into the Society of Jesus, and thirteen years later was ordained priest. He had studied humanities in Leoben and philosophy in Graz, besides mathematics, Greek, and Hebrew. The first fruit of his literary labours, produced in his twenty-first year, was an "Exercitium grammaticale in prophetiam Obadiea". He published as an appendix to the "Institutiones linguae sacrae" of P. J. Engstler. After his ordination, and probably for some time before, he was professor at the Jesuit gymnasium at Leoben and Steyer; probably also at Judenburg, and finally at the college of Vienna, where he taught poetry and rhetoric, and acquired a mastery of this and of which he handled with ease and elegance. We still possess two rather comprehensive odes from his pen, "Plausus Urbs" and "Plausus Ruris". He left, besides, two German poems written for special occasions, in the style of that period, and a speech of the same nature delivered on the occasion of the journey of Emperor Joseph II to Italy.

How he became a numismatist, Eckhel himself has told us in the preface to his "Numi veteres anecdoti". Whilst teaching at the Academia Cesiensis in Rome, he became interested in its cabinet of coins, which was under the supervision of his fellow-Jesuit, P. Kehl. The collection, which had been formed by the learned Erasmus Frohlich, who had edited many of the ancient coins; Eckhel set to work selecting the coins which were as yet unknown and unedited, and added thereto the unedited coins of the choice collections of Count Michael Vinczay and Paul Festetics. Forced by ill-health to abandon teaching, he devoted himself entirely to numismatics and archeology. With the permission of his superior he went to Italy in 1772 for his further education. In Bologna and Rome he studied all the accessible coin collections, but found his richest treasures in Florence. Rainaldo Cocchi, prefect of the Archdiocesan Museum, received him most cordially and obtained for Eckhel the commission to arrange the coins which had been collected by Cardinal Leopoldo de' Medici, and which had afterwards been very considerably increased. Cocchi, who died shortly after this, recommended Eckhel to the Archduke Peter Leopold, who in turn introduced him to his mother, the Empress Maria Theresa. Meanwhile (1773) the Society of Jesus was suppressed, and Eckhel, like his brethren, was secularized. Returning to Vienna through the South of France in January, 1774, he was delighted to be entrusted by the empress with the task of transferring the collection which belonged to the university college of the Jesuits, to the court cabinet, where, however, it received a separate place. In March of the same year, having acquired an excellent reputation as a numismatist, he was named director of the cabinet of ancient coins, with Duval as his superior. After the latter's death (1775) he was appointed his successor, and at the same time curator of the imperial coin cabinet. Eckhel was commissioned to deliver bi-weekly lectures on numismatics in the coin cabinet. In the fall of 1775 he was promoted to the chair of antiquities and of the historical auxiliary sciences in the university. In the same year his first numismatic publication appeared. J. von Bergmann writes of Eckhel's official work: "Eckhel, as is everywhere evident, was an expert administrator of the treasure committed to his charge. Without much ado, without ostentation, he wrote only what was needful and regarded merely that which was essential. Besides his very simple accounts and some reports written during the twenty-four years of his incumbency, only a very few documents concerning the collection of antique coins are in existence. He enriched the cabinet without advertising it." He obtained the means for these acquisitions from the proceeds of the sale of duplicates in his cabinet, and examples resulted from the amalgamation of the collection of Francis I with that of the imperial family. Moreover, the series of the Persian and Parthian kings were transferred from the Oriental to the ancient department. The collection of Duke Charles of Lorraine, that of the Count of Arundel, and a selection of coins from the collections of suppressed monasteries were added. By means of embassies and lucky finds the coin cabinet acquired important additions (e.g. those of Ostropataka and Sleighy-Somlyo). As a professor in the university Eckhel lectured on ancient numismatics. His delivery is described as being simple, clear, instructive, inspiring, and often abounding in humour. He was highly respected by his pupils. That he also enjoyed high repute among his colleagues is attested by his appointment as dean of the philosophical faculty the same year.

The first numismatic work published by Eckhel was "Numi veteres anecdoti ex museis Caesarii Vindobonensis, Florentini Magni Duci Ettruriae, Granelliani nunc Caesaroe, Vitizianoe, Festitectianoe, Savorgnani Veneto allisqu" (Vienna, 1775, in two 4to sections "Catalogus antiquitatum veterum II, 17 copper-plate engravings") (Vienna, in two large folio parts with numerous illustrations) followed four years later. Eckhel had given the collection entrusted to him an entirely new arrangement, discarding the time-honoured alphabetical order, and substituting quite a new system. He divided ancient numismatics into large departments: the first contained the coins minted by cities other than Rome, arranged according to the geographical situation of the countries as far as this was possible; the second comprised all the coins of the Roman Empire. First come the important but crude issues, then the less important and less instructive pieces with the inscription "Roma". They are followed by those of the various families, emperors, and empresses, all arranged as far as possible in chronological order. Those whose date could not be exactly obtained are placed after each emperor as unclassified in alphabetical succession. "By this method", says Eckhel, "the author was enabled to rectify countless errors which Mezzabarba had forced upon us in his General Catalogue" (Imperator Romanorum numismata, Milan, 1683). And to make these corrections principally led him to prepare this catalogue for print. In it he gives an account, not on outside authority, but from personal observation and after lengthy and painstaking research, of everything instructive which so numerous a collection presents. The work was written in Latin and, "contrary to the present ornamental style, in the simplest language". This catalogue was followed by "Syloge II, numerorum veterum anecdotorum Thesauri Caesaris" and "Descrcriptio numerorum Antiochiae" (1786), then by the classical work "Doctrina numerorum veterum", in eight volumes (1792-1798). Friedrich Kenner says of this: "Misguided dilettantism had produced most mischievous results in the field of numismatics. Eckhel, through his system, wanted of critical judgment, and the disorderly arrangement of the literature had begotten confusion and distrust, which prevented numismatists from taking the place among other sciences to which it was so naturally entitled. With his natural critical faculty Eckhel mastered all the literature of his subject, eliminated errors and forgeries with the help of his profound learning, and then combined the results into an organic whole in his 'Doctrina numerorum veterum'". Eckhel has become the founder of the scientific numismatics of classical antiquity and taken his place alongside of his contemporaries, Heyn, and Winckelmann.
maties, hitherto despised, he changed into a kind of encyclopedia of classical antiquities, which includes extensive and much-used sources for other branches of archaeology." The addenda to this work which Eckhel entered in his manuscript copy were edited by his successor, M. B. M. S. B. M. S.

By command of Emperor Joseph II, Eckhel wrote an excellent manual, "Kurzgefasste Anfangsgründe zur alten Numismatik" (Vienna, 1757; 2nd ed., 1807). The work appeared in a Latin translation in 1799 and in a French revision in 1825. He edited, besides, "Choix des pièces gravées du Cabinet Impérial". Furthermore, a number of smaller treatises still exist in manuscript form. His "Inscriptions veteres" was used by Theodore Mommsen. He also left an extensive correspondence with the most prominent representatives of his branch of learning (Abbe Barthélemy, R. Cosczynski, L. Lanz, G. Marini, F. Séguier, and others).

Eckhel died shortly after the completion of his "Doctrina". He was, as Bergmann writes, "a man of firm and decided character, serious, but at the same time cheerful, indulging in sarcasm, and at times more than a little literary arrogance". He used his extensive learning to correct thousands of blunders committed by other writers, and was modest and not at all disputatious in his controversies. He spoke as he thought and acted as he spoke." Later scholars rank Eckhel's scientific importance equally high; in the first century of his birth a mere trick (by Manfredini) with the inscription, systematics, relig. nume. antiq. condi. to distich which Michael Denis dedicated to his dead friend will vindicate its own truth:—

Eckhelium brevis hora tulit, sed diva Moneta
Scripta viri sevee vivere seca jubet.


KARL DOMANIG.

ECLECTICISM (Gr. ἐκλέχεσθαι; Lat. eligere, to select), a philosophical term meaning either a tendency of mind in a thinker to conciliate the different views or positions taken in regard to problems, or a system in philosophy which seeks the solution of its fundamental problems by selecting and uniting what is deemed true in the various philosophical schools. In the first sense, eclecticism is a characteristic of all the great philosophers, with special development in some, such as Leibniz; an element of the integral method of philosophy more or less emphasized in the divers schools. The term eclectics, however, is properly applied to those who accept Eclecticism as the true and fundamental system of philosophy. It is with Eclecticism in this strict sense that we are dealing here.

As a rule, in the history of philosophy, Eclecticism follows a period of scepticism. In presence of conflicting doctrines regarding nature, life, and God, the human mind desires of a system of science and knowledge about these important subjects. Eclecticism then aims at constructing a system broad and vague enough to include, or not to exclude, the principles of the divers schools, though giving at times more importance to those of one school, and apparently sufficient to furnish a basis for the conduct of life in the later period of Greek philosophy, during the two centuries preceding the Christian Era and the three centuries following. Eclecticism is represented among the Epicureans by Aeschyleades of Bithynia; among the Stoics by Boethus, Panetius of Rhodes, (about 180-110 B.C.), Posidonius (about 50 B.C.), and later on by the neo-Cynics, Demetrius Phellinus (about A. D. 150); in the New Academy by Philo of Larissa (about 80 B.C.) and Antiochus of Ascalon (d. 68 B.C.); in the Peripatetic School by Andronicus of Rhodes (about 70 B.C.), the editor and commentator of the works of Aristotle, and later on by Aristocles (about A. D. 180), Alexander of Aphrodisias (about A. D. 200), the physician Galen (A. D. 131-201), Porphyry in the third, and Simplicius in the sixth century of our era. The eclectic school, by its character, the one which was best suited to theEstado of the Romans. With the exception of Lucretius's doctrine, their speculative philosophy was always and altogether eclectic, while Stoicism dominated in their ethical philosophy. Cicero is, in Rome, the best representative of the school. His philosophy is a mixture of the scepticism of the Middle Ages, Stoicism and Peripateticism. The School of the Septuagint, with Quintus Sextius (80 B.C.), Sotion, and Celsus, was partly Stoic and Cynic, partly Pythagorean. Under the empire, Seneca, Epicurus the slave, and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius combined the principles of Stoicism with some doctrines taken from Platonism. The neo-Platonic School of Alexandria, in the second and third centuries after Christ, is considered by some as eclectic; but the designation is not exact. The school borrows, indeed, many of its principles from Pythagoreanism, Stoicism, Peripateticism, and even especially from Platonism; but all are dominated by and interpreted according to certain principles of religious mysticism which make this neo-Platonicism a genuine form of monotheistic system. The same may be said of the Christian writers of this school who take some of their philosophical principles from the dominant systems, but who are guided in their choice as well as in their interpretation by the teaching of Christian revelation.

In modern times Eclecticism has been accepted in Germany by Wolff and his disciples. It has received its most characteristic form in France in the nineteenth century from Victor Cousin (1792-1867) and his school, which is sometimes called the Spiritualistic School. Drawn away from sensationalism by the teaching of Royer Collard, Cousin seeks in the Scottish School a sufficient foundation for the chief metaphysical, moral, and religious truths. Failing in this attempt, he takes up the different doctrines then current; he is successively influenced by Maine de Biran whom he calls "the greatest metaphysician of our time", by the writings of Kant, and by personal intercourse with Schelling and Hegel; finally, he turns to the works of Plato, Plotinus, and Proclus, only to come back to Descartes and Leibniz. He then reaches the conclusion that the successive systems elaborated throughout the foregoing ages contain the full development of human thought; that the actual truth is to be found in a system resulting from the happy fusion, under the guidance of common sense, of the fragmentary thoughts expressed by the different thinkers and schools of all ages. Four great systems, he says, express and summarize the whole development of human speculation: sensism, idealism, scepticism, and mysticism. Each contains a part of the truth; none possesses exclusively the whole truth. Human thought cannot represent any new system of philosophy without neglecting any of the old ones. Not the destruction of all the foregoing, but the reduction of all to one, will put us in possession of the truth.

There is, indeed, something true in Eclecticism. It would be folly for each thinker to deliberately ignore all that has been said and taught before him; and each must find a method within the principle of the period of his own life. The experience and knowledge acquired by past ages is a factor in the development of human thought. The history of philosophy is useful; it places at our disposal the truths already discovered, and by showing us the errors into which philosophy has fallen, it guides us against the same, and against the methods which have caused them. This is the element of value contained in the system. But Eclecticism errs when it substitutes for personal reflection
as the primary source of philosophy a mere fusion of systems, or the history of philosophy for philosophy proper. Eclecticism does not furnish us with the ultimate principles of philosophy or the criterion of certitude. We cannot say that philosophy has reached the highest degree of precision either in its science or in presentation of every problem; nor that it knows all that can be known about nature, man, or God. But even if this were the case, the principles of Eclecticism cannot provide us with a firm, complete, and true system of philosophy. Cousin says that there is some truth in every system; supposing this to be exact, this partial truth has to be derived at first through principles and a rule of certitude which are independent of Eclecticism. When Cousin declares that there is a mingling of truth and error in every system, he evidently assumes a principle superior and antecedent to the very principle of Eclecticism. The eclectic must first separate error from truth, before building into a system the results of his discrimination. But this is possible only on the condition of passing a judgment upon each of these systems and therefore of having, quite apart from history, some rational principle as an ultimate criterion. In a word, Eclecticism is considered as a study of the opinions and theories of others in order to find in them some help and enlightenment, has its place in philosophy; it is a part of philosophical method; but as a doctrine it is altogether inadequate.

G. M. SAUVAGE.

Ecstasy.—Supernatural ecstasy may be defined as a state which, while it lasts, includes two elements: the one, interior and indivisible, when the mind rivets its attention on a religious subject; the other, corporal and visible, when the activity of the senses is suspended, so that not only are external sensations incapable of influencing the soul, but considerable difficulty is experienced in awakening such sensations, and this whether the ecstatic himself desires to do so, or others attempt to quicken the organs into action. That quite a large number of the saints have been granted these gifts is attested by the Sanctoralists; but in these days even free-thinkers are slow to deny historical facts that rest on so solid a basis. They no longer endeavour, as did their predecessors of the eighteenth century, to explain them away as grounded on fraud; several, indeed, abandoning the eclectic theory, current in the nineteenth century, have advocated the psychological explanation, though they exaggerate its force.

False Views on the Question of Ecstasy.— The first three errors here mentioned are psychological in nature; they fail to estimate at its proper value the content of ecstasy; the other false theories spoken of identify this state with certain morbid physical or psychological conditions.

(1) Certain infidel philosophers maintain that during an ecstasy there is a lessening of intellectual power, that at a certain stage there is an annihilation of the faculties. This is the theory of Muries and de Leuba. The arguments for this view are based upon an exaggerated interpretation of certain phrases used by the mystics. Their accounts, however, (those, for instance, of Blessed Angela of Foligno), give the lie to such an explanation, for the mystics state clearly that they experience, not only the fulness, but the superabundance of intelligence, an increase of activity of the highest faculties. Now, in a science that is based on observation, as is mysticism, we are not justified in brushing aside the numerous and consistent testimonies of those who have tested the facts, and putting in their place the creations of the imagination.

(2) The theory of unconsciousness distorts the facts so unscrupulously that some writers have preferred a theory less crude, i. e. the emotional explanation. The ecstatic, it is admitted, is not merely passive, rather, he experiences violent emotions, in consequence of which he loses the use of the senses; and as there is nothing new to occupy his attention, it follows that his mind is taken up by some trifling thought, so trifling, indeed, that these writers deem it unworthy of their attention. This theory classifies with historical data than does the first, since it does not wholly eliminate the activity of the ecstatic; but it denies half the facts emphatically urged by the mystical writers.

(3) It has been said that ecstasy is perhaps a phenomenon wholly natural, such as might well be occasioned by a strong concentration of the mind on a religious subject. But if we are not to rest satisfied with arbitrary conjectures, we must show that similar facts have been observed in spheres of thought other than purely religious. The ancients attributed natural ecasies to three or four sages, such as Archimedes and Socrates, but, as the present writer has proved elsewhere, these stories are founded either on inconclusive arguments or upon false interpretation of the facts (Des grâces d'oraison, c. xxxi).

(4) The rigid condition of the ecstatic's body has given rise to a fourth error. Ecstasy, we are told, is another form of lethargy or catalepsy. But, the loss of consciousness, however, that accompanies these latter states points to a marked difference.

(5) In view of this, some have sought to identify ecstasy with the hypnotic state. Physically, there are usually some points of contrast. Ecstasy is always accompanied by noble attitudes of the body; whereas in hospitals one often marks motions of the body that are convulsive or repelling; barring, of course, any counter-command of the hypnotist. The chief difference, though, is to be found in the soul. The intellectual faculties, in the case of the saints, became keener. The sick in our hospitals, on the contrary, experience during their trances a lessening of their intelligences, while the gain is only a slight representation in the imagination. A single idea, let it be ever so trivial, e.g. that of a flower, or a bird, is strong enough to fasten upon it their profound and undivided attention, by the mere fact of being an abstraction from the field of consciousness; and this precisely the starting-point of all theories that have advanced to explain hypnotic ecstasy. Moreover, the hallucination noticed in the case of these patients consists always of representations of the imagination; they are visual, aural, or tactile; consequently they differ widely from the purely intellectual perceptions which the saints usually enjoy. It is no longer possible, then, to start with the extremely simple hypothesis that the two kinds of phenomena are one and the same.

A comparison of the effects that follow these states will bring out more clearly the essential difference between the two. (a) The neuropath, after an hypnotic trance, is dull, lifeless, and depressed. (b) His will is extremely weak. In this abnormally weak is to be sought the reason why the subject can no longer resist suggestion. These are not cured by the greatest effort of will, lifeless, and helpless, pass their days in idle dreams. (c) The level of their morality is frequently as low as that of their intelligence. From a threefold point of view, then, there is a contrast between their case and that of the saints who have been granted ecasies. (a) The neuropath projects lofty and difficult in the execution; in proof of this assertion we might appeal to the history of the founders of religious orders. (b) Their will-power is second to none in energy; so strong, indeed, as to enable them to break through all opposition, especially that which arises from their own na-
ture. (c) Lastly, the saints keep before them a moral ideal of a lofty character, the need of self-forgetfulness if they would give themselves to the glory of God and the temporal and spiritual welfare of their fellow-men. The hysterical subject of hypnotism, on the contrary, comes near to none of this nobility of life.

(6) An attempt has been made to rank ecstasies with somnambulism, with which have also been classed, but with greater reason, the trances of spirit mediums. The case which most approaches, on the surface, the ecstasies of the saints is that of Helen Smith, of Geneva, whom Professor Fournier studied carefully during the closure of the nineteenth century. Damascus, in the crisis of spontaneous somnambulism she described her visions in word or in writing. At one time she saw the inhabitants of the planet Mars, at another she dwelt among the Arabs or the Hindus of the fourteenth century. In 1864 she had crises lasting a quarter of an hour, during which she painted in oil pictures of Christ and the Madonna, though she was quite unconscious of what she was doing. The ecstasies of the saints were, it was thought, of exactly the same nature. There are, however, some striking differences: (a) From the moral viewpoint the visions of the saints partake of a remarkable change in manner of life, and lead them to the exercise of the most difficult virtues. Helen experiences nothing of the kind. She is a good woman, that is all. (b) Unlike the saints, she remembers nothing of what she has seen. (c) While the vision lasts, the faculties at play are not the same. In the case of the saints, the activity of the imagination is arrested during the culminating periods, and throughout always holds a subsidiary place, while the intellect undergoes a marvellous expansion. In the case of Helen, the imagination alone was at work, and its objects were of the most commonplace character. Not a single elevated thought, simple of visions of houses, animals, or plants—notthing but a mere copy of what we see on earth. Such descriptions serve only as stories to amuse children.

(7) A seventh theory would identify ecstasies with the wild reveries and disordered fancies occasioned by the use of alcohol, ether, chloroform, opium, morphine, or nitrous oxide. In the first place, the physical condition is quite different. No one, for instance, would mistake the exalted attitude of an ecstasis for that of a man under the influence of narcotics. Secondly, the mental perceptions are not the same in character. For if in the Saints the drugs we have described have not lose all consciousness, if he still retains any ideas, they consist of extravagant, incoherent images, whereas the ideas and thoughts of the mystic are throughout coherent and elevated. Finally, the victims of alcohol and of opium, on recovering from their debauch, remain in a state of sottishness. Thought and action are simultaneously lessened; the moral and the social life have equally suffered. The use of narcotics has never enabled a man to lead a purer life or to better himself and others; experience points to the contrary.

The above, then, are false views that have been entertained in the question of ecstasies. Nor should it be a matter of surprise that free-thinkers should have ventured on these explanations. It is but the conclusion that follows logically from the principles with which they start, i.e., there is no such thing as the supernatural. They must, then, at any cost, seek the causes in natural phenomena. (See Contemplation.)

B. Angela de Fulgino Visionum et Instructionum Liber (reprinted Cologne, 1601); Acta SS., 4 Jan.: tr. Crusoehake (New York, 1920); Eutychianus, Opera omnia (Cologne, 1652); Leonis ed., Obras de Santa Teresa (Salamanca, 1888); Alvarez de P. d. Inquisitionis poxs (Lyons, 1617); Joaquina de Sez, S. Th. mystica (Seville, 1710-1714); Poullain, Des grocs d'oraison, 6th ed. (Paris, 1909).

Aug. Poullain.

Ecsthesia. See Heraclitus, Emperor: Monothelites.

Ecuador, Republic of (La República del Ecuador), an independent state of South America, bounded on the north by Colombia, on the east by Brazil, on the south by Peru, and on the west by the Pacific Ocean. The north-western corner of the State is called the Equator, hence its name. No part of America has been so much looked upon for scientific explorations, specially geographic and physiographic, as the first half of the nineteenth century. One, sent out in 1715 by the French Government for the purpose of measuring the meridian near the Equator, returns the remarkable results, that the 20 degrees north and south of the Equator, the Coasts of Ecuador (1799–1804) forever associates Alexander von Humboldt with the history of the New World.

Area, Physical Features, etc.—Ecuador is the smallest of the three Republics of the South American republics. It forms, approximately, an isosceles triangle wedged between Colombia and Peru. Indenting the southwest coast is the Gulf of Guayaquil within which lies the large Island of Puná. As in the case of other South American republics, the boundaries of Ecuador are ill-defined and subject to modification by treaty. Its area is variously given as from 80,500 to 152,000 sq. miles. It is cut through by volcanic ranges, divided the Caroni River, lying about 90°–92° west long., 10 degrees off the coast, and covering from 2400 to 3000 sq. miles. These islands are at least in number, only one of which (Isabella or Albemarle) is inhabited by some two hundred people. The eastern half of Ecuador forms long, wooded, and traversed by many rivers emptying into the Maranon or Upper Amazon; the western is very mountainous, the high Andes chain dividing the two sections. This mountain range runs nearly due south from the southern boundary of Colombia to the Peruvian frontier. It has a number of high peaks, all the volcanic origin of which is between Chimborazo (20,500 ft.), and many volcanoes. Of the latter, Cotopaxi (19,615 ft.), Tunaygaru (16,690 ft.), and Sungai (17,464 ft.) are still active; Antisana (19,335 ft.), Pichincha (15,918 ft.), etc. have been extinct for a century or more; while Altar, Cotocachi, etc. show traces only of activity in ages past long. The Ecuadorian table-land and higher mountain valleys are temperate, though the temperature is low in the greater altitudes. The year is divided into the dry and the wet season. Under the Equator, however, there is very little difference between the seasons. All the coast valleys and plains are affected by the climate generally unhealthy. Ecuador has but one navigable river, the Guayas, which empties into the Gulf of Guayaquil. The other streams of Western Ecuador are of little importance.

The flora is luxuriant except in high altitudes. Both lower slopes of the Andes are densely wooded. On the coast there is an arid zone of limited extent; the larger portion, however, is very fertile as far as the Peruvian boundary at Tumbez. The inland forests in the South are rich in cinchona bark, and extend nearly to a height of nearly 10,000 feet. Then follows a sub-Andean zone for the next 3200 feet, where cereals thrive in an average temperature of from 55° to 59° F. This is followed by what are called the páramos, cold and stormy wastes, treeless, and exposed to daily snows, which attain an altitude of 15,000 feet above sea-level, and where the tough puna-grass flourishes. On the eastern slope of the Andes dense forests are found again and the cinnamon tree. Animal life is tropical and is found in proportion to the vegetation. As far as known Ecuador is fairly rich in minerals. It is the only South American state, with the exception of Colombia, where emeralds have been found in any quantity (at Montes Azules and Esmeraldas); their location, however, is uncertain.

The population is estimated at 1,272,000, of whom about 400,000 are supposed to be Indians. Exact statistics, however, do not exist. Of the 400,000, one-
half is allowed to the wild forest-tribes of the Eastern section and the other half to the remnants of the diverse sedentary tribes which formerly occupied the table-land and coast. The whole country is divided into fifteen provinces besides the Eastern territory and the islands.

History.—Of the pre-Columbian conditions and languages of the Indians of Ecuador little is known. The coast tribes have almost disappeared and those of the higher regions have adopted Spanish customs. That they differed from the Peruvian Quichua seems likely. The Sea-Quichua were the Caingang and the Purus or Puruaya; a tribe known as the Ngaric is mentioned in the neighbourhood of Quito. They were all sedentary; knew how to work gold, silver, copper, and possibly bronze; and practised the fetichism common to primitive Americans. The coast tribes built their houses of wood and cane, while those of the interior used stone. Some were skilful navigators, some of their vessels being estimated at thirty tons, and propelled by oars and cotton sails.

The Spaniards, led by Francisco Pizarro, first saw the coast of Ecuador in 1533. From Tacna or Atacama they touched Paruro, dispatched a pilot, to the south. In the account of Pizarro we have the earliest description of the Ecuadorian coast people. He sailed south beyond the present limits of Peru, verifying his pilot's report, and in 1528 returned to Spain to prepare for the conquest of Peru. He arrived in the great days of 1531, landing on the south along the shore, established himself, despite the hostility of the natives, on the Island of Pumá. The permanent Spanish occupation of Ecuador, however, began in 1534, from Pura in Peru under Sebastian de Belalcazar. He had a tedious campaign to Quito, in which the Indians resisted by the Cofanes. In 1535 three towns were established: San Francisco de Quito (15 Aug.) at Riohamba, thirteen days later transferred to its present site, Chimbo; and Guayaquil, also originally founded at a place distinct from the one it now occupies. Meanwhile Pedro de Alvarado had headed on the coast with a considerable force from Guatemala. Reaching the central plateau he was confronted by Belalcazar and Diego de Almagro the elder. An amicable agreement was reached, and Gonzalo Pizarro pushed into the cinnamon country, but made little headway. He had to turn back. His lieutenant, Alvarado, however, floated down the Amazon and landed on the Isle of Trinidad, whence he carried to Spain the first information about south-eastern Ecuador.

The second epoch of civil wars in Peru, the uprising of Gonzalo Pizarro against the viceroy Nuñez de la Fara on an end with the defences of the viceroy near Quito, 16 Jan., 1546. Quito became the head-quarters of the Crown's representative, and with this as a basis the independence movement was put down. During the colonial period the Church founded institutions of learning such as the University of Quito and established a printing press at the same place in 1760. Political disturbances were few, but during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries volcanic and seismic phenomena were frequent and often disastrous. An attempt was made in 1680 to overthrow Spanish power, and Ecuador, Colombia, and Venezuela, together with the rest of Spanish South America, then engaged in efforts towards independence. In 1820 Guayaquil succeeded in throwing off Spanish control, and the battle of Pichincha (22 May, 1822) finally put an end to the domination of the mother country. Panama and Ecuador, with Colombia and Venezuela, next formed an independent confederacy until 1830, when the union was dissolved and the first Ecuadorian congress met. Since then Ecuador has been torn by internal dissensions and foreign complications, chiefly with Colombia. The opposing political parties are the Conservatives, or Clericals, and the Liberals. Since 1898 the latter have been in power and have to a great extent adopted a policy of secularization in church matters. From 1833 to 1908 Ecuador has had nineteen presidents.

Government, Education, etc.—Ecuador is a constitutional republic. From 1830 to 1883 it had not less than ten constitutions, and that was the last. The executive head is the president, elected with the vice-president directly by the people for a term of four years. The senators (30) and the deputies (41) are also elected by direct vote, the former for four, the latter for two years. Congress meets biennially at Quito, the capital, on 10 August, and is in session for sixty days. The principal cities are: Quito (50,000), Guayaquil (151,000), Cuenca (30,000), Riobamba (18,000), and five of 10,000 or more inhabitants. Guayaquil is the chief seaport. In 1904 Ecuador had 108 miles of railroad and 2545 miles of telegraph, both of which have since been added to. The monetary unit is the sucre, about equal to the peso of other Spanish-American countries, but subject to fluctuation in value. The chief exports are cacao, vegetable ivory, indigo, rubber, and straw hats.

Educational statistics are scanty. There is a university at Quito with two professors and two hundred and sixteen students (1905). Institutions for higher education are found at Guayaquil and Cuenca. The number of secondary schools is 35; primary schools 1688 with 7498 teachers and 63,880 pupils; and 9 high schools and colleges.

Religion.—Soon after the discovery of the country missionaries began their labours in Ecuador, and in 1545 the Bishopric of Quito was erected. Work among the different Indian tribes on the tributaries of the Amazon was difficult, and the Dominican missions were destroyed in 1599 by the savage Jivaros. Later, however, the Dominicans re-established themselves and were assisted by the Jesuits who had been in Quito since 1596. By the close of the seventeenth century Ecuador was well evangelized, but after the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767, who on the Napo alone had thirty-three missions with 100,000 inhabitants, the Dominicans were unable to keep up the work and the natives fell back into paganism. The revolution destroyed all traces of two hundred years of untiring labours. Since 1848 Ecuador has formed an ecclesiastical province. The population is Catholic except for a small number of foreigners and a few pagan Indians in the East.

Up to 1861 the government was in the hands of the Liberal and largely anti-Catholic party. When Garcia Moreno (q. v.) was elected president (1861—65 and 1869—75), however, he reorganized civil and religious affairs and secured a concordat (20 Nov., 1863) which was concluded with Rome, new dioceses were erected, schools and missions given to the Jesuits, who had been recalled) and others, and in 1874, at the time of the spoliation of the Holy See, ten per cent of the State's income was guaranteed to the pope. Moreno was murdered 6 Aug., 1875, and his death not only put an end to the concordat, but under the new regime which succeeded him a series of persecutions occurred. In 1885, when Bishop Schumacher took charge, nearly all the native clergy were suspended and replaced by Europeans and practically a new hierarchy established. The religious and moral education of the people was likewise in bad condition. The revolution of Alfaro in 1895 was a severe blow to the Church. The orders, among them the Capuchins, Salesians, Missionaries of Steyl, and the various sisterhoods, were all abolished. Schumacher continued and the Church rose, although her mission was not yet accomplished.

The State religion is the Catholic, but other creeds are not interfered with. Since tithes were abolished the State has provided for the maintenance of Catholic worship; it also supports religious educational institutions, such as the three seminaries at Quito and six elsewhere, one in each of the six dioceses. Civil marriage was recognized in 1901, and two years later the
Ecclesiastical Affairs: Canoels and Maças, Mendes and Gualaquiza, Napo, Zamora.

The first known printed description of the Ecuadorian coast is made by Juan de Samano, Relación de los primeros descubrimientos de Francisco Pizarro y Diego de Almagro (1525-26) in Documentos para la historia de España, 5. Accounts of eyewitnesses on the conquest: Francisco de Xerez, Verdadera relación della Conquista de la Peru y provincias de lo que llamamos la nueva Castilla (ed. 1834; Salamanca, 1827; and translation); La Conquista del Perú llamada la nueva Castilla (ed. 1829; Salamanca); Martinez, Relacion del descubrimiento y conquista del perú (c. 1571) in Doc. para la hist. de España, 5.

Later sources are: Ceza, Primera Parte de la Cronica del Peru; Augustin de Zara, Hist. del Descub, y Con. del Perú (Antwerp, 1553); Santa Clara, Hist. de las guerras civiles del Perú (Madrid, 1904); Ceza, La Guerra de Quito in Doc. para la Hist. de España, 5.

H. E. A. Bandelier.


Edda, a title applied to two different collections of old Norse literature, the poetic or "Elder Edda" and the prose or "Younger Edda." Properly speaking the title "Edda" is given to the whole body of the latter work, having been given to the former through a misnomer.

I. The "Younger Edda": the work of the Icelandic historian and statesman Snorri Sturluson (1178-1241), is a treatise on poetry for the guidance of the skalds or Icelandic poets. The title "Edda" is not given to this work in the most important manuscript with which we are possessed of it, the "Upsala Codex," dating from about 1300. The meaning of the word Edda is not certain. The older explanation of "great-grandmother" is now generally discarded, the most commonly accepted rendering being 'poetics' (from Óðhr, 'spirit', 'thought'). Some scholars derive the word from Oddi, the name of a place in southern Iceland, where Snorri received his earliest training. The work itself was intended to supply to the skald all the necessary information concerning mythology, poetic diction, and versification. Besides a formal (preface) of later origin it contains three parts. (1) "Gyftragnarminn" (Gylfi's Deception), an abstract of old Scandinavian mythology in the form of a dialogue between King Gýfi and three gods. Appended to this are the "Bragurærhoður" (Bragi's Sayings), stories about Odín and Thor, related by Bragi, the god of poetry, and the "Sighvataugdr" (Psalms of the Gímr). The "Younger Edda" (Prose Edda) is a collection of poetic paraphrases (konningar) and synonyms (okend hendi), interspersed with mythological and legendary stories. (3) "Háttatal," a panegyric on the Norwegian King Håkon Håkonarson and Jari Skúli, containing one hundred and two strophes, each of which is composed in a different metre. This is followed by a prose commentary written, however, after Snorri's death by an unknown author. The work was unfinished when Snorri died and was subsequently revised and amplified by other writers, notably Sakariyo, Torr, Perto, Yorico (1771), Riobamba (1863). There are also four vicariate Apostolic subject to the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs: Canoels and Maças, Mendes and Gualaquiza, Napo, Zamora.

The first known printed description of the Ecuadorian coast is made by Juan de Samano, Relación de los primeros descubrimientos de Francisco Pizarro y Diego de Almagro (1525-26) in Documentos para la historia de España, 5. Accounts of eyewitnesses on the conquest: Francisco de Xerez, Verdadera relación della Conquista de la Peru y provincias de lo que llamamos la nueva Castilla (ed. 1834; Salamanca, 1827; and translation); La Conquista del Perú llamada la nueva Castilla (ed. 1829; Salamanca); Martinez, Relacion del descubrimiento y conquista del perú (c. 1571) in Doc. para la hist. de España, 5.

Later sources are: Ceza, Primera Parte de la Cronica del Peru; Augustin de Zara, Hist. del Descub, y Con. del Perú (Antwerp, 1553); Santa Clara, Hist. de las guerras civiles del Perú (Madrid, 1904); Ceza, La Guerra de Quito in Doc. para la Hist. de España, 5.

H. E. A. Bandelier.
poems of this kind not found in the "Codex Regius" were edited by Heusler and Ranis, "Édica Minor" (Dortmund, 1903). The best translation into German is the metrical version of Hugo Gering (Leipzig, 1892). The first English version (of the mythological songs only) was made by A. S. Cottle (London, 1797). A complete English version is that of Benj. Thorpe (London, 1855–66). The songs are also translated in Vignolus and Powell’s "Corpus poeticum boreale" (Oxford, 1883), and some songs are also rendered in Magnusson and Morris's "Translation of the Poems of King Olaf" (London, 1906). A new translation by W. H. Carpenter is in preparation (1908).

For the Snorra Edda consult Jonsson, Den Óldnorveg og Óldis-landiske Litteratur Historie (Copenhagen, 1894–1902). II, 77–90. O. Brandes, Geschicht der norwegisch-slawischen Literatur in Pauls Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie (Stra- burg, 1904), pp. 889–906. See also the introduction to the edition of Simonsgtering for full bibliographical and critical material.

Arthur F. J. Remy.

Edelinck, the family name of four engravers.—Gerard, b. in Antwerp c. 1640; d. in Paris, 2 April, 1707. Galle instructed him in the rudiments of his art, and from him, in Antwerp, the youth imbibed that vigour and energy characteristic of Rubens' school of engraving, which was later to transform the art in France and impart to it Northern freshness and simplicity. In 1665 Gerard came to Paris, studied with de Poilly, quickly surpassed him, and almost immediately reached the height of his powers, which remained undiminished until his death. In 1671 he received commissions, a pension, the title of engraver to the king, apartments in the Gobelins, and the position of professor of the Gobelins Academy from the monarch whose features he depicted in fourteen engravings. In 1673 he was naturalized; in 1677 he became a Royal Academician; and soon thereafter the order of Chevalier of Saint-Michel was conferred upon him.

Edelinck was one of the greatest masters of pure engraving. He never used etching or dry-point on his plates, and of the four hundred that he produced there was not one that is poor. Edelinck's work was epoch-making: he revolutionized engraving, abandoning lines that crossed to form squares for lozenge forms. Further, he massed his lines and changed their direction, thus avoiding the monotony that had marked work in France. Edelinck had all the merits of his predecessors and, besides, rendered texture, colour, and light and shade as they never before had been rendered. His strokes were clear and bold, and the results beautifully finished, harmonious, and silvery. His proofs were the first to possess the quality called technically by engravers "colour". Sometimes they were slightly "metallic". Reproductions on steel by Edelinck frequently suggested more colour and quality in the originals than the latter possessed. He worked with marvellous facility and concealed his consummation so that he was under an untraught technic. While he did not confine his burin to portraits, it was these which gave him his great fame, for he so depicted all the notable men of his time, in the Church and the Court, and in literature and art, that we, to-day, gain an insight into their very character. The greater part of his work was reproductive, but he sometimes engraved from his own drawings, for he was a superb draughtsman. Edelinck was chosen to engrave Raphael's "Holy Family", Le Brun's "Magdalen", and "Alexander Visiting the Family of Darius", the first named bringing him instant fame. Only two impressions before letters of the "Holy Family" exist. Edelinck's life was one of piety, contentment, and tireless labour; it was made up of teaching engraving to his son and his two brothers and working on his own plates. Death found him engraving the "Alexander Entering the Tent of Darius", a superb plate finished by Pierre Drevet. To his family he left a fortune. Plates wholly his own were signed "Gerard Edelinck", or "Edelinck eques"; but when his compatriot Pitau or Gaspard Edelinck assisted him the signature was "Edelinck". Among his pupils were Gaspard, Jean, and Nicolas Edelinck, Lombard, and Trouvain. His principal works are: "Portrait of Louis XIV", after Le Brun; "Portrait of Rigaudi", after Rigaud; "Portrait of Mme. Hélyot with a Crucifix", after Galliot; "Portrait of Philippe de Champaigne", which the artist thought his best work, after Champa- igne; "Combat of the Four Horse- men", after da Vinci.

Nicolas, son of the preceding, b. in Paris in 1630; d. there in 1730. He studied under his father, Gerard, and to perfect himself subsequently went to Italy. In Venice he produced many plates in the style of his father, whom, however, he never equalled in vigour or quality. He engraved several plates for the Croizat collection. His masterpiece is a "Virgin and Infant" after Correggio.

His works include a "Portrait of his Father", after Tertebat; "Portrait of Cardinal Giulio de’ Medicì", after Raphael; "Portrait of John Dryden", after Kneller.

Jean, b. in Antwerp, c. 1643; d. in Paris, 1680. He was a younger brother and pupil of Gerard, with whom he worked and whose style he imitated. Plates wholly his own are much inferior to those of his celebrated brother, though they have considerable merit. "The Deluge", after A. Veronese, is his masterpiece. He made many engravings of the statues in the gardens of Versailles.

Gaspard-François, b. in Antwerp, 1652; d. in Paris, 1722. Gaspard, the youngest brother of Gerard, who was his teacher and co-worker, was inferior in talent to the other members of the Edelinck family, and did not long follow the career of engraver. Because he used a signature similar to that of Gerard and because his master often helped him with his plates, much of his work is difficult to distinguish from Gerard's.

Leigh Hunt.

Eden. See Paradise, Terrestrial.

Edessius and Frumentius, Tyrian Greeks of the fourth century, probably brothers, who introduced Christianity into Abyssinia; the latter a saint and first Bishop of Axum, styled the Apostle of Abyssinia, d. about 383. When still mere boys they accompanied their uncle Metriopus on a voyage to Abyssinia. When their ship stopped at one of the harbours of the Red Sea, people of the neighbourhood massacred the whole crew, with the exception of Edessius...
and Frumentius, who were taken as slaves to the King of Axum. This occurred about 316. The two boys soon gained the favour of the king, who raised them to positions of trust and shortly before his death gave them their liberty. The widowed queen, however, permitted them to remain in the court and thereby in the education of the young prince Erazanes and in the administration of the kingdom during the prince’s minority. They remained and (especially Frumentius) used their influence to spread Christianity. First they encouraged the Christian merchants, who were temporarily in the country, to practice their faith openly by meeting at places of public worship; later they also converted some of the natives. When the prince came of age Edesus returned to his friends and relatives at Tyre and was ordained priest, but did not return to Abyssinia. Frumentius, on the other hand, seems eager for the conversion of Abyssinia, accompanied Edesus as far as Alexandria, where he requested St. Athanasius to send a bishop and some priests to Abyssinia. St. Athanasius considered Frumentius himself the most suitable person for bishop and consecrated him in 328, according to others between 318–320. Frumentius returned to Abyssinia, erected his episcopal see at Jaffa, baptized King Aziazanas, who had meanwhile succeeded to the throne, built many churches, and spread the Christian Faith throughout Abyssinia. The people called him Abuna (Our Father) or Abba Selama (Father of Peace), titles still given to the head of the Abyssinian Church. In 339 Emperor Constantius addressed a letter to King Aziazanas and his brother Soizanas in which he vainly requested them to substitute the ancient Irian bishop Theophilus for Frumentius. (Athanasius, “Apol. ad Constantium” in P. G., XXV, 631). The Latins celebrate the feast of Frumentius on 27 October, the Greeks on 15 November, and the Copts on 10 December. Abyssinian tradition credits him with the first Ethiopian translation of the New Testament.

Michael Ott.

Edessa, a titular archiepiscopal see in that part of Mesopotamia formerly known as Osrhoene. The name under which Edessa figures in cuneiform inscriptions is unknown; the native name was Orsoe, after some local sarpas, this being the Armenian form for Chosroes; it became in Syriac Ourbai, in Armenian Ourdian, in Arabic Er Roha, commonly Urba or Urfa, its present name. Seleucus Nicater, when he rebuilt the town, 303 B.C., called it Edessa, in memory of the ancient capital of Macedonia of similar name (now Voden). Under Antiochus IV (175–164 B.C.) the town was called Antiochia by colonists from Antioch who had settled there. On the foundation of the Kingdom of Osrhoene Edessa became the capital under the Abgar dynasty. This kingdom was successively held by Iranian or Arabic tribes from North Arabia, and lasted nearly four centuries (132 B.C. to A.D. 244), under thirty-four kings. It was at first more or less under the protectorate of the Parthians, then of the Romans; the latter even occupied Edessa from 115 to 118 under Trajan, and from 216 to 244, when the kingdom was definitely suppressed to form a Roman province. The literary language of the tribes which had founded this kingdom, was Aramaic, whence came the Syriac.

The exact date of the introduction of Christianity into Edessa is not known. It is certain, however, that the community was first made up of the Jewish population of the city. According to an ancient legend, King Abgar V, Ushama, was converted by Addai, who was one of the seventy-two disciples. (For a full account see Abgar.) In fact, however, the first King of Edessa to embrace the Christian Faith was Abgar IX (c. 200). Under him Christianity became the official religion of the kingdom. As for Addai, he was neither one of the seventy-two disciples as the legend asserts, nor was he the Apostle of Addai, as Justinian says (Hist. IV, xvi); but a missionary from Palestine who evangelized Mesopotamia about the middle of the second century, and became the first bishop of Edessa. (See Doctrine of Addai.) He was succeeded by Aggaí, then by Patlout (Palet), who was ordained about 200 by Nersian of the Church of Edesia, until then under that of Jerusalem, was subject to the monarch of Syria. The aforesaid relations with Jerusalem and Antioch caused an important Syriac literary movement at Edessa of which the city long remained the centre. Thence came to us in the second century the famous Peshitta, or Syriac translation of the Old Testament; also Tattian’s Diatessaron, which was compiled about 172 and in common use until St. Rabula (Rabulas), Bishop of Edessa (412–35), forbade its use. Among the illustrious disciples of the School of Edessa special mention is due to Baraneses (154–222), a schoolfellow of Abgar IX, the founder of Christian philosophy, and the bishop of Lira, or Edessa. In the meanwhile Christian priests from Edessa had evangelized Eastern Mesopotamia and Persia, and established the first churches in the kingdom of the Sassanids. Aulaen, Bishop of Edessa, assisted at the Council of Nicea (325). The “Peregrinatio Silvica” (or Ethrius) (ed. Gamurrini, Rome, 1887, p. sqq.) gives an account of the many sanctuaries at Edessa about 388.

When Nisibis was ceded to the Persians in 363, St. Ephrem left his native town for Edessa, where he founded the celebrated School of the Persians. This school, largely attended by the Christian youth of Mesopotamia, and closely watched by St. Rabula, the friend of St. Cyril of Alexandria, on account of its Nestorian tendencies, reached its highest development under Bishop Ibas, famous through the controversy of the Three Chapters (q.v.), was temporarily closed in 457, and finally in 489, by command of Emperor Zeno and Bishop Cyrus, when the teachers and students of the School of Edessa repaired to Nisibis and became the founders and chief writers of the Nestorian Church in Persia (Labourt, Le christianisme dans l’empire perse, Paris, 1904, 130–141). Monophysism prospered at Edessa, even after the Arab conquest.

Rebuilt under the later centuries of Edessa Jacob Baradeus, the real chief of the Syrian Monophysites known after him as Jacobites (q.v.); Stephen Bar Sudalai, monk and pantheist, to whom was owing, in Palestine, the last crisis of Origenism in the sixth century; Jacob, Bishop of Edessa, a fertile writer (q. v.); Theophilus the Maronite, an astronomer, who translated into Syriac verse Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey; the anonymous author of the “Chronicon Edessenseum” (Chronicle of Edessa), compiled in 540; the writer of the story of “The Man of God,” in the fifth century, which gave rise to the legend of St. Addai. The oldest known date of Syrian manuscripts (A.D. 411 and 462), containing Greek patriotic texts, come from Edessa. Rebuilt by Emperor Justinian, and called after him Justinopolis (Evagrius, Hist. Eccl., IV, viii), Edessa was
taken in 609 by the Persians, soon retaken by Heraclius, but captured again by the Arabs in 640. Under Byzantine rule, as metropolis of Osrhoene, it had eleven suffragan sees (Echos d'Orient, 1907, 145). Lequien (Orients chrst., II, 963 sqq.) mentions thirty-five bishops of Edessa, yet his list is incomplete. The Greek hierarchy seems to have disappeared after the eleventh century. Of its Jacobite bishops twenty-nine are mentioned by Lequien (II, 1129 sqq.), many others in the “Revue de l'Orient chrétien” (VI, 195), some in “Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft” (1909). Moreover, Nestorian bishops are said to have resided at Edessa as early as the sixth century. The Byzantines often tried to retake Edessa, especially under Romanus Lacaenus, who obtained from the inhabitants the “Holy Mandylion,” or ancient portrait of Christ, and solemnly transferred it to Constantinople, 16 August, 944 (see Constantinopolis 944). The Rev. Robert Edgeworth, through conscientious motives resigned his living, embraced the Catholic religion, and, finding life at home intolerable under the penal laws, with his family (all of whom became Catholics) removed to Toulose, then main centre of Nestorianism, to receive his early training for the ecclesiastical state. He was afterwards sent to the seminary of Trence-Trois, Paris, at the suggestion of Bishop Moylan of Cork, to be consecrated as priest in the metropolitan see of Osrhoene (at one time a cure of clergy). After a course of theology at the Sorbonne, Henry Essex Edgeworth was ordained priest, and the capital of France became the theatre of his apostolic labours. The Irish bishops offered him a mitre in Ireland, an honour which he declined with his usual humility. On the removal of her confessor, Madame Elisabeth, sister of the ill-fated Louis XVI, requested the superior of Les Missions Etrangères, where the abbé resided, to recommend her another and he unstintingly selected the Abbé Edgeworth. The Archbishop of Paris approved of the abbé’s choice, and introduced him at court. This he became known to the royal family as a devoted friend. In their fallen fortunes he stood by them at the risk of his life, followed the survivors after the Revolution into exile, and died in their service.

When the Archbishop of Paris was obliged to fly in 1792 in order to save his life, he vested the Abbé Edgeworth with all his powers, making him his grand vicaire, and committed the great diocese to his care. In answer to the urgent entreaties of his friends to seek safety in Ireland or England, at this time, the abbé replied: “Almighty God has baffled my measure, and ties me to this land of horrors by chains I have not the liberty to shake off. The case is this: The wretched master [the king] charges me not to quit this country, as I am the priest whom he intends to prepare him for death. And should the iniquity of that nation commit this last act of guilt, I also prepare myself for death, as I am convinced the popular rage will not allow me to survive an hour after the tragic scene; but I am resigned. Could my life save him I would willingly lay it down, and I should not die in vain” (Letter to Mr. Maffey, priest in London).

On the 22nd last, on the 3rd of January, 1793, he was summoned by the Executive Council to proceed to the Temple prison at the desire of “Louis Capet,” who was condemned to die on the following day. The abbé, having remained in the Temple all night, said Mass in the king’s apartment on the morning of the execution, sat beside him in the carriage on the way to the scaffold.
fold, and, when the axe of the guillotine was about to fall, consigned his beloved master with the noble words: "Son of St. Louis, ascend to heaven." In his graphic and authoritative account of the last moments of Louis XVI (the original of which in French is in the British Museum) the Abbé is silent about this fine apostrophe, which everyone has heard of; but, when asked if he made use of the memorable expression, he replied that, having no recollection of anything that happened to himself at that awful moment, he neither affirmed nor denied having used the words, as he was allowed to leave the scene of the execution unmolested, and so escaped; but soon after his head was demanded in several clubs, so that he was obliged to quit Paris and take refuge at Bayeux, whence at that time he might easily have escaped to England. Three chief considerations, however, bound him to the land of horrors. He had a great diocese committed to his care; he had promised Madame Elisabeth, then in prison, never to desert her, and he could not abandon his mother and sister, still living in Paris. Dressed as an ordinary citizen, and passing under the name now of Essex, now of Edgeworth, and again of Henry, he eluded capture and escaped, until, after a perilous life, in August, 1793, after the death of his mother, and the execution of Madame Elisabeth, he escaped to Portsmouth, and proceeded to London.

Mr. Pitt offered to settle a pension for life on him, but he respectfully declined it. During the three months he spent in London he was lionized by fashionable society. His brother, Usher, who resided at Firmount, and his relatives at Edgeworthstown, proud of his fame and renown, were most anxious to see him in Ireland; and, in fact, he was on the point of revisiting the land of his birth when he was entrapped with confidential despatches for Louis XVI, then at Blankenburg. This changed all his plans. At the earnest entreaty of the exiled king he resolved to remain with him as his chaplain, going afterwards with the royal family to Mittau in Russia, where he spent the remainder of his days, revered and honoured by all with whom he came in contact. The Emperor Paul settled a pension of 500 roubles per annum on him. When Napoleon invaded Russia in 1807 it happened that some French soldiers were taken prisoners, and sent to Mittau. A contagious fever broke out among them, and in attending to their spiritual wants A.D. 1807, never of such an extent, compelled the Abbé to go to the sick bed of her "beloved and revered invalid, her more than friend, who had left kindred and country for her family," to use her own words. He was interred at Mittau. Louis XVIII wrote his epitaph, a copy of which, together with a letter of condolence, was sent by Louis' orders to Mr. Usher Edgeworth, the abbe's brother, residing in Ireland.

JOSEPH GUINAN.

Edict of Milan. See CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

Edict of Nantes. See HUGUENOTS.

Edict of Worms. See LUTHER.

Edinburgh, the capital of Scotland, though not its largest city, derives its name from the time (about A.D. 620) when the fortress of Edinburg was raised on a lofty spur of the Pentland Hills, overlooking the Firth of Forth, and established the Anglian dominion in the northern part of the Northumbrian Kingdom. Edinburgh Castle was a royal residence in the reign of Malcolm Canmore, husband of St. Margaret, who died there in 1093. Round the castle the town grew up, and a little lower down the collegiate church of St. Giles, predecessor of the present church bearing that name, was erected in the twelfth century. In 1306 David I., father of St. Margaret, bought the Holyrood, at the foot of the castle hill, 1128; but the town of Edinburgh for several centuries did not extend beyond the ridge sloping eastwards from the castle. In the middle of the fifteenth century Edinburgh became the real capital of Scotland, that is, the seat of the Parliament and the residence of her kings, and the scene of many of the most important provincial councils which regulated the affairs of the Scottish Church. James II. was the first king crowned at Edinburgh instead of in the Abbey of Scone, and he and his successors conferred many privileges on the capital, and did all in their power to develop it and increase its prosperity. The buildings of the city gradually spread outside the ancient walls, all along the sloping ridge which extends from the castle at the top to Holyrood at the bottom; and towards the end of the nineteenth century the New Town was built to the northward, beyond the extensive lake (since drained) which stretched under the castle hill.

During the past hundred years Edinburgh has steadily increased in population and wealth, if not so rapidly as other cities which are greater centres of manufactures and commerce. The unrivalled beauty of its situation, and the social and other advantages which it offers as the capital of the country, as well as the memorable educative facilities afforded by its many splendidly equipped schools and colleges, have always made it exceptionally attractive as a place of residence. Literary taste and culture were long the special characteristics of Edinburgh society, and it still possesses some of the literary charm which won for the city the title of the Modern Athens in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, when Scott, Wilson, Jeffrey, Brougham, and others made it famous by their personality and their genius. Modern facilities of travel and of intercommunication have inevitably given to Edinburgh, as to every centre of population in the kingdom, outside London, a certain note of provincialism; but it has not altogether lost the dignity and charm proper to a capital. The population of Edinburgh is now (1898) 177,000, an increase of more than 100,000 in the past thirty years; and its area is 11,000 acres. It returns four members to Parliament, and is governed by a town council of fifty members, presided over by the lord provost. Printing, brewing, and distilling have long been, and still are, the principal industries of the city. Edinburgh is the seat of the supreme court of Scottish law, which in its external forms as well as in many essential points differs greatly from the law of England. The presidents of the courts are the lord-justice-general and the lord-justice-clerk; and the judges, properly entitled "senators of the college of justice," enjoy the official title of Lord. The supreme courts occupy the Scottish Parliament house, a stately seventeenth-century building; and under the same roof is the Advocates' Library, one of the most extensive and valuable collections of books and manuscripts in the kingdom.

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY, the only one of the four Scottish universities not founded in Catholic times, was established in 1582 by royal charter granted by James VI., and was speedily enriched by many benefactions from prominent citizens. Its buildings occupy the site of the ancient collegiate church of St. Mary-in-the-Field (the Kirk of the Canongate, the scene of the mysterious murder of Lord Darnley), and have in recent years been greatly extended and embellished. The university comprises the usual faculties of divinity, law, medicine, and arts, and has pro-
duced many eminent men. The Edinburgh medical school has a world-wide reputation, and attracts students from all parts of the empire, as well as many foreigners. No religious tests prevent Catholics from enjoying the full benefit of university education in Edinburgh, but the number of Catholics frequenting the schools is remarkably small. The total number of students frequenting the university is between three and four thousand.

Ecclesiastical History.—Edinburgh is naturally much bound up in its ecclesiastical history with the country at large. In the earliest centuries of its existence, belonging as it did to the Kingdom of Northumbria, Edinburgh was included in the Diocese of Lindisfarne, as we find from the list of churches belonging to that see compiled by Simeon of Durham in the old chronicles.

The early connexion of the city with Lindisfarne is shown by the dedication to St. Cuthbert of its oldest church, founded probably in the ninth century. St. Cuthbert's church was presented to the newly established Abbey of Holyrood by King David; it was the richest church in Edinburgh, and possessed several outlying chapels, such as St. Ninian's, St. Roque's, and St. John Baptist's. When the diocesan system came to be fully established in Scotland, under Malcolm and Margaret and their sons, Edinburgh was included in the metropolitan Diocese of St. Andrews, and continued to be so until the suppression of the ancient hierarchy in the sixteenth century. The archbishop's see, as well as the episcopal residence, was of course in the primate city of St. Andrews, beyond the Firth of Forth; and there was no building known as a cathedral in Edinburgh prior to 1634, when the new Anglican Diocese of Edinburgh was formed out of the ancient archdeaconry of Lothian, and Forbes became the first occupant of the see. The old collegiate church of St. Giles was at this time, and during the revival of Episcopalianism in Scotland, used as the cathedral of the Protestant bishop. As regards the Catholic Church, Edinburgh was the head-quarters of the vicars Apostolic of the Eastern District of Scotland from the time of the foundation of that vicariate in 1828, when the church now known as St. Mary's Catholic Cathedra! had been in existence for some fifteen years. It has no architectural interest, but a spacious chancel was added, and other improvements carried out, in 1891. A cathedral for the Episcopalian body (whose bishop resides in Edinburgh) was erected about 1875, at a cost of over $500,000, from funds left by two charitable ladies. It is a Gothic building of much dignity, and by far the finest ecclesiastical building, either ancient or modern, now existing in Edinburgh. The Presbyterians have some handsome churches, but the grand old church of St. Giles, now in their hands, has been hopelessly vulgarized by the "restorer." A new church built by the Irvingites is adorned within by some fine mural paintings.

The seven Catholic churches which (besides the cathedral) supply the needs of the Catholic population of Edinburgh are of no particular merit architecturally, the most interesting being the latest erected, St. Peter's, which is in the earliest Byzantine style, and forms, with its presbytery, a little group of much originality and charm. The Catholic Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh (the fourth who has held that office in thirty years) resides in Edinburgh, and has his episcopal seat in St. Mary's Cathedral. St. Andrews (to which the title of Edinburgh was added at the restoration of the hierarchy in 1878) possesses a small Catholic church; but the Catholic population of the primate city is—except for summer visitors—only a handful. In Edinburgh the Catholics are estimated to number about 20,000. In the reign of Queen Anne (1702-14) a list sent in to the privy council of "Popish parents and their children in various districts of Scotland" gives the number of Catholics in Edinburgh as 160, including the Duke and Duchess of Gordon with their family and household, and several other noble families. The majority of the Catholics of Edinburgh to-day are of the poorer classes, and of Irish origin; but the past decade or so has witnessed a considerable number of conversions among the more well-to-do inhabitants of the city. Since the great anti-Catholic tumults of 1779, when the chapels and houses belonging to the insignificant Catholic body were burned by the rioters, the spirit of tolerance has
made progress in the Scottish capital as elsewhere in the kingdom. Catholics are generally respected, and may and do rise to high positions of trust in the commercial, legal, and municipal world.

Something remains to be said of the religious houses which have flourished in Edinburgh in ancient and modern times. The principal and wealthiest monastery in former days was the Abbey of Holyrood, founded by David I for Augustinian canons, who were brought from St. Andrews. The Blackfriars or Dominican monastery was founded by Alexander II in 1230, on a site now occupied by a hospital. The Greyfriars or Franciscan church (of the Observant branch of the order) stood in the Grassmarket until it was destroyed by fire in 1845. The Whitefriars or Carmelites did not settle in Edinburgh until 1518. Their house of Greenside, near the Calton Hill, was transformed at the Disso- lution into a lepers' hospital. Beyond the Carmelite house, nearer Leith, stood the preceptory of St. An-

thony, the only house of that order in Scotland. The collegiate churches in and about Edinburgh included those of St. Giles and St. Mary-in-the-Fields (already mentioned), Trinity Church, Restalrig, Corstorphine, Creighton, and Dalkeith. Trinity church, one of the most exquisite Gothic buildings in Scotland, was destroyed in the nineteenth century by a deplorable act of vandalism, to make room for new railway works. Neither the Benedictine nor Cistercian monks, who had numerous houses in Scotland, were established in Edinburgh. The Cistercian or Bernardine nuns, however, possessed the convent of St. Marie-in-the-wynd (or lane) near a hospital, where the sisters tended the sick. The Dominican nuns had also a convent (called Scionnes or Shenes, from St. Catherine of Siena) in the outskirts of the city. The numerous hospitals in Catholic Edinburgh comprised St. Mary Magdalen's in the Cowgate, founded in 1503 (the chapel remains, and is now used as a medical mission-hall); St. Leonard's, at the foot of Salisbury Crags; St. Mary's, in Leith Wynd, for twelve almsmen (converted into a workhouse by the Edinburgh magistrates in 1619); St. Thomas's, near the water-gate, founded in 1514 by Abbot Crichton of Holyrood for seven almsmen in red gowns; and Ballantyne's Hospital, founded by Robert Ballantyne or Bellenden, Abbot of Holyrood. The two religious orders of men now working in Edinburgh and its seaport of Leith are the Jesuits and the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. The former serve one of the largest churches in the city, and the latter have a house at Leith. There are eight convents of nuns, the oldest being St. Margaret's (Ursuline), founded in 1835, the first since the Reformation. The nuns keep a high-class school and attend several hospitals. St. Catherine's Convent of Mercy has a well-equipped training-

college for teachers as well as a ladies' school. The other convents are those of the Sisters of Charity, Little Sisters of the Poor, Sisters of the Sacred Hearts, Poor Clares, Order of Marie Réparatrice, Helpers of the Holy Souls, and Sisters of the Immaculate Conception.

The other Catholic institutions of the city include a children's refuge, orphanages for boys and girls, home for working boys, home for destitute children, dispensary, and home for penitents.

MAITLAND, Hist. of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1754); ANDERSON, Hist. of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1835); CUMBERIA, Traditions of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1825); WILSON, Memorials of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1843); LEWIS, Hist. of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1857); ANNOT, Hist. of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1778); Lectures on the Monasteries of Edinburgh to the Guild of St. Joseph (Edinburgh, 1845); CLEPhANT, Royal Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1890).

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

**Editions of the Bible**—In the present article we understand by editions of the Bible the printed reproductions of its original texts. We are not concerned with copies of the versions of the Bible, whether printed or written; nor do we purpose to consider the manuscript copies of the original text. The written reproductions are described under CODEX ALEXAN-
drinus and similar articles. We also consider BIBLICAL, in the latter part of which article (Vol. IV, pp. 499, 500) will be found an explanation of the critical nomenclature of Bible codices and the symbols by which they are denoted. The translations of the Bible will be treated under the title VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE. Since the original text of the Bible was written in Hebrew or Greek (the original Aramaic portions can for the present purpose be considered as coincident with the Hebrew), our study of its printed reproductions naturally considers first the editions of the Hebrew text, and secondly those of the Greek.

1. EDITIONS OF THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE BIBLE—Roughly speaking, there are three classes of editions of the Hebrew text: 1. The so-called Incunabula (Lat. cunabula, pl., "cradle"); 2. The common editions; 3. The critical editions. The reader will see that this division has an historical as well as a logical basis.

1. The Incunabula.—Technically speaking, the Incunabula are the editions issued before the year 1500. From our present critical standpoint, they are very defective; but since they represent manuscripts now lost, they are important even for critical purposes. The following publications constitute the main body of the Incunabula:

(1) The quarto edition of the Hebrew Psalter with the commentary of Rabbi David Kimchi, printed in 1477, probably at Bologna. Vowels and accents are wanting, except in the first four psalms. The volume is noted for its omissions, abbreviations, and general lack of accuracy.

(2) The folio edition of the Pentateuch, with vowels and accents, containing the Targum of Onkelos and the commentary of Rabbi Samuel Jarchi, printed at Bologna, 1482. This publication is much more perfect and correct than the foregoing.

(3) The so-called Earlier Prophets, i.e. the Books of Josue, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, printed in 1488 at Soncino, near Cremona, in Italy.

(4) The folio edition of the Later Prophets, i.e. Isaia, Jeremias, Ezeciel, and the twelve Minor Prophets, printed soon after the preceding publication, without accents and vowels, but interlined with the text of Kimchi's commentary.

(5) The Psalter and the Megilloth, or "Rolls", i.e. the Canticle of Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, printed in the same year as the preceding publication, at Soncino and Casale, in Italy, in a quarto volume.

(6) Three folio volumes containing the Hagiographa with several rabbinic commentaries, printed at Naples in 1487; the text is accompanied by the vowels, but not by the accents.
(7) A complete Hebrew Bible, in folio, printed in 1488 at Siena, without any commentary. Its text, accompanied by both vowels and accents, is based partly on the previously printed portions of the Hebrew Bible, partly on Hebrew manuscripts, but it lacks many important contents.

(8) A folio containing the Hebrew and Chaldean Pentateuch with Rashi's commentary, printed in 1490 in Isola del Liri.

(9) A most accurate and highly esteemed quarto edition of the Pentateuch, printed at Lisbon in 1491. It was the second and complete edition of the Hebrew text, in quarto, printed in 1494 at Bruges. The editor calls himself Gerson ben Mose of Siconio. The text, which is accompanied by its vowels and accents, exhibits many peculiar readings not found in any other edition. The type is small and indistinct, the proofreading most slovenly; in a word, the edition is utterly defective. Luther based his translation on it.

(11) The foregoing text is repeated in an octavo edition printed at Pisa in 1494.

(12) A folio edition of the Hebrew Bible, printed on parchment, bears no indication of its date or place of printing, but probably appeared in Constantinople about 1500.

(13) To these may be added Seb. Münster's Hebrew-Latin Bible, printed in folio at Basle, 1534 and 1546, since its text is based on that of the 1488 and 1494 editions. Here also belong, for the same reason, the "Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana," first edition (see below), the editions of R. Stephanus (1539-44, 1548), and the manual editions of Bomberg.

2. Common Editions.—By these we understand editions of the Bible reproduced either from manuscripts or previous printed editions without the aid of critical apparatus and the application of critical principles. While the editions of the Hebrew text thus far enumerated owed their publication to Jewish enterprise, those that follow were, at least in part, due to Christian scholarship. For practical purposes we may divide the common editions into two classes: (1) those not depending on other printed editions (independent editions); (2) those depending, at least partly, on a previously printed text (dependent, or mixed, editions).

(1) Independent editions.—This class of editions comprises the principal edition of the "Biblia Polyglotta Complutensia" and the "Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana," second edition. Here we can give only a summary of their principal features.

(a) "Biblia Polyglotta Complutensia".—In the year 1502, Cardinal Ximenes engaged several learned scholars to prepare the edition of a polyglot text called variously after the name of its ecclesiastical patron and the place of its publication (Alcalá, in Lat. Complutum). The editors of the Hebrew text were Jewish converts. Ancient manuscripts, estimated at the value of 4000 florins, and probably also the best extant printed copies of the Hebrew text, were placed at their disposal. Thus the cardinal's scholars produced a text quite different from the other printed texts of his time. They marked the vowels, but not the accents. The Polyglot was finished in 1517, but was published only in 1520 or 1522, according to Gregory (Compendium and Text of the New Testament in York, 1907). The pure form of its text was only once reprinted in the so-called "Biblia Polyglotta Vatablii," or "Polyglotta Sanctandreana," or again, "Bertram's Polyglot." (Heidelberg, 1586, 1599, 1616).

(b) "Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana," second edition.—Daniel Bomberg, of Antwerp, who had established a printing-office for Hebrew and rabbinic literature in Venice, published, in 1518, two important editions of the Hebrew text: (a) an edition for Christian readers, in quarto, which was reprinted in 1521, 1525-26, and 1544; (b) an edition for Jewish readers, edited by the Jewish convert Felix Pratensis. It contained the Targumim, the Massorah, and many Jewish commentaries, but did not satisfy the Jews. Hence Bomberg found it advisable to publish another edition under the editorship of R. Jacob ben Chayim, the most celebrated Jewish scholar of his time. He brought the text into closer agreement with the Masorah, and added several more Jewish commentaries. The work appeared in Venice, in four folio volumes, 1525-26, and was justly regarded as the first Massoretic Bible. It won the approbation of both Jewish and Christian scholars, so that it had to be republished in 1547-49, and 1588; the last edition was brought out under the direction of John de Garis (or de Garis), and using the great merits of the work, it is not wholly free from defects; Ben Chayim paid too much attention to the Massorah and too little to reliable old manuscripts. The principal codex he followed fell afterwards into the hands of de Rossi, who certifies that it is quite defective and has not been carefully edited. Chayim printed it without correcting its most glaring mistakes. The subsequent editions were influenced principally by Ben Chayim's text, and only secondarily by the Complutensian Polyglot. Thus the former text was repeated by Brugsch (Venice, 1620), a slightly modified form, by Justinianni (Venice, 1551, 1552, 1563, 1573), the editors of Geneva (1618), John de Garis (Venice, 1566, 1568, 1582), Plantin (Antwerp, 1566), Hartmann (Frankfort, 1595, 1598), the editors of Wittenberg (1585, 1587), and Tores (Amsterdam, 1618). Long before this, John Buxtorf edited first the Hebrew text in manual form (Basle, 1611), then Chayim's rabbinic Bible in four folio volumes (Base, 1612, 1619). Though he corrected some of Ben Chayim's mistakes, he allowed others to remain and even introduced some new ones. He ought not to have regulated the vocalization of the Targumim according to the vowels in the Chaldean fragments of the Bible, and it was at least inconsistent to change the Massorah according to the Hebrew text, seeing that Ben Chayim, whose text he professed to follow, had modified the Hebrew text according to the Massorah.

(2) Dependent, or Mixed, Editions.—In the editions thus far mentioned the text of one or the other of the two principal forms of the Hebrew Bible was reproduced without any notable change. We have now to consider the attempts made to correct the text either according to the reading of other editions or according to that of ancient manuscripts.

(a) Texts Corrected according to Printed Texts.—The first mixed text of the Hebrew Bible appeared in the Antwerp Polyglot (1569-72); the same text was also repeated in a Paris Polyglot (1629-45), in the London Polyglot (1657), in that of Reineccius (Leipzig, 1750-51), the smaller Plantin editions (Antwerp, 1580, 1582; Burgos, 1581; Leyden, 1613), the manual edition of Reineccius (Leipzig, 1725, 1739, 1756); and in the Vienna Bible (1740). The beautifully printed Bible of Hutter (Hamburg, 1588) presents a peculiarly mixed text. Here may be added the names of a few editors who published a Hebrew text without vowels and without reference to critical accuracy: Plantin (Antwerp, 1573, 8vo and 12mo; Leyden, 1585, 16mo; 1610, 12mo; Hanau, 1610, 24mo; Muenchen, 1610; Amsterdam, 1630, 1639, 8vo); Leusden (1694, 8vo); Marsius (1701, 8vo); Jablonsky (Berlin, 1711, 24mo); Forster (Oxford, 1750, 4to).

(b) Texts Corrected according to Codices and Printed Texts.—The mixture of Chayim's text with that of the Complutensian could not give perfect satisfaction. Every comparison of the mixed text with that of any good manuscript brought to light many discrepancies and suggested the idea that a better Hebrew text might be obtained by the help of good codices. The first attempt to publish a Hebrew text thus corrected was made by John Leusden with the cooperation of the printer Jos. Athias (Amsterdam,
1661, 1667). The editor revised Chayim's text according to the readings of two codices, one of which was said to be about 900 years old. This edition, printed by Athias, was revised by George Nissel according to the readings of Hutter's Bible (Leiden, 1662) and makes no pretense of having consulted any codices, so that his work is noted for its scarcity rather than its critical value. Clodium, too, endeavored to correct Athias's text according to earlier editions, but was not always successful (Frankfort, 1677, 1692, 1716). Jablonsky corrected the second edition of Athias according to the readings of several codices and of the better previous editions, paying special attention to the vowels and accents (Berlin, 1699, 1712); his first edition is commonly regarded as being one of the best. Van der Hoogh corrected the second edition of Athias according to the Masorah and the previous printed editions (Amsterdam and Utrecht, 1705); his attention to the smallest details and the printer's care account for the general favour with which the edition was received. A still more perfect reprint of the edition was published by Props (Amsterdam, 1724). Simonis, too, published corrected and cheap reprints of Van der Hoogh's Bible. Opitz corrected the edition of Athias according to the readings of seventeen of the best previous editions and of several manuscripts (Kiel, 1709; Zöllichau, 1741). He supervised the proof in person, and even the type was remarkable for its size and clearness, so that the edition was considered the most accurate extant. J. H. Leopold published the first Hebrew text with variants (Halle, 1720). He based it on the text of Jablonsky which he compared with twenty-four earlier editions and with five manuscripts preserved in Erfurt. The more important variants he added at the bottom of the page. It has been found that the older printed editions were received more superficially as far as the printed editions were concerned, and there is no good reason for supposing that more care was taken in the comparison of the manuscript text. Still, the edition remains valuable, because it is the first of its kind, and some of its variants deserve attention even today. The Oratorian Father Houbigant tried to produce a text far superior to the commonly received one. Taking Van der Hoogh's text for his basis, he added his own corrections and conjectures in critical notes. His apparatus consisted of a number of manuscripts, the annotations of Chayim, and the Hebrew scholarship of his time. The reputation of his inferences and the rashness of his conjectures did much to create a prejudice against his method, though the merit of his work has been duly appreciated by scholars. His "Notes Critiques" were printed in separate form in Frankfort (1777), after the full edition had appeared in Paris (1753).

Here may be mentioned the work of the Italian Jew, Salomo Norzi. He began in the early years of the eighteenth century to compare Bomberg's text with the best of the printed editions, with a number of good manuscripts of both Bible and Masorah, with the Biblical citations found in the Talmud, the Midrashim, and in other rabbinical writings, and with the critical annotations of the more notable Jewish commentators; the results of his long study he summarized in a Masoreto-critical commentary intended to accompany the text of the Hebrew Bible, which had been rather scantily corrected. The title of the work was to be "Repaire of the Breeke" (Is. lvi, 12), but the author died before he could publish his book. Nearly a century later, a Jewish physician named Raphael Chayim Italia had Norzi's work printed at his own expense under the title "Offering of the Gift" (Munster, 1756). Among the variants of Bomberg not noted by the editor, Norzi's reader have remained unnoticed until Bruns and Dresch drew attention to it. In spite of his best intentions, Norzi at times rather corrupts than corrects the Hebrew text, because he prefers the readings of the Masorah to those of the manuscripts.

3. Critical Editions.—The editions thus far enumerated can hardly be called critical, since their editors either lacked the necessary apparatus or did not consider it prudent to correct the received Hebrew text according to the full light of their textual information. Moreover, on, two classes of scholars have criticized the critical editions of the Hebrew text; some endeavored to restore critically the most correct Massoretic text obtainable; others tried to find the most accurate pre-Massoretic text.

(1) Critical Editions of the Massoretic Text. In order to restore critically the correct Massoretic text, it was necessary first to collect the apparatus. About the middle of the eighteenth century this need was felt very keenly by Benjamin Kennicott, a canon of Christ Church, Oxford, who determined to remedy the evil. Beginning in 1759, he collected either in person or through others as many as 615 Hebrew manuscripts, 82 printed editions, and the Talmud, continuing this preparation until the year 1773. Then he began the printing of the work (Vetus Testamenti Hebr. eum var.lectionibus, 2 volumes, Oxford, 1776-80) based on Van der Hoogh's Hebrew text as edited by Simonis. The variants, with their respective sources, were included in the introduction to each section of the second volume the author gives the history of his enterprise and justifies his methods. He found this necessary because, after the appearance of the first volume, his critics had charged him with lack of care and discernment in the choice of the manuscripts used, of the variants noticed, and in the treatment of the Masorah.

Bernardo de Rossi, professor at Parma, tried to construct an apparatus that should not be open to the exceptions taken against Kennicott's work. The material on which de Rossi worked exceeded that of Ken-nicott by 731 manuscripts, 390 printed editions, and several ancient versions. In his work (Variae lectiones Vetus Testamenti, Volumes, Parma, 1784-88) and its subsequent supplement (Supplementa ad variis. text.lectiones, 1798) he noted the more important variants, gave a brief appreciation of their respective sources and their values, and paid due attention to the Masorah. He follows Van der Hoogh's text as his basis, but considers it known, and so does not print it. All of de Rossi's critics are at one in admiring the laboriousness of his work, but they deny that its importance and value lies in the apparatus rather than in the apparatus itself. Perhaps the most severe critic was the author himself, in his "Dissertatio preliminaris" to vol. IV, gives a fairer opinion of his work than his critics do. It can hardly be denied that de Rossi at least showed what can be done by a study of the manuscripts and of the old editions for the correction of the received Hebrew text.

The apparatus of the textual, or lower, criticism of the Old Testament text (see CRITICISM, BIBLICAL) is not limited to the works of Kennicott and de Rossi; it comprises also the above-mentioned work of Salomo Norzi, re-edited in Vienna, 1813; the writings of Wolf; the publications of the "Comité de l'Oeuvres de la Bibliothèque des Oeuvres du Temple" (1864), and "Massora Magna" (Hanover, 1876); the prophetic "Codex of St. Petersburg", dating back to 916, phototyped by Strack in 1876; all the recently discovered or recently studied codices and fragments, together with the works of the ancient Jewish grammarians and lexicographers.

But even with these means at their command, the editors of the Hebrew text did not at once produce an edition that could be called satisfactory from a critical point of view. The editions of Döderlein-Meiser (Leipzig, 1793) and Jahn (Vienna, 1807) only popularized the variants without showing their value, but utilizing them properly. The edition published under the name of Hahn and prefaced by Rosennmüller (Leipzig, 1834) is anything but critical. The stereotype editions of Hahn (Leipzig, 1839) and Thiele (Leipzig, 1849) remained for many years the best
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manual texts extant. More recently the apparatus has been used to better advantage in the edition of Ginsburg (The New Massoretico-Critical Text of the Hebrew Bible, 1894) and in that of Baer and Deitzsch. The last-named appeared in single books, beginning with the year 1891. The Books of Ecclesiasticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy are still wanting; both editors are dead, so that their work will have to be completed by other hands.

(2) Critical Editions of the Pre-Massoretic Text.—The editors whose work we have thus far noticed endeavoured to restore as far as possible the text of the Massoretic. However valuable such an edition may be in itself, it cannot pretend to be the last word which textual criticism has to say concerning the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. After all, the Massoretic text attained its fixed form in the early centuries of the Christian Era; before that period there were found many text-forms which differed considerably from the Massoretic, and which nevertheless may represent the original text with fair accuracy. The most ancient and reliable witness for the pre-Massoretic text-form of the Hebrew Bible is found in the Septuagint. But it is practically certain that, even at the time of the New Testament, the original text had suffered considerable corruptions; these can be corrected only by comparing parallel passages of the context, or again by conjectural criticism; a critical edition of this kind presupposes, therefore, a critical edition of the Septuagint text.

Various attempts have been made to restore the pre-Massoretic text of single books of the Old Testament: thus Oelschauer worked at the reconstruction of the Book of Genesis (Beiträge zur Kritik des überlieferten Textes im Buche Genesis, 1870); Wellhausen (Text der Bücher Samuels, 1871), Driver (Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, 1890), and Klostermann (Die Bücher Samuels und der Könige, 1887) at the correction of the Books of Samuel; Cornill at the correction of the Book of Ezechiel (Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel, 1886). To these might be added various other publications; e. g., several recent commentaries, some of the works published by Bickell, etc. But all these works concern only part of the Old Testament text. “The Sacred Books of the Old Testament”, edited by Paul Huf (see Critical, Biblical, s. v. Textual), is a series intended to embrace the whole Hebrew text; but its criticism is in many instances questionable; Kittel’s “Biblia Hebraica” (Leipzig, 1905), too, deserves a mention among the critical editions which attempt to restore the pre-Massoretic Hebrew text.

1. Editions of the Greek Text of the Bible.—Before speaking of the Greek text of the New Testament, we shall have to give a brief account of the editions of the Greek books of the Old Testament. They appear partly in separate editions, partly in conjunction with the Septuagint.

1. Separate Editions.—The principal separate editions of the deuterocanonical books appeared at Antwerp, 1566 (Plantin), 1584, and with Latin text taken from Ximenes’ Polyglot, 1612; at Frankfort, 1684; Halle, 1749, 1766 (Kircher); Leipzig, 1757 (Reineccius), 1850, 1857 (Augusti), 1837 (Apel), 1871 (Fritzsche); Oxford, 1842, 1871 (Fritzsche); Florence, 1842; Frankfort and Leipzig, 1691 (partially edited); Book of Tobias, Franeker, 1591 (Drusius), and Freiburg, 1870 (Reusch); Book of Judith, Würzburg, 1887 (Schoel, Commentar); Book of Wisdom, 1566 (Holk); Book of Prayer (Prælectiones eorum de Sine Polygeto); Coburg, 1601 (Pauli); Venice, 1827 (Greek, Latin, and Armenian); Freiburg, 1588 (Reusch); Oxford, 1881 (Deane); Ecclesiasticus, 1551, 55, 68, 70, 89, 90 (Drusius), 1804 (Breternieder); Books of Maccabees, Franeker, 1600 (Drusius); I Mach., Heilholds, 1751, 1754.

2. Editions Joined to the Septuagint.—The history of V.—19

these editions of the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament is connected with that of the Septuagint editions. The reader will find full information on this question in the article Septuagint.


The newly invented art of printing had flourished for more than half a century before an attempt was made to publish an edition of the Greek New Testament. The Canticles, Magnificat, and Benedictus were printed at Venice, 1486 and 1496, as an appendix to the Greek Psalter: John, i, i, to vi, 58, appeared in Venice, 1495 and 1504, together with the poems of St. Gregory Nazianzen; the beginning of the Fourth Gospel, John, 1, 1–11, was published at Venice, 1495, and at Tübingen, 1511. Not that the reading public of that age did not feel interested in the other parts of the New Testament; but it did not show any desire for the Greek text of the Bible. After the beginning of the sixteenth century the world’s attitude with regard to the Greek text of the New Testament changed considerably. Not counting the publication of codices, mere stereotype reprints of parts of the Testament, the number of editions of the complete Greek text has been estimated at about 550; in other words, since the beginning of the sixteenth century, every year has witnessed the publication of, roughly speaking, two new editions of the complete Greek text. For our present purpose, we will consider the principal editions under the four headings of the Complutensian, the Erasmian, the Received, and the Critical text.

1. The Complutensian Text.—It was the Archbishop of Toledo, Cardinal Tommaso de' Cavalieri, who began at Alcalá, in 1502, the preparation of the edition of the Old Testament in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and of the New Testament in Greek and Latin. It has been thus far impossible to ascertain what codices served as the basis of the work called the Complutensian Polyglot. Though Leo X sent from the Vatican Library some manuscripts vererandae vetustatis for the use of the scholars engaged in the work at Alcalá, it is quite certain that the well-known Codex Vaticanus was not among them. It appears that the Greek New Testament text of the Polyglot rests on the readings of a few manuscripts only, belonging to the called Byzantine family (see Criticism, Biblical, s. v. Textual). The charge that the Complutensian text was corrected according to the evidence of the Latin Vulgate, is now generally abandoned, excepting with regard to the New Testament text, which is contained in the fifth or, according to other arrangements, in the last of the six folios of the Polyglot; it was finished 10 January, 1514, and though the rest of the work was ready 10 July, 1517, four months before the great cardinal’s death (8 Nov., 1517), it was not published until Leo X had given his permission propria motu, 22 March, 1520.

The Complutensian text, corrected according to certain readings of the Erasmian and of that of Stephanus, was repeated in the Antwerp Polyglot published, under the auspices of King Philip II, by the Spanish theologian Benedict Arias Montanus and his companions, and printed by the celebrated typographer, Christopher Plantin, of Antwerp, 1559–72. The Greek New Testament text occurs in the fifth and in the last of the eight folios which make up the Antwerp Polyglot; in the fifth by Tyrtus; Codex, 1601 (Pauli); Venice, 1827 (Greek, Latin, and Armenian); Freiburg, 1588 (Reusch); Oxford, 1881 (Deane); Ecclesiasticus, 1551, 55, 68, 70, 89, 90 (Drusius), 1804 (Breternieder); Books of Maccabees, Franeker, 1600 (Drusius); I Mach., Heilholds, 1751, 1754.

2. Editions Joined to the Septuagint.—The history of V.—19.
The eighth volume reappears in a number of editions:
Antwerp, 1573–84 (four editions, Christopher Plantin);
Paris, 1584 (Syriac, Latin, and Greek text; Prevost-
teau); Heidelberg, 1599, 1602 (Comeliin); Lyons,
1590 (Rob. Stephanus); Paris, 1592 (reprinted
in very different editions; Pierre de la Roiie, Sam.
Crispin, James Stoer); Leipzig, 1567 (with the inter-
linear version of Arias Montanus; Kirchenr); Vienna,
1740 (edited by Deibel, published by Kalwoda);
Mainz, 1733 (edited by Goldhagen; published by
Var-

tery).
Lege, 1539 (Rhein.); Nuremberg, 1580. 1600 (Hutter's Poly-

giot, twelve languages); 1602 (the same, four lan-
guages); Amsterdam, 1615 (the same, Welschert);
Geneva, 1628 (Jean de Tournes; one edition gives
only the Greek text, another gives Beza's Latin ver-
sion and a French translation).

2. The Erasmian Text.—On 17 April, 1515, the well-
known humanist, Beatus Rhenanus, invited Desiderius Erasmus, who lived at the time in England, to
to the Greek New Testament which John Froben, a cele-
brated printer of Basle, was anxious to publish before
Pope Leo X should give his permission to put forth
the Complutensian text printed more than a year be-
fore, as had hitherto been done to him, almost bodily the text of the manuscripts that hap-
pended to fall into his hands: the Gospels according
to a manuscript of Basle (Evv. 2); the Book of Acts
and the Epistles according to another manus-
script of Basle (Act. 2); the Apocalypse according
to a manuscript named after Reuchlin in "codex Reuch-
lini" (Apoc. 1). He made a few corrections after
superficially collating some other Basle manuscripts.
Evv. 1 among the rest. Since Reuchlin's manu-
scribed did not contain the end of the Apocalypse, Erasmus transcribed Apoc., xxii, 16–21, from the
Vulgata. The printing began in Sept., 1516, and the
whole New Testament text was finished in the begin-
ing of March, 1516. Under these circumstances satis-
factory work could hardly be expected; Erasmus himself, in a letter to Finkheimer, confesses that the first New Testament edition is "precipitatum verius qua
ter fatum" (1). In 1516 and 1517 (Robertus Stephanus introduced corrections from the Codex
Codex Polyglot); in his third edition, R. Stephanus repeats the fifth Erasmian with variants
from fifteen manuscripts and the Complutensian Poly-
giot (Paris, 1530). This edition is called Regia,
and is the basis of the English Authorized Version
(1611). Stephanus's fourth edition (Geneva, 1551)
was the first to give the Greek text, the latter of which
is for the first time divided into verses, a colo-
dation which was introduced into the Latin Vulgate in 1555,
and then became general. The last edition of R.
Stephanus was reprinted with slight modifications
a great number of times; its principal repetitions were
those supervised by Theodore Beza (Geneva, 1553,
1582, 1599, 1598 in folio; 1565, 1567, 1580, 1590, 1604
in octavo) and the brothers Bonaventure and Abra-
ham Elzevir (Leyden, 1624, 1633, 1641; Amsterdam,
1566, 1662, 1670, 1678). In the preface of the second
Elzevir edition (Leyden, 1639) we read the words:
"The text now given is the same as that published by
the Textus ergo habens; hence this Elzevir text became known as the textus receptus, or the Received Text.

3. The Received Text.—From what has been said it
follows that the Received Text is that of the second
Elzevir edition, which is practically identical with the
third edition of the fourth edition of Rober-
tus Stephanus corrected in about one hundred and
fifty passages according to the readings of the Codex
Claromontanus, the Codex Cantabrigiensis, the Latin,
Syriac, and Arabic versions, and certain critical notes
of Henry Stephanus. In its turn, the fourth edition
of Robertus Stephanus is almost identical with the
fifth Erasmian edition which exhibits the text of five
rather recent manuscripts corrected in about one hun-
dred passages according to the reading of the Complu-
tensian Polyglot. Still, it can hardly be denied that
the readings peculiar to the text can be traced at least
to the sixteenth century. From the six-
tury the Received Text held undisputed sway; its edi-
tions numbered about one hundred and seventy, some of
the more important being the following: (1) The fifth
volume of Brian Walton’s "Biblia Polyglotta" (Lon-
don, 1657) contains the New Testament in Greek,
Syriac, Arabic, Bashite, and Ethiopic; a learned apparatus
has been added in the sixth volume. (2) John W. Ed. ed. the
20. The edition anonymously (Oxford, 1675) with variants
collected "ex plus centum mss. codicibus et antiquis
versionibus". (3) John Mill reprinted the text of
Stephanus, 1550, together with valuable prolegomena
and a critical apparatus (Oxford, 1707), and L. Kuster
published an enlarged and corrected edition of Mill's
work (Amsterdam, 1710). (4) Not to speak of Rich-
ard Bentley's "Proposals for Printing", published in
1720, we must mention Wetstein's edition, the prole-
gomena to which appeared anonymously in 1730, and
were followed by the body of the work in two folios
(Amsterdam, 1751–1752) with an apparatus collected
from codices, versions, readings of the Fathers, printed
editions, and works of Biblical scholars. He also laid
down principles for the use of variants, but did not put
them into practice consistently enough. (5) The
same Wetstein went on with Wetstein's work, as
followed in W. Bowyer's edition of the Greek New
Testament (London, 1763). (6) When the foregoing
scholars had collected an almost unmanageable num-
ber of variants, John Albert Bengel endeavoured to
simplify their use by dividing them into two families,
an Asiatic and an African; besides, he constructed a
Greek text based on the readings of previous editions,
excepting that of the Apocalypse, which was based
also on the readings of manuscripts (Tübingen, 1734).
(7) This edition was enlarged and emended by Burck
(Tübingen, 1763).

4. The Critical Text.—In the last paragraph we have
evenuated a list of editions of the Greek New Testa-
ment which contain, besides the text, a more or less
complete apparatus for the critical reconstruction of
the true reading. We shall now mention a number of
editions in which such a reconstruction was attempted.
(1) Griesbach developed Bengel's method of group-
ing the variants into a formal system. He admitted
three textual recensions: the Occidental, the Alexan-
drian (or Oriental), and the Constantinopolitan (or
Byzantine). The first two he derived from the middle
of the second century, and the third he considered as
a revision of the two, being prior to the latter. His
though subsequently modified. After laying down
his principles of textual criticism, he tried to recon-
struct the text best known in the ancient Church of
both East and West. In 1774 he published the text of
the synoptic Gospels; in 1796–1806, the text of the
New Testament, called "Editio secunda"; in 1827 David Scholz added the first volume of a third edition. Griesbach is not always faithful to his principles, being too much under the sway of the Received Text; moreover, he did not sufficiently utilize the codices most important for his purpose. His text has been followed by Schott, Knapp, Tittmann, Hahn, and Theile.

(2) It suffices to mention the editions of Mace (London, 1729), Harwood (London, 1776), Matthaei (Riga, 1782-1788), Alter (Vienna, 1786), and Scholz (Leipzig, 1830-1836); the last named scholar (a Catholic, and the professor of exegesis in the University of Bonn) reduced Griesbach's first two recensions to one, distinguishing it only from the Constantinopolitan text-form, which he derived from the more correct copies circulating in Asia Minor, Syria, and Greece during the first centuries. Scholz himself had industriously collected manuscripts in the East. The labours of Hug and Eichhorn may also be mentioned briefly. The former substituted his so-called Common Edition, and the latter the uncorrected text of Asia and Africa, for Griesbach's Occidental class. Both Hug and Eichhorn assign the Alexandrian text-form to Hesychius, and the latter to Lucian; finally, Hug assigns to the labours of Origen in his old age a four-fold authority identical with a middle class favoured by Griesbach and Eichhorn. Rinck (1830) divided the Occidental manuscripts into African and Latin, both of which are surpassed in purity by the Oriental.

Lachmann was the last of the "historical" critics who tried to reconstruct a New Testament text independent of the Received. Believing that the autograph text could not be found, he endeavoured to restore the text-form most common in the Oriental Church during the course of the fourth century. He published his small selection in 1833 (Berlin), and his large Latin-Greek text in 1842-50 (Berlin); this latter is accompanied by P. Buttmann's list of authorities for the Greek readings. Though Lachmann's text is preferable to the Received, his apparatus and the use he made of it are hardly satisfactory in the light of our present-day methods.

(4) Among the editors of the New Testament text, Tischendorf deserves a place of honour. During the thirty years which he devoted exclusively to textual studies, he published twenty or twenty-one editions of the Greek Testament; the first of these among their predecessors in one or another of the following recensions: (a) In 1841 (Leipzig) he issued an edition in which he surpassed even Lachmann in his departure from the Received Text; the ancient manuscripts, the early versions, and the citations of the Fathers were regarded as the highest authorities in the selection of his reading. In 1842 Tischendorf published in Paris an edition destined for the French Protestants (Didot), and in the same year and place, at the instance of the Abbé I. M. Jager, another for the French Catholics, which he dedicated to Archbishop Affre. In this he received the Greek readings most in keeping with the Latin Vulgate. (b) The second recension consists of four stereotype editions (12mo, 1842-59) containing the Greek text brought into agreement with the Latin Vulgate. (c) Tischendorf's third recension is represented by his fourth (Lipsiensia secunda, 1849; Winter); by his fifth (1850, Tauchnitz), and his sixth edition (corrected Latin Vulgate and Luther's translation; Leipzig, 1854, Avenarius and Mendelssohn). A separate print of the Greek text of this last edition (1855) constitutes the foundation of the "Neues Testament" edition. In the seventh reprint of the academic edition, as well as in the third of Tauchnitz's stereotype text, the readings were changed according to Tischendorf's fifth recension. (d) The fourth recension is found in Tischendorf's "Editio Septima Critica Maior" (Leipzig, 1856-59; Winter). The work contains valuable prolegomena and a detailed critical apparatus. (e) Tischendorf's fifth recension is found in his "Editio Octava Critica Maior" (Leipzig, 1864-72, Giessecke and Devrient). In his first recension Tischendorf is further removed than Lachmann from the Received Text; in his second he favours the Latin Vulgate; in the third, and still more in the fourth, he returns to the readings of the Received Text. editions. Tischendorf made a new text of the Greek text of the Greek text; but in the fifth he again follows the principles of Lachmann and favours the readings of his first recension rather than those of his third and fourth. Tischendorf will always occupy a high rank among the editors of the Greek text; but he is rather a student of the text than a textual critic. The "Prologomena" to the eighth edition had to be supplied by C. R. Gregory on account of the great editor's untimely death (7 Dec., 1874). Gregory published these "Prologomena" in three instalments (Leipzig, 1884, 1890, 1894), giving the reader a most satisfactory and complete summary of the information necessary or useful for the better understanding of the Greek text and its apparatus.

(5) The discrepancy between the text of Scholz's edition (Leipzig, 1830-36) and the readings of the Origenian documents stimulated Tregelles to an independent study of textual questions mainly thorough in order to resolve the existing uncertainty. The favourable reception of his "Book of Revelation in Greek . . . with a new English Version" published with a "Prospectus of a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament, now in progress," also encouraged him in the course of studies he had begun. After collating all the more important manuscripts which were to be found in England, he visited the libraries of Rome, Florence, Modena, Venice, Munich, Basle, Paris, Hamburg, Dresden, Wolfenbüttel, and Utrecht for an accurate study of their respective codices. It has been noted that when the results of Tregelles differ from those of Tischendorf, the former are usually correct. He was enabled to publish the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark in 1857; those of St. Luke and St. John in 1861; the Acts and the Catholic Epistles in 1865; the Pauline Epistles in 1869-70. While engaged on the last chapters of the Apocalypse, he had a stroke of apoplexy, so that this part had to be finished by the hand of a friend (1872). Seven years later, Hort and Streane added "Prologomena" to the work of Tregelles. Tischendorf published a reprint of his critical apparatus and an appendix in 1887. The character of the work is well described by its title, "The Greek New Testament, Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in full, and the Latin Version of Jerome" (London, 1857-79).

(6) The textual labours of Tregelles and Tischendorf were, to a certain extent, overshadowed by the work achieved by the two eminent Cambridge scholars, Brook Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. Like their predecessors, they acknowledged and followed the principles of Lachmann; but they differed from Lachmann as well as from Tischendorf and Tregelles in utilizing and systematizing the genealogical grouping of the ancient readings, thus connecting their labours with the views of Bengel and Griesbach. They distinguished four branches of textual tradition. (a) The Western has a tendency to paraphrase the text and to interpolate it from parallel passages and other sources. It is found mainly in Codex D, the old Latin Version, and partly in Cureton's Syriac manuscript.

(b) The Alexandrian is purer than the Western, but contains changes of a grammatical character. It is found in the oldest manuscripts, except the oldest codices, and in part of it, a number of cursive manuscripts, and the Egyptian versions. (c) The Syrian is a mixture of all the other texts, or at least it contains some of the characteristics of all the others. It is found in the later uncials, and in most of the cursive manuscripts and versions. (d) The neutral text comes nearest to the original text, being almost identical with it. Its
pure form is found nowhere, but the readings of A and some of the oldest uncials, especially of B, give us the nearest approach to it. As to the value of the several classes of readings, Hort believes that most of the Western and Alexandrian, and all the Syriac must be rejected. The farthest approaches to the text before the middle of the third century. All the necessary explanations have been collected in a volume accompanying Westcott and Hort’s “New Testament in the Original Greek” (Cambridge and London, 1881). The volume contains an introduction (324 pages) and an appendix (175 pages). The introduction treats of the necessity of Textual New Testament Criticism (pp. 4–18), of its various methods (19–72), of the application of its principles to the restoration of the New Testament text (73–287), and finally of the character, the aim, and the arrangement of the new edition (288–324). The appendix contains critical comments on difficult passages (pp. 1–140), notes on certain orthographic and grammatical discrepancies between the ancient codices (pp. 141–173), and finally a complete list of the Old Testament passages employed in the New (pp. 174–188). The volume containing the text of Westcott and Hort’s edition was published also separately in the year of the first appearance. In 1885 (1887, etc.) the text appeared separately in a volume of smaller size, and in 1895–96 both volumes of the original work were published anew in their larger form.

(7) Westcott and Hort’s Greek New Testament, though published at a time when a vast number of textual critics, did not meet with unchallenged praise. Among the dissenters were Godet, Wurdliech, Dobschütz, Jülicher, Bousser, and Burgon (The Revision Revised; The Quarterly Review, 1881–82; 2nd ed., London, 1885). Of these, some object to Westcott and Hort’s method, others to their appreciation of Codex B, others to their attitude towards the so-called Western readings, others, finally, uphold the claims of the Received Text. In the third and fourth editions of his “Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” F. H. Scrivener writes against the views of Tischendorf, Trüggles, and Westcott-Hort; he favours the readings of the later manuscripts in the reconstruction of the Greek New Testament text, and advocates the return to a text-form similar to the Received Text. Among his various publications we may notice “The New Testament in the Original Greek, together with the Prolegomena, and the Adopted in the New Testament, London, 1894) and his various collations of texts (Twenty Manuscripts of the Gospels, London, 1883; Collation of Codex Sinaiticus with the Received Text, Cambridge and London, 1893, 1897). Here may be mentioned also “The Greek Testament with a critically revised text, a digest of various readings, marginal references to verbal and idiomatic usage, prolegomena, and a critical and exegetical commentary” edited by Henry Alford, afterwards Dean of Canterbury (London, 1849–1856; sixth edition, 1871). Tischendorf was of opinion that Alford’s revision of the text was not satisfactory. “The New Testament in the Original Greek, with Notes and Introduction” (London, 1866–69; newly edited with index, 1867), by Christopher Wordsworth, Canon of Lambeth, is a mixture of the texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Elsner. Finally, in connection with the Revised Edition, Professor C. Palmer, of Oxford, published “The Greek Testament, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorised Version” (Oxford, 1881; Clarendon Press).

(8) Among the chief works dealing with the textual restoration of the Greek New Testament which have appeared in recent years, we must mention the most important of the works of B. Weiss: Part I, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse (Leipzig, 1894, Hinrichs); Part II, The Pauline Epistles together with Hebr. (1896); Part III, The Gospels (1900). A manual edition of this text appeared 1902–05, in three volumes; the mistakes of the first issue were corrected as far as possible. Richard Francis Weymouth edited in a handy form “The Resultant Greek Testament” (London, 1886, Elliot Stock; cheap edition, 1892 and 1896; third edition, 1905); in it he gives us the text on which the majority of modern editors, together with the readings of Stephens (1550), Lachmann, Tregelles, Lightfoot, Alford, Weiss, the Bale Edition (1880), Westcott-Hort, and the Revision Committee, with an introduction by J. B. Lightfoot. The editor may not give the reader anything of his own, but he furnishes a text verbal edition which the Bible student can hardly afford to neglect. Dr. E. Nestle has edited a “Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatus critico” (Stuttgart, 1898, 1899, 1901, 1903, 1904, 1906) based on the four most prominent of the recent texts: Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, Weymouth, and Weiss. All the variants of the four editions, excepting as to minor details, are noted, so that the reader obtains at a glance the results of the foremost textual criticism on any given text. It would be difficult indeed to contrive a handier and more complete edition of the Greek text than this of Nestle’s, treated with delight and respect, with the original text, with an alternative ending of the Second Gospel, as a “Western non-interpolation”, suggesting that it is an ancient Eastern interpolation of the sacred text. The rules of the new Index sont be employed with precision those classes of Catholics who may read texts like that of Nestle; others must content themselves with one of the following editions: P. A. Graetz edited the Complutensian text (Tübingen, 1821; Füss); L. Van Ess published a combination of the Complutensian and the Erasmian text (Tübingen, 1827; Füss); Jaumann adheres closely to the edition of Tittmann (Munich, 1832; Lindauer); we have already mentioned Tischendorf’s text prepared for Catholic readers under the influence of I. M. Jager (Paris, 1847, 1851, 1859); Reithmayr produced a combination of this latter edition and that of Lachmann (Munich, 1847; Ratisbon, 1851); V. Loeh derived his text, as far as possible, from the Codex Vaticanus (Tübingen, 1862); Tauchnitz published, with the approbation of the proper ecclesiastical authority of Dresden, Theile’s text almost without change, together with the text of the Latin Vulgate; Brandeschi edited the Greek text and the Latin Vulgate of the New Testament in such a way as to bring the former as much as possible into agreement with the latter (Freiburg, 1901, etc.); finally, M. Hetzenauer published his “Novum Testamentum Graece” (Innsbruck, 1904, Wagner), reproducing in separate form the Greek text of his Greek-Latin edition (1890–98). He is more independent of the Latin Vulgate text than many of his predecessors, and he adopts the more important variants in the margin, or in footnotes, or again in an appendix critica.

(10) It must not be imagined that the textual criticism of the New Testament has arrived at a state that can be regarded as final. Without doing injustice to the splendid results attained by the labours of the scholars enumerated in this article, it must be confessed that the condition of the textual criticism of the New Testament is more uncertain to-day than it was twenty years ago. The uncertainty springs mainly from the doubts of our critics as to the real value of the Western readings. It cannot be denied that it is important to state the importance of these Western readings, at least with regard to the Book of Acts, when he considers them as the transcript of the inspired writer's first or rough copy, while he identifies the Eastern with the copy actually sent out to Antioch. Even if stu-
Edmondsbury. See Bury St. Edmonds.

Edmund, Congregatio of Saint, founded in 1843, by Jean-Baptiste Muard, at Pontigny, France, for the work of popular missions. The members were to devote themselves to parochial work, to the education of youth in seminaries and colleges, to the direction of pious associations, and to foreign missions. The mother-house is at Pontigny, but since the expulsion of the religious orders the superior general resides at Hitchens, England. In the United States, the Congregation has two houses: a missionary house and an apostolic school at Swanton, Vermont, for the training of young men who wish to study for the priesthood and the religious life; and a college at Winookski, Vermont, with 12 fathers, 8 scholastics, and 100 pupils.

E. M. SALMON.

Edmund Arrowsmith, Venerable, English martyr, b. in 1855 at Haddock; executed at Lancaster, 23 Aug., 1628. He is of great reputation for the numerous favours, spiritual and temporal, which are won through his holy hands, still preserved as an object of veneration in the church of St. Oswald, Ashton, near the martyr's birthplace. His parents suffered much for their religion, and the future martyr was once, when a child, left shivering in his night-clothes by the pursuivants, who carried his parents off to Lancaster jail. He entered Douai College in 1605, but ill-health compelled him to interrupt his studies; he was, however, ordained priest in 1612. Lancashire was the scene of his missionary labours and he was eminent for his fervent, zeal and ready wit. At a preponderatingly discussion with him and his minister. Regaining his liberty he entered the Society of Jesus in 1623, and made his noviceship on the Mission, retiring to London for a spiritual retreat. He was eventually betrayed by false bretheren, tried at Lancaster in 1628, and was found guilty of high treason for being a Jesuit priest and a seducer in religion. His fellow-prisoner, Father John Southworth, afterwards a martyr, absolved him as he went forth to undergo the usual butchery.

EDMOND.

EDMUND Campion, Blessed, English Jesuit and martyr; he was the son and namesake of a Catholic bookseller, and was b. in London, 25 Jan., 1540; executed at Tyburn, 1 Dec., 1581. A city company sent the promising child to a grammar school and to Christ Church College. When Mary Tudor entered London in state as queen, he was the schoolboy chosen to give the Latin salutatory to her majesty. Sir Thomas White, lord mayor, who had built and endowed St. John's College at Oxford, accepted Campion as one of his first scholars, appointed him junior fellow at seventeen, and, dying, gave him his last messages for his academic family. Campion shone at Oxford in 1560, when he delivered oneoration at the reburial of Amy Robart, and another at the funeral of the founder of his own college; and for twelve years he was to be followed and imitated as no man ever was in an English university except himself and Newman. He took both his degrees, and became a celebrated tutor, and, by 1585, junior proctor. Queen Elizabeth had visited Oxford two years before; she and Dudley, then chancellor, won by Campion's bearing, beauty, and wit, bade him ask for what he would. Sucesses, local responsibilities, and allurements, his natural ease of disposition, the representations, above all, of his friend Bishop Cheynell of Gloucester, blinded Campion in regard to his course as a Catholic: he took the Oath of Supremacy, and deacon's orders according to the new rite. Afterthoughts developing into scruples, scruples into anguish, he broke off his happy Oxford life when his proctorship ended, and betook himself to Ireland, to await the reopening of Dublin University, an ancient papal foundation temporarily extinct. Sir Henry Sidney, the lord deputy, was interested in Campion's future as well as in the revival which, however, fell through. With Philip Sidney, then a boy, Campion was to have a touching interview in 1577.

As too Catholic minded an Anglican, Campion was suspected, and exposed to danger. Hidden in friendly houses, he composed his treatise called "A History of Ireland". Written from an English standpoint it gave much offence to the native Irish, and was severely criticized, in the next century, by Geoffrey Keating in his Irish history of Ireland. Urged to further effort by the zeal of Gregory Martin, he crossed to England in disguise and under an assumed name, reaching BLESSED EDMUND CAMPION.

P. RYAN.
London in time to witness the trial of one of the earliest Oxonian martyrs, Dr. John Storey. Campion now recognized his vocation and hastened to the seminary at Douai. Cecil lamented to Richard Stanhurst the expatriation of "one of the diamonds of England". In Douai Campion remained for the theological course and its lesser degree, but then set out as a barefoot pilgrim to Rome, arriving there just before the death of St. Francis Borgia; "for I meant", as he said at his examination, "to enter into the Society of Jesus, thereof to vow and to be professed". This he accomplished professedly on 18 April (1570); being the first novice received by Mercurianus, the fourth general. As the English province was as yet non-existent, he was allotted to that of Bohemia, entering on his noviceship at Prague and passing his probation year at Brün in Moravia. Returning to Prague, he taught in the college and wrote a couple of sacred dramas; and there he was ordained in 1578. Meanwhile, Dr. Allen was organizing the apostolic work of the English Mission, and rejoiced to secure Fathers Robert Parsons and Edmund Campion as his first Jesuit helpers. In the garden at Brün, Campion had had a vision, in which Our Lady foretold him his martyrdom. Cornelianus hastened to take a scroll for E. M. D. C. P. Campianus Martyr, and to paint a prophetic garland of roses within his cell. Parsons and Campion set out from Rome, had many adventures, and called upon St. Charles Borromeo in Milan, and upon John in Geneva. Campion was met in London; closely clapped, armed, and conducted to the native young convert friend. His office was chiefly to reclaim Catholics who were wavering or temporizing under the pressure of governmental tyranny; but his zeal to win Protestants, his preaching, his whole sanctity and solidly characterized, made a general and profound impression. Himself religious, he fled to the North, where he fell again to writing and produced his famous tract, the "Decem Rationes". He returned to London, only to withdraw again, this time towards Norfolk. A spy, a former steward of the Roper family, one George Eliot, was hot upon his track, and ran him and others down at Lyfords Grange near Wantage in Berkshire on 17 July, 1581.

Amid scenes of violent excitement, Campion was factiously murdered by an alarm of the Tower, before the Dean of St. Paul's and other divines, Campion had been denied opportunity to prepare his defence, and had been severely racked. Thus weakened, he stood through the four long conferences, without chair, table, chairs, and stood undeterred. Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, who was looking on in the flush of worldly pride, became thereby inspired to return to God's service. The privy council, at its wits' end over so purely spiritual a "traitor", hatched a plot to impeach Campion's loyalty, and called in the hirings Eliot and sundry as accusing him of treason. Westminster Hall, 20 Nov., 1581. Campion, pleading not guilty, was quite unable to hold up his often-wrenching right arm, seeing which, a fellow-prisoner, first kissing it, raised it for him. He made a magnificent defence. But the sentence was death, by hanging, drawing, and quartering: a sentence received by the martyrs with a joyful shout of Haec dies and Te Deum. Campion, with Sherwin and Briant, who were on a separate hurdle, was dragged to Tyburn on 1 December. Passing Newgate arch, he lifted himself as best he could to salute the statue of Our Lady of Pillar, when, to the amazement of the bystanders, he was able to taunt him with his mind concerning the Bull of Pius V excommunicating Elizabeth, he answered only by a prayer for her, "your Queen and my Queen". He was a Catholic Englishman with political opinions which were not Allen's, though he died, as much as St. Ignatius, before the province of the Holy See. The people loudly lamented his fate; and another great harvest of conversions began. A wild, generous-hearted youth, Henry Walspole, standing by, got his white doublet stained with Campion's blood; the incident made him, too, in time, a Jesuit and a martyr.

Historians of all schools are agreed that the charges against Campion were wholesale falsehoods. There was his high intelligence, his beautiful gaiety, his fiery energy, his most chivalrous gentleness. He had renounced all opportunity for a dazzling career in a world of master men. Every tradition of Edmund Campion, every remnant of his written words, and not least his untried noble personality, show that we have nothing less than a man of genius; truly one of the great Elizabethans, but holy as none other of them all. He was beatified by Pope Leo XIII on 9 Dec., 1888. Relics of him are preserved in Rome and Prague, in London, Oxford, Stonyhurst, and Roffington. A not very convincing pendant to the story, and soon after his death for the Gesù in Rome under the supervision of many who had known him. Of this there is a copy in oils at Stonyhurst, and a brilliantly engraved print in Hazart's "4 Kerkyeleke Historie" (Antwerp, 1689), Vol. III (Engelandt, etc.), though not in every copy of that now scarce book.

Campion's Historie of Ireland was first published by Stanhurst in Holinshed, Chronicles (1587), then in Ware's book under the same title (1588), and again the Phoenix Press (Dublin, 1809); Edmund's Campianus Decem Rationes et aliae Opuscula, carefully edited (Antwerp, 1831); this included Orations, Letters, and the Narratio Dvovitii Henri VIII, Regis Angliae, ab Uzore et ab Eclesia, first printed by Harpfield. There is no modern ed. or tr. The standard biography is Simson, Edmund Campian, Jesuit Protonotary of England (London, 1866; reissued, London, 1897). Accounts of Campion's life, labours, and death in English and abroad are in Memoirs of Missionaries Priests; Foley, Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, and Stannton, Emulation of England and Europe, Select and Exact (Edinburgh, 1789), article on Campian's "Seditions". Biog. and that in Gifford, Bibl. Diet. Eng. Cath., are based, in phrase, as in fact, upon Simson, op. cit. A much better account is contained in Lives of the English Martyrs, ed. and by Camm (2 vols., London, 1905), II, 366-357. A book by Gollser appears in The English Martyrs of the True Society, 2 vols., London, 1892). For minor points connected with Campion see The Month (August, 1863; September, 1867; January, 1905); and The Irish Ecclesiastical Record, XII, Series III, 1891, pp. 629, 725. Besides a bibliography in Gifford, pp. 385-392, there is a more extensive one in Simson, Append. itself founded on de Bacon, Bibl. des Ecriv. de la c. de J. A small book devoted to him is The Blessed Edmund Campion in the St. Nicholas Series (London, 1868).

L. J. Guiney.

Edmund Rich, Saint, Archbishop of Canterbury, England, b. 20 November, c. 1180, at Abingdon, six miles from Oxford; d. 16 Nov., 1240, at Soissy, France. His early chronology is somewhat uncertain. His parents, Reichard (Reginald) and Isabel Rich, were remarkable for piety. It is said that his mother constantly wore hair-cloth, and attended almost every night at Matins in the abbey church. His father, even during the lifetime of his mother, entered the monastery of Eynsham in Oxfordshire. Edmund had two sisters and at least one brother. The two sisters became nuns. From his earliest years he was taught by his mother to practice acts of penance, such as fasting on Saturdays on bread and water, and wearing a hair shirt. When old enough he was sent to study at Oxford. While there, the Christ Child appeared to him while he was walking
alone in the fields. In memory of what passed between him and Christ on that occasion, he used every night to sign his forehead with the words “Jesus of Nazareth,” a custom he recommended to others. Anxiously to preserve purity of mind and body, Edmund made a vow of chastity and as a pledge of his holy vows he procured two rings; one he placed on the finger of Our Lady’s statue in St. Mary’s, Oxford, the other he himself wore.

About 1195, in company with his brother Richard, he was sent to the schools of Paris. Thenceforward, for several years, his life was spent between Oxford and Paris. He taught with success in both universities. After having devoted himself to the study of theology, Edmund acquired fame as a preacher, and was commissioned to preach the Sixth Crusade in various parts of England. All this time his austerities were very great. Most of the night he spent in prayer, and the little sleep he allowed himself was taken without lying down. Though thus severe to himself, he was gentle and kind towards others, especially to the poor and sick, whom sometimes he personally attended. In 1222 Edmund became treasurer of the Holy Sepulcher. Ten years later he was appointed to the Archbishops of Canterbury by Gregory IX and consecrated 2 April, 1234.

Notwithstanding the gentleness of his disposition, he firmly defended the rights of Church and State against the exactions and usurpations of Henry III. In 1237 Edmund came in his turn. During the twenty years of Henry’s reign, Edmund was always ready to support and defend the rights of his clergy and his Church, as he defended the rights of his country. He had the advantage of the papal legates’ authority to nullify Edmund’s power. Unable to force the king to give over the control of vacant benefices, and determined not to countenance evil and injustice, Edmund saw he could not remain in England. In 1240 he retired to the Cisterian Abbey of Pontigny. Here he lived like a simple religious till the summer heat drove him to Soissey, where he died. Within six years he was canonized by Innocent IV. His body was taken to Pontigny, and numerous miracles have been wrought at his tomb. Notwithstanding the devastation that from time to time has overtaken Pontigny, the body of St. Edmund is still venerated in its abbey church. Important relics of the saint are preserved at Westminster Cathedral; St. Edmund’s College, Ware; Portsmouth Cathedral, and Erdington Abbey.

The ancient proper Mass of St. Edmund, taken from the Sarum Missal, is used in the Diocese of Portsmouth, of which St. Edmund is patron. In September, 1874, 350 English pilgrims visited St. Edmund’s shrine. The community, known as Fathers of St. Edmund, were forced to leave their home at Pontigny by the Associations. The “Spectrum Ecclesiae,” an ascetical treatise, and the “Provincial Constitutions” are the most important of St. Edmund’s writings.

Besides the three ancient lives of St. Edmund by Matthew Paris, Robert Bacon, and Bertrand Rich, there is a fourth one in the “Thesaurus Anecdotorum,” for a complete account of the MSS. records, the reader is referred to Wallace, St. Edmund of Canterbury (London, 1893); 1-18, and to de Paravicini, St. Edmund of Abingdon (London, 1893). See also: Butler, Lives of the Saints, 16th Nov.; Archb. of Canterbury; Land, Tractarian: Ward, St. Edmund Archb. of Canterbury (London, 1883); Archb. of Canterbury in Dict. of Nat. Biol., u. v.

**COLUMBA EDMONDS.**

**EDMUND THE MARTYR, SAINT, King of East Anglia, b. about 840; d. at Hoxne, Suffolk, 20 November, 870.** No other accounts represent St. Edmund as descended from the preceding kings of East Anglia, though, according to later legends, he was born at Nuremberg (Germany), son to an otherwise unknown King Alcind of Saxony. Though only about fifteen years old when crowned in 855, Edmund showed himself a model ruler from the first, anxious to treat all with equal justice, and closing his ears to flatterers and dishonest informers. In his eagerness for prayer he retired for a year to his royal tower at Hadleigh and learned the whole Psalter by heart, in order that he might afterwards recite it regularly. In 870 he bravely repulsed the two Danish chiefs Hinguar and Hubba who had invaded his dominions. They soon returned with overwhelming numbers, and pressed terms upon him which as a Christian he felt bound to refuse. In his desire to avert a fruitless massacre, he disbanded his troops and himself retired towards Framlingham; on the way he fell into the hands of the invaders. Having loaded him with chains, his captors conducted him to Hinguar, whose impious demands he again rejected, declaring his religion dearer to him than his life. His martyrdom took place in 870 at Hoxne in Suffolk. After beating him with cudgels, the Danes tied him to a tree, and cruelly tore his flesh with whips. Throughout these tortures Edmund continued to preach under the tree, until at last, exasperated by his constancy, his enemies began to discharge arrows at him. This cruel sport was continued until his body had the appearance of a porcupine, when Hinguar commanded his head to be struck off. From his first burial-place at Hoxne his relics were removed to other places, and have remained there, since called St. Edmundsbury, where arose the famous abbey of that name. His feast is observed 20 Nov., and he is represented in Christmart with sword and arrow, the instruments of his torture.

**THOMAS ARNOLD, Memorials of St. Edmund’s Abbey in B. S. (London, 1880), containing Abbo of Flambury, Ponsano Edmund (1895), and Gaufridus de Pontibus, Infanta S. Eadmundi (c. 1150); Tynemouth and Canterbury Anglois, ed. Horneman (Oxford, 1901); Butler, Lives of the Saints (Dublin, 1872); Mackinlay, Saint Edmund King and Martyr (London, 1883).**

**G. E. PHILLIPS.**

**Education.—In General.—In the broadest sense, education includes all those experiences by which intelligence is developed, knowledge acquired, and character formed. In a narrower sense, it is the process by which certain agencies and institutions, the home and the school, for the express purpose of training immature minds. The child is born with latent capacities which must be developed so as to fit him for the activities and duties of life. The meaning of life, the results of its purposes and values are secured by the educative process, which primarily determines the nature of his work. Education aims at an ideal, and this in turn depends on the view that is taken of man and his destiny, of his relations to God, to his fellowmen, and to the physical world. The content of education is furnished by the previous acquisition of mankind in literature, art, and science, in moral, social, and religious principles. The inheritance, however, contains elements that differ greatly in value, both as mental possessions and as means of culture; hence a selection is necessary, and this must be guided largely by the educational ideal. It will also be influenced by the consideration of the educative process. Teaching must be adapted to the needs of the developing mind, and the endeavour to make the adaptation more thorough results in theories and methods which are, or should be, based on the findings of biology, psychology, and physiology.**

The work of education begins normally in the home; but it is, for obvious reasons, continued in institutions where other teachers stand in place of the parents. To secure efficiency it is necessary that each school be properly organized, that the teachers be qualified, and that the subjects of instruction be wisely chosen. Since the school, moreover, is so largely responsible for the intellectual and moral formation of those who
will later, as members of society, be useful or harmful, there is evidently needed some higher direction than that of the individual teacher, in order that the purpose of education may be realized. Both the Church and the State, therefore, have interests to safeguard; each in its own sphere must exercise its authority; education is to strive for the true ideal through the best content and by the soundest methods. It is thus obvious that education at any given time expresses the dominant ideas in philosophy, religion, and science, while, in its practical control, the existing relations between the temporal power and the spiritual must enter into the spiritual atmosphere of society. As, moreover, these ideas and relations have varied considerably in the course of time, it is quite intelligible that a solution of the central educational problems should be sought in history; and it is further beyond question that historical study, in this as in other departments, has a manifold utility. But a mere recital of facts is of little avail unless certain fundamental principles be kept in view, and unless the fact of Christian revelation be given its due importance. It is needful, then, to distinguish the constant elements in education from those that are variable; the former including man’s nature, the arts, as sculpture, the doctrine of God, the latter all those changes in theory, practice, and organization which affect the actual conduct of educational work. It is with the first aspect of the subject that the present article is mainly concerned; and from this standpoint education means as far as that form of social activity which is carried on under the direction of mature minds and by the use of adequate means, the physical, intellectual, and moral powers of the immature human being are so developed as to prepare him for the accomplishment of his life-work here and for the attainment of his eternal destiny. Neither shall he be frozen from the former activities of society, nor be deprived from the beginning. In primitive times the helplessness and needs of the child were so obvious that his elders by a natural impulse gave him a training in the rude arts that enabled him to procure the necessities of life, while they taught him to propagate the hidden power in each object of nature, and handed on to him the tribal customs and traditions. But of education properly so called the savage knows nothing, and much less does he busy himself with theory or plan. Even civilized peoples carry on the work of education for a long time before they begin to reflect upon the meaning and such reflection is guided by philosophical speculation and by established social, religious, and political institutions. Often, too, their theorizing is the work of exceptional minds, and presents a higher ideal than might be inferred from their educational practices. Nevertheless, an account of what was done by the principal peoples of antiquity will prove useful by bringing out the profound modification which Christianity wrought.

Oriental Education.—The invention of writing was of the utmost importance for the development of language and the keeping of records. The earliest texts, chiefly of a religious nature, became the sources of knowledge and the means of education. Such were in China the writings of Confucius, in India the Vedas, in Egypt the Book of the Dead, in Persia the Avesta. The main purpose in having these books studied by youth was aimed at the same ends of thought and conduct, and varying conformity with the past. In this respect Chinese education is typical. The sacred writings contained minute prescriptions for conduct in every circumstance and station of life. These the pupil was obliged to memorize in a purely mechanical fashion. If he understood them it was quite indifferent. He simply stored his memory with a multitude of established forms and phrases, which subsequently he employed in the preparation of essays and in passing the governmental examinations. That he should learn to think for himself was of course out of the question. With such a training, the development of free personality was impossible. In China, the family, with its sacred traditions and its ancestor-worship, was dominant; in Persia, education was controlled by the State; in Egypt by the priesthood; in India by the different castes. Moreover, there was, doubtless, in all the Oriental minds, a feeling of responsibility, personality; but no effort was made to strengthen and give it value. On the contrary, the Hindu philosophy, which regarded knowledge as the means of redemption from the miseries of life, placed that redemption itself in nirvana, the extinction of the individual soul through the absorption into the being of the world. The position of woman was, in general, a degraded one. Though the early training of the child devolved upon the mother, her responsibility brought with it no dignity. But little provision was made for the education of girls; their only vocation was to marry, bear children, and render service to the head of the family.

In view of these facts, it cannot be said that education as the Western world conceives it owes any great debt to the East. It is true that some of the sciences, as mathematics, astronomy, and chronology, and some of the arts, as sculpture, and architectural design and music, as well as to a certain degree of perfection; but the very success of Oriental ability and skill in these lines only emphasizes by contrast the deficiencies of Oriental education. Even in the sphere of morality the same antagonism appears between precept and practice. It cannot and need not everywhere be forgotten that Confucius, evince a high ideal of virtue, while some of the Hindu precepts, such as those of the "Panthatantra," are full of practical wisdom. Yet these facts only make it more difficult to answer the question: Why was the actual living of these people so far removed from the concepts of virtue? Nevertheless, Oriental education has a peculiar significance; it shows quite plainly the consequences of sacrificing the individual to the interests of human institutions, and of reducing education to a machine-like process, the aim of which is to mould all minds upon one unchanging pattern; and it further shows how little can be accomplished for real education by despotic authority, which demands, and is satisfied with, an outward observance of custom and law. (See Davidson, "A History of Education," New York, 1894.)

The Greeks.—If the education of the Oriental peoples was stationary, that of the Greeks exhibited a progressive development which passes from one extreme to another through a variety of movements and reactions, of ideals and practices. What remains constant throughout is the idea that the purpose of education is to train youth for citizenship. This, however, was conceived, and its realization attempted, in different ways by the several City-States. In Sparta, the child, according to the Code of Lycurgus, was the property of the State. From his seventh year onward he received a public training whose one object was to make him a soldier, by developing physical strength, courage, self-control, and obedience to law. It was a hard training in gymnastic exercises, with little attention to the intellectual side and less to the aesthetic; even music and dancing took a military character. Girls were subjected to the same severe discipline, not so much to emphasize the equality of the sexes as to train the sturdy mothers of a warrior race.

The ideal of Athenian education was the completely developed man. Beauty of mind and body, the cultivation of every inborn faculty and energy, harmony between thought and life, decorum, temperance, and regularity, such were the results aimed at at the home and in the school, in social intercourse, and in civic relations. "We are lovers of the beautiful," said Pericles, "yet simple in our tastes, and we cultivate the mind without loss of manliness" (Thucydides, II, 46). The means of culture were music and gymnas-
ties, the former including history, poetry, the drama, oratory, and science, along with music in the narrower sense; while the latter comprised games, athletic exercises, and the training for military duty. That music was no more "accomplishment" and that gymnastics had a higher aim than bodily strength or skill is evident from what Plato tells us in the "Protagoras". The Greeks indeed laid stress on courage, temperance, and obedience to law; and if their theoretical disquisitions could be taken as fair accounts of their actual practice, it would be difficult to find, among the products of human thinking, a more exalted ideal. The essential weakness of their moral education was the failure to provide adequate sanction for the principles they formulated and for the counsels they gave to youth. The practice of religion, whether in public services or in household worship, exerted but little influence upon the formation of character. The Greek deities, after all, were no models for imitation; some of them could scarcely have been objects of reverence, since they were endowed with the weaknesses and passions of men. Religion itself was mechanical and external; it did not touch conscience nor awaken the soul. As to the future life, that of the Greeks believed in the immortality of the soul; but this belief had little or no practical significance. Thus the motive for virtuous action was found, not in respect for Divine law nor in the hope of eternal reward, but simply in the desire to temper in due proportion the elements of human nature for social need and personal advantage. Virtue is not self-repression for the sake of duty, but, as Plato says, "a kind of health and beauty and good habit of the soul"; while vice is "a disease and deforms and sickness of it". The just man "will so regulate his own character as to be on good terms with himself, and to set those three principles [prudence, temperance, and justice] in their due relation to each other and himself and the community, so that he may be truly the ruler of his soul; and thus the just man will have reached the stage we have defined as "the exercise and practice of virtue" (Republic, IV, 443). This conception of virtue as a self-balancing was closely bound up with that idea of personal worth which has already been mentioned as the central element in Greek life and ethics. But the personality that of man for the sake of his humanity, nor even that of the Greek for the sake of his nationality; it was the personality of the free citizen, and from citizenship the artisan and the slave were excluded. The mechanical arts were held in bad repute; and Aristotle declares that "they render the body and soul or intellect of free persons unfit for the exercise and practice of virtue" (Politics, V, 1337). A still more serious limitation, affecting not only their concept of human dignity, but their regard for human life as well, consisted in the exposure of children. This was practiced at Sparta by the public authority, which destroyed the child that was unfit for the service of the State; while at Athens the fate of his offspring was committed to the father and might be decided in accordance with purely personal interests. The mother's position was not much better than it had been in the Orient. "The laws are general; the law is to be absolute, the soul and the body and the whole man are to be free persons unfit for the exercise and practice of virtue" (Euripides, Medea, 406). At best she was a means to an end, the bearing of children and the care of the household; her education consequently was of the least sort. The only exceptions were the heroines who were outside the home circle and who with greater freedom of living combined higher culture than the legitimate wife could hope for. Under such circumstances marriage implied for woman a lowering of personal worth that was in marked contrast with the ideals set up for the education of men.

These ideals, again, underwent a decided change during the fifth century B.C. In one respect at least it was a change for the better; it extended the rights of citizenship. The constitution of Solon was set aside and that of Cleisthenes adopted in its stead (509 B.C.). The democratic spirit of the time, the in-crease in prosperity at home and the widening of foreign relations, afforded new opportunities for individual ability and endeavour. This heightened activity, however, was not put forth in behalf of the common good, but rather for the advancement of personal interests. At the same time morality was deprived of even the outward support it had formerly drawn from religion; philosophy gave way to scepticism; and education, while it became more intellectual, laid emphasis on form rather than on content. The most influential teachers were the Sophists, who supplied the growing demand for instruction in the art of public discussion and offered information on every sort of subject. Developing in practical directions the principle that "man is the measure of all things", they carried individualism to the extreme of subjectivism alike in the sphere of speculative thought and in the political field. The purpose of their teaching was correspondingly modified, and new problems arose. Now that the old standards and basis of morality had been rejected, the main question was to replace them by others in which due allowance would be made on the one hand for individuality and on the other for the conditions under which men lived. "Know thyself" and "Knowledge is virtue", i.e. a knowledge drawn from personal experience, yet possessing universal validity; and the means prescribed by him for obtaining such knowledge was his mateurics, i.e. the art of giving birth to ideas through the method of question and answer, by which he developed the power of thinking. As an intellectual discipline, this scheme had undoubted value; but it left unsolved the chief problem: how is knowledge, even of the highest kind, to be translated into action? Plato offered a twofold solution. In the "Republic", setting out from his general theory that the idea alone is real, and that the good of each thing consists in harmony with the idea whence it originated, he reaches the conclusion that knowledge consists in the perception of this harmony. The aim of education, therefore, is to develop knowledge of the good, and we need not go far, this scheme contains little more promise of practical results than that of Socrates. But Plato adds that society is to be ruled by those who attain to this knowledge, i.e. by the philosophers; the other two classes, soldiers and artisans, are subordinate, yet each individual is assigned to the class for which his abilities fit him, reaches the highest self-development and contributes his share to the social weal. In the "Laws", Plato attempts to revise and combine certain elements of the Spartan and of the Athenian system, but this reactionary scheme met with no success. This problem, finally, was taken up by Aristotle in the "Ethics" and the "Politics". As in his philosophy, so in his educational theory, he departs from Plato's teaching. The goal for the individual as well as for society is happiness; "What we have to aim at is the happiness of each citizen, and happiness consists in a complete activity and practice of virtue" (Politics, IV). More precisely, happiness is "the conscious activity of the highest part of man according to the law of his own excellence, not unaccompanied by adequate, external conditions". Merely to have what goes beyond this is not enough; this knowledge must issue in practice, the goodness of the intellect (knowledge of universal truth) must be combined with goodness of action. The three things which make men good and virtuous—nature, habit, and reason—must be in harmony with one another (for only then do they always agree); men do many things against habit and nature, if reason persuades them that they ought.
We have already determined what natures are likely to be most easily moulded by the hands of the legislator. All else is the work of education; we learn some things by habit and some by instruction" (Politics, Bk. VII). Education, however, must always be adaptable to the peculiar character of the State and the time. "The citizen should be moulded to suit the form of government under which he lives" (ibid., VIII). And again, "It is right that the citizens should possess a capacity for affairs and for war, but still more for the enjoyment of peace or leisure; right that they should be capable of actions as auxiliary, but still more of such as are moral per se. It is with a view to these objects, then, that they should be educated while they are still children, and at all other ages, till they pass beyond the need of education" (ibid., IV). "Neither must we suppose that any one of the citizens belongs to himself, for they all belong to the State, and are each of them a part of the State, and the care of each part is inseparable from the care of the whole" (ibid., VIII).

In the theories of Plato and Aristotle are found the highest reaches of Hellenic thought regarding the purpose and nature of education. Each of them, with thinkers established schools of philosophy, and each has profoundly affected the thought of all subsequent time, yet neither succeeded in providing an education sound and permanent enough to avert the moral and political downfall of the nation. The diffusion of Greek thought and culture throughout the world by conquest and colonization was no remedy for the evils which sprang from an exaggeraded individualism. Once the idea was accepted that each man is his own standard of conduct, neither brilliancy of literary production nor fineness of philosophic speculation could prevent the decay of patriotism and of a virtuous spirit which had never looked higher than the State for its sanction. Aristotle himself, at the close of his "Ethics," points out the radical difficulty: "Now if arguments and theories were able by themselves to make people good, they would, in the words of Theognis, be entitled to receive high and great rewards, and it is with theories that we should have to provide ourselves. But the truth apparently is that, though they are strong enough to encourage and stimulate young men of liberal minds, though they are able to inspire with goodness a character that is naturally noble and sincerely loving, the beautiful, the useful, to convert the mass of men to goodness and beauty of character." No such "conversion" was aimed at by the Sophists. Appealing to the natural tendencies of the individual, they developed a spirit of selfishness which in them broke out in discord, thus opening the way for the conquest of Greece by Roman arms.

The Romans.—In striking contrast with the Greek character, that of the Romans was practical, utilitarian, grave, austere. Their religion was serious, and it permeated their whole life, hallowing all its relations. The family, especially, was far more sacred than in Sparta or Athens, and the position of woman as wife and mother more exalted and influential. Still, as with the Greeks, the power of the father over the life of his child—patris potestas—was absolute, and, in the earlier period at least, the exposure of children was common practice. In fact the Twelve Tables provided for the immediate destruction of deformed offspring and gave the father, during the whole life of his children, the right to imprison, sell, or slay them. Subsequently, however, a check was placed on such practices. The ideal at which the Romans strived was neither harmony nor happiness, but the performance of duty and the maintenance of his rights. Yet this ideal was to be realized through service to the State. Deep as was the family feeling, it was always subordinate to devotion to the public weal. "Parents are dear," said Cicero, "and children and kindred, but all loves are bound up in the love of our common country" (De Officiis, I, 17). Education therefore was essentially a preparation for civic duty. "The children of the Romans are brought up that they may one day be able to be of service to the fatherland, and one must accordingly instruct them in the customs of the institution of the State and the institutions of the State, the fatherland has produced and brought us up that we may devote to its use the finest capacities of our mind, talent, and understanding. Therefore we must learn those arts whereby we may be of greater service to the State; for that I hold to be the highest wisdom and virtue."

These words express, at any rate, the spirit of the early Roman education. The home was the only school, and the parents the only teachers. Of scientific and aesthetic training there was little or none. To learn the Laws of the Twelve Tables, to become familiar with the lives of the men who had made Rome great, and to copy the virtues which he saw in his father were the chief endeavour of the boy and youth. Thus the moral element predominated, and virtues of a practical sort were inculcated: first of all pietas, obedience to parents and to the gods; then prudence, fair play, modesty, firmness, and gravity. These qualities were to be developed, not by abstract or philosophical reasoning, but through the imitation of worthy models and, as far as possible, of living concrete examples. "Vine discimus, "We learn for life," said Seneca; and this phrase sums up the whole purport of Roman education. In the course of Roman schools (ludi) were opened, but they were conducted by private teachers and were supplementary to the home instruction. About the middle of the third century B.C., foreign influences began to make themselves felt. The works of the Greeks were translated into Latin, Greek teachers were introduced, and schools established in which the educational characteristics of the Greeks reappeared. Under the direction of the literatus and the grammaticus education took on a literary character, while in the school of the rhetor the art of oratory was carefully cultivated. The importance which the Romans attached to eloquence is clearly shown by Cicero in his "De Oratore" and by Quintilian in his "Institutes"; to produce the orator became eventually the chief end of education. Quintilian's work, moreover, is the principal contribution to educational theory produced in Rome. The heliconian springs were still there, and gradually one Roman character yielded but slowly to the intellectualism of the Greeks, and when the latter finally triumphed, far-reaching changes had come about in Roman society, government, and life. Whatever the causes of decline—political, economic, or moral—they could not be stayed by the imported refinement of Greek thought and practice. Nevertheless, pagan education as a whole, with its ideals, successes, and failures, has a profound significance. It was the product of the highest human wisdom, speculative and practical, that the world has known. It pursued in the turns that appear most natural to the human mind. It engaged the thought of the greatest philosophers and the action of the wisest legislators. Art, science, and literature were placed at its service, and the mighty influence of the State was exerted in its behalf. In itself, therefore, and in its results, it shows how much and how little human reason can accomplish when it seeks no guidance higher than itself and strives for no purposes other than those which find, or may find, their realization in the present phase of existence.

The Jews.—Among the pre-Christian peoples the Jews occupy a unique position. As the recipients and custodians of Divine revelation, their conceptions of life and morality were far above those of the Gentiles. God manifested Himself to them directly as a Person, a Spirit, and an ethical Being, guiding them by His providence, making known to them His will, and pre-
scribing the minutest details of life and of religious practice. Throughout the Old Testament, God appears as the teacher of His chosen people. He sets before them a standard of righteousness which is none other than Himself: “You shall be holy, because I am the Lord your God” (Lev., xi, 46). Through Moses and the Prophets He gives them His Commandments and the promise of a Messiah to come. But He also placed upon them the duty of instructing their children. “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thy heart: and thou shalt tell them to thy children, and thou shalt meditate on them sitting in thy house, and walking in thy journey, sleeping and rising” (Deut., vi, 4–7).

In accordance with this injunction, education, at least in the earlier period, was given chiefly in the home. Jewish family life, indeed, far surpassed that of the Gentiles in the purity of its relations, in the position it secured to woman, and in the care which it bestowed on children, who were regarded as a blessing vouchsafed by God and destined for His service. The training for the coming of God’s Kingdom was a serious duty of the synagogue. Through Moses and the doctors, the instruction of youth, which was committed to the scribes and the doctors, was practised. Schools, as such, came into existence only in the later period, and then the teaching was permeated by religion. Though the Old Testament contains a number of maxims which abounds in maxims and principles which are all the more weighty because they are inspired by Divine wisdom and because they have a practical bearing upon life. God Himself showed the dignity of the teacher’s office when He declared: “They that are learned shall teach them, and they that are instructed shall teach others” (Deut., vi, 7). In the light, however, of a more perfect revelation, it is clear that God’s dealings with Israel had an ultimate purpose which was to be realised “in the fulness of time”. Not only the utterances of the Prophets, but many signal events in the history of the Jews and many of their ritual observances were types of the Messiah; as St. Paul says, “All these things happened to them in figure” (I Cor., x, 11), and “The law was our pedagogue in Christ” (Gal., iii, 24).

As Sasson the Teacher of God, who imparting to them the truth which they presently needed, also prepared the way for the greater truths of the Gospel.

**Christian Education.**—As in many other respects, so for the work of education, the advent of Christianity is the most important epoch in the history of mankind. Not only does the Christian conception of life differ radically from the pagan view, not only does the Christian teaching impart a new sort of knowledge and lay down a new principle of action, but Christianity, moreover, supplies the effectual means of making its ideal actual and of carrying its precepts into practice. Through all vicissitudes of conflict and adjustment, of changing civilizations and varying opinions, in spite even of the shortcomings of its own adherents, Christianity has steadfastly held up before men the life and the lessons of its Divine Founder.

**Jesus the Teacher:**—“God, who, at sundry times and in divers manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all, in these days hath spoken to us by His Son” (Heb., i, 1–2). This communication through the God-Man was to reveal the true way of living: “The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men: instructing us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly desires, we should live soberly, and justly, and godly in this world, looking for the blessed hope and coming of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” (Titus, ii, 11, 12). Of Himself and His mission Christ declared, “I am come a light into the world; that whosoever believeth in me, may not remain in darkness” (John, xii, 46); and again, “For this was I born, and for this came I into the world; that I should give testimony to the truth” (John, xviii, 37). The knowledge which He came to impart was no mere intellectual possession or theory: “I am come that they may have life, and may have it more abundantly” (John, x, 10). He taught, therefore, “the authority”. He insisted that His hearers should believe the truths which He taught, even though these might seem to be “hard sayings”. His doctrines, indeed, made no appeal either to pride of intellect or to self-sufficiency or to passion. For the most part, as in the Sermon on the Mount, they were direct expositions opposed to the maxims that had obtained in the pagan world. They were, in the highest sense, supernatural, not only in proposing eternal life as the ultimate goal of man’s existence and action, but also in enjoining the denial of self as the chief requisite for attaining that destiny. Service to the neighbour was insisted upon, but this was to be rendered in the spirit of love, the new commandment which Christ gave (John, xiii, 34). Faithfulness also to civil duty was required, but the sanction which imparted force to such obligations was their relation to the Kingdom of God.

Religion, for Jesus, was the highest of all human aspirations. “Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you” (Matt., vi, 33). The faith of Christ was far removed from the material optimism of the natural tendencies of human thought and desire, could be imparted only by one who embodied in himself all the qualifications of a perfect teacher. The philosophers no doubt might, and did, formulate beautiful theories regarding knowledge and virtue; but Christ alone could say to His disciples: “I am the way, the truth, and the life” (John, xiv, 6). And whatever worth they attached in theory to personality was of far less significance than the actual realisation of the highest ideal in Christ’s own Person. He could thus rightfully appeal to that eminent tendency which is so deeply rooted in man’s nature and from which so much is expected in modern education. The axiom, also, that we learn by doing, and that knowledge gets its full value only when it issues in action, finds its best exemplification in Christ’s dealings with His disciples. He “brought many to see their faith, and He gave evidence of His power over all nature, and therefore of His authority to require faith in His words: “The works themselves which I do give testimony of me, that the Father hath sent me” (John, v, 36). To His disciples, when they hesitated or were slow to realise that the Father abides in Him, He answered: “Otherwise believe for the very works’ sake” (v, 12). What He demanded in turn was no more outward profession of faith or loyalty: “Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doth the will of My Father” (Matt., vii, 21).

The necessity of manifesting belief through action is constantly pointed out both in the literal teaching of Christ and in His parables. These, again, illustrate His practical wisdom as a teacher. They were drawn from objects and circumstances with which His hearers were familiar. In each instance they were adapted to the manner of thinking suggested by the local surroundings and the customs of the people; and they were often called forth by an incident that seemed unimportant or by a question which was asked now by the following His tireless Master, or the simplest of things—of the vine, the fig-tree, the birds of the air, and the grass of the field—were made to yield lessons of the deepest moral significance. His aim was not to adorn His own discourse, but rather to bring its content into the minds of His hearers more vividly, and to secure for its greater permanence by associating in their thought some supernatural
ural truth with the facts of daily experience. Sensory perception, memory, and imagination were thus formed to develop a mental setting for the great truths of the Kingdom. The same principle found its application in the institution of the sacraments whereby natural phenomena are made the outward signs of inward grace. As St. John Chrysostom aptly says, "Wert thou incorporeal, He would have bestowed on thee incorporeal gifts in their bare reality; but because the soul is bound up with the body, He gives thee intelligible things under sensible forms" (Homilia ix, ad populum Antioch.).

In fact, the whole teaching of Christ is the clearest proof of the principle that education must adapt itself in method and practice to the needs of those who are to be taught. In accordance with this principle He prepared the minds of His followers beforehand for the institution of the Holy Eucharist, for His own death, and for the coming of the Holy Ghost (John, vi, xiv, xv); and He ever reserved certain truths to be made known by the Paraclete: "I have yet many things to say to you: but you cannot bear them now. But when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all things..." (xvi, 12, 13). Thus the success of His work as a teacher is left not to human conjecture or speculation, nor to the theories of philosophical schools, but to the Spirit of God Himself. This of course was best realized by those who were nearest to Him; yet even those of the Jews who were not among the Apostles, but were, like Neode mones, able to judge fairly, confessed His superiority: "We know that thou art come a teacher from God; for no man can do those signs which thou dost, unless God be with him." (John, iii, 2).

The Aim of Christian Education.—Had Christ's mission ended when He quitted the earth, He would still have been a word and work of God; the ideal teacher would have influenced for all time the education of mankind so far as its ultimate aims and basic principles are concerned. But as a matter of fact, He made ample provision for the perpetuation of His work by training a select body of men who for three years were constantly under His direction and were thoroughly imbued with His spirit. To these Apostles, moreover, He gave the command: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations..." (Matt., xxviii, 19, 20). These words are the charter of the Christian Church as a teaching institution. While, however, they are directly to the doctrine of salvation, and therefore to the imparting of religious truth, they nevertheless, or rather by the very nature of that truth and its consequences for life, carry with them the obligation of instilling in certain principles and maintaining certain characteristics which have a decisive bearing on all educational problems.

1. The truth of Christianity is to be made known to all men. It is not confined to any one race or nation or class, nor is it to be the exclusive possession of highly gifted minds. This characteristic of universality is in plain contrast with the highest conceptions of the pagan world. The cultured Greek had only contempt for the barbarian, and the Roman looked upon outside nations as subjects to be governed rather than as people to be taught. But at Athens also and at Rome there was the distinction between freemen and slaves, in consequence of which the latter were excluded from the benefits of education. As against these narrow limitations Christ charged His Apostles to "teach all men"; and St. Paul, in the same spirit, professes himself a debtor to all men, Greeks and barbarians, wise and unwise alike. All in fact, were to be dealt with as children of the same Heavenly Father and heirs of the Kingdom of God. In respect of these supernatural prerogatives, the distinctions which had hitherto prevailed were set aside: Christianity appeared as one vast school with mankind at large for its disciples.

2. The commission given to the Apostles was not to expir with them; it was to remain in force "all days, even to the consummation of the world". Perpetuity, therefore, is an essential feature in the educational work of Christianity. The institutions of paganism were advanced towards a natural phase of development, but they did not contain the element of enduring vitality. In the higher departments of learning, as in philosophy, school had followed school into vigour and into decay. And in education itself, one ideal after another had been put forward only to be discarded. Christianity, on the contrary, while it could never become a rigid system, held up to mankind certain unchangeable truths which should serve as criteria for determining the value of every fundamental theory of life and of education. By insisting, especially, that man's destiny was to be attained, not in any form of temporal service or success, but in union with God, it proposed an ideal which should be valid for all time and amid all the variations of human thought and endeavour. That such changes would inevitably come to pass, Christ, without doubt, foresees. In view of these, a merely human teacher could have provided the stability which devices which, if successful, have attested his foresight, or shrewdness, or knowledge of human nature. But Christ's guarantee to the Apostles is as simple and surer: "Behold I am with you all days". The task of instructing the world in Christian truth was to be impossible but for this permanent abiding of Christ with His appointed teachers. On the other hand, once the force of His promise is realized, the significance of Christianity as a perpetual institution becomes evident: it means that Christ Himself through a visible agency was to continue for all time the work He began during His earthly life as Teacher of the human race.

3. It has already been pointed out that some of the pagan peoples, and notably the Greeks, had attained a very high conception of personality; and it has also been shown that this conception was by no means useless. The teaching of Christianity in this respect is so far superior to any other that if a single element could be designated as fundamental in Christian education it would be the emphasis which it lays on the worth of the individual. In the first place, Christianity had its origin, not in any abstract speculation as to goodness, but in the actual concrete life of a Person who was absolutely perfect. It was not, then, obliged to cast about for the ideal man, or to present a theory as to what that ideal might possibly be: it could and it did point to a realization which far surpassed the most exalted ideas of human wisdom. In Christ first appeared the full dignity of human nature through its elevation to personal union with the Word of God; and in Him, as never before or since, were manifest those traits which furnish the noblest models for imitation.

Christianity, furthermore, elevated human personality by the value it set upon each human soul as created by God and destined for eternal life. The State is no longer the supreme arbiter, nor is service to the public the ultimate standard. These, it is true, within their legitimate sphere have just claims upon the individual. Christianity by no means teaches that such claims can be disregarded or the corresponding duties neglected, but rather that the discharge of all social and civic obligations will be more thorough when subordinated to, and inspired by, fidelity in the duties that man owes to God. While the value of personality is thus enhanced, the sense of responsibility is correspondingly increased. If the requirement of the person is not allowed to culminate in selfishness nor in that extreme individualism which is a threat to social organization.

4. From these principles Christianity drew consequences which were totally at variance with the
thought and practice of paganism. The position of woman was lifted at once to a higher plane; she ceased to be a chattel, or a mere instrument of passion, and became the equal of man, with the same personal worth and the same eternal destiny. Marriage was regarded as an institution entered into through caprice or convention, but an indissoluble bond involving mutual rights and duties. Moreover, it was raised to the dignity of a sacrament, which not only sanctified the marital relation and its purposes, but also conferred the grace needful for the due fulfilment of its obligations. The whole meaning of the family was thus transformed. Parental authority was indeed maintained, but such an exercise of the patria potestas as the destruction or the exposure of children could not have been tolerated once it was realized that the child's personality also is sacred, and that parents are responsible not simply to the State, but also to God, for the proper education of their offspring. Christianity, moreover, laid upon the child the duty of respecting and obeying his parents, not out of servile fear or hard necessity, but through a spirit of reverence and filial love. The ties of home-life were thereby strengthened, and the whole work of education took on a new character because it was consecrated in its very source by religion.

5. In respect of its content Christianity opened up to the human mind wide realms of truth which unaided reason could not possibly have attained, and which, however, are of far greater import than the most learned speculations of pagan thought. Upon those truths, also, which the philosophers had but vaguely discerned, or about which they had remained in doubt, it shed a new light. There could be no further questioning, for the Christian, as to the existence of a personal God, the reality of His providence, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, and the resulting accountability of man to Divine Justice. Above all, the nature of the moral order was set forth in unmistakable terms. Christianity insisted that morality was not mere outward conformity to custom or law, but the inner rectitude of the will, that aesthetic refinement was of far less consequence than purity of heart, and that love of the neighbour as proven in deeds, not personal gain or advantage, was the true norm of human relationships. That such a conception of life, with its emphasis on really spiritual thought and its appeal to the formal ideals unknown to the pagan world, is obvious. But on the other hand it would be wrong to infer that Christianity, in its "otherworldliness", reduces or neglects the values of the present life. What it consistently maintains is, that life here gets its highest value by serving as a preparation for the life to come. The question is not whether one should live now without any regard to the future or look forward to the future with no concern for the present; but rather how one should profit by the opportunities of this life in such wise as to secure the other. The problem, then, is one of establishing ideals, i.e. of determining values according to the standard of man's eternal destiny. When education is defined as "preparation for complete living" (Herbert Spencer), the Christian can take no objection to the words as they stand; but he will insist that no living can be "complete" which leaves out of consideration the ultimate purpose of life, and hence that no education really "prepares" which thirsts that purpose or sets it aside. It is just this completeness—in teaching all men, in harmonizing all truths, in elevating all relationships, and in leading the individual soul back to the Creator—that forms the essential characteristic of Christianity as an educational influence.

The Educational Work of the Church. Next in importance to Christ's personal teaching was the establishment of a teaching body whose mission was identical with His own: "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you" (John, xxi, 21); and "He that heareth you, heareth me" (Luk, x, 16). He was not content with proclaiming once for all the truth of the Gospel, nor did He leave His wider dissemination to individual enthusiasm or initiative; He founded a Church to carry on His work. The spread of His doctrine was thus entrusted, not to books, but to schools of philosophy, nor to the governments of the world, but to an organization that spoke in His name and with His authority. No other body of teachers ever undertook so vast a work, and no other ever accomplished so much for education in the highest sense. Apart from the preaching of the Apostles, the earliest form of Christian instruction that came to the catechumen of (q. v.) in preparation for baptism. Its object was twofold: to impart a knowledge of Christian truth, and to train the candidate in the practice of religion. It was conducted by the bishop and, as the number of catechumens increased, by priests, deacons, and other clerics. Until the third century this mode of instruction was an important adjunct to the Apostolate; but in the fifth and sixth centuries it was gradually replaced by private instruction of the converts, who were then less numerous, and by the training given in other schools to those who had been baptised.

The catechumenal schools, however, gave expression to the spirit which was to animate all subsequent Christian education: they were open to everyone who accepted the Faith, and they united religious instruction with the preparation for the exercise of the sacred arts. Schools, also under the bishop's supervision, prepared young clerics for the priesthood. The courses of study included philosophy and theology, and naturally took on an apologetic character in defense of Christian truth against the attacks of pagan learning. One of the oldest of these schools was at the Lateran in Rome; the most famous was that of Alexandria (see Doctrines, Christian).

In addition to this formal instruction, the Church from the beginning carried on through her worship an educational work embodying the deepest and soundest psychological principles. The ritual at first was of necessity simple; but as the Church was allowed a larger freedom, and her worship passed from the catacomb to the basilica, statelier forms were introduced; yet their essential purpose was the same. The Mass, which has always been the central liturgical function, appeals to the mind through the medium of sense; it combines light and colour and sound, the action of the priest, and the dramatic movement that fills the sanctuary, especially in the more solemn service. Beneath these outward forms lies the inner meaning. The altar itself, in every detail, is full of a symbolism that brings vividly to mind the life and personality of Christ, the work of redemption, and the enduring sacrifice of the Cross. In due proportion, each item of the liturgy conveys a lesson through eye and ear to the highest faculties of the soul. Sense, memory, imagination, and feeling are thus aroused, not simply as aesthetic activities, but as a support of intellect and will which thereupon issue in adoration and thanksgiving for the "mystery of faith". On the other hand, the liturgy has always included in its purpose the participation of the faithful, and hence it prepares the response of the people to the prayers at the altar, the chanting of certain portions of the service, bodily postures and movements in keeping with the various phases of the sacred rite. The faithful are not merely bystanders or onlookers; they are not to maintain a passive, receptive attitude, but rather to give active expression to the religious thought and feeling aroused in them. This is especially evident in the sacramental system. While each of the sacraments is a sign to be perceived, it is also a source of grace to be received; and the reception involves in each case a series of actions which manifest the faith and disposition of the recipient. Moreover, each sacrament is
adapted to some particular need, and the whole system of sacrament, from baptism to extreme unction, builds up the spiritual life by processes of cleansing, strengthening, nourishing, and healing, which parallel the stages and requirements of organic growth.

In a largely, but also, the climax the Church designates the principal events in the life of Christ, brings into Christian worship a variety which affects to some extent both the details of the liturgy itself and the religious feelings which it inspires—from the joy of Christmas to the triumph of Easter and Pentecost. For the true observer, as of Julian the Apostate, the Church was at its prime, as in Advent and Lent, by seasons of preparation. The Old Law with its types foreshadowed the New; the Baptist announced the Messiah; Christ himself prepared his disciples beforehand for the mystery of the Eucharist, for his death, and for the coming of the Holy Ghost. The Church, following the same practice, arranges in the mind of the faithful those thoughts and feelings which form an apperceptive preparation for the central mysteries of faith and their proper observance at appointed times. Along with these greater solemnities come year by year the commemorations of the Church's past, of the austere women who have walked in the footsteps of Christ, laboured for the spread of his kingdom, or even shed their blood for his sake. These are held up as models to be imitated, as realizations more or less perfect of the sublime ideal which is Christ Himself. And associated with the former is the Mother of Christ, the ideal of Christian womanhood, to whom the Son of God was “subject” in the home at Nazareth. Each festival in her honour is at once an exhortation to copy her virtues and an evidence of the high station to which woman was raised by Christ. The liturgy, in its liturgical form, on a large scale of those principles which underlie all real teaching—appeal to the senses, association, apprehension, expression, and imitation. The Church did not begin by theorizing about these, nor did she wait for a psychological analysis to determine their value. Instructed by her Founder, she imitated and incorporated in her liturgy those elements which were best fitted to teach men the truth and lead them to act in conformity with the Gospel. It is none the less significant that modern education is adopting for its own purposes, i.e., the teaching of secular subjects, the psychological principles which the Church from the beginning has put into practice.

While the Church, in her interior life and in the execution of her mission, gave proof of her vitality and of her ability to teach mankind, she necessarily came into contact with influences and practices which were the legacy of paganism. In point of religious belief there was, of course, a clean break between the polytheism of Athens and Rome and the doctrines of Christianity. But philosophy and literature were factors which had to be counted with as well as the educational system, which was still largely under pagan control. Schools had been opened by converts who were imbued with the ideas of Greek philosophy—by Justin at Rome, and Aristides at Athens; while, at Alexandria, Clement and Origen enjoyed the highest repute. These men regarded philosophy as a means of defending faith, and, later, even against the attacks of paganism. Others again, like Tertullian, condemned philosophy outright as something with which the Christian could have nothing to do. In regard to the pagan classics the conflict of opinion was even sharper. Some of the greatest theologians, like St. Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Gregory of Nazianz, and St. Gregory of Nyssa, had studied the classics under pagan masters and were therefore in favour of sending Christian youths to non-Christian schools on the ground that literary studies would enable them the better to defend their religion. At the same time these Fathers would not permit a Christian to teach in such schools lest he should be obliged to take part in idolatrous practices. Tertullian (de Iddololatriâ, c. x) insists on the same distinction: the teacher, he says, by reason of his authority, becomes in a way the “catechist of demons”; the pupil, imbued by the lesson of paganism, will not receive instruction, but rejects its false doctrine and holds aloof from the superstitious practices which the teacher can hardly avoid. Such a distinction was naturally the source of difficulties and gave rise to much discussion. The situation was not remedied by the Council of Nicaea forbidding the Christians to teach; though this called forth some protests, it suggested the creation of a Christian literature based on classical models of style, nothing decisive resulted. On the other hand, fear of the corrupting influence of pagan literature had more and more alienated Christians from such studies; and it is not surprising to find among the opponents of the classics such men as St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine. Though they had received a thorough classical education, and though they appreciated fully the worth of the pagan authors, their final attitude was adverse to the study of pagan literature. Yet from many controverted points in this subject, it is clear that the Fathers, at a time when the environment of the Church was still pagan, were far more anxious for the purity of faith and morals than for the cultivation of literature. In later ages, as the danger of pagan contamination grew less, classical studies were given up and encouraged by the Church; but their value has more than once been questioned (see Lalanne, Influence des Pères de l'Eglise sur l'éducation publique, Paris, 1850).

Meanwhile the work of education was not neglected. If the Empire gave way before barbarian invasion, the Church found a new field of activity among the vigorous races of the North. To these she brought not only Christianity and civilization, but also the best elements of classical culture. Through her missionaries she became the teacher of Germany and France, of England and Ireland. The task was a difficult one, and its accomplishment was marked by many vicissitudes of temporary failure and hard-won success. At times, indeed, it would seem that the desire for learning had quite disappeared even among those for whom the acquisition of knowledge was a sacred obligation. These drawbacks on the part of ecclesiastical and civil rulers in behalf of a more thorough and systematic education. Thus the salient feature of the Middle Ages is the co-operation of Church and State for the development of schools. Theodoric in Italy, Alfred in England, and Charlemagne in the Frankish Kingdom are illustrious examples of princes who joined their authority with that of bishops and councils to secure adequate instruction for clergy and people. Among churchmen it suffices to mention Chrodegang of Metz, Alcuin, St. Bede, Boethius, and Cassiodorus (see the several articles). As a result of their efforts, education was provided for the clergy in the cathedral schools under the direct supervision of the bishop and for the laity in parochial schools to which all had access. In the curriculum, religion held the first place; other subjects were few and elementary, comprising at best the trivium and quadrivium (see Arts, THE SEVEN LIBERAL). But the significance of this education lies not so much in its content as in the fact that it was the means of arousing a love of learning among peoples that had just emerged from barbarism, and of laying the foundations of Western culture and science. The history of education records no greater achievement for the task was not one of improving or perfecting, but of creating, and had not the Church gone vigorously about her work, modern civilization would have been retarded for centuries. (See SCHOOLS; MIDDLE AGES.)

One of the chief factors in this progress was monas-
ticism (q. v.). The Benedictine monasteries especially were homes of study and depositories of the ancient learning. Not only sympathetic writers, like Montalembert, but those also who are more critical, acknowledge the service which the monks rendered to education. In those restful ages of rude culture, of constant warfare, of perpetual lawlessness and the rule of might, monasticism offered the one opportunity for a life of repose, of contemplation, and of that leisure and relief from the ordinary vulgar but necessary duties of life essential to the student. . . . Thus it happened that the monasteries were the sole schools for teaching; they offered the only professional training; they were the only universities of research; they alone served as publishing houses for the multiplication of books; they were the only libraries for the preservation of learning; they produced the only scholars; they were the sole educational institutions of this period. 11 (Paul Monroe, A Text-Book in the History of Education, New York, 1907, p. 255). In addition to their prescribed studies, the monks were constantly occupied in copying the classic texts. “While the Greek classics owed their safe preservation to the libraries of Christian nations and to the monasteries of the East, it is primarily to the monasteries of the West that we are indebted for the survival of the Latin classics” (Sandy, A History of Classical Scholarship, 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1906, p. 617). The specific work of education was carried on in the monastery school and was in fact, primarily for the novices. In some, however, a schola exterior, or outer school, was added for lay students and for aspirants to the secular priesthood. The course of study included, besides the seven liberal arts, the reading of Latin authors and the music of the Church. Finally, through their animating influence, the monks provided a rich store of information concerning medieval life, which is invaluable to the historian of that period. The chief importance, however, of the monastic schools is found in the fact that they were conducted by an organized body of teachers who had withdrawn from the world and devoted their lives, under the guidance of religion, to literary pursuits and educational work. The same Christianity that had sanctified the family now gave to the profession of teacher a sacredness and a dignity which made teaching itself a noble vocation.

Two other movements form the climax of the Church’s endeavoring the naturalistic thought. The development of Scholasticism (q. v.) meant the revival of Greek philosophy, and in particular of Aristotle; but it also meant that philosophy was now to serve the cause of Christian truth. Men of faith and learning like Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, far from dreading or scorning the products of Greek thought, sought to make them the rational basis of belief. A synthesis was thus effected between the highest speculation of the pagan world and the teachings of theology. Scholasticism, moreover, was a distinct advance in the work of education; it was an intellectual training in method, in systematic thought, in severe logical reasoning, and in accuracy of statement. But taken as a whole, it furnished a great object-lesson, the purport of which was that, for the keenest intellect, the findings of reason and the truths of Revelation could be united. Having used the metaphysical thinking to sharpen the student’s mind, the Church thereupon presented to him her dogmas without the least fear of contradiction. She thus united in a consistent whole whatever was best in pagan science and culture with the doctrine entrusted to her by Christ. In THE MONASTERIES; SOCIETIES OF RELIGION; ORATORIA. The same synthetic spirit took concrete form in the universities (q. v.). In founding these the popes and the secular rulers co-operated; in university teaching

all the then known branches of science were represented; the student body comprised all classes, laymen and clerics, seculars and religious; and the diploma conferred was an authorization to teach everywhere. The university was thus, in the educational sphere, the highest expression of that completeness which had long characterized the teaching of the Church. It is the spirit of inquiry which animated the medieval university remains, in spite of other modifications, the essential element in the university of modern times. The changes which have since taken place have for the most part resulted in separating those elements which the Church had built into a harmonious whole. As Protestantism by rejecting the principle of authority brought about innumerable divisions in belief, so it led the way to rupture between Church and State in the work of education. The Renaissance in its extreme forms ranked pagan culture above everything else; and the Reformation in its fundamental tenet went beyond the individualism which led to the decline of Greek education. Once the schools were secularized, they fell readily under influences which transformed ideals, systems, and methods. Philosophers and scientists frequently formed new systems of life and its values, thus moved, at first slowly then more rapidly, away from the positive teachings of Christianity. Science in turn cast off its allegiance to philosophy and finally proclaimed itself the only sort of knowledge worth seeking. The most serious practical of these was the withdrawal of mental and religious activity from purely intellectual education—a result which was due in part to religious differences and political changes, but also in large part to erroneous views concerning the nature and need of mental training. Such views again are in general derived from the denial of the existence of the supernatural in man, and its meaning for human life in its relations to God; so that, during three centuries past, the main endeavour outside the Catholic Church has been to establish education on a purely naturalistic basis, whether this be aesthetic culture or scientific knowledge, individual perfection or social service. In its earlier stages Protestantism, which laid so much stress on faith, could not consistently have sanctioned an education from which religious ideals were eliminated. But according to its principles worked out to their legitimate consequences, it became less and less capable of supplanting the naturalistic element. The Catholic Church has thus been obliged to carry on, with little or no help from other Christian bodies, the struggle in behalf of those truths on which Christianity is founded; and her educational work during the modern period may be described in general terms as the steadfast maintenance of the union between the natural and the supernatural.

From a human point of view the Church was under many disadvantages. The loss of the universities, the confiscation of monastic and other ecclesiastical property, and the opposition of various governments seemed to make her task hopeless. Yet these difficulties only served to call forth new manifestations of her vitality. The Council of Trent gave the impulse by decreeing that a more thorough education of the clergy should be secured through the seminaries (q. v.); and urging upon bishops and priests the duty of founding up the parochial schools. Similar measures were adopted by provincial and diocesan synods throughout Europe. Then came the religious orders founded for the express purpose of educating Catholic youth. (See especially InstruRtive of the Brothers of the Christian Education, and the Society of Jesus; Oratorians.) And to these finally must be added the numerous congregations of women who devoted their lives to the Christian training of girls. However different in organization and method, these institutions had for their common purpose the spread of religious truth along with secular knowledge among all classes. Thus
E D U C A T I O N

there arose, by force of circumstances, a distinctly Catholic system of education, including parish schools, academies, colleges, and a certain number of universities which had remained under the control of the Church or were founded anew by the Holy See. It is especially the parochial school that has served in recent times as an essential factor in the work of religion. In some countries, e.g., Canada, it has received support from the Government; in others, as in the United States, it is maintained by voluntary contributions. As Catholics have also to pay their share of taxes for the public school system, there are under a double burden; but this very hardship has only served to place in clearer light their practical loyalty to the principles on which Catholic education is based. In fact, the whole parochial school movement during the nineteenth century forms one of the most remarkable chapters in the history of education. It proves on one side that neither loss of the State's co-operation nor lack of material resources can weaken the determination of the Church to carry on her educational work; and on the other side it shows how faith and devotion on the part of parents, clergy, and teachers can accomplish in the interests of religion what are at stake.

Schools.) As this attitude and this action of Catholics place them in a position which is not always rightly understood, it may be useful to present here a statement of the principles on which the Church has based her course in the past, and to which she adheres unshakably to the present time. When the parents and the education are the subject of so much discussion and the cause of agitation in various directions. The Catholic position may be outlined as follows:

1. Intellectual education must not be separated from moral and religious education. To impart knowledge and to develop mental efficiency without building up moral character is not only contrary to psychological law, which requires that all the faculties should be trained, but is also fatal both to the individual and to society. No amount of intellectual attainment or culture can serve as a substitute for virtue; on the contrary, the most thorough intellectual education becomes, the greater is the need for sound moral training.

2. Religion should be an essential part of education; it should form not merely an adjunct to instruction in other subjects, but the centre about which these are grouped and the spirit by which they are permeated.

The study of nature without any reference to God, or of human ideals with no mention of Jesus Christ, or of human legislation without Divine law is at best a one-sided education. The fact that religious truth finds no place in the curriculum is, of itself, and apart from any open negation of that truth, sufficient to warp the pupil's mind in such a way and to such an extent that he will feel little concern in his school-days or later for religion in any form; and this result is the more likely to ensue when the curriculum is made to include everything that is worth knowing except the one subject which is of chief importance.

3. Sound moral instruction is impossible apart from religious education. The child may be drilled in certain desirable habits, such as neatness, courtesy, and punctuality; he may be imbued with a spirit of obedience, kindness, truthfulness—and none of these should be neglected; but if these duties towards self and neighbour are sacred, the duty towards God is immeasurably more sacred. When it is faithfully performed, it includes and raises to a higher plane the discharge of every other obligation. Training in religion, on the other hand, furnishes the best motives for conduct and the noblest ideals for imitation, while it sets before the mind an adequate sanction in the holiness and justice of God. Religious education, it should be noted, is more than instruction in the dogmas of faith or the precepts of the Divine Law; it is essentially a practical training in the exercises of religion, such as prayer, attendance at Divine worship, and reception of the sacraments. By these means conscience is purified, the will to do right is strengthened, and the mind is fortified to resist those temptations which, especially in the period of adolescence, threaten the greatest danger to the moral life.

4. An education which unites the intellectual, moral, and religious elements is the safest safeguard for the home, since it places on a secure basis the various relations which the family implies. It also ensures the performance of social duties by inculcating a spirit of self-sacrifice, obedience to law, and of Christian love for the fellow-man. The most effectual preparation for citizenship is that schooling in virtue which habituates a man to decide, to act, to oppose a movement or to further it, not with a view to personal gain nor simply in deference to public opinion, but in accordance with the standards of right that are fixed by the law of God. The welfare of the State, therefore, demands that the child be trained in the practice of virtue and religion no less than in the pursuit of knowledge.

5. Far from lessening the need of moral and religious training, the advance in educational methods rather emphasizes that need. Many of the so-called improvements in teaching are of passing importance, and some are at variance with the laws of the mind. Upon their relative worth the Church does not pronounce, nor does she commit herself to any particular method. Provided that the essentials of Catholic education are secured, the Church welcomes whatever the sciences may contribute toward rendering the work of the school more efficient.

6. Catholic parents are bound in conscience to provide for the education of their children, either at home or in schools of the right sort. As the child must be cared for, so, for still graver reasons, must the mental and moral faculties be developed. Parents, therefore, cannot take an attitude of indifference toward this essential duty nor transfer it wholly to others. They are responsible for those earliest impressions which the child receives passively, before he exercises any conscious selective imitation; and as the intellectual powers develop, the parents' example is the lesson that sinks most deeply into the child's mind. They are also obliged to instruct the child, according to his capacity, in the truths of religion, and in the practice of the religious duties, thus co-operating with the work of the Church and the school. The virtues, especially of obedience, self-control, and purity, can nowhere be inculcated so thoroughly as in the home; and without such moral education by the parents, the task of forming upright men and women and worthy citizens is difficult, if not impossible.

That the need of moral and religious education has impressed the minds of non-Catholics also, is evident from the movement inaugurated in 1903 by the Religious Education Association in the United States, which meets annually and publishes its proceedings at Chicago. An international movement of moral training was started in London in 1906, and the report has been edited by Professor Sulder under the title, "Moral Instruction and Training in Schools" (London, 1908).

For the respective rights and duties of the Church and the civil authority, see SCHOOLS; STATE.

GENERAL: MONROE, Bibl. of Education (New York, 1897); HALL AND MANNFIELD, Bibl. of Education (Boston, 1953); CUPPERSLEY, Syllabus of Lectures on the Hist. of Ed. (New York, 1873).

Catholic Writers: STECKEL, Gesch, d. Pädagogik (Mainz, 1876); KRIEG, Lehrb. d. Pädagogik (Paderborn, 1900); DRIESEN, The Catholic Education of Schools and Colleges, a series of monographs, biographical and expository (Freiburg, 1888); NEWMAN, The Idea of a University (London, 1879); BROWNING, Catholic Education (New York, 1886); WILLMANN, Didaktik als Pädagogik (Göttingen, 1894); SCHRÖDER, Pädagogik und das Höhere Leben (Chicago, 1890); IDDEM, Means and Ends of Education (Chicago, 1895); IDDEM, Religion, Agnosticism and
Education (Chicago, 1902); Duvanloup, De l'éducation (Paris, 1850); De la haute éducation intellectuelle (Paris, 1855-57); Gaume, Catholicisme dans l'éducation (Paris, 1855); Gaume, Lettres sur le paganisme dans l'éducation (Paris, 1852); Kleur- gen, Über die alten und die neuen Schulen (Münster, 1899).

The convention was the largest and most representative gathering of Catholic educators that had up to that date been held in the country. It may be that these meetings is now generally recognized. They give an understanding of the strength and weakness of the Catholic educational position that can be obtained in no other way. A great deal of earnest and serious work is done at them; they foster a spirit of unity and cooperation in all departments of Catholic education; and they inspire the educators with a greater love and devotion to their calling. The whole system of Catholic educational activity has been strengthened, unified and developed by the annual conventions of the association, and more especially was this the result of the meeting in Cincinnati.

As the understanding of the Catholic educational situation, with its difficulties and possibilities, becomes clearer, the work of the association becomes every year more definite and more practical. The slow and gradual growth of the association has given it a form of organization well suited to the development of the work. Catholic educators have a good understanding of the problems they must solve, among which are the problem of secondary education, and the problem of curriculum. Of more importance, even, than the thoroughgoing development of educational interests of Catholic education, and the vindication of the principles on which it is based. The secular system of education is based largely on the theory that man is born for the State and that he derives his rights from the State. The socialist would have the State absorb all authority in the domain of learning and industry, and there are many secular educators who would fain see the monopoly of education lodged in the power of the State. The Catholic system is based on the right of the parent, the right of the child, and a reasonable individualism. The resolutions of the Cincinnati convention insisted on the right of the parent in the matter of education, and the association exists for the purpose of maintaining the right of the parent and the principle of liberty of education. The Catholic Educational Association is an expression of the unity of principle that unites all Catholic educators.

The relations are a president general, several vice-presidents general, a secretary general, treasurer general, and an executive board. The association includes the college, school, and seminary departments. The affairs of the association are managed by the executive board. Each department is represented in this board by its president and two other members elected by the department. Each department regulates its own affairs, and each may organize sections for the more special work in which its members are interested. In the Parish School Department, there is a Superintendent's Section and a Local Bureaus Section. A local meeting for the teachers is organized at every convention through the Parish School Department.

In the constitution the aims of the association are stated as follows: "The object of this association shall be to keep in the minds of the people the necessity of religious instruction and training as the basis of morality and sound education; and to promote the principles and safeguard the interests of Catholic education in all its departments; to advance the general interests of Catholic education, to encourage the spirit of cooperation among Catholic educators, to promote by study, conference, and discussion the thoroughgoing of Catholic educational work in the United States; to help the cause of Catholic education by the publication and circulation of such matter as shall further these ends."

According to the report of the secretary general
there were on 1 July, 1908, three hundred and sixty-four members of the Parish school Department, fifty-two colleges in the College Department, and fourteen seminaries in the Seminary Department. The association publishes an annual report giving all the papers and discussions of the Association and its departments. It also publishes "The Catholic Educational Association Bulletin" quarterly, which contains matters of interest to the members of the association and articles that have an important bearing on Catholic educational work. The association has issued to 1908 five annual reports from the secretaries' office, G. G. Gunness, Ohio. 

FRANCIS W. HOWARD.

Education of the Blind.—Although the education of the blind as a class dates back no farther than the year 1784, historians and statisticians generally admit that the affliction which it tends to relieve was no less prevalent before than it has been since that date. Indeed, so far from having increased, blindness appears to have in a marked degree decreased during the last hundred years.

General Statistics of Blindness.—An exact statement of the number of blind persons in all parts of the inhabited earth is of course impossible. The estimates which publicists have formed upon the basis of census returns, as also those derived from the observation of travellers, give the ratio of blind persons to the whole population in Asia 1 to 500; in Africa 1 to 3,000; in Europe 1 to 1000; and in the United States 1 to 1094 (the figure 1 to 709; Italy, 1 to 1194; Germany, 1 to 1136; European Russia, 1 to 534; Austria, 1 to 1234; Hungary, 1 to 952; Italy, 1 to 1074; Spain, 1 to 855; Denmark, 1 to 1428; Sweden, 1 to 1262; Norway, 1 to 795; Finland, 1 to 899; Belgium, 1 to 1229; Switzerland, 1 to 1325; Bulgaria, 1 to 321). For the other great geographical divisions no data are available for even a fairly satisfactory approximation. (See below Blindness in the United States.) Consistently with the foregoing ratios, and with such conjectures as may be hazarded for America, Australasia, etc., it may be estimated that the number of blind persons now living in all parts of the world is not far short of 2,500,000. A careful study of the figures shows that blindness prevails at its greatest in tropical, and least in temperate, regions; more in the Eastern than in the Western Hemisphere. In the temperate climates of the North the blind are comparatively few; nearer the Arctic Circle, the glittering snows, the alternation from the brilliant nights of the Arctic summer to the prolonged darkness of the winter, and other conditions affect the visual organs unfavourably, while in the torrid zones the glare from desert sands and the intense heat of the sun occasion many diseases, resulting in either total or partial loss of sight.

Blindness in the United States.—In the Western Hemisphere a different ratio seems to obtain. The data, however, for an accurate comparison are wanting, except in the United States (lying between the 24th and 49th parallels of north latitude), where, according to the census of 1900, the ratio of the blind to the entire population is 1 to 1175. In 1890, the ratio was 1 to 1242. The number of blind persons in the United States on the 1st of January, 1900, as returned by the enumerators of the Federal Census Bureau, 1900, was 101,123; by subsequent correspondence with individuals, this number was reduced to 64,763; but the special report on "The Blind and the Deaf" states that this should be considered only as a minimum, being probably about 100,000 and possibly over 100,000. Of the minimum 64,763 reported in the Census, 50.2 per cent were males, 42.8 per cent females; about 13 per cent were under, and about 87 per cent over, twenty years of age. Of the juvenile 13 per cent (8308), those entirely or partially blind before the age of two years numbered 8106.

Causes and Effects.—In a careful study of the causes of blindness Cohn of Breslau estimates that among 1000 blind there are only 220 absolutely unavoidable cases, 119 possibly avoidable, and 529 (or nearly one-third) absolutely avoidable. Blindness may result from accidents, from congenital or hereditary causes, and from disease. Among the most frequent cases of total blindness are: ophthalmia neonatorum, or inflammation of the eyes of the new-born; trachoma, often called "granular lids", and glaucoma, and atrophy of the optic nerve. Blindness from ophthalmia of the new-born is so widespread that, according to Magnus de Blaas, in 1890, blindness in Germany, 10-85 per cent were due to this cause. Among the blind under the age of twenty the proportion is as high as 30 per cent. In the United States, between 6000 and 7000 persons have thus become blind. Thanks to improved sanitary conditions in homes, to more intelligent care on the part of midwives and nurses, and more skilful medical treatment, ophthalmia in certain countries appears as a cause of blindness in only seven per cent of the total number of cases, as against the 41 per cent recorded fifty years ago.

The function of sight can, to a certain extent, be repaired by the use of other senses. The necessity for sight is as much due to it being seen, as to its use, and that attention is aroused, the brain are as capable of reflection and reason as other human beings, while, owing to their condition, they are more frequently forced to close mental application. That blindness does not necessarily render its subjects intellectually inferior, may also be inferred from the number of famous persons who were blind from childhood or early youth. A list of such examples might with little difficulty be produced, long enough and important enough to show how erroneous is the idea that the physical darkness of the blind is necessarily associated with intellectual darkness.

History of Education of the Blind.—That no attempt was made in ancient times to instruct the blind, or in any way to cultivate their intelligences, was mainly due to the prevalent error as to their mental capacities. The same error, generally speaking, produced the same result during the earliest ages of civilization until as late as the end of the eighteenth century. On the other hand, the Church, from the earliest ages, at least made provision for their corporal needs, while here and there attempts were made to teach them various handicrafts. Among the most noted of the hospices for the poor and afflicted which began to appear in all parts of Christendom almost as soon as persecution ceased, was that established in the fourth century by Saint Basil at Cæsarea, where special provision was made for the blind, and guides were supplied for them. In the fifth century, Linnæus, a hermit of Syria, received, in cottages for them, the blind of the surrounding country, whom he taught, among other things, to sing the praises of God. Two centuries later, towards the year 630, a refuge exclusively for the blind, such as was called in the Middle Ages a hypplocomium, was founded at Jerusalem.

In the West, the Church was animated with similar charity. Early in the seventh century, St. Bertrand, Bishop of Le Mans, founded a hospice for the blind at Ponthieu, in the north-west of France. In the eleventh century, William the Conqueror, in expiation of his sins, founded a number of hospices; among them four hospices for the blind and other infirm persons at Cherbourg, Rouen, Bayeux, and Caen respectively. Towards 1260, St. Louis, King of France, established at Paris the Hospice des Quinze-Vingts, where he housed and instructed three hundred blind
person. The inmates of the hospice, after the example of the students and the craftsmen of the day, formed among themselves a distinct brotherhood, to whom the saintly king gave special statutes and privileges. It is noteworthy that, in spite of the changes of government, the ‘Hospice des Quinze-Vingts’ has survived to this day. A similar institution, though less extensive, was established and endowed at Chartres by King John the Good in 1350. Provision was made for 120 blind persons. For various reasons, however, the number of inmates dwindled till, in 1857, according to Dufau, there were but ten. A hospice for the blind is said to have been erected (1305) at Bruges, in Flanders, by Robert de Béthune, in gratitude for the courage displayed by the inhabitants in repelling (1300) an invasion of Philip the Fair. A similar foundation was made at Ghent by Peter Van der Leyen about 1570. Brotherhods of the blind were formed, particularly at Chartres, Caen, Châlons, Meaux, Padua, Memming, Frankfort, and Hull. That the inmates of these institutions received other suitable instruction besides that in the Catechism and in trades there can be no doubt. So desultory, however, were the attempts to give the blind a mode of education, and so inadequate were the means employed, that the problem of their special education remained unsolved. No one had as yet suggested the idea of providing a permanent literature for them. As early as the sixteenth century attempts were made to devise special processes, but these attempts, so far as we know, met with very little success. Among others, Girolamo Cardano (1501-1576), an Italian mathematician, had pointed out a way of teaching the blind to read and write by the sense of touch. They were to trace with a steel bodkin or stylus the outlines of the letters of the alphabet, engraved on metal, until they could distinguish the letters by the sense of touch and reproduce them on paper. Cardano, however, failed to suggest how to write on a straight line with uniformity of space between the lines. In 1575 Rampazetto produced at Rome prints in intaglio from letters carved in wood. His invention was dedicated to St. Charles Borromeo. In 1580, under Philip II, to whom he dedicated his invention, Francesco Lucas, at Madrid, engraved letters in wood for the instruction of the blind; but the letters being sunk in the wood, the outlines could not as readily be followed with the finger-tips. In 1640, Pierre Moreau, a notary at Paris, had movable letters cast for the use of the blind, but for lack of means was unable to follow up his undertaking. In his work, ‘De l’Instruction de l’EAU au FYNZ’, published at Nuremberg in 1651, George Hardinger describes how the blind can recognize, and be taught to name and imitate, letters engraved in wax. Padre Francesco Lana-Terzi, the same Italian Jesuit who anticipated by more than a century the system of lip-reading for deaf mutes, also suggested, as an improvement on Cardano’s invention for the blind, a guide consisting of a series of wires and strings arranged in parallel lines at equal distances from one another, to secure straight writing and uniformity of space between the lines. Besides this, Lana-Terzi describes, in his ‘Prodromo’, an invention of his own, by which the blind may be taught to correspond with each other by a secret code. We have looked in vain in works of reference for any description of this cryptographic device. It is so simple that it can be learned in a few hours. Instead of compelling a blind person to learn how to form all the letters of the alphabet, the three methods pointed out by Lana-Terzi demand only a tacit knowledge of the letters, familiarity with their positions in their respective sections, and a little skill: (1) to insert one, two, or three dots within a square or parts of a square or right angles turned in four different directions; or (2) to prefix to either a comma, colon, semicolon, period, or interrogation mark any one of the first four numerals; or (3) merely to form these numerals. The letters of the alphabet with the lines enclosing them, Lana-Terzi suggests, should be in relief rather than in intaglio, raised letters being far more distinguishable to the sense of touch than letters sunk in a plane surface. The following diagrams will make the matter clear.

First (Lana-Terzi) Method.—Suppose the blind correspondent wishes to send the cipher message, Son prigione (I am a prisoner), he will turn to his tablet,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and ascertain by touch that the letter s is the second of those enclosed within the lines forming the figure. He will trace this figure with a pencil, and, to indicate that it is the second letter in the above figure, he will write, either above, or below, or within it, two dots, thus: The message in full is as follows:

The position of each letter in its own section is indicated by one of the first four numerals according to the order in the section. Thus, the message, Il re è morto (the king is dead), would be written as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1:</th>
<th>2:</th>
<th>3:</th>
<th>4:</th>
<th>5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>è</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third Method.—Instead of designating by punctuation marks the different sections into which the letters are distributed, they may be indicated by numerals, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By this method the blind person would have to learn how to form only the first five numerals. Thus the above message, Il re è morto, according to this method, would be written as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-3 2-3 4-4 1-2 3-3</th>
<th>1-4 4-4 2-5 4+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To enable the correspondent to make out for himself the answer to his message or communication, Lana-Terzi proposes the following plan: Let each of the correspondents have a table or long strip of wood...
on which are engraved or embossed the letters of the alphabet arranged in serial order at equal distances from each other, as in the diagram here given.

Suppose now that a person who is not blind should wish to send to his blind friend this message: "Il nemico di trama vivace (the enemy is trying to ensnare you)." Let him take a piece of thread or twine, apply the end of it to the extreme point of the tablet, extend the thread over the space from a to the first letter i of the message and make a knot at that point; for the second letter, apply this first knot to point a, extend the thread over the space from a to the letter l, make, as before, a knot at that point, and so on for the rest of the letters. It will readily be understood how the blind person, to whom the roll of knotted thread or twine is sent, can make out the communication by applying the various thread lengths over the distances indicated by the knots, and thus discover each letter of a word. The blind correspondent, in his turn, can easily send by this same method whatever communication he wishes.

A few years after the publication of Lana-Terzi's "Prodromo," Jacques Bernoulli, being at Geneva in 1766, taught Elizabeth Waldkirch to read by a method not unlike that of Cardano. The young lady made such progress that after four years she was able to correspond with her friends in German, French, and Latin, all of which she spoke fluently at the age of fifteen. She knew almost all the Bible by heart, was familiar with philosophy, and was an accomplished musician.

About the year 1711 the first known attempt was made to construct a tactile ciphering-tablet or apparatus by which all the operations of arithmetic might be performed and recorded. This was the work of Nicholas Sauderson, who became blind when one year old. So distinguished was this blind mathematician that he was appointed Lucasian Professor of Mathematics in the University of Cambridge. The Abbé Claude-François Deschamps (1715-91), in his treatise on the education of the deaf and dumb, is said to have also sketched the outlines of the art of teaching the blind to read and write. Diderot in his "Lettre sur les Aveugles," which appeared in 1768, and for which he was condemned to prison, mentions his interview with Lenôtre, better known as "The Blind Man of Paisaux." Among other remarkable things related to him is the teaching of his son, though not blind, to read by means of raised letters. Between 1772 and 1784 we read of the earliest attempt to make maps in relief for the blind. This invention is ascribed to R. Weissenburg, of Mannheim, who was partially blind at five years of age, and totally at fifteen. Whether any of the credit is due to Weissenburg's teacher, Christian Nissen, cannot be ascertained. Though Diderot was among the first to call special attention to the condition and wants of the blind, and to make them generally known through his famous letter, yet neither he, nor Leibniz, nor Reid, nor Condillac, nor any of the Encyclopedia went beyond abstract psychological speculation. None of them proposed any measure of practical utility or relief nor devised any plans for the instruction and training of sightless persons.

The modern era in the history of education of the blind opened in 1784—nearly three centuries after the death of Cardano—by apparently individual attempts of Cardano and others—when Valentin Hauy (1743-1822) invented and himself to do for the blind what the Abbé de l'Epée had done for deaf mute babies. It was in June, 1784, that Hauy met, in one of the churches of Paris, a young mendicant named Lesueur, who had been blind from his birth. Having already spent many years in studying the theory, Hauy took this young waif to be the subject of his first practical essays in teaching the blind. Lesueur was promised a regular daily allowance in place of the
contemporary education of the blind.—general aspects.—in nearly all the countries referred to in the foregoing table, most of the schools for the blind maintain three distinct departments: a literary department, a department of music, and an industrial department. the rank of these institutions varies according as more or less prominence is given to literature and music as compared with industrial or manual training. in the leading schools the literary department embraces kindergarten, primary, secondary, and, in a few instances, collegiate education; the department of music embraces primary, secondary, and collegiate education; while the industrial department embraces the teaching of handicrafts, varying in kind according to age, sex, and country. the courses of study in the literary department are generally the same as those pursued in the public high schools of the respective countries. the work in the department of music varies from instruction in the mere elements of music to thoroughly organized courses of study and highly specialized instruction in the science and art of music. in the industrial department the chief trades are: in the department, piano-making, the making of baskets, mats, matting, brooms, and mattresses, chair-caning, hammock-work, and upholstery; in the female department, basket-making, knitting, hand- and machine-sewing, crocheting, fancy work of various kinds.

the rudimental stages of education, there was a tendency in almost all the schools for the blind to make the industrial department the most prominent feature. the lack of books, of adequate educational appliances, and of definite methods, the comparative ease in teaching some one or other of the simpler trades, the want of technical experience on the part of instructors, the dependence upon manual occupations and mechanical arts for self-support, the readiness to be swayed by the utilitarian principle of training the blind for the active duties and occupations opening the way to self-maintenance and independence—these and other similar considerations were strong arguments in favour of industrial training, to the neglect and detriment of the prime and essential work of education. of late years, however, a marked change has been wrought in the ideals pursued in the education of the blind. owing to the increase of general intelligence on the one hand, and the value of manual labour, on the other hand, educators of the blind have come to realize that it is not technical skill, or ability to work successfully at one or more of the usual trades, but only a broad and liberal scheme of education that will release the blind from the bondage of dependence, uplift them as a class, and raise them to a level of usefulness and independence. in consequence of the extensive employment of machinery in almost every department of human activity, there has sprung up among educators of the blind a growing conviction that the only field in which the sightless can hope in the future to compete successfully with the seeing is a field of thought where the intellect can have free play and where blindness will be no hindrance to advancement and success. the blind need, therefore, at least as good an education as the seeing and no lighter strokes, no collegiate education, no special education, but simply education in the spirit of favour and charity than as of strict obligation. in the united states the education of the blind rests on a different basis. as modern methods of instruction have proved the possibility of imparting to the normal blind child practically the same education as to other children, it is generally acknowledged that the blind, as a class, have an equal right with the seeing to share in all the educational benefits which are provided for every child in the commonwealth; and since this education cannot for obvious reasons be given them in the common schools, special provision should be made for their education in institutions private or public.

systems of embossed print.—three centuries and a half elapsed after the invention of printing before any attempt to make printing available for the blind as a class was successful. whatever information and instruction may have been drawn by the ingenious inventor from special processes devised before his day, the credit of having first made reading by finger-touch possible must be accorded to valentin haüy (see above). the first book embossed by haüy for the use of the blind was, according to guadet, his "esquisse sur l'éducation des aveugles" (1786). this book was translated into german by michel, and into english, in 1795, by the blind poet blacklock. the style of type adopted by haüy was the french script, resembling the legal manuscripts of the time. the capital and small letters were respectively fourteen and seven and a half millimeters in height. the book consisted of 111 pages, printed on one side only, two pages being gummed together back to back, to preserve the relief. the pages were embossed from metal type by the blind children of haüy's school under the direction of clousier, the court printer. while this invention won considerable notice, he himself had little use for his achievements compared to those of the abbé de l'épée, modestly protested, "i only fit spectacles, while he bestows a soul." from 1806, the time of haüy's departure for st. petersburg, to 1814, when line-print was superseded by point-print, the type used at the institution des jeunes aveugles at paris varied between the french script, the italic, and roman capitals.

embossed printing in england.—printing for the blind had been used in france for forty-three years, in austria for eighteen, in prussia for twenty-six, before it was used in england; haüy's system of printing, it is claimed, was introduced into england by sir charles lowther, to whom it was suggested by a copy of one of the books printed at the institution des jeunes aveugles, and purchased for him by his mother, he being himself blind. in 1826, james gall, of edinburgh, who had seen and used haüy's book, was shown some of the paris institution, set himself to improve the alphabet, by making it more perceptible to the touch. in 1827 he printed a small book in an angular modification of the common english alphabet. it is said to have been the first english book printed for the blind in england, and naturally great interest was excited when it was found that the blind could read it easily with their finger-tips. between 1828 and 1838 no fewer than 20 styles of embossed printing were brought out in great britain. of these, however, only six obtained recognition: those of haüy, gall, fry-alston, lucas, prece, and moon. haüy's script was adopted by sir charles lowther in his publication, in 1834, of the gospel of st. matthew. though gall modified the common characters of the alphabet to make them more easily distinguishable by touch, he did not believe that absurdity was necessary ever to be universally adopted, maintaining that these books should be legible to both blind and seeing. besides two or three booklets previously embossed, gall printed, in 1832, the gospel of st. john. the fry-alston system of embossed printing is the plain upper-case roman without serifs or strokes, and was devised for the blind by the fry and adopted by alston at the glasgow institution for the blind, of which he was principal. in 1832 the scottish society of arts offered a gold medal for the best system to produce cheapness and tangibility in connexion with an alphabet suited alike to the fingers of the blind and to the eyes of the seeing. nineteen
different alphabets, seventeen of which were of a purely arbitrary character, were submitted to the society between 9 January, 1832, and 24 October, 1833. After much deliberation and a series of rigid tests, the medal was awarded (after Dr. Fry's death) to Alston, 31 May, 1837. From the award made to Dr. Fry's alphabet, the Scottish Society of Arts evidently shared the idea of Haüy and of other advocates of the Roman letter that in the education of the blind everything should be done to establish a bond of vital unity between them and the seeming and to lessen the isolation which arbitrary systems of alphabet would only increase. As Alston's type was rather small and not very legible, his system did not stand the test of time. Lucas invented a stenographic system formed of arbitrary characters and of numerous contractions. In this system the Gospel of St. John and the Acts of the Apostles were printed in 1837 and 1838 respectively. Frere devised a phonetic system which he himself describes as a "scientific representation of speech". It consists of 34 characters indicating each of the simple sounds in speech. Frere was the first to introduce (1839) the "return lines", in which the reading is alternately from left to right and from right to left, and the letters themselves are reversed in the same way; the reading of the letters is from right to left. He also devised an ingenious system of embossing from stereotype plates; which in determining was, at the time, the greatest improvement in embossing since the days of Haüy. The larger part of the Old and portions of the New Testament were printed in Frere's system. Dr. Moon of Brighton, whose system is used more than any other by the adult blind, at least in England, devised, towards 1845, an alphabet formed of more or less arbitrary characters, which either resemble or suggest a resemblance to the Roman letters which they represent. He also adopted, with a number of slight alterations, Frere's "return lines" and his method of stereotyping. The first book in Moon's system appeared in 1847. The printing of the Bible was begun in 1848 and completed in 1858. Moon's books, though easy to read owing to their large type, are very bulky and expensive; 50 volumes are required for the Protestant edition of the Bible, which omits a number of books contained in the Catholic edition. The chief defects of the Moon system are that it is a movable system and that it lacks a musical notation. It is useful chiefly for adults whose finger-touch has been dulled by age or manual labour.

**Embosed Printing in Continental Europe.**—Between 1809, when embossed printing, of which he claimed to be the inventor, was begun by Klein, the founder of the first school for the blind at Vienna, and 1841, when Knie, principal of the institution for the blind at Breslau, introduced the Braille system into Germany, three styles of embossed printing, known as the Stachel-Presse, and Punktirte Typendruck (the needle, line, and punctured print) had been used in Germany, Austria, Holland, Switzerland, and Denmark. These systems were different forms of the upper or lower case or of both upper and lower case, of the Roman letters. Owing to the size of the letters, the books embossed in other parts of Europe were much bulkier than those of like content in France or in England. For a long time after the introduction of the Braille system into Germany, line-print was retained, even where Braille was adopted. It was not until 1876 that interest began to be aroused in regard to uniformity of embossed printing, in consequence, no doubt, of the movement inaugurated in England by the British and Foreign Blind Association in favour of Braille.

**Embosed Printing in the United States.**—From 1832, when the first school for the blind was opened in the United States, to 1860, when Dr. Pollack introduced Braille in the Missouri school (there being then as many as twenty-one institutions for the blind in this country), two systems of printing were in vogue. The first was that of Dr. Howe, the head of the Boston school for the blind, and the second that of Mr. Friedlander, the principal of the Philadelphia school. Dr. Howe's system was the angular lower case Roman and Mr. Friedlander's system the Roman capitals of the Fry-Alston type. In 1853 Dr. Howe published several books in the Boston letter; Mr. Friedlander's Roman capital was not adopted in Philadelphia until 1857. From an educational as well as from an eco-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Haüy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fry</strong></th>
<th><strong>Howe</strong></th>
<th><strong>Moon</strong></th>
<th><strong>Braille</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Six Principal Systems of Embossed Type**

By 1859, when embossed printing, of which he claimed to be the inventor, was begun by Klein, the founder of the first school for the blind at Vienna, and 1841, when Knie, principal of the institution for the blind at Breslau, introduced the Braille system into Germany, three styles of embossed printing, known as the Stachel-Presse, and Punktirte Typendruck (the needle, line, and punctured print) had been used in Germany, Austria, Holland, Switzerland, and Denmark. These systems were different forms of the upper or lower case or of both upper and lower case, of the Roman letters. Owing to the size of the letters, the books embossed in other parts of Europe were much bulkier than those of like content in France or in England. For a long time after the introduction of the Braille system into Germany, line-print was retained, even where Braille was adopted. It was not until 1876 that interest began to be aroused in regard to uniformity of embossed printing, in consequence, no doubt, of the movement inaugurated in England by the British and Foreign Blind Association in favour of Braille.

**Embosed Printing in Continental Europe.**—Between 1809, when embossed printing, of which he claimed to be the inventor, was begun by Klein, the founder of the first school for the blind at Vienna, and 1841, when Knie, principal of the institution for the blind at Breslau, introduced the Braille system into Germany, three styles of embossed printing, known as the Stachel-Presse, and Punktirte Typendruck (the needle, line, and punctured print) had been used in Germany, Austria, Holland, Switzerland, and Denmark. These systems were different forms of the upper or lower case or of both upper and lower case, of the Roman letters. Owing to the size of the letters, the books embossed in other parts of Europe were much bulkier than those of like content in France or in England. For a long time after the introduction of the Braille system into Germany, line-print was retained, even where Braille was adopted. It was not until 1876 that interest began to be aroused in regard to uniformity of embossed printing, in consequence, no doubt, of the movement inaugurated in England by the British and Foreign Blind Association in favour of Braille.
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ggested a combination of points arranged in a rectangle—twelve points in two vertical columns of six each. The most conspicuous, though not most radical, defect was the large and unwieldy size of the signs, which could not be covered with the finger. Another drawback was the great waste of space. As the "cell", or rectangle, was of fixed size, if a letter was represented by a point in one corner, all the rest of the space was left blank. This was observed by Braille, who reduced Barbière's rectangle one-half; thus he limited the number of the points to six instead of twelve. The six points in Braille are arranged in two vertical rows of three each. By the omission of one or more of the points sixty-three distinct signs are formed, to represent the entire alphabet, accents, Arabic numerals, marks of punctuation, word- and part-word signs, as well as some of the braille and musical notation. Of these sixty-three characters, ten are called fundamental signs, and form the basis of all the rest by the addition of one point in some part or other of the "cell" either to the fundamental signs or to the series formed from them. The chief advantages of the Braille system are: (1) its simplicity and easy acquisition; (2) its "tangibility", or efficiency in impressing the sense of touch, enabling the blind not only to read but also to write; (3) its adaptability to both the writing and printing of a system of musical notation.

In spite, however, of its evident advantages, many years went by before the new system obtained recognition, even in countries where, for lack of "tangibility" in the existing systems, the use of books in the class-room had been almost unknown. It is quite possible that the slowness and reluctance in the adoption of Braille was due to the fact that institutions for the blind had been so widely separated in dates of origin and in locality that the need of unity of action and community of interest was but slowly realized. In many cases prejudice, petty jealousy, and obstinate attachment to theories long since proved false, yielded attitude towards improved methods, which has often stood in the way of true and uniform progress in the education of the blind. From the day when the system was finally adopted in the schools of France, England, Germany, the United States, and other countries, the Braille has undergone various modifications; hence a variety of Braille systems, which have caused even greater confusion than the diversity of the earlier Roman styles of embossed literature. As late as 22 April, 1902, in an address made at the conference held at Westminster on matters relating to the blind, Mr. William H. Illingworth, head-master of the Royal Blind Asylum and School, West Craigmillar, Edinburgh, spoke as follows regarding the diversity of Braille alphabets and the desirability of a uniform system: "Out of a chaos, born of conflicting opinions and petty jealousies, combined with an almost incredible amount of apathy, indifference and indecision such as exists in the Braille world, it would be impossible by any means short of a miracle to create or to formulate such a scheme..." We hear often and are treated to examples of 'English as she is spoke', but I venture to think that for variety and specimens of the grotesque, this pales into insignificance before 'Braille as she is wrote'. Though the time may be quite ripe for a serious attempt being made to improve the existing state of matters, it will require years of patient thought and interchange of opinion, absolute singleness of purpose and charitable, sympathetic self-abnegation to devise a perfectly uniform and practical system, and make the Braille—if that system be the best system—as perfect and simple as possible and as worthy to be the tangible exponent of the most powerful and universally spoken language of modern times.'

New York Point (see cut).—The claim to being, in the words of the writer quoted above, a system "as perfect and simple as possible and as worthy to be the tangible exponent" of the English language can justly be made for the punctographic system known as New York Point, or the Wait system, unquestionably the most perfect form which the idea suggested by Barbier and rescued from oblivion by Louis Braille has as yet attained. This system is a genuine American product, the outcome of years of patient thought, of indefatigable labour, and of absolute singleness of purpose. To Mr. William B. Wait, for upwards of forty-three years at the head of the leading institution for the blind in the United States, is due the credit of the originalisation, development, construction, and application of the literary, musical, and mathematical codes of the New York Point System. The genesis of this new punctographic system is the result of a desire on the part of Mr. Wait to improve the Braille by remodelling it, on principles of compactness and economy of time and space. Careful study, however, of the structure and application of Braille led to the conclusion...
that the vertical position of Braille signs, allotting a fixed and unvarying space to all signs alike, was defective in more than one important respect. Owing to its limited number of only sixty-three possible signs, it was inadequate to the requirements of music, if not to those of literature and mathematics and it was also found to be much more bulky, and hence more costly, than the Boston-Line, which, in the absence of any other system, was then taken as a standard. To remedy these structural defects, by increasing the number of signs, and reducing the bulk and cost of books, to the lowest possible minimum, only one course was left open. A different mode of sign structure was devised, employing two points instead of three vertically and extending the base forms to three, four, or five points horizontally. By this method the new sign-structure of New York Point yields 120 single, and 20 compound, signs against the 63 single signs to which the Braille is limited, and thus answers all the requirements of literature, music, and mathematics. Besides, even apart from the application of the principle of recurrence in the structure of the New York Point—a principle that was not applied in the original Braille—all the advantages of simplicity, economy, of time, and in writing, as well as of cost, are on the side of the New York Point system, as has been demonstrated by the most rigid tests. Thus, in printing a font of 520 letters in each system on a perfectly uniform scale, the letter-, word-, and line-space being the same in each system, any page composed of the New York Point (where the alphabet is the only used, and the contractions or punctuation marks) requires 51.75 per cent more space than the New York Point. The space required by punctuation marks in Braille is 20 per cent greater than in the New York Point. The excess of labour in the writing of Braille is twenty-seven per cent greater than in New York Point. In the writing of punctuation marks there is a slight excess of labour on the side of New York Point. However, the use of punctuation marks does not materially affect the question, as they form only about 1/4 of the whole bulk of composition. Another advantage of the New York Point over Braille is its having true capitals. In Braille the practice is to place before words requiring capitals a sign identical with the period, and to begin the word with the usual small letter. This requires two full "cells" or sixty per cent more area than the New York Point, which is four points wide. Although up to the sixth or seventh century no distinction was made in Europe, and none is made to this day in the Oriental alphabets, between capitals and small letters (the latter, in fact, were evolved from the former), yet, for those who are over-exacting regarding "good use," the advantage of possessing true capitals, instead of shorn ones, is not inconsiderable. Furthermore, the gliding of the finger over the points signs in but one direction, the lateral, is, on physiological grounds, an important advantage which the New York Point has over the Braille system, where the finger moves first in the longitudinal and then in the lateral direction.

Methods of Writing.—The invention of the New York Point marked an epoch in the history of the education of the blind; yet, had facilities not been supplied for writing and printing it, the new system would have failed to make its mark as an educational force. Fortunately, however, such appliances were provided by Mr. Wm. Wait in 1894, and consist of a desk-tablet, a pocket-tablet, the kleidograph for paper writing, and the stereograph for embossing the metal plates used in printing. The kleidograph and stereograph have been used in facing the entire mass of the blind. The former, designed for the purpose of writing literature, music, and mathematics in tactile form, is invaluable for speed and efficiency, and for the reason that what is written by it can at once be read by the blind writer without removing or reversing the paper, as must be done when the tablet is used. At least eighty per cent of the time required for writing music is saved, and sixty per cent for literary work. The stereograph is a development from the kleidograph, designed to emboss both sides of sine or brass printing plates ready for use. The composer can prepare twice or thrice as much matter in a given time as by the movable type; besides, the matter comes from the composer's hands stereotyped and ready for the press. The cost of the complete plate is reduced by more than one-half. The further application of the process, and of printing on both sides of the sheet at one impression from the plates embossed by Mr. Wait's stereograph, will reduce the cost of books still further, and effect a saving, in metal, in paper, and in binding, of nearly 50 per cent.

The many appliances devised since the days of Valentin Haüy, particularly in France, England, and Germany, to enable the blind to write, may be grouped under three classes. First, the "hand-guides" are designed merely to help the blind to write in straight lines and at equal distances. For correspondence with the seeing, an ordinary pen, or, more generally, a lead pencil is used, and the letters are written from left to right. For correspondence with the blind the ordinary letters have to be formed with a blunt stylus from right to left and reversed on paper which is underlaid with some soft material, as felt or blotting-paper, to bring out the writing on the reverse side of the page and reading from left to right. Valentin Haüy devised a simple method of pencil-writing by placing the paper upon a frame in the inferior of which were stretched parallel cords of catgut; between these cords it was an easy matter to write in straight lines and to make the letters of uniform size. Another ingenious way of producing tactile writing was, at the suggestion and request of Haüy, devised by Adet and Hassenfratz in 1783. It was to trace the letters in a bold hand with a glutinous ink, over which sand was spread, so as to form, when it adhered to the letters, a rough sort of relief, or "tangible" writing. Various other fluids were devised for embossed writing, by Challan and Rousseau in 1821, by C. L. Müller in 1823, by Freissiauf in 1836, by Riesmer in 1867, and finally by the Abbé Vitali of Milan, in 1893. The use of these various coloured fluids produces a writing which is once "tangible" to the blind and visible to the seeing.

Among the more elaborate appliances for writing in straight, parallel, equidistant lines, may be mentioned the tablets of Généresse (1807) and of Bruno, the typograph of Passard, Dr. Nond's skograph, Dr. Wuczchowsky's amaurograph, Count de Beaumont's stylograph, Wedgewood's noetograph, and the writing-frames of the Elliot brothers, of Thumsfield, Dooley, and Levitte. The second class of apparatus are those designed not only to enable the blind to write in straight lines and to make the letters of uniform size, but also to mechanically assist the blind in the formation of the letters and in tracing them at the same distance from each other. These appliances may be divided into line-cell and point-cell frames, according as the ordinary line-letter alphabet or the point system is used in writing. Of the line-cell frames or tablets, the best known are those devised by the Rev. Joseph Engelmann of Linz (1825), James Gall of Edinburgh, Mercier-Capette, Hebold, Dr. Llorens of Barcelona, by C. E. Guldberg of Copen- hagen (1858), Galumberti of Milan, Martuscelli of Naples, Moon of Brighton, England, Kempe of Grave, Wedgewood, Lamb, Ballu, Bedii, Passerini, Lambert, Belgium, and Mlle Mulot of Angers, France. Mlle Mulot's stylographic frame enables the blind to correspond not only with the sighted, but also with the seeing just as readily and satisfactorily. Of the numerous print-cell writing-frames or tablets de-
signed for writing Braille, the best known are those of Louis Braille, Ballu, Laas-d’Aguen, Kruger, Kull, Pablasek, Signora della Casa, T. R. Armitage; and for writing New York Point, Mr. Wait’s desk and pocket-board already mentioned. Essentially, all point-cell tables are made up of a board bearing a movable metal plate indented with pins and having connected with it, and over it, a metal guide with two rows of either oblong or square holes. The paper is placed between the pitted plate and the metal guide. The writing is done with a blunt awl or bodkin, which forces the paper into the holes and makes the pin indented by which the respective letters. When the paper is taken out and turned over, the writing which was from right to left appears in relief and is read from left to right. The metal guide has from four to five rows of openings, allowing for the writing of four or five lines; when these are written the guide is shifted downwards and held fast to the frame by two little pins, when four or five more lines are written, and the operation is repeated until the end of the page is reached. The third class of apparatus are those designed for increased speed in writing, not by hand, however, but by mechanical means. Among the principal writing machines for the ordinary line-letter alphabet, are those of Braille-Foucault (1842), Thurber (1847), Hughes of Manchester (1850), Larivière of Nancy, Saintard (1847), Hirzel of Lausanne, Oehlerwein of Weimar, Marchesi, Colard Viennot, Gastaldon of Turin, Ballu (1861), the Hammer of Simplex, Yost, Blickensderfer, Coligraph. Without any doubt, the most rapid and most satisfactory way for the blind to correspond with the seeing is by means of typewriters. All methods of writing, however, which are not tangible to the fingers are liable to the objection that the written matter cannot be readily corrected by the blind writer. Of machines constructed for embossing Braille and New York Point, those chiefly in use in the United States are Hall’s writer, for Braille, and Wait’s kleiglyph, for New York Point. In France, England, and Germany, a number of Braille machines have been designed on the lines of Hall’s Braille-writer.

Geography.—The blind are fond of the study of geography, and with proper teaching are as capable of forming correct geographical notions as the seeing. Most of the detailed teaching of geography, however, must be from raised maps. In the elementary course, maps made by pupils themselves are used, the outlines by means of pins and string are very helpful. The first maps used by the blind were on embroidered cloth or canvas, the needle-work representing the land and the plain cloth the water; boundaries were marked by coarse corded stitches, and towns and cities by points made with the same coarse material. Various attempts were subsequently made to construct relief maps on paper or cardboard, the boundary lines, river courses, lakes, bays, positions of towns and cities, etc., being represented in a variety of ways. The best thus far made are the wooden dissected maps, in which the divisions of a country are represented by a movable section, bodies of water by a depression in the wood, hills and mountains by a slight elevation, towns and cities by brass-headed nails. When all the movable sections are fitted together they form a complete map. The principal objection to the dissected maps is that they are very expensive and better suited to individuals than to class teaching.

The Teaching of Arithmetic.—Records are not wanting to show that, from the very beginning, arithmetic and other branches of mathematics held an important place in education provided for the blind. It was soon observed that the blind displayed great fondness for arithmetical calculations. While mental arithmetic was particularly encouraged, it became evident that in the more advanced branches of the science, the blind needed special apparatus, and various appliances were devised to meet this want. Among the earliest attempts to construct a tangible device for the more abstruse calculations of arithmetic and algebra is that of the great mathematician, Nicholas Saunderson. Since his day a great many different ciphering boards, or tablets, have been constructed. One of the best is Taylor’s octagonal board with square pins and octagonal holes. On one end of the pin one of the edges is raised into a prominent ridge, and on the other end there is a similar ridge divided in the middle by a deep notch. The holes in the board are star-shaped, with eight points. The pin can be placed in eight different positions, and on reversing it, with the notched end uppermost, in eight more; this gives ten signs for the Arabic numerals and six for the ordinary algebraic signs. For pure algebra another pin is needed, differing from that used in arithmetic. This gives sixteen additional signs, which are quite sufficient. It is essential for a good arithmetic board that the same pin should represent every character; otherwise it is lost in selecting the required character and in distributing the type at the end of each operation. In the United States a board is used with square holes, and two rows of type are required to give even the Arabic numbers.

Music.—Since the days of Hauxy, music has always been considered as one of the most potent factors in the education of the blind, offering them advantages which they can derive from no other source. Though a fair percentage of the blind attain to a high degree of musical skill, and find for themselves positions of responsibility and importance, yet, contrary to the general belief, no larger proportion of persons with exceptional musical talent is found among the blind than in any other class. The conclusions that the blind are taught music by ear is erroneous; it arises partly from the assumption that those who are sightless must of course possess an abnormally acute sense of hearing, and partly from the fact that so many persons are unaware that a tactile musical notation exists. Since 1784 there have, in fact, been almost as many such systems as systems of embossed reading. Besides the common musical notation in relief, used by Valentin Hauxy, by W. Taylor of York, and Alston of Glasgow, special systems were devised by Frere, Lues, and Moon in England; by Guadet, Rousseau, and the Abbé Goupil, in France; by Klein, Krämer, Oehlerwein, and Warschauer, in Germany; by Petzel in Austria; by D. Pedro Llorens in Spain; and by M. Mahony in the United States. In most of these systems the common letters in relief were used to express the notes and their values, the octaves, flat, sharp, and time signs, etc. All of the above systems, however, with the exception of the common musical notation in relief, have long since been entirely superseded by the Braille and the New York Point systems of musical notation. Soon after Louis Braille had devised the literal code he adapted his punctographic system to musical notation. An outline of the New York Point musical notation was first presented in 1872, and the first edition of the notation was printed in the same year. In 1875 it received the unanimous approbation of the American Association of Instructors of the Blind, and it was adopted a few years later.
in most of the institutions for the blind in the United States. As to the comparative merits of the two systems, it is claimed that the Braille notation is inferior in completeness and clearness of expression. The notation of music requires not less than 140 signs. The New York system, excluding disabling infinitives, yields 120 single and 20 compound signs, while the Braille system admits of but 63 single signs and requires a uniform space for each. Ambiguity is the consequence of this inadequate number of signs, the same sign being made to represent two different things of the same species, as, for example, a whole note and a sixteenth, a half-note and a thirty-second.

Industrial Training.—From the very beginning of systematic education of the blind down to the last decade, industrial training has always occupied a decidedly prominent place in the curriculum. Too often, particularly in the earlier days, the essential work of education was subordinated to conditions created and demands made by the industries. Instead of being used as a means of education, the teaching of trades was made the chief aim and end. The success of certain pupils in careers from which they seemed necessarily excluded naturally gave rise to somewhat extravagant hopes of the possibilities of industrial education. Hence, perhaps, arose the prevalent notion and expectation that schools for the blind should graduate young men and women so equipped that each and all would be self-supporting and able to earn as much, or nearly as much, as persons of equal natural ability with the sense of sight. The fact, however, is that only a small proportion of the blind in Europe and America are wholly self-supporting. According to the United States Census of 1900, of 62,456 blind persons, ten years of age and upwards, only 12,506, or about 20 per cent, were reported as regularly engaged in remunerative occupations. The percentage of the general population so employed was upwards of 50. As most institutions for the blind, particularly in the United States, are open to all blind children of average intelligence, the heterogeneous character of the membership of such schools must lower the standard of efficiency. Another factor which has too often been lost sight of is that blindness is a disabling infirmity, more difficult and more difficult with only four senses than with five; it would, therefore, be unreasonable to expect better results of the schools for the blind than are expected of the public schools for normal children, in which schools neither trades nor music are taught. The teaching of skilled trades, it must also be remembered, properly belongs to a stage of education later than the primary, and it should not be allowed to trespass upon the legitimate work of the schools. As soon as adults are admitted to the school with minors, the industrial feature tends to become dominant and unavoidably impairs an element of commercialism to the school. Both adults and younger pupils become disposed to lay more stress on shop work than on mental exercises and discipline. In consequence, the finished pupils lack those general qualifications which are necessary to begin business in the trades they have learned, and still more to successfully compete against sight and machinery. The long, trying, and costly experience of the leading schools in the United States has, moreover, proved that the teaching of trades or industries during the school period confers no lasting good upon the pupils and is void of even such results as the sense of self-reliance to become self-supporting which, it was believed, were being promoted. For these reasons the industrial experiment is gradually being abandoned in order to save the institutions for that strictly educational work for which they were established. If trades, then, are to be taught the blind, and industry to be fostered on by them, the technical training should, as in the case of seeing pupils, be taken up only after the completion of the primary or secondary course of studies and in a location altogether removed from the school proper.

Manual Training.—Instead of the teaching of the ordinary trades, which, owing to the radical change in industrial conditions, can no longer be carried on by the blind at a financial profit, a system of regular and thorough training of the hands, the senses, and the muscles has been generally introduced in the leading American institutions for the blind. To various forms of solid work, of work in clay, paper, and cardboard, as well as sewing, cooking, weaving, basketry, simple wood-carving, etc., are the processes of manual training most commonly employed in the general education of the blind.

Physical Training.—Educators of both blind and seeing pupils are in entire accord as to the great importance of physical training. The blind, for obvious reasons, are peculiarly in need of healthful, systematic exercise. Observation and statistics show that their health and strength are far below the normal standard. Hence, before there is any hope of obtaining satisfactory educational results, all physical and physiological defects, such as deformities in the muscular system, unsightly movements, natural timidity, awkwardness in walking, etc., must be corrected as far as possible. In view of these facts, physical training forms an integral part of the regular curriculum of the schools for the blind.

Libraries for the Blind.—It is almost impossible for those who enjoy the use of sight to realize what a boon reading is for those who live in perpetual darkness. Outside of their early education, for those who have been blessed with it, there is nothing in the life of the blind so stimulating, so broadening, and so comforting as good books. In no country have more efforts been made to supply the blind with books and to solve the problem of their circulation than in the United States. In no country has such a liberal government provision been made for the education of the blind through the
publication of books as was made by the United States Government, when by an act of Congress (3 March, 1879) the sum of $250,000 was set apart as a perpetual fund, the interest of which ($10,000) is expended each year in printing and distributing suitable books among the institutions for the blind in the United States. Mainly as a result of this provision, the number of volumes distributed among the thirty-nine school libraries amounts, according to the Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for 1902, to 105,804 volumes, an average of 2,713 volumes per school. In November, 1879, it was said that far greater individual co-operation and a more general interest displayed in furthering the extension of libraries for the blind than in the United States. Thus the "Association Valentin Haüy" of Paris had, in 1902, on its list of voluntary writers of books for the blind the names of 1150 persons who embossed in Braille and donated in that year to the "Bibliothèque Braille" for its fourty-nine travelling libraries, 1,633 volumes. In the same year the British and Foreign Blind Association of London was indebted to 574 generous persons who gave valuable time in writing Braille books for the blind.

Catholic Literature for the Blind in the United States.—Before 1900, with the exception of a small catechism and Cardinal Gibbons' "Faith of Our Fathers", there were no Catholic books for the blind to be had in this country. To supply this long-felt want, which, with the Catholic schools, is one of the factors in the Catholic literature of the United States Catholic literature embossed in the Vatican City was sent to New York Point, from a list of a few devoted ladies, who helped to raise the necessary funds, a printing plant was equipped and has been in operation ever since. The society was incorporated in March, 1904, under the name of "The Xavier Free Publication Society for the Blind of the City of New York". Although from its inception the society has been dependent for the maintenance of its work upon donations and annual subscriptions, still, with the encouragement and blessing of the Catholic hierarchy, the deep appreciation and gratitude of thousands of Catholic blind throughout the country, and the generous help of its benefactors, it has been enabled to pursue its beneficent object for the moral and intellectual elevation of the blind. Since its foundation, thousands of volumes of Catholic literature, embracing ascetical, Biblical, biographical, doctrinal, and historical works, as well as works of general literature, of fiction, and of poetry, have been placed in upwards of thirty-seven state, city, or institute libraries for general and free circulation among the blind. The publications of the society are also circulated throughout the country from its own central library. "The Catholic Transcript for the Blind", a monthly magazine, published by the Xavier Free Publication Society for the blind since 1900, is so far (1900) the only Catholic periodical embossed in the English language.

Catholic Literature in England.—It is only within the last few years that, through the initiative of the Rev. Michael Fear, who taught Braille to most of the writers, upwards of four hundred books have been hand-typed by voluntary workers and placed at the disposal of the Catholic Truth Society of London for circulation among the Catholic blind in Great Britain. This work would not have been undertaken had it been impossible to get Catholic books at the great English libraries for the blind.

The Blind-Deaf.—According to the special reports of the United States Census Office for 1900, of the 64,763 persons reported as blind, 2,772, or nearly 4% per 1000, were found to be deaf. The age of occurrence of these two defects cannot be stated exactly, except for those blind and deaf from birth, of whom there are 76. Between birth and five years of age are 64; between five and nine, 54; between ten and fourteen, 37; between fifteen and nineteen, 24. That the public, and even professional educators, entertain incorrect ideas with regard to the blind and deaf has been shown by Mr. William Wade in his interesting monograph, "The Blind-Deaf!" For this excellent publication, and still more for his widespread and munificent charity to the blind-deaf, and particularly to the deaf and dumb and blind of this country, Mr. Wade should receive the highest possible praise in the hearts of this doubly afflicted class. The knowledge by the public that the education of the blind-deaf is by no means the difficult task commonly believed, and the further knowledge of the number of those who have been educated and of their advanced position in mental attainments, will do much, if it is contended by the author of the monograph, to advance the interests and the happiness of the blind-deaf. "In the early education of the blind-deaf", we are told by Dora Donald, "there are three distinct periods. In the first the pupil receives impressions from the material world. The mind of the blind-deaf child differs from that of a normal child; given the same opportunity, it will develop in the same way. Whilst the normal child discovers the world through the five senses, the world must be brought to the blind-deaf child and imparted by the teacher through the sense of touch. During the second period the child must give utterance to his conceptions. This may be done either through the sign language, the manual alphabet of the deaf, or through one of the systems of printed print for the blind, if articulated speech cannot be taught the child. The third and by far the most important period of his training is that of procuring mental images from the printed page. If the child has been thoroughly trained in the habit of personal investigation, if he has been taught to express freely the results of such investigation by means of the manual alphabet and to record them in print, he will eventually be able to reverse the process and to build about him an imaginary existence that will cause the printed page to teem with life and to glow with the charm of actual existence. At this stage of the child's education, he may enter either a school for the deaf, a school for the blind, or the common school throughout the country. Armed with the necessary apparatus and accompanied by a teacher who will faithfully translate all that he might obtain through sight and hearing, he may be taught by the same methods used for normal children, ever keeping in mind this one point of difference—touch must take the place of sight and hearing; the manual alphabet or embossed page being substituted for speech."
need exists, it must include, moreover, the awakening for the first time into activity and usefulness of some faculty which, but for the awakening, might remain forever dormant. As regards intellectual development, the deaf individual is the most handicapped of them all. The term "deaf and dumb", so frequently applied to that class of individuals who neither hear nor speak, is becoming obsolete among the educators of the deaf, as it implies a radical defect in both the auditory and the vocal organism. Persons who are born deaf, or who lose their hearing at a very early age, are unable to speak, although their vocal organs may be in perfect condition. They become dumb because, being deprived of hearing, they are unable to imitate the sounds which constitute speech. To correct the error involved in the term dumb, it is customary to speak of human beings who do not hear and speak as deaf-mutes, a term which implies that they are silent, but not necessarily incapable of speaking. Brute animals that are deaf, are deaf and dumb; the little child, before it has learned to speak, is mute, but not dumb. There are found individuals who can hear, but cannot speak. To such may be applied the term dumb, inasmuch as they are either deaf or mute, either because they are unable to hear, or because they are unable to speak and are lacking in intelligence. Such children are generally found to be more or less idiotic. On account of the great progress made, especially during the last century, in the education of deaf-mutes, by which a large percentage are taught, the term mutism is also omitted when speaking of matters pertaining to that class formerly designated as "deaf and dumb". Institutions for them are named preferably "Schools for the Deaf" and in the literature of the subject they are spoken of simply as the "deaf", e.g., "The Annals of the Deaf", etc. Here it is well to remark that there is a strong and growing objection among the deaf and their educators to calling their institutions asylums - a term which classifies them with unfortunate needing relief and protection, like the insane. In fact, Webster, under the word "Asylum", classes the deaf and dumb with the insane. Efforts are consequently being made to place such institutions under the control of educational rather than of charity boards.

History.—That there were deaf persons in the remote past is evident from the fact that the causes of deafness, such as disease, were as prevalent then as now. Therefore the Christian Era, their condition was not deplorable. By many they were considered as under the curse of heaven; they were called monsters and even put to death as soon as their deafness was satisfactorily ascertained. Lucretius voices the received opinion that they could not be educated:

"To instruct the deaf, no art can ever reach,
No care improve them, and no wisdom teach.
Greeks and Roman poets and philosophers classified them with defectives, and the Justinian Code abridged their civil rights. In the family they were considered a disgrace, or were looked upon as a useless burden and kept in isolation. It is a bright page in the Old Testament which narrates the kindness of our Divine Lord, who, doing good to all, did not forget the deaf and dumb. After His example, the Church has extended its charity to this afflicted class, and has led the others following up for them other charitable thought in place of the hearing faculty. The statement met with in literature connected with the education of the deaf, that the real history of deaf-mute instruction must be considered as dating from the Reformation, is the old fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc. The fact is, that not a few of the more famous educators of the deaf received their first lessons from those who preceded the Reformation or were not influenced by its errors, but undertook the instruction of deaf-mutes for the sole purpose of imparting religious instruction. No Catholic theologian maintained that the adult deaf and dumb from birth are beyond the pale of salvation, because "Faith cometh by hearing" (Rom., x. 17). The assertion is often made, without references being given, that St. Augustine held such an opinion. Although the great doctor may have held the opinion of his time, that the deaf could not be educated, he certainly did not exclude the possibility of salvation any more than he excluded pagans to whom the Gospel had not yet been preached.

That the deaf are very much handicapped, even in our time, as regards religious instruction, so necessary for the preservation of faith and morals, must be admitted. Many deaf children born of Catholic parents have lost the Faith, owing to a lack of Catholic educational facilities. Moreover, they are deprived of the usual Sunday instructions and sermons. There are in the United States few priests engaged in ministering to their spiritual welfare, and such as have taken up this apostolate are not at leisure to devote their whole energy to the work. On the other hand, Protestant ministers travel through the length and breadth of the land and in their monthly itineraries assemble the deaf for religious services. There can be no doubt that from the dawn of Christianity the deaf enlisted the sympathy and support of many Christian apologists and missionaries who, by various ingenious devices, at the occasion, taught them the essential truths of faith; but history has left meagre records of their good work. According to Venerable Bede, St. John of Beverley (721?) caused a deaf and dumb youth to speak, he removed a stone over his mouth and wrote it on himself, in his "De Loquela per gestum digitorum", describes a manual alphabet. Rudolph Agricola, the distinguished humanist (1443-1485), states that he saw a deaf and dumb man who was able to converse with others by writing (De inventione dialectica, iii, 10). Ponce de Leon (1520-1594), a Spanish Benedictine monk, undertook the education of several deaf-mutes, as is related in the accounts of his work discovered among the archives at Oña. He relates that he taught pupils who were deaf and dumb from birth to speak, to read, to write, and to keep accounts, to repeat prayers and to confess orally. He first taught his pupils to write the names of objects and then to articulate. A contemporary writer, Francesco Valles, says that Ponce de Leon's method proved that, although we learn first to speak and then to write, the reverse order answers the same purpose for the deaf. In 1620 he was made a cardinal and a doctor of the Church, and undertook the instruction of the deaf and dumb by the principle announced by Girolamo Cardano (1501-1576), a friend of St. Charles Borromeo, that "writing is associated with speech, and speech with thought, but written characters may be connected together without the intervention of sounds. The deaf can hear by reading and speak by writing." About fifty years later, Juan Pablo Bonet, a Spanish priest, published a treatise entitled, "Reducion de las Letras y Arte para Enseñar a hablar Los Mudos" (Madrid, 1620). He made use of a manual alphabet, invented a system of visual signs representing to the sight of words, of which he gives a description of the position of the vocal organs in the pronunciation of each letter. His work contains many valuable suggestions useful to modern teachers of articulation and lip-reading.

Francis de Sales, having on his missionary journeys met a deaf-mute, took him into his service and succeeded in establishing communication with him by signs, and prepared him for confession and Holy Communion. The celebrated Jesuit naturalist and physician, Juan Terzi (1631-1687), in his "Prodromo dell Arte Maestra", considers the education of the deaf, according to him, the first thing in teaching them to perceive the dispositions of the organs of speech in the formation of sounds, and then imitating them; and recognizing speech in others by lip-reading. To that end they should first utter each sound separately, read it on the lips of another, then join them in words;
next they should be taught the meaning of these words by being shown the objects signified, and gradually be made acquainted with the meaning of those which relate to the functions of the senses, the arts, the understanding and the will” (Arnold). Lorenza Hervas y Panduro (1738–1800), a celebrated Spanish philologist and missionary in America, took an active interest in the education of the deaf in Rome and published a learned work in two volumes entitled “Escuela Española de Sordo-mudos, o Arte Para Enseñarle a Escribir y Hablar el Idioma Español” (Madrid, 1795). The work consisted of six distinct lessons: the deaf in the political, physical, philosophical, and theological aspects of the subject and the linguistic questions it gives rise to; the second is a history of their education up to that time, which is the first complete account written; the third explains the practical method of teaching idiomatic language by writing; the fourth that of teaching speech; and the fifth is on the instruction of the deaf in metaphorical ideas and in moral and religious knowledge” (Arnold).

Among other writers in the interest of the education of the deaf and dumb must be mentioned John Bulwer of Leiden (d. 1660) who in his work “De Institutione Sordidorum” recommends writing, signs, and, on occasion, lip-reading as the helpful instruments in the education of the deaf; William Holder (1616–1698), and his contemporary, John Wallis (1616–1703); George Dalgarne (1626–1687), of Aberdeen, Scotland, who published, in Latin, “Signorum” and “Simulacrum Dei” (1680) “Didascalica” (or “Deaf and Dumb Man’s Tutor”), and devised a double-handed alphabet; Baron Von Helmont (1618–1699); John Conrad Amman (1669–1724), a native of Schaffhausen, Switzerland, who published (1700) “Disertatio de Loquela,” in which are described his methods by which the deaf and dumb from birth may acquire speech.

Although Germany cannot claim originality in the field of the education of the deaf and dumb, several works published in other countries were translated into German, and their teachings put in practice. Among the earliest to take up this work were Kerger (1704), Raphel (1673–1740), Lasius (1775), and Arnoldi (1777). The first public institution for the deaf in Germany was established by Samuel Heinicke (1729–1790), the great advocate of the oral method of instruction, which has generally been followed in Germany for the deaf. To Friedrich Martin (1805–1874), regarded as one of the greatest teachers of the German deaf, is due that which is distinctively called the “German System”, which has found an able critic in J. Heidsieck, of the Breslau Institution for the Deaf, in a work entitled “Das System der Drei Sprachen der Sprache,” Jacob Rodrigue Pereire (1715–1750), a Portuguese Jew, gave an exhibition of his skill in teaching the deaf before the Academy of Science in Paris. His efforts were confined to a privileged few, and, from this circumstance, as well as keeping his methods secret, his work, unlike de l’Epée’s, had no lasting effect upon the deaf as a class” (Arnold). Abbé Deschamps, of Orleans, devoted his life and fortune to the education of the deaf-mutes and, in his instructions, relied chiefly on reading and writing together with speech and lip-reading.

In the middle of the eighteenth century, it was believed that speech was indispensable to thought. The practical utility of pantomime had not been fully shown before the days of Abbé Charles-Michel de l’Épée (1712–1789), the father of the sign-language and founder of the first school for the deaf. The description of the two preceding sections gives the reader a means of judging of the instruction given in the schools of that period. The first report, and certainly the most striking fact, is the extraordinary zeal with which the instruction was followed by the deaf-mutes themselves. They were taught to speak, and the result was that they could communicate with each other in pantomime and make use of certain natural gestures indicative of objects, their quality and action, he came upon the idea of using a sign-language as the means of instruction. Since words are conventional signs of our ideas, why should not the deaf-mutes use signs to indicate the same objects? He concluded that the natural language of signs, which the deaf-mutes themselves invent, would be of great service in their instruction. He accordingly made himself familiar with the few signs already in use and added others more or less arbitrary. He opened a school for deaf-mutes in Paris, about 1760, which soon won international fame. De l’Épée died in 1789, leaving as his successor the Abbé Sicard, who made important improvements in the system of de l’Épée. At about the same time a school for the deaf was opened by Samuel Heinicke at Dresden, which was attended by Thomas Braidwood, at Edinburgh. The successful results obtained in these schools prompted other cities and countries to establish similar ones under the direction of persons trained by de l’Épée, Heinicke, or their disciples.

In Italy the first school for the deaf was established in 1784 at Rome, by the Abbate Silvestri, a disciple of Abbé de l’Épée. Among other Italian educators must be mentioned Tommaso Pendola (1800–1883) and his brilliant associate, Enrico Marchio; Abbate Balesco and Abbate Giulio Tarra (1832–1889), who acted as president at the Milan International Institution for the deaf in 1880 and saw his most cherished ideas regarding oral teaching practically approved by the resolutions that were adopted, and which hastened the progress of oral teaching, especially in France.

Francis Green, a native of Boston, 1742, whose son was a deaf-mute, was the earliest advocate of deaf-mute education in America. In his “Vox Ocellis Subiecta”, published in London, 1783, he describes the method by which the deaf-mute may be taught to speak. In about 1812, John Braidwood, Jr., a grandson of the founder of the Edinburgh school, attempted to establish a school in Virginia, New York, and Baltimore, but failed. “The immediate effects”, says the “History of American Schools for the Deaf” (I, 10), “was to hinder and delay the opening of the first permanent school; for the members of his family in Great Britain, who controlled the monopoly of deaf-mute instruction in America, placed obstacles in the way of Dr. Gallaudet, when he sought to acquire the art of instruction in the mother country.” An exceptionally large number of deaf-mutes having been found in the State of Connecticut by Dr. M. F. Cogswell, whose daughter was deaf, a corporation of several gentlemen was enlisted for the purpose of establishing a school at Hartford, under the care of Dr. Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet. For the purpose of mastering the art of instructing the deaf, Dr. Gallaudet sailed for England; but the exorbitant and humiliating terms imposed by the Braidwood-Watson family, which held the monopoly of the art, repelled him. Happening to meet Abbé Sicard, who with his pupils was visiting London, he accepted an invitation to visit the school in Paris. Here he received every assistance. The Abbé gave him several hours of instruction every week and general information. He was also allowed Laurent Clerc, one of his pupils and valuable associates, to accompany him on his return to America. In the contract drawn up between Dr. Gallaudet and Laurent Clerc, it is stipulated (article 11): “He [Laurent Clerc] is not to be called upon to teach anything contrary to the Roman Catholic religion”, and in his letter to Bishop Cheve-
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rus of Boston, Abbé Sicard writes: "The extreme desire to procure for the unfortunate deaf-mutes of the country in which you dwell, and fulfill so well the mission of the Holy Apostles, the happiness of knowing our holy religion, leads me to a sacrifice which would exceed your powers. I send you the best taught of my pupils, a deaf-mute whom my art has restored to society and religion. He goes fully resolved to live and be faithful to the principles of the Catholic religion which I have taught him." Notwithstanding the kind solicitude of his beloved master, Laurent Clerc, like so many others, he proved of constant religious instruction, in his surroundings weakened in the Faith and apostatized.

The kindness of Abbé Sicard only served to lay the foundation of a Protestant propaganda which, ever since the opening of the Hartford School founded by Dr. Gallaudet, has controlled the education of the deaf in America. This Hartford School, then known as the American Asylum, was opened 15 April, 1817, under the superintendency of the Rev. Dr. Gallaudet, whose two sons, the Rev. T. Gallaudet and E. M. Gallaudet, have been active in the cause of deaf-mute education. The Rev. T. Gallaudet was the founder of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb at Washington, D. C., which was opened 13 June, 1857. Later on, in 1864, it developed into a school for the higher education of the deaf under the name of the National Deaf-Mute College. Connected with the college is a normal department of the training of teachers for the deaf.

A course of studies leading up to entrance into the National Deaf-Mute College may be found in the "American Annals of the Deaf" for November, 1907. As regards higher education and normal-school practice, opportunities are also afforded by the Catholic deaf-mute schools in the State of New York.

When the Abbé de l'Épée originated the method of signs, many of his contemporaries, such as the Abbé Deschamps, refused to be associated with the new school, and between him and Samuel Heinicke of Leipzig, the great upholder of the speech method, there was carried on a spirited controversy, which has continued ever since, among the educators of the deaf. Professor E. A. Fay, in the "American Annals of the Deaf", gives the following classification and definition of the methods used in the schools for the deaf:

(1) The Manual Method.—Signs, the manual alphabet, are the chief means of instruction of the pupils, and the principal objects aimed at are mental development, and facility in the comprehension and use of written language. The degree of relative importance given to these three means varies in different schools: but it is a difference only in degree, and the end aimed at is the same in all.

(2) The Manual Alphabet Method.—The manual alphabet method and writing are the chief means used in the instruction of the pupils, and the principal objects aimed at are mental development, and facility in the use and comprehension of written language. Speech and speech-reading are taught to all of the pupils in one of the schools (the Western New York Institution) recorded as following this method.

(3) The Oral Method.—Speech and speech-reading, together with writing, are made the chief means of instilled human strength. I send to the United States the chief in speech and speech-reading in the course of instruction; but they are differences only in degree, and the end aimed at is the same in all.

(4) The Auricular Method.—The hearing of semi-deaf pupils is utilized and developed to the greatest possible extent, and, with or without the aid of artificial appliances, their education is carried on chiefly through the use of speech and hearing, together with writing. The aim of the method is to graduate its pupils as hard-of-hearing people instead of deaf-mutes.

(5) The Combined System.—Speech and speech-reading are regarded as very important, but mental development and the acquisition of language are regarded as still more important. It is believed that, in many cases, mental development and the acquisition of language can be best promoted by the manual or the manual-alphabet method, and so far as circumstances permit, such methods are adapted for each pupil as seems best adapted for his individual case. Speech and speech-reading are taught where the measure of success seems likely to justify the labor expended, and, in most of the schools, some of the pupils are taught wholly or chiefly by the oral method or by the auricular method.

Some educators of the deaf employ the method of visible speech, which is a species of phonic writing symbolizing the movements of the vocal organs in the production of speech. There is also a phonic manual in which the several positions of the hand not only represent sounds, but also the simultaneous representation of the phonetic method, whose several positions of the hand not only represent sounds, but also the simultaneous representation of the phonetic method.

It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss the merits of the various methods in use. A teacher of the deaf cannot lose sight of the fact that in the term deaf or deaf-mute, there are included at least four subclasses, namely, the semi-deaf, who have lost their hearing after they had acquired more or less perfectly the use of language; the semi-deaf, who retain some power of hearing, but yet cannot attend with profit for the deaf, the congenitally deaf, possessing some ability to perceive sound; and the totally deaf from birth, who are unable to perceive sound. A teacher of hearing children may take for granted, if the class is properly graded, that all his pupils are on the same plane; but a teacher of the deaf, whose pupils may be only four in number, may have before him, even in the lowest grade, as many different kinds of deaf children as there are pupils in the class. These he must instruct and educate. Considering that the deaf child is very much handicapped, and that the period of its school-days are limited, it is reasonable to suppose that a good teacher will take advantage of every latent power possessed by the child for educational development. In a word, the teacher will suit the method to the child and not endeavour to adapt the child to the method. It would certainly be a mistake to use the purely oral method for all deaf-mutes without discrimination and without considering the capacity, eyesight, etc. of the pupil.
Europe and more than sixty in America dealing with questions concerning the deaf. The oldest among the latter, “The American Annals of the Deaf”, edited by Dr. Fay, is eclectic in its character and as such is the organ of the combined system of instruction. For the diffusion of this oral method there was founded, in 1899, at Philadelphia, a special periodical, “The American Association Review”, published by the “American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf”. Among the efficient agencies for the promotion of educational work for the deaf must be numbered the meetings, congresses, and conferences of superintendents and teachers of the deaf, and of the deaf themselves. The oldest organization of the kind is the “Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf”, which met for the first time in New York in 1850, and for the sixteenth time in 1901, at the Le Couteux, St. Mary’s Institution for the Improved Instruction of Deaf Mutes, Buffalo, as the guests of the Sisters of St. Joseph.

There are also annual meetings of the “Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf”; meetings of principals and of the Department of Special Education of the National Association of American Teachers. At the invitation of the Right Rev. Daniel Fay, Rector, of the Catholic University of America, all persons interested in the education of Catholic deaf-mutes met in July, 1907, at Milwaukee, simultaneously with the Catholic Educational Association, and organized the Catholic Deaf-Mute Conference. The conference is a powerful factor in carrying on the work of the Deaf-Mute Conference. The deaf themselves, also, at stated times, hold State and national conventions. Such meetings are carried on in the sign language, which, because visible to a large audience, is best adapted for public addresses, sermons, etc. Whenever at these meetings the deaf touch upon educational topics, they take occasion to manifest their strong protest against pure oralism in the schools, and their unequivocal adherence to the sign-language and the combined system of education. In the United States deaf-mutes are entitled to a share in the school fund, and special boarding and day schools are provided for them. Most of the institutions are controlled by trustees appointed by the State. The term of instruction is from seven to twelve years.

Actual Conditions—According to the subjoined statistics, compiled from the “American Annals of the Deaf” for 1907, there are 60 public State schools, 60 public day-schools, and 17 denominational and private schools, making in all 139 schools for the deaf in the United States, having an attendance of 11,648 pupils—6317 boys and 5331 girls—1552 instructors—471 men and 1081 women. Out of the total number of 139 schools for the deaf, there are 13 Catholic schools with the following enrollment: St. Joseph’s School for the Deaf, Oakland, California, 29; St. John’s School for the Deaf, Chicago, Illinois, 72; Institute of the Holy Rosary, Chinea, Louisiana, 37; St. Francis Xavier’s School, Baltimore, Maryland, 35; Boston School for the Deaf, Randolph, Massachusetts, 93; Mater Boni Consilii School, St. Louis, Missouri, 13; and the two Catholic schools in which the oral method there was taught, Kansas City, 20; Notre Dame School, Cincinnati, Ohio, 12; St. John’s Institute, St. Francis, Wisconsin, 71; St. Joseph’s School, 3, New York City, 417; Le Couteux, St. Mary’s School, Buffalo, New York, 176-making in all 1002 deaf pupils in Catholic schools. It will be noted that in the four Catholic schools for the deaf in the State of New York, which has a deaf population of about 10,000, there are 593 children cared for; and that, in nine schools scattered throughout the remaining portion of the United States, where there is a deaf population eight times as great as that of the State of New York, only 409 are provided for. If all the States were as generous as New York in caring for its deaf children, there should be, if adequate facilities were provided, 4744 children in Catholic schools for the deaf outside of the State of New York.

With the exception of the New York institutions for the deaf, the other Catholic institutions are almost entirely dependent upon the charity of the community. Pupils of all denominations are admitted, the only requirements for admission being a sound mind and good morals. Good work has been done by these devoted sisters for Church and State, and their graduates are respected and self-supporting citizens; but, as they carry on their schools with little support from without, the number of pupils is necessarily small. The pupils are for the most part girls, and, because there is no male community in the United States, as there is in Canada and Europe, to take charge of the deaf-mute boys, these are obliged, with very few exceptions, to attend State or public day-schools.

The celebrated school for the deaf at Cabra, near Dublin, Ireland, has two departments. The St. Joseph’s School for boys is under the care of Christian Brothers, and the St. Mary’s School for girls is in charge of Dominican nuns. It was established in the year 1846 by Archbishop Murray. The chief patrons of the institution are the archbishops and bishops of Ireland, the president of the management being the Archbishop of Dublin. Without government grant, the school has attained a foremost rank among educational institutions for the deaf. According to the report for the year 1900, there were 105 boys and 258 girls under instruction,—260 boys and 258 girls. Industrial training suited to the age and capacity of the children, and so necessary for the deaf, forms an important part in the educational system of the school.

The institutions for the deaf in the United States, during the last decades, have a marked number of day-schools. This is due to the strong influence of the defenders of the oral method, who, for their purpose, consider such schools superior to boarding-schools. The conscientious duty of Catholic parents to withdraw their afflicted children from State boarding-schools that have proved so dangerous to faith, has also influenced the establishment of day-schools. Until boarding-schools are provided, the day-school, notwithstanding its many inconveniences, is preferable for the Catholic deaf-mute child, so that he may not be deprived of religious influence. Until 1870, the schools for the deaf established in the United States were almost entirely boarding-schools.

Deaf-Blind.—There are some individuals who are not only deaf but also blind, and not a few who are deaf, mute, and blind. Wonderful results have been produced in the education of this afflicted class during the last half-century, as is evidenced in the case of Laura Bridgeman, taught by Dr. Howe; Helen A. Keller, educated by Miss Annie Sullivan; Clarence Selby, poet and author, taught by Sister Dosithea of the Le Couteux, St. Mary’s Institution, Buffalo, New York, and Lottie Sullivan, educated by Mrs. G. W. Veditz of the Colorado School, and instructed for her first Holy Communion by the Sisters of St. Joseph in St. Louis. About forty more remarkable cases are known in the United States and Canada (see “American Annals of the Deaf”, June 1900). It is evident that a teacher of this class must be strong in the power of inventing means for the attaining of results, and of utilizing the unimpaired faculties as indirect ways of communication between the imprisoned soul and the outer world. Usually they are taught the manual alphabet, and made to understand that objects have names, and that by these names, recognized in raised print or by spelling on the fingers, objects can be designated. So delicate is their sense of touch that, like Helen Keller, they can, by feeling the movements of the vocal organs in the production of speech, be taught to speak and even to read the speech of others.
MANUAL ALPHABETS.—Venerable Bede (op. cit.) describes finger alphabets. Monks under rigid rules of silence often made use of them. Rosellius, a Florentine monk, in his "Thesaurus Artificiose Memoriae" (1579), figures three one-hand alphabets which, with minor differences, were used by Bonet and Hervas y Panduro. The first alphabet used in teaching spoken and written language to the deaf was the Spanish one-hand alphabet of Rosellius. "The happy thought of this adaptation," says J. C. Gordon, "is attributed to the pious and learned monk, Pedro Ponce de Leon" (1529-1554). The two-handed alphabet, used in Great Britain, was in use centuries ago among the school-boys of Spain, France, and England. Manual alphabets have nothing to do with "signs" or the "sign-language". They constitute a manner of writing language by spelling words on the fingers. As a means of intercourse with the deaf, they are preferable to writing on paper, being more convenient and rapid.

For the sake of promoting the welfare of thousands of deaf persons, it is recommended to hearing persons to master this art, which is easily acquired.

STATISTICS.—According to the United States Special Census Report for 1900, there are in Continental United States 9,277 persons with seriously impaired powers of hearing. Of these 2,772 are blind-deaf, 37,426 are totally and 51,861 partially deaf; 51,371 became deaf under the age of 20 and 37,416 in adult life, 46,915 are males and 42,372 females; 84,361 deaf are white, and 4926 coloured.

There are on an average 1175 deaf to the 1,000,000 population in Continental United States. Considering that there are in this territory probably 15,000, 000 Catholics, it follows that, if conditions and causes are uniform, there are 17,625 Catholic deaf—10,572 under the age of 20 and 7553 adults. Since deaf-mutism is common among the poor, it is probable that the number of Catholic deaf is much larger. The statistics for the schools for the deaf throughout the world may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3152</td>
<td>25,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>12,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>628</td>
<td>5085</td>
<td>39,746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reports received from fifty-three State schools in the United States, having an aggregate attendance of 10,124 pupils, show the values of the grounds and buildings to be $13,370,576; expenditure for grounds and buildings, $605,027; expenditure for salaries and other expenses, $2,556,459, making a total expenditure of $3,161,486, or $312 average cost per capita.

Reports from forty-three public day-schools show expenditures for salaries and other expenses to be $96,014 for 788 pupils, or an average cost per capita of $122. Reports from three denominational and private schools show an aggregate expenditure of $20,649 for 135 pupils, that is to say, an average cost per capita
Edward III, King of England (1312-77), eldest son of Edward II and Isabella, daughter of Philip IV of France; b. at Windsor Castle, 13 Nov., 1312; d. at Sheen, 21 June, 1377. He succeeded to the throne in his fifteenth year through the deposition of his father in January, 1327, Edward II being forced to agree to his own deposition, as the son refused to accept the crown without his father's consent. His marriage to Philippa, daughter of the Count of Hainault, took place at York, 21 January, 1328. In person Edward was graceful, strong, and active; he was fond of hunting, hawking, and all knightly pastimes, especially war. Ambition seems the most prominent point in his character, and his life, characterized throughout by selfishness and extravagance, was spoilt in later years by indulgence in a shameful passion. As a king, though he won great renown by his wars, he seems to have cared neither to maintain the royal prerogatives nor to follow any policy which would benefit his people.

For the first four years of his reign all power was in the hands of the queen-mother and Mortimer, and not till their overthrow in November, 1331, can Edward be said to have begun to rule. His first warlike experience was inglorious. In 1327 the Scots, led by Robert Bruce, bent on recovering their independence, invaded the North of England. Edward marched to meet them; but not quick enough to arrive were the Scots that Edward marched from York to Durham without gaining any definite news of their position, and, when he tried to cut them off and force them to fight, was completely outmanoeuvred by them. The "Shameful Peace" of Northampton, made in 1328, by which Scotland's independence was again recognized, was one of the causes which brought about the downfall of Mortimer and Isabella. Edward renewed his struggle with Scotland in 1333, supporting Edward Baliol in an attempt on the Scottish throne. He defeated the Scots under Sir Archibald Douglas at Halidon Hill, and set Baliol on the throne. But the Scots quickly expelled Baliol, and, though Edward restored him, the quarrel with France prevented Edward from continuing the struggle. Further contests with Scotland took place during the Crécy campaign, when David Bruce, after securing his rightful place as king, took advantage of Edward's absence in France to invade England, only to be defeated and captured at Neville's Cross, October, 1346. David remained a prisoner for eleven years, but the Scottish raids continued. In 1355 the Scots took Berwick; Edward retook it in the following year, but, though he ravaged the Lothians in the campaign known as "Burnt Candles," he was unable to bring the Scots to terms. When David was released, in 1357, and found himself unable to pay the stipulated ransom, he agreed to make Edward heir to the Scottish throne. But David died, in 1371, and left Edward in a position which prevented him from prosecuting his claim or interfering with Scotland's independence.

Partly caused by the war with Scotland in 1333 and 1334 was the great war between England and France known as the Hundred Years War. The Scots had been helped by money from Philip VI of France, and Edward's anger at this was increased by the presence of a French exile, Robert of Artois, who did all in his power to stir up enmity between the English and the French kings. Edward and Philip had been rival claimants for the French throne in 1328, and after Philip had been chosen king there was much dispute over the hereditary military command for his French fiefs. Philip, too, was anxious to be king over all France, a claim which involved the annexation of Guienne and Gascony, the parts still held by England. Thus personal and national rivalry combined to cause war. Edward's personal share in the war which lasted from 1338 to 1370 was a distinguished one. The first campaigns, however, were more remarkable for the concessions won by Parliament out of the king's needs than for successes in battle. By the end of 1339 he had agreed not to take a tallage of any kind without the consent of Parliament; and in 1341, to obtain further supplies, he submitted his accounts being audited by a board chosen in Parliament, and promised not to choose ministers without the consent of his council. But, having received the money, Edward shamefully broke his promises, saying that he had "dissembled in order to avoid greater evils." The campaign of 1340 led to Edward's naval victory at Sluys over a fleet of five hundred French ships which attempted to prevent his landing; and this, taken with his victory off Winchelsea, in 1350, over the Spanish fleet, goes some way towards justifying his claim to the sovereignty of the seas.

The next campaign in which Edward took an important part was that of 1346. The Earl of Derby had been appointed to command in Gascony, and in 1346 Edward was about to lend an army to help him, when he was persuaded to attack, instead, the unprotected northern part of France. Landing near Cherbourg, he marched through Normandy, doing as much mischief as he could, and advanced almost to Paris. Then, crossing the Seine, he retreated towards Calais, pursued closely by Philip; and at Crécy, 24 August, he won a complete victory over the French force. Continuing to Calais, he began a lengthy siege which ended in the surrender of the town, August, 1347. Truces frequently signed after this were as frequently broken till open war broke out again in 1355. Edward himself had small part in the warfare which followed till the campaign of 1359-60, when, after trying to take Rouen, he concluded a treaty with the regent of France at Brétigny, 8 May, 1360, by which all the ancient province of Aquitaine with Calais, Guines, and Ponthieu was ceded to him, and he renounced his claim to the French crown and to all French provinces except Brittany. The period between 1347 and 1355 was remarkable for the Black Death, a plague which in
England swept off about half the people. Decrease in population caused increase in labourers' wages. And in 1350 the king attempted to deal with the difficulty by proclaiming that labourers must work for the same wages as before the plague, under penalty fixed by statute. (Chaucer, The Black Death, new ed., London, 1908.)

Ecclesiastically, Edward's reign was marked by some legislation directed against the pope. The difficulties were caused partly by the heavy taxation levied by the pope on the clergy, and partly by the appointment of foreigners to English benefices by the pope; while the irritation of Englishmen at these grievances was increased by the pope's residence at Avignon, under the influence of the French King. In 1351 the Statute of Provisors was passed. The king had, in 1344, complained to the pope against reservations and provisions by which English benefices were given to foreigners, and the rights of patrons were defeated; and this proving ineffectual, the statute now made all who procured papal provisions for benefices liable to fine and imprisonment. But the statute can hardly have benefited patrons, for preferments filled by provisions were declared forfeit to the Crown for that turn. In 1353, by the Statute of Presumption, all subjects of the king were forbidden to plead in a foreign court in matters which the King's Court could decide, and in 1365 the papal courts were expressly included under this.

Urban V in 1366 demanded the annual tribute promised by King John, which was then thirty-three years in arrear; but, on Parliament refusing to pay, nothing more was heard of the claim.

The last years of Edward's reign were a time of failure and disappointment. In France he had lost, by 1374, all possessions but Calais, Bordeaux, and Bayonne; at sea the English were badly beaten by the Spaniards in 1372; the king himself after the death of his wife, in 1369, was completely under the influence of Alice Perrers; the court became more extravagant than before, and ministers were suspected of corruption. The Commons, supported by the Prince of Wales and William of Wykeham, attacked some of these evils in the "Good Parliament" of 1376. Lord Latimer, the king's chamberlain, and Richard Lyon, his financial agent, were impeached and imprisoned; and though Edward sent a message begging Parliament to deal gently with Alice Perrers for the sake of his love and his honour, she was banished from court. But the death of the Black Prince immediately afterwards was a great blow to the Commons. John of Gaunt was able, on Parliament's dismissal, to recall the impeached ministers, and by Edward's wish Alice Perrers returned. The struggle between the anti-ecclesiastical party, led by John of Gaunt, in alliance with John Wyclif, and the clergy, led by William of Wykeham, is so closely connected with Edward personally, except in so far as this and other evils were due to Edward's neglect of the affairs of his kingdom, that it is necessary to give some account of it here.

Discontent and conflicts at home, and failure abroad brought his reign to a close. He died deserted by all except one priest who attended him out of compassion. He was buried in Westminster Abbey.


Thomas Williams.

Edward the Confessor, Saint, King of England, b. in 1005: d. 5 January, 1066. He was the son of Ethelred II and Emma, daughter of Duke Richard of
Edward, being thus half-brother to King Edmund Ironside, Ethelred's son by his first wife, and to King Haraldine, Emma's son by her second marriage with Canute. When hardly ten years old he was sent with his brother Alfred into Normandy to be brought up at the court of the duke his uncle, the Dunes having gained the mastery in England. Though during the best years of his life in exile, the crown having been settled by Canute, with Emma's consent, upon his own offspring by her. Early misfortune thus taught Edward the folly of ambition, and he grew up in innocence, delighting chiefly in assisting at Mass and the church offices, and in association with religious, whilst not disdaining the pleasures of the chase, or recreations suited to his station. Upon Canute's death in 1035 his illegitimate son, Harold, seized the throne, Haraldine being then in Denmark, and Edward and his brother Alfred were persuaded to make an attempt to gain the crown, which resulted in the cruel death of Alfred who had fallen into Harold's hands, whilst Edward was obliged to return to Normandy. On Haraldine's sudden death in 1042, Edward was called by acclamation to the throne at the age of about forty, being welcomed even by Danish settlers owing to his gentle saintly character. His reign was one of almost unbroken peace, the threatened invasion of Canute's son, Sweyn of Norway, being averted by the opportune attack on him of Sweyn of Denmark; and the internal difficulties occasioned by the ambition of Earl Godwine and his son Edward's being sent without bloodshed by Edward's own gentleness and prudence. He undertook no wars except to repel an inroad of the Welsh, and to assist Malcolm III of Scotland against Maelbicht, the usurper of his throne. Being devoid of personal ambition, Edward was the very guardian of his people. He remitted the obnoxious "Danegeld," which had needlessly continued to be levied; and though profuse in alms to the poor and for religious purposes, he made his own royal patrimony suffice without imposing taxes. Thus was the commitment caused by "the good St. Edward's laws," that their enactment were repeatedly demanded by later generations, when they felt themselves oppressed.

Yielding to the entreaty of his nobles, he accepted as his consort the virtuous Editha, Earl Godwin's daughter. Having, however, sworn a vow of chastity, he first required her agreement to live with him as his sister. As he could not leave his kingdom without injury to his people, the making of a pilgrimage to St. Peter's tomb, to which he had bound himself, was commuted by the pope into the rebuilding at Westminster of St. Peter's abbey, the dedication of which took place but a week before his death, and in which he was buried. St. Edward was the first King of England to touch for the "king's evil," many sufferers from which disease were cured by him. He was canonized by Alexander III in 1161. His feast is kept on the 13th of October, his incorrupt body having been solemnly translated on that day in 1163 by St. Thomas of Canterbury in the presence of King Henry II.


G. E. PHILLIPS.

Edward the Martyr, Saint, King of England, son to Edgar the Peaceful, and grandson to St. Edward the Confessor. While delighting Churl, the son of Ethelfred, being on his crown for her own son Ethelred, then aged seven, in which she eventually was successful. Edward's claim, however, was supported by St. Dunstan and the clergy and by most of the nobles; and having been acknowledged by the Witan, he was crowned by St. Dunstan. Though only thirteen, the young King had already given marriage of high sanctity, and during his brief reign of three years and a half won the affection of his people by his many virtues. His stepmother, who still cherished her treacherous designs, continued to whisper about his death. Whilst hunting in Dorsetshire he happened (18 March, 979) to call at Corfe Castle where she lived. There, whilst drinking on horseback a glass of mead offered him at the castle gate, he was stabbed by an assassin in the bowels. He rode away, but soon fell from his beast, and having dragged by the stirrup was flung into a deep morass, where his body was revealed by a pillar of light. He was buried first at Wareham, whence three years later, his body, having been found entire, was translated to Shaftesbury Abbey by St. Dunstan and Earl Alfere of Mercia, who in Edgar's lifetime had been one of his chief opponents. Many miracles are said to have been obtained through his intercession. Elfrida, struck with repentance for her crimes, built the two monasteries of Werwell and Ambrebury, in the first of which she was buried and her days in penance. The violence of St. Edward's end, joined to the fact that the body of a saint had been that of the irreverent, whilst he himself had ever acted as a defender of the Church, obtained for him the title of Martyr, which is given to him in all the old English calendars on 18 March, also in the Roman Martyrology.


G. E. PHILLIPS.

Edwin (EDUN), Saint, the first Christian King of Northumbria, b. about 585, son of Ælla, King of Deira, the southern division of Northumbria; d. 12 October, 633. Upon Ælla's death in 588, the sovereignty over both divisions of Northumbria was usurped by Ethelric of Bernicia, and retained at his death by his son Ethelfrid; Edwin, Ælla's infant son, being compelled until his thirtieth year to wander from one friendly prince to another, in continual danger from Ethelfrid's attempts at his life. This while, he residing with King Redwald of Northumbria, Angell, Ethelfrid repeatedly endeavoured to bribe the latter to destroy him. Finally, however, Redwald's refusal to betray his guest led in 616 to a battle, fought upon the river Idle, in which Ethelred himself was slain, and Edwin was invited to the throne of Northumbria. On the death of his first wife, Edwin, in 625, asked for the hand of Ethelburga, sister to Eadwald, the Christian King of Kent, expressing his own readiness to embrace Christianity, if upon examination he should find it superior to his own religion. Ethelburga was accompanied to Northumbria by her brother, Paulinus, one of St. Augustine's fellow missionaries, who thus became its first apostle. By him Edwin was baptized at York in 627, and thenceforth showed himself most zealous for the conversion of his people. In instance of this, Venerable Bede tells how, at their royal villa of Ye. in Northumberland, the king and queen entertained Paulinus for five weeks, whilst he was occupied from morning to night in instructing and baptizing the crowds that flocked to him. By Edwin's persuasion, moreover, Eorpwald, King of East Anglia, was converted. Edwin's old friend Redwald was also Christian. In token of his authority over the other kings as Bretwalda, Edwin used to have the tufta (a tuft of feathers on a spear, a military ensign of Roman origin) borne publicly before him, and he received tribute from the Welsh princes. Under him the law was so respected, that it became, as the Venerable Bede attests, a proverb that "a woman might travel
through the island with a babe at her breast without fear of insult". St. Edwin was slain on 12 October, 633, in repelling an attack made on him by Penda, the pagan King of Mercia, who, together with the Welsh prince Cadwallon (a Christian only in name), had invaded Penda's dominion, and in conflict with the enemies of the Faith, he was regarded as a martyr and as such was allowed by Gregory XIII to be depicted in the English College church at Rome. His body was conveyed to Whithby. Churches are said to have been dedicated to him at London and at Brive in Somerset.

G. E. PHILLIPS.

Edwy (or EADWIG), King of the English, eldest son of Edmund and St. Aelfgifu, b. about 940; d. 959. Though but fifteen years old at the death of his uncle Edred, he was unanimously chosen king, and was crowned at Kingston in January, 956. Too young, almost, to know his own mind, and surrounded by counsellors who pandered to all that was worst in his nature, his reign was of short duration. Despite the exhortations of St. Dunstan and Archbishop Odo, both of whom fell under his displeasure, he put imposition after imposition upon his subjects. His relatives were removed from court, honest thanes were deprieved of their lands and inheritances, and his grandmother Eadgiva, who, by her piety and dignity, had endeared herself to the entire nation, was deprived of all her possessions.

At length, in 957, the Mercians and Northumbrians, whose course was now followed against Edgar, Edwy's younger brother, withdrew from the court with Archbishop Odo and put himself at the head of the insurgents. Edwy advanced to meet him but was defeated at Gloucester and obliged to flee for his life. Unwilling to prolong a civil war, the men of Kent and Wessex assembled to a general meeting of the thanes from North and South to arrange for peace. It was decided that the country should be divided in half at the Thames, and that each brother should rule over a part. To Edwy was allotted the southern portion, and to Edgar the northern. Taught prudence by his recent victory, Edgar governed his portion from that time forward with commendable justice and moderation, but died, prematurely, in 959.

His relations with St. Dunstan were not the happiest, and constitute the chief interest of Edwy's career. His opposition to the saint dated from the refusal of the latter to countenance his relations with Ethelgiva, by some presumed to be his foster mother, and her daughter. Seeing that he was in disfavour, Dunstan withdrew for a time to his cloister, but the anger of the king, kept alive by Ethelgiva, followed him into that sanctuary. The monks were incited to revolt, the abbey was plundered. Dunstan fled and, though hotly pursued, managed to escape to the Continent, where he remained until after Edwy's death.

Osbern's story of the effect that Edwy engaged in a general persecution of the monks may, however, be safely rejected, as the revolt against him was not concerned with the dispute between the pope and seculars which began only after Edwy's death. On the other hand, Edwy's dislike for Dunstan may have helped to impede the saint's monastic reforms.

Egan, Boetius. Archbishop of Tuam, b. near Tuam, Ireland, 1734; d. near Tuam, 1798. He belonged to a family owning large estates in the County Galway. In the eighteenth century they were reduced in position and means. The penal laws made it difficult for an Irish Catholic to engage in business at home; nor do we know where young Egan received his early education. Neither is it certain at what age he went to France to be trained for the priesthood. This training he received at the College of Bordeaux, founded by Irish exiles and endowed by Anne of Austria, in the seventeenth century. After his ordination he returned to Ireland and laboured in the ministry for some years till, in 1785, he was appointed Bishop of Achonry. Two years later he became Archbishop of Tuam. Acquainted during his whole life in Ireland with the barest toleration of his religion, he joyfully welcomed the Catholic Relief Act of 1778, and hastened to express his gratitude to George III. When Maynooth College was founded in 1795, he was named one of its trustees. One of his last public acts was to sign an address to the Irish viceroy, Lord Camden, condemning the revolutionary associations then in Ireland. In this address George III was called "the best of kings", and the Irish Parliament as "our enlightened legislature". It was strange language to use of such a king and of such a parliament.

BURKE, Catholic Archbishops of Tuam (Dublin, 1882); HEALY, History of Maynooth College (Dublin, 1899).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Egan, Michael, first Bishop of Philadelphia, U. S. A., b. in Ireland, most probably in Galway, in 1701; d. at Philadelphia, 22 July, 1814. Entering the Order of St. Francis he was rapidly advanced to important offices. In his twenty-sixth year he was elected Guardian of St. Isidore's, the house of the Irish Franciscans, at Rome, and held this position for three years, when he was transferred to Ireland. After labouring for several years as a missionary in his native land, he responded to an earnest appeal of the Catholics of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and went to the United States. Though lacking the constitution demanded by the pastoral duties of that pioneer age, and suffering often from sickness, Father Egan's priestly zeal and eloquence in the pulpit gained universal recognition, and, in April, 1803, he was appointed by Bishop Carroll one of the first bishops of St. Augustine in Philadelphia. On 8 April, 1808, Pope Pius VII erected this city into an episcopal see, with Michael Egan as first bishop. Archbishop Carroll describes him to the Roman authorities as a man of about fifty who seems endowed with all the qualities to discharge with perfection all the functions of the episcopacy except that he lacks robust health, greater experience and a greater degree of firmness in his disposition. He is a learned, modest, humble priest who maintains the spirit of his Order in his whole conduct. Owing to the Napoleonic troubles, the papal Bulls did not reach America until the year 1810. On 28 Oct. Bishop Egan was consecrated by Archbishop Carroll in St. Peter's church, Baltimore. His brief episcopate was embittered and his health shattered by the contumacious behaviour of the lay trustees of St. Mary's church, in which he had chosen for his residence, who were tainted with the irreligious notions of the times, without any legal right, and contrary to the canons of the Church, claimed the privilege of electing and deposing their pastors and of adjusting their salaries. This un-Catholic contention that "the lay owners of the churches and the clergy are their inventors" disturbed the peace, retarded the progress, and threatened the existence of the Catholic religion in Pennsylvania during two episcopates. Bishop Egan's troubles were aggravated by the insubordination of two Irish priests whom he had admitted to the diocese. James Harold and his better-known nephew, William
EGBERT

Egburt, Saint, a Northumbrian monk, born of noble parentage c. 639; d. 729. In his youth he went for the sake of study to Ireland, to a monastery, says the Venerable Bede, "called Rathmelsigi", identified by some with Mellifont in what is now County Louth. There, when in danger of death from pestilence, he prayed for a vision to do penance for his own sins and for things to live always in exile from his own country. In consequence he never returned to England, though he lived to the age of ninety, and always fasted rigorously. Having become a priest, he was filled with zeal for the conversion of the still pagan German tribes related to the Angles, and would himself have become their apostle, if God had not shown him that his real calling was to other work. It was, however, that dispatched to Fiesland St. Wigbert, St. Willibrord, and other saintly missionaries. St. Egbert's own mission was made known to him by a vision, that Melrose, and had seen a disciple of St. Boisil. Appearing to this monk, St. Boisil sent him to tell Egbert that the Lord willed him instead of preaching to the heathen to go to the monasteries of St. Columba, "because their plagues were not going straight", in consequence of their sins, and to pray in the celebration of Easter. Leaving Ireland therefore in 716, Egbert crossed over to Iona, where the last thirteen years of his life were spent. By his sweetness and humility he induced the Iona monks to relinquish their erroneous mode of computation; in 729 they celebrated Easter with the rest of the Church upon 24 April, although their old rule placed it that year upon an earlier day. On the same day, after saying Mass and joining joyfully in their celebration, the aged Egbert died. Though he is now honoured simply as a confessor, it is probable that St. Egbert was a bishop. By Boisil he is expressly called antistes and episcopus, and an Irish account of a synod at Brra names him "Egbert Bishop", whilst the term accordvis used by the Venerable Bede, is sometimes applied by him to bishops.

Egburt, Archbishop of Trier, d. 8 or 9 December, 933. He belonged to the family of the Counts of Holland. His parents, Count Theodoric I and Countess Hildegarde, sent him to be educated in the Abbey of Egmont, located within their dominions. Egbert is first mentioned in history about 899, when he was made bishop of Trier, then under Archbishop Willigis of Mainz. Documents of 976 and 977 record him as holding this office. In 977 he was made Archbishop of Trier, which see was vacant by the death of Theodoric. Here he remained till 993. He sought principally to remove from this great diocese the ravages caused by the Northmen at the end of the ninth century, and to foster the ecclesiastical reforms that had been progressing since the days of Otto I. He completed the restoration, begun by his predecessor, of the Abbey of S. Maria ad Martyres near Trier. Just before he died he built the abbey-church of St. Eucharius (St. Mathias), to which Otto II contributed generously. On this occasion the body of St. Celsius was discovered. The abbey itself was richly endowed and its monastic school flourished again. The collegiate church of St. Patrokli, near the town, being similarly endowed, a regular income for its clergy assured, and a fitting solemnity in Divine worship made possible. Abbot Hetzel of Mettlach was disposed for conduct unworthy of his vows and station. The monastery was reformed, and its school became the effective centre of studious occupation. The sternmaifeld St. Martin's was raised to the dignity of a collegiate church and was correspondingly en-

Egburt (EGBERT or EGBHRYT), frequently though incorrectly called “First King of England”, d. A.D. 839. He styled himself in 828 Reg Anglorum, i.e. “Overlord of East Anglia”, a title used by Offa fifty years before; in 830 he described himself as “King of the West Saxons and Kentishmen”, and in 833 he is “King of the West Saxons”. He came of the royal race descended from Ine of Wessex and, owing to his pretensions to power, was exiled by the joint action of Beorhtwine of Wessex and Offa of Mercia. The date and duration of his exile are unknown, but he returned in 802 and was chosen King of the West Saxons. In 815 he ravaged Cornwall and conquered the West Welsh who dwelt there. They rebelled in 823, when he again defeated them just in time to repel a Mercian invasion, and the battle of Edington he. Shortly afterwards Kent, Surrey, Sussex, and Essex accepted him as king and East Anglia submitted to his overlordship. With the Mercians again broke out, and ended in Egburt driving out Wiglaf and receiving the submission of that kingdom. In 829 he attacked Northumbria, but the Northumbrians met him at Dere and recognized him as overlord.

Thus for the first time he had united the whole English race under one overlordship, in this way substantially justifying the title King of England, though the idea of territorial kingship had not at that time come into being. Nor was he actually king of all the subject tribes, for the under-kings still ruled, though they were under him as Bretwalda. He was the true Wignaff to the throne of Mercia and made his own son Ethelwulf King of the Kentishmen. In his own Kingdom of Wessex he developed the shire system, carefully regulating the relations of the ealdorman and the bishop to the shire. He also organized the Pur, or militia. His ecclesiastical policies were very favourable to the Church, and at the Council of Kingston, in 838, he gave the archbishop assurances of friendship and certain privileges which considerably strengthened the primatial see. In 831 he forced the North Welsh (the people of Wales) to accept his overlordship, but three years later he had to defend his realm from Scandinavian pirates who were invading Sheppey. He beat them off, but they returned in 835 and defeated him at Charmouth in Dorsetshire. In 837 he again had to meet a great fleet of Northmen, who on this occasion were helped by an invasion of the Irish. He, however, won a great victory over the allies at Hengestdu, on the borders of Cornwall, after which he remained at peace till his death.

The chronology of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is often too, and sometimes three, years out with regard to the events of his reign. His coins, although specimens from nineteen different mints are known, bear his name and the title Rex, the additions Saxon, “M”, or “A” denoting Wessex, Mercia, and East Anglia respectively.


EDWIN BURTON.

Egbert, Bishop Egan died worn out by his struggles to maintain his episcopal authority.

Egburt, Archbishop of Trier, d. 8 or 9 December, 933. He belonged to the family of the Counts of Holland. His parents, Count Theodoric I and Countess Hildegarde, sent him to be educated in the Abbey of Egmont, located within their dominions. Egbert is first mentioned in history about 899, when he was made bishop of Trier, then under Archbishop Willigis of Mainz. Documents of 976 and 977 record him as holding this office. In 977 he was made Archbishop of Trier, which see was vacant by the death of Theodoric. Here he remained till 993. He sought principally to remove from this great diocese the ravages caused by the Northmen at the end of the ninth century, and to foster the ecclesiastical reforms that had been progressing since the days of Otto I. He completed the restoration, begun by his predecessor, of the Abbey of S. Maria ad Martyres near Trier. Just before he died he built the abbey-church of St. Eucharius (St. Mathias), to which Otto II contributed generously. On this occasion the body of St. Celsius was discovered. The abbey itself was richly endowed and its monastic school flourished again. The collegiate church of St. Patrokli, near the town, being similarly endowed, a regular income for its clergy assured, and a fitting solemnity in Divine worship made possible. Abbot Hetzel of Mettlach was disposed for conduct unworthy of his vows and station. The monastery was reformed, and its school became the effective centre of studious occupation. The sternmaifeld St. Martin's was raised to the dignity of a collegiate church and was correspondingly en-
dowed. From all these regenerated centres, likewise from the Abbeys of Echternach and St. Maximin, that needed no reformation, a beneficent, spiritual, and intellectual influence radiated in all directions through the diocese.

The intimate friend of Otto II, and with Willigis of Mainz exerted a wholesome influence over the emperor, whom he accompanied on his journey to Italy in 983. After Otto's death he stood at first for a time at the court of the emperor, but soon went over to Otto III and his mother Theophano. Other evidence of the religious renewal and the awakening of the Diocese of York is found in the admirable works of ecclesiastical art inspired by Egbert and executed mostly in Trier itself. Among these are several valuable manuscripts: the famous "Codex Egberti", a book of Gospels written at Reichenau and richly adorned with miniatures, now preserved in the library of Trier; the "Psalterium Egberti", written in 981 and now in the chapter library of Cividale (Italy), to which it was donated by St. Elizabeth of Thuringia (also called the "Codex Gertrudianus"), after the Russian Grand Duchess Gertrude, who became its possessor in 1085; the "Codex Epistularum", which contains also the letters of the Gospels and is kept in the cathedral library; likewise several Sacramentaries, transcripts from the "Letter Book" (Registrum) of St. Gregory the Great (596-604), etc. The arts of the goldsmith and of the worker in enamel were particularly well cultivated at Trier. A collection of specimens still extant are: a portable altar, at Limburg the golden case or cover with richly adorned head of the so-called St. Peter's Staff, once a part of the relics of the Trier cathedral, now in the sacristy of the Franciscan church at Limburg. Egbert was buried in the chapel of St. Andrew, built for the cathedral of Trier.

Egbert, Archbishop of York, England, son of Eata, brother of the Northumbrian King Eadbald and cousin of King Cæolwulf, to whom the Venerable Bede dedicated his history; date of birth unknown; d. 19 November, 766. He received his early education in a monastery, and then went to Rome with his brother Egred, where he was ordained a deacon. Egred died in Rome and Egbert immediately returned to Northumbria. On the resignation of the Bishopric of York by Wilfrid II in 732, King Cæolwulf appointed Egbert his successor. Shortly after his accession Bede wrote a letter to him to urge him to give so much time to study and prayer, to ordain more priests for the administration of the sacraments, and to translate the Gospel and the Lord's Prayer into the Saxon tongue. He also urged him to strive to obtain the subdivision of many of the dioceses of the North in order that episcopal visitsations might be more frequent. He called his attention to many disorders that were prevalent and particularly urged him to secure the pallium for himself. Acting upon this advice Egbert obtained the pallium from Gregory III at Rome in 735, and thus became the second Archbishop of York, the first since Paulinus had been lost to Kent more than a century before. During all those years no one had sought for the restoration of that lost dignity, and this neglect was afterwards used as a strong argument in favour of the precedence of Canterbury, when the well-known controversy arose between the two sees. The restoration of the pallium to Egbert increased his power and authority over the Northern bishops, who thus became his suffragans; and his power was still more strengthened in 788 when his brother Eadbald succeeded to the throne of Northumbria.

Egbert was thus placed in a position which enabled him to carry out many reforms, and in the performance of these he proved himself a strict disciplinarian; but though stern when correction and rebuke were justly deserved, he was remarkable for his sweetness and gentleness. His talent, combined with his piety and energy and always refers to him in terms of the deepest affection. "He is said to have been the first prelate who possessed a mint at York. He paid much attention to the services and music of his church, introducing the observance of the Hours. He was also a benefactor to the fabric of the minster, bestowing upon his cathedral the choice work of the jeweller and the goldsmith, and giving to it figured curtains of silk of foreign workmanship. He was, in all probability, the first introducer of the parochial system into the North." (Fasti Ebor.). One of his greatest works, perhaps, was the foundation of the famous minster at York and its celebrated library. The renown of its masters and scholars soon spread through every Christian country, and noble youths from all parts flocked to York to be taught by the great archbishop. He himself taught divinity, whilst his assistant Albert, who was afterwards consecrated bishop, excelled in grammar and in the arts and sciences. The fact that the illustrious Alcuin was Egbert's pupil, sheds no little lustre on this famous school.

The archbishop's daily work has been thus described by Alcuin himself: "As soon as he was at leisure in the morning, he sent for the Fabulamortua, and having sat on his couch taught them successively till noon, at which time he retired to his private chapel and celebrated Mass. After dinner, at which he ate sparingly, he amused himself with hearing his pupils discuss literary questions in his presence. In the evening he retired with them to the cloister, and then calling them in order, he gave his blessing to each as they knelt in succession at the feet" (Mabillon, Acta SS. Ord. S. B., ad an. 815). Towards the end of his life he left the care of the school to Albert and Alcuin, giving himself more time and opportunity to prepare for his end in peace and joy. In this life of retirement and prayer he was joined by his brother King Eadbald, who voluntarily resigned his throne to enter the monastery in 757. Egbert died before his brother, having ruled over the Diocese of York nearly thirty-four years. He was buried in the porch of his cathedral, and his body was interred near him, in the crypt of the cathedral. His best-known work is the "De Jure Sacerdotali", a collection of canonical regulations. Extracts from it made in the eleventh century, under the title of "Excerptiones et dictatvum et canonicum patrum" (Mansi, XII, 413 sq.), were long current as a work of Egbert. Among the writings which have given a "Pontificale", or series of official offices for the use of a bishop; a "Dialogus Ecclesiae Institutionis"; a "Confessionale"; and a "Pententinale", both of which were written in the vernacular as well as in Latin. The "Pententinale", an important liturgical text which has been published by the Surtees Society, and his other works may be found in the second volume of Thorpe's "Ancient Laws and Institutes of England". In its present shape the "Pententinale Egberti" (P. L., LXXXIX, 411 sqq.) contains but little from the hand of Egbert, and is a ninth-century Frankish compilation, put together mostly by the Chorister and the "Dialogus Ecclesiae Institutionis" (Mansi, XII, 482-88) is said not to be from Egbert in its present form (see YORK; PENTENTIAL BOOKS; LIBER PONTIFICIALIS).
Eger, Diocese of. See Agria, Diocese of.

Egfrid (also known as Ecgfrid, Ecgfrith, Egfrith), King of Northumbria, b. 650; d. 685. He ascended the Northumbrian throne at Oswy’s death in 670, and after defeating the Picts who had sought to impose upon his youth by asserting their independence, turned his attention to Wulphere, King of Mercia, and broke, for a time, the power of the southern kingdom. In 679 new trouble with Mercia arose, and in the course of the subsequent struggle Aelfwīn, Egfrid’s brother, was slain. Through the intervention of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, peace was at last restored and in lieu of vengeance Egfrid was prevailed upon to accept the legal wergeld (fine) for his brother’s death.

Egfrid now consolidated his kingdom by diplomacy, annexation, and treaty, bringing Cumberland, Galloway, and North Lancashire under Northumbrian influence in the desire for conquest, however, had entered his veins, and in 684 he dispatched an expedition into Ireland. The invasion was unsuccessful, but nevertheless was productive of much damage and bitterness to a hospitable, friendly people who had conferred numerous benefits on the Angles and who found violence where they expected gratitude. Disregarding the advice of his counsellors, Egfrid led an expedition against the Picts the next year, and, being decoyed into the mountains, was trapped and slain. He was buried by the victors in the cemetery on the island of Iona, and his brother succeeded to the Northumbrian throne.

See also Etheldreda; Ely.

Egidius. See Giles.

Eginhard. See Einhard.

Eglofstein, Frederick W. von, b. at Aldorf, near Nuremberg, Bavaria, 18 May, 1824; d. in New York, 1885. He served in the Prussian army in his early manhood and then emigrated to the United States. Von Eglofstein has been called “The Father of Half-tone Engraving” in the United States, for the reason that he was the first one to employ ruled glass screens, together with photography, to produce engravings. In 1861 he engaged Samuel Sartain, a steel engraver, to rule with wavy lines numbering 250 to the inch glass plates covered with an opaque varnish, and he was engaged in perfecting his experiments in this direction when he entered the United States. Von Eglofstein’s method of engraving made in 1866 is given in Inland Printer (Chicago, Oct., 1894), 38; Anthony’s Photographic Bulletin (New York, 1896–97), 1, 201.

Egmont, Lamoral, Count of. See Aggstein, half-tone engraving in United States.

Egmont, Lamoral, Count of, Prince of Gavre, b. at the Château de La Hamaide, in Hainault, 15 Nov., 1522; beheaded at Brussels, 5 June, 1568. He was a descendant of one of the oldest families of the Low Countries; his paternal castle, near the Abbey of the same name, was on the coast of the North Sea, about three miles west of Alkmaar, Holland. In 1538 he went to Spain with his elder brother, Charles, and both took part in the expedition to Algers in 1541, in which Charles was injured. Charles died the following year. Lamoral succeeded to the title and estates, which, beside those of Holland, comprised the principality of Gavre, seven or eight baronies, and a number of seigniories. When, in 1544, he married Sabina, Duchess of Bavaria and Count Palatine of the Rhine, the emperor and the King of the Romans assisted at his wedding. Egmont distinguished himself in various campaigns during the reign of Charles V, who, when he was only twenty-six years of age, invested him with the Order of the Golden Fleece, and appointed him to several confidential missions such as sending him to England to seek the hand of Queen Mary for Philip II. His principal titles to military glory are two battles which he won against the French: the battle of St-Quentin, which was fought through his vehement persuasion (1557), and that of Gravelines, the honour of which is due to him exclusively. As a reward for his services he was nominated by Philip II, in 1559, stadtholder of the province of Flanders, and a member of the Council of State for the Low Countries.

But these honours did not satisfy Egmont. Though handsome, brave, rich, generous, and popular, still he viewed with jealousy the prominence given Cardinal Granvella, who was in the confidence of the king. He entered a blank-note of protest against the proceedings of this minister and clamoured for his removal, going so far as to refuse to sit in the Council of State if Granvella were allowed to remain. His hatred of the king’s favourite led him into the plots of William of Orange against the Spanish Government. Later, when religious troubles broke out in Flanders, it was evident...
that he did not rise to the occasion; he granted the
sectarians concessions emphatically disapproved of
by the king and assumed a quite equivocal attitude in
the matter of the iconoclasts. It is true that he al-
leged, in excuse, that there were no troops at his disposal
and that he was a decoy rendered powerless. On the
other hand, he refused to take part in the plots against
the Government, and when the Duke of Alva arrived
in the Netherlands, he would not follow the Prince
of Orange into exile, saying that his was a clear conscien-
tial attitude cost him his life. With the Count of
Hornen, he was arrested by the orders of the duke and
denounced (or death), despite the promise of
the Golden Fleece. Both were declared guilty
of high treason by the Conseil des Troubles, a court
established by the Duke of Alva, and which was his
service instrument. The two friends were beheaded
amid universal grief. Egmont met his death with digni-
ty and Christian resignation; he protested to the
last moment his devotion to his religion and his king,
and to the latter's compassion recommended his wife,
who, through the confiscation of his property, was left
peniless with the care of eleven children. Egmont
had been imprudent, but was guilty of no crime. His
death was then no more a popular accusation than the
principal grievances of the Low Countries against the Spanish Government.

De FAVY, Procès du comte d' Egmont et pièces justificatives (Brussels, 1855); Dubrille, Le Journal de Nicolas de Lan-
ger, général du Comte d'Egmont en Bullets de la Commission royale d'Histoire (1851); Juste, Le comte d'Egmont et le comte de Hornes (Brussels, 1862); Prescott, History of Philip II (1855-56).

GODEFROID KURTH.

Egoism (Lat. ego, I, self), the designation given to
those ethical systems which hold self-love to be the
sole end of all action and the determinant of moral
conduct. In a broad and popular sense the term
could be called egotistical which makes any good of
the ego the end and motive of action. The name,
however, has been appropriated by usage to those
systems which make happiness, pleasure, or personal
advantage the sole end of conduct. In one form
and with various modifications, the principle
pervades the theories of the Cyrenian, Epicurean,
Utilitarian, and Evolutionary Schools; and, slightly
disguised, it lurks at the bottom of all altruistic
philosophy. Its typical expression is to be found in Hobbes
and Mandeville, while Jeremy Bentham, combining it
with the other cognate principle, that pleasure and pain
are the only good and evil, formulates it in its full
character as egoistic hedonism. Two of Bentham's
statements, when taken together, set forth concisely
the essence of the doctrine. "Pleasure is itself a good, nay,
setting aside immortality from pain, the only good.
Pain is itself an evil, and indeed without exception,
the only evil, or else the words good and evil, have no
meaning." (Principles of Morals and Legislation,
chap. ix.) "The search after motives is one of the
prominent causes of man's bewilderment in the in-
vestigation of the question of motives. But any system
pursuit in which every moment employed is a moment
wasted. All motives are absolutely good, no man has
ever had, can, or could have a motive different from
the pursuit of pleasure or shunning of pain." (Deon-
tology, vol. I, p. 126.) The undisputed fact that men
do experience sentiments of benevolence and perform
disinterested actions offers an obvious difficulty to
the egoist. Hobbes seeks to evade it by resolving altru-
istic impulses into personal hopes and fears. Later
hedonists, recurring to the principle of the association
of ideas, contend that virtue, which at first is pursued
as an end in itself, becomes a means to the pleasure it brings, through a confusion of means and end, to be pursued for its own sake. Innumerable analyses have shown that pleasure and pain are not measurable, and still less
commeasurable. The scheme devised by Bentham
for estimating the quantity of different pleasures by
considering their various dimensions—intensity, dura-
tion, nearness, certainty, purity (freedom from pain),
fruitfulness—is commonly regarded as a piece of
absurdity. This fundamental postulate of egoistic
hedonism, therefore, false. But a closer examination of
the system shows that the principal vice lies in its primary
principle that self-interest is the only motive of human action.
This doctrine reduces all virtue to mere selfish calculation,
and outrages the liveliest moral feelings by resolving
the highest and noblest impulses into a base
pursuit of personal pleasure. To say that man is
irresponsible of acting from motives other than self-interest
is to degrade human nature. Mankind at large understands very clearly that self-interest is one
thing and virtue quite another; that self-sacrifice and
heroic devotion do exist, and are not vice and immor-
ality; that a worthy action challenges our approbation in
proportion to the disinterestedness of the agent. Let
it become known that the hero of what we at first
considered a brilliant act of self-sacrifice had after all no
other motive than to obtain some advantage for himself,
and immediately he appears a vulgar mercenary." As
Lecky says: "No Epicurean can aver before a popular audience that the
was the pursuit of his own happiness without an out-
burst of indignation and contempt, no man could
conscientiously make this—which according to the
selfish theory is the only rational and indeed possible
motive of action—the deliberate object of all his
undertakings without his character be branded as
repulsive and degraded." (European Morals, vol. I,
p. 35.) Besides, if the egoistic impulse is made the
sole and unqualified motive of action, it is idle to
speak of obligation and duty. Nor can the hedonist,
consistently with his theory, claim that he safeguards
the moral pre-eminence of self, which is a proper
doctrine derivable from it to be the highest form of
pleasure. For if one kind of conduct yields this
pleasure, while another does not, then evidently
there must be some essential difference, unaccounted for in
the egoistic and hedonistic systems. In one form or
other, good conduct, in virtue of which they produce con-
trary results of happiness and pain for the agent. But
moral judgments are not resolvable into estimates of
self-interest; and if we commit ourselves to classifying
conduct purely by the advantages, in terms of the
pleasure received from doing, we shall be
forced to appraise as virtuous actions which the
reasonable judgment of men condemn as immortal;
while, on the other hand, we shall be compelled to brand as
wrong acts of self-sacrifice such as, in all life and litera-
ture, challenge the highest honour and reverence.
"At the bottom of the errors of egoistic hedonism
there lies a truth which this system misinterprets and
perverts. However complete and disinterested we
may be, we can never strip ourselves of self. The
constitution of his nature compels man to seek his
good, however he may err in the deliberate choice that
he makes among the various goods that solicit his
efforts. The end constituted for him by God is to
reach that highest good which consists in realizing
the moral perfection of his nature. This good is to be
sought for its own sake chiefly, and in its train follows
happiness as, if the expression may be permitted, an
automatic consequence. Hence in pursuing the
moral good, I am implicitly pursuing my own hap-
iness. This self-realization is not egotism; for egoism
makes itself the centre, the beginning and the end of
action. On the other hand, the virtuous man sub-
ordinates himself to the moral good, which in the
last analysis is identified with God. In this sense, as
Aristotle points out, the true and virtuous man may be
said to love self-lover. "For he gives to himself what is most
honourable, and the greatest goods, and gratifies
the authoritative part of himself, and obeys it in every-
thing. Therefore, he must be a self-lover, after a dif-
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different manner from the person who is reproached for it, and differing in as great a degree as living in obedience to reason differs from living in obedience to passion, and as desiring the honourable differs from desiring what seems to be advantageous." (NICH. ETHICS, Bk. IX, ch. viii, § 8) When I say that duty must be fulfilled exclusively for duty's sake, with disregard of all considerations of happiness or welfare, I mean the fact that by annexing happiness as a concomitant of the good the Creator evidently intends that we may legitimately aim at our own happiness; provided we do not invert the order, by which makes happiness subordinate to the good. Duty is not the be-all and the end-all. It is a means to reach our supreme end and good.

St. Thomas, Summa Theologica, I, Q. Q.-LIX; Aristotel, Nichomachian Ethics, Bk. IX, ch. viii; H. J. L. FABRICE, La Liberté et le Désordre (Paris, 1902), Part II; MÉRICA, Du Droit et du Désordre (Paris, 1877), Part II, ch. 1, 2; F. NOVIGRACH, The Methods of Ethics (New York, 1890), I, vii-viii; II, i, iii; LEGGY, History of European Morals (New York, 1870), I; MUSHER, The Elements of Ethics (New York, 1892), I.—The authoritative presentation of Egoism is to be found in the works of HOBES, PALEY, BENTHAM, and J. S. MILL.

EGWEN, SAINT, third Bishop of Worcester; date of birth unknown; d. (according to Mabillon) 20 December, 720, though his death may have occurred three years earlier. His fame as founder of the great Abbey of Evesham is no doubt tended to the growth of legends which, though mainly founded on facts, render it difficult to determine the exact details with the precision which this late-borne history implies. It appears that either in 692 or a little later, upon the death of Offa, second Bishop of Worcester, Egwen, a prince of the Mercian blood royal, who had retired from the world and sought the seclusion of religious life, was invited by the people to assume the vacant see. The biographers say that king, clergy, and commonalty all united in demanding his elevation; but the popularity which forced on him this reluctant assumption of the episcopal functions was soon wrecked by his apostolic zeal in their discharge.

The Anglo-Saxon population of the then young diocese had had less than a century in which to become habituated to the restraints of Christian morality; they as yet hardly appreciated the sanctity of Christian marriage, and the struggle of the English Benedictines for the chastity of the priesthood had only fairly begun. At the same time large sections of England were more or less permanently occupied by pagans closely allied in blood to the Anglo-Saxon Christians. Egwen displayed undaunted zeal in his efforts to evangelize the heathen and to enforce ecclesiastical discipline. He himself, however, was not content with his own flock created a bitter resentment which, as King Etheldred was his friend, could only find vent in accusations addressed to his ecclesiastical superiors. Egwen undertook a pilgrimage to seek vindication from the Roman Pontiff himself. According to a legend, he prepared for his journey by locking shackles on his feet, and throwing the key into the River Avon. While he prayed before the tomb of the Apostles, at Rome, one of his servants brought him this very key—found in the maw of a fish that had just been caught in the Tiber. Egwen then released himself from his fetters, and straightway obtained from the pope an authoritative release from the load of obloquy which his enemies had striven to fasten upon him.

It was after Egwen's triumphant return from this pilgrimage that the shepherd Eoves came to him with the tale of a miraculous vision by which the Blessed Virgin commanded him to found an abbey. The place which Egwen had been shown would be dedicated to her. Egwen himself went to the spot pointed out by the shepherd (Eoves han, or "dwelling") and to him also we are told the same vision was vouchsafed. King Etheldred granted him the land thereabouts upon which the famous abbey was founded. As to the precise date of the foundation, although the monastic tradition of later generations set it in 714, recent research points to some year previous to 709. At any rate it was most probably in 709 that Egwen made his second pilgrimage to Rome, this time in the company of Cœned, the successor of Etheldred, and Offa, King of the East Saxons. When Pope Constantine granted him the extraordinary privileges by which the Abbey of Evesham was distinguished. One of the last important acts of his episcopate was his participation in the first great Council of Clavesho.
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The Anglo-Saxon population of the then young diocese had had less than a century in which to become habituated to the restraints of Christian morality; they as yet hardly appreciated the sanctity of Christian marriage, and the struggle of the English Benedictines for the chastity of the priesthood had only fairly begun. At the same time large sections of England were more or less permanently occupied by pagans closely allied in blood to the Anglo-Saxon Christians. Egwen displayed undaunted zeal in his efforts to evangelize the heathen and to enforce ecclesiastical discipline. He himself, however, was not content with his own flock created a bitter resentment which, as King Etheldred was his friend, could only find vent in accusations addressed to his ecclesiastical superiors. Egwen undertook a pilgrimage to seek vindication from the Roman Pontiff himself. According to a legend, he prepared for his journey by locking shackles on his feet, and throwing the key into the River Avon. While he prayed before the tomb of the Apostles, at Rome, one of his servants brought him this very key—found in the maw of a fish that had just been caught in the Tiber. Egwen then released himself from his fetters, and straightway obtained from the pope an authoritative release from the load of obloquy which his enemies had striven to fasten upon him.

It was after Egwen's triumphant return from this pilgrimage that the shepherd Eoves came to him with the tale of a miraculous vision by which the Blessed Virgin commanded him to found an abbey. The place which Egwen had been shown would be dedicated to her. Egwen himself went to the spot pointed out by the shepherd (Eoves han, or "dwelling") and to him also we are told the same vision was vouchsafed. King Etheldred granted him the land thereabouts upon which the famous abbey was founded. As to the precise date of the foundation, although the monastic tradition of later generations set it in 714, recent research points to some year previous to 709. At any rate it was most probably in 709 that Egwen made his second pilgrimage to Rome, this time in the company of Cœned, the successor of Etheldred, and Offa, King of the East Saxons. When Pope Constantine granted him the extraordinary privileges by which the Abbey of Evesham was distinguished. One of the last important acts of his episcopate was his participation in the first great Council of Clavesho.

Egypt.—This subject will be treated under the following main divisions: I. General Description; II. Ancient Egyptian History; III. Ancient Egyptian Religion; IV. Literary Monuments of Ancient Egypt; V. The Coptic Church; VI. Coptic Literature; VII. Coptic-Arabic Literature.

General Description.—The ancient geographical name Upper Egypt properly applies only to the rather narrow valley of the Nile from the Mediterranean, 31°35'N. latitude, to the First Cataract, at Assuan (Syene), 24°5'30"N. latitude, a stretch of about 680 miles by rail. However, from remote antiquity, as now, Egypt held sway over the greater part of Nubia, reaching its northern boundary, the Gebel Barkal, 18°30' N. latitude, which, under the eighteenth dynasty, was the southernmost city of the empire—another stretch of about 590 miles by rail. Distances by water are somewhat greater owing to the winding course of the river. From Napata the Nile continues for a few hundred yards in width and at not a few points, especially near the Cataract, the river is broken by a cataract, where its waters rush between barren or less or more diminutive islands, the most famous of which is the island of Philae above and Elephantine in front of Assuan. The cataract, however, has lost much of its grandeur since the building of the great dam which now regulates the supply for the irrigation of the country in time of low water. From Assuan to Edfu (about 48 miles) the banks are so high that even in the annual inundation they are above the level of high water, and consequently remain barren. Near Edfu the valley widens out and becomes wider and rougher in the neighboring district of Assiut. At Luxor (part of Thebes) it again narrows for a few miles, but after that it maintains a respectable breadth, averaging between twelve and fifteen miles. At Assuan begin the two high ranges of the Libyan and Arabian deserts, between which the valley extends. The range to the left is somewhat farther from the river, so that most of the towns are built on the western bank.

Near Girgeh (Abydos) begins the Bahr-Yusef, Joseph's Canal. It was formerly a branch of the Nile; it runs parallel to the main stream at a distance of from 5 to 6 miles along the left bank, and empties...
into the Fayûm (nome of Arsinoë). One hundred and ten miles above Memphis the Libyan mountains bend to the north-west, and then, facing north-east, they draw nearer again to the Nile, thus surrounding a large extent of territory, which of old was known as Ta-Šhe, or Lakeland, from the great inland lake frequently mentioned and described by the Greek travellers and geographers under the name of Lake Marrít. It is still called Fayûm, from the Coptic pjiom, “the sea.” This lake once occupied almost the entire basin of the Fayûm, but within the historical period its circumference does not seem to have exceeded 140 miles. It lay 73 feet above the sea level, Lake Borolos (Lacus Buto or Paralus) east and Lake Edkû west of the Rosetta mouth (Ostium Bolbitinum), and Lake Marrít (Mareotis Lacus) south of the narrow strip of land on which Alexandria stands. Between Lake Menzaleh and the Red Sea, on a line running first south and then south-south-east, are Lake Balah, Lake Timsíh, and the Bitter Lakes (Lacus Amari), now traversed by the Suez Canal. Wâdi Tumilât connects Lake Timsíh with the Delta across the Arabian Desert, and forms the natural entrance to Egypt from the Asiatic side. West of the Delta, in a depression of the Libyan Desert, lies the Wâdi Natrûn (Valla Nitria), famous in early Christian times, under the

and was very deep, as shown by its last vestige, the Birket-el-Karûn, which lies 144 feet below the same level (Baedeker, op. cit., p. 156 sq.).

A little before reaching Cairo, the Nile flows along the rocky and sandy plateau upon which the three best-known pyramids stand. There, too, the two ranges of Arabian and Libyan mountains, which above this point run for many miles close to the river, turn sharply aside in the direction of the north-east and north-west, thus forming a triangle with the Mediterranean shore. The immense alluvial plain thus encompassed was called by the Greeks the Delta, owing to its likeness to the fourth letter of their alphabet (Δ).

As soon as the river enters this plain its waters divide into several streams which separately wind their way to the sea and make it a garden of incredible fertility. In ancient times there were seven of these branches, five natural and two artificial. Only two are now of importance for navigation, the Damietta (Tanaitis) and the Rosetta branches, both named from the towns near which they discharge into the sea. It is to be remarked that, as a natural result of the incessant struggle between sea and land, the outline of the Delta is even now somewhat indefinite, and was probably much more so in the remote past. The shore is always partly covered with lagoons which move from one place to another. The most extensive of these are now, from east to west, Lake Menzaleh between the ancient Ostium Phænitium and Ostium Pelusiacum, name of Desert of Scete, for its Coptic monasteries, four of which exist to this day.

Geology.—The low Nubian table-land through which the Nile meanders consists of a red sandstone, belonging to the upper cretaceous formation. It has furnished the Egyptians with an excellent building stone which they have exploited from remote antiquity, especially at Gebel Silsileh (Silisils), 26 miles south of Edfu, where the sandstone beds, in sharp contrast with their former low level, rise in steep banks overhanging the river, thus offering unusual facilities for quarrying and transporting the stone. Near Edfu the sandstone is replaced by the nummulitic limestones (Eocene) of the Tertiary period, which form the bulk of the Libyan Desert and of a considerable portion of the Arabian Desert as well. The Libyan Desert is a level, or almost level, table-land, averaging 1000 feet above the sea. On the east it is fringed with craggy cliffs overhanging the valley, while its outward border, running aslant to the north-west, offers here and there deep bays in which lie the oases of Khârgeh and Dâkhlieh (Great Oasis), Farârâh (Tringthoos Oasis), and Siweh (Jupiter Ammon). The oasis of Bahriyeh (Small Oasis), north-east of Farârâh, lies, on the contrary, in a depression entirely surrounded by the higher plateau. The Fayûm, in fact, is nothing but such an oasis on a larger scale. The plateau itself is waterless and practically without vegetation. Its strata are gently inclined to the
north-west, so that the highest level is in the south, near Luxor, where the oldest (lower Eocene) strata appear, and valleys (Bibân-el-Molâk) take the place of the cliffs, undoubtedly for the same reason as in the Arabian Desert (see below).

The Nile the limestone formation originally presented much the same appearance as in the Libyan counterpart. This appearance, however, was changed by a high (6000 to 7000 feet) range of crystalline rocks (granite, gneiss, dolomite, porphyry, etc.) which sprang up along the Red Sea, lifting and tilting both the limestone formation and the sandstone beds (which lie farther north on the eastern than on the western side of the river), thus creating numerous deeply eroded valleys. Some of these run north and south, and more of them slope down to the Nile. The Wâdi Hamamât (the Rehenu Valley of the Egyptians) runs almost straight across the desert from Keft (Coptos) on the Nile in the direction of Koseir (Leucos Limén of the Greeks) on the Red Sea. In spite of this the Arabian Desert still preserves its general appearance of a table-land. The open plains, of course, are almost devoid of vegetation, but numerous plants can be seen in the valleys, and they thicken in the sheltered ravines among the hills where springs occur. Near Assuan a spur of the eruptive range just mentioned runs in a western direction to the Nile, extending clear across the bed of the river and thus occasioning the so-called first cataract.

The origin of the present Valley of the Nile, in Egypt proper, dates from the Pliocene times, when it first appeared as a fiord into which the water of the Mediterranean Sea flowed at least as far as Eneh (Huenopolis) and perhaps even as far as Esneh (in the older Miocene times, the valley did not exist at all, the Arabian and Libyan Deserts forming first a continuous table-land). Intimately connected with the formation of the valley are the sands and loams occurring to the south of the pyramids of Gizeh, as is shown by numerous Pliocene fossils they contain (Baedeker, Egypt, p. 1). The silicified wood which abounds in the district of Moghra, west of Wâdi Natrun (see above), belongs to the Miocene times, as do also the marine limestones of the Plateau of Cyrenaica, north of the Oasis of Siwa, on the eastern edge of the Arabian Desert and on the shore of the Gulf of Suez. The so-called petrified forests near Cairo consist of stems of trees silicified by the sand, and which have escaped the silexiferous debris buried forth amid the network of lagoons existing in these parts in Oligocene times. Those forest trees are still more common in the Fayûm, where innumerable bones of extinct terrestrial and marine mammals and reptiles have been found in sands of the same geological age (Baedeker, loc. cit.).

Deposits of alabaster are to be found in the neighbourhood of El ‘Amarna, where the alabaster quarries of Hetnub were worked by the Egyptians from the time of the Fourth Dynasty. The cultivated plains of the Delta and the Nile valley consist of recent alluvial deposits, ranging from fine sand to the finest silt laid down by the water of the annual inundation. Under these lie coarser yellowish sands and gravels of Pleistocene age, which here and there reach the surface in the Delta as islands of sandy waste among the rich cultivated land of the surrounding country (Baedeker, Egypt, p. xlix). Gold-bearing quartz and iron ore are plentiful in the eruptive range of the eastern desert both in Nubia and in Egypt, and gold mines were exploited there by the pharaohs. No workings of iron ore have been found (Bredas, ‘History of the Ancient Egypt’), 122, 142, 129.

Flora and Agriculture.—Since the remoted antiquity Egypt has been famous for its fertility. The black soil, really a gift of the Nile, annually enriched by a fresh layer of silt, requires but little care in tilling and ploughing. Hence the primitive character of the agricultural implements—the plough, in particular, which is precisely the same now as it was 5000 years ago, a pole to which is fastened a piece of wood bent inward at an acute angle and shod, at least in later periods, with a three-pronged piece of iron. There is no trace of large forests similar to our own having ever covered the valley proper of the Nile in quaternary times, much less the Libyan and Arabian Deserts; the Delta still has, and may have had in the past, large groves of palm trees. So far as we can judge from the paintings of the early tombs, the whole cultivable land was laid out in fields, orchards, or gardens. The fields gave rich crops of wheat, barley, melon (Sorghum vulgare), flax, lentil peas, and beans. The orchards were stocked with trees which, as a rule, were planted as much for the shade they afforded as for their refreshing fruit. There were palms of two species: the ordinary date-palm and the palm-plum, the latter growing in Upper Egypt only. Oranges and lemons were peculiar to Lower Egypt, white cucumbers, tamarisks, aecias of various kinds, the vine, the pomegranate, and the olive were common; oleanders, roses, carnations, and geraniums were, as they still are, the principal decorative plants. In the kitchen gardens grew leeks, cabbages, cucumbers, melons, garlic, which the Israelites seem to have regretted no less than the excellent fish (Num., xi, 5) and the fat fleshed fish (Ex., xvi, 3) of the land of bondage. Reeds of various kinds grew abundantly in the marshes in Lower Egypt especially; the most important were, the papyrus; its stalks were used as a material for various purposes. The reeds were of various kinds and were used lengthwise. Two layers of such slices were disposed at right angles on one another and fastened with a sort of glue under some pressure, and the sheet of paper was ready for use as soon as it dried. When written upon, the sheet was rolled up with the writing inside, and the title of contents was then added on the back end of it. In ancient Egypt the tuft of papyrus was the coat of arms or symbol of the Northern Kingdom. This reed, so common in Egypt up to the first centuries of our era, has now completely disappeared from that country, very likely on account of the high tax which the Roman emperors imposed on its cultivation. It exists still, however, on the upper course of the Nile, and, according to Bruce, the Abyssinians still make boats of its stalks. Among the many other aquatic plants must be mentioned the lotus, a water-lily, of which two species, the Castalia Scirra (Nymphaea cornuta), with blue flowers, and the Castalia mystica (Nymphaea lotus), with white blossoms, are often found figured on Egyptian monuments, particularly on columns. The flower of the lotus was the emblem of Upper Egypt, as the tuft of papyrus was of Lower Egypt.

The inundation of the Nile is of the utmost importance to Egypt; it is no exaggeration to say that but for its annual recurrence the rich valley would soon become a desert similar to those of Libya and Arabia. The overflow is due principally to the torrents of rain that fell almost uninterrupted in the rainy Abyssinia in the four months of summer and swell the Blue Nile (Astatus), which discharges into the Nile proper, or White Nile, at Khartum. The rise of the Nile begins in Egypt a few days before the summer solstice, that is between the 16th or 26th of June; but the rise begins until fully two months later. It reaches its maximum height about the autumnal equinox when it begins gradually to subside until the vernal equinox, so that the whole process of inundation lasts about nine months. The maximum height of the water varies in different places, decreasing as the area covered by the inundation increases. The mean differ-
ence between the highest and lowest stages of the river is 21 feet at Khartium, 20 feet at Wadi Halfa, 23 feet at Assuan, 22 feet at Assiut, and 22 feet at Minieh. Below the last-named point controlling works now prevent the normal rise of the river. (Baedeker, Egypt, p. xx.) At Cairo today the pool is in the case of the river 10 feet. Some twenty-five years ago it used to be 25 feet at Cairo, 21 feet at Rosetta. When stated generally the height of the inundation must be understood as the height of the kilometre on the island of Rödsah, near Cairo (close by the ancient Babylon). Formerly a rise of 15 to 20 feet was common. It is now 10 inches (21 to 25 feet is common, 27 and above too much. For seven years, A. H. 157–161 (A. D. 1065–1072) the inundation prevailed altogether. The long duration of the overflow is due to the fact that it is controlled by artificial means without which it would undoubtedly prove as detrimental as it is beneficial. The only part left to nature is the process of infiltration which is due to the pressure of the water on the banks and is favoured by the porous nature of the soil, also by the fact that the subsoil, like the surface of the valley, gently slopes down to the mountains. It is only when this natural process is completed that the river is ready to overflow its banks, and then begins man's work. The sluices of the canals are opened, and the waters are led first to the higher level lands nearer the banks, then to the lower lands, for in its general configuration the soil to be submerged, as the subsoil is constantly concave, as in the case of our own marshes and the Delta. This work is done by earthen dykes across the canals and the fields; the dykes are removed when the preceding tract has been sufficiently irrigated. The reverse is done when the river begins to fall, and the waters are kept in the remaining part of the valley as much as possible above the level of the river, and they are let out slowly, so as to secure irrigation for the lower water-months, March to June. This process, however, is not always possible, either because the inundation is insufficient or because the canals and sluices are not kept in good condition. The fall hence (later in the season) they have to raise the water from the river, the canals, or the numerous wells fed by natural infiltration, so as to water their fields.

Two machines chiefly are used for this purpose: the sákhyel and the shiddif. The sákhyel consists of two wheels working at right angles to one another. The perpendicular wheel carries an endless chain to which are attached leather, wooden, or clay buckets. As the wheel turns the buckets are dipped in the water and filled, when they are lifted and emptied into a channel which conveys the water to the fields. These machines are worked by asses or buffaloes in Egypt, and by camels in Nubia. The shiddif is a roughly made pair of gigantic scissors in which the trays are replaced by a bucket at one end and a stone on the other, the stone being a little more than the weight of the bucket when filled. A man stands on the bank and, pulling on the rope which is attached to the latter, then letting go, the weight of the stone lifts the bucket out, when it can be emptied into the proper channel. In the Lower Delta, where the level of the water in the canals remains nearly the same, they use a wooden wheel called tábálá, which raises the water by means of numerous compartments in the hollow fellows. Such methods, however, while absorbing all the energies of the population for most of the year, are far from exhausting the irrigation power supplied by the Nile during inundation. Nine-twelfths of the annual outstanding water is contributed during this maximum rise. It allows one crop only for the irrigated lands, and leaves many districts desert-like for lack of water. The pharaohs of the twelfth dynasty, it seems, tried partly to obviate these defects by using the natural lake of the Fayûm as a reservoir where the surplus of the inundation waters were stored during their highest rise, which allowed them to double the volume of the river below the Fayûm during the three months of low Nile. The immense waterworks necessitated by this undertaking, at the point where the lake was most commonly visited by foreigners, gave the impression that the lake itself was an artificial excavation, as reported by classic geographers and travellers.

This great enterprise was not resumed until the close of the last period, when a series of gigantic works ending in the Nile was planned by the Egyptian Government; these, however, have been completed. The Barrage du Nil (about twelve miles below Cairo) was completed in 1890. It extends across the Rosetta and Damietta branches and two of the principal canals of the Delta, thus ensuring constant navigation on the Rosetta branch and preventing irrigation through much farther in the Nile. The dam of Assiut, constructed 1898–1902, regulates the amount of water in the Ibrâhîmîî Canal and thus ensures the irrigation of the provinces of Assiut, Minieh, Beni-Suef (10 miles east of Heracleopolis Magna), and, through Bahr-Yass, of the Fayûm. Finally the dam of Assiut, also completed in 1902, below the island of Phîlêtê, maintains such a supply of water in the canals of Lower and Middle Egypt that upwards of 500,000 acres have been added to the area of cultivable land in the summer. This dam, the largest structure of the kind in the world, rises 130 feet above the foundation, and dams up the water of the Nile to a height of 83 feet, thus forming a lake of 234,000,000,000 gallons. Its length is 2150 yards; its width 98 feet at the bottom, and 23 feet at the top. The Egyptian Government has lately decided to raise the height of the dam to 125 feet, which will bring the reservoir's capacity and will afford irrigation for about 930,000 acres of land now lying waste in Upper Egypt (Baedeker, Egypt, p. 365). In addition to these gigantic waterworks, the number and capacity of the canals have been considerably increased, thus allowing the inundation through much farther up the Nile. The average level of high waters is lower than that used to be—25 feet at Assiûn instead of 40, although for the region below Minieh this change is also to be explained by the manipulation of the controlling waterworks (Baedeker, Egypt, p. xiv).


II. Ancient Egyptian History.—Chronology.—The ancient Egyptians practically had only one kind of year: a vague year consisting of 12 months, each of 30 days, and 5 supplementary days which were intercalated between the 30th day of the last month of the year just elapsed and the first day of the first month of the following year. Technically, those five days did not belong to the year; the Egyptians always said "the year and the five days to be added to the three months" and those five days were sacred to Osiris, Horus, Set, Isis, and Nephthys. They were days of bad omen. The year was divided into three periods, or seasons, for four months each: the inundation (Egyptian Echet, or Echet), the sowing-time (Prosiet), and the harvest
SOMA.]

In ancient times months had no special names, they were simply designated by ordinal numbers in each season, as "the first month of the inundation" and so on. Each month (as also the decades and years) however, had a patron one of the deities whose feast occurred during that month, and the patrons, it seems, varied according to time and locality. At a rather late period the names of those patrons passed over to the months themselves, hence the names transmitted to us by the classical writers (see table below). Each month was divided into three decades (the Egyptians do not seem to have ever used, or even known, the week of seven days); each day into 24 hours, 12 hours of actual day time and 12 hours of actual night time. The hours of day and night, consequently, were not always of the same length. The sixth hour of night corresponded to midnight, and the sixth hour of day to noon. There were further subdivisions of time, but their relation to the hour is unknown. The day most likely began with the first day-time hour; some, however, think it began with the first hour of night.

The year began with the first day of Thoth (Inundation I) which, of course, was supposed to coincide with the first rise of the river. The first of Thoth was also supposed to coincide with the day of the heliacal rising of Sirius, which was called New Year's Day and celebrated as such each year with a great festival. Long before Sirius, her star, was believed to bring with the inundation a promise of plenty for the new year; this takes us back into the first centuries of the fifth millennium, when the summer solstice, which precedes by a few days only the inundation, actually coincided with the heliacal rising of Sirius. We know, however, of the classical writers that the latter phenomenon occurred on the 19th or 20th of July (according to the Julian Calendar), which points to Memphis as the home of the Egyptian Calendar. The Egyptians, however, must have perceived in course of time (if they had not foreseen it) that their calendar of 365 days would not, as they evidently believed at first, bring back the seasons every year at their respective natural times. Their year being about one-fourth of a day shorter than the Sirius year, on the fourth anniversary of its adoption, it had retroceded a whole day on the heliacal rising of Sirius; 460 years later its precession was only one day, the calendar indicated the opening of the inundation time in fact the harvest was only beginning; and so on until, after 1461 revolutions of the civil year and 1460 only of Sirius, the first of Thoth fell again on the same day as the heliacal rising of that star. This period of 1460 Sirius years (1461 Egyptian years) was designated later the name of SOthic period from SOthis, a Greek form of Sopdet, the Egyptian name of Sirius. Long before the end of the first Sothic period it was found necessary to consider the first of Thoth as a New Year's Day also, the civil New Year's Day. As early as the Fourth Dynasty we find the two New Year's Days recorded side by side in the tombs.

To the common people, who, as usual, were guided by the appearances, the calendar was steady while Sirius and the natural seasons were moving around it. Cirrus's New Year seem to be all they knew or ever cared to know of the Sirius year—was a movable feast, the date of which was to be announced every year. The fact that they estimated its precession on the calendar at six hours exactly, which was not correct except in 3231 b. c. (see Egyptian Church, 1. 232-234), shows that the date was not obtained from astronomical observation, but in a mechanical way on the supposition that every four years it would fall one day later, this rule having been ascertained astronomically once for all, and considered as correct (E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 10).

The cycle of the Sothic periods has been established in different ways by various scholars, with slight variations in the years of beginning of the several periods (see Ginzel, "Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie", 187 sqq.). According to E. Meyer (op. cit., p. 11) this began:

19 July, A. D. 140-141
19 July, 1321-20 b. c.
19 July, 2781-80 b. c.
19 July, 4241-40 b. c.

These dates have been adopted by Bredin in his chronology (Ancient Records of Egypt, I, sec. 44), which we shall follow in the arrangement of the Egyptian dynasties (see below).

We have no evidence of the Egyptians having ever become aware of the difference between the Sirius year and the solar year, which accounts for the shifting of the summer solstice and, consequently, of the beginning of the inundation from 25 July, in 4256 b. c. to 21 June, in 139 a. d. (see Ginzel, op. cit., 190). This divergence, however, was too slow, and amounted to so little, even in the course of several centuries, that the Egyptian astronomers might well have overlooked, or at least ignored, it with regard to the calendar. It is still more remarkable that, after noting the retrocession of their vague year, they should not have tried to even it up with the Sirius year. But the astronomers were also priests and, as such, custodians of the religious side of the calendar, which in their eyes was the more important. The simple insertion of an intercalary day would have been sufficient when the two years agreed, but that happened rarely; and the need of a reform was not felt by the contemporary generation. When that need was most acute, as in the middle of a Sothic period, the intercalation was not enough; the reform, to be satisfactory, would have demanded the bringing back of the seasons to their right times (at least in the measure allowed by the shifting of the summer solstice), which could not be done without passing over several months and days (cf. the Gregorian Reform), and consequently almost as many feasts or popular festivals. Indeed, in Ptolemaic times, when, prompted by pressing political-religious reasons, the priests finally undertook a reform, they were satisfied with the insertion of a sixth epagomen day every four years. This fixed year, known as the Canopic or Tantonic year, began on 28 October 228 a. d. (Julian), the first attempt, the second of so many attempts, would have demanded the bringing back of the seasons to their right times (at least in the measure allowed by the shifting of the summer solstice), which could not be done without passing over several months and days (cf. the Gregorian Reform), and consequently almost as many feasts or popular festivals. Indeed, in Ptolemaic times, when, prompted by pressing political-religious reasons, the priests finally undertook a reform, they were satisfied with the insertion of a sixth epagomen day every four years. This fixed year, known as the Canopic or Tantonic year, began on 28 October 228 a. d. (Julian), the first attempt, the second of so many attempts, would have demanded the bringing back of the seasons to their right times (at least in the measure allowed by the shifting of the summer solstice), which could not be done without passing over several months and days (cf. the Gregorian Reform), and consequently almost as many feasts or popular festivals. Indeed, in Ptolemaic times, when, prompted by pressing political-religious reasons, the priests finally undertook a reform, they were satisfied with the insertion of a sixth epagomen day every four years.
The Egyptian Sothic period, the first year of which fell on 19 July, 4241 B.C., when the summer solstice was on 25 July, and the inundation on 28 July. At the beginning of the preceding period, 19 July, 2781 B.C., the summer solstice had already retreated to 13 July, so that the inundation (16 July) preceded the heliacal rising of Sirius, while at the beginning of the following period, 19 July, 5701 B.C., the summer solstice was due only on 6 August, and the inundation on 9 August, or 21 days after the heliacal rising of Sirius (cf. Ginzel, op. cit., 190; E. Meyer, op. cit., 14 sqq.). The date 2781, as a possible date of the inauguration of the Egyptian Calendar, is also excluded by the fact that the intercalary days (proving the use of the shifting year of 360 plus 5 days) are mentioned in the so-called Pyramid Texts, which are far older than the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties, although they occur for the first time on the monuments of these dynasties (E. Meyer, op. cit., 40; Breasted, "Ancient Records of Egypt," I, 30). The date of the heliacal rising of Sirius varies according to the latitude from which it is observed. The fact that most of the classical writers and the Egyptian documents fix that date at 19 July shows that the Egyptians observed it from the 30th degree of N. latitude, which points to one of the ancient cities of the Southern Delta as the home of the Egyptian year, probably Memphis or Heliopolis (E. Meyer, op. cit., 41; Ginzel, op. cit., I, 186; Breasted, op. cit., I, sec. 45).

The following table exhibits the seasons and the 12 months of the Egyptian year with their Greek names (still in use with slight changes of orthography in the Coptic Calendar) and their respective dates of beginning according to the Julian Calendar, when I Thoth fell on the day of the heliacal rising of Sirius, i.e. at the opening of the Sothic period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inundation</td>
<td>I Thoth</td>
<td>19 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athyr</td>
<td>II Phaoph</td>
<td>18 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tybi</td>
<td>III Athyr</td>
<td>17 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phamenot</td>
<td>IV Cholai</td>
<td>17 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachon</td>
<td>V Tybi</td>
<td>16 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phamenot</td>
<td>VI Phaoph</td>
<td>15 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>VII Pachon</td>
<td>14 February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>VIII Pachon</td>
<td>13 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>IX Pachon</td>
<td>12 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>X Pachon</td>
<td>11 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>XI Pachon</td>
<td>10 June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows the correspondence of the present Egyptian (and Coptic) Calendar, as reformed under Augustus, with our own calendar, both before and after intercalation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egyptian</th>
<th>Gregorian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thoth I</td>
<td>28 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Phaoph</td>
<td>29 Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Athyr</td>
<td>29 Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Cholai</td>
<td>29 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Tybi</td>
<td>29 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Phaoph</td>
<td>28 Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Pachon</td>
<td>28 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Pachon</td>
<td>28 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Pachon</td>
<td>28 Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Pachon</td>
<td>28 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI Pachon</td>
<td>28 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Pachon</td>
<td>28 July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the Egyptians kept track of the Sirius year, in so far as its beginning was the official New Year's day, they do not seem to have made use of it for chronological purposes. The same must be said of other methods of reckoning the year which may have been in use among some classes of the population, as, for instance, the natural year based on the recurrence of the natural seasons. It is not uncommonly taken for granted or advanced that the Egyptian vernal year of 365 days was preceded by a round year of 360 days, and that the former was obtained by adding 5 days to the latter. Arguments in favour of that view are few and not convincing. A year of 360 days neither lunar nor solar is hardly imaginable (cf. Ginzel, op. cit., 69; E. Meyer, op. cit., 10). It is more likely that, even before the arrangement of 360 days, the Egyptian year took its period of 365 days, which had become lunisolar and increased to 365 days, either as a fixed number for every year by means of intercalary days distributed over the whole year (as in the Julian year), or as an average number in a series of years by process of embolism (as for instance in the Hebrew year). Finally it was decided to adopt the former, the far simpler and more rational arrangement of 12 even months followed by 5 intercalary days; the distribution of the days was changed, not their number. This recoin of the calendar found expression at a very early period, if not at the time when it took place, in the following table preserved by Plutarch (De Iside et Osiride, xii), but undoubtedly very ancient, as we may judge from the fact that the divinities mentioned in it belonged to the earliest stages of the Egyptian Pantheon. Rhea (Egyptian Nūt) having had secret intercourse with Kronos (Geb), Hēlios (Sun), cast a spell upon her husband that she might be buried in a coffin for a period of 5 years only during any month of any year. But Hermes (Thoth), who loved her, played dice with the Moon and won from her the 73d part (not 60th as Maspéro, "Histoire ancienne," p. 87; nor 70th as E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 9; nor 72d, as Ginzel, op. cit., p. 171) of her properties (literally lights, etc.), which were divided 40 (the remaining 360 days). During these five days Nūt brought forth her children (Osiris, Horus, Set, Isis, and Nephthys).

The ancient Egyptians never had eras in the usual sense of the word, i.e., epochs from which all successive years are counted regardless of political or other changes in the life of the nation. Instead of eras, during the first five dynasties, they used to name each civil year from some great political or religious event (a usage which had its parallel in Babylonia), as "the Year of the Smiling of the Troglydotes," "the Year of the Conquest of Nubia," "the Year of the Defeat of the Lover Egypt," "the Year of the Worship of Horus," or from some fiscal process recurring periodically, as "the Year of [or after] the Second Occurrence of the Census of all Cattle, Gold," etc. which was often abbreviated to "the Year of the Second Occurrence of the Census," or, still more briefly, "the Year of the Second Occurrence." The census having become annual, each year of any given reign came to be identified as the year of the first (or whatever might be the proper ordinal) census of that reign, a new series thus beginning with each reign. From the Eleventh Dynasty on, the years were always numbered from the first of the current reign, and the second year of the reign was supposed to begin with the first day of Thoth next following the date of the king's accession, no matter how recent that date might be. The absence of eras in ancient Egypt is all the more remarkable as there were several periods which could easily have been utilized for that purpose, the Sothic period especially. (On other epochs—Phoeni, Apis, etc.—mentioned by the classical writers, but not yet found on Egyptian monuments, as also on the so-called Great and Small Years and the supposed Nubiti Era, see Ginzel, op. cit., I, sec. 38 and 45.)

In later times several eras were created or adopted in Egypt, the principal of which was the Era of Alexandria. Its epoch, or starting-point, has been conventionally fixed at 30 (or 31) August of the first year of Augustus (Julian, 30 B.C.), although, as we have seen, it did not acquire its full Imperial status until 26, or even 23, B.C., so that its first years were ordinary Egyptian vernal years (for further details see Ginzel, op. cit., I, pp. 224-28). The Philippic, or Macedonian, Era (more generally known as the Era of Alexander) was introduced into Egypt in the third century B.C.
after the death of Alexander the Great (323 B.C.). Up to Ptolemy Philadelphus (283–47 B.C.), Egyptian monuments were dated according to the old Egyptian system, but after that time the Macedonian dates are generally found together with the Egyptian. Macedonian dating was gradually superseded by the Egyptian, the fixed eras, yet it is found, sporadically at least, as late as the second century after Christ (Ginzel, op. cit., I, p. 232). The Philippi Era begins on I Thoth, 425 (12 Nov., 324 B.C., Julian style) of the Era of Nabonassar; like the latter it is based on a vague year on the same pattern, men’s names included, of the old Egyptian year. The Era of Nabonassar begins at noon, 26 February, 747 B.C. (Julian style). It is the basis of the famous Canon of Ptolemy. It was used in Egypt especially for astronomical purposes, and it met with great favour with the chronographers on account of the certainty of its starting-point and its well established accuracy. The reduction of Nabonassar’s years into the corresponding usual Christian reckoning is rather complicated and requires the use of special tables (see Ginzel, op. cit., I, p. 143 sqq.). Only a very small portion of the colossal mass of inscriptions, papyri, etc., so far discovered, in Egypt, has any bearing on, or can be of any assistance in, chronological questions. The astronomical knowledge of the ancient Egyptians does not seem to have gone very far, and, as every one knows, accurate astronomical observations rightly recorded in connection with historical events within the limits of astron-omical chronology of ancient times. It is remarkable that the Egyptian Claudius Ptolemy (second century after Christ) took from the Babylonians and the Greeks all the observations of eclipses he ever used and started his calendar (see above) with Babylonian, not with Egyptian, data. Evidently what he had was not recordings of observations made in Egypt. Yet, for religious reasons, the Egyptians noted the occurrences of the heliacal risings of Sirius on the various dates of their movable calendar. A few have reached us, and have been of no small assistance in astronomically determining, within four years at least, some of the most important epochs of Egyptian history. The Egyptians also recorded the coincidence of new moons with the days of their calendar. Such data in themselves have no chronological value, as the phases of the moon return to the same positions on the calendar every nineteen years; however, in the presence of such data, they can help us to determine more precisely the chronology of some events (Breasted, op. cit., I, sec. 46). Moreover, ancient Egypt has bequeathed to us a number of monuments of a more or less chronological character: (1) The calendars of religious feasts (Cal-endars of Dendera (Thyatira), Edfu, Eneh, all three of which belong to the late period, Calendar of Papyrus Salleri IV) are especially interesting because they illustrate the nature of the Egyptian year (see Ginzel, op. cit., p. 200 sqq.). (2) The lists of selected royal names comprise the so-called Tables of Sakkara, Nineteenth Dynasty, forty-seven names beginning with the sixth of the First Dynasty; Karnak (part of Thebes), Eighteenth Dynasty, sixty-six names, unfortunately not chronologically arranged; Abydos, Nineteenth Dynasty, seventy-six names beginning with Menes. (3) The Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved. Unfortunately, the first of these last two monuments is broken into many fragments and other- wise mutilated, while the second is but a fragment of a list of monarchs, but the former, although known as the Turin Papyrus, Nineteenth Dynasty, and the Palermo Stone, Fifth Dynasty, from the places where they are now preserved.
"Egypt" (6th ed., 1908), with the exception of the year 408, the last of the Twenty-seventh Dynasty and first of the Twenty-eighth, which we copy from Maspéro, "Guide to the Cairo Museum" (Cairo, 1903), p. 32.

4241* B. C. Introduction of Calendar
3400 B. C. Accession of Menes and beginning of dynasties
2980-2900 B. C. First and Second Dynasties
2900-2750 B. C. Third Dynasty
2750-2625 B. C. Fourth Dynasty
2625-2475 B. C. Sixth Dynasty
2475-2415 B. C. Seventh and Eighth Dynasties
2415-2160 B. C. Ninth and Tenth Dynasties
2160-2000 B. C. Eleventh Dynasty
2000-1785* B. C. Twelfth Dynasty
1785-1580 B. C. Thirteenth to Seventeenth Dynasties (including Hyskos times)
1580-1350 B. C. Eighteenth Dynasty
1350-1205 B. C. Nineteenth Dynasty
1205-1050 B. C. Twentieth Dynasty
1050-950 B. C. Twenty-first Dynasty
945-745 B. C. Twenty-second Dynasty
745-518 B. C. Twenty-third Dynasty
518-712 B. C. Twenty-fourth Dynasty
712-605 B. C. Twenty-fifth Dynasty
605-525 B. C. Twenty-sixth Dynasty
525-408 B. C. Twenty-seventh Dynasty
408-398 B. C. Twenty-eighth Dynasty
398-378 B. C. Twenty-ninth Dynasty
378-341 B. C. Thirtieth Dynasty

Dates marked with an asterisk in the above table are astronomically computed and correct within three years, while the date 525 is attested by the Canon of Ptolemy. Several dates besides, within the period of the Eighteenth Dynasty and the initial date of Shebatik, second king of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty, are also astronomically determined, or African—three of the double-dagger (†) indicates that the numerical difference between the two following dates is the minimum of duration allowed by the monuments for the corresponding dynasties. The double-dagger (‡) on the contrary, indicates the maximum of duration. This is the case only for the period from the Thirteenth to the Seventeenth Dynasties. What this period may lose some day will be the gain of the nine following dynasties, but the extreme dates, 1788 and 663, will not be affected. The duration of 295 years for the Ninth and Tenth Dynasties, indicated by the two extreme dates 2145-2100, is an estimate, in round numbers, based on an average of 16 years for each of their 15 kings. The uncertainty which attends to that period affects the dates of all the preceding dynasties, which, consequently, may some day have to be shifted as much as a century either way.

Günzel, Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie I, Zeitrechnung der Babyloniern, Ägyptern, Moham- medanen, Perser, etc. (Leipzig, 1809—ep. 5, 254 sq.), contains a complete bibliography of Egyptian chronology—Lehnmann, Zwei Hauptprobleme der altorientalischen Chronologie (Berlin, 1898); Meyer, Ägyptische Chronologie (publication of the Berlin Acad., 1901); Nebraü, Die Chronologie der Geschichte Israels, Ägyptens, Babyloniens und Assyriens (Leipzig, 1899); also chapters in a bibliography of ancient bibliography, especially in Breasted, Ancient Records, and Petrie, Illustrated History of Egypt.

Ethnology.—Scholars are at variance as to the origin of the Egyptians. Some, chiefly philologists, suppose that the Egyptians of historical times had come from Western Asia either directly, through the Thamusi of Suez, or, as most will have it, through the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb and Ethiopia. Others, principally naturalists, think they came from, or at least through, Libya, while others still place the original home of the Egyptians in Central Africa. The first hypothesis is now the most commonly received. Anatomical and statistical investigations tend to make it plausible: the fact, for instance, that wheat and barley, which have been found in the most ancient tombs dating from before the First Dynasty, are originally indigenous to Asia, as well as linen, wine, and the produce of other cultivated plants which are represented among the funeral offerings in the tombs of the earliest dynasties. And the same can be said of the two sacred trees of the Egyptian pantheon, the sycamore and the person. Finally, the fact that the ancestor of the domesticated Egyptian ass had its home in the wildernesses south of Egypt would show that the Asiatic invaders or settlers came through Ethiopia. This theory tallies with the Biblical narrative, Gen. x, 6, which makes the ancestor of the Egyptians, under the ethnic name of Misraim, the brother of Cush the Ethiopian of Phht (e.g. Paimut, the Penti of the Latins), and Canaan, all three of whom certainly had their original homes in Asia. What seems more certain is that the Egyptians of historical times belong to the same stock as the Libyans and other races, some of which were absorbed, while others were totally or partly driven away by them. Five at least of these are given in the Bible (Gen. x, 14) under ethnic names of some sort: Ludim (according to Maspéro, "Histoire Ancienne des peuples de l'orient", Paris, 1908, p. 16, the Rotu or Romitu of the hieroglyphics, i.e. the Egyptians proper), Ludim (the Libyans), Naphtihim (the inhabitants of Not-Pith, or Memphite), Patroum (the inhabitants of the To-red, i.e. Upper Egypt), Amamum (the Anu, who, in prehistoric times, founded On of the North, or Heliopolis, and On of the South, or Hermontis).

Predynastic History.—At all events, in the predynastic times, when the twilight of the day begins, dawn on Egypt, various races which at different periods had settled in Egypt, had been blended under the moulding influence of the climate of their new home, and turned into a new race, well characterized and easily distinguishable from any other race, Asiatic, Euro- pean, or Libyean. The head is rather large, the forehead square and rather low, the nose short and flat, the lips thick, but not turned up, the mouth rather large, with an undefinable expression of instinctive sadness. This type perpetuated itself through thirty or forty centuries of revolutions, invasions, or pacific immigrations and survives to this day in the peasant class, the fellaheen, who form the bulk of the population and the sinews of the national strength. All agree that, even before the Egyptian race had attained that remarkable degree of ethnological permanence, Egypt, from a merely pastoral region, had become an agricultural country, as a result of the immigration of Asiatic tribes, for, before the dawn of historical times, they had learned to grow wheat and barley, using the plough in their cultivation. Next came the political organization of the country. It was subdivided into a number of small independent States, which became the nuclei of the harmonious group, each of its own laws and religion. In course of time some of these States were merged in one another until they formed two large principalities, the Northern Kingdom (To-Mehri) and the Southern Kingdom (To-Res), an arrangement which must have lasted some time, for when the final degree of centralization was
reached, and the two countries united under one rule, the king took the title of "Lord of Both Lands", or "King of Upper and Lower Egypt" (never "King of Kemit" or "Kemetic", i.e., of Egypt), and often wore a double crown consisting of the white crown of the South and the red crown of the North (the modern Kib, a few miles north of Edfu) was the capital of the Southern Kingdom; the vulture-goddess, Nekhabet, was its protecting deity. But at both capitals the hawk-god, Horus, was worshipped as the distinctive patron-deity of both kings. That ancient population of Egypt, referred to in later texts as the "Horus-worshippers", have recently emerged from the mythical obscurity to which their kings had been relegated before the days of Manetho, who knows them as the "timmers", i.e., the deified ancestors. The Palermo Stone has revealed to us the names of six or seven dynasties of the Northern Kingdom; and in the Upper Egypt, thousands of sepulchres (none of the kings, unfortunately) have recently been excavated. The bodies, unembalmed, lie side by side, in what is called the "embryonic" posture, surrounded by pottery or stone jars, where remains of food, drink, and ointment can still be discerned. Such legendary elements, flushed out of the tombs, and clay models of various objects which the deceased might need in the life hereafter—are especially, to cross the waters that surround the Elysian Fields. From those early times, date, as to the essentials of concept and expression, the Pyramid Texts alluded to in a later section of this volume. The whole is documented in Chronology, that the institution of the calendar dates from predynastic times (4241 B.C.), and that its original home was in the Northern Kingdom, probably at Memphis or at On (Heliopolis). The computations necessary for this calendar show clearly that we must trace to predynastic times the hieroglyphic system of writing which we find fully developed in the royal tombs of the first two dynasties (Breasted, "Ancient History of the Egyptians", pp. 35–39).

**Dynastic History.**—Since Manetho of Sebennytus (3rd century B.C.) has been custodian of the hieroglyphic series of kings who ruled over ancient Egypt, from the beginning of history until the conquest of Alexander the Great, in thirty dynasties, each of which corresponds, or as a rule, seems to correspond, to a break in the succession of legitimate rulers, resulting from internal dissensions or military reverses, the latter almost invariably leading to an invasion and, eventually, the establishment of a foreign dynasty. Manetho's claim, that his history was compiled from lists of royal ancestry and original documents, is fairly borne out by the monuments—the so-called Tables (royal lists) of Saqqara, ABYDOS, KARNAK, and especially the famous, but much mutilated, Turin Papyrus and Palermo Stone, as well as annals of individual kings recorded on the walls of temples, tombs, etc.

These thirty dynasties are very unevenly known to us; of a good many we know next to nothing. This is like the case for the Seventh and Eighth dynasties (Memphites), the Ninth and Tenth (Heracleopolites), the Eleventh (Theban—contemporary with the Tenth), the Thirteenth (Theban) and the Fourteenth (Xoite—in part simultaneous), the Fifteenth, and Eighteenth (Hyksos and Dynasty (Theban—partly contemporary with the Sixteenth). Other dynasties are known to us by their monuments, especially their tombs, which are often extremely rich in information as to the institutions, arts, manners, and customs of Egypt during the lifetime of the occupants, but almost totally devoid of historical evidence proper. Such is the case, for instance, for the first five dynasties, of which all we can say is that they must have ruled successively over the whole land of Egypt and that their kings must have been conquerors as well as builders. We know little or nothing of the peoples they battled with, nor can we detect the political or the military elements of the rise and fall of the several dynasties. Evidently, in some cases the lack of information on some periods, which must have been very momentous ones in the political life of ancient Egypt, should be attributed to the disappearance of monuments of an historical character, or to the fact that such monuments have not yet been discovered; it is very likely, however, that in many cases no historical evidence was ever handed down to posterity. In Egypt, as in Assyria and Babylonia, it was not customary for kings to place their defeats on record, nor did the chieftain or the soldier of fortune who after a period of internal dissensions succeeded in establishing himself as the founder of a new dynasty, care to take posteriority into his confidence as to his origin and previous political career. Manetho, who, as a rule, does not seem to have been much better informed than we are, resorts often, strongly tinged with legendary elements, to compare kings with those which have since been discovered in the keeping of the priests and belonged, very likely, to the same stock as most of those related by Herodotus on matters that could not fall under his personal observation. Such traditions, until confirmed by the monuments, or at any rate purified of their legendary elements, flatly are not to be taken as evidence, and must of course be kept in abeyance. For the present the royal names are almost all that we can regard as certain for several of the dynasties. Such is the case for the first two dynasties, which until about A.D. 1888 were considered by most scholars as entirely mythical. Their tombs were discovered at Umm-El-Ga'ab, near Abydos, in the territory of the ancient Thys (Thinis), and the names of Menes, Zer, Usaphis, and Miebs have already been found. A good many other kings of Manetho's list cannot be identified with the owners of the tombs discovered, owing to the fact that, while Manetho gives only the proper names of the kings, the monuments contained, as a rule, nothing but their Horus names (Maspero, "Histoire Ancienne", 56 sq.). Monuments of these kings have been discovered in Upper Egypt and at Thebes that they must have ruled over the whole land of Egypt. The various articles found in these early royal tombs point to a high degree of civilization by no means inferior to that of the immediately following dynasties. Religion in general, and the funerary ritual in particular, were already fixed, and the hieroglyphic system of writing had reached its last stage of alphabetic development (Maspero, loc. cit.; Breasted, "History of Ancient Egyptians", 49 sq.).

The history of Egypt can be divided into two large periods, the first of which comprises the first seventeen and the second the other thirteen dynasties. In current literature Dynasties Three to Eleven are often variously referred to as the Old Kingdom (ancien empire), Dynasties Twelve to Seventeen as the Middle Kingdom (moyen empire), Dynasties Eighteen to Twenty as the Empire (nouvel empire). The simpler division which we propose here seems to us more rational.

**First Period:** First to Seventeenth Dynasty. — During this period Egypt and the Asiatic empires never, so far as we know, came into contact, except possibly in a pacific manner and the Seventeenth Dynasty (Theban—partly contemporary with the Sixteenth). Other dynasties are known to us by their monuments, especially their tombs, which are often extremely rich in information as to the institutions, arts, manners, and customs of Egypt during the lifetime of the occupants, but almost totally devoid of historical evidence proper.
who for centuries contended with Babylonia and Chaldea for supremacy in Western Asia. On their side the kings of Egypt had to secure their own borders (principally the southern) against the neighbouring tribes, a necessity which led them, after many centuries of warfare, to the conquest of Nubia. As early as the reign of Pepi I (Sixth Dynasty) Nubia had been brought under control so far as to receive Egyptian colonies. Under the kings of the Eleventh Dynasty, chiefly under Userkaf, the Nubian, the conquest was achieved, and the valley of the Upper Nile as far as the Second Cataract was organized into an Egyptian province. The Lybians, also, and the tribes settled between the Nile and the Red Sea had to be repeatedly repelled or conquered. The brief records of such punitive expeditions, which appear on the Palermo Stone, attribute to them dates as early as the first two dynasties. Extensive commercial relations were maintained with the Syrian coast (whither King Smenir, of the Third Dynasty, sent a fleet to procure cedar logs from Mount Lebanon) and with the Upper Nile districts, with Arabia to the south, and with the Somali coast (Punt, Pinmit) to the east. Roads were built for this commerce between Coptos and different points on the Red Sea. The chief of these roads led through Wadi Hammamat (Rohanh or Rehenu Valley), the rich quarries of which were operated by the Egyptians from the time of the Fifth Dynasty; it furnished the niger, or Thebacon, lapis, a hard dark stone which was used for statues and coffins. In Asu proper the pharaohs of that time sought no extension of territory, with the exception of a few points in the Peninsula of Sinai, where, as early as the First Dynasty, but especially since the time of Smenir, they operated mines of copper and turquoise. As a rule on the north-west border they kept on the defensive against the raids of the nomadic tribes established in the Syrian desert and, like the modern bedouins, always ready for plunder. On that side the frontier was protected by a wall across the Wadi Tumilat and a line of forts extending from the Nile to the Red Sea. Occasionally the Egyptians resorted to counter-attacks on the Syrian territory, as in the case of the Amus and Hurshatir under Pepi I, but, the punishment inflicted, they invariably returned to their line of defence.

The seat of government during that first period was several times shifted from one city to another. Menes, before the union of the two kingdoms, very likely resided at Thebes, in his native home of Abyod, in Upper Egypt. Having succeeded in bringing Lower Egypt under his rule, he appropriately selected Memphis for the capital of the new kingdom, as being more central. During the Ninth and Tenth Dynasties, Hermopolis, only a short distance south of Memphis, became the official seat of government, for no special known reason—perhaps simply because the pharaoh of the reigning dynasty had originally been natives and princes of these homes. They were opposed by the princes of Thebes (Eleventh Dynasty) who finally (Twelfth Dynasty) succeeded in overthrowing them and selected their own city as capital.

This radical change had the advantage of bringing Nubia within closer range, and it may have contributed substantially to the conquest of that province; but it weakened the northern border, which was now too far from the centre of political life.

The pharaohs of the Thirteenth Dynasty (most of whom were called Sebek-hotep or Nofer-hotep), without abandoning Thebes, seem to have paid more attention than their predecessors to the cities of the Delta, where—at Tans in particular—they occasionally resided, and it was from Xos (Sakha), a city of Lower Egypt, that the next following (Fourteenth) dynasty arose. It seems that the kings of that dynasty never succeeded in establishing a firm and lasting government. Their rapid succession on the throne and the famous invasion of the Hyksos which Manetho registers at that time, point to internal dissensions and a condition of affairs verging on anarchy.

"At this time there came to us a king Tomyris by name. Under this king, God, why I do not know, sent an adverse wind to us, and against all likelihood from the parts of the East people of ignoble race came unexpectedly, invaded the country and conquered us and without battle." This testimony contains contradictory elements. It is difficult to imagine how an invasion could result in a conquest unless it took place gradually and consequently not "unexpectedly". The most probable interpretation of Manetho's words seems to be: the invaders came in peaceful quest of new homes, and not all in one body, though in comparatively large numbers at a time; that they first settled, with their flocks, in the rich pasture lands of the Delta, then, little by little, adapted themselves to the political life of the country, some succeeding in occupying important situations in the army or in the administration; that finally one of them, favoured by the rivalries of competitors for the vacant throne, seized the reins of government and was recognized as king not only by the men of his own race, but also by quite a considerable party of the natives.

The identity of the Hyksos has been the subject of long discussions. Some, with De Crem, think they were the same as the Hittites, others (Baedeker, "Egypt", p. Ixxix) see in them simple Syrian bedouins. The opinion which seems most probable and best agrees with the tradition preserved by Manetho, identifies them with the large Ummamaitian family once settled in Lower Chaldea, along the Persian Gulf and the Arabian coast. According to Professor Jumeau (op. cit., 194 sqq.) it was the invasion of the lower Euphrates by the Elamites under Kidashakhe (2285 b. c.) that forced this family to migrate to the West in search of a new home. The seafaring tribes settled along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean.
Sea to which they gave their name (Phoenicians, Phœniæs; Egyptians, Pu‘en; Biblical, Phœt). Others settled in the mountainous districts of Palestine (Canaan proper), where they resumed their nomadic life, and gradually developed into an agricultural people. Others, chiefly the Nubians, were probably prevented from taking a northern direction by the powerful and well-organized nation of the Hittites, turned to Egypt, where they settled as explained above. Manetho assigns to them three dynasties, the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth, of which only the Sixteenth held sway over all Egypt. During the Fifteenth Dynasty the princes of the southern homes, for a time at least, managed to retain a certain independence. They regained it under the Third Hyksos Dynasty, with which they share the honour of being recognized as the Seventeenth Dynasty. The last of them, Ahmosis, after a war of six years, finally succeeded in driving the intruders out of Egypt, pursuing the remnant of their army as far as Sharhuna (perhaps Sharukhen, Jos., xiv, 6) in Southern Syria, where the last battle was fought and won by the Egyptians. From the monuments we know the name of at least four of the Sixteenth kings, three of them having the name of Apophi and one Khian. An alabaster vase bearing the names of the last has been found under a wall of the palace of Cnosos in Crete, and a lion in Bagdad. Their capital seems to have been Avaris on the north-eastern border of the Delta. Some think the names may be conformed to the ancient name of Thebes, in the Babylonian language and script, possibly dates from the period of the Hyksos. Few of the monuments of the Hyksos have been preserved, enough of them, however, to show us that as a rule the shepherd kings conformed to the ancient culture of Egypt, adopting its language, art, religion (cf. however, Maspero, op. cit., 263) and political institutions. But they oppressed their Egyptian subjects, and posterity held their memory in abomination.

It is in the Hyksos period that we must place the arrival of the Israelites in Egypt. The migration of the Terachites from Ur in Chaldea may have coincided with, or at all events was posterior to, that of the Canaanites. Both families found and took root in Egypt, and, by and by, they spread over the Delta and Upper Egypt. Of the two families, the Canaanitic branch, which came in later, and the Semitic branch, which came in first, only the second, under the name of Shepherds, survived. The Semitic branch, being thoroughly Semitic, more quickly assimilated itself to the local population. The Canaanitic branch, more original in tradition, more richly endowed, held its own in the Delta, and, in the course of time, acquired the ancient name of Apophi.

The second period is that of the Great Egyptian Dynasties, from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth, and many would extend it to the Twenty-second. This is that period in which the arts and literature of Egypt attained their highest development. It is in this period that we find the rich material for the study of the Near East in general and of Egypt in particular. The literature of this period is of two kinds: the one, the so-called 'liturgical' literature, consisting of hymns and prayers, and the other, the so-called 'epic' literature, consisting of tales and stories. The former is of great importance for the study of religious and ceremonial usages, while the latter is of great importance for the study of social and political conditions. The most important works of this period are the 'Papyrus of Ani', the 'Papyrus of Amennakhte', and the 'Papyrus of Neferjemet'.

The third period is that of the Greek and Roman Dynasties, from the Twenty-first to the Twenty-seventh. This is the period of the Ptolemies and the Roman emperors. The literature of this period is of great importance for the study of the history of Egypt, and of the Near East in general. The most important works of this period are the 'Papyrus of Turin', the 'Papyrus of Ebers', and the 'Papyrus of Harris'. The latter contains a great deal of information about the medical knowledge of the time, and is one of the most important works of this period.
El 'Amarna), a city which he founded in a like spirit, and he also founded two other cities of the same name, each with a Gen-Aton temple, one in Nubia, at the foot of the Third Cataract (where it was discovered in 1907 by Professor Breasted), and another in Syria, the site of which is still unknown. This reform was violently opposed by the established priesthood, and the land was soon thrown into a state of general confusion verging on anarchy. The temples and cities dedicated to Aton were destroyed and abandoned soon after the royal reformer's death. Harmhab (1350–1315 B.C.), the founder of the Nineteenth Dynasty, was principally engaged in bringing the land out of the confusion into which it had fallen during the last years of the preceding dynasty, and restoring the temples of the ancient gods to their former splendour. Seti I (1313–1292 B.C.) attempted to recover the Asiatic provinces lost by Ramses. Thirteen years later the Hittite king visited Egypt on the occasion of the marriage of his eldest daughter with the pharaoh. Diplomatic union of that kind had already taken place during the preceding dynasty. The treaty was faithfully observed by both parties, at least until the death of Merneptah (1225–1215), the son and successor of Ramses II, when the Hittites seem to have taken part in an invasion of the Delta by the Libyans and various peoples of the northern Mediterranean, their allies.

Neither this, however, nor the disaffection which at the same time was rampant among his Asiatic vassals spurred Merneptah to new conquests. The Hittite war of Ramses II, it seems, had completely exhausted the military enterprise of Egypt. Her armies from that time keep to the defensive. Merneptah was satisfied to bring back Palestine to submission and defeat and drive out the Libyans—among whom the Tefenu tribe was prominent apparently because they were settled on the Egyptian border—and their allies, the Sherden (Sardinians), the Shekeles (Sicilians?), the Ekewesh (Armenians?), and the Lycians. But these were considered great achievements, and the people sang:—

The Kings are overthrown, saying: "Salâm!"
Not one holds up his head among the nine nations of the bow.
Wasted is Tehenu,
The Hittite land is pacified.
Plundered is the Canaan, with every evil,
Carried off is Askalon,
Seized upon is Gezer,
Yenoam is made as a thing not existing,
Israel is desolated, her seed is not.
Palestine has become a [defenceless] widow for Egypt.
All lands are united, they are pacified,
Every one that is turbulent is bound by King Merneptah.

(Breasted, op. cit., 330; "Ancient Records of Egypt", III, 603 sqq.) The situation at home was no brighter, and it became worse under Merneptah's successors, Amennes, Memphites-Istapht, and Seti II, until complete anarchy prevailed. Thrusting aside a host of less daring pretenders, a Syrian named Iris (or Yerson), who held an important position as head of one of the nomes, seized the power and for five years ruled the land in tyranny and violence. Breasted, "Ancient Records of Egypt", IV, § 395. Thus ended the Nineteenth Dynasty.

Of Setnakht (1290–1298 B.C.), the founder of the following dynasty, we know little except that he was a strong man who succeeded in restoring order. His son, Ramses III (1198–1163 B.C.), was confronted by very much the same situation as Merneptah some twenty-five years before, only a great deal more serious. The allies of the Libyans defeated by Merneptah were only the vanguard of a far more dreadful army of invasion. This was now approaching. It was followed at close range by motley hordes of immigrants from the islands and the northern shores of the Mediterranean, the "peoples of the sea", as the Egyptians called them. Besides those already mentioned we find now the Peleset (Philistines) and the Denyens (Danaoi). Some of the invaders were coming by sea, along the coast, others by land. Ramses III showed himself equal to the occasion. Having defeated a first contingent who had already landed in the Delta and joined the Libyans, he sent a strong fleet to check the advance of the main body of the invaders' ships and hastened by land, with his army, to Syria, where he expected to meet the enemy. Both land and naval battles were fought in about the same region, for Ramses, having routed the land forces of the enemy, was in time to co-operate with the Egyptian fleet in defeating that of the invaders. This brilliant campaign stayed the advance of the immigrants who now came straggling along, settling here and there as vassals of
Egypt, in Syria and in Palestine, where, later, one of their tribes, the Peleset, or Philistines, offered a stubborn resistance to the invasion of the Hebrews. On the other hand the great Hittite confederation had been very much weakened, if not entirely disintegrated, as a result of the invasion. Ramses III had to repel another invasion of the Libyans, impelled this time by the Meshwesh (the Maxyes of Herodotus), and shortly after he found it necessary to appear again with his army in Northern Palestine, where rebellion had broken out among some of his vassals. The boundary remained, probably, where it was under the Nineteenth Dynasty, including the whole course of the River Leontes (or Litany) and possibly a small portion of the upper Orontes, excluding Kadesh. Ramses III had no further trouble with his Asiatic vassals.

With the successors of Ramses III, nine weak pharaohs of the same name (Rameses IV–XII), national decay sets in. Egypt entirely loses her prestige abroad, particularly in Asia, where Assyria is expanding under Tiglath-Pileser I; at home everything is confusion. Priests, officials, and mercenaries, whose wealth and prerogatives have been steadily growing at the expense of both pharaoh and his people, now fight among themselves for the controlling political influence, the pharaoh being reduced to a mere puppet. Such a state of disorganization prevails everywhere that, in the necropolis of Thebes, in sight of the temple of Amon, where the high-priest is so powerful, the tombs of the pharaohs are desecrated and plundered by a gang of robbers, and the royal mummies despoiled of all their most costly ornaments.

At some period during the Nineteenth Dynasty the pharaohs had their capital at Tanis (Sîn-el-Hagar) in the Delta. Thebes remaining the religious capital of the empire. There Ramses XII resided when a local noble, Nesubenebed, seized the power (1113 B.C.) and established himself as king over the Delta. The weak pharaoh retired to Thebes, where he was soon overshadowed by Hrihor, the high-priest of Amon, who, when Ramses XII died as ignominiously as he had lived, was finally proclaimed supreme ruler of Egypt by an oracle of Khonsu followed by the approval of Amon. Hrihor’s rule, in fact, may be extended over Lower Egypt, and his independence was not even suspected by Manetho who, after Ramses XII, introduces the Twenty-first Dynasty, with Nesubenebed as its founder. The division between the two countries was to continue, save for short intervals, for about four hundred and fifty years. Thebes, however, rarely during that time enjoyed complete independence, and still more rarely ruled over the whole country. Her relations to the Delta were usually those of a vassal to a suzerain. Her influence was particularly felt in Nubia, whither descendants of Hrihor seem to have retired at an early period, eventually founding an independent kingdom at Napata. Confusion and disorder still prevailed all over the land. To save them from further desecration, the royal mummies had to be concealed in an old, and probably, unused tomb of Amenhotep I, near the temple of Deir el-Bahri, where they remained hidden until they were rifled some three or forty years ago by the Arabs. Most of them are now at the Museum of Cairo. The capital of this dynasty was at Tanis. Its last king, Psibkhenno II, may be the pharaoh mentioned in III Kings, xi, 18; iii, 1; ix, 16 (see below). Assyria was then on the decline and we can best represent to ourselves David and Solomon as at least nominal vassals of Egypt.

Sheshonk (945–924), founder of the Twenty-second Dynasty, was a powerful mercenary prince, or chief of hired troops, of Heracleopolis, where his ancestors, of Libyan origin, had settled early in the Twenty-first Dynasty. In 945 B.C. he proclaimed himself king, establishing his residence at Bubastis, in the Delta. Sheshonk seems to have been an ambitious and energetic ruler. He certainly led a successful campaign in Palestine, perhaps the same mentioned in III Kings, xiv, 25 (cf. II Paralip., xii, 2 sqq.), where it is said that he came to Jerusalem in the fifth year of Reboam, and took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, although Jerusalem is not among the one hundred and fifty-six Palestinian cities recorded in his inscription. In Solomon’s time Sheshonk had given hospitality to Jeroboam (III Kings, xi, 40). According to Professor Breasted (Ancient Egyptians, 362), Sheshonk is also to be identified with the pharaoh who gave his daughter as a wife to Solomon (III Kings, iii, 1) and later on conquered Gezer and turned it over to his daughter, Solomon’s wife, as a dowry (III Kings, ix, 16) while Professor Maspero (Hist. Anc., 416) refers these episodes and that of Hadad (III Kings, xi, 14 sqq.) to Psibkhenno II, the last king of the Twenty-first Dynasty. During the following reigns of this dynasty history records nothing but endless civil wars between the two principalities of Thebes and Heracleopolis, and feuds between the mercenary lords of the Delta. On the other hand, Assyria was more powerful than ever. Shalmaneser defeated, at Barkar on the Orontes, a Syrian
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conditio to which one of Sheshonk's successors—probably Takelot II—had contributed one thousand men (854 b. c.). Under such circumstances Egypt's

influence in Palestine must have dwindled to nothing.

One of the Delta lords, Pedibast, at the death of

Sheshonk, is the founder of the Twenty-first Dynasty, succeeded in establishing a new dynasty, which Maneco places at Tanis, although Pedibast

was of Bubastite origin. But neither he himself nor

his successors could control the situation. Under

his successor, Osorkon III, a dynasty of Saïs, Tefnakhte

undertook to supplant him and the many other dynas-

ties, several of whom were claiming the title and

prerogatives of royalty. He had partly succeeded

when Piankhi, ruler of the independent kingdom of

Napata (see above), overran Egypt as far as the Med-

iterranean, obliging all the pretenders, Osorkon and

Tefnakhte included, to recognize his suzerainty. But

as soon as the invaders had withdrawn, Tefnakhte re-

sumed his designs and was eventually successful in sub-

duing Osorkon, who acknowledged himself his vassal.

(We must refer to this period the King of Egypt

mentioned in IV Kings, xxvii, 4, as inciting Osee of Sa-

mai, and the sweeping claim of Sheshonk to the

title of Pharaoh of Egypt (cf. Ps. 82:9).)

Son Bochoris, however, was regarded as the founder of a new dynasty, his father, probably, having died before

Osorkon. Scarcely had he reigned six years when Shabaka, Piankhi's brother, invaded Egypt in his turn, and so firmly did he intrench himself there that he became the founder of the Twenty-third Dynasty of Egyptian, Dynasty. Unfortunately for him and his

successors, Assyria, having absorbed all the principal

states of Syria and Palestine, and holding the others well under control, was now threatening to invade the territory of Egypt. Shabaka, alive to the danger, formed an alliance with Philistia, Tyre, and Egypt, and

sent to Assyria an army under the command of his nephew Taharka (cf. IV Kings, xix, 9, where Taharka is called King of Ethiopia). The allies were completely defeated, and

Shabaka was beheading Jerusalem, which alone, so far, with Tyre, had resisted him, when, to use the words of the Bible, "in angel of the Lord came, and slew in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and eighty-five thousand. And when he arose early in the morning, he saw all the bodies of the dead, and Shabaka king of the Assyrians departing out of the land of Egypt into his own land," (IV Kings, xix, 35, 36). But the power of Assyria was not broken for that all, although Taharka, who was now reigning, might have believed it when, twenty-seven years later, he succeeded in repelling Esrat-Hudion, of which repulse he made great display on the pedestal of a statue of his, drawing on the lists left by Ramses II of Asiatic captured cities to swell his own victory. In

670 the Assyrians appeared again, more formidable than ever, defeated Taharka, captured Memphis, and withdrew after having organized at lower Egypt into an Assyrian dependency. Among the princes who hastened to do homage to the King of Assyria the first place is given to Necho of Saïs, a descendant of Tefnakhte through Bochoris. Taharka had fled to the south, where he raised fresh troops, and marched on lower Egypt hoping to recover the lost provinces, but his offer to the two pharaohs, who routed him again and pursued him almost as far as Thebes (668 b. c.). The reigning family of the Delta, who had sided with him, were sent to Nine-

veh in chains. Necho was one of them, but he knew how to ingratiate himself with Assurbanipal, who re-
sulted to his Kingdom to Saïs Turpinus, having succeeded his father Taharka (663 b. c.), undertook in his turn the recovery of lower Egypt, but with no better success. This time Assurbanipal's

army pursued the enemy to Thebes, which was sacked and plundered.

Psamtik, son of Necho, took advantage of the

struggle in which his protector, Assurbanipal, had

now become involved with Babylonia to free himself from the Assyrian allegiance. He succeeded in sup-

pressing practically all of the mercenary lords and

local dynasties, repaired the long-neglected irrigation works, and gave a new impulse to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, which he introduces, was, as a whole, a period of restoration and great internal prosperity. It was also a period of renascence in art, reli-

gion, and literature, marked by a return to archeic traditions. Industrial art flourished as never before.
The army was rewarded and strengthened with large contingents of Greek mercenaries, the Libyans

having lost their efficiency in becoming Egyptianized. Psamtik does not seem to have made much use of the army, but Necho and his successors could not refrain from interfering with the affairs of Asia. The tempta-

tion was great. During the long reign of Psamtik I

Assyria had been constantly declining. In 609 he was

succeeded by his son Necho, and three years later

Nineveh was finally captured, and Assyria had come to an end forever. Necho thought this a favourable

chance to recover the old Asiatic possessions of Egypt, and marched southward with his army (cf. Ps.

.xxxvii, 20; Jerem., xvi, 7-9). At Magiddo the King of Juda, Josias, who foolishly persisted in disputing his

passage, was routed and mortally wounded (II Para-

lip., xxxv, 22). This incident brought Necho to Jeru-

salem, where he deposed Joahaz, the successor of Josias, and put in his place the Twenty-third Dynasty of

the name of Jehoiakim. As for Joahaz, he took him to

Egypt (II Paralip., xxxvi, 1-4; cf. IV Kings, xxiii,

29-34). Hearing of Necho's conquest, Nabopolassar,

to whom that country had fallen in the division of

Assyria's possessions, sent his son Nebuchadnezzar

(Menechon) to check his advance. Necho was

so completely defeated at Carchemish (605 b. c.) that

he did not dare to make another stand, and retreated to Egypt; 'And the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his own country: for the king of Babylon had taken all that had belonged to the king of Egypt, from the river of Egypt, unto the river Euphrates.' (IV Kings, xxvii, 7). Apries (588-569 b. c.), Necho's

second successor, was not more fortunate in a similar

attempt. Zedekiah had sent to him for assistance

against Nebuchadnezzar (Ezech., xvi, 15), but Apries

either retired without fighting (Jerem., xxxviii, 6) or

was defeated (Josephus, Antiq. XI, 8). And finally

Jerusalem was captured, and her temple destroyed

(587 b. c.). When, however, the remnant of the Jews

fled to Egypt, taking Jeremiah with them, Apries

received them and allowed them to settle in different

cities of the Delta, at Memphis, and in Upper Egypt

(Jer., xl, 17-18; xlv, 1). Such, very likely, was the

origin of the Jewish colony established in the island

of Elephantine "before Cambyses," as related in the

Judeo-Aramaic papyri recently discovered there (see

below, under Twenty-seventh Dynasty). Later, probably after Tyre had finally surrendered to the

Chaldeans (574), Apries successfully commanded a naval expedition against Phoenicia (Map, Hist. anc.,

639; Breasted, Hist. of the Anc. Egypt, 409, places

that expedition in 587 b. c.).

The reverses of Necho and Apries in Asia did not affect the prosperity of Egypt; during the reign of the two pharaohs, any more than did the rivalry of one of his

officials, Amasis, whom Apries had sent to repress a mutiny of the Egyptian native troops, and who was

proclaimed king by them. Apries and Amasis reigned together for some time, and when, a conflict having

broken out between the two, Apries was defeated and slain, Amasis gave him an honorable burial. To

say, Amasis, who had been the champion of the native

element as against the Greeks, now favoured the latter

far more than any of his predecessors. He founded

for them the city of Naukratis, in the Delta, as a home

and market, and they soon made it the most impor-
tant commercial centre of Egypt. The foreign policy of Amasis, as a rule, was one of prudence; his only conquest was Cyprus, over which, since the days of Thotmes III, Egypt had often exercised suzerainty. He made, however, one fatal mistake; he joined the abortive league formed by Persia, King of Persia, against Cyprus, and, although he afterwards carefully avoided crossing the path of the Persian conqueror, the latter’s son, Cambyses, taking the will for the deed, did not fail to resent his past inclinations.

Cambyses invaded Egypt in 525 B.C., shortly after Persia had succeeded Assyria. The pharaoh was put to death under cruel circumstances; the tomb of Amasis was violated, his mummy burnt to ashes, and a Persian governor was appointed. Otherwise Cambyses did all he could to conciliate his Egyptian subjects. He assumed the traditional pharasonic titles and ceremonial, and caused himself to be initiated in the mysteries of the goddess Neith. He made good the damages sustained by the temples during the conquest, led an unsuccessful expedition against the oases of the Libyan desert, and was not much happier in a campaign against the independent Kingdom of Napa- tia, plundered by these enemies, he defeated later, from his former conciliatory policy, and committed sacrilegious acts which exasperated the people against him. Darius I (521-486) completed the canal begun by Necho between the Nile and the Red Sea. He reopened the road from Coptos to the Red Sea, garrisoned the oases, and thus ther the prosperity and security of Egypt. In his reorganization of the Persian Empire, which he divided into a number of governments under a central administration, Egypt, with Cyrene, Bata, and Lower Nubia, formed the sixth government, or satrapy. This, however, affected the cities and their respective territories. Elsewhere the old feudal organization was left untouched, and from time to time the local princes availed themselves of their semi-independence to rebel.

After the battle of Marathon (487) the Egyptians revolted and expelled the Persians. But in the following year Achemenes, who had just been appointed satrap by his brother Xerxes I (486-465), brought them back to submission. Of a far more serious character was the insurrection which broke out in 463 under Artaxerxes I (465-425), and which was not quelled until 425, when the garrison cities of Lydia and the Black Sea, (the Athenians, who had two successive Persian armies (454). Under Darius II the power of the Persians began to decline. The weakness of their administration at that time is attested by the Judeo-Aramaic papyri recently discovered at Elephantine. From these documents we learn that, while the provincial governor was absent, the commander of the garrison of Syene had been bribed by the Egyptian priests of Chnub (Chnun) to plunder and destroy the temple of the Jewish colony of Elephantine. The culprits, it seems, were put to death by the Persian authorities, yet, when the victims applied for a permission to rebuild their temple, their request was granted only on the condition that they should not in future offer up bloody sacrifices—a concession, evidently, to the priests of Chnub, who probably objected to the slaughter of animals sacred to their god. The little colony, we may well suppose, did not long enjoy its curtailed privileges; it very probably succumbed to Egyptian fanaticism during the two following dynasties (Stähelin, “Israel in Egypten nach neugedundene Urkunden,” 14 sq.), the last of which formed by Cyrus, an animal sacred to their god, the little colony, we may well suppose, did not long enjoy its curtailed privileges; it very probably succumbed to Egyptian fanaticism during the two following dynasties (Stähelin, “Israel in Egypten nach neugedundene Urkunden,” 14 sq.). The Twenty-ninth Dynasty (Mendesian), comprising the reigns of Neferites, Achoris, and Paummatna, who took an active part in the wars of Greece against Artaxerxes II, lasted twenty years. The Thirtieth Dynasty (Sebennytic) began with Nectanebo I (378-361), who successfully repelled the Persians. Tachos (360-359), his successor, attempted to invade the Syrian territory, but, as a result of the treachery of his agent, Tachos himself was killed by the Persians, who had appointed his own successor. He was supplanted by Nectanebo II (358-342), a cousin of Tachos the king, and went to war with Artaxerxes II, to whom he tasted defeat, and the Persians once more became masters of Egypt (341). The king fled to Ethiopia, and the temples were plundered. It was then that Egypt lost forever the right of being governed by rulers of her own.

**EGYPT AND THE BIBLE.**—VIGOURoux, _La Bible et le décou- vertes modernes_ (4 vols., Paris, 1884); MATHEYS, _Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme; Striedorf in Recent Research in Bible Lands, ed. HILPERT (Philadelphia, 1908); GRIFFITH in Authority and Archaeology (London); LICHTENBERG, “The Egyptian Collections,” Abhandlungen zur Geschichte und Kunde der alten Welt (Leipzig, 1899-1901); MÜLLER, _Aegyptische Rundschauern zum 1906. Konvent (Strassburg, 1901); IDEN, “Aegypten nach neugedundene Urkunden” (Stähelin, “Israel in Egypten nach neugedundene Urkunden,” 14 sq.).

**III. ANCIENT EGYPTIAN RELIGION.**—God and man, those two essential terms of every religion, are but imperfectly reflected in the Egyptian religious monuments. A book similar in scope to our Bible certainly never existed in Egypt, and if their different theological schools, or the priests of some particular theological school, ever agreed on certain truths about God and man, it is certain that the latter did not condone such writings. Nor is the vast body of religious monuments bequeathed to us by ancient Egypt of such a nature as to compensate for this lack of positive and systematic information. The figured and inscribed monuments discovered in the temples, and especially in the tombs, acquaint us with the names and external aspects of numerous deities, with the material side of the funereal rites, from which we may safely conclude that they admitted the dependency of man on superior beings, and a certain survival of man after death. But as to the essence of these gods, their relation to the world and man as expressed by the worship of which they were the objects, the significance and symbolism of the rites of the dead, the nature of the surviving principle in man, the nature and modes of the survival itself as depending on earthly life and the like, the monuments are either silent about or offer us such contradictory and incongruous notions that we are forced to conclude that the Egyptians never evolved a clear and complete system of religious views. What light can be brought out of this chaos we shall concentrate on two chief points: (a) The Future Life, as best representing the term Man. (b) The Egyptian Pantheon.
demons or spirits which animated almost everything man came in contact with—stones, plants, animals—and the lesser deities which presided over every stage of human life—birth, naming, etc. The worship they received was of an entirely local and private nature, and we know almost nothing of it.

Each nome had its own chief deity or divine lord, male or female, apparently inherited from the ancient tribes. With each deity an animal, as a rule, but sometimes a tree or mineral, was associated. Thus Osiris of Bubastis was associated with a pillar, or the trunk of a tree; Hathor of Denderah, with a sycamore; Osiris of Mendes, with a goat; Set of Tanis, with an ass; Buto of the city of the same name, with a serpent; Bast of Bubastis, with a cat; Atum, or Tum, of Heliopolis, with a serpent, a lion, or possibly, later the bull Minneus; Ptah of Memphis, with the bull Apis; Sovek, in the Fayum and at Omoos (Kom Ombo), with a crocodile; Anubis of Assiut, with a jackal; Ament, and Chons; in Memphis the group of Pthah, Sekhmet, and Nefertem; etc. Sometimes the triad consisted of one god and two goddesses, as at Elephantine, or even of three male deities. Those groups were probably first obtained by the fusion of several totems, the number into one suggested by the human family, or possibly by the family triad Osiris, Isis, and Horus, of the Osiris cycle. In some cases the second element was a mere grammatical duplicate of the first, as Amun, wife of Amen (Amon), and was considered as one with it; it was then the son with his parents, and so arose the concept of one god in three forms. There was in this a germ of monotheism. It is doubtful, however, whether it would ever have developed beyond the limits of henotheism but for the solar religion which seems to have sprung into existence towards the dawn of the dynastic times, very likely under the influence of the school of Heliopolis. But before we turn to this new phase of the Egyptian religion, we must consider another aspect of the ancient gods which may have furnished the first basis of unification of the various local worship.

The Gods of the Dead.—Gods, being fancied like men, were like them, subject to death, the great leveler. Each community had the mummy of its god. But in the case of gods, as in that of men, death was not the cessation of all life. With the assistance of magical devices the dead god was simply transferred to another world, where he was still the god of the departed who had been his devotees on earth. Those two forms of the same god, frequently under two different names which eventually led to the conception of distinct gods of the dead. Such were Chen-Atm, the first of the Westerners (the dead) at Abydos, Sokar (or Seker), probably a form of Ptah, at Memphis. Sometimes, however, the god of the dead retained the name he had before, as Anubis at Assiut, Khenty at Thebes, and Osiris, wherever he began to be known as such.

Legend of Osiris.—Each of these gods had his own legend. Osiris was the last god who reigned on earth, and he was a wise and good king. But his brother Set was a wicked god and killed Osiris, cutting his body into fragments, which he scattered all over the land. Isis, sister and wife of Osiris, collected the fragments, put them together, and embalmed them, and her son Horus. Anubis here, perhaps, a substitute for Set, who does not seem to have been originally conceived as his brother's slayer), and Nephthys, Set's wife. Isis then, through her magical art, revives her husband who becomes king of the dead, while Horus defeats Set and reigns on the earth in his father's place. According to another version, Qeb, father of Osiris, and Set put an end to the strife by dividing the land between the two competitors, giving the South to Horus and the North to Set.

Sidereal and Elemental Gods.—It is generally conceded that some of the local gods had a sidereal or elemental character, of Edfu and El-Kab (Heliopolis), and Anher, of this, represented one or other aspect of the sun. Thoth of Heliopolis and Khonsu of Thebes were solar gods. Min of Akhmim (Chemmis) and Coptos, represented the cultivable land and Set, of Omoos (near Nakadeh), the desert. Hapi was the Nile, Hathor the vault of heaven. In some cases this sidereal or elemental aspect of the local gods may be primitive, especially among the tribes of Asiatic origin; but in other cases it may be of later date and due to the influence of the solar religion of Re, which, as we have already said, came into prominence, if not into existence, during the early dynastic times.

Solar Gods, Re or Ra.—That Re was such a local god representing the sun, is generally taken for granted although by no means proven. We cannot assign him to any locality not furnished with another
god of its own. We never find him, like the vast majority of the local gods, associated with a sacred animal, nor is he ever represented with a human figure, except as a substitute for Atum, or as identified with Horus or some other god. His only representative among the pharaohs was the pharos, who in the earliest dynastic monuments appears as his son. Finally, it is difficult to understand how the kings of the southern kingdom, after having extended their rule to the north, should have given up their own patron god, Horus, for a local deity of the conquered land. It looks as if the worship of Re had been inaugurated some time after the union of the two lands, and possibly for political reasons. At all events, the solar religion soon became very popular, and it may be said that to the end it remained the state religion of Egypt. Re, like the other gods, had his legend—or rather myth—exaggerated by the theologians of Heliopolis in connexion with the cosmogonic system of the same school. He had created the world and was king over the earth. In course of time the mortals rebelled against him because he was too old, whereupon he offered their destruction by the goddess of war, but on the presentation of jars of human blood he was satisfied and decided to spare men. Tired of living among them, he took his flight to heaven, where, standing in his sacred bark, he sailed on the celestial ocean. The fixed stars and the planets are so many gods who play the parts of pilot, steersman, and oarsmen. Re rises in the east, conquers the old year, could be no perfect and lasting political unity as long as the various names retained their individual gods.

It is significant that in the only two periods when the pharaohs seem to have had absolute political control of Egypt—viz. from the Fourth to the Fifth and from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Dynasty—the systems of Re, in the former period, and his Theban form, Ammon-Re, in the latter period, came clearly to the front, while the local religious systems fall into the background. These, however, though they were no more tolerated, seemed to constitute a menace to political unity. The effort of Amenhotep IV to introduce the cult of his own god, Aton (see above), in Dynastic History; Second Period, was perhaps not prompted exclusively by a religious ideal, as is generally believed. A similar attempt in favour of Re and his symbol Horus was perhaps evolved by the Thebans under the name of Heliopolitan Re, from Khafre, second king of the fourth dynasty, to the end of the sixth dynasty, the word Re is a part of the name of almost every one of those kings, and the monuments show that during that period numerous temples were erected to the chief of the Heliopolitan gods, the form of Osiris and combinations of the names of the official religion on the local forms of worship may have caused the disturbances which marked the passage from the fifth to the sixth dynasty and the end of the latter. That such disturbances were not of a merely political nature is clear in the light of the well-known facts that the royal tombs and the temples of that period were violated and plundered, if not destroyed, and that the mortuary statues of several kings, those of Khafre in particular, were found, shattered into fragments, at the bottom of a pit near these pyramids. Evidently Qeb analyst had not been quite as baseless as is assumed by some modern scholars (Maspero, Histoire Ancienne, pp. 78 sq.).

If the foregoing sketch of the Egyptian religion is somewhat obscure, or even produces a self-contradictory effect, this may perhaps be attributed to the fact that the extremely remote periods considered (most of which are prehistoric) are known to us from monuments of later date, where they are reflected in
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superimposed outlines, comparable to a series of pictures of one person at different stages of life, and in different attitudes and garbs, taken successively on the same photographic plate. The Egyptians were a most conservative people; like other peoples, they were open to new religious concepts, and accepted them, but they never got rid of the older ones, no matter how much the older might conflict with the newer. However, if the writer is not mistaken, two prominent features of their religion are sufficiently clear: first, animal fetishism from beginning to end in a more or less mitigated form; second, superposition, during the early Memphite dynasties, of the sun-worship, the sun being considered not as creator, but as organizer of the world, from an eternally pre-exist-

ing matter, perhaps the forerunner of the demigurges of the Alexandrine School.

(b) The Future Life — As early as the predynastic times the Egyptians believed that man was survived in death by a certain principle of life corresponding to our soul. The nature of this principle, and the conditions on which its survival depended, are illustrated by the monuments of the early dynasties. It was called the ka of the departed, and was imagined as a counterpart of the body it had animated, being of the same sex, remaining throughout its existence of the same age as at the time of death, and having the same needs and wants as the departed had in his lifetime. It endured as long as the body, hence the paramount importance the Egyptians attached to the preservation of the bodies of their dead. They generally buried them in ordinary graves, but always in the dry sand of the desert, where moisture could not affect them; among the higher classes, to whom the privilege of being embalmed was at first restricted, the mummy was sealed in a stone coffin and deposited in a carefully concealed rock-cut vault over which a tomb was built. Hence, also, the presence in the tombs of lifelike statues of the deceased to which the ka might cling, should the mummy happen to meet destruction. But the ka could also die of hunger or thirst, and for this reason food and drink were left with the body at the time of the burial, fresh supplies being deposited from time to time on the top of the grave, or at the entrance of the tomb. The ka, or “double,” as this word is generally interpreted, is confined to the grave or tomb, often called “the house of the ka”. There near the body, it now lives alone in darkness as once, in union with the body, it lived in the sunny world. Toilet articles, weapons against possible enemies, amulets against serpents, are also left in the tomb, together with magic texts and a magic wand which enable it to make use of these necessaries.

Along with the ka, the earliest texts mention other surviving principles of a less material nature, the ba with the kha. Like the ka, the ba resides in the body during man’s life, but after death it is free to wander where it pleases. It was conceived as a bird, and is often represented as such, with a human head. The kha is luminous; it is a spark of the divine intelligence. According to some Egyptologists, it is a mere transformation which the ba undergoes when, in the hereafter, it is found to have been pure and just during lifetime; it is then admitted to the society of the gods; according to others, it is a distinct element residing in the ba. Simultaneously with the concepts of the ba and the kha, the Egyptians developed the concept of a common abode for the departed souls, not unlike the Hades of the Greeks. But their views varied very much, both as to the location of that Hades and as to its nature. It is very likely that, originally, every god of the dead had a Hades of his own; but, as those gods were gradually either identified with Osiris or brought into his shade as secondary infernal deities, the various local concepts of the region of the dead were ultimately merged into the Osiran concept. According to Professor Maspero, the kingdom of Osiris was first thought to be located in one of the islands of the Northern Delta, whither cultivation had not yet extended. But when the sun, to which the realm of the dead was shifted to the region traversed by the sun during the night, wherever that region might be, whether under the earth, as more commonly accepted, or in the far west, in the desert, on the same plane with the world of the living, or in the north-eastern heavens beyond the great sea that surrounds the earth.

As the location, so does the nature of the Osiran Hades seem to have varied with the different schools; and here, unfortunately, as in the case of the Egyptian pantheon, the monuments exhibit different views superimposed on one another. We seem, however, to discern two traditions which we might call the pure Osiris and the Re-Osiris traditions. According to the former tradition the aspiration of all the departed is to be identified with Osiris, and live with him in his kingdom of the Faru, or Yalu, fields—such a paradise as the Egyptian peasant could fancy. There ploughing and reaping are carried on as upon the earth, but with hardly any labour, and the land is so well irrigated by the many branches of another Nile that wheat grows seven eels. All men are equal; all have to answer the call for work without distinction of former rank. Kings and grandees, however, can be spared that light burden by having ushebtis (respondents) placed with them in their tombs. These ushebtis were small statuettes with a magic text which enabled them to impersonate the deceased and answer the call for him.

To procure the admission of the deceased into this realm of happiness his family and friends had to perform over him the same rites as were performed over Osiris by Isis, Nepthys, Horus, and Anubis. Those rites consisted mostly of magical formulae and incantations. The mumification of the body was considered an important condition, as Osiris was supposed to have been mumified. It seems, also, that in the beginning at least, the Osiran doctrine demanded a certain dismemberment of the body previous to all further rites, as the body of Osiris had been dismem-
bered by Set. Possibly, also, this took place in the pre-dynastic times, when the bodies of the dead appear to have been intentionally disembowelled and then put together again for burial (Chantepie de la Sauysse, op. cit., I, 214). At all events Diodorus narrates that the artisans made the first incision on the body and, vi-s-ous to the removal of the viscera had to take to flight immediately after having accomplished his duty, while the mob pretended to drive him away with stones (Diodorus Siculus, I, 91), as though he im-
personated set. This custom, however, of disemboweling bodies may be older than that of the Osirian doctrine, may explain it rather than be explained from it (Chantepie de la Sauysse, op. cit., I, 220). When all the rites had been duly performed the deceased was pronounced Osiris so-and-so—he had been identified with the god Osiris. He could now proceed to the edge of the great river beyond which are the Eura fields. Turn-face, the ferryman, would carry him across, unless the four sons of Horus would bring him a craft to float over, or the hawk of Horus, or the ibis of Thoth, would condensate to transport him on its pinions to his destination. Such were, during the Memphite and Dynastic ages, the conditions on which the parted soul obtained eternal felicity; they were based on ritual rather than on moral purity. It seems, however, that already at that time some texts show the deceased declaring himself, or being pronounced, free of certain sins. In any case, under the twelfth dynasty, the deceased was represented in the Memphite Tombs by a Scarab inscribed with a magical spell which prevented the heart from testifying against the deceased. The concept of retribution implied by the judgment very likely originated with the School of Abydos (see Maspero, "Revue de l'histoire des Religions," I, 305 sqq.).

According to another tradition, which is represented along with the foregoing in the Pyramid Texts, the deceased is ultimately identified not with Osiris himself, but with Re identified with Osiris and his son Horus. His destination is the bark of Re on the eastern horizon, whither he is transported by the same ferryman Turn-face. Once on the sacred bark, the deceased may bid defiance to all dangers and enemies, he enjoys absolute and perfect felicity, leaves the kingdom of Re-Osiris, and follows Re-Horus across the heavens into the region of the living gods. The same concept was resumed by the Theban School. An important variant of this Re-Osiris tradition is to be found in two books due to the Theban Ammon-Re School of theology, the "Book of what there is in the Dust" (Hades) and the "Book of the Gates". In both books the first incision on the body is performed by the sacred serpent, and the darkness is divided into twelve sections corresponding to the twelve hours of night, but in the latter book each section is separated by a gate guarded by gigantic serpents. Some of these sections are presided over by the old gods of the dead, Sokar and Osiris, with the new gods, the gods older than the ancients. The difference between these two books is the concept of a retribution which we now meet clearly expressed for the first time. While the innocent soul, after a series of transforma-
tions, reaches at last, on the extreme limit of the lower world, the bark of Re, where it joins the happy crowd of the gods, the criminal one is submitted to various tortures and finally annihilated (see, however, below under IV).

IV. LITERY MONUMENTS OF ANCIENT EGYPT.—

The earliest specimens of Egyptian literature are the so-called Pyramid Texts engraved on the walls of the pyramids and tombs of the kings of the Fifth Dynasty (Fifth Dynasty) and Teti, Pepi I, Memrie, and Pepi II (Sixth Dynasty). They represent two ancient rituals of the dead, the older of which, as is generally conceded, antedates the dynastic times. The texts concerning to this one are mostly incen-
tations and magic prayers supposed to protect the deceased against serpents and scorpions, thirst, and old age. The gods are made to trans-
it to the deceased the offerings deposited in the tomb; nay, these offerings are so placed in his power that he positively eats and digests them, thus assimilating their strength and other desirable qualities. In these last two features Professor Maspero sees an indica-
tion that although the concept of the ba had already been superposed on that of the ka, when that ritual first came into existence, yet anthropophagous sacri-
fices, if no longer in use, were still fresh in the memory of the Egyptians. This high, probably predynastic, antiquity is confirmed by peculiarities of language and orthography, which in more than one case seem to have puzzled the copyists of the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties [Maspero, in "Revue de l'histoire des religions", XII (1886), pp. 115 sqq.]. The other ritual texts of the Pyramid Tombs, besides the Pyramid Texts, are the Funeral Texts, known already in several recensions and published by Professor E. Schiaparelli (Il libro de' funerali degli Antichi Egitiani, Rome, 1881-2). It is sup-
posed to be the repetition of the rites by which Isis and Horus had animated the mummy of Osiris with the life he had as god before his death. The form of the text consisted in the opening of the mouth and eyes of the mummy, so that the deceased, in his second life, could enjoy the mortuary offerings and guide and express himself in the next world. For the details of this exceedingly interesting ritual we refer the reader to the excellent analysis of Professor Maspero in the "Revue de l'Histoire des Religions" [XV (1887), 158 sqq.]. These two books were very popular with the Egyptians down to the end of the Ptolemaic times, especially the second one, which is profusely illus-
trated in the tomb of Seth I, "The Book of the Dead." This text in antiquity comes the Book of the Dead, the most widely known monument of Egyptian literature. Numerous copies of it are to be found in all the principal museums of Europe. It may be best described as a general illustrated guidebook of the departed soul in Amenti (the Region of the West). There, whatever his belief as to the survival of man in the hereafter, or the location and nature of the region of the dead, the deceased found what he had to do to be admitted, what ordeals he would have to undergo before reaching his destination, what spirits and genii he would have to propitiate, and how to come out of all this victorious. Broadly speaking, the book can be divided into three sections: (1) "Book of the Going Out by Daytime" (cc. i-xvi), a title general-
ly, though wrongly, extended to the whole book; (2) Chapters xxvii-xxxiv: fitting the deceased for admission to the Hall of Justice, which book comprised the dead man's right to, whether by water or overland (xxiii-ci, exii-cxix), and his settlement therein (ciii-cx), without further formality than conciliating the ferryman or the guar-
dian genii with certain incantations and magical prayers recited with the right intonation; in case of deceased believing in retribution, before gain-
ing admission he had to repair to the Hall of Justice, there to be tried by Osiris (cxxii-cxxv); (3) Chapter cxxv to the end: practically another guide-
book for the special profit of the followers of the School of Abydos. It begins with the trial, after which it goes over pretty much the same ground as the con-
mon guide, with variations peculiar to the doctrine of the school. For further details see the masterly review by Maspero of Naville’s edition of the Book of the Dead during the Eighteenth to Twentieth Dynasties, in “Revue de l’histoire des religions,” XV (1887), pp. 209–215. As far as the chapters, from a mythological viewpoint, are perhaps the seventeenth, a compendious summary of what the deceased was supposed to know on the nature of the gods with whom he was to identify himself, and the one hundred and twenty-fifth, where, along with the dissertation of forty-two odes, we find also an enumeration of several gods, are borrowed according to his own belief (in Budge, “Egypt’s Place in Universal History,” V, 66–83) and Piffret (Le Livre des Morts des Anciens Egyptiens, Paris, 1882) are based on that edition. In 1886 E. Naville published a critical edition of the Theban recension, “Das ägyptische Todtenbuch der XVIII bis XX. Dynastie” (Berlin, 1886). In 1901 Dr. E. A. W. Budge published a translation of that same recension, but augmented with a considerable number of chapters (in all, 160) from the new Theban manuscripts and 16 chapters from the Saitic recension (The Book of the Dead, London, 1901). For further bibliographical details see Budge, “The Papyrus of Ani” (London, 1895, 371 sqq.).

Substitutes for the Book of the Dead.—Other books similar in scope to the Book of the Dead, and often substituted for it in tombs, are: (1) “The Book of the Respirations communicated by Isis to her brother Osiris to restore a new life to his soul and body and renew all his limbs, so that he may reach the horizon with his father Re, and his soul may rise to the heavens in the disk of the moon, and his body shine in the stars of Orion on the bosom of Nut; in order that this may also happen to the Osiris N.” This book has some similarity only with the incantations of the Dead, and priests and priestesses of Amun-Re. It not only makes allusion to the formula and acts by means of which the resurrection is effected, but also treaties of the life after death (tr. by P. J. Horrocks in “Records of the Past”, IV, 119 sqq.). A variation of this book under the title of “Another Chapter of Coming Forth by Day, in order not to let him [the deceased] absorb impurities in the necropolis, but to let him drink truth, eat truth, accomplish all transformations he may please, to restore a new life” etc. (as above) was published by Wiedemann in “Denk-Texte für den Museen zu Berlin u. Paris” (Leipzig, 1879). (2) “The Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys” (tr. by Horrocks, op. cit., II, 117 sqq.). (3) “The Book of the Glorification of Osiris”, a variation of the preceding, published by Piffret from a Louvre papyrus. (4) The “Book of the Wandering of Eternity”, published by Bergmann, “Das Bluten-Gang der Seele” in “Sitzungsber. d. K. K. Ak. d. Wiss. in Wien” (1882).

Mythological Compositions.—A different group of funeral books is represented by certain mythological compositions. They consist principally of figures relating to the various diurnal and nocturnal phases of the sun, accompanied with explanatory legends. The oldest of such compositions can be assigned to the Eighteenth Dynasty, and refers to both the daily and nightly courses of the sun, the two being often combined in one picture in two sections. In later times the nocturnal aspect of the sun prevails, and the composition becomes more and more funereal in character and scope, until the diurnal solar symbols disappear almost entirely (see Devéria, “Catalogue,” etc., pp. 1–13). Several of the figures are borrowed from the Book of the Dead.

Book of the Duat.—Closely related to these mythological compositions is the “Book of what there is in the Duat” (or Lower Hemisphere, as commonly, though perhaps wrongly, understood. See below, under Astronomy). It consists of a hieroglyphic text with numerous mythological or symbolical illustrations describing the nocturnal navigation of the sun (represented as the ram-headed god Chnum) on the river Uernes (cf. the Oypasos of the Greeks) during the twelve hours of night, through as many halls. To each hall corresponds one of the successive modifications through which the deceased is supposed to be brought back from death to a new life. Such modifications are effected by the deities in charge of the various halls, who, in addition, contribute, either by towing or in other more mysterious ways, to the progress of the solar bark on the Uernes, typifying that of the solar regeneration. However, this process of regeneration is not accomplished in Chnum himself but in the god Sokar, who plays the part of the dead sun. The deceased, who is never mentioned by his name, appears as a mere figurant, or rather an onlooker. All those who take part in the action seem to be permanently settled in the Duat, with no other apparent purpose than to play their own parts on the passage of the solar bark. This is the case even with the damned, who, when the time of retribution comes at the end of the tenth, and during the eleventh, hour, impersonate the enemies of Osiris, and for the time being are submitted to atrocious torments and even annihilated. Whether one is justified, as generally granted, in seeing in this last point a proof that the Egyptians as a people believed in eternal retribution, does not appear quite certain if we consider the highly mystical character of that book, the understanding of which was the privilege of a few initiated. For further details see the introduction to and the analysis of that book by Devéria (“Catalogue,” etc., pp. 15–39. See also Jéquier, “Livre de ce qu’il y a dans l’Hâdès”, Paris, 1804).

Ritual of the Embalming.—To close the above remarks on the funerary books we mention the Ritual of Embalming, published by Professor Maspero (Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits etc., t. XXIV, Paris, 1802).

Liturgies.—The religion of the living, if we may so express ourselves, is far from being as largely repre-
presented in Egyptian literature as that of the dead. Yet we have a few important works such as the ritual, or rather the liturgy, of Osiris in his temple at Abydos, of which an illustrated edition has been preserved on the walls of that temple (published by Moret, “Le Rituel dédié du divin Jouster en Egypte”); and the liturgy of the Amon-worship contained in a Berlin papyrus (O. v. Lemm, Ritualbuch des Amon-dienstes, 1828). The Litany of the Sun has been translated by Naville, in “Records of the Past,” VIII, 103 sqq.; also a fragment of the Legend of Re to which we have already alluded (op. cit. 103 sqq.) and several hymns to Osiris (op. cit., New Series, IV, 17 sqq.), the Nile (op. cit., New Series, III, 46 sqq.), and Amon-Re (in Maspéro, “Histoire ancienne”, pp. 328 sqq.; Grébaut, “Hymnes à Amenon-Ra”, Paris, 1875; cf. Stern in “Zeitschrift für ägyptische Kunstgeschichte”); and Brugsch, “Religion u. Mythologie der alten Aegypter”, Leipzig, 1885, pp. 690 sqq.). From the point of view of composition and style these hymns are the most remarkable literary products of ancient Egypt, as they are the most striking specimens of the monothetic tendencies which were developed under the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties as a result of the political supremacy of Thebes. Not less noteworthy are the hymns composed by Amenophis IV in honour of his sole god Aton (see the specimen published by Breasted, “History of the Egyptophiles”, pp. 273 sqq.).

Several Egyptian literary compositions of a moral nature have reached us. The two oldest are attributed to Kagemen, vizier of King Snefru, and Ptahottep, vizier and chief judge under King Iesi, last but one of the fifth dynasty. Both compositions, preserved in a manuscript of the Twelfth Dynasty, contain a collection of apothegms, or wise sayings, which contain a rather positive and practical nature, as “A slight failure is enough to make vile a great man” (Kagemen), or “A wise son shall be happy on account of his obedience; he shall grow old and get favour”. If you are a wise man, fix your home pleasantly, love your wife, do not quarrel with her, give her food and jewels, because this makes her come, give her perfume and pleasures during your life. She is a treasure which must be worthy of its owner” (Ptahottep). Under the Twelfth Dynasty we have the teaching of Amenemhet, where the old Egyptian language gives way to the new successor, Ausetesen, against placing too much confidence in, and being too intimate with, those around him, exemplifying his teaching from his own experience (translated in “Records of the Past”, II, p. 9 sqq.). Of a much higher order and wider scope are the counsels that Ani, a scribe of the Nineteenth Dynasty, gives to his son Khons-Hotep: “Let thine eye observe the deeds of God; it is he who strikes whatsoever is stricken. Piety to the gods is the highest virtue”; “It is I who gave thee to thy mother, but it is she that bore thee and while she was carrying thee she suffered many pains. When the time of her delivery arrived thou wert born and she carried thee like the veriest yoke, her lap in thy mouth, for three years. Thou didst grow, and thy filthiness never so far disgusted her as to make her cry out: ‘Oh! what am I doing?’ Thou wert sent to thy mother, and she again with the very day, bringing thee meat and drink from home. Thou didst take a house and wife of thine own, but never forget the pains of childhood thou didst cost to thy mother; give her not cause to complain of thee, lest perchance she lift up her hands to the gods, and they may smite this in mind whenever thou hast to make a decision: Even as the most aged die thou also shalt lie down among them. There is no exception; even for him whose life is without blame, the same lot awaits him as well. Thy death-messenger will come to thee too, to carry thee away. Discontent will avail thee nothing, for he is coming, yea, he is ready even now. Do not begin to say: ‘I am still but a child, I whom thou takest off.’ Thou knowest not how thou shalt die. Death comes to the sucking babe; yea, to him who is yet in the womb, as well as to the old, old man. See, I tell thee things for thy good, which thou shalt perhaps ponder in thy heart in Egypt” (tr. of Chabas, “L’Egyptologie”, Paris, 1876-8).

History.—Egyptian historical literature is somewhat illustrated from what we have said of the sources of chronology (see above, II, subsection Chronology). There is a sharp contrast with that which generally characterizes such documents, the so-called prose-poem of Pentaur stands alone so far. Pentaur is the name of the copyist, not of the author, as was long believed. Its subject is an episode of the famous campaign of Ramses II against the Hittites. When taken by surprise he, with only the household troops and a few officers who happened to be there, bravely charged the van of the enemy who were in pursuit of his defeated army, and so brilliantly successful was he that the rout was turned into a victory. The work displays a good deal of literary skill and is the nearest that can be found among the ancient Egyptians’ compositions. The first dynasty is left out of our book, for it was but a scanty series of kings, usually driven to flight by the Hittites. The noblest form of ancient Egyptian historical literature and the most important historical document of that time (Breasted, “Anc. Rec. of Egypt”, I, 134 sqq.); (2) the famous stele of Piankhi (see above, II, under Dynamic History; Second Period) which Professor Breasted calls the clearest and most rational account of the history of ancient Egypt, (Breasted, “Hist. of the Anc. Egyptians”, 320; cf. Maspéro, “Hist. Anc.”, 272 sqq.). Not less remarkable, perhaps, although less pretentious in point of style are: (1) the long autobiography of Uni, under three successive kings, (see above, II, under Dynamic History; Second Period) which Professor Breasted calls the clearest and most rational account of the history of ancient Egypt (Breasted, “Hist. of the Anc. Egyptians”, 370); (3) the great Papyrus Harris, a huge roll one hundred and thirty feet long, the longest document from the Early Orient. It contains an enormous inventory of the gifts of Ramses III to the three chief divinities of Egypt, a statement of his achievements abroad, and his benefactions to his people at home (op. cit., 347).

Fiction.—If history proper is not more largely represented in Egyptian literature, it is because its naturally positive and dry character, which is the structure of Egyptian life that is deficient in this respect. The Egyptian mind was not in harmony with the highly imaginative Egyptian mind. No doubt the Egyptians were proud of their kings; but from one end of the country to the other the rivers and the Nile flowed, and the walls of the temple, which were carved with scenes in gorgeous inscriptions and reliefs. That was all the history they needed. It furnished them with historical outlines which their fertile imaginations filled out with stories or tales after their own taste, tales in the style of the “Arabian Nights”; or tales after their own taste, tales in the style of the “Arabian Nights”, where only a few tales filled out with stories or tales after their own taste, tales in the style of the “Arabian Nights”, where only a few tales
change of fortune, as in the case of Sinuhet, Twelfth Dynasty, or in some clever stratagem, as in "How Thutiy captured Joppa", Twentieth Dynasty, and in the story of Ramsesnit (Herod., I, 121), Suite times. The "dramatis personae" of such tales and stories are often personified, the god or the royal person himself not infrequently playing the principal part; and the names which they bear, as a rule, are real historic names, so that in some cases it is not clear, at first sight, whether one has to deal with history or with fiction. More frequently, however, the names have been selected at random, sometimes from proper names, sometimes from the "personae" or even from popular nicknames. Moreover, chronology, as usual in popular fiction, is grossly disregarded. In the story of "Satni-Khâmûn", for instance, Menepthah, instead of appearing as the brother of the hero, is alluded to as a remote predecessor of Ramesses II (Usarmi of the tale, a "praenomen of Rameses II in his youth"). This literature of historical fiction was evidently very popular in Egypt at all times and in all classes of society. That it was chiefly from this source that Herodotus collected most of his notices concerning the ancient kings of Egypt is evident from the chronological confusion and the great many wrong names, "praenomina" which prevail in his writings. See on this all-important point the very interesting introduction of Prof. Maspero to his "Contes populaires de l'ancienne Egypte" (3d ed., Paris, 1903).

The Egyptian astronomers have no special treatise on astronomy written by ancient Egyptians in book form. They dealt, however, with the seasons and tombs especially, giving us a fair idea of their astronomical knowledge. On the whole, their notions were rather elementary. They knew the zodiac and the principal constellations, and had special names for Orion (Saoun) and Osiris (Saupel), the former being at the latter to Isis, and for the thirty-six decom which prevailed over the thirty-six decades of the year. They had compiled tables of the risings and settings of the great many, if not all, of the stars visible to the naked eye. They knew the difference between fixed stars and planets, and the apparently retrograde motion of Mars at certain periods of the year had not escaped their attention. Beyond this they knew probably little or nothing (see Ginzel, "Handbuch der mathematischen u. technischen Chronologie", I, 153).

We have seen above (I, subsection Chronology) how the Egyptians used what they knew of astronomy for the division of time and its computation. They fancied the earth round and flat, surrounded with mountains beyond which flowed a large river which they called Uerne (cf. the Ópeavl of the Greeks). At the four cardinal points the mountains rose higher and supported the celestial vaults, which they imagined as solid, although transparent. Over this vault flowed the celestial waters on which the sun, and the moon, and the stars floated in banks. The sun at the end of every day went out through the western mountains, and ended on the Uerne first northward, then southward to the mountain of the east, where he entered our world again through a large gate. Egyptian mythology saw in the celestial vault an immense cow (Hathor), or a woman, the goddess Nuit, whom shu (the atmosphere) had separated from her husband Geb, or Seb (the earth), and who brought forth the sun every morning, and swallowed it every evening. Maspero in "Revue de l'Histoire des Religions", XV, 239 sqq.) the many representations of the celestial vault in tombs and on the inner sides of the lids of sarcofagi are purely mythological (op. cit., I, 151).

Our earliest Egyptian treatise on mathematics is the Rhind Papyrus of the British Museum ed. Eisenlohr, Ein mathematisches Handbuch der alten Ägypter, 1877; L. Rodet in Jour. de la Soc. Math. de France, VI (1878), 130 sqq.; it dates back to the Nineteenth Dynasty. It contains: (a) several theorems of plane geometry with rules for measuring solids; (b) a manual of the calculator on a purely arithmetical basis, not algebraic (Rodet in Jour. Asiatique (1881), XVIII, 184 sq., 390 sq.). The numerical system was decimal, and contained figures which, like the symbols of the figures were repeated as many times as contained in the number to be expressed. With the exception of two-thirds, the only fractions which they could write with one sign were those having 1 as numerator.

**Astrology.**—Among the documents belonging to this science the most important is a fragmentary astronomical calendar (British Museum) written at the time of the Nineteenth Dynasty. It contains a list of the things which it is proper to do or to avoid on each day of the year. The reason why such a day was fas or nefes was ordinarily taken from some mythological tradition. The Greeks and Romans were not ignorant of this science, but the name "Egyptian days" (diai Egyptian), by which they designated it, shows clearly that they borrowed it from Egypt.

**Medicine.**—The Museum of Berlin preserves a copy of an Egyptian treatise on medicine, said to have been completed by, or at least under, Kings of the First and Second Dynasties. There is besides, the University Library of Leipzig, a papyrus commonly known as the Ebers Papyrus containing a copy (Eighteenth Dynasty) of another treatise attributed to King Cheops of the Fourth Dynasty. From these two documents and others of lesser importance we may infer that the Egyptians knew little about this science, as, for religious reasons, they were not allowed to study anatomy. Practical medicine on the other hand, was so far developed among them that the Egyptian physicians were those most highly esteemed by the Greeks and Romans. The names given to diseases are not always available; but the description of its symptoms is often sufficiently detailed to enable a physician to identify them. Pharmaceutical science was still more advanced. Four kinds of remedies are to be found in the recipes: ointments, potions, plasters, elixirs; they were usually taken from vegetables, sometimes from minerals (as sulphate of copper, salt, nitre, memphis stone); the raw flesh, blood (fresh or dried up), hair, and horn of animals were also used, especially to reduce inflammations. The elements of such remedies were first washed, boiled, and strained, then diluted with water or with beer. The names of these substances are given in the treatise on Chronology, and even human urine. But the Egyptians believed that not all diseases were of natural origin; some were caused by evil spirits who obsessed the patients.

For Egyptian Art see Temple.

(a corruption of Gr. Ἀγάντων). The Arab conquerors thus designated the old inhabitants of Egypt (in vast majority followers of Dioscorus) in contradistinction both to themselves and to the Melchites of Greek origin and language who were still in communion with the Coptic Church, but have since drifted within the orbit of the so-called Orthodox, i.e. schismatic Greek Church. A general article on the Coptic Church will be found under ALEXANDRIA, THE CHURCH OF. Special features of importance are treated under the titles ALEXANDRIA, COUNCILS OF; Gnosticism; Monasticon; Panarion; Sacerdotal; Versions; Writings of the Bible. See also Athanasius; Cyril of Alexandria; Dionysius of Alexandria; Mark; Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria; Clement of Alexandria; Origen; Dioscorus; Melchites; Missions. In the present article we shall treat in particular of the origins and constitution of the Coptic Church, especially the question of its episcopate, to the Council of Nicea (325). We shall close with a short sketch of the present condition of both the Jacobite and the Uniat branches of the Coptic Church, chiefly from the point of view of their organization.

Christianity in Egypt.—We have no direct evidence of Christianity having existed in Egypt until Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 150-200) when it had already spread over the land. What we know of the Church of Egypt before that time is exclusively through inferences or unconfirmed traditions preserved gradually by Eusebius. It may infer the existence of Christianity in Egypt during the second century from the fact that under Trajan a Greek version of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" was being circulated there (Duchesne, Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise, I, 120). We know that this Gospel, like the Jewish-Christian baptism which it shows that the Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians of the same date of another Christian community, recruited from among the Gentiles. This, presumably, followed another Gospel which Clement of Alexandria calls "the Gospel according to the Egyptians" (On the Gospel of the Egyptians, see Harnack, Chronologie der alchristlichen Litteratur, I, 1, pp. 612-22 on the Gospel of the Hebrews, ibid., pp. 631-49.) This writer quotes it along with the "Gospel according to the Hebrews". However, he clearly distinguishes both from the canonical Gospels, which show that these and other relics of the past, or at least were old enough to be entitled to some consideration in spite of their uncanonical character. Some writers, as Bardenhewer (Geschichte der alchristlichen Litteratur, I, 337), think that the "Gospel according to the Egyptians" owed its name to its diffusion among the Egyptians throughout the land, in contradistinction to some other Gospel, canonical or uncanonical, in use in Alexandria. In this case we might conclude furthermore to the existence of a third Christian community, consisting of native Egyptians, as it is difficult, to suppose that two Hellenistic communities would have used two different Gospels. But we have no evidence of a native Church having existed at as early a period as suggested by the elimination of the Gospel of the Egyptians from the canon at the time of Clement of Alexandria.

It is certain, however, that Christianity at an early date in Egypt is, indirectly at least, attested by the activity of the Gnostic schools in that country in the third and fourth decades of the second century. Eusebius is authority that "Basilides the heresiarch," founder of one of these schools, came into prominence in the year 150 and that he set up "the school of Basilides". Clement of Alexandria, Carpocterus, belong to the same period. Valentinus had already moved to Rome in 140, under the pontificate of Pope Hyginus (Irenaeus, Adv. Her., III, iv, 3), after having preached his doctrines in Egypt, his native country. As Duchesne (op. cit., I, 391) well remarks, one cannot believe that these heretical manifestations represent all the Alexandrine Christianity. These schools, precisely because they are nothing but schools, suppose a Church, "the Great Church", as Celsius calls it; such aberrations, precisely because labelled with their authors' names, testify to the existence of a Church, as())->Eusebius, to the effect that Christianity was first introduced in Egypt by St. Mark the Evangelist in the third year of Claudius (A.D. 43), only one year after St. Peter established his see in Rome, and one year before Evodius had been raised to the See of Antioch. He preached there the Gospel and founded Churches in Alexandria. Little is added by
Eusebius, viz., that, according to Clement of Alexandria, Mark had come to Rome with St. Peter (probably after Agrippa's death in 44), and that, according to Papias, after Peter's death (probably 64), Mark had written there the Gospel that bears his name (see Har- 
nam's note). This is just related. The apostolate and death of St. Mark, have been handed down mostly by the Oriental compilers of chronicles. They are strongly legendary and often conflict with one another and with the Eusebian traditions. In more than one instance they seem to have originated from a misunder-
standing of Eusebius's text, of which we know there was a Coptic translation, or from an effort to harmonize or supplement the traditions reported (but not confirmed) by that writer. Until these Oriental sources have been critically edited and their chronol-
gy brought out of its chaotic state, it is impossible to make them to any determinable purpose.

It seems, however, certain (1) that St. Mark died a martyr, though the constant tradition that his martyrdom was on Easter Day and on the 24th or 25th of April seems to be worthless, seeing that from the year 15 to the end of the first century Easter never fell on either of these dates; (2) that, however, the Gospel was composed in Egypt to go (or to return) to the Pentapolis. St. Mark had appointed Anianus his successor several years prior to his own death. Severus of Nesteraweh, a bishop of the ninth century, says that it was seven years before his martyrdom. It is remarkable that liable, while stating that Anianus succeeded St. Mark in the eighth year of Nero (A.D. 62–3), does not mention Mark's death (as in the case of St. Peter). Probably he had found no tradition on that point. The fact, however, that he gives Anianus as the first Bishop of Alexandria shows that, in his mind, the two events were not contemporaneous. For if Anianus had taken possession of the see on St. Mark's death he would have been the second, and not the first, bishop. There is some reason to suspect the correctness of the traditions transmitted by Julius Africanus through Eunapius. The round number of ten is, to a period of which we otherwise know nothing, the fact that in every case the pontificate consisted of complete years only without extra months and days, the further fact that we find in that short list two pontificates of ten years, two of eleven, two of twelve, two of thirteen, which seems to indicate that the other two originally were fourteen years each—all this might suggest that the list of Julius Africanus is to some extent at least artificial, and based on a number of twelve years for each pontificate, giving a sum total of one hundred and twenty years for the list. One might surmise that the list was originally supposed to start from St. Mark's death, and that later on the enthronement of Anianus was taken as its beginning, his pontificate being, as a consequence, increased by from four to eight years. Nor is it, perhaps, entirely fortuitous that the different recensions of the "Chronicon Orientale," Armenian recension, for instance, should so very near 144 years (12 x 12) from St. Mark's arrival in Egypt to Demetrius. It would not be difficult to find other instances of chronologies of predocumentary times thus artificially rounded out on the basis of the numbers ten and twelve.

But, perhaps, a relic of an entirely different tradition in a remark to be found in the "Chronicon Orientale" of Peter Ibn Ruhib, namely, that after the pontificate of Anianus there was a vacancy of three years, owing to the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem under Titus. If we had not the list of Julius Africanus, such a statement might not seem devoid of plausibility. As we have seen before, the first Christian community of Alexandria consisted chiefly of Jews, and we should naturally suppose that its first pastors were chosen from among the Jews. At any rate they were regarded as Jews by the Government, and the Jews were, indeed, much more persecuted. But it is known that, when the Temple of Jerusalem, Vespasian adopted measures of extreme rigour against the Jewish population of Egypt, lest they should try to make their temple of Leontopolis the national centre of their race, and thus defeat his very purpose in wiping out of existence the temple of Jerusalem, it was not until A.D. 73, when this obnoxious temple was, in its turn, destroyed, that the persecution ceased, and the Jews were restored to their former privilege of free worship. Supposing that the predecessor of Abilius died A.D. 70, it would ap-
pear likely enough that the see should have remained vacant during the time of the persecution.

3. Nature of Early Episcopate.—There is much dis-
sussion as to the nature of the early episcopate of Egypt.

Tradition seems to point to a collective episcopate con-
sisting of twelve presbyters with a bishop at their head. St. Jerome, in a letter to Evangelus (P. L., XXII, 264), insists on this as the "true order of the patricians." The period for which this is given is from St. Mark's time to the end of the first century. The presbyters of Alexandria used to call bishop one they elected from among themselves and raised to a higher standing, just as the high priest makes an emergency appointment to the office of a missing archpriest, one from their own body whom they know to be of active habits." This is confirmed by: (1) A passage of a letter of Severus of Antioch, written from Egypt between 514 and 538. Speaking of a certain Dasias who added an ancient canon to prove the validity of his episcopal ordination, although performed by a single bishop, Severus says: "It was also customary for the bishop of the city famous for the orthodoxy of its faith, the city of the Alexandrians, to be appointed by priests. Later, however, in agreement with a canon which obtained everywhere, the sacramental institution of their bishop took place by the hands of the bishops." (2) A passage of the annals of Eutychius, Mofhite Patriarch of Alexandria who flourished in the early decades of the tenth century: "St. Mark along with Ananius [Anianus] made twelve priests to be with the patriarch; so that when this should be wanting, they might elect one out of the other eleven, and the remaining eleven should lay their hands upon his head and bless him and appoint him patriarch; and should after this choose a man of note and make him priest with them in the place of the one who had been made patriarch from among the twelve priests, in such sort that they should always be twelve. This custom, that the priests of Alexandria should appoint the patriarch from the twelve priests, did not come to an end till the time of Alexander Patriarch of Alexandria, one of the three hundred and eighteen [the Fathers of Nicea] who forbade the presbyters [in the future] to appoint the patriarch, but decreed that on the death of the patriarch the bishops should convene and appoint the patriarch, and he furthermore decreed that on the death of the patriarch they should elect a man of note from whosoever place, from among those twelve priests or not appoint him [cf. from the Arabic text ed. Cheikho, in "Corpus Script. Christ. Orientalium; Scriptores Arabici," Ser. III, tom. VI, 95, 96]. Finally, we read in the apothegms of the Egyptian monk Psemen (Butler, "Lives of the Fathers of the Church") that certain heretics came to Psemen and desired the Archbishops of Alexandria as having ordination (episcopalia) from them. Psemen did not answer, but he said to the brothers: "Prepare the table, make them eat, and dismiss them in peace." It is generally supposed that the heretics in question were Arians and really intended to make Psemen believe that the then Archbishop of Alexandria had been
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ordained by priests, and St. Athanasius is supposed to have been that archbishop. Now, as it is a well-known fact that St. Athanasius was consecrated by bishops, that accusation is considered one of the many calumnies the Arians used to spread against him. If this interpretation be true, the Lausiac text should add nothing for the nature of the early Alexandrian episcopate. But it seems highly improbable that the Arians should have dared to assert what everyone in Egypt in the least familiar with contemporary events, must have known to be false. In fact the Lausiac text is capable of a more plausible interpretation, viz., that the episcopal character of the Archbishop of Alexandria was to be traced to simple presbyters, while in other Churches the Apostolic succession had been transmitted from the very beginning through an uninterrupted line of bishops. In this case the Lausiac would be the oldest witness of the tradition transmitted by Jerome, Severus, and Eutychius, for Ptolemaios flourished in the first half of the fifth century (Dict. Christ. Biog., s. v.), or even as early as the latter half of the fourth century, if Charles Gore is right in his argument that Rufinus visited that holy bishop (Journal of Theological Studies (JTS), 2d ed., II, 133, n. 3). Moreover, that the bishops of Alexandria were originally not elected, but also appointed, by presbyters is, indirectly at least, confirmed by another tradition for which Eutychius is authority, viz., that, till Demetrius there was no other bishop in Egypt, and the Bishop of Alexandria was appointed by the synod of priests (cf. Sellaris (Hist. Chron. Patr. Alex., 8° = 108) and others, but we shall see in the following section that their reasons are not conclusive (cf. Harnack, "Missa u. Ausbreitung", 2d ed., II, 133, n. 3). The tradition that the early Bishops of Alexandria were appointed by the synod of presbyters is therefore, if not certain, at least highly probable. On the other hand it seems almost certain that that custom came to an end much earlier than Eutychius, or even Jerome, would have it. Significant is the fact that they disagree on the term or ad quem; still more significant that Severus of Antioch is silent on that point. Besides, several passages of the works of Origines and Clement of Alexandria can hardly be understood without supposing that the mode of episcopal election and ordination was then the same as throughout the rest of the Christian world (see Cabrol in his "Dict. d'archéologie chrét."); s. v. Alexandria: Election du Patriarche.

We may not dismiss the question without recalling the use which Presbyterians, since Selden, have made of that tradition to uphold their views on the early organization of the Church. It suffices to say that their theory rests, after all, on the gratuitous assumption (to put it as mildly as possible) that the presbyters who used to elect the Bishop of Alexandria, were priests as understood in the now current meaning of this word. Such is not the tradition, according to Eutychius himself, Selden's chief authority, the privilege of patriarchal election was vested not in the priests in general, but in a college of twelve priests on whom that power had been conferred by St. Mark. They were in that sense an episcopal college. Later on, when it became necessary to establish resident bishops, the station in question was filled by a bishop who had been selected from the college of presbyters, while still retaining their former quality of members of the episcopal college. So that, little by little, the power of patriarchal election passed into the hands of regular bishops. The transfer would have been gradual and natural, had the Lausiac text been true, the Lausiac text is silent about it in that case all certainly would have taken part in the election. Besides, if Cedalon's predecessor had called a synod or council, Severus, or the author from whom he borrowed that message biography, would not have failed to swell the list of representatives. There seems to be no other solution than to see in that synod a body of presbyters or delegated bishops who were habitually in residence in Alexandria, but some of them, being on the mission, were not able to take part in the election. There was, therefore, under the archbishop of Alexandria a body of clergy which were called bishops, and yet had no ordinary jurisdiction, as is evidenced, first, by the express statement in Cedalon's case and, secondly, by the fact that they usually resided in Alexandria, as stated or implied in the other two cases. Such a body of men the twelve presbyters of Eutychius must have been; so that
those three passages, far from contradicting Eutychius’s testimony, rather confirm it. We find, however, a more direct confirmation of Eutychius’s statement in another, so far equally misinterpreted, passage of Severus. In the biography of Julian, the immediate successor of Diocletian, we read: “His father, the Patriarch of Alexandria, did not remain always there, but he used to go out secretly and organize the hierarchy [yauism kahanat, literally, “ordain clergy”], as St. Mark the Evangelist had done.”

The same remark is to be found in the “Chronicon Orientale” of Peter Ibn Rabih, with the variation, “No bishop always remained in Alexandria”; and the omission of the last words “as St. Mark” etc. We know that the words yauism kahanat have been so far rendered “ordinationes sacerdotum faciabat” (Renaudot, Hist. Patr. Alexandr., p. 181), “ordained priests” (Evett, “Hist. of the Patriarchs of the Cop- tic Church of Alexandria” in Graffin-Nau’s “Patrologia Orientalis”, i, 154). There is no doubt, however, that the word kahanat (plur. of kabin) as a rule stands for bishops and deacons as well as for priests. That it really is so in this case is made clear from a comparison with the Severian version of the same episcopate of the life of St. Mark. The author of the second biography in Severus’s work says that the Evangelist, seeing that the people of Alexandria were plotting against his life, went out from their city (secretly, adds Severus of Nesteraweh, Bargis, op. cit., p. 56) and returned to Pentapolis, where he “appointed bishops, priests, and deacons in all its provinces.” The Melchite Martyrology of Alexandria, under 25 April, says that St. Mark went from Alexandria to Barca (Pentapolis) and beautified the churches of Christ, “instituting bishops and the rest of the clergy of that country. It is evident that in the mind of the author of the latter passage kahanat, on the one hand, and “bishops, priests, and deacons”, on the other, are interchangeable.” Finally, in the “Chronicon Orientale”, where the same episode of St. Mark’s life is related, we find simply: “appointing clergy [kahanat] for them”, without special mention of the bishops.

And the argument will appear all the more convincing if we notice that the remark of Julian’s biography must have had in view the labours of St. Mark in the Pentapolis, when he added “as St. Mark the Evangelist had done”, for neither the Oriental nor the Severian sources mention the ordinations performed by St. Mark outside of Alexandria.

Before we dismiss this interesting passage of Julian’s biography, let us call attention to another detail of it. The patriarch is styled simply the Bishop of Alexandria, which shows that the source from which the remark was borrowed must belong to a time when the expressions archbishop and patriarch had not yet come into use. It may, therefore, be considered as absolutely certain that, according to all the Oriental sources, there was from the times of St. Mark to Julian’s death only one diocese in the whole territory of Egypt proper, namely, the Diocese of Alexandria, and only one bishop, the Bishop of Alexandria. That bishop was assisted by a college of presbyters. These were bishops to all intents and purposes, excepting jurisdiction, which they had by delegation only. If Eutychius calls them presbyters, it is because he found that word in the source he was using, possibly the very same in which the author of Julian’s biography found the word bishop used to designate the patriarch. In the “Lives of the Patriarchs” by Severus of Asmunein, they called bishops, in agreement with the current usage of the time, when these biographies were first written. On so much the Oriental sources agree, and substantially they confirm the traditions preserved by St. Jerome and Severus of Antioch. They disagree as to the number of presbyters created by St. Mark; Makrizi, who probably copied Eutychius, gives the same number (twelve) and does not speak of deacons. Severus’s second biography of St. Mark, Al-Makin, and the “Chronicon Orientale” say three presbyters and seven deacons. According to Severus of Nesteraweh, St. Mark “ordained the sons of Ananias, who were the clergy of Aquantiaca.” Although we have no means of determining, to what extent Christianity had spread over Egyptian territory during the first two centuries of our era, there is hardly any doubt that the number of communities, as well as the area over which they were scattered, very much exceeded the proportions of an ordinary diocese of the primitive Church. Christianity, says Clement of Alexandria (Strom., vi, xviii, 107), has spread πάνω μέρος καὶ κάθε ἐν πανίν παρανά, i.e. whole houses and families have embraced the faith, which has found adherents in all classes of society. And this statement is borne out by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., vi, 1), who says that in the year 202, during the reign of Emperor Elagabalus, he went to Alexandria, for trial ἀρχειοντα καὶ ἕναἰδιον ἀνάτομα. It would seem that under ordinary circumstances there must have been a call for an ordinary resident bishop at least in each of the three great provinces of Heptanomis (Middle Egypt), Thébaïs (Upper Egypt), and Diesis (the Fayum).

But in Egypt, as elsewhere, the Church in its infancy naturally copied the political organization of the country, and Egypt, in that respect, was entirely different from the rest of the Roman Empire. Rome, or rather Augustus, in taking possession of Egypt as his personal spoil, took in almost bodily the old political organization created by the Pharaons and strengthened and the Ptolemies, simply replacing the king by a prefect in whom, as his representative, all authority, judicial and military, was vested. That organization was characterized by the total absence of municipal institutions; no organized cities, as in the rest of the Roman Empire, no magistrates elected by a senate and governing in its name. The country was divided, as of old, into nomes, each of which was administered by a strategos (formerly, nomarch) under the prefect, though occasionally two nomes were temporally united under a further inferior strategos, or one nome was divided between two strategos. The strategoi appointed all subaltern officials throughout the nome, subject to approval from the prefect, and transmitted to them his orders. In judicial matters they could initiate proceedings, but could deliver judgment only when specially empowered as delegates of the prefect. In each village there was a council of elders who acted as intermediaries for the payment of taxes, and were held responsible to the authorities of the nome for the good order of their fellow villagers; they had, however, no authority except by way of delegation.

In Alexandria there was no exact parallel. The authority of the strategos extended to the whole nome, and was transferred to the city by the prefect until the reign of Septimius Severus that the city was granted a senate, and even then the citizens were not permitted to elect their own magistrates. The situation was probably the same in other cities which at a still later period secured the privilege of a senate. For convenience’ sake the Ptolemies had grouped the nomes of Upper Egypt into one province governed by an epistrategos: the Romans at first did the same for the nomes of Middle Egypt (including the Arsinoite nome, the modern Fayum) and the Delta, or Lower Egypt. But this and other later arrangements of the nomes into provinces serves only to show the old organization of the country. The epistrategoi were the usual delegates for many of the powers nominally exercised by the prefect. They appointed the strategoi and other local officials, subject to confirmation by the prefect. In a general way they acted as intermedi-
aries for the transmission to the authorities of the nome of the orders issued by the prefect (Miline, p. 4–6). In each nome there was a metropolis which was the residence of the strategos and, as such, the political centre of the nome. It was a religious centre as well, and it was also the chief sanctuary of the sacred revenue of the whole nome. The chief priest in charge of that sanctuary naturally ruled in religious matters over all the secondary temples scattered throughout the territory of the nome. There was in Alexandria a "High-Priest of Alexandria and all Egypt," appointed by the emperor, and probably a Roman, like the prefect, whom he depended and whose substitute he was in religious matters. He had supreme authority over the priests and control of the temple treasures all over Egypt. In course of time, particularly under Diocletian, several changes took place in that organization; but these changes affected in no way the workings of the administration of the country, which, through a chain extending from the prefect to the last and least subaltern of the smallest village, brought every inhabitant under the control of the imperial prefect.

A more striking example of centralized power can be imagined, however, which should have been brought about by the branches of administration: between him and the people, intermediaries who transmit his orders, but never act except on his behalf, and refer to him all cases of any importance. Such, also, was the organization of the Coptic Church in the first one hundred years of its existence: one master presbyter, supreme patriarch, supreme metropolitan; one seat and source of jurisdiction, one judge—the Bishop of Alexandria. It is, therefore, this fullness of jurisdiction rather than the fullness of the priesthood—plenitude sacerdotii—that is understood by the title of the presbyters who elect the Bishop of Alexandria, also have the fullness of the priesthood but they have no jurisdiction of their own. We found them temporarily in charge in the provinces, but they were acting in behalf of the bishop; and for that reason, in the older sources, they are not called bishops. With Demetrius (188–232) a new era opens. The bishops of Alexandria, we have seen, began to leave the city secretly, and ordained bishops, priests, and deacons everywhere, as St. Mark himself had done when he went to the Pentapolis. The word secretly is suggestive of times of persecution (cf. Abraham Hefele, "Eutychius vindicatus," 25; Renanot, "Hist. Petarchearum Alexandrini," 25). We seem to accept this new departure of Demetrius took place in the very first years of the third century, when the Severian persecution broke out. The dangers then threatening the Christian communities—which by this time had greatly increased in all parts of Egypt—may have been the chief consideration that prompted the bishop to come to the assistance of his flock by giving it permanent pastors (see, however, Harnack, "Mission," II, 137, note 2, quoting Schwartz). According to the tradition of Eutychius, Demetrius created three bishops: Hesecas (232–48), as many as twenty. The number of bishops so increased, under Dionysius (248–65), Maximus (265–82), Theonas (282–300), Peter Martyr (300–11), Achillas (312), and Alexander (313–326), that the last of these could, in 320, muster nearly one hundred bishops against Arians (it contained the chief sanctuary of the special god), the Pentapolis. The Egyptian hierarchy was then fully organized (cf. Harnack, op. cit., II, 142), a fact which explains, and is explained by, the wholesale Christianization of Egypt during the third century. In spite, however, of that astonishing development of the hierarchy, the monasteries of the desert, the old institutions of the monks, were not yet entirely disappeared. It happened often during the persecutions that bishops were incarcerated pending trial, and therefore were unable to hold ordinations. Their places were then filled by "episkopos", or itinerant bishops ordained for that purpose, and resident in Alexandria when not actively engaged in their sacred functions. It was for having presumed to usurp the functions of such "episkopoi" that Mele- tius, Bishop of Lycopolis (in Upper Egypt) was censured by the Patriarch Alexander, and finally condemned and deprived of his jurisdiction by the Council of Nicæa (see Hefele-Leclercq, I, p. 381). Paris, 1907, I, 488–500, where all the sources are indicated.

The existence of metropolitan (in the canonical sense of the word) in the Church of Egypt is a matter of considerable doubt (see Harnack, op. cit., II, 150, 164, 173; B. H. Swartz, "Athanasiana," I, "Nachricht d. K. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. zu Göttingen," 1904, p. 180, and Lübeck, "Reichsein- theilung u. kirchliche Hierarchie," pp. 109 sqq., 116 sqq.). If some bishops (which is very likely; see Hefele, "Conciliengeschichte," I, pp. 391, 392) bore that title, they could not have differed from the ordinary Egyptian bishops in their relations to the Bishop of Alexandria. It is a well-known fact that the Bishop of Alexandria was wont to ordain not only his metropolitan, as did other patriarchs, but also their suffragans, with the sole proviso that their election was sanctioned by the bishops of Egypt (Hefele, op. cit., I, p. 393). St. Epiphanius, writing of Meletius, whom he calls ἀρχιεπίσκοπος (Heres., Ixix, c. iii), by which he means really metropolitan (Hefele, ibid.), says: "Hoc quidem ceteris [Egypti episcopis antecellentes, secundum unum Petro Alexandrinorum] dignitatem ac honorem in ecclesiastical affairs: one master presbyter, supreme patriarch, supreme metropolitan; the whole humanity adiutor sed eadem tamen subjectus et ad ipsum de rebus ecclesiastici referens" [He indeed, being preeminent over all the other bishops of Egypt, held the position next in dignity to that of Peter (of Alexandria), as being his helper, yet subject to him and dependent on him in ecclesiastical affairs]. In what concerns Meletianism St. Epiphanius is not to be implicitly trusted. In this case, however, his testimony is probably correct; his words depict just such a condition of affairs as we should naturally expect from the general analogy of the church-organization with the civil government. The existence of the episcopate and the nature of their relations to the prefect of Egypt might well have suggested the appointment of metropolitans with just as limited an independence of the Bishop of Alexandria as St. Epiphanius attributes to Meletius.

PRESIDENT STATE OF THE COPTIC CHURCH.—The Jacobite Church has thirteen dioceses in Egypt: Cairo, under the Patriarch of Alexandria, with 25 churches and 35 priests; Alexandria, with a metropolitan, having charge also of the Provinces of Bohaire and Menouf, 48 churches, 55 priests; Memphis, 6 bishops, 16 priests, 4 churches; Pentapolis, 6 bishops, 856 priests, 449 churches, and about 600,000 souls. There are in addition, outside of Egypt, a metropolitan in Jerusalem, a bishop for Nubia and Kharthum, a metropolitan and two bishops in Abyssinia. Some ten years ago the Abbots of the monastery of St. Anthony, St. Paul (both in the Arabian Desert), and Baramús (in the desert of Nitria) were raised to the dignity of bishops.

There are three categories of schools. (a) Church schools under the patriarch (conservative): 1 ecclesiastical college, 90 pupils; 6 boys' schools, 1,100 pupils;
2 girls' schools, 350 pupils. (b) Tewfik schools, under the society of the same name (rather liberal and in opposition to the patriarch): 1 boys' school, 290 pupils; 1 girls' school, 110 pupils. (c) Private schools: 5 boys' schools, 350 pupils; 1 girls' school, 5 pupils.

During his administration the Schismatic Church of Alexandria captured by the Patriarchate of Alexandria, and elsewhere. Athanasius continued to reside in Jerusalem, whence he ministered to his charge in Egypt through his vicar-general, Justus Manari. During his administration flourished Raphael Tuki, a native of Circelia and an alumnus of the Urban (Propaganda) College at Rome. After a few years of fruitful labours in his native land he was recalled to Rome (where he received the title of Bishop of Arsinus) to superintend the printing of the Coptic liturgical books (Misali, 1746; Psalter, 1749; Breviary, 1750; Pontifical, 1761; Ritual, 1763; Thebain, 1764). Athanasius was succeeded (1751) by John Farghali as Vicar of the Coptic Church, with the title of Bishop of Hypsopolis; but he never received episcopal consecration, there being no Catholic bishop of the Coptic Rite to perform it. The same can be said of his successor Matthew Righet, appointed (1751), and made Bishop of Uthina in 1752; he died in 1752, and was succeeded also Bishop of Uthina in 1784, and a few months later Patriarch of Alexandria, by decree of Leo XII, who, at the request of the Khedive Mehmet-Ali, had decided to restore the Catholic Patriarchate of Alexandria. The decree, however, never went into effect owing, apparently, to the opposition of Abrahah Cashoor, then at Rome, where he had been consecrated Archbishop of Memphis by the pope himself. Maximus died in 1831. His successor was Theodore Abi-Karim, made Bishop of Alia in 1832, and appointed Delegate and Visiting Bishop of Athos, and at the same time Bishop of Arsinus in 1840. He died in 1864, and was succeeded in 1856 by Athanasius Khúnum, Bishop of Maronza, who in turn was succeeded in 1866 by Agapius Behai, Bishop of Cariopolis, representative of his nation at the Vatican Council in 1869-70. Owing to regrettably, with his flock, this bishop, more learned and pious than tactful, was recalled to Rome in, or soon after, 1878, and did not return to Egypt until 1887, forty days before his death. During his absence, and after his death, the Church was administered by an Apostolic visitor, Monsignor Anthony Moreo (not a Copt nor a bishop) with the title of pro-vicar Apostolic. His successor was also a simple Apostolic visitor and governor of the Uniat Copts until 1895, when the Patriarchate of Alexandria was restored by Leo XIII (Litter. Apost. “Christi Domini”) with a bishop, Cyril Macaire, as Apostolic administrator, and two suffragans, Hibernus (residence at Minieh) and Thebes (residence at Tirtah), which were entrusted respectively to Bishops Maximus Seddouai and Ignatius Berzi, both consecrated in 1896. In 1899 Bishop Cyril Macaire was promoted to the title and rank of Patriarch of Alexandria, with residence at Cairo, taking the name of Cyril II; he resigned in 1908, and Bishop Seddouai was named administrator. The Uniat Coptic Diocese of Alexandria counts (Lower Egypt and Cairo) 2500 souls, 4 churches or chapels, 14 priests (2 married), a petit seminaire with 8 pupils (under the direction of the Rev. Father Assan Benoit). In the Diocese of Hermopolis (Middle Egypt) there are 2500 Catholics, 10 priests (4 married), 7 churches or chapels, 12 stations, 9 schools for boys, 240 pupils, and 1 for girls, with 50 pupils. The Diocese of Thebes (part of Upper Egypt) has 15,250 souls, 31 priests (15 married), 35 churches or chapels, 18 stations, 1 theological seminary (for all three dioceses), with 17 pupils, 21 schools for boys, with 240 pupils, and 5 schools for girls, with 253 pupils. In addition to the above-mentioned clergy and institutions, there are several local religious (both men and women) whose members minister to the Catholic Church.
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Bartholomew, the Martyrdoms of St. James, son of Zebedee, St. James the Less, St. Peter, St. Paul; also by the life of the pseudo-Prochoros and the martyrdom of St. John and a Martyrdom of St. Simon (different from the documents generally known under the names of Prochoros and "Martyrdom of St. John and a Martyrdom of St. Simon," and of which short fragments only have been preserved in Coptic). The texts of all these have been published by Professor I. Guidi in his "Framenti Copti" (Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, III and IV, 1887-88), and "Di alcune pergamente Suidiche (dei Presbiteri della R. Acc. dei Lincei, Classe di Lettere morali, storie e filologiche, II, fasc. 7, 1893), and the translations in the same author's "Gli atti apocrifi degli Apostoli" (Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana, vol. II, pp. 1-66, 1888), and in his "Di alcune Pergamente," just mentioned. The same documents have been to no small extent supplemented from St. Petersburg manuscripts by Oscar v. Lemm, in his "Koptische apocryphe Apostelaschen" in "Mélanges Asiatiques tirés du Bulletin de l'Académie impériale de St. Pétersbourg," X, 1 and 2 [Bulletin, N. S., I and II (XXXIII and XXXV), 1890-92].

A section with the mention of two documents of more than usual interest: first, seven leaves of papyrus (Berlin P. S. 502) of the πράξεως Πηγον and a considerable portion of the Acta Pauli (Heidelberg Copt. Papyrus IV), in their original form (i.e. including the so-called "Acta Pauli et Theae"). Both of these documents have been published, translated into German, and thoroughly discussed by C. Schmidt ("Die alten Petrusakten," etc. in "Texte u. Unters." N. S., IX (1903)); "Acta Pauli," Leipzig, 1904, 2 vols. (vol. II, photographic reproduction of the Coptic text); 2d edit. (without photographic plates), Leipzig, 1905, 1 vol."


Post-Chalcedon Fathers.—Only a few of these had the honour of a place in Coptic literature. The separation of the Church of Egypt from the Catholic world was complete after the brief pontificate of Dioscorus (431), and, in spite of the efforts of the Byzantine Court to bring back Egypt to unity by forcing orthodox pontiffs on her and by other means of coercion, the native Egyptians stubbornly refused to allegiance to the "intruders," and from that time on would have nothing to do with the Greek world, the very name of which became an abomination to them. The chief exception was in favour of the works of Severus, the expelled Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch, who had taken refuge and died in Egypt. We may judge from what has come down to us in the various dialects. In Bohairic we have over forty complete homilies or sermons of St. John Chrysostom, several of St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Gregory Nazianzen, Theophilius of Alexandria, and St. Ephraem the Syrian, while in Sahidic we find a few complete writings and a very large number of fragments, some quite considerable, of the homiletical works of the same Fathers and of many others, like St. Athanasius, St. Cyprian, Proclus of Cyprus, Libanus, and Severianus of Gabala, Cyril of Jerusalem, Eusebius of Cesarea, and the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. Liberius of Rome and St. Ephraem are also represented by several fragments of sermons. We need not say that these writings are not always spurious, and that they can in no case be held up as models of translation.

The Bohairic part of this great mass of literature is still almost entirely undescribed, we might say unexplored. Two sermons of St. Ephraem have been published, one, on the adulterous woman of the Gospel, by Guidi (Bessarione, Ann. VII, vol. IV, Rome, 1893), the other (fragment) on the Transfiguration by Budge (Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Archaeology, IX, 1887, pp. 317 sqq.). Budge published also a large fragment of an encomium on Elijah the Tishbite attributed to St. John Chrysostom (Transactions of the Soc. Bibl. Arch., XXIV, 3rd ser. 1893, pp. 355 ff.).

also mention here a panegyric of St. George, Martyr, by Theodosius, Monophysite Bishop of Jerusalem (d. after 453), published and translated into English by E. A. Wallis Budge, "The Martyrdom and Miracles of St. George of Cappadocia" (Oriental Text Series, I, London, 1888). The compiler of the version of the epitaph of the Monophysite successor of Dossorius, which the Monophysite successors of Dossorius were involved accounts probably for the almost complete absence of their works from Coptic literature in general and in particular from this section. The only homilies or sermons we can record are, first, a sermon on the homily in the edition of the Victory of the Cross (already mentioned among the Apocrypha) and an encomium on St. Michael, by Theodosius (the latter published by Budge, "Three Encomiums", mentioned above), both in Bohairic and probably spurious; also a Sahidic fragment of a discourse pronounced by the same on the 11th of Thoth; secondly, a sermon on the Marriage at Cana, by Benjamin, in Bohairic; thirdly, the first sermon of Mark II on Christ's Burial, also in Bohairic. Rarer still are the sermons or homilies by other bishops of Egypt. The only two names worthy of mention are those of John, Bishop of Paralou (Burlos), and Bishop of Thebes, both of unknown century. To the latter, we have one short Sahidic fragment of a discourse on "St. Michael and the blasphematory books of the heretics that are read in the orthodox churches"; of the latter, several important fragments of homilies on the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, also in Sahidic. (See P. Botticher, "Memoires d'apres le manuscrit d'Alep, de S. Marcou".)

Church Discipline.—Among the various early collections of Apostolic precepts and church regulations which the Copts incorporated from the Greek into their native literature, we shall mention:

(1) The Didache.—It is true that up to the present this document is known to be extant in Coptic except in so far as chapters iv—xiv of the Apostolic Church Ordinance (see below) are a paraphrase of the first four chapters of the Didache as revealed to us by Bryennios. Towards the end of the last century, however, the first part of the Didache (chapter ii—iv), the so-called "Dum Verum," was discovered imbedded in Shenute's Arabic life published by Amelineau (Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Egypte chrétienne aux IVe et VVe siècles. Vie de Schénoûti, pp. 289 sqq.), in "Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire", vol. I, 1880, and although that insertion is in Arabic, like the rest of the Life, its grammar is so thoroughly Coptic that there can be no doubt that it, also, was translated from a Coptic original. For further detail see Iselin and Heusler, who were first to make the discovery ("Eine bisher unbekannte Version der ersten Teil der Apostellehre" in "Texte u. Unterschungen", XIII, I, 1895), and U. Benigni, who, three years later, quite independently of Iselin and Heusler, had reached the same conclusions [Didache Coptica: 'Durum viarum' recensio Copticæ monastica per arabicam versionem superser, 2d ed., Rome, 1889 (Reprint from "Bessarione", 1898)].

(2) The so-called Apostolic Church Ordinance, consisting of thirty-two canons, and extant both in Bohairic and in Sahidic. The former text was published and translated into English by H. Tattam (The Apostolic Constitutions of the BohairicManuscripts of the Apostles, London, 1848, pp. 1–30), and re-translated into Greek by P. Botticher (later P. de Lagarde) in Chr. C. Bunsen's "Analecta Ante-Nicena" (London, 1864, II, 435–460); the latter text was edited, without translation, both by P. de Lagarde, in his "Egyptiaca" (Göttingen, 1864, pp. 280–300), and by Bouriant, in "Les Canones Apostoliques de Clément de Rome": traduction en dialecte thénain d'après un manuscrit de la biblio théque du Patriarche Jacobite du Caire" [in "Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne", V (1884), pp. 202–206].

(3) The Egyptian Church Ordinance, consisting of thirty-two canons and extant, likewise, both in Bohairic and in Sahidic. The Bohairic was published and translated into English by H. Tattam (op. cit., pp. 31–92), and re-translated into Greek by P. Botticher (in Bunsen's "Analecta", pp. 461–477). The Sahidic was published by de Lagarde, "Egyptiaca", (pp. 218–256, can. 31–92) and Bouriant (op. cit., pp. 206–216). A translation into German by G. Stein dorf, from the edition of de Lagarde, is found in Achelis, "Die Kanones Hippolyti" (Leipzig, 1891, in "Texte u. Untersuchungen", VI, 4, pp. 39 sqq.).

An epitomized section of chapters 1–34 of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions both in Bohairic (published and translated into English by H. Tattam, op. cit., pp. 93–172) and in Sahidic (published by de Lagarde, "Egyptiaca", pp. 266–291, canons 63–78, and Bouriant, op. cit., VI, pp. 97–109; examined and translated into English from the Lagarde edition, by Leopold, "Säidische Auszüge", etc., in "Texte u. Untersuchungen", new series, 1, 6, Leipzig, 1894). According to Leopold (op. cit., pp. 6–9), this abstract, in which the liturgical sections are either curtailed or entirely omitted, has much in common with different versions per Hippolytum, in the choice of the selection, as already shown by Achelis, but also in point of style; the Coptic document is beyond doubt of Egyptian origin. Besides the above Bohairic and Sahidic texts, there is a fragment (de Lagarde, can. 72–78, 24) of another Sahidic version, which, according to Leopold (who copied it and translated it into German, op. cit.), belongs to an older recension. The text published by de Lagarde and Bouriant is derived from an older recension, with corruptions from the Greek Apostolic Constitutions as they were when the "Constitutiones per Hippolytum" were taken from them. On this theory of Leopold's, however, see Funk, "Das achte Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen in der Koptischen Ueberlieferung" in "Theologische Quartalschrift", 1904, pp. 429–447.

The above three documents, (2), (3), (4), form one collection of 78 canons, under the following title: "These are the Canons of our holy Fathers the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, which they established in the Churches". As a whole they are known, since de Lagarde's edition, as "Canones Ecclesiasticorum Apostolorum (4th, or 4°, Tractatus de Sacra, De Sacra Virginum Communione, etc.,)". The last, however, see Funk, "Das acht Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen in der Koptischen Ueberlieferung" in "Theologische Quartalschrift", 1904. The author gives variant readings from several manuscripts for each version, and in a long introduction he examines the mutual relationships of the various texts.

(5) Canones Apostolorum.—A Recension of Book VIII, canons 1–47, of the Apostolic Constitutions entitled: The Canons of the Church which the Apostles gave through Clement (Clementine) and the Apostles, London, 1848, pp. 1–30), and re-translated into Greek by P. Botticher (later P. de Lagarde) in Chr. C. Bunsen's "Analecta Ante-Nicena" (London, 1864, II, 451–460); the latter text was edited, without translation, both by P. de Lagarde, in his "Egyptiaca" (Göttingen, 1864, pp. 280–300), and by Bouriant, in "Les Canones Apostoliques de Clément de Rome": traduction en dialecte thénain d'après un manuscrit de la bibliothèque du Patriarche Jacobite du Caire" [in "Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne", V (1884), pp. 202–206].

(6) Canones Hippolyti.—A Sahidic fragment of the Paris collection (B. N. Copte 129 14 ff. 71–78) contains a series of canons under the title of "Canones of the Church which Hippolytus, Bishop of Rome, wrote". So far as the present writer knows, these
canons have not yet been the object of a critical study; nor does it seem that they were ever published.

(7) The Canons of Athanasius, or rather the Coptic writing which underlies the Copto-Arabic collection of 167 canons bearing that name, are undoubtedly one of the most important sources of church regulations and are likely rightly attributed by the tradition to St. Athanasius of Alexandria, and, in that case, perhaps to be identified with the "Commandments of Christ" which the Chronicle of John of Nikiu attributes to this Father of the Church and the "Canons of Apa Athanasius" mentioned in the catalogue of the library of a Theban monastery, which catalogue dates from about A. D. 600. The Sahidic text, unfortunately not complete, was published and translated (along with the Arabic text by Riedel) by Crum from a British Museum papyrus (sixth or seventh century) and two fragments of a manuscript on parchment (tenth century) preserved in the Borgia Collection (Naples) and the Rainer collection (Vienna), in Riedel and Crum's "Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria," London, 1904. To this work we are indebted for the information contained in this brief notice. Although this interesting document is a pure Egyptian production, there is but little doubt that it was originally written in Greek.

(8) The Canons of St. Basil, preserved in a Turin papyrus broken into many hopelessly disconnected fragments, which Fr. Rossi published and translated although he could not determine to what writing they belonged. The papyrus (Coptic de Muza, II, fasc. II, fac. IV) of late those fragments were identified by Crum, who, despairing of establishing their original order, arranged them for convenience according to the Arabic recension published by Riedel ("Die Kirchenrechtquellen des Patriarchats Alexandriens," Leipzig, 1900, pp. 231) and translated them into English ("Coptic Version of the Canons of St. Basil" in "Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology," XXVI (1904), pp. 81-92).

History.—Among the historical productions of Coptic literature, none of which can be highly commended, we shall mention the following:

(1) An Ecclesiastical History in twelve books, extending from a period we cannot determine, to the re-establishment of Timothy Ælurus as patriarch of Egypt. If we suppose that in this, as often in similar works, the author continued his narrative until his own times, it would seem almost certain that he wrote it in Greek. At all events the prominence given to the affair of the Church of Alexandria shows him an Egyptian, from his tone it is clear that he professed Monophysitism. Like so many other Coptic literary productions, the Ecclesiastical History reached us in the shape of fragments only. They are all in Sahidic, and once belonged to two different copies of the same work, or perhaps to two copies of two works very similar in scope and method. Both copies (or works) contain a number of passages translated (more frequently paraphrased, sometimes abridged) from the "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius. On the other side the Coptic work was heavily laid under contribution by Severus of Ashmunein in his "History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria." Some of the fragments were published by Zögera in "Catalogus Byzantinarum Codicorum," with a Latin translation, some by O. v. Lomm, "Koptische Fragmente zur Patriarchengeschichte Alexandriens" ("Memories de l'Acad. Imp. de St. Péetersb.," VIIe sér., XXXVI, 11, St. Petersburg, 1888; and "Bulletin de l'Acad. Imp. de St. Péetersb.," 1896, IV, p. 257, in both cases with German translation; the others by Crum, "Eusebius and Coptic Church Histories" in "Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Archeology," XXIV, 1902, with English translation).


(3) The Acts of the Council of Ephesus, of which we have considerable fragments in a Sahidic text in the Borgia and Paris collections. The fragments of the former collection were published by Zoega, "Catalogus," pp. 272-280, with a Latin translation; those of the latter collection by Bouriant, "Actes du concile d'Ephese: texte Copte publié et traduit" ("Memories publiés par la Mission archéol. française au Caire," VIII, Paris, 1892). The Paris fragments have also been translated into German and thoroughly discussed by Kraaz, with the help of C. Schmidt, "Koptische Acten zum Ephesischen Konzil vom Jahre 431 (Texte u. Untersuchungen, new series, XI, 2, Berlin, 1904). Kriezler thinks that this recension is the work of an Egyptian and, in substance, it is the best representative of the Greek documents already known. These fragments contain, however, additional information not entirely devoid of historical value.

(4) The so-called "Mémores de Dioscorus," a Monophysite collection of the Acts of St. Dioscorus of Chalcedon. It is in the shape of a Bohairic panegyric of Macarius, Bishop of Tkhlu, delivered by Dioscorus during his exile at Gangrie in presence of the Egyptian delegates who had come to announce to him the death of Macarius. The publication of this curious document with a French translation and commentary was begun by Revillout under the title of "Récits de Dioscore exilé à Gangrie sur le concile de Chalcédoine" ("Revue Egyptologique," I, pp. 187-189, and II, pp. 21-25, Paris, 1880, 1882), published and translated into French by E. Amelineau, "Monuments pour servir" ("Mémories publiés," etc., IV, Paris, 1884, pp. 92-161). As against Revillout, Amelineau asserts the spuriousness of these Acts. Almost immediately after the latter's publication, Krall published and translated some Sahidic fragments which exhibited a better recension of the same document, and show that the Bohairic version was translated from the Sahidic. In disagreement with Amelineau, Krall thinks it more probable that the Memoirs of Dioscorus were originally written in Greek, and sees no reason to doubt their genuineness ("Koptische Beitritte zur ägyptischen Kirchengeschichte" in "Mittheilungen aus der sammlung der Papyrus Erzerzog Rainer," IV, p. 67, Vienna, 1888). In 1903 Crum published copies by A. des Rivières of ten leaves of a papyrus codex, once a part of the Harris collection, now lost. Three of those leaves belonged to the panegyric of Macarius, while the others were part of a collection of Dioscorus, of which a summary was published by Nau ("Histoire de Dioscorus, patriarche d'Alexandrie écrité par son disciple Théophilète" in "Journal Asiatique," Série X, t. 1, pp. 5-108, 241-310). Nau thinks that the Syriac and Coptic recensions of the life are independent of each other, which points to a Greek original for that document and probably also for the panegyric ("Notes sur quelques fragments copiés relatifs à Dioscore, ibid., t. II, pp. 181-4).

(5) A correspondence in Bohairic between Peter Mongus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Acacia, Patriarch of Constantinople. It includes the Henoton which Zeno issued at the suggestion of Acacia. It was published in a French translation by E. Revillout, "Le premier schisme de Constantinople" ("Revue des questions historiques," XXII (1877), Paris, pp. 83-134), and by Amelineau, "Lettres de Pierre Mongus et
The Euchologium was edited by Raphael Tuki in three books under both Coptic and Arabic titles, which we translate as follows: (1) “Book of the three Anaphoras, namely, those of St. Basil, St. Gregory the Theologian, and St. Cyril, with the other holy prayers”, Rome, Propaganda, 175 pp.—Morning Incense, Evening Incense, and Morning Incense with the prærior tempóris thereto; Mass, including the three Anaphoras; Prayers Before and After Meals, Blessing of the Water, and the Ordo Renovationis Caelestis. (2) “Book containing all the holy prayers”, ibid., 1761-2, 2 vols.—Concerning Religious Habit, Enthronization of Bishops, Consecration of myron (Holy Chrim) and Churches (676 pages); II, Consecration of Altars and Sacred Vessels, Blessing of Church Vestments, Sacred Pictures, Relics, Consecration of Churches (if rebuilt) and Baptismal Fonts; Blessing of the Boards used for the Hëzik (Holy of holies); Reconciliation of the same if replaced because decayed or if desecrated; Special Services for the Epiphany, Maudy Thursday, Pentecost, the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul; Reconciliation of persons guilty of apostasy and other special crimes; Blessing of the water, Wine bitten by a wolf, etc. (515 pages). (3) “Book of the Service of the Holy Mysteries, Funerals of the Dead, Canticles, and one month of the Katameros” (this last item, a reduction of the work of the same name described hereunder, is printed here for convenience). (4) as “Missale Copto-Arabice”, “Pentecostale Copto-Arabice”, and “Rituale Copto-Arabice”, although these designations do not appear on the title pages nor elsewhere in the books. Neither does the name of the editor (Tuki) appear.

The edited Missal has a slightly different arrangement, both in Coptic and Arabic, under the title: “Euchologium of the Alexandria Church”, Cairo, Catholic Press of St. Mark, Era of the Martyrs 1614 (A. d. 1898). Another Egyptian edition (Jacobite!) of the Missale (Cairo, 1887) is mentioned by Brightman (Liturgies Eastern and Western, II, p. lxvi), and a Jacobite “genuine” edition of the “Euchologium [complete?] from manuscript sources” (Cairo, 1902), by Crum (Reaencyclopaide für protestantische Theologie, 3d edition, XII, p. 810). The Missal edited by Tuki does not differ from the oldest Coptic Liturgical manuscript of the Very Church, for reasons stated above, except that the names of Dioscorus, Severus of Antioch, and Jacobus Baradseus have been expunged from the dipytches, and that of the pope added to them, mention of Chaledon introduced after that of Ephesus, and the Filoque inserted in the Creed. As for his description of the Coptic and Rituale, they contain nothing but everything that is essential and common to the majority of good codices. Naturally the latter vary both in the arrangement and in the selection of prayers according to their origin and date of compilation. Tuki’s Ordo Communiun, and St. Basil’s Anaphora, with rubrics in Latin only, were reprinted by J. A. Assemani, “Missale Alexadrinum”; pars II, pp. 1-90, in “Codex Liturgicus”, VII (Rome, 1751). John, Marquess of Bute, published also an edition of the Morning Incense, Ordo Communiun (from Tuki’s text with some additions), and St. Basil’s Anaphora (from Tuki’s). “Ordo Copto-Arabic of the Copti Morning Service for the Lord’s Day” (London, 1882), pp. 35 sqq. (See Brightman, op. et loc. cit.)

There has been no complete translation. The Ordo Communiun and the three Anaphoras have been translated into (1) Latin, (a) from an Arabic (Vienenna) manuscript by Vercor; (b) the Ordo Coptici Gregorii Theologi, Cyrillici Alexandrini ex Arabico converse” (Vienna, 1604—reprinted in “Magnus Bibliotheca Patrum”, Paris, 1654, t. VI); (2) from a Paris Copti manuscript by Renaudet, “Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio” (2 vols., Paris; Frankfort, 1847); (3) English, (a) from “an old manuscript” by Malan, “Original Documents of the Coptic Church,” V, the
Divine Εὐχέρειαν" (London, 1857); (b) from a manuscript now in the library of Lord Crawford, by Rodwell, "The Liturgies of St. Basil, St. Gregory and St. Cyril from a Coptic manuscript of the thirteenth century." (London, 1870). The Ordo Communis and St. Basil’s Psalter are in Latin. The Psalms and Gospels are in Arabic (op. et loc. cit.); in English by Rouaud's Latin, by Neile, "History of the Eastern Church" (London, 1850), introduction, pp. 381 sqq., 532 sqq. The Ordo Communis and St. Cyril's Anaphora (from Bodleian manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) by Brightman (op. cit., pp. 104-186). Most Incense, Ordo Communis, and St. Basil's Anaphora, by John, Marquess of Bute (op. cit.).

Horarium (Arab. Agniñah, Eqbiñah), corresponding to our Breviary, edited by R. Tuki under the following title (Coptic and Arabic): "A Book of the seven prayers of the day and of the night" (Rome, 1750), generally referred to as "Diurnius Alexandrinum Copto-Arabicum" [Morning (Prime), Terce, Sext, None, Evening (Vespers), Sleep (Complin), Prayer of the veil (extra-canonical)], Midnight (Matins). This book is intended for private recitation and gives but an imperfect idea of the office as performed in the monasteries even in the churches where a numerous clergy is in attendance.

Katamarios (Gr. Karà μετά, Arab. Kutamrûd) contains the portions of the Psalms, Acts, Catholic Epistles, St. Paul's Epistles, and the Gospels which are read between the monastic Hours. It is divided into three volumes: (1) from Thoth to Mechir; (2) from the beginning of Lent to Pentecost inclusive; (3) from Pachon to the Epagomenes days which the Copts called the "little month" or in Arabic, the "forgotten days." The Katamarios for the two weeks from Palm Sunday to Easter Sunday has been published under the Coptic and Arabic title of "Book of the Holy Pasch according to the rite of the Alexandrine Church" (Catholic Press of St. Mark, Cairo, 1899). This portion of the Katamarios contains numerous lessons from the Old Testament (see Versions of the Bible). Its current text is attributed to Gabriele I Tureik, seventieth patriarch (d. 1145). Mai (Scriptorum vetera nova collectio, IV, Rome, 1831, pp. 15-34) gives a table of the Gospels for feasts and fasts and for Saturdays, Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays of the year. Malan (Original Documents of the Coptic Church, IV, London, 1853) gives the Gospels and versicles for Vespers, Matins, and Mass for the year. De Lagarde tabulated the lessons and Psalms from Athyr to Mechir, and from Epiph to the "little month", also those for Lent and the Ninevites' fast, for the Sundays of Eastertide, and for the principal feasts. Abhandlungen d. histor.-philol. K. d. U. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, XXIV, 1879).

The Psalmodia.—This is a collection of poetical compositions in honour of Our Lord and the Blessed Virgin, the saints and the angels, sung during the various services, especially at Vespers, Matins, and Prime. They form two distinct systems, one of which, called Théotokia, is most elaborate, and, as its name indicates, deals exclusively with the Mother of God. The other, the Doxologia, extends to all saints. A compendium of this book has been published by Tuki, under the title "Book of the Holy Theotokia and Katastox of the month of Choia" (Rome, 1746), 341 pp. The book is the subject of an interesting study by Mallon, "Les Thêotokia ou office de la Sainte Vierge dans le rite copte" in "Revue de l'Orient Chrétien" (1904), IX, pp. 17-51.

The Antiphonary (Arab. Andinîrû, Dînarray), a collection of anthems in honour of the saints. The composition or the arrangement of this book is attributed to Gabriel I Tureik. (See Manual.)

Of the Sahidic recension (or recensions) of the Egyptian Liturgy we have fragments from the various books, which books seem to have been the same as in the Bohairic recension. The most interesting of those relics belong to the Liturgy proper or Mass, to the Anaphoras principally. Of these the Churches of Upper Egypt apparently had a large number, for we have portions of those of St. Cyril, St. Gregory, St. Pachom, St. James, and St. Macarius, besides others not yet identified. Some have been published and translated by Giorgi (Lat. tr.), Krall (Ger. tr.), and Hyvernat (Lat. tr. only). For the titles of the publications and further information on nature of fragments published, see Brightman, "Liturgies East and Western" (1889), pp. Ixxxvi-lxxxix. There are also important relics of the Dionysius, probably enough to reconstruct that book entirely (one fragment published by Giorgi, "Fragmentum Evangelii St. Joannis" etc., Rome, 1789, a very large number of fragments of the Katameros, lectionaries, and not a few hymns (some of them particular rather than liturgical) which of late have aroused the interest of students of Coptic poetry see Junker, "Koptische Poesie des 10. Jahrhunderts" in "Orients Christianus" (1906), VI, pp. 319-410; with literature on the subject complete and up-to-date). The fragments in British Museum and Leiden University collections have been published in full in the catalogues of Cruze (pp. 144-161, 969-978) and Pleye-Boeser. A complete edition and translation of the Sahidic liturgy is being prepared (1909) by the writer of this article for the "Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium", V. H. Costen.—Coptic was revived, and Coptic liturgy was translated into Arabic by Abu Ishaq ibn al-Assal, for having realized the uselessness of composing, as was done before, dictionaries extending to the whole literature. This remark would hardly be intelligible if the translating of the non-liturgical part of Coptic literature had not been then completed, much less if it had not yet begun. Those early translations include not only the works already referred to in the preceding section of this article, but a good many more now lost in the Coptic version or translated anew from the Greek or the Syriac originals. Among the latter are quite a number of Nestorian writers, expurgated when necessary. But the glory of the Copto-Arabic literature lies in its original writings. We have already mentioned (see above, V.) the three historians of the Coptic Church, Severus of Ashmúnein, Eutychius, and Al-Makín. The authors of new Canons are: Christodulós, sixty-sixth patriarch, 1047-77; Cyrilus II, sixty-seventh patriarch, 1078-92; Macarius, sixty-eighth patriarch, 1094-1106; Gabriel, seventieth patriarch, 1106-12; Cyrilus III, 1131-45; Cyrilus III Ibn Lalaq, seventy-fifth patriarch, 1235-43, and Michael, Metropolitan of Damietta, twelfth century. Collectors of Canons: Abu Sohit Ibn Bâná, eleventh cent., Macarius, fourteenth cent. (if not to be identified with the Simeon Ibn Maqárá, mentioned by Abu ʿI-Barakát)—Compilers of Nomo-Canons: Michael of Damietta, twelfth cent., Abu ʿI-Faddaib Ibn al-Assal, fourteenth cent., etc. (see Riedel, "Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien", Leipzig, 1900).—Hagiographers are represented by Peter, Bishop of Melig, twelfth and thirteenth centuries; credited by Abu ʿI-Barakát with the composition of the rimasákâ, a liturgical, and Michael, also Bishop of Melig, fifteenth cent., to whom the same book is also attributed (because he revised and completed the work of his predecessor). Severus of Ashmúnein, Peter of Melig,
Abū Isḥāq Ibn al-'Asāṣī and his brother Abū 'l-Fadā'il Ibn al-'Asāṣī are the chief representatives of theology, as Severus of Ashmunein and Abū 'l-Farag Ibn al-'Asāṣī, thirteenth cent., are of Scriptural studies, and John Abū Zakariya Ibn Sāba and Gabriel V, eighty-eth of the Coptic Church. The Testament of the City of Egypt, of the eleventh century, of liturgy: John’s treatise “Gauhatr an-nafṣāsah” (Pecorous Gem) has been published ( Cairo, 1902).—For the grammarians and lexicographers, several of whom have already been mentioned in one connection or another, see the excellent study of A. Mallon, S.J., “Une école de savants Égyptiens au moyen âge” (Dehlinger de l’École Orientale de l’université Saint Joseph”, I, pp. 109-131, II, pp. 213-264. There remains to mention the great eclectic encyclopedia of the Coptic Church, the “Lamp of Darkness and Illumination of the Church Service” of Shams al-Rūsah Abū ‘l-Barakāt Ibn Khīb (1273-1363). This stupendous work sums up, so to speak, the four centuries of liturgical activity we have just reviewed. (See Riedel, op. cit., pp. 15-80.)

Coptic Literature—QUATREMIERE, Recherches sur la langue de l’Égypte (Paris, 1818); RENARDIN, Bases de la bibliographie: Copte (Paris, 1895); Literature chrétienne de l’Égypte récente. (Berlin, 1890).


In the Coptic Church, the “Testament of the Lord” (or Hailman in 1899. H. Achelis strenuously maintained that the “Canones Hippolyti” are the oldest in the series and were written early in the third century; on the contrary, according to him, the other documents of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions being the latest development. Von Funk maintained the same order of documents as Achelis, only inverting their sequence, beginning with Book VIII of the Apostolic Constitutions, and ending with the “Canones Hippolyti.” Gradually, however, Funk’s thesis seems to be winning almost universal acceptance, namely that Book VIII of the Apostolic Constitutions was written about 400, and the other documents are modifications and developments of the same. The Coptic Church, in particular having arisen in Monophysite Egyptian circles between the years 400 and 500.

Cooper and Macken, The Testament of the Lord (London, 1903); Wordsworth, The Ministry of Grace (London, 1901); von Funk, Das Testament der Hera von Coele-Syria (1907); Schriften (1901); BAUMGARTEN, Nichtegeb. Paralleltext zum Buche der Ap. Const. in Oriens Chr. (1901); Binnie, C. SHAHAB, Pathology (Freiburg im Br., 1905), 353-357.

J. P. ARENDSEN.

Egyptians, Gospel according to the. See Apocrypha.

Eichendorff, JOSEF KARL BENEDIKT, FREIHERR VON, “the last champion of romanticism”, b. 10 March, 1778, in the Upper-Silesian castle of Lubowitz, near Ratibor; d. at Neisse, 26 Nov., 1857. Till his thirteenth year he remained on the parental estate under the care of a Clerical Tutor; when fourteen he was sent to the University of Breslau where he attended the Mariagolden gymnasium, at that time still Catholic. During those student years (1804) were written the first of Eichendorff’s extant poems; no doubt his poetical talent had already been awakened in his patriotic home. In the spring of 1805 he matriculated at the University of Halle. Here, under the influence of Professor Steffens, he became a follower of the Romantic School of poetry, and at the same time became acquainted with Calderon, some of whose plays were performed by the ducal company of Wei mar in the neighboring town of Lauchstädt. In later years he translated several autors socrates in the truly poetical language. Eichendorff’s development was even more strongly influenced by his sojourn in Heidelberg (1807), where the triumvirate of romanticism, Göres, Armin, and Brentano, in the brave time of the “first siedler Zeitung”, took the field against pedantry and philistinism. With the two last-named the young poet did not then cultivate a closer acquaintance—he certainly did so in 1809 at Berlin—but the lectures of the great Göres made a deep impression on him. Recommended by Count Lichtenberg, Göres’ intimate friend, his first poems were printed in Ast’s periodical, among them the famous song “In einem kühlen Grunde”. The
first of his larger works, the novel "Ahnung und Gegenwart", was written partly at home, in Lubowitz, where he spent several years after the completion of his studies, partly in Vienna, where he had gone to qualify himself for the Austrian civil service; his friendly relations with Fr. Schlegel and his adopted son, the painter Veit, kept awake the poet's romantic enthusiasm.

In 1815, when Prussia and Austria were preparing for the War of Liberation, Eichendorff abandoned his poetry, his professional studies, and his preparation for the civil service, and joined the famous volunteers of Lutzow at Breslau. Again, in 1817, when Napoleon had returned to Elba, he followed the call to arms, although he had just married (Oct., 1814) Luise von Larisch, and entered Paris with the conquerors. It was only in 1816, when the chivalric baron left the army and entered the Prussian civil service as a lawyer at Breslau. The next three years passed in quiet seclusion; their principal literary production is the story "Das Mor- morbild". He received his first appointment in 1820 on the Catholic board of education at Danzig; there he took a lively interest in the restoration of the Marienburg, a house of the Teutonic Order; later (1844) he wrote its history at the request of the Government. His tragedy "Der letzte Held von Marienburg" was suggested by this circumstance. At the same time appeared his most popular production, "Aus dem Leben eines Taugenichts". In the year 1831 he was called to Berlin as councillor in the ministry of public worship. In this high office he found many opportunities to be useful to the Church; but he also met with difficulties under a government which did not shrink from imprisoning the Archbishop of Cologne, Clemens August. When Eichendorff, who was a staunch Catholic, was asked to defend the measures of the Government in public, he asked for his dismissal, which, however, was not granted till 1844. The succeeding years were passed mostly in Berlin, where the poet was occupied more with literary and historical than with poetical work; after the death of his wife (1835) he lived with his family in Neisse. Two years later, having finished his swan-song, the epic "Lucius", he died.

What has estabilished the fame of Eichendorff as a poet and has given him a place not only in literature, but also in the heart of the people, are his simple but heartfelt songs. Many of them have become Volkslieder (popular songs) in the truest sense of the word; almost all are fitted for singing owing to their spirit and their melodious language. There is hardly another German poet who has found so many composers for his songs. The great lyrical talent which made Eichendorff the master of the short story, "Aus dem Leben eines Taugenichts", "Das Mormorbild", "Schmuage" (Erlaune); his "Durande", was prejudicial to the novel "Ahnung und Gegenwart", and to the longer story "Dichter und ihre Gesellen", inasmuch as the action is neglected for discursive discussions. Lack of compression and of action has also been censured in the two dramas, "Ezelin von Romano" and "Der letzte Held von Marienburg". Still, "Ezelin"; the tragedy of a consuming pride ruined through the very abuse of its gigantic strength, no less than "Der letzte Held", in which Flauen fails on account of his excesses of magnanimity and bravery, amply fits the dramatic talent of the poet. His best comedy "Die Freier" has been found very well adapted to the stage. In his later years Eichendorff devoted his genius more to the history of literature. His history of the poetical literature of Germany (Kempten, 1807), especially the description of romanticism, outsold as it is by one of its best representatives, is of lasting value, also the sketch of the German novel in the eighteenth century. His solid character and his strong religious faith raise "the champion of romanticism" far above his fellow-poets. Not only did his genius never lead him away from the duties which religion and custom imposed upon him, but he also knew how to distinguish between poetical ideal and reality, and to avoid the underlying wish of truth to which the earlier romanticism had succumbed.

Eichstätt (Eystadium, Dioecese of (Eystettensis or Aiystetensis), in Bavaria, lies north of the Romanic Alps, and is suffragan to Bamberg. This diocese was founded by St. Boniface, who consecrated his nephew St. Willibald (born 700 of an Anglo-Saxon royal family) first as abbot- and regional bishop (741), and then (743) circumscribed and organized the diocese. Willibald called to his aid his brother Wunibald, who, together with St. Boniface, had been active on the German mission of Thuringia, and also his sister St. Walburga. He erected for them the monastery of Heidenheim on the Hahnmann, where the saintly pair laboured most effectively and found their resting-place (Wunibald d. 761, Walburga d. 779). Willibald, well known for his knowledge of the Christian Orient and as a pilgrim to Palestine, founded in Eichstätt a flourishing school over which he presided as magister. He died in 781. The unbroken series of his successors down to the present time (1909) counts seventy-five names. Bishop Erchenbach, who was consecrated Bishop of Eichstätt, acquired sovereignty (under Bishop Hartwig in 1220), and after various struggles became, from the fourteenth century, independent rulers over a territory which at one time comprised 437 square miles with 56,000 subjects. In the "secularization" of 1803 these domains were made over to Bavaria.

There were many illustrious incumbents of the See of Eichstätt. Bishop Gregorius (965-989) was admired as a poet, musician, scholar, and orator. Bishop Heribert (1022-1042) was a patron of the cathedral school. Gundekar II (1057-1075) rebuilt the cathedral; composed the Pontilium, in which the lives of his predecessors, the "Vita Pontilium Eystettensium", and many other subjects, especially liturgical, are treated. This work, still preserved in the original (Codex M), is of great value for the history of the diocese. Gundekar is venerated as a saint. His predecessor was Gebhard (1042-1057), the chamberlain and friend of Henry III. Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII, did not rest until this emperor allowed the reluctant Gebhard to assume the papal dignity. He was the first pope whom in a long time the clergy and people of Rome had chosen freely. As Victor II (1055-
1057) he was friendly to reforms, an extremely energetic man, and saintly in his life. Had he lived longer he would have taken rank among the greatest of the popes; he died in 1057 at the age of thirty-nine. Bishops Eberhard I (1049-1112), Ulrich II (1112-1123), Gebhard II (1125-1149), and Otto (1132-1185) vigorously inaugurated reforms that were perfected and confirmed in the diocesan synod of 1180. A similar activity was displayed by Bishops Henry IV (1246-1259), Reimboto (1279-1297), and Philipp von Rathsmahausen (1306-1322). The last-named was a prolific writer, patron of the cathedral school, and by synods tried to raise clergy and people to a higher level. Bishop (1354-1365), for instance, built the Willibaldsburg, provided for the material welfare of the clergy, and protected them against the attacks of laity, nobility, and princes (Constitutio Bertoldiana). On all sides we meet with evidence of his regulating and stimulating zeal (Synodal statutes of 1554). The Western Schism left its traces on the diocese. Bishop Johann III von Eich (1446-1464), a saintly man, did all in his power to avert them. He reformed the monasteries, organized the instruction of the clergy, issued pastoral directions, protected vigorous conduct of the Church, and attracted the interest of many among him the Humanist Albert of Eyb). Having been, before his election, chancellor of the emperor and his representative at the Council of Basle, he continued as bishop to serve the State on diplomatic missions of great importance. Thus, he represented the emperor in the congress of princes which Pius II called at Mantua. His friend and successor, Wilhelm von Reichenau (1464-1486), the tutor of Maximilian I, was a statesman, diplomat, and patron of the fine arts, but also a bishop who walked in the footsteps of his predecessor and left after him the memory of a brilliant administration. In 1480 he made a visitation of the whole diocese. The original records of this visitation, the oldest thus far known, are still extant, and give us an interesting picture of religious life in the Middle Ages, in which, however, there are not lacking deep shadows. His successors, the cultured Gabriel von Eyb (1496-1535) and the noble Moritz von Huttten (1539-1552), were men who fully understood the critical situation and set themselves against the perilous innovations of their time, but they could not prevent the imperial cities of Nuremberg and Weissenburg, the margraves of Ansbach and the palgroves of the Rhine, from annexing a large part of the territory of the diocese in order to restore their finances by means of church property, and from forcing the people to apostatize. Bishop Moritz gathered about him men of ability (Vitus von Ammerbach, Coehlause, and convoked (1548) a diocesan synod whose records exhibit the spreading spiritual desolation.

Bishop Martin von Schauberg (1560-1590) founded the first Trinitarian seminary (1564) one year after the close of the council, and secured for it the assistance of its teachers (Robert Turner, Peter Stifter, Frederick Staphylus). Bishop Konrad von Germingen (1593-1612) rebuilt the Willibaldsburg, founded the "Hortus Eystettenensis," a garden well known to all European botanist and ordered frequent visits of the diocese, made the cathedral a lyceum and a fine church, in which the theologians are Johann Eck, P. Canisius, Gregory of Valencia, Salmeron, Jacob Gretser; among its canonists: Reifenstuel, Pirching, Schmalzgrueber; among its jurists, Wiegules Kreitzmayer, Ad. Ickstatt; among its philosophers, scientists, and mathematicians: Johann Reuchlin, Conrad Celtis, Christoph Scheiner, Caspar Seipppus, Philipp and Petrus Apian, Fuchs Leonhard, and others. Early in the nineteenth century the university was transferred to Landshut, thence to Munich.

The most important monastery of the diocese in olden times was the Benedictine abbey founded by St. Willibald in 710 and out of which grew the diocese. At the end of the tenth century it became the cathedral chapter with secular canons. Heidenheim was at first a double monastery, founded by St. Willibald; it was changed (800) to a chapter of canons; later it became again a Benedictine chapter with the monks moved to Herrieden and erected there, under Abbot Dietker and through the benevolence of Charlemagne, a new monastery, which was changed to a chapter of canons in 885 and secularized in 1584. The nuns moved from Heidenheim to Morbach, taking with them some of the relics of St. Walburga, which were lost in the "secularization" of the sixteenth century. St. Walburga (Benedictine nuns) in Eichstatt (founded 870) was endowed in 1035 by Count Leodegar and reorganized by Bishop Heribert. It is yet flourishing despite its temporary seculariza-
EIMHIN

EINHARD (less correctly EINGHARD), historian, born c. 770 in the district watered by the River Main in the eastern part of the Frankish Empire; d. 14 March, 840, at Seligenstadt.

His earliest training he received at the monastery of Fulda, where he showed such unusual mental powers that Abbot Baugulf sent him to the court of Charles-magne. His education was completed at the Palace School, where he was fortunate enough to count among his masters the great Alcuin, who bears witness to his remarkable talent in mathematics and architecture, and also to the fact that, in spite of his unattractive person, he was among the emperor's most trusted advisers. Charlemagne gave...
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of robbers who coveted the treasures offered at the shrine by devout pilgrims, but during the next eighty years the place was never without one or more hermits emulating St. Meinrad’s example. One of them, named Eberhard, previously Provost of Strasburg, erected a monastery and church there, of which he became first abbot. The church was miraculously consecrated, so the legend runs, in 948, by Christ Himself assisted by the Four Evangelists, St. Peter, and St. Gregory the Great. This event was investigated and confirmed by Pope Leo VIII and subsequently ratified by many of his successors, the last ratification being by Pius VI in 1793, who confirmed the acts of all his predecessors. In 965 Gregory, the third Abbot of Einsiedeln, was made a prince of the empire by Otto I, and his successors continued to enjoy the same dignity up to the cessation of the empire in the beginning of the nineteenth century. In 1274 the abbey, with its dependencies, was created an independent principality by Rudolf of Hapsburg, over which the abbot exercised temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction. It continued independent until the French Revolution. The abbey is noted for its name is termed nullius honorum, the abbot having quasi-episcopal authority over ten parishes served by the monks and comprising nearly twenty thousand souls. For the learning and piety of its monks Einsiedeln has been famous for a thousand years, and many saints and scholars have lived within its walls. The study of letters, printing, and music have greatly flourished there, and the abbey has contributed largely to the glory of the Benedictine Order. It is true that discipline declined somewhat in the fifteenth century and the rule became relaxed, but Ludovicus II, a monk of St. Gall who was Abbot of Einsiedeln 1526–44, succeeded in restoring the stricter observance. In the sixteenth century the religious disturbances caused by the spread of the Protestant Reformation in Switzerland were a source of trouble for some time. Zwingli himself was at Einsiedeln for a while, and used the opportunity for protesting against the famous pilgrimages, but the storm passed over and the abbey was left in peace. Abbot Augustine I (1600–29) was the leader of the movement which resulted in the erection of the Swiss Congregation of the Order of St. Benedict in 1602, and he also did much for the establishment of unrelaxed observance in the abbey and for the promotion of a high standard of scholarship and learning amongst his monks. The pilgrimages, just mentioned, which have never ceased since the days of St. Meinrad, have tended to make Einsiedeln the rival even of Rome, Loreto, and Compostela, and constitute one of the features for which the abbey is chiefly celebrated. The pilgrims number from 150,000 to 200,000 annually, from all parts of Catholic Europe. The miraculous statue of Our Lady, originally set up by St. Meinrad, and later
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in 1274, the abbey, with its dependencies, was created an independent principality by Rudolf of Hapsburg, over which the abbot exercised temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction. It continued independent until the French Revolution. The abbey is noted for its name is termed nullius honorum, the abbot having quasi-episcopal authority over ten parishes served by the monks and comprising nearly twenty thousand souls. For the learning and piety of its monks Einsiedeln has been famous for a thousand years, and many saints and scholars have lived within its walls. The study of letters, printing, and music have greatly flourished there, and the abbey has contributed largely to the glory of the Benedictine Order. It is true that discipline declined somewhat in the fifteenth century and the rule became relaxed, but Ludovicus II, a monk of St. Gall who was Abbot of Einsiedeln 1526–44, succeeded in restoring the stricter observance. In the sixteenth century the religious disturbances caused by the spread of the Protestant Reformation in Switzerland were a source of trouble for some time. Zwingli himself was at Einsiedeln for a while, and used the opportunity for protesting against the famous pilgrimages, but the storm passed over and the abbey was left in peace. Abbot Augustine I (1600–29) was the leader of the movement which resulted in the erection of the Swiss Congregation of the Order of St. Benedict in 1602, and he also did much for the establishment of unrelaxed observance in the abbey and for the promotion of a high standard of scholarship and learning amongst his monks. The pilgrimages, just mentioned, which have never ceased since the days of St. Meinrad, have tended to make Einsiedeln the rival even of Rome, Loreto, and Compostela, and constitute one of the features for which the abbey is chiefly celebrated. The pilgrims number from 150,000 to 200,000 annually, from all parts of Catholic Europe. The miraculous statue of Our Lady, originally set up by St. Meinrad, and later
enthroned in the little chapel erected by Eberhard, is the object of their devotion. This chapel stands within the great abbey church, in much the same way as the Holy House at Loreto, encausted in marbles and precious woodwork, elaborately decorated, though it has been so often restored, rebuilt, and adorned with the offerings of pilgrims, that it may be doubted whether much of the original sanctuary still remains. The fourteenth of September and the thirteenth of October are the chief pilgrimage days, the former being the anniversary of the miraculous consecration of Eberhard's basilica, and the latter that of the translation of St. Meinrad's relics from Reichenaus to Einsiedeln in 1039. The millenary of St. Meinrad was kept there with great splendour in 1861. The great church has been many times rebuilt, the last time by Abbot Maurus between the years 1704 and 1710, and one of its chief treasures now is a magnificent corona presented by Napoleon III when he made a pilgrimage there in 1865. The library, which dates from 946, contains nearly fifty thousand volumes and many priceless MSS. The work of the monks is divided chiefly between prayer, the confessional, and study. At pilgrimage times the number of confessions heard is very large. The community numbers about one hundred priests and forty lay brothers, and attached to the abbey is a seminary and a college for about two hundred and sixty boys, both of which are taught by the monks, who also direct six convents of nuns. In 1854 a colony was sent to America from Einsiedeln to work amongst the native Indian tribes. From St. Meinrad's Abbey, Indiana, which was the first settlement, daughter-houses were founded, and these in 1881 were formed into the Swiss-American Congregation, which comprised (in 1906) seven monasteries and nearly four hundred religious. Dom Thomas Bossart, the fifty-third Abbot of Einsiedeln and formerly dean of the monastery, was elected in 1905.

Gallia Christiana (Paris, 1781), V; Album Benedictinum (St. Vincent's, Pennsylvania, 1809); Migne, Dict. des Ab-

burgomaster of Stuttgart, Eisengrein matriculated as student of jurisprudence at the University of Ingolstadt, 25 May, 1553, but before a year had passed he was at the University of Vienna, where he took the degree of Master of Arts in May, 1554. During the tolerant rule of Ferdinand I, Eisengrein, though still a Protestant, became in 1555 professor of oratory and, two years later, of physics at the University of Vienna, a Catholic institution. Though his Catholic surroundings and especially his frequent intercourse with the Jesuits of Vienna may have had great influence in bringing about his acceptance of the Catholic Faith, still his conversion was one of conviction, as is apparent from his numerous controversial writings and his scrupulous solide for the integrity of Catholic Faith and morals at the University of Ingolstadt. His conversion took place about 1558. In 1559 he received a canonry at St. Stephen's in Vienna, and a year later he was ordained priest. In 1562 he went to the University of Ingolstadt whither he had been invited by the superintendent of the university, Frederick Staphylus. He was appointed pastor of the church of St. Maurice, which was incorporated with the university, and in April of the same year he was elected rector of the university. Besides being professor, he devoted much of his time to the study of theology and, after receiving the degree of licentiate in this science on 11 No-
their names would seem not to refer to any title of their father, but might be more correctly interpreted as the "children of Divine or ardent love". This interpretation is further strengthened by an account of a vision, accorded the two virgins, in which it is related that Christ, in the form of an infant rested in their arms. In one of the legends contained in the "Acts" of St. Moling, Bishop of Ferns, it is told that Eithene and her sister were visited by this venerable saint. The abode of St. Eithene, called Tech-Ingen-Baith, or the "House of the daughters of Baith" lay near Clonard in the present Barony of Nethercross, County Dublin. This saint is also venerated at Killinis, the former name of a townland in the same locality.

Eithene, Saint, styled "of the golden hair", is commemorated in the Irish martYROLOGIES under the name of March. Eithene was daughter of Leogaire, of the noble family of the Ard-Righ, or Hy-Sovereign of Ireland at the time of St. Patrick's first visit, as a missionary, to the court of Tara (433). According to the prevailing custom of those days the children of kings and princes were frequently placed, at an early age, in the charge of the family of the Ugallach-Diarmait, to acquire the coveted honour of guardianship of the royal offspring. Hence it is assumed that Eithene and her younger sister were fostered close to Cruachan Magh Al, the dwelling-place, or royal residence, of the Gaelic kings of Connaught. However the brief story of the saint's life in the one scene, which took place beside the ford of Clebach, County Roscommon, and is described in the "Acts" of the national apostle of Ireland.

On his way to the royal abode, during his mission to the western province, it is told that St. Patrick and his disciples camped one evening close to the Well of Clebach. On the following day the clerics rose at dawn to chant the Divine Office, and prepare for the mystic sacrifice. It would appear that the two royal princesses were accustomed to visit the same fountain, and on this occasion were surprised at the appearance of the strange company who were in possession of the place. They were not, however, dismayed, and Eithene, the elder of the sisters, accosted Patrick and his companions, asking who they were and whence they came. Whereupon the apostle, speaking in a sweet voice, said—"It was not for you to confess your faith in our true God than ask about our race." Then, at their request, St. Patrick unfolded to them the doctrines of Christianity, which, under the influence of Divine grace, they accepted with heart and soul. Having baptized them, the saint placed on their brows the veil of virginity.

Then, it is related, Eithene and her sister asked "to see the face of Christ, the Son of the true God", but Patrick said: "You cannot see the face of Christ unless you taste death, and receive the Sacrifice". Whereupon they besought him to give them the Sacrifice that they might see their Spouse, the Son of God. So, by the brink of the fountain, the Sacrifice was offered, and having received their First Communion, Eithene and her sister, in an ecstasy of rapture, swooned away and died. Their mourning was ended both were laid side by side, close by the scene of their death, where afterwards a church was raised over the grave.

**EITHENE**

Eithene, Saint, styled "daughters of Baite", with her sister Sodelib, are commemorated in the Irish calendars under 20 March. They were daughters of Ailch, son of Calibre, King of Leinster, who flourished about the middle of the 6th century. The designation "daughters of Baite" usually coupled with this page...
Ekkehard, name of five monks of the (Swiss) Abbey of St. Gall from the tenth to the thirteenth century. (1) Ekkehard I (Major, “the Elder”), d. 14 Jan., 973. He was of noble birth, of the Jonschwy family in Toggenburg, and was educated in the monastery of St. Gall; after joining the Benedictine Order, he was made a canon of St. John the Baptist in the inner church there. Later, under Abbot Kralo, who trusted him implicitly, he was elected dean of the monastery, and for a while directed all the affairs of the abbey. Ekkehard made a pilgrimage to Rome, where he was retained for a time by Pope John XII, who presented him with various advantages of the imperial court; he was also elected abbot of Aquitaine with the Burgundian princess Hildesdegne, from the land of the Huns, followed by the battle of Waggenstein between Walter and the followers of Gunther and Hagen (ed. Peiper, Berlin, 1873). He also composed various religious hymns and sequences, e.g. in honour of the Blessed Trinity, St. John the Baptist, St. Benedict, St. Columbanus, St. Stephen (Meyer, “Philologische Bemerkungen zum Waltharius” in “Abhandl. der bayer. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, Munich, 1873; Strecrer, “Ekkehard und Waltharius,” Mittheil f. deutsches Altertum,” 1898, XLIII, 338–366). (2) Ekkehard II (Palatinus, “the Courtier”), d. 23 April, 990. He and Ekkehard III were nephews of the preceding, who educated also at St. Gall his other nephews, Notker the physician and Burkard, later abbot of the monastery. Ekkehard II was taught by his uncle and the monk Geraldus, and was later a teacher in the monastery school. A number of his pupils joined the order; others became bishops. According to the “Casus Sancti Galli” he was called later to the seat of the Duchesse Hadwig of Saba, widow of Burkard II. The duchess occasionally invited him to visit St. Gall, and eventually (973) asked for and obtained the services of Ekkehard as her tutor in the reading of the Latin classics. Nevertheless, he continued to render great services to his monastery, especially on the occasion of the differences between St. Gall and Reichenau (Abbot Ruedmann); in many other ways also he proved himself useful to the monks by the influence he had obtained as tutor of the duchess. Ekkehard was also prominent at the imperial court of Otto I. Later he became provost of the cathedral of Mainz, where he died 23 April, 1000. He was buried in the church of St. Alban, outside the city gates. He was the author of various ecclesiastical hymns, known as sequences, all of which are lost, except one in honour of St. Desiderius. (3) Ekkehard III, also a nephew of Ekkehard I and a pupil of the preceding, he shared the educational advantages of his cousin and, at his invitation, accompanied him to Hohentwiel to superintend and direct the studies of the local clergy. On his return to St. Gall he was made dean of the abbey, and is reported to have filled this office for thirty years. He died early in the eleventh century. (4) Ekkehard IV.—According to the testimony in his “Chronicle” (especially in view of his statement that he had heard from eyewitnesses of the great conflagration at St. Gall in 937), the date of his birth is usually placed about 1000; he died 21 Oct., but the year of his death is unknown (1057–1060?). The same “Chronicle” indicates Alsace as his birthplace, though we do not know with certainty either the place of his birth, or his family origin. His boyhood was spent at St. Gall where he had for tutor Notker Labeo the German, one of the most learned scholars of his time. From him Ekkehard acquired a profound knowledge of the Latin and Greek classics, he also studied mathematics, astronomy, and music, and was acknowledged while living as a scholar of note even outside the monastery. After the death of Notker Labeo (1022) Ekkehard was called to Mainz by Archbishop Aribo, where he became director and teacher in the cathedral school, and held both offices until the death of his patron (1031), distinguishing himself as head of the school; indeed, he was noted as a successful teacher and promoter of learning. A treatise on the “Jube me, Domine, benedicere”, inscriptions, and benediction prayers remain as evidence of his literary activity. Emperor Conrad II, when at Ingelheim near Mainz, distinguished him by marks of personal favour (Easter, 1030). Shortly after his return to St. Gall Abbot Tietbald died (1034) and Norbert of Stavelot, who introduced the reforms of Cluny, was elected to succeed him. A dissension, however, arose among the monks, the seniors being dissatisfied with the new reforms. Ekkehard, meanwhile, began work on the ancient abbey chronicle, the famous “Casus S. Galli”, begun by Ratpert and continued to Abbot Solomon (883), and carried it on from that date to Notker’s novice (972). This work is a most important document for the contemporary history of St. Gall (ed. von Arx in “Mon. Germ. Historiae: Scriptores” II, Hanover, 1821; ed. Meyer von Knonau in “St. Gallische Geschichtsquellen” in “Mitteil. zur vaterl. Geschichte” (new series, nn. 5 and 6, St. Gall, 1857); it is also the main source of our knowledge concerning the Ekkehards. The “Casus” is mostly a compilation of anecdotes and traditions concerning distinguished monks. They contain, however, many historical errors and misrepresentations, and the Latin diction is often barbarous. Nevertheless, owing to the excellence and simplicity of the narrative, they are a valuable source of contemporary history, especially of its culture. The second important literary work of Ekkehard is his “Liber Benedictinum”. It comprises metrical inscriptions for the walls of the Mainz cathedral, and benedictions (also in verse) for use by the monks, the seniors being also poems in honour of the festivals of various saints, partly from his own pen and partly by Notker Labeo. In poetical merit these works are inferior enough; nevertheless they betray a very fair knowledge of Latin. The glosses from his pen, both on his own manuscripts and others belonging to the abbey, remain as proof of his lifelong zeal in pursuit of knowledge. He was also skilled in music, especially ecclesiastical music, always diligently and successfully cultivated at St. Gall. (5) Ekkehard V (Minimus), d. about 1200. He is the last of the St. Gall Ekkehards, and flourished towards the end of the twelfth, and the beginning of the thirteenth century. No particulars are known concerning his life, and tradition is silent as to his origin, the year of his birth and of his death. He was abbot of the abbey in the reign of Innocent III. About 1214 he wrote a life of St. Notker Balbus, a learned monk of St. Gall, who lived towards the end of the ninth, and the beginning of the tenth century (Acta SS., April, I, 579), from which work we gather that his author was versed in ecclesiastical music. 

J. P. Kirch.
Ekkehard of Aura

Ekkehard of Aura (Uraugensis), Benedictine monk and chronicler, b. about 1050; d. after 1125. Very little is known of his life. About 1101 he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and in 1106 took part in the Council of Guastalla. Apparently he began at first to the monastery of St. Michael at Bamberg, and later (1108 or 1113) was abbot of the monastery of Aura, founded by Bishop Otto of Bamberg, on the Franconian Saale, near Kissingen, Bavaria; this monastery followed the Rule of Hirschau. The "Chronicon universale", called after the monasteries of Aura, is the chief source for the history of Germany during the years 1080–1125. In its present form it was divided into five books: the first contains ancient history from the Creation to the buildling of the city of Rome; the second extends to the birth of Christ; the third reaches the time of Charlemagne; the fourth goes to the opening of the reign of Emperor Henry V; the fifth contains an account of the title of this ruler. No other medieval general chronicle covers so much ground; in the manuscripts now extant it is evidently not the work of one man but represents rather the fusion of various recensions and continuations. Bresslau, in his acute investigation of the subject (Neues Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde, VII), traces these changes, for the most part, to Rutollo, prior of St. Michael's (d. 17 Feb., 1103). It is now believed that Ekkehard simply rewrote the greater part of the chronicle, and that his original contribution is the account of the reign of Emperor Henry V. The chronicle, taken as a whole, is a very skilful compilation, and shows in the selection and arrangement of the matter a good understanding and mastery of the material at hand. The language is good and simple, and the presentation clear and well summarized. Continuations were written by various chroniclers, among whom may be mentioned Conrad of Liechtenau and Albert of Stade. Ekkehard's chronicle has been published several times (Mon. Germ. Hist., Script. VI, 13–265; Migne, P. L., CLIV, 459–1060). A German translation was issued by Pflüger (Leipzig, 1893), as vol. LI of the series "Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit".

Becwolz, Ekkehard von Aura (Leipzig, 1888); Wattenbach, Deutschland's Geschichtsquellen (Berlin, 1893), II, 169.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Elba, a titular see of Asia Minor. Elba, said to have been founded by Mesenethus, was situated at a distance of twelve stadia from the Caicus, one hundred and twenty stadia from Pergamus. It appears in history about 450 b. c., at the time of the Athenian naval league. It belonged to Alexander, then to the kings of Pergamus, and was the port of the latter. In 190 b. c. it was besieged by Antiochus of Syria, in 150 by Prusias, who ravaged all the country. It was partly destroyed in a. d. 90 by an earthquake. In its Roman period it struck coins. As a suffragan of Ephesus Elba is mentioned by most "Notitiae episcopatuum" as late as the twelfth or the thirteenth century. We know only three of its bishops: Iainius in 451, Obianius in 787, Theodulus in 960. In the twelfth century, Or. Con. 1202. In the tenth century St. Paul the Younger, a monk of Mount Latros, was born there (Analecta Bollandiana, XI, 1–74, 136–182). The city must have been destroyed either by the Mongols or by the Turks. The ruins stand about three kilometres south of Kiliisse Keui in the vilayet of Smyrna. The Greek Church also gives the title of Elba to auxiliary bishops.

S. PETRIDS.
landed on the island, 1 May, 1814, but left it on 26 February, 1815; during his short administration Napoleon did much for the benefit of the island, especially in the improvement of the roads. The Congress of Vienna, in 1815, restored the island to Tuscany, with which it was finally incorporated into the united Kingdom of Italy.

Simon, La Toscana e la sua Tyrrenienne (Paris, 1858); Pulli, Monografia agraria del circonvallone dell' Elba. (Porto Farinace, 1875); P. Barbare, Isola d' Elba (Florence, 1883); G. Grop- Moncloa, Description de l' administration de l' Elba (2nd ed., Paris, 1885); Giovanni de' Medici (Rome, 1890, 2nd ed., 1892), biographical; and N. Barbatano, I,Pubblicazione in Appendie (Rome, 1893). See also A. Morelli, Contributo storico dell'Elba (Rome, 1886).

Ecclesia (or Chalema), a sect of Gnostic Ebionite, whose religion was a wild medley of heathen superstitions and Christian doctrines with Judaism. Hippolytus (Philosophumena, IX, 13-17) tells us that under Callistus (217-222) a cunning individual called Aelcius, a native of Apamea in Syria, came to Rome, bringing a book which he said had been received from Parthia by a just named Elchasai (θέλθαια; but Epiphanius has θελήται and ἐλέκσαι; Methodius, ϕοιτ.-method.) The contents of the book had been revealed by an angel ninety-six miles high, sixteen miles broad, and twenty-four across the shoulders, whose footprints were fourteen miles long and four miles wide by two miles deep. This was the Son of God, and He was accompanied by His sister, who had the same dimensions. Aelcius announced that a new remission of sins had been proclaimed in the third year of Trajan (A. D. 100), and he described a baptism which should import this forgiveness even to the grossest sinners. Harnack makes him say that Elchasai 'proclaimed' instead of 'had been proclaimed' (as εὐαγγελιζόμενος and not εὐαγγελισθέντο), and thus infers that a special year of remission was spoken of as past once for all—that Aelcius had no reason for inventing this, so that Hilgenfeld was right in holding that Elchasai really lived under Trajan, as Epiphanius supposed. If we put aside this blunder of Harnack's (and also his earlier odd conjecture that the remission in the third year of Trajan meant that the first two books of the Pastors of Hermes were published in that year), we see that the remission offered is by the new baptism. Hippolytus represents this doctrine as an improvement made by Aelcius on the lax teaching of his enemy Callistus. He does not perhaps expect us to take this seriously—it is most likely ironical—but he seems to regard Aelcius as the author of the book. Origen, writing somewhat later (c. 246-9), says the heresy was quite new; he seems to have met with Aelcius, though he does not give his name. There is no reason why we should dissent from these contemporary witnesses, and we must place the first appearance of the book of Elchasai c. 220. A century and a half later, S. Epiphanius found it in use among the Samnitians, descendants of the earlier Ecclesiastes, and also among the Osages, and many of the other Ebionite communities. En-hadim, an Arabic writer, c. 987, found a sect of Sabeans in the desert who counted Elchasai as their founder (Chwolson, Die Sababier, 1891, 343, cited by the author).

According to Hippolytus the teaching of Aelcius was borrowed from various heresies. He taught circumcision, that Christ was a man like others, that he had many times been born on earth of a virgin, that he devoted himself to astrology, magic, and incantations. For all sins of impurity, even for lust, as a first step, a second baptism is enjoined, "in the name of the great and most high God and in the name of His Son the great King", with an adjuration of the seven witnesses written in the book, sky, water, the holy spirits, the Angels of prayer, oil, salt, and earth. One who has been bitten by a mad dog is to run to the nearest water and jump in with all his clothes on, using the foregoing formula, and promising the seven witnesses that he will abstain from sin. The same treatment—forty days consecutively of baptism in cold water—is recommended for consumption and for the insane. Other Ebionites of Epiphanius' time also practised this treatment. That saint tells us that mention was made in the book of Elchasai's brother, Ixai, and that the heresiarch was a Jew of the time of Trajan. Two of his descendants, two sisters, Marthas and Marthana, lived till the days of Epiphanius. They were revered by the people and the dust of their feet and their spittle were used to cure diseases. This suggests that Elchasai was not a fictitious personage. He was presumably a primitive leader of an Ebionite community, to whose Aelcius ascribed his own book. We learn further from Epiphanius that the book condemned virginity and continence, and denied marriage and the Priestly Order. It permitted the worship of idols to escape persecution, provided the act was merely an external one, disowned in the heart. Prayer to be made not to the East, but always towards Jerusalem. Yet all sacrifice was condemned, as was a denial that it was offered by the high priests or under the Law. The Prophets as well as the Apostles were rejected, and of course St. Paul and all his writings. It has been customary to find Ecclesiastical doctrine in the Clementine "Homilies" and "Recognitions", especially in the former. On the groundlessness of this see Codd, The Faith.

Hippolytus, Philosophumena, IX, 13-17; X, 29; Orig. in Euchresius, H. E., VI, 38; Methodius, Conv., VIII, 18; Epiphanius, Hær., XIX and XXX, 1819, 17, 13, and 21, but the latter has simply used Epiphanius. See Hilgenfeld, N. T., extra eonem receptum (Leipzig, 1881), fass. III; cf. also A. K. Riese and Christiane (Leipzig, 1886) and the various writings on the Sabaean-Clementine, esp. Uhlhorn. A good account is by Salmon in Diet. Christ. Theol., s. v. Ebionites; more recent is Harnack, Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., I, 207; II, 197; II, 167; Bardenhewer, Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., I, 350; idem, Schari, I, Petrologie (Freiburg in Br.); 1898.)

John Chapman.

Elder, George, educator, b. 11 August, 1793, in Kentucky, U. S. A.; d. 28 Sept., 1838, at Bardstown. His parents, James Elder and Ann Richards (a convert), natives of Maryland, emigrated shortly after their marriage to Hardin's Creek, in the present Marion County, Kentucky, where George, the second of their seven children was born. The Elders enjoyed many of the advantages of a good religious education. The family was well versed in the Scriptures and thoroughly acquainted with the teaching of the Church, which he frequently defended in discussion and explained to converts who were preparing for baptism. The elder Elder imbued a love for serious study, and in his sixteenth year he entered Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland, to pursue classical studies. Here he became the friend of William Byrne (q. v.), afterwards founder of St. Mary's College, Kentucky. Both studied theology in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, and were ordained priests at Bardstown by Bishop David, 18 Sept., 1819. In addition to the duties of an assistant at the cathedral there, Father Elder was entrusted by Bishop Flaget with the founding of a high-school or college for lay students. This was, at first, a day school and was taught in the basement of the theological seminary (erected in 1818). A separate building was erected in 1820-23. The college was then one of the largest and best appointed educational institutions in the entire West. The arrival in 1825, of fifty-six Southern students was the beginning of the college patronage the college received from the Southern States, notably Louisiana and Mississippi, and which continued down to the Civil War. In 1827 the Rev. Ignatius A. Reynolds (afterwards Bishop of Charleston) was appointed president and Father Elder was given charge of the congregation of St. Fius, in Scott
County. Dr. Reynolds was transferred in 1830 to pastoral work, and Father Elder again became president, a position which he held until his death. He frequently did duty in the cathedral and was one of the editors of the Louisville "Catholic Advocate" newspaper (founded in 1836), to which he contributed a series of well-written articles on the education of children and the obligations of parents in such matters. "Letters to Brother Jonathan", half satirical, half controversial, were also the product of his pen. His sense of justice forced him, in spite of his characteristic amiability, to prosecute a bigoted persecutor, Nathan L. Rice, for libelling, after the manner of "Maria Monk", a worthy Kentucky priest, then absent in Europe. Father Elder's last illness was brought on by over-exertion and fatigue at the burning down (25 Jan., 1838) of the main college building.

Spalding, Sketches of Early Catholic Missions in Kentucky (Louisville, 1844); Wren, The Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky (Louisville, 1854); Smea, History of the Catholic Church in U. S. (New York, 1890); J. L. Spalding, Life of Archbishop Spalding (New York, 1873); Catholic Advocate (Louisville, 1836-7). P. M. J. ROCK.

Elder, William Henry, third Bishop of Natchez, Mississippi, U. S. A., and second Archbishop of Cincinnati, b. in Baltimore, Maryland, 22 March, 1819; d. in Cincinnati, 31 Oct., 1904. His father, Basil Elder, was a descendant of William Elder, who had emigrated from England to America, in colonial times; his mother, Elisabeth Miles (Snowden) Elder. In 1831 he entered Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland, then presided over by the Rev. John Baptist Purcell, who, two years later, became the second Bishop, and later the first Archbishop, of Cincinnati. In 1842 he went to Rome, to complete his theological studies at the College of the Propaganda, where he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity. He was ordained priest in Rome, 29 March, 1846. Returning to Maryland, he became professor at Emmitsburg, which position he held until he was appointed Bishop of Natchez, for which he was consecrated in the cathedral of Baltimore, by Archbishop Kenrick, 3 May, 1857. In 1864 he was brought into prominence by his refusal to obey the order of the Federal troops at Natchez, to have certain prayers for the President of the United States read publicly in the churches of the town. The right was arrested, tried, and convicted; but the decision of the military court was reversed at Washington. His devotion to his people during the yellow-fever epidemic of 1878 won universal commendation. On 30 January, 1880, he was made titular Bishop of Avara and transferred to Cincinnati, as coadjutor with the right of succession to Archbishop Purcell, whom he succeeded 4 July, 1883. Great financial difficulties clouded the last years of Archbishop Purcell's life and made the task of his successor a trying one. But the reopening of the theological seminary, Mt. St. Mary's of the West, the founding of St. Gregory's Preparatory Seminary, the enlarging of St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum, besides the building of numerous other religious institutions, show how well Archbishop Elder overcame these difficulties. (See CINCINNATI.)

Archbishop Elder's Jubilee Album (Cincinnati, 1890); Ricas, Ring CycI. Cath. Historian (Philadelphia, 1889); Catholic Telegraph (Cincinnati), Oct., 1904 and files. T. H. J. DEAR.

ELEAZAR

ELEAZAR (Heb. אלעזר, God's help).—I. Elizahbat, daughter of Aminadab and sister of Nahashon, bore to him four sons, Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar (Ex., vi, 23), all of whom, with their parents, were anointed . . . and consecrated, to do the functions of priesthood (Num., iii, 2-3; Lev., viii., i-13). As Nadab and Abihu died without children, punished for offering strange fire before the Lord (Lev., x, i-7; I Par., xxix, 1-2), "Eleazar and Ithamar performed the priestly office in the presence of Aaron (Num., iii, 4). Thus entitled to succeed his father in the office of high-priest, "Eleazar . . . took a wife of the daughters of Phutiel", and so became the father of Phinees (Ex., vi, 25). Prince of the princes of the Levites "that watch for the guard of the sanctuary" (Num., iii, 22), directing the sons of Caath when wrapping up "the sanctuary and the vessels thereof at the removing of the camp" (Num., iv, 15-16), Eleazar was selected as the suitable official, "to whose charge pertaineth the oil to dress the lamps, and the sweet incense, and the sacrifices of holocaust, and whatsoever pertaineth to the service of the tabernacle, and of all the vessels that are in the sanctuary" (Num., iv, 16). At the very moment when his brothers were punished "by fire coming out from the Lord", Eleazar, though deeply affected by mental anguish, obeyed the order of Moses, and consecrated their garments (Lev., x, i-20). After the terrible punishment inflicted on the daring usurpers, Core, Dathan, and Abiram, as if to make more evident his right to become the high-priest, Eleazar, complying with orders, beat into plates the still smoking censers used by these unfortunate rebels, and for a sign and a memorial, fastened this metal to the altar (Num., xvi, 1-40). Appointment to preside over the immolation of the red cow (Num., xix, 1-10), Eleazar next appears, clothed with the vesture of Aaron, and exercising the office of high-priest (Num., xx, 22-29). Hence it is that we find what is remarkable associated with him, the children of Israel after the slaughter of the twenty-four thousand (Num., xxxvi, 1-4), in settling the inheritance case presented by the daughters of Salphad (Num., xxvii, 1-3), in distributing the spoils taken from the Amalekites (Num., xix, 1-5), and, finally, in considering the request of Ruben and Gad for land east of the Jordan (Num., xxxii, 1-5). To Eleazar, Josue, the successor of Moses, is presented by the Jewish lawgiver himself (Num., xxvii, 12-23). On the list of those appointed to divide among the Israelites the lands west of the Jordan, the very first name is that of Eleazar (Num., xxxiv, 16-19; Jos., xiv, 1-2; xix, 51), who was buried "in Gabaaath, that belonged to Phinees his son, which was given him in mount Ephraim" (Jos., xxiv, 33). If we except the period from Heil to Solomon, during which the descendants of Ithamar continued to exercise the office of high-priest (I Kings, ii, 30-36; III Kings, ii, 26-27), those holding this most sacred calling, down to the time of the Machabees, belonged to the family of Eleazar (Ex., vi, 25). II. Eleazar, surnamed Aboran, was the fourth son of Mathathias (I Mach., ii, 5). With some probability, he is identified with the Elzaras who bore to Sisera his wife, and with Nic словам the Holy Book to the Jewish warriors (II Mach., viii, 22-24). In the engagement at Bethzacharam, he displayed marvellous courage in attacking and killing the elephant, on which "it seemed to him that the king [Antiochus Eupator] was crushed to death beneath the charging elephant. Eleazar exposed himself to deliver his people.
and to get him an everlasting name" (I Mach., vi, 17-46.)

III. Eleazar, a scribe and doctor of the law, though ninety years of age, bravely preferred to die a most glorious death than to purchase a hateful life by breaking the law which forbade the Israelites use of swine’s flesh. His friends, "moved with wicked pity", were willing to substitute lawful flesh, that Eleazar, feigning to have eaten the forbidden meat, might be delivered from death. But, considering "the dignity of his age . . . and the inbred honour of his grandfathers", Eleazar refused the offer, and turned his well-meant proposal, which if accepted, though securing his deliverance from punishment, might scandalize many young persons, and could not deliver from the hand of the Almighty. Having thus changed into rage the rejected sympathy of his friends, the holy man bravely endured his cruel tortures, probably at Antioch, during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. (II Mach., vi, 18-31; I Mach., i, 57-63.)

*Palais and Leverque in Vig. Dict. de la Bible (Paris, 1898); Allen in Hnt., Dict. of the Bible (New York, 1888); E. Giger, Outlines of Jewish History (New York, 1905).*

D. P. DUFFY.

**Elec**t denotes in general one chosen or taken by preference from among two or more; as a theological term it is equivalent to "chosen as the object of mercy or Divine favour, as set apart for eternal life". In order to determine the meaning of the word more accurately, we may have to study its usage both in the Old Testament and the New.

I. **The Old Testament** applies the term elect, or chosen, only to the Israelites in as far as they are called to be the people of God, or are faithful to their Divine call. The idea of such an election is common in the Book of Genesis, in the Deuteronomy and in Ps. cxlv, 6 and 43, and cv, 5, the chosen ones are the Hebrew people, in as far as it is the recipient of God’s temporal and spiritual blessings; in Is., lv, 9, 15, and 23, they are the repentant Israelites, as few in number "as if a grain be found in a cluster" (ibid., 8); in Tob., xiii, 10, they are the Israelites remaining faithful during their captivity; in Wisd., iii, 9, and iv, 15, they are God’s true servants; in Eccles., xxiv, 4, 13, and xliv, 2, these servants of God belong to the chosen people.

II. **The New Testament** (excepting perhaps Acts, xiii, 17) the meaning of the term from its connexion with the people of Israel to the members of the Church of Christ, either militant on earth or triumphant in heaven. Thus I Pet., i, 1, speaks of the elect among the "strangers dispersed" through the various parts of the world; I Pet., ii, 9, represents them as "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people", called from darkness into God’s marvellous light. St. Paul, too, speaks of the elect (Rom., viii, 33) and describes the five degrees of their election: they are foreknown, predestined, called, justified, and glorified (loc. cit., 29, 30). He returns to the idea again and again: II Thess., ii, 12 sq.; Col., iii, 12; Tit., i, 1, 2; II Tim., ii, 10. St. John gives the title of elect to those who fight on the side of the Lamb against the powers of darkness (Apoc., xvii, 14). According to St. Luke (xvii, 7), God hears the cries of his elect for vengeance; according to the first two Books of Maccabees, the Lamb will shorten the days on them, the elect (Matt., xxiv, 22, 24, 31; Mark, xiii, 20, 22, 27).

If it be asked why the name elect was given to the members of the Church Militant, we may assign a double reason: first, they were freely chosen by God’s goodness (Rom., xi, 5-7, 28); secondly, they must and do conduct the life which God will have to them. The word elect (Matt., xxv, 13; xvi, 19; xxii, 14). It is agreed on all sides that the term refers to members of the Church Triumphant, but there is some doubt as to whether it refers to mere membership, or to a more exalted degree. This distinction is important; if the word implies mere membership in the Church Triumphant, then the chosen ones, or those who will be saved, are few, and the non-members in the Church Triumphant are many; if the word denotes a special degree of importance, all will attain this rank, and many will fail to do so, though many are called to it. The sentence “many are called, but few chosen” does not, therefore, settle the question as to the relative number of the elect and the lost; theologians are divided on this point, and those who consider the object of saving one’s soul (Luke, xiii, 23, 24), he alternately so strengthens our hope and excites our fear as not to leave us any solid ground for either presumption or despair.

*Lesé in Dict. de la Bible (Paris, 1899), II, 1708 sqq.; Murray, Dict. of the Bible (New York, 1900), i, 678 sqq.; Knabenbauer, Evang. secundum Matthæum (Paris, 1899), II, 178, 247; Mosses, Conférence de Notre-Dame (1899), Conference VI.*

A. J. MAAS.

**Election** (Lat. *elictio*, from *eliger*, to choose from).

—This subject will be treated under the following heads: I. Juridical Concept; II. Electors; III. Persons Eligible; IV. The Act of Electing: Forms and Methods; V. After Election; VI. Elections Now in Use.

I. **Juridical Concept**—In its broadest sense election means a choice among many persons, things, or sides to be taken. In the stricter juridical sense it means the choice of one among many persons for a definite charge or function. If we confine ourselves to ecclesiastical law, canonical election, in a broad sense, would be any designation of a person to an ecclesiastical office. The word thus understood includes various modes: postulation, presentation, nomination, recommendation, request or petition, and, finally, free collation. In a narrower sense, election is the canonical appointment, by legitimate electors, of a fit person to an ecclesiastical office. Its effect is to confer on the person thus elected an actual right to the benefice or charge, independently of the confirmation or collation ulteriorly necessary. Hence it is easily distinguished from the aforesaid modes that only in a broad sense can be termed election.

(a) Postulation differs canonically from election, not as regards the electors, but as regards the person elected, the latter being juridically ineligible on account of an impediment from which the superior is asked to dispense him. For instance, if in an episcopal election the canons designate the bishop of another see, or a brother of thirty years of age, or one of illegitimate birth, etc., no actual right would be conferred on such a person, and the ecclesiastical superior would be in no wise bound to recognize such action; hence the electors are then said to *postulate* their candidate, this postulation being a matter of favour (gratia), not of justice; (b) Presentation, on the contrary, differs from election not in respect to the person elected but to the electors; it is the exercise of the right of patronage, and the patron may be a layman, whereas the electors to ecclesiastical dignities must be clerics. In both cases the right of the candidate is the same (ad rem); but when the candidate is canonical, confirmation, presentation by a patron leads to canonical institution by a competent prelate. Moreover, when the right of patronage belongs to a moral body, e.g. a chapter or an entire congregation, presentation may have to follow along the lines of election. Though frequently called nomination, the designation of bishops and beneficed clergy by the metropolitan in virtue of concordats is in reality presentation, and results in canonical institution. (c) Correctly speaking, nomination is the canonical act by which the electors propose several fit persons to the free choice of the superior. The role of electors in nomination is
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the same as in election properly so called; as election, however, can fall only on one person, so nomination cannot confer on several a real right to a benefice—rather, their right is real inasmuch as it excludes third parties, though none of them possesses the jus ad rem (see Bishop). It differs from election and nomination in that the bishop or members of the clergy do not act as electors, i.e., all the persons designated do not acquire any real right to be the Holy See remaining perfectly free to make a choice outside of the list proposed. (e) Still further removed from election is simple request, or petition, by which the clergy or people of a diocese beg the pope to grant them the prelate they desire. The authors of this petition, not being properly qualified, as in the case of recommendation, to make known their appreciation of the candidate, it is needless to say the latter acquires no right whatsoever from the fact of this request. (f) Finally, free collation is the choice of the person by the superior, free and precise: and, being method most in use for appointment to inferior benefices, and the practical rule for the filling of episcopal sees, apart from some well-known exceptions. Evidently, where free collation obtains, election, properly so called, is excluded.

Electors.—Electors are those who are called by ecclesiastical law or statute to constitute an electoral college, i.e. to designate the person of their choice, and who have the qualifications required for the exercise of their right to vote. The law appoints competent electors for each kind of election; cardinals for the election of a pope; and for the election of a bishop or a vicar capitular; and the various chapters of their order, etc. for the election of regular prelates. In general, election belongs, strictly speaking, to the college, i.e., the body of which the person elected will become the superior or prelate; if this college have a legal existence, like a cathedral chapter, it can exercise its right as long as it exists, even if reduced to a single member, though, of course, such a one could not elect himself. Electors called upon to give a prelate to the Church must be ecclesiastics. Hence laymen are excluded from participation in a canonical election; it would be invalid not only if made by them exclusively (c. iii, h. t.), but even if they only co-operate with ecclesiastics, every custom to the contrary notwithstanding. Ecclesiastics alone, and those only who compose the college or community to be provided with a prelate, can be electors. This is well exemplified in the cathedral chapter, all of whose canons, and they alone, are episcopal electors. Other ecclesiastics have no right to associate with the chapter in the election of a bishop, unless (a) they are in full possession of this right and it is proved by long prescription; (b) hold a pontifical privilege, or (c) can show a right resultant from the foundation of the chapter or the church in question. To exercise their right, the electors, whoever they may be, must be full members of the body to which they belong, and must, moreover, be in a condition to perform a juridical, hierarchical act; if different from the time of nomination and those who have not reached the age of puberty; ecclesiastical law debar (1) canons who have not attained full membership in the chapter, i.e. who are not yet subdeans (Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, c. iv, De ref.), and (2) religious who have not made their profession, in punishment of certain offences; some may have forfeited their right to elect, either for once or permanently, e.g. those excommunicated by name, those suspended, or those placed under interdict. The Constitution of Martin V, "Ad evitanda scandala," permits the excommunicated known as tolerati (tolerated) to take part in an election, but exception may be taken to them, and their exclusion must follow; if, after such exception, they cast a vote, it must be considered null. Apart from censures incurred, privation of an active share in elections occurs frequently in the ecclesiastical law affecting bishops; in common law and for the secular clergy, it exists in only two cases: First, when they have elected or postulated an unworthy person (c. vii, h. t.); second, when the election has been held in consequence of an abusive intervention of the civil authority (c. xliii, h. t.); finally, when it has not been made within the required time. In all these cases the election devolves upon the superior (c. xii, h. t.).

III. PERSONS ELIGIBLE.—Those persons are eligible who meet the requirements of common ecclesiastical law, or special statutes, for the charge or function in question; hence, for each election it is necessary to ascertain what is required of the candidate. In general, for all kinds of elections, the necessary qualifications are mature age, moral integrity, and adequate knowledge (c. vii, h. t.); for each charge or function dependent on an election these conditions are defined with greater detail. Thus, no layman, nor a religious who is not yet subdeacon can be elected bishop; and no regular can be elected superior, etc., unless he has made his final profession. Some of the aforesaid requirements are easily verified, e.g. the proper age, adequate knowledge, the latter being normally exacted in some degree (Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, c. ii. De ref.); others, especially an upright life, must usually depend on negative evidence, i.e. on the absence of proof to the contrary, such proof being positive offences, particularly when they have seriously impaired the reputation of the person in question or called for canonical punishment. It is principally candidates of consummate morality who are termed unworthy; the sacred canons constantly repeat that the unworthy must be set aside. Such unworthy persons are: (1) all outside the Church, viz. infidels, heretics, and schismatics; (2) all who have been guilty of great crimes (crimina majora), viz. the sacrilegious, forgers, perjurers, sodomites, and simoniacs; (3) all whom law or fact, for whatever reason, has branded as infamous (infamii juris aut facti); (4) all under censure (excommunication, suspension, interdict), unless said censure is an irregular one, particularly a penal one (ex crimen), debar from receiving or exercising Holy orders. Those also are excluded who, at the time of election, hold several incompatible benefices or dignities without dispensation (c. lib. h. t.); or who, at a preceding election, have already been rejected as unworthy (c. xii, h. t.), and all who have consented to be elected through the abusive intervention of lay authority (c. xiii, h. t.). There are other cases in which regulars cease to be eligible. The legislation here described was meant for the episcopal elections of the thirteenth century and aims at abuses now impossible.

IV. THE ACT OF ELECTION: FORMS AND METHODS.

—in this matter, even more than in the preceding paragraphs, we must consider special laws and statutes. Strictly speaking, the common ecclesiastical law, precisely the thirteenth-century Decretals, considers only episcopal elections (lib. i. tit. vi. De electone et electi potestate; and in VI). Since an election is held to appoint to a church or an ecclesiastical charge or office that is vacant, it is obvious that the first condition requisite for an election is the vacancy of said church, charge, or office, in consequence of death, transfer, resignation, or deposition; any election made with a view to filling an office not yet vacant is a canonical offence. When an election becomes necessary, the first step is to convoke the electoral assembly in some specified place, and for a certain day within the legal time-limit. The
place is ordinarily the vacant church or, if it be question of an election in a chapter, wherever the deliberations of the chapter are usually held. The time-limit set by common ecclesiastical law is three months, after the lapse of which the election devolves upon the immediate successor (c. xxix, h. t.). In an electoral college, the duty of convoking the members belongs to the superior or president; in a chapter this would be the highest dignitary. He must issue an effectual summons, for which no special form is prescribed, to all the electors without exception, whether present in the locum or absent, unless where, however, there be too far away.

The distance considered as constituting a legitimate excuse for absence (see c. xviii, h. t.) should be more narrowly interpreted to-day than in the thirteenth century. It is unnecessary to convolve electors publicly known to be incompetent to exercise their electoral right, e.g. canons excommunicated by name or not yet subdeacons. So binding is this conviction that if even one elector be not summoned he can, in all justice, enter a complaint against the election, though the latter is not ipso facto null by reason of such absence. Such an election will stand provided the elected elector abides his colleagues or abandons his complaint. As no one is bound to use a right, common law does not oblige an elector to attend the assembly and take part in the voting; the absent are not taken into consideration. As a general rule the absent cannot be represented or voted for unless, accidentally, they are summoned. "Quia propter" (xliii, h. t., Lateran Council, 1215) they are at a great distance and can prove a legitimate hindrance. Moreover, they can choose as proxy only one member of the assembly, but they can commission him to vote either for a particular person or for whomsoever he himself may deem more worthy.

On the appointed day the president opens the electoral assembly. Though the common law requires no preliminary solemnities, such are frequently imposed by special statute, e.g. the Mass of the Holy Ghost, which should be attended by all the assembled electors and those not prevented from attending; also the recital of certain prayers. Moreover, the electors are often obliged previously to promise under oath that they will conscientiously vote for the most worthy. However, apart from such oath, their obligation is more absolute and serious. These preliminaries over, the electoral assembly proceeds if necessary to verify the credentials of certain electors, e.g. those who act as delegates, as happens in the general chapters of religious congregations. Then follows the discussion of the merits (tituli) of the candidates. The latter need not have previously made known their candidacy, though they may do so. The electors, nevertheless, have all freedom to propose and sustain the candidates of their choice. Frank and fair discussion of the merits of candidates, far from being forbidden, is perfectly conformable to the law, because it tends to enlighten the electors; indeed, some maintain that an election made without such a discussion would be null or could be annulled (Matheucci, in Ferraris, "Bibliotheca", s. v. "Electio", art. iv, n. 5). It is more accurate to say that the election would be vitiated if the presiding officer were to oppose such discussion for the purpose of influencing votes. However, though the law strictly prohibits cabals and secret negotiations in the interest of certain candidates, the line between illicit manoeuvring and permissible negotiating is in practice not always easily recognizable. [See the Constitution "Ecclesia" of the Council of Trent (1563), chapter ii, v., no. 6, also the regulations that govern a conclave (q.v.)]

The discussion concluded, voting begins. Actually there is only one customary method, i.e. secret voting (secretum secreto) by written ballots. The common ecclesiastical law (c. Quia propter, xliii, h. t., Lateran Council, 1215) admits only three modes of election: the normal or regular method by ballot, and two exceptional modes, namely, compromise and quasi-inspiration. Recourse to lots is especially prohibited; nevertheless, the Sacred Congregation of Elections (May 21, 1757) ratified an election where the chapter, equitably called between two candidates in other respects fit, had drawn lots: just about as was done for the Apostolic election of St. Matthias. As to the two exceptional methods: (1) Election by quasi-inspiration takes place when the name of a candidate with enthusiasm and acclamation, in which event the ballot is omitted as useless since its result is known in advance, and the candidate in question is proclaimed elected. However, modern custom in this matter differs from ancient habits, and it is wiser, even in the case of such apparent unanimity, to proceed by ballot. (2) Compromise occurs when all the electors confide the election to one or several specified persons, either members of the electoral college or strangers, and ratify in advance the choice made by such arbitrator or arbitrators. Formerly this exceptional method was often resorted to, either to avoid prolonging and fruitless sessions, or when there was a lack of exact information concerning the candidates; it is minutely regulated by the law of the Decretals. The compromise must be agreed to by all the electors without exception, and can be confined to ecclesiastics only. It may be absolute, according to the law, i.e. free, or conditional, i.e. accompanied by certain reservations concerning the manner of election, the persons to be elected, the time-limit within which the election should be held, and so on.

The normal or regular method by ballot, according to the law of the Decretals was to be worth-while. The law "Quia propter" (see above) merely calls for the choice of three trustworthy scrutineers from among the electors. These were charged with collecting secretly (in a whisper) and in succession the votes of all; the result was then drawn up in writing and made public. The candidate who had obtained the votes of the more numerous or sounder party (major vel sanior pars) of the chapter was declared elected. However, this appreciation, not only of the number but also of the value of the votes, led to endless discussions, it being necessary to compare not only the number of votes obtained, but also the merits of the electors and their zeal, i.e. the honesty of their intentions. It was presumed, of course, that the majority was also the sounder party, but proof to the contrary was admitted (c. ixi, h. t.). The use of the secret and written ballot has long since remedied these difficulties. If the Council of Trent did not modify on this point the existing law, at least it exacted the secret ballot for the elections of regulars (Sess. XXV, c. vi, De regul.). According to this method the scrutineers silently collect the ballots of the electors present; when occasion requires it, certain members are delegated to collect the votes of electors beneath the same roof (e.g. at a conclave or at one of the regular chapters) or even in the city (for cathedral chapters), if the statutes so prescribe. This accomplished, the scrutineers count the number of the votes collected, and if, as should be, they tally with the number of electors, the same officers proceed to declare the result. Each ballot is in turn opened, and one of the scrutineers proclaims the name inscribed thereon, then passes it to the second scrutineer for registration, while the third, or secretary, adds up the total number of votes obtained by each candidate. As a general rule, elections, by ballot, are decided for the candidate who obtains the majority of votes, i.e. an absolute, not merely a relative, majority; however, certain statutes require, e.g. in a conclave, a majority of two-thirds. When the electors are odd in number, a gain of one vote ensures the majority; if the number be...
even, it requires two votes. In calculating the majority, neither absent electors nor blank ballots are taken into account; whoever casts a blank vote is held to have forfeited his electoral right for that ballot. If no candidate obtains an absolute majority, balloting is recommenced, and so on until a definite vote is reached. However, not to prolong useless balloting, special statutes can prescribe, and in fact have provided, various solutions, e.g. that after three rounds of fruitless balloting the election shall devolve upon the superior; or again, that in the third round the electoral vote only between the two most favored candidates; or, finally, that in the fourth round a relative majority shall suffice (Rules of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for congregations of women under simple vows, art. cxxxiii sq.). Other special regulations provide for the case of two candidates receiving the same number of votes (the voters being of even number), in which event the election is decided in favor of the senior (by age, ordination, or religious profession); sometimes the deciding vote is assigned to the presiding officer. For all these details it is necessary to know and observe the special legislation which covers them.

When the final vote is obtained, whatever its character, it should be made public, i.e. officially communicated to the electoral assembly by the presiding officer. The decree of election is then drawn up; in other words, the document which verifies the voting and confirms the election. The role of the electoral college thus fulfilled, the election is closed.

The principal duty of an elector is to vote according to his conscience, without allowing himself to be actuated by human or selfish motives, i.e., he must vote for him whom he deems the most worthy and best qualified for the person elected, or for the college. External law can scarcely go farther, but moralists rightly declare guilty of mortal sin the elector who, against his conscience, casts his vote for one who is unworthy. In order, however, to fulfill his duty, the elector has a right to reasonably and unreservedly oppose the dread of any unjust annoyance (vexatio) which might affect his vote, whether such annoyance be in its source civil or ecclesiastical (cc. xiv and xliii, h. t.).

V. After Election. We are confronted here by two cases: either an election is or not disputed. An election may be disputed by whoever is interested in it, in which case the question of its validity is referred to the superior, in accordance with the same rule as for judicial appeals. Now, an election may be defective in three ways, i.e. as to the electors, the person elected, or the mode of election. The defect concerns the electors if, through culpable neglect, one or more of those who have a right to participate in the election are not summoned; or if laymen, excommunicate vitandus, or unauthorized ecclesiastics are admitted as electors. The defect lies with the person elected if it can be proved that he was not fit (idoneus) in which case he may be postulated, or that he was positively unworthy, in which event the election is invalid. Finally, the defect concerns the form or mode of election when the legal prescriptions relative to balloting or compromising are not observed. The challenged election, with proofs of its imperfection, is judged canonically by the proper ecclesiastical superior. If the alleged defect is not proven, the election is sustained; if it be proven, the judge declares it, whereupon the law provides the following sanctions: All who aided by laymen, or who are involved (c. lvi, h. t.); the one at which an excommunicated person has been admitted to vote, as also that to which an elector has not been invited, must be closely investigated, but is not to be annulled unless the absence of the excommunicated person, or the presence of the unwelcome elector might have given a different turn to the vote. The election of a person who is not unworthy, but simply the victim of an impediment, may be treated indulgently; that of an unworthy person is to be annulled, while the electors who, knowing him to be such, nevertheless elected him, are deprived of that time of the right to vote and are suspended for three years from the benefices they hold in the vacant church in question. Finally, the election wherein the prescribed form has not been observed must be annulled. In all of these cases the right to elect (bishops) devolves upon the Holy See (Boniface VIII, c. xviii, h. t., in VI²); the only case in which it devolves upon the immediate superior is when the election has not been made within the prescribed time-limit.

If, on the contrary, the election meets with no opposition the first duty of the presiding officer of the electoral college is to notify the person elected that choice is made of his person. If he be present, e.g. in the elections of regulars, the notification takes place immediately; if he be absent, the decree of election must be forwarded to him within eight days, barring legitimate hindrance. On his side, the person elected is allowed a month within which to make known his acceptance or refusal, then within a third month receiving the decree of election or the permission of the superior when such is obligatory. If the person elected refuses the honour conferred upon him, the electoral college is summoned to proceed with a new election, under the same conditions as the first time he refused, if he accepts, it is to be noted well as his duty to demand from the superior the confirmation of his election within the peremptory limit of three months (c. vi, h. t., in VI²); but if, without legitimate hindrance, he allows this time to pass unused, the election has lapsed. From the moment of acceptance, the person elected acquires for the first time, although still incomplete, right to the benefice or charge, the jus ad rem to be completed and transformed into full right (justinum) by the confirmation of the election; it is his privilege to exact this confirmation from the superior, just as it is the latter’s duty to give it, except in the event of unworthiness, of which fact the superior remains judge. However, until the person elected has received this confirmation, he cannot take advantage of his still incomplete right to interfere in any way whatever in the administration of his benefice, but the punishment being the indemnity of his negligence, all acts thus accomplished and privation of the benefice itself. The ecclesiastical legislation on this point is very severe, but it concerns episcopal sees only. In the time of Innocent III (1198-1216) those elected to an ordinary episcopal see had to seek the confirmation of the metropolitan, or the metropolitan had to seek the confirmation of the see, but not the metropolitan; bishops outside of Italy who had to obtain from Rome the confirmation of their election (metropolitans, or bishops immediately subject to the Holy See) were authorized (c. xiv, h. t.), in cases of necessity, to enter at once on the administration of their churches, provided their election had aroused no opposition; meanwhile real confirmation proceedings went their ordinary course at Rome.

At the Second Council of Lyons, in 1274 (c. Avariar. v, h. t., in VI²), elected persons were forbidden, failing of their due elections, not to be admitted to the episcopal dignity in the administration of their benefices by assuming the title of administrator, procurator, or the like. A little later, Boniface VIII (Extrav., Injunctae, i, h. t.) established the rule still in force for entering on possession of major benefices and episcopal sees, according to which the person elected must immediately appear in person, unless he present to the provisional administrators the Apostolical Letters of his election, promotion, and confirmation. The Council of Trent having established the vicar capitular as provisional administrator of the dioceses during the vacancy of the see, it became necessary to prohibit elected persons from entering on the administration of their future dioceses in the ca-
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tian (Hic aecepto epistula Lucio Britannio rege, ut Christianus efficereur per ejus mandatum). Whence the author of the first part of the "Liber Pontificalis", drew this information, it is now impossible to say. Historically speaking, the fact is quite improbable, and is refuted by all recent critics.

As at the end of the second century the Roman administration was so securely established in Britain, there could no longer have been in the island any real native kings. That some tribal chief, known as king, should have applied to the Roman bishop for instruction in the Christian faith seems improbable enough at that period. The unsupported assertion of the "Liber Pontificalis", a compilation of papal biographies that in its earliest form cannot antedate the first quarter of the sixth century, is not a sufficient basis for the acceptance of this statement. By some it is considered a story intended to demonstrate the Roman origin of the British Church, and consequently the latter's natural subjection to Rome. To make this clearer they locate the origin of the legend in the course of the seventh century, during the dissensions between the primitive British Church and the Anglo-Saxon Church newly established from Rome. For this hypothesis all proof is lacking. It falls before the simple fact that the first part of the "Liber Pontificalis" was compiled long before these dissensions, most probably (Duchesne) by a Roman cleric in the reign of Pope Boniface II (550-552), or (Waitz and Monball) even earlier in the seventh century, more probably during the entire conflict that centred around the peculiar customs of the Early British Church no reference is ever made to this alleged King Lucius. Saint Bede is the first English writer (673-735) to mention the story repeatedly (Hist. Eccl., I, V, V, 24, De tempore primo, ad loc. 25), and he took it, not from native sources, but from the "Liber Pontificalis". Harnack suggests a more plausible theory (Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1901, I, 906-916). In the document, he holds, from which the compiler of the "Liber Pontificalis" drew his information the name found was not Britonia, but Britto. Now this is the name (Birtha Brittonum) of the fortress of Edessa. The king in question is, therefore, Lucius Aelius Septimius Megas Abgar IX, of Edessa, a Christian king, as is well known. The original statement of the "Liber Pontificalis", in this hypothesis, had nothing to do with Britain. The identity of the name was to Abgar IV of Edessa. But the compiler of the "Liber Pontificalis" changed Britio to Britannio, and in this way made a British king of the Syrian Lucian.

The ninth-century "Historia Brittonum" sees in Lucius a translation of the Celtic name Lleuwer Maaw (Great Light), says that the envoy of Lucius were Fagan and Wervan, and tells us that with this king all the other island kings (regii Britanniae) were baptized (Hist. Brittonum, xviii). Thirteenth-century chronicles add other details. The "Liber Landavensis", for example (ed. Rees, 26, 65), makes known the name of Elfan and Medwy, the envoy sent by Lucius to the pope, and transfers the king's dominions to Wales. An echo of this legend penetrated even to Switzerland. In a homily preached at Chur and preserved in an eighth- or ninth-century manuscript, St. Timothy is represented as an apostle of Gaul, whence he came to Britain and baptized there a king named Lucius, who became a missionary, went to Gaul, and finally settled at Chur, where he preached the gospel with great success. In this way Lucius, the early missionary of the Swiss district of Chur, became identified with the legendary British King of the "Liber Pontificalis". The latter work is authority for the statement that Eulogius died 24 May, and was buried on the Vatican Hill (in Vaticano) near the body of St. Peter. His feast is celebrated 26 May.


J. P. Kirsch.

**Eulogius** (Fr. *ELEUTHERE*), Saint, Bishop of Tournai at the beginning of the sixth century. Historically there is very little known about St. Eulogius, but he was without doubt the first Bishop of Tournai. Theodore, whom some give as his immediate predecessor, was either a bishop of Tours, whose name was placed by mistake on the episcopal list of Tournai, or simply a missionary who ministered to the Christian scattered throughout the small Frankish Kingdom of Tournai. Before he became Bishop of Tournai, Eulogius lived at court with his friend Medardus, who predicted that he would attain the dignity of a count and also be elevated to the episcopate. After Clovis, King of the Franks, had been converted to Christianity in 496, with more than 3000 of his subjects, bishops took part in the royal councils. St. Remigius, Bishop of Reims, organized the Catholic hierarchy in Northern Gaul, and it is more than likely that St. Eulogius was named Bishop of Tournai at this time.

The saint's biography in its present form was really an invention of Henri of Tournai in the twelfth century. According to this, Eulogius was born at Tournai towards the end of the reign of Cloidric, the father of Clovis, of a Christian family descended from Irenus, who had been baptized by St. Platus. The saint's father's name was Teronius, and his mother Blanda. Persecuted by the tribune of the Scheldt obliged the Christians to flee from Tournai and take refuge in the village of Blandinium. The conversion of Clovis, however, enabled the small community to reassemble and build at Blandinium a church, which was dedicated to St. Peter. The church he was made Bishop of Tournai, and Eulogius succeeded him. Consulted by Pope Hormisdas as to the best means of eradicating the heresy which threatened nascent Christianity, Eulogius convened a synod and publicly confounded the heretics. They vowed vengeance, and as he was on his way to the synod, they fell on him and, after beating him unmercifully, left him for dead. He recovered, however, but his days were numbered. On his death-bed (529) he confided his flock to his lifelong friend, St. Medardus.

The motive underlying this biography invented by Canon Henricus (1141), was to prove the antiquity of the Church of Tournai, which from the end of the eleventh century had been trying to free itself from the jurisdiction of the bishops of Noyon. The sermons on the Trinity, Nativity, and the feast of the Annunciation (Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. XV), sometimes attributed to St. Eulogius, are of a more doubtful authenticity. His cult, however, is well established; there is record of a recovery of his relics during the episcopate of Heliodorus in 597 or 598, and a translation of them by Bishop Baudouin in 1064 or 1065, another in 1217. Relics of this saint are preserved in the monastery of St. Martin at Tournai, and in the cathedral at Bruges. His feast is given in martyrologies on 20 or 21 July, but is usually celebrated on the former date. The translation of his relics is commemorated 25 August.

*Sources*:

Frey, Vito S. Eleutherie and Vita II in *Acta SS.* Belgii (Brussels, 1792), I, 475-494; Vita Medardus, ii, in *Acta SS.* Belgii, II, 80. Works: Hengstenberg, De S. Eleutherio episcopo Tournaiensi in Belgico commentario praecepit in *Acta SS.* Belgii, i, 635-75; Fiévret, Saint Éleuthère, évêque de Tours (Tournai, 1900); Kehr, Clovis (Paris, 1901), II, 164, 246-47; Warnez, Les origines de l'église de Tournai (Louvain, 1902), passing;
Eleutheropolis, a titular see in Palestina Prima. The former name of this city seems to have been Beth Gabra, “the house of the strong men”, which later became Beit Djibrin, “the house of Gabriel”. Vespasian slaughtered almost all its inhabitants, according to Josephus, De Bell. Jud., IV., viii, 1, where its name is written Betarais. In A.D. 200 Septimius Severus, on his Syrian journey changed its name to Eleutheropolis, and it soon became one of the most important cities of Judea. Its special era, which figures on its coins and in many inscriptions, began 1 Jan., A.D. 200. (See Echos d’Orient, 1903, 310 sq.; 1904, 39 sq.) Its first known bishop is Macarius (325); five others are mentioned in the fourth and two in the sixth century (Lequien, Or. Christ., III, 631). In 393, during the episcopate of Zebennus, the relics of the Prophets Habakuk and Micah were found at Celia and Tell Zakariya near Eleutheropolis (Sozom., H. E., XV, xxix). At Eleutheropolis was born St. Epiphanius, the celebrated bishop of Salamis in Cyprus; at Aδ in the neighbourhood he established a monastery which is often mentioned in the polemics of St. Jerome with Rufinus and John, Bishop of Jerusalem. The city in later times, an important monastic centre, was at least the till the coming of the Arabs. The latter beheaded (638) at Eleutheropolis fifty soldiers of the garrison of Gaza who had refused to apostatize. They were buried in a church built in their honour. (See Anal. Bolland., 1904, 289 sq., and Echos d’Orient, 1905, 40 sq.) The city was destroyed by the Mussulmans in 700 in the civil wars. The Crusaders erected there a fortress, in 1134, under Fulco of Anjou; the Knights of St. John, to whom it was committed, restored at this time the beautiful Byzantine church at Sandahsana. The citadel was taken in 1187 by Saladin, conquered in 1191 by Richard Lion Heart, destroyed in 1263 by Sultan Bihars, and rebuilt in 1551 by the Turks. Today Beit Djibrin is a village with about 1000 Mussulman inhabitants, on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza, in a fertile and very healthy region. The medieval fortress still stands, about (80) feet square; there are also the remains of the walls, and a cloister and medieval church. In the neighbourhood are remarkable grogutes, which filled St. Jerome with wonderment. Some of these grogutes were used in early Christian times as places of worship; others bear Arabic inscriptions.

**Eleutheropolis**

Van der Esseen, Etude critique et litteraire sur les Vies des Saints M-rovengua of l’ancienne Belgique (Louvain, 1907), 394-97.

**L. Van der Esseen.**

Elevation, The.—What we now know as par excellence the Elevation of the Mass is a rite of comparatively recent introduction. The Oriental liturgies, and notably the Byzantine, have indeed a showing of the consecrated Host to the people, with the words “Holy things to the holy”, but it should rather be regarded as the counterpart of our “Eece Agnus Dei” and as a preliminary to the Communion. Again, in the West, a lifting of the Host at the words “omnien honor et gloria”, immediately before the Pater Noster, has taken place since the ninth century or earlier. This may very probably be looked upon as originally an invitation to adore when the great consecratory prayer of the canon extending from the Preface to the Pater Noster (see Cabrol in “Dict. d’Archeologie”, I, 1558) had been concluded. But the showing of the Sacred Host (and still more of the Chalice) to the people after the utterance of the words of Institution, “Host est corpus meum”, is not known to have existed earlier than the close of the twelfth century. Eleudes de Sully, Bishop of Paris from 1196 to 1208, seems to have been the first to direct in his episcopal statutes that after the consecratory words the Host should be “elevated so that it can be seen by all”.

There has, however, been a good deal of confusion upon this point in the minds of some early liturgists, owing to the practice which prevailed of lifting the Host from the altar and holding it in the hands above the chalice while consecrating it. The degree of lifting, at the words “accepit panem in sanc- tias ac venerabiles manus suas”, was unavoidable, and many priests carried it so far that liturgical commentators spoke of their act as “elevere hostiam” (cf. Migne, P. L., CLXXXVII, 370), and (CLXVI, 1186), as a careful examination of the case would prove that this was quite a different thing from showing the Host to the people. Moreover, the motive of this latter showing has generally been misconceived. It has often been held to be a protest against the heresy of Berengarius; but Berengarius died a century before, and the statements of writers at the beginning of the thirteenth century make the whole development plain. The great centre of intellectual life at that period was Paris, and we learn that at Paris a curious theological view was then being defended by such eminent scholars as the chancellor Peter Manducator and the professor Peter Canterbury, that the Host of the bread only took place when the priest at Mass had pronounced the words of consecration over both bread and wine (see, e.g., Giraldeus Cambrensis, Works, II, 124; Cesarius of Heisterbach, “Dialogus”, IX, 4, 13, and “Libri Miraculorum”, II, 22), to quote the words of Peter of Poitiers “dicit quidam... quod non facit transubstantiatio panis in corpus donec prolata sint hic verba ‘Hic est corpus’” (Migne, P. L., CCX, 1245; Pope Innocent III; “De sacro altaris mysterio” IV, 22, uses similar words). This view, as may readily be understood, aroused considerable opposition, and notably on the part of Bishop Eudes de Sully and Stephen Langton, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury and cardinal. It seems clear that the theologians of this party, by way of protest against the teaching of Peter Canterbury, adapted the custom of adoring the Host immediately after the words “Host est enim corpus meum” were spoken, and by a natural transition they encouraged the practice of showing it to the people for this purpose. The developments can be easily followed in the synodal decrees of France, England, and other countries during the thirteenth century. We find mention of a little bell of warning in the early years of that century, and before the end of the same century it was enjoined in many dioceses of the Continent and in England that one of the great bells of the church should be tolled at the moment of the Elevation, in order that those at work in the fields might kneel down and adore.

It will be readily understood from the above explanation that there was not the same motive at first for insisting on the elevation of the Chalice as well as the Host. No one at that period doubted that by the time the words of Institution had been spoken over the Host, transubstantiation had already taken place in both species. We find accordingly that the elevation of the Chalice was introduced much more slowly. It was not adopted at St. Alban’s Abbey until 1429, and we may say that it is not practised by the Carthusians even to this day. The elevation of the Host at Mass seems to have brought in its train a great idea of the special merit and virtue of looking upon the Body of Christ. Promises of an extravagant kind circulated freely among the people describing the privileges of him who had seen his Maker at Mass. Sudden death could not befall him. He was secure from hunger, infection, the danger of fire, etc. As a result of the elevation desire developed to see the Host when elevated at Mass, and this led to a variety of abuses which were rebuked by preachers and satirists. On the other hand, the same devout instinct undoubtedly fostered the introduction of processions of the Blessed Sacrament and
the practice of our familiar Exposition and Benediction (qq. v.).

All the usual authorities upon the liturgical history of the Mass draw a satisfactory, though not necessarily safe, conclusion from this important point as to the teaching of the Paris theologians of the fourteenth century. See Thurston, El Elevation in The Tablet, 10 Oct., 1907. But many useful details may be gleaned from Giorghi, De Liturgia Rom. Pont. (Rome, 1744); III. Lavrion, Exposition, et description des circonscriptions de la Messe (Paris, 1726); GHR, Das heilige Messopfer (tr. St. Louis, 1902); Thamesser, Liturgia (Freiburg, 1893); II. Duberger, Enquestes sur l'action liturgique (Cambridge, 1907), and other authors of value. See further the bibliography of the article CANON OF THE MASS.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Eleven Thousand Virgins, THE. See Ursula, SAINT.

Eluyar ye Suvisa, Fausto de, a distinguished mineralogist and chemist, b. at Logroño, Castile, 11 Oct., 1755; d. 6 Feb., 1833. He was professor in the School of Mines, Vergara, Biscay, from 1781 to 1785. His most celebrated work is the isolation of tungsten. Associated with his br. Juan José, in 1783, two years after Schelle and Bergman had announced the probable existence of this metal, he isolated it, reducing it by carbon. At the present time when tungsten steel, known as high speed steel and self-hardening steel, is revolutionizing machine-shop practice, the work of Eluyar is of particular interest. He named the metal Wolfram, a name which it still retains in the German language; the name, tungsten, meaning heavy stone, is generally used in other tongues.

The Academy of Sciences of Toulouse, 4 March, 1784, received notice of this discovery. Eluyar then spent three years in travelling, for the purpose of study, through Central Europe and went to Mexico, then called New Spain. Here he had general superintendence of the mines and founded a Royal School of Mines in 1792. Driven away by the Revolution, he returned to Spain, where he was appointed general director of mines and was busy reorganizing his department when he was seized with a fit of apoplexy and died. His works are numerous; he wrote on the theory of amalgamation, a system for the reduction of silver from its ore which received great development in Mexico. In 1818, he published the mintage of coins. He was also the author of memoirs on the state of the mines of New Spain (now Mexico) and on the exploitation of the Spanish mines. At Madrid, in 1825, he published a work on the influence of mineralogy in agriculture and chemistry.

BEAUMONT, La Grande Encyclopédie, and under tungsten and Wolfram. His work on the reduction of tungsten is described in VON HUMBOLDT: Dictionnaire des arts et des sciences (Berlin); WATTS, Dictionary of Chemistry, MEMPH. Chim. C.

T. O'CONNOR SLOANE.

Elías (Heb. 'El'ıhwh, "Yahveh is God"); A.V., Elijah, the loftiest and most wonderful prophet of the O. T. What we know of his public life is sketched in a few popular narratives enshrined, for the most part, in the Third (Heb., First) Book of Kings. These narratives, which bear the stamp of an almost contemporary age, very likely took shape in Northern Israel, and are full of the most graphic and interesting details. Every part of the prophet's life therein narrated bears out the description of the writer of Ecclesiasticus: He was "a fire, and his word burnt like a torch" (xlviii, 1). The times called for such a prophet. Under the baneful influence of his Tyrian wife Jezebel, Ahab, though perhaps not intending to forsake altogether Yahveh's worship, had nevertheless erected in Samaria a temple to the Tyrian Ba'al (III K., xvi, 32) and introduced a multitude of foreign priests (xvii 19); doubtless he had occasionally offered sacrifices to the pagan deity, and, most of all, had allowed a bloody persecution of the prophets of Yahveh.

Of Elías's origin nothing is known, except that he was a Thebrite; whether from Thebes of Nephthi (Tob., i, 2; Gr.) or from Thebom of Galaad, as our texts have it, is not absolutely certain, although most scholars, on the authority of the Septuagint and of Josephus, prefer the latter opinion. Some Jewish legends, echoed in a few Christian writings, assert moreover that Elías was of priestly descent; but there is no other warrant for the statement than the fact that he offered sacrifices. His whole manner of life resembles somewhat that of the Nazarene, and is a loud protest against his corrupt age. His skin garment and leather girdle (IV K., 1, 8), his swift foot (III K., xvii, 46), his habit of dwelling in the clefts of the torrents (xvii, 3) or in the caves of the mountains (xix, 9), of sleeping under a scanty shelter (xvii, 5), betray the true son of the desert. He appears abruptly on the scene of history to announce to Ahab that Yahveh had determined to avenge the apostasy of Israel and her king by bringing a long drought on the land. His message delivered, the prophet vanished as suddenly as he had appeared, and, guided by the spirit of Yahveh, betook himself by the brook Jabbok, to the east of the Jordan, and there the ravens (some critics would translate, however improbable the rendering, "Arabs" or "merchants") "brought him bread and flesh in the morning, and bread and flesh in the evening, and he drank of the torrent" (xvii, 6).

After the brook had dried up, Elías, under Divine direction, crossed over to Sarepta, within the Tyrian dominion. There he was hospitably received by a poor widow whom the famine had reduced to her last meal (12); her charity he rewarded by increasing her store while and oil all the while; the drought and famine prevailed, and later on by restoring her son from death (14–24). For three years there fell no rain or dew in Israel, and the land was utterly barren. Meanwhile Ahab had made fruitless efforts and secured the country in search of Elías. At length the latter resolved to confront the king once more, and, supernaturally appearing before Abídi, bade him summon his summer heat (xviii, 7 sq.). When they met, Ahab bitterly upbraided the prophet as the cause of the misfortune of Israel. But the prophet flung back the charge: "I have not troubled Israel, but thou and thy father's house, who have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and have followed Baalim" (xviii, 18). Taking advantage of the discomfiture of the silent king, Elías bids him to summon the prophets of Baal to Mount Carmel, for a decisive contest between their god and Yahveh. The ordeal took place before a great concourse of people (see CARMEL, MOUNT) whom Elías, in the most forcible terms, presses to choose: "How long do you halt between two sides? If Yahveh be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him" (xviii, 21). He then commanded the heathen prophets to invoke their deity; he himself would "call on the name of his Lord"; and the God who would answer by fire, "let him be God" (24). An altar had been erected by the Baal-worshippers and the victim laid upon it; but their cries, their wild dances and mad self-mutilations all the day long availed nothing; "there was no voice heard, nor did any one answer, nor regard them as they prayed" (29). Elías, having repaired the ruined altar of Yahveh which stood there, prepared thereon his sacrifice; then, when it was time to offer the evening oblation, as he was praying earnestly, "the fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the holocaust, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench" (38). The issue was fought and won. The people, maddened by the success, fell at Elías's command on the pagan prophets and slew them at the brook Cison. That same evening the drought ceased with a heavy downpour of rain, in the midst of which the strange prophet ran before Ahab to the entrance of Jezreel.

Elías's triumph was short. The anger of Jezebel, who had sworn to take his life (xix, 2), compelled him to flee without delay, and take his refuge beyond the desert of Judá, in the sanctuary of Mount Horeb. There, in the wilds of the sacred mountain, broken-
spirituated, he poured out his complaint before the Lord, who strengthened him by a revelation and restored his faith. Three commands are laid upon him: to anoint Hazael to be king of Syria, Jehu to be king of Israel, and Elisha to be his own successor. At once Elisha set out on the appointee of the Lord and new burden. On his way to Damascus, he meets Elisha at the plough, and throwing his mantle over him, makes him his faithful disciple and inseparable companion, to whom the completion of his task will be entrusted. The treacherous murder of Naboth was the occasion for a new reappearance of Elisha at Jezreel, as a champion of the people's rights and of social order, and as a witness that his impending doom. Ahab's house shall fall. In the place where the dogs licked the blood of Naboth will the dogs lick the king's blood; they shall eat Jezabel in Jezreel; their whole posterity shall perish and their bodies be given to the fowls of the air (xxi. 20–26). Consequence-striking, Ahab qualifier before the man of God, and in view of his penance the threatened ruin of his house was delayed. The next time we hear of Elisha, it is in connexion with Ochozias, Ahab's son and successor. Having received severe injuries in a fall, this prince sent messengers to the shrine of Elijah, and Ananias, to inquire whether he should recover. They were intercetted by the prophet, who sent them back to their master with the intimation that his injuries would prove fatal. Several bands of men sent by the king to capture Elisha were stricken by him in the heavenly; finally the man of God appeared in person before Ochozias to confirm his threatening message. Another episode recorded by the chronicler (II Par., xxi, 12) relates how Jerom, King of Juda, who had indulged in Baal-worship, received from Elisha a letter warning him that all his house would be smote by a plague, and that he himself was doomed to an early death.

According to IV K., iii, Elisha's career ended before the death of Josaphat. This statement is difficult—but not impossible—to harmonize with the preceding narrative. However this may be, Elisha vanished still more mysteriously. As he had appeared. Like Enoch, he was "translated", so that he should not taste death. As he was conversing with his spiritual son Elisha on the hills of Moab, "a fiery chariot, and fiery horses parted them both asunder, and Elisha went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (IV K., ii, 11), and all the efforts to fill him made by the prophets disbelieving Elisha's recital, availed nothing. The memory of Elisha has ever remained living in the minds both of Jews and Christians. According to Malachias, God preserveth the prophet alive to entrust him, at the end of time, with a glorious mission (iv. 5–6); at the New Testament period, this mission was believed to precede immediately the Messianic Advent (Matt., xvii, 10, 12; Mark, ix, 11); according to some Christian commentators, it would consist in converting the Jews (St. Jer., in Mal., iv, 5–6); the rabbis, finally, held that its object will be to give the explanations and answers hitherto kept back by them. I Mach., ii, 58, extols Elisha's zeal for the Law, and Ben Sira entwines in a beautiful page the narration of his actions and the description of his future mission (Eccles., xxviii, 1–12). Elisha is still in the N. T. the person up to the consummation of God (Matt., xvii, 14; Luke, i. 17; ix, 8; John, i. 21). No wonder, therefore, that with Moses he appeared at Jesus' side on the day of the Transfiguration.

Nor do we find only in the sacred literature and the commentaries thereof evidences of the conspicuous name Elishas won for himself in the minds of after-generations. To this day the name of Jebeel Mar Elyas, usually given by modern Arabs to Mount Carmel, perpetuates the memory of the man of God. Various places on the mountain: Elishas's groto; El-Khadr, the supposed school of the prophets; El-Muhraka, the traditional spot of Elishas's sacrifice; Teli El-Kassis, or Mound of the priests—where he is said to have slain the priests of Baal—are still in great veneration both among the Christians of all denominations and among the Moslems. Every year the Druses assemble at El-Muhraka to hold a festival and offer a sacrifice in honour of Elias. All Mussulmans have the prophet in great reverence; no Druse, in particular, would ever consider an oath made in the name of Elisha. Not only among them, but to some extent also among the Jews and Christians, many legendary tales are associated with the prophet's memory. The Carmelites monks long cherished the belief that their order could be traced back to unbroken succession to Elias whom they hailed as their founder. Vigorously opposed by the Bollandists, especially by Papenbroeck, their claim was no less vigorously upheld by the Carmelites of Flanders, until Pope Innocent XII, in 1698, deemed it advisable to silence both contending parties. Elisha is honoured by both the Greek and Latin Churches on 20 July.

The old stichometrical lists and ancient ecclesiastical writers (Const. Apost., VI, 16; Origen, Comm. in Matth., xxvii, 9; Euthalius; Epiphanius, Haer., xiii) mention an apocryphal "Apocalypse of Elisha", citations from which are said to be found in I Cor., ii, and Eph., v. 14. Lost to view since the early Christian centuries, this work was partly recovered in a Coptic translation found (1883) by Maspero in a monastery of Upper Egypt. Other scraps, likewise in Coptic, have since been discovered, and the work is now no longer considered as this Apocalypse—and it seems that we have by far the greater part of it—was published in 1899 by G. Steindorf; the passages cited in I Cor., ii, 9, and Eph., v. 14, do not appear there; the Apocalypse, on the other hand, has a striking analogy with the Jewish "Sepher Elia".

STEINDORF, Die Apokalypse des Elias, eine unbekannte Apokalypse und Bruchstücke der Sophonias Apokalypse (Leipzig, 1894); SMITH, The Prophets of Israel (London, 1856); Les Prophêtes d'Israël (Paris, 1892); CLEMENS, Die Wunderberichte über Elia und Elisa in den Büchern der Könige (Grimma, 1877).

CHARLES L. SOFTY.

Elias, Apocalypse of. See Elyas; Egypt, VI, Coptic Literature.

Elias of Cortona, Minister General of the Friars Minor, b., it is said, at Bevila near Assisi, c. 1180; d. at Cortona, 22 April, 1253. In the writings of Elias that have come down to us he styles himself "Elia, Sinner", and his contemporaries without exception call him simply "Brother Elias". The name of a town was first added to his name in the fourteenth century; in Franciscan compilations like the "Chronica XXIV generalium" and the "Liber Conformitatum" Elias is described as Helias de Assisio, whereas the name of Cortona does not appear in connexion with his before the seventeenth century. It is clear in any event that Elias did not belong to the noble family of Coppe as some have asserted. From Salimbe, who knew Elias well, we learn that his family name was Bonisbaro or Bounbarone, that his father was from the neighbourhood of Bologna, and his mother an Assianian; that before becoming a friar Elias worked at his father's trade of mattress-making and also taught the children of Assisi to read the Psalter. Later on, according to Eccleston, Elias was a scrivener, or notary, at Bologna, where he doubtless applied himself to study. But he was not a cleric and never became a priest. Elias appears to have been one of the earliest companions of St. Francis of Assisi. The time and place of his joining the saint are uncertain; it may have been at Assisi in 1211, as Wedding says; or in the service of the seraphs, or among the friars from the first. After a short sojourn, as it seems, in Tuscany, Elias was sent in 1217 as head of a band of missionaries to Palestine, and two years later he became the first provincial of the then extensive province of Syria. It was in this
In Elias He In Faenza great St. We household few Faversham, Elias Ravenna. Elias Elias
ELIAS
capacity in St. this burial of splendour, pope, end 1226), Elias Elias
so-sole Collis Inferni at the western extremity of the town, and proceed to collect money in various ways to meet the expenses of the building. Elias thus alienated the zealots in the order, who felt entirely with St. Francis upon the question of poverty, so that at a chapter held in May, 1227, Elias was ejected in spite of his prominence, and Giovanni Parenti, provincial of Spain, was elected second general of the order.

Thenceforth Elias devoted all his energies to raising the basilica in honour of St. Francis. The first stone was laid 17 July, 1228, the day following the solemnity of saint's canonization, and the work advanced with such incredible speed that the lower church was finished within twenty-two months. It was consecrated 25 May, 1230, the hurried, secret, and still unexplained translation of St. Francis's body thither from San Giovanni in Colline by Elias having taken place a few days previously, before the general and other friars assembled for the purpose were present. Soon after this, though there is some difference of opinion as to the exact date, Elias attempted, as it seems by a kind of coup de main, to depose Innocent, and secure the government of the order by force, but the attempt failed. He thereupon retired to a distant hermitage, where we are told he allowed his beard and hair to grow, wore the vilest habit, and to all appearances led a most penitential life. However this may be, Elias was afterwards elected general at that time, and in 1232, magis tumuloque quam canonice, as a contemporary chronicler expresses it; and he continued to govern the Friars Minor for nearly seven years. During that period the order was passing through one of the crises of its earlier development. It is well known (see CONVENTUALS) that during that time a division of St. Francis a division had shown itself in the ranks of the friars, some being for relaxing the rigour of the rule, especially as regards the observance of poverty, and others for adhering to its literal strictness. The conduct of Elias after his election as general helped to widen this breach and fan the flames of discord in the order. In arbitrary fashion he refused to convene a chapter or to visit any of the provinces, but sent in his place "visitors", who acted rather as tax collectors—for Elias's chief need was money to conduct a war and convert the Franchise—than only violating the rule himself, but causing others to do so also.

In many other respects Elias abused his authority, receiving unworthy subjects into the order and confiding the most important offices to ignorant lay brothers, and when several of the early and most vocal companions of St. Francis failed to wear the capes of the mendicant order, they were dealt with as mutineers, some being scourged, others exiled or imprisoned. Elias's manner of life made his despotism more intolerable. It seems to have been that of a powerful baron rather than of a mendicant friar. We are told that he gathered about him a household of great splendour, including secular lackies, dressed in the gayest livres, that he kept "a most excellent cook" for his exclusive use, that he fared sumptuously, wore splendid garments, and made his journeys to different courts on fine palfreys with rich trappings. Because of these excesses, which threatened the complete destruction of the rule, the opposition to Elias became widespread. It was organized by Aymon of Faversham, who, in conjunction with other provincials from the North, determined to have him removed, and appealed to Gregory IX. Elias excommunicated the appoints and sought to prevent their reception by the pope. But Gregory received them and, in spite of Elias, summoned a chapter at Rome. Elias resisted to the utmost and strove to browbeat his accusers, but Gregory called on him to resign. He refused to do so, and thereupon deposed by the pope, the English provincial, Albert of Pisa, being elected general in his stead. This was in 1239.

After his deposition, Elias, who still kept the titles of Custos of the Assisian Basilica and Master of the Works, seems to have busied himself anew for a time at the task of completing the church and convent of S. Francesco, but subsequently retired to Cortona. Refusing, as he was wont, to obey either the general or the pope, Elias now openly transferred his allegiance to Frederick II, and resigned, in 1240 with the emperor's army, riding on a magnificent charger at the siege of Faenza and at that of Ravenna. Some two years before this Elias had been sent by Gregory IX as an apostolic assignato to Frederick. He now became the supporter of the excommunicated emperor in his strife with Rome and was himself excommunicated by Gregory. It is said that Elias then forwarded a letter to the pope explaining his conduct and asking pardon, and that this letter was found in the tuine of Albert of Pisa after the latter's death. Aymon of Faversham, who had been the principal opponent of Elias, and who was elected general in succession to Albert, having died in 1244, a chapter was thereupon held at Genoa. Elias was summoned by Innocent IV to attend it, but he failed to appear. Some say that the papal mandate never reached him. Be this as it may, Elias was excommunicated anew and expelled from the order. The news of his disgrace spread quickly "to the great scandal of the Church", and the very children might be heard singing in the streets:

"Hor attorna frat': Helya
Ke pres' ha la mala via",
a couplet which met the friars at every turn, so that the very name of Elias became hateful to them. It was about this time that Elias was sent by Frederick II on an important diplomatic mission to Constantinople and Cyprus. When not employed by the emperor, Elias resided at Cortona with a few friars who had remained faithful to him. He dwelt for a time in a private house which he had acquired in the city, and which he granted to his friars. In this house he was assassinated, probably the work of some disorderly friar, or perhaps of the very friars whom Elias had estranged by his haughty and despotic conduct.

Soon after, his brother-in-law, Giovanni da Parma, became gen-
eral in 1247, he sent Fra Gerardo da Modena to Cortona to beg Elias to submit, promising that he would be treated with the utmost clemency. But Elias, who seems on the one hand to have feared imprisonment by the pope and on the other to have been unwilling to renounce the favour of Frederick II, died during the Passiontide, 1253, the lonely old man,—for Elias had lost his protector by Frederick’s death in 1250—fell seriously ill. We learn from the sworn testimony of several witnesses that Bencius, Archpriest of Cortona, recognizing at once the gravity of Elias’s condition and the reality of his distress, went on Saturday, 19 April; that two days later Elias received Holy Communion at the hands of Fra Diotante, but that he could not be anointed, since Cortona was then under interdict, no holy oil was to be found. On Easter Tuesday Elias died, reconciled indeed with the church, but outside the order. He was buried at Cortona in the church he had built, which two years later—his followers having returned to obedience—passed into the hands of the order. But Elias’s bones were not suffered to rest at St. Francesco, for a later guardian dug them up and flung them out.

Elias is perhaps the most difficult character to estimate in all Franciscan history. In the first place it is wellnigh impossible, with the documents at our disposal, to obtain even a clear idea of his chequered career. There is no contemporary life of Elias, and, with the exception of Celano’s Vita Prima, of which our only evidence is that written under the influence of Elias, none of the early biographies of St. Francis make any allusion to him. In the second place, considerable bias has to be reckoned with in what is recorded of Elias in later works, especially in the writings of the Zealots, who are often indebted less by analogy than by direct considerations than by party spirit. Many stories have gathered around the life of Elias which are largely inventions. Yet these fictions have been indiscriminately reproduced by subsequent writers, with the result that Elias has come to be depicted by too many of the early biographers of St. Francis as a traitor to his master’s interests, as a mere tool of the Curia in transforming the order and destroying the manner of life intended by the Poverello. But if some have branded Elias as another Judas, others, going to the opposite extreme, have not hesitated to call St. Paul of Sicily the “Blessed Paul of St. Francis.” The stress on some words of St. Antoninus, he has sought to exculpate Elias altogether, to justify his conduct at all hazards, even where it is wholly unjustifiable; they would fain make him appear as a second founder of the order, to whose ability its great success was mainly due. It is just because so few have written calmly about Elias that it becomes additionally difficult to form a just estimate of the real motives which guided him. He has been too much abused and too much lauded. Between the two extremes it seems necessary, if we would judge with fairness, to distinguish two periods in the life of Elias, namely, before the death of St. Francis and after it. In spite of the account of Elias’s early pride and profoundness given by the “Fioretti” which may be set aside as a picturesque slander introduced for artistic effect, there is nothing to show that Elias was other than a good religious during the lifetime of St. Francis, else it is hard to understand how the latter could have entrusted him with so much responsibility, and how he could have merited the special death-bed blessing of the Poverello. On the other hand that Elias really loved St. Francis there can be no doubt, and since we have means of ascertaining there never was any breach between them. At the same time it would be difficult to imagine two characters more widely different than Elias and St. Francis. Their religious ideals were as far apart as the poles. The heroic ideal of poverty and detachment which the Poverello con-

ceived for his friars Elias regarded as exaggerated and unpractical. Hence, while St. Francis did not desire large loci for his friars, Elias multiplied spacious convents. Again, Elias’s views with regard to learning among the friars were very far removed from those of St. Francis. “The habit of Helias,” writes Salimbene, “qua Ordinem fratum Minorum ad studium theologiam promovit.” But Elias did more than this. In particular the extension of the Franciscan missions among the infidels owes more to his work than is commonly admitted. For all that, Elias was cherished, beloved by the men of the Antonine Order, whom he thought to be the glory of the order. On the other hand it would be idle to deny that Elias was utterly lacking in the true spirit of his master. Ambition was Elias’s chief fault. So long as he remained under the influence of Francis his ambition was curbed, but when he came to govern, forgetting his own past life, the example of St. Francis, and the obligations of his office, Elias so far allowed ambition to dominate him that when it was thwarted he had not the humility to submit, but, reckless of consequences, plunged to his ruin.

There is no doubt owing to his fall and disgrace that in an order so prolific in early biographies Elias remained so long without a biographer. It would be difficult, however, to exaggerate the importance of his influence upon the history of the Franciscan Order. Even his opponents conceded that Elias possessed a remarkable ability, and, none denied his eloquence. His “Who in the whole of Christendom,” asks Eccleston, “was more gracious or more famous than Elias?” Matthew of Paris dwells on the eloquence of his preaching and Bernard of Besse calls him one of the most erudite men in Italy. We know that good as well as great men sought his friendship and that strange as it may seem, he appears to have retained the confidence of St. Clare and her companions.

Nothing that can really be called a portrait of Elias remains. Giunta Pisano’s picture of him “taken from life” in 1236 having disappeared in 1634, but a seventeenth-century replica in the Museum at Assisi is believed to have been more or less copied from it. In the latter, Elias is represented as a small, sparse, dark-haired man, with a melancholy face and thin beard, and wearing an Armenian cap. With the exception of his letter to the order announcing the death of Francis, the writing of Elias has been very little preserved. The works dealing with alchemy, formerly circulated under his name, are undoubtedly supposititious. Whether or not Elias was himself the architect of St. Francesco, the fact remains that if the tomb of the Poverollians remains, “the flower and the fairest of Italian Gothic” and the glory of Assisi, it is to Elias we owe this, and it constitutes his best monument.

Biographies of Elias: Anonimo Cortonese, (Veneza), Vita di Frate Elias (2nd ed., Leghorn, 1784); Affco, Vita di Frate Elias, (2nd ed., Padua, 1818); Ryker, Elias von Cortona (Leipzig, 1872); these may still be read with interest, but they have been to some extent superseded by Le Pégion, De Aldeo Minorum in Angliae in Ansel. Franc., I (Paris, 1841), and passing: ibid., I. III, (ibid., 1841). Celano, Chronicle, Catalogus Generalis, ibid., III (1867), 695; Glassborow, ibid., I (1855) 504; Pahl, Emblemata, Chronicon in Germ. Rec. Script. XXXI, 279; Pahl, Emblemata, ed. Wollfinger, in Breviarium (Munich, 1890); II, Prima e seconda Legenda Minorum; Chron. XXII, 979, 297; Pahl, Liber conglomeratus, ibid., IV (1890). See also Roffel, Die, History, Seraph, Reimonta, Vereine, 1560, II, 177; etc., and Wadding, J., ed. 1621, 9, 79, 1253, 30; Scriptrors, ed. Nardecchia (Rome, 1900), 72—73; Sarale, Bollari Franc., I
Elia of Jerusalem, d. 518, one of the two Catholic bishops (with Flavian of Antioch) who resisted the attempt of the Emperor Anastasius I (491–518) to abolish the Council of Chalcedon (451). Anastasius spent the greater part of his reign in a vain attempt to impose Monophysitism on his subjects. Unlike his predecessors, who favoured Monophysitism merely as a political expedient whereby to conciliate Egypt and the great number of Monophysites in Syria, Anastasius carried on his propaganda apparently from religious conviction. His chief advisor, Marinos, a Syrian, was also a convinced Monophysite. At first the emperor tried to arrange a compromise. The population of Constantinople and nearly all the European provinces were too Chalcedonian for an open attack of the Emperor. Macedius II, Patriarch of Constantinople (450–511), submitted so far as to sign Zenon’s Heriotikon (482), but refused to condemn the council. Flavian of Antioch also for a time approved of a policy of compromise. The Acacian schism (484–519) still continued during the reign of Anastasius, but the emperor and his patriarch made advances to the Roman see—advances that came to nothing, since the pope always insisted on the removal of the names of former schismatics from the Byzantine diptychs. Gradually Anastasius went over completely to the Monophysite position. Macedius, Severus of Scythopolis, Xenias of Tahal in Persia, and a great crowd of Syrian and Egyptian Monophysite monks overwhelmed him with petitions to have the courage of his convictions and to break openly with the Dyophysites. In the emperor’s chapel the Trisagion was sung with the famous Monophysite addition (“who was crucified for us”). Macedius of Constantinople was deposed (511), and an open Monophysite, Timothy I (511–518), took his place. Timothy began a fierce persecution of Catholics. Then the Government summoned a synod at Sidon in 512 that was to condemn the Chalcedon. But the chiefly Elia of Jerusalem who prevented this result.

Elia was an Arab, by birth, who had been educated in a monastery in Egypt. In 457 he was driven out by the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy the Cat. He then came to Palestine and founded a monastery at Jericho. Anastasius of Jerusalem ordained him priest. In 464 Elia succeeded Sallustius as Bishop of Jerusalem and governed the see until 513. He acknowledged Euphemius of Constantinople (see Euphemius) and refused the communion of Macedius, the intruder about 508. The Monophysite Xennias of Hierapolis tried to make Elia sign a Monophysite formula, and the emperor ordered him to summon a synod that should condemn the Council of Chalcedon. Instead, Elia sent the emperor a Catholic profession that his enemies seem to have falsified on the way. Evagrius says: “The bishop has written it and sent it to the Emperor by the hands of Diocorus’ followers” (Monophysites). “And the profession that they then showed contained an anathema against those who speak of two natures in Christ. But the Bishop of Jerusalem, saying that it had been counterfeited with, sent another without that anathema. Nor is this surprising. For they often corrupted works of the holy Fathers” (II. É., III., xxxi). The Synod of Sidon in 512 was to condemn Chalcedon and depose Elia and Flavian. But they succeeded in persuading the Fathers to do neither (Labbe, Concil. IV, 1414). The Monophysites went on accusing these two of Nestorianism, and Anastasius deposed them, in spite of the protest of Elia’s legate, Sabas. Flavian was deposed first and Severus, an open Monophysite, was intruded in his place. With this person Elia and the monks of Palestine would have no communion (Evagrius, II. É., III., xxxii). Then the Council of Palestine, in 513, at Jerusalem and offered Elia his choice of signing a Monophysite formula or being deposed. Elia refused to sign and was banished to Aila on the Red Sea (513). His monasteries were closed. Elia remained faithful to the end.

Elia of Jerusalem was the founder of many monasteries in his patriarcate. The imperial presentation of him as a compromiser is unjust. He was steadfastly Catholic throughout and protested at once against the heretical formula brought to the emperor in his name. The Syrian Uniat Church keeps his feast, with St. Flavian of Antioch, on 18 Feb. (Nilles, Kalend. Man., I, 471). These two are named in the Roman Martyrology on 4 July.


ADRIAN FORTESSUCC.
conspicuous for his fairness and consideration for his colleagues. He was also the author of "Observations sur les différentes formations dans le système des Vosges", Paris, 1829; "Mémoires pour servir à une description géologique de la France" (with Dufrenoy), 4 vols., Paris, 1830-38; "Recherches sur quelques accidents de la surface du globe", Paris, 1834; "Explications de la carte géologique de la France", Paris Part I, 1841; Part II-IV, 1848-78 (with Dufrenoy).


H. M. BROOK.

Eliquis (Fr. Eloï), Saint, Bishop of Noyon-Tournai, b. at Châtellerat near Limoges, France, c. 590, of Roman parents, Eucherius and Tergidia; d. at Noyon, 1 December, 660. His father, recognizing unusual talent in his son, sent him to the noted goldsmith Abbo, master of the mint at Limoges. Later Eliquis went to Neustria, where he worked under Babo, the royal treasurer, on whose recommendation Clotaire II commissioned him to make a throne of gold adorned with stones. Eliquis stayed in this so long that the king that he appointed him master of the mint at Marseilles, besides taking him into his household. After the death of Clotaire (629), Dagobert appointed his father's friend his chief councillor. The fame of Eliquis spread rapidly, and ambassadors from various kings went to him before going to the king. His success in inducing the Breton King, Judith, to submit to Frankish authority (636-37) increased his influence. Eliquis took advantage of this to obtain arms for the poor and to ransom Roman, Gallic, Breton, Saxons, and Missionaries captives, who were arriving daily at Marseilles. He founded several monasteries, and with the king's consent sent his servants through towns and villages to take down the bodies of malefactors who had been executed, and give them decent burial. Eliquis was a source of edification at court, where he and his friend Dagobert I were of the same age. He also built the basilica of St. Basile, and restored that of St. Martial at Paris. He erected several fine churches in honour of the relics of St. Martin of Tours, the national saint of the Franks, and St. Denis, who was chosen patron saint by the king. On the death of Dagobert (639), Queen Nade rode took the reins of government, and Eliquis and Dado left the court and entered the priesthood. On the death of Acarius, Bishop of Noyon-Tournai, 13 May, 640, Eliquis was made his successor with the unanimous approbation of clergy and people. The inhabitants of his diocese were pagans for the most part. He undertook the conversion of the Flemings, Antwerpians, Frisians, Suevi, and the barbarian tribes along the coast. In 644 he approved the famous privilege granted to the Abbey of Saint-Denis, Paris, exempting it from the jurisdiction of the ordinary. In his own episcopal city of Noyon he had a church built and endowed an abbey for virgins. After the finding of the body of St. Quentin, Bishop Eliquis erected in his honour a church to which was joined a monastery under the Irish rule. He also discovered the bodies of St. Piatus and companions, and in 654 removed the remains of St. Ikerus, the celebrated Irish missionary (d. 636). Eliquis was buried at Noyon. There is in existence a sermon written by Eliquis, in which he combats the pagan practices of his time, a homily on the last judgment, also a letter written in 645, in which he begs for the prayers of Bishop Desiderius of Cahors. The fourteen other homilies attributed to him are of doubtful authenticity. His homilies have been edited by Krusch in "Mon. Germ. Hist." (loc. cit. infra).

St. Eliquis is particularly honoured in Flanders, in the province of Antwerp, and at Tournai, Courti of Ghent, Bruges, and Donai. During the Middle Ages his relics were the object of special veneration, and were often transferred to other churches. Eliquis was made church in 1,066, 1,137, 1,235, and 1,306. He is the patron of goldsmiths, blacksmiths, and all workers in metals. Cabmen have also put themselves under his protection. He is generally represented in Christian art in the garb of a bishop, a crozier in his right hand, on the open palm of his left a miniature church of chased gold.


Elijah. See Elia.

Elined (ALMEDHA), Saint, virgin and martyr, flourishing c. 490. According to Bishop Challoner (Britannia Sancta, London, 1746, II, 59), she was a daughter of Bragan (Brychan), a Briton, whom the present province of Brecknock is named, and her memory was kept in Wales. Giraldus Cambrensis, in his "Itinerarium Cambir," (I, ci. ii), the chief authority for Elined, speaks of the many churches throughout Wales named after the children of Bragan, and especially of one on the hill, in the region of Brecknock, not far from the castle of Aberhodni, which is called the church of St. Almeda, "who, rejecting the marriage of an earthly prince, and espousing herself to the eternal King, consummated her course by a triumphant martyrdom." Her feast was celebrated 1 August, on which day the religious visited the church, and many miracles were wrought. William of Worcester says that she was buried at Usk. The church mentioned by Giraldus was called, says Rees, Swith chapel. The Bollandists (1 August) express themselves satisfied with the evidence of her cultus. This saint is the Luned of the "Mabinogion" (Lady Guest, I, 113-14, II, 164) and the Luyne of Tennyson's "Gareth and Lynette." She is also supposed to be identical with the End of the "Mabinogion" and Tennyson's "Idyls.

Elipandus. See Adoptionism.

Eliseus (Elisea; Heb. יְלָשָׁא, God is salvation), a Prophet of Israel.—After learning, on Mount Horeb, that Eliseus, the son of Saphat, had been selected by God as his successor in the prophetic office, Eliseus set out to make known the Divine Will. Thelaid by casting his mantle over the shoulders of Eliseus, whom he found "one of them that were ploughing with twelve yoke of oxen" Eliseus delayed only long enough to kill the yoke of oxen, whose flesh he boiled with the very wood of his plough. After he had shared this farewell repast with his father, mother, and
friends, the newly chosen Prophet “followed Elias, and ministered to him”. (II Kings, xix, 8–21.) He went with his master from Galgal to Bethel, to Jericho, and thence to the eastern side of the Jordan, the waters of which, touched by the mantle, divided as to let them pass over on dry ground: and then beheld Elias in a fiery chariot taken up by a whirlwind into heaven. By means of the mantle let fall from Elias, Elisha miraculously recrossed the Jordan, and so won from the prophets at Jericho the recognition, that “the spirit of Elias hath rested upon Elisha” (IV Kings, ii, 1–15.) He won the gratitude of the people of Jericho for healing with salt its barren ground and its waters. Elisha also knew how to strike with salutary fear the adorers of the calf in Bethel, for forty-two little boys, probably encouraged to mock the Prophet, on being cursed in the name of the Lord, were torn by “two bears out of the forest”. (IV Kings, ii, 19–24.) Before he settled in Samaria, the Prophet passed some time on Mount Carmel (IV Kings, ii, 25.) When the armies of Juda, and Israel, and Edom, then allied against Mesha, the Moabite king, were bestridden by the Idumean desert, Elisha conceived a scheme to relieve them of that obstacle. He sent a letter to King Benadad of Syria, offering to give him up upon the judgment of God, and afterwards to strike him dead. Benadad, who had been mortally wounded by his own sword, lettered back for Elisha to come and see what the Lord would do for him. The latter was not deceived about the king’s condition, and predicted that Benadad should live, and die by the sword in a distant land. He was of course true to his word, and died in that manner (IV Kings, iv, 37–41.) By the cure of Naaman, who was afflicted with leprosy, Elisha, little impressed by the possessions of the Syrian general, whilst willing to free King Joram from his perplexity, principally intended to show “that there is a prophet in Israel.” Naaman, at first reluctant, obeyed the Prophet, and washed seven times in the Jordan. Finding his flesh ‘restored to him like the flesh of a little child’, the prophet was struck with amazement at this momentous sign, by this evidence of God’s power, and by the disinterestedness of His His Prophet, as to express his deep conviction that “there is no other God in all the earth, but only in Israel” (IV Kings, v, 1–19.) It is to this chapter that Arminius refers when he said: “And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet: none of them was cleansed but Naaman the Syrian” (Luke, iv, 27.) In punishing the avarice of his servant Gide (IV Kings, v, 20–27), in saving “not once nor twice” King Joram from the ambuscades planned by Benadad (IV Kings, vi, 8–12), in ordering the ancients to shut the door against the messenger of Israel’s ungrateful king (IV Kings, vi, 25–32), in bestriding a wild blindness the soldiers of the Syrian king (IV Kings, vi, 13–23), in making the iron tablets to remove from embarrassment a son of a prophet (IV Kings, vi, 21–22), in confuting the sudden flight of the enemy and the consequent cessation of the famine (IV Kings, vii, 1–20), in unmaking the treachery of Hazael (IV Kings, viii, 7–15), Elisha proved himself the Divinely appointed Prophet of the one, ungrateful, Whose knowledge and power he was privileged to share.

Mindful of the order given to Elias (III Kings, xix, 16), Elishas delegated a son of one of the prophets to quietly anoint Jehu King of Israel, and to commission him to cut off the house of Ahab (IV Kings, ix, 1–10). The death of Joram, pierced by an arrow of the Ammonites (I Kings, iv, 1), the ignominious end of Jezebel, the slaughter of Ahab’s seventy sons, proved how faithfully executed was the Divine command (IV Kings, ix, 11–x, 30).

After predicting to Josiah his victory over the Syrians at Aphek, as well as three other subsequent victories, ever bold foretold to kings, ever kindly towards the lowly, Elisha died, and they buried him (IV Kings, xiii, 14–20). The very tomb of his corpse proved to be a place to cite a dead man (IV Kings, xiii, 20–21). “In his life he did great wonders, and in death he wrought miracles.” (Eccles., xviii, 15.)

**ELISHA. See ELSIEUS.**

Elisha, a famous Armenian historian of the fifth century, place and date of birth unknown, d. 480. Some identify him with Elishé, Bishop of Ani, who took part in the Synod of Artashat (449). According to a different and more common tradition, he had been in his younger days a companion, as soldier or secretary, of the Armenian general Vahram, during the war of religious independence (449–451) against the Persian King. His memoirs, relating to the life and wars of the Armenians in union with the Iberians and the Albanians, for their common faith, against the Persians (449–451). It is considered one of the masterpiece of ancient Armenian literature and is almost entirely free from words and expressions. An old edition of it was published at Venice (1826) by the Mechitarists of San Lazaro. One of the manuscripts on which it is based purports to be a faithful copy of another manuscript dated 616. The text of that edition was further improved in subsequent editions at the same place (1829, 1838, 1859, and 1864). Among other editions of value may be mentioned those of Theodosia (Crimes), 1801, and of Jerusalem, 1865. There is an English, but unfinished, translation by C. F. Neumann (London, 1830); one in Italian by G. Capellelli (Venice, 1849); and one in French by R. Langlois in his “Collection des mémoires et modernes de l’Arménie” (Paris, 1869). Among the seven chapters mentioned by Elishé himself in his introductory remarks, all the editions contain an eighth chapter referring to the so-called Leonian martyrs (451) and other historical events. It has been noted that in all manuscripts the fifth chapter is missing, while in the earlier editions the original sixth chapter is cut in two so as to make up for the missing chapter. On the first point see Langlois, op. cit., II, p. 190; on the second see G. F. Neumann, “Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur, nach den Werken der Mechitaristen feat gearbeitet.” (Leipzig, 1836), pp. 64 sqq. See also Terminansians, “Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu der syrischen Kirche” (Leipzig, 1894), p. 37. Elishé is also the author of a commentary on Joshua and Judges, an explanation of the Our Father, a letter to the Armenian monks, etc., all found in the syllabus of the “History of Vahram.”

**FINCK, Geschichte der armenischen Literatur in Geschichte der christlichen Literatur, des Koinon, der Armenier (Leipzig, 1907), 97 sqq:**

**BARDENHEWER, Patrology, tr. SHANNON (Freiburg im Br., St. Louis, 1908), 599.**

**H. HYVERNAT.**

**Elizabeth.** (God is an oath—Ex., vi, 23.) Zachary’s wife and John the Baptist’s mother, was “of the daughters of Aaron” (Luke, i, 5), and, at the same time, Mary’s kinswoman (Luke, i, 36), although what their actual relationship was, is unknown. St.
Hippolytus (in Niceph. Call., Hist. Eccles., II, iii) explains that Sohe and Anna their mothers were sisters, and that Sohe had married a "son of Levi." Whether this indication, probably gathered from some apocryphal writings, and later on adopted by the compilers of the Greek Menologium, is correct, cannot be ascertained. Elizabeth, like Zachary, was "just before God, walking in all the commandments and justifications of the Lord without blame" (Luke, i, 6). She had been deprived, however, of the blessings of motherhood until, at an advanced age, a son was promised her by the Angel Gabriel (Luke, i, 8–20). When, five months later, Elizabeth was visited in her home by the Virgin Mary, not only was her son sanctified in her womb, but she herself was enlightened from on high to salute her cousin as "the mother of my Lord." (Luke, i, 45). According to some modern critics, we should even attribute to her the canticle "Magnificat!". After the birth and circumcision of John the Baptist, the Gospels do not mention Elizabeth any more. Her feast is celebrated on 8 September by the Greeks, and 5 November in the Latin Church.


The Visitation

Triumphal Arch, Venice

ELIZABETH, SISTERS OF SAINT, generally styled "Grey Nuns". They sprang from an association of young ladies established by Dorothea Klara Wolff, in connexion with the sisters, Mathilde and Maria Merkert, and Franziska Werner, in Neisse (Prussia), to tend in their own homes, without compensation, helpless sick persons who could not or would not be received into the hospitals. The members purposed to support the needy through the labour of their own hands. Without adopting any definite rule, they led a community life, and wore a plain dress, a brown woolen habit with a grey bonnet. For this reason they were soon called by the people the "Grey Nuns". As their work was soon recognized and praised everywhere, and as new members continually applied for admission, their spiritual advisers sought to give the association some sort of religious organization. They endeavoured, whenever possible, to affiliate it with already established confraternities having similar purposes. But their foremost desire was to educate the members for the care of the sick in hospitals. Great difficulties arose, and the attempt failed, principally through the resistance of the foundresses, who did not wish to abandon their original plan of itinerant nursing. Thus the association which had justified such bright hopes was dissolved, and many of the newly admitted members joined the Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo, while the foundresses left the novitiate which they had already entered. Klara Wolff and Mathilde Merkert died shortly after, in the service of charity. The other two began their work anew in 1830 and placed it under the special protection of St. Elizabeth. They speedily gained the sympathy of the sick of all classes and creeds, and also that of the physicians. New candidates applied for admission, and the sisters were soon able to extend the sphere of their activity beyond Neisse. Of especial importance was the foundation made at Breslau, where the work of the sisters came under the direct observation of the episcopal authorities. Soon after, 4 Sept., 1839, Prince-Bishop Heinrich Forster was prevailed upon by the favourable reports and testimonials to grant the association ecclesiastical approbation. As such a recognition presupposed a solid religious organization, a novitiate was established, according to the statutes submitted. In the following year the twenty-four eldest sisters made the three religious vows. State recognition, with the grant of a corporative charter, was obtained by the confraternity 25 May, 1864, under the title, "Catholic Charitable Institute of St. Elizabeth", through the mediation of the Prussian Crown-Prince Frederick William, subsequent Emperor of Germany, who had observed the beneficent activity of the sisters on the battle-fields of Denmark. The approbation of the Holy See was granted for the congregation on 26 Jan., 1887, and for its constitutions on 26 April, 1898. The congregation has spread to Norway, Sweden, and Italy, and has (1908), dependent on the mother-house at Breslau, 305 filial houses, with 2565 sisters and about 100 postulants.


Elizabethans. See THIRD ORDER OF ST. FRANCIS.

Elizabeth Associations (Elisabethenvereine), charitable associations of women in Germany which aim for the love of Christ to minister to the bodily and spiritual sufferings of the sick poor and of neglected children. On 10 December, 1842, eight ladies of Munich formed a society, of which the Princess Leopoldine von Löwenstein was the head, for the purpose of visiting and aiding the sick poor in their homes. In 1841 it was made a religious corporation, by which many indulgences were granted by the Holy Father. In order to carry on better the visiting of the sick the first branch or conference of the association was founded in 1870. According to its statutes the members are divided into two classes: associate members,
or those who aid the organization by means of annual contributions, and active members who, besides contributing of their means, also visit the sick poor and perform other duties, as those of administration, at the direction of the president of the society. The branches are merely means of carrying on the affairs of the main society with which they are closely affiliated, but they are independent in administration. The Elizabeth Association of Munich, according to the financial report covering the year 1907, has 157 active and 3686 associate members; the receipts were 129,550.06 marks ($32,339.76), and disbursements of 123,422.77 marks ($30,585.69). During the year 1907 4345 poor persons were assisted, 195 children cared for in asylums and nurseries, and 18 old people were provided for in asylums and infirmaries.

Other Elizabeth Associations, although with some differences of organization, were formed on the model of that of Munich at Barmen and Trier in 1843, Cologne in 1848, etc. These societies are now found chiefly in the following sections of Germany: Bavaria, 36 societies, 24 of these in the Palatinate; Diocese of Cologne, 110 societies with 1200 members, and 190 contributors, and an income of 150,000 marks, families assisted 3500; Diocese of Paderborn, 120 societies with 16,000 members and contributors, and an income of 175,000 marks, families assisted 3000. There are also Elizabeth Associations in the Dioceses of Freiburg, Münster, Trier, Limburg, and the Vicariate Apostolic of Cologne; in the Diocese of Breslau, instead of Elizabeth Associations, there are about 130 women's conferences of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. In Germany the Elizabeth Associations number altogether some 550 branches or conferences which aid annually 10,000 to 50,000 families.

MS. History of the Elizabeth Association of Munich; by-laws, annual and financial reports of the different associations, MS. Historical Collection, etc.; Regel des Vereins von der St. Elisabeth (Cologne, 1900); Regeln und Gebote des Vereins der hl. Elisabeth in die Diöcesen Paderborn (Paderborn, 1900); short sketch of the association in Frankfurt. Die heilige Elisabeth von Thüringen (München-Gluckstadt, 1907); statistics in Krause, Kirch. Handbuch, 1903-09 (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1908), 224-25.

GREGOR REINHOLD.

Elizabeth of Hungary, Saint, also called Saint Elizabeth of Thuringia, b. in Hungary, probably at Angyalföld (Angelfeld) near Angyalföldybergen (not 19 November), 1231. She was a daughter of King Andrew II of Hungary (1205-35) and his wife Gertrude, a member of the family of the Counts of Andechs-Meran; Elizabeth's brother succeeded his father on the throne of Hungary as Bela IV; the sister of Gertrude was Swietogen, or Swietogenia, wife of Duke Heinrich I, the Bearded, of Silesia, while another saint, St. Elizabeth (Isabel) of Portugal (d. 1336), the wife of the tyrannical King Diniz of that country, was her great-niece. In 1211 a formal embassy was sent by Landgrave Hermann I of Thuringia to Hungary to arrange, as was customary in that age, a marriage between his eldest son Hermann and Elizabeth, who was then four years old. This plan of a marriage was the result of political considerations and was intended to be the ratification of a great alliance which in the politics of the time it was thought to form against the German Emperor Otto IV, a member of the house of Guelph, who had quarreled with the Church. Not long after this the little girl was taken to the Wartburg in Thuringia to court to be brought up with her future husband and, in the course of time, to be betrothed. The court of the Wartburg was this period famous for its magnificence. Its centre was the stately castle of the Wartburg, splendidly placed on a hill in the Thuringian Forest near Eisenach, where the Landgrave Hermann lived surrounded by poets and minnesingers, to whom he was a generous patron. Notwithstanding the turbulence and purely secular life of the court and the pomp of her surround-

ings, the little girl grew up a very religious child with an evident inclination to prayer and pious observances and small acts of self-mortification. These religious impulses were undoubtedly strengthened by the sorrowful experiences of her life. In 1215 Elizabeth's mother, Gertrude, was murdered by her father, in all likelihood, probably out of hatred of the Germans. On 31 December, 1216, the oldest son of the landgrave, Hermann, whom Elizabeth was to marry, died; after this she was betrothed to Ludwig, the second son. It was probably in these years that Elizabeth had to suffer the hostility of the married couple of the Thuringian court, to whom the contemplative and pious child was a constant rebuke. Ludwig, however, must have soon come to her protection against any ill-treatment. The legend that arose later is incorrect in making Elizabeth's mother-in-law, the Landgravine Sophia, a member of the royal family of Bavaria, the leader of this court party. On the contrary, Sophia was a very religious and charitable woman and a kindly mother to the little Elizabeth. The political plans of the old Landgrave Hermann involved him in great difficulties and reverses; he was excommunicated and lost his mind. He died, 25 April, 1217, unreconciled with the Church. He was succeeded by his son Ludwig IV, who, in 1221, was also made regent of Meissen and the East Mark. The same year (1221) Ludwig and Elizabeth were married, the groom being twenty-one years old and the bride fourteen. Their marriage was really a happy and exemplary one, and the couple were devotedly attached to each other. Ludwig proved himself worthy of his wife. He gave protection to her acts of charity, penance, and her vigils and often held Elizabeth's hands as she knelt praying at midnight beside his bed. He was also a capable ruler and brave soldier. The Germans call him St. Ludwig, an appellation given to him as one of the best men of his age and the pious husband of St. Elizabeth. They had three children: Hermann II (1222-41), who died young; Sophia (1224-84), who married Henry II, Duke of Brabant, and was the ancestress of the Landgraves of Hesse, as in the war of the Thuringian succession she won Hesse for her son Heinrich I, called the Child; Gertrude (1227-97), Elizabeth's third child, was born several weeks after the death of her father; in after-life she became abbess of the convent of Oldenburg near Wetzlar.

Shortly after their marriage Elizabeth and Ludwig made a journey to Hungary; Ludwig was often after this employed by the Emperor Frederick II, to whom he was much attached, in the affairs of the empire. In the spring of 1226, when floods, famine, and pestilence wrought havoc in Thuringia, Ludwig was in Italy attending the Diet at Constance on behalf of the emperor and the empire. Under these circumstances Elizabeth assumed control of affairs, distributed alms in all parts of the territory of her husband, giving even state robes and ornaments to the poor. In order to care personally for the unfortunate she built below the Wartburg a hospital with twenty-eight beds and visited the inmates daily to attend to their wants; at the same time she aided nine hundred poor daily. It is this period of her life that has preserved her name as that of gentle and charitable châtelaine of the Wartburg. Ludwig on his return confirmed all she had done. The next year (1227) he started with the Emperor Frederick II on a crusade to Palestine but died, 12 September of the same year at Otranto, from the news that Elizabeth was still alive in Thuringia until October, just after she had given birth to her third child. On hearing the tidings Elizabeth, who was only twenty years old, cried out: "The world with all its joys is now dead to me."

The fact that in 1221 the followers of St. Francis of Assisi (d. 1226) made their first permanent settlement in Germany was one of great importance in the later
career of Elizabeth. Brother Rodeger, one of the first Germans whom the provincial for Germany, Cassarius of Speier, received into the order, was for a time the spiritual instructor of Elizabeth at the Wartburg; in his teachings he unfolded to her the ideals of St. Francis, who was strongly impressed by her. The story of Elizabeth the Franciscans in 1225 founded a monastery in Eisenach; Brother Rodeger, as his very close companion in the order, Jordanus, reports, instructed Elizabeth, to observe, according to her state of life, chastity, humility, patience, the exercise of people filled with the spirit of poverty. His rule prevented the attainment of the other ideals of St. Francis, voluntary and complete poverty. Various remarks of Elizabeth to her female attendants make it clear how ardently she desired the life of poverty. After a while the post of Brother Rodeger had filled was assumed by Master Conrad of Marburg, who belonged to no order, but was a very ascetic and, it must be acknowledged, a somewhat rough and very severe man. He was well known as a preacher of the crusade and also as an inquisitor or judge in cases of heresy. On account of the latter activity he has been more severely judged than is just; at the present day, however, the evidence of his judgments is a fairer one. Pope Gregory IX, who wrote at times to Elizabeth, recommended himself to the God-fearing preacher. Conrad treated Elizabeth with inexorable severity, even using corporal means of correction; nevertheless, he brought her to a firm hand by his self-mortifications. Her poverty and the importance of her death was very active in her canonization. Although he forbade her to follow St. Francis in complete poverty as a beggar, yet, on the other hand, by the command to keep her door she was enabled to perform works of charity and tenaciousness. It was believed, on account of the testimony of one of Elizabeth’s servants in the process of canonization, that Elizabeth was driven from the Wartburg in the winter of 1227 by her brother-in-law, Heinrich Raspe, who acted as regent for her son, then only five years old. About 1888 various investigators (Korn, Marcel, Wenzel, E. Michael, etc.) asserted that Elizabeth left the Wartburg voluntarily, the only compulsion being a moral one. She was not able at the castle to follow Conrad’s command to eat only food obtained in a way that was certainly right and proper. Lately, however, Huyskens (1897) tried to prove that Elizabeth was of her own free will in Marburg in Hesse, which was hers by dover right. Consequently, the Te Deum that she directed the Franciscans to sing on the night of her expulsion would have been sung in the Franciscan monastery at Marburg. Accompanied by two female attendants, Elizabeth left the castle that stands on a height commanding Marburg. The next day her children were brought to her, but they were soon taken elsewhere to be cared for. Elizabeth’s aunt, Matilda, Abbess of the Benedictine nunnery of Kitzingen near Nuremburg, took charge of the unfortunate landgravine and sent her to her uncle Eckhart, Bishop of Bamberg. The bishop, however, was intent on arranging another marriage for her, although during the lifetime of her husband Elizabeth had made a vow of continence in case of his death; the same vow had also been taken by Francis, and these strongly appealed to her. When Elizabeth was mainly for her position against her uncle the remainders of her husband were brought to Bamberg by her faithful followers who had carried them from Italy. Weeping bitterly, she buried the body in the family vault of the landgraves of Thuringia in the monastery of Reinhardsthal, the widow of Conrad she received the value of her dower in money, namely two thousand marks; of this sum she divided five hundred marks in one day among the poor. On Good Friday, 1228, in the Franciscan house at Eisenach Elizabeth formally renounced the world; then going to Master Conrad at Marburg, she and her maids received from him the dress of the Third Order of St. Francis, thus being among the first tertians of Germany. In the summer of 1228 she built the Franciscan hospital at Marburg and on its completion devoted herself entirely to the care of the sick, especially to those afflicted with leprosy, which was common in Marburg still imposed many self-mortifications and spiritual renunciations, while at the same time he even took from Elizabeth her devoted domains. Constant in her devotion to God, Elizabeth’s strength was consumed by her charitable labours, and she passed away on the twenty-fourth day of the following month, at the age of forty, a time when life to most human beings is just opening.

Very soon after the death of Elizabeth miracles began to occur at her grave in the church of the hospital, especially miracles of healing. Master Conrad showed great zeal in advancing the process of canonization. By papal command three examinations were held of those who had been healed; namely, in August, 1232, January, 1233, and January, 1235. Before the process reached its end, however, Conrad was murdered, 30 July, 1233. But the Teutonic Knights in 1233 founded a house at Marburg, and in the same month, 1233, Conrad, Elizabeth’s brother-in-law of Marburg, entered the order. At Pentecost (28 May) of the year 1235, the solemn ceremony of canonization of the “greatest woman of the German Middle Ages” was celebrated by Gregory IX at Perugia. Landgrave Conrad being present. In the course of the same year (1235) the corpse was exhumed from the beautiful Gothic church of St. Elizabeth was laid at Marburg; on 1 May, 1236, Emperor Frederick II attended the taking-up of the body of the saint; in 1249 the remains were placed in the choir of the church of St. Elizabeth, which was not consecrated until 1253. Pilgrimages to the grave soon increased in such importance that at times they could be compared to those to the shrine of Santiago de Compostela. In 1539 Philip the Magnanimous, Landgrave of Hesse, who had become a Protestant, put an end to the pilgrimages by unjustifiable interference with the church that belonged to the Teutonic Order and by forcibly removing the relics and all that was sacred to Elizabeth. Nevertheless, the entire German people still honour the “dear St. Elizabeth,” as she is called; in 1907 a new impulse was given to her veneration in Germany and Austria by the celebration of the seven-hundredth anniversary of her birth from the council of the Church. The church of St. Elizabeth is generally represented as a princess graciously giving alms to the wretched poor or holding roses in her lap; in the latter case she is portrayed either alone or as surprised by her husband, who, according to a legend, which is, however, related of other saints as well, met her unexpectedly as she went secretly on an errand of mercy, and, so the story runs, the bread she was trying to conceal was suddenly turned into roses.

The original materials for the life of St. Elizabeth are to be found in the letters sent by Conrad of Marburg to Pope Gregory IX (1232) and in the testimony of her four female attendants (Libellus de actis quatuor anniculare) taken by the third papal commission (January, 1235). The best account of this testimony is to be found in Huyskens, Quellenstudien zur Geschichte der St. Elisabeth, Leipzig, 1898, pp. 110-40. Pp. 1-150 of these Quellenstudien were published in Historisches Jahrbuch for the Grosse Society (Munich, 1887), XXVIII, 499-510; 720-729, etc. The work of E. Menken, ed. in Monographs of the Germanic Institute (Leipzig, 1728-30), II, 357-43; Epistola Cornelia in Huyskens, Quellenstudien, 154-60; and in Weis, Geschichte der Kirchen in Deutschland, Buch 1, Neukirchen der Deutschen Bibelgesellschaft (Leipzig, 1879), 31-45, in the Publications of the prehistoric Society of Strasbourg, III, formerly issued in Allatia, Seraglio, etc., Nouvelles (Cologne, 1653), 28Q. For bibliography of these and other works see Dobeneck, Register der Geschichtsquellen Thuringia, 1-111 (Jena, 1894-1904), III, 298; for the Acts of the process of canonization see Huyskens, Quellenstudien, 110-295; Voss, Die Biographie der hl. Elisabeth, O. Curt. (1226), ed. Huyskens, in Annalen der historischen Freunde in den Niederlanden (1887), Pf. LXXXI, 147-176; and in Bornbom, Thesaurus Monumentorum Ecclesiasticorum (Amsterdam, 1731), IV, 115-132. For other
Elizabeth of Portugal, Saint, Queen (sometimes known as The Peacemaker); b. in 1271; d. in 1336. She was the illegitimate daughter of King Denis I of Portugal, later ruled by her greatest-aunt, the great Elisabeth of Hungary, but is known in Portuguese history by the Spanish form of that name, Isabel. The daughter of Pedro III, King of Aragon, and Constantia, grandchild of Emperor Frederick II, she was educated very piously, and led a life of strict regularity and self-denial from her childhood; she said the full Divine Office daily, fasted and did other penances, and gave up amusement. Elizabeth was married very early to Denis (Denis), King of Portugal, a poet, and known as the “busy king”, from his hard work in his country's service. His morals, however, were very bad, and the court to which his wife was brought consequently most corrupt. Nevertheless, Elizabeth quietly pursued the regular religious practices of her maidenhood, while doing her best to win her husband’s affections by gentleness and extraordinary forbearance. She was devoted to prayer and sick, and gave every moment she could spare to helping them, even pressing her court ladies into their service. Naturally, such a life was a reproach to many around her, and caused ill will in some quarters. A popular story is told of how her husband’s jealousy was aroused by an evil-speaking page; of how he condemned the queen's supposed guilty accomplice to a cruel death; and was finally convinced of her innocence by the strange accidental substitution of her accuser for the intended victim. 

Diniz does not appear to have reformed in morals till 1294, when we are told that the saint won him to repentance by her prayers and unfailing sweetness. They had two children, a daughter Constantia and a son Afonso. The latter so greatly resented the favours shown to the king’s illegitimate sons that he rebelled, and in 1233 was declared and hemmed up. St. Elisabeth, however, rose in person between the opposing armies, and so reconciled her husband and son. Diniz died in 1235, his son succeeding him as Afonso IV. St. Elisabeth then retired to a convent of Poor Clares which she had founded at Coimbra, where she took the Franciscan Tertiary habit, wishing to devote the rest of her life to the poor and sick in obscurity. But she was called forth to act once more as peacemaker. In 1336 Afonso IV marched his troops against the King of Castile, to whom he had married his daughter Maria, and who had neglected and ill-treated her. In spite of age and weakness, the holy queen dowager insisted on hurrying to Extremos, where she was drawn up. She again stopped the fighting and caused terms of peace to be arranged. But the exertion brought on her final illness; and as soon as her mission was fulfilled she died of a fever, full of heavenly joy, and inhoring herself to the love of holiness and peace. St. Elisabeth was buried at Coimbra, and miracles followed her death. She was canonized by Urban VIII in 1625, and her feast is kept on 8 July.

Elizabeth of Reute, Blessed, of the Third Order of St. Francis, b. 25 Nov., 1386, at Waldsee in Swabia, of John and Anne Acheer; d. 25 Nov., 1420. From her earliest days “the good Berta”, as she was called, showed a rare piety, and under the learned and devout Conrad Kügelin, her confessor, provost of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine at St. Pölten, she made extraordinary progress towards perfection. When fourteen she received the habit of the third order, but continued to live at home. Finding the life uncongenial, she secured the consent of her parents after long entreaties to leave home. Receiving the support from that she remained at the house of a pious tertiary, and the two worked at weaving; but the remuneration was small and they frequently suffered from hunger and other privations. After three years Conrad Kügelin established a house for tertiarys at Reute on the outskirts of Waldsee and Elisabeth entered it together with some others.

Here she took up her work in the kitchen, and now began her wonderful life of seclusion, fasting, and prayer. There was no clausura at the convent, still she led so retired a life that she was called “the Retired”. She spent many hours in a little garden, kneeling on a stone or prostrate on the ground in contemplation. So pure was her life that her confessor could scarcely find matter for absolution. She had much to suffer from attacks of the evil spirit, from suspicions of her sister in religion, from leprosy, and other sicknesses, but in all her trials she showed a heavenly patience, learned from the Passion of Christ, which she made the continual subject of meditation, the object of her love, and the rule of her life. In consequence God permitted her to bear the marks of the Passion on her body; her head often showed the marks of the Thorns, and her body those of the Scourging. The stigmata appeared only now and then, but her pains never ceased. She was shown the happiness of the blessed and the souls in the state of purgation; the secrets of hearts and of the future were unveiled to her. She foretold the election of Martin IV and the end of the Western schism. Though so much favoured by Divine Providence she always preserved a great humility. After her death she was buried in the church of Reute. Her life was written by her confessor and sent to the Bishop of Constance, but it was only after 1623, when her tomb was opened by the provost of Waldsee, that veneration spread in Swabia. After several miracles had been wrought through her intercession the Holy See was asked to ratify her cult. This was done 19 June, 1766, by Clement XIII. The Franciscans celebrate her feast on 25 November.

ELIZABETH

Elizabeth of Schonau, Saint, b. about 1129; d. 18 June, 1165.—Feast 18 June. She was born of an obscure family, entered the double-monastery of Schonau in Nassau at the age of twelve, received the Benedictine habit, made her profession in 1147, and in 1157 was made superior of the nuns under the Abbess Hildebrand. After her death she was buried in the abbey church of St. Florin. When her writings were published the name of saint was added. She was never formally canonized, but in 1351 her name was entered in the Roman Martyrology and has remained there.

Given to works of piety from her youth, much afflicted with bodily and mental suffering, a zealous observer of the Rule of St. Benedict and of the regulations of her convent, and devoted to practices of mortification, Elizabeth was favoured, from 1152, with ecstasies and visions of various kinds. These generally occurred on Sundays and Holy Days at Mass or Divine Office or after hearing or reading the lives of saints. Christ, His Blessed Mother, an angel, or the special saint of the day would appear to her and instruct her; or she would see quite realistic representations of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, or other scenes of the New Testament. What she saw and heard she put down on wax tablets. Her abbot, Hildebrand, told her to relate these things to her brother Egbert (Eckard), then priest at the church of Bonn. At first she hesitated, fearing lest she be deceived or be looked upon as a deceiver; but she obeyed. Egbert received the inspiration of Elizabeth and, according to the accounts written by oral explanations. Egbert (who became a monk of Schonau in 1155 and succeeded Hildebrand as second abbot) put everything in writing, later arranged the material at leisure, and then published all under his name.

Thus came into existence (1) three books of "Visions"—of these the first is written in language very simple and in unaffected style, so that it may easily pass as the work of Elizabeth. The other two are more elaborate and replete with theological terminology, so that the influence of Egbert is very plain. She utters prophetic threats of judgment against priests who are unfaithful shepherds of the flock of Christ, against the avarice and wordliness of the monks who only wear the garb of poverty and self-denial, against the vices of the laity, and against bishops and superiors delinquent in their duty: she urges all to combat earnestly the heresy of the Cathari; she declares Victor IV, the antipope supported by Frederick against Alexander III, as the one chosen of God. All of this appears in Egbert's own writings. (3) The revelation of the martyrdom of St. Ursula and her companions. This is full of fantastic exaggerations and anachronisms, but has become the foundation of the subsequent Ursula legends. There is a great diversity of opinion in regard to her revelations. The Church has never passed sentence upon them nor even examined them. Elizabeth herself was convinced of their supernatural character, as she states in a letter to Hildegarde; her brother held the same opinion; Trithemius considers them genuine; Eusebius Amort (De revelationibus visionibus et apparitionibus privatis regule tute, etc., Augsburg, 1744) holds them to be nothing more than his own imagination; viewed with some suspicion, and a few suspect them as human inventions. The canonization of the Blessed Virgin, and, above all, the dogma of her Immaculate Conception have made her the patron of new and popular legends. Elizabeth, a great example of humility and charity, was, like Gertrude, the patron of hospital foundations.

ELWANGEN


Ellis, Philip Michael, first Vicar Apostolic of the Western District, England, subsequently Bishop of Segni, Italy, b. in 1562; d. 16 Nov., 1726. He was the son of the Rev. John Ellis, Rector of Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire, a descendant of the Ellis family of Kiddall Hall, Yorkshire, and Susannah Welbore. Of six brothers, John, the eldest, became Under-Secretary of State to Edward I. William, a Jacobite Protestant, was Secretary of State to James II in exile; Philip became a Benedictine monk and Catholic bishop; Welbore became Protestant Bishop of Kildare and afterwards of Meath, Ireland; Samuel was Marshall of King's Bench; and Charles an Anglican clergyman. Philip, while still a Westminster schoolboy, was converted to the Catholic faith, and when eighteen years old went to St. Gregory's, Douai, where he was professed, taking the name of Michael in religion (30 Nov., 1670). After ordination he returned in 1688 to the English mission where he became one of the first members of the English Missions. As such he was one of the first Vicars Apostolic of the newly created Western District and was consecrated by Mgr. d'Aluè (6 May). At the revolution of 1688 he was imprisoned, but being soon liberated he retired to Saint-Germain and afterwards to Rome. In 1696 he was named assistant-prelate at the pontifical throne; and in Rome his knowledge of English affairs made him so useful that his repeated petitions for leave to return to his vicariate were refused. In 1704 he resigned the vicariate, and in 1708 was made Bishop of Segni, being ennobled on 25 Oct. His first care was to rebuild the ruined monastery of St. Chiara, and open an obse- sian seminary. This he enriched with many gifts and a large legacy. A curious survival of his English title survives in an inscription at Segni to "Ph. M. Mylord Ellis." Eleven sermons preached in 1685 and 1686 before James II, Queen of Modena, and Queen Henrietta Maria, were published in pamphlet form, some of which have been reprinted (London, 1714; 1772). The Acts of his Alexander III in Segni in 1710 were also published by order of Clement XI.


Edwin Burton.

Ellwangen Abbey, the earliest Benedictine monastery established in the Duchy of Württemberg, situated in the Diocese of Augsburg about thirty miles north-east of the town of Stuttgart. Harlof, Bishop of Langres, was, in 1453, with his new foundation abbot. The foundation of the abbey was about 764, though there are a few authorities for as early a date as 752. In later times it became a royal abbey, a privilege which seems to have been conferred in 1011 by the Emperor Henry II, and afterwards confirmed by the Emperor Charles IV, in 1347. Some authorities date the granting of this privilege as late as 1555. This cannot be correct, for it is known that the suprema of Ellwangen took his seat in the Diet among the princes of the country in 1500. The Benedictine occupation of the abbey came to an end in the first half of the fifteenth century. In 1460 it was sold by the Abbot William, and the abbey was passed into the hands of the secular canons under the rule of a provost. Ellwangen had many men of renown connected with it: the Abbot Lindolf and Erfinan, whom Mabillon speaks of as famous authors; Abbot Gebhard began to write the life of St. Udalricus but died before completing it;
Abbot Ermenrich (c. 845), author of the life of St. Solus which may be found in the fourth volume of the "Acta Sanctorum" of Mabillon. Adalbero, a monk of the Abbey of St. Gall, was made Bishop of Augsburg in 894. Abbot Lindebert became Archbishop of Mainz, as also did Abbot Hatto (891). St. Gebhard, Abbot of Ellwangen, became Bishop of Augsburg in 996. Abbot Milo about the middle of the tenth century was one of the visitors appointed for the visitation of the famous Abbey of St. Gall. Nothing is known of the property connected with Ellwangen during the period of its Benedictine history, but in the eighteenth century, after it had passed into the hands of the secular canons, its possessions included the court manor of Ellwangen, the manors of Taustall, Neuler, Rothlien, Tannenburg, Wasserthal, Abts-Gundand, Koekenberg near the town of Aalen, Henschlingen on the River Lein, and Lautern. Most of the ecclesiastical buildings still exist, though they are no longer used for religious purposes.

Since the secularization they have been held by the State and used for state purposes.


G. E. H. Hind.

**Elmo, Saint.** See Peter Gonzalez, Saint.

**Elne, Diocese of.** See Perpignan.

**Elne, Synod of.** See Perpignan.

**Ellohim (Sept., Ἱάσως; Vulg., Deus) is the common name for God. It is a plural form, but "the usage of the language gives no support to the supposition that we have in the plural form *Ellohim* to the God of Israel, the remains of an early polytheism, or at least a combination with the higher spiritual beings" (Kautzsch). Grammarians call it a plural of majesty or of rank, or of abstraction, or of magnitude (Gesenius, Grammatik, 27th ed., nn. 124 g, 132 h). The Ethiopic plural * ḥ̄ ḫ̄ * has become a proper name of God. Hoffmann has pointed out an analogous plural *dim* in the Phenician inscriptions (Ueber eine phil. Inscr., 1889, pp. 17 sqq.), and Barton has shown that in the tablets from El Amarna the plural form * dani* replaces the singular more than forty times (Proceedings of the American Oriental Society, 21-23 April, 1892, pp. xxvi-xxix).

**Etymology.** - *Ellohim* has been explained as a plural form of * Eloah* or as a plural derivative of *El*. Those who adhere to the former explanation do not agree as to the derivation of *Eloah*. There is no such verbal stem as *Eloah* in Hebrew; but in the Arabist Fleischer, Franz Delitzsch, and others appeal to the Arabic *a'lah*, meaning "to be filled with dread", "anxiously to seek refuge", so that * ḥ̄ ḫ̄ (Eloah) would mean in the first place "dread", then the object of dread. Gen., xxxi, 42, 53, where God is called "the fear of Israel", Is., viii, 13, and Ps. lxxv, 12, appear to support this view. But the fact that *a'lah* is not only an independent verbal stem but only a denominate from * ḥ̄ ḫ̄*, signifying originally "possessed of God" (cf. *ebyd waw aram, bmm*), renders the explanation more probable. It is not in the contention of Ewald, Dillmann, and others that the verbal stem, *dālah* means "to be mighty", and is to be regarded as a by-form of the stem * ṣ̄ ḫ̄*; that, therefore, *Ellohim* grows out of * ḥ̄ ḫ̄* as *El* springs from * ḥ̄ ḫ̄*. Baethgen (Beitraige, 297) has pointed out that of the seventy-four occurrences of *Eloah* forty-one belong to the Book of Job, and the others to late texts or poetic passages. Hence he agrees with Bulan in maintaining that the singular form *Eloah* came into existence only after the plural form *Ellohim* had been long in common use; in the case, a singular was supplied for its pre-existing plural. But even admitting *Ellohim* to be the prior form, its etymology has not thus far been satisfactorily explained. The ancient Jewish and the early ecclesiastical writers agree with many modern scholars in deriving *Ellohim* from *El*, but there is a great difference of opinion as to the method of derivation. Nagel (Theol. Stud., 1877, 217) supposes that the plural has arisen by the insertion of an artificial h, like the Hebrew *m̄m̄h̄* (maiden) from *m̄h̄*. Buhl (Gesenius' Hebräisches Handwörterbuch, 12th ed., 1895, pp. 41 sqq.) considers *Ellohim* as a sort of augmentative form of *El*; but in this respect as well as to the method of derivation, these writers are one in supposing that in early Hebrew the singular of the word signifying God was *El*, and its plural form *Ellohim*; and that only more recent times coined the singular form *Eloah*, thus giving *Ellohim* a grammatically correct correspondent. Lagrange, however, maintains that *Eloah* and *Ellohim* are derived collaterally and independently from *El*.

**The Use of the Word.** - The Hebrews had three common names for God, *El*, *Ellohim*, and *Eloah*: besides, they had the proper name *Yehoech.* Nestle is authoritative for the statement (Mont. Yehoech., 1900, p. 353) that *El* was in the thousand times in the Old Testament, while all the common names of God taken together do not occur half as often. The name *Ellohim* is found 2576 times; *Eloah*, 57 times (41 in Job; 4 in Pss.; 4 in Dan.; 2 in Hab.); 2 in Canticle of Men (Dietrich, 760); in Gen., ii, 3; 1 in Ps. ; 1 in Neh. (iv. 1.); *El*, 226 times (El, 9 times). Lagrange (Etudes sur les religions sémitiques, Paris, 1905, p. 71) infers from Gen., xvi, 3 (the most mighty God of thy father), Ex., vi, 3 (by the name of God Almighty), and from the fact that *El* replaced *Eloah* in the proper name of God. Hoffmann has pointed out an analogous plural *dim* in the Phenician inscriptions (Ueber eine phil. Inscr., 1889, pp. 17 sqq.), and Barton has shown that in the tablets from El Amarna the plural form * dani* replaces the singular more than forty times (Proceedings of the American Oriental Society, 21-23 April, 1892, pp. xxvi-xxix).

**Meaning of the Word.** - If *Ellohim* be regarded as derived from *El*, its original meaning would be "the strong one" according to Wellhausen's derivation of *El* from *d̄l* (Skizzen, 133, 199); or "the foremost one", according to Nödecke's derivation of *El* from *d̄l* (Sitzungsberichte der Leipz. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1880, pp. 175 sqq.; 1882, pp. 1175 sqq.); or the "mighty one", according to Dillmann's derivation of *El* from *d̄l,* or *b̄l,* or *b̄l,* to be mighty" (On Genesis, i, 1); or, finally "He after whom one strives", "who is the goal of all human aspiration and endeaue", "to whom one has recourse in distress or when one is in need of guidance", "to whom one attaches oneself closely", coincidentibus interea bene et sine, according to the Ration of the *El* from the preposition *d̄l,* to*, advocated by L. Place (cf. Lagarde, 1885, etc., p. 107), Lagarde gives the meaning of the word derived from the root *d̄l* (Religions, pp. 79 sqq.), and others. A discussion of the arguments which militate for and against each of the foregoing derivations would lead us too far.

If we have recourse to the use of the word *Ellohim* in the context, we find that its meaning is seven occurrences, it is used to denote either the true God or false gods, and metaphorically it is applied to judges, angels, and kings; and even accompanies other nouns, giving them a superlative meaning. The presence of the article, the singular construction of the word, and its context show with sufficient clearness whether it must be taken in its proper or its metaphorical sense, and what is its precise meaning in each case. Kautzsch
(Encyclopædia Biblica, III, 3324, n. 2) endeavours to do away with the metaphorical sense of "Elohim. Instead of the rendering "judges" he suggests the translation "God", as witness of a lawsuit, as giver of decisions on points of law, or as dispenser of oracles; for the rendering "angels" he substitutes "the gods of the heavens", which, in later post-exilic times, fell to a lower rank. But this interpretation is not supported by solid proof.

According to Renan (Histoire du peuple d'Israel, I, p. 30) the Semites believed that the world was surrounded, penetrated, and governed by the Elohim, many of whose active beings, analogous to the spirits of the savages, alive, but somehow inseparable from one another, not even distinguished by their proper names as the gods of the Aryans, so that they can be considered as a confused totality. Marti (Geschichte der israelitischen Religion, p. 26), too, finds in Elohim a trace of the original Semitic polytheism; he maintains that the word signified the sum of the divine beings that inhabited any given place. Baethgen (op. cit., p. 257), F. C. Baur (Symbolik und Mythologie, I, 304), and Hellmuth-Zimmer (Elohim, Berlin, 1900) make Elohim an expression of power, godhead, and totality. Lagrange, op. cit., urges against these views that even the Semitic races need distinct units before they have a sum, and distinct parts before they arrive at a totality. Moreover, the name El is prior to Elohim (op. cit., p. 77 sq.), and El is both a proper and a common name of God. Originally it was either a proper name and has become a common name, or it was a common name and has become a proper name. In either case, El, and, therefore, also its derivative form Elohim, must have denoted a single God. This inference becomes clearer after a little reflection. If El was, at first, the proper name of a false god, it could not become the common name for deity any more than Jupiter or June would; and if it was, at first, the common name for deity, it could become the proper name only of that God who combined in him all the attributes of deity, who was the true God. This does not imply that all the Semitic races had from the beginning a clear concept of God's unity and Divine attributes, though all had originally the Divine name El.


A. J. MAAS.

Eloi (Ely, St. See ELOI.

Elphege (or Alphege), Saint, b. 954; d. 1012; also called Goldwine, martyred. Archbishop of Canterbury, left his widow mother and patrimony for the monastery of Deerhurst (Gloucestershire). After some years as an anchorite at Bath, he became abbot, and (19 Oct., 981) was made Bishop of Winchester. In 994 Elphege administered confirmation to Olaf of Norway at Andover, and it is suggested that his patriotic spirit inspired the decrees of the Council of Elnham. In 1006, on becoming Archbishop of Canterbury, he went to Rome for the pallium. At this period England was much harassed by the Danes, who, towards the end of September, 1011, having sacked and burned Canterbury, made Elphege a prisoner. On 19 April, 1012, at Greenwich, his captors, drunk with wine, and enraged at ransom being refused, pelted Elphege with bones of oxen and stones, till one Thurnham dispatched him with his own axe. Elphege's body, after resting for years in St. Paul's (London), was translated by King Canute to Canterbury. His principal feast is kept on the 19th of April; that of his translation on the 8th of June. He is sometimes represented with an axe cleaving his skull.


Patrick Ryan.

Elphin (Elphinum), Diocese of, suffragan of Tuam, Ireland, a see founded by St. Patrick. All the known facts respecting its first bishop are recorded in two important memorials of early Irish hagiography, the "Vita Tripartita" of St. Patrick, and the so-called "Patrickian Documents" in the "Book of Armagh" (q. v.). On his missionary tour through Connaught, within he entered by crossing the Shannon at Drum-boolan, near Battle-bridge, in the parish of Arderne, in 134 or 453, St. Patrick came to the territory of Coreoglan on, in which was situated the place now called Elphin. The chief of that territory, a noble Druid named Ono, of the royal Connacht race of Hy-Britain, gave land, and afterwards his castle or fort, to St. Patrick to found a church and monastery. The place, which has hitherto been called Elphin, or Elphinum, or Emlagh-Ono, received the designation of Elphin, which signifies "rock of the clear spring", from a large stone raised by the saint from the well opened by him in this land and placed on its margin, and the copious stream of crystal water which flowed from it and still flows through the street of Elphin. There St. Patrick built a church called through centuries Tempull Phadraig, i.e. Patrick's church. He established here an episcopal see, and placed over it St. Assicus as bishop, and with him left Bate, a bishop, son of the brother of Assicus, and Cita, mother of Bate. St. Patrick also founded at Elphin an episcopal monastery, or college, one of the first monasteries founded by him, and placed Assicus over it, in which office he was succeeded by Bate. Both were buried at Raccun, in Donegal, where St. Patrick built a church and a habitation for seven bishops. The "Septem episcopi de Raccun" are invoked in the Festology of Angus the Culdees (q. v.).

The first bishop of Elphin is described in the "Book of Armagh" as the cera i.e. the wight or goldsmith of St. Patrick; and he made chalices, patens, and many book-covers for the newly founded churches. Following the example of their masters, the successors and spiritual children of St. Assicus founded a school of art and produced beautiful objects of Celtic workmanship in the Diocese of Elphin. Some of these remain to the present day, objects of interest to all who see them. The famous cross of Cong (see Cross), undoubtedly one of the finest specimens of its age in Western Europe, was (as the inscription on it and the Annals of Inisfallen testify) the work of Manus MacEgan, successor of St. Finian of Clooneraff near Elphin, in the County Roscommon, and was made at Roscommon under the superintendence of Domhnall, son of Flanagan O'Duffy, successor of Coman and Kieran, abbots of Roscommon and Collannacoe, and Bishop of Elphin. It is held that the exquisite Ardagh Chalice, which was given to Collannacoe by Turlough O'Coner, and was stolen thence by the Danes, was made, if not by the same artist, at least in the same school at Roscommon. The Four Masters record (1166) that the shrine of Manchan
of Maothail (Mohill) was covered by Rory O’Conor, and an embroidery of gold placed over it by him in as good style as relic was ever covered in Ireland. It is, therefore, fair to conclude that this beautiful work was also executed in the school of art founded by St. Assicus in the Diocese of Elphin. Within four miles of the present town of Elphin is Rathoroughan, the famous palace of Queen Maeve and the Connaught kings; Relig-na-Righ, the Kings’ Burial Place; also the well of Ogulla, or the Virgin Monument, the scene of the famous conversion and baptism of Aithne (Eithe) and Fidelma, the daughters of Leoghar, monarch of Ireland in the time of St. Patrick. Ware states that after the union with Elphin of the minor sees of Roscommon, Arderne, Drumcliffe, and other bishoprics of lesser note, finally effected by the Synod of Kells (1132), the see was esteemed one of the richest in all Ireland, and had about seventy-nine parish churches. The Four Masters describe its cathedral as the “Great Church” in 1235, and speak of the bishop’s court in 1258. It had a dean and chapter at this time, as we learn from the mandate of Innocent IV, sent from Lyons, 3 July, 1245, to the Archbishop of Tuam, notifying him that the pope had annulled the election of the Provost of Roscommon to the See of Elphin, and ordering him to appoint and consecrate Archdeacon John, postulated by the dean Malachy, the archdeacons John and Clare, and the treasurer Gilbert. Among the early bishops was Bron of Killaspugbroke, a favoured disciple of St. Patrick. He was also the friend and adviser of St. Brigid when she dwelt in the plain of Roscommon and founded monasteries there. According to Ware, of the successors of St. Assicus in the See of Elphin he found mention of only two before the coming of the English, Domhnall O’Dubhatag (O’Duffy), who died in 1036, and Flanachan O’Dubhatag, who died in 1168. There is reference to at least two other bishops of Elphin, in 640 and 1190. From St. Assicus to 1099 the names of at least fifty-four occupants of the see are enumerated in the ecclesiastical annals and public records of Ireland and Rome. Many of them were renowned for learning, wisdom and piety. During the Reformation and subsequent persecutions, there continued in Elphin an unflagging succession of canonically appointed Catholic bishops. They were faithful dispensers of the divine mysteries, like George Brann and John Max; confessors true to the Catholic Faith and the See of Peter, through years of persecution and exile like O’Higgins and Ó’Cearn; martyrs sealing their testimony with their blood, like O’Healy and Galviri. The present Diocese of Elphin includes nearly the whole of the county of Roscommon, with large portions of Sligo and Galway. In the census of 1901 the population was: Catholices, 125,743; non-Catholices, 7661. The present chapter consists of a dean, archdeacon, treasurer, chancellor, theologian, penitentiary, and four prebendaries. The parishes number 33, parish priests and curates 100. There is a convent of Dominicans at Sligo. The female orders in the dioce- se: Ursulines of Mixed Habit; Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul; Ursulines of Mary, of the Immaculate Conception; at Sligo. The Marist and Presentation Brothers teach large schools. The cathedral of the diocese at Sligo, an early Romanesque structure, simple and massive, was erected by Most Rev. Dr. Gillooly, and consecrated in 1897. He also built St. Mary’s Prebastery, and the College of the Im- maculate Conception, Sligo. These, with a Temper- ance Hall, form a group of ecclesiastical buildings worthy of their beautiful scenic surroundings. Bishop Gillooly was succeeded, 24 March, 1895, by the Most Rev. John Joseph Clancy, born in the parish of Riverstown, County Sligo, in 1856. Educated at the Marist College, Sligo, and Summerhill College, Athlone, and entered Maynooth in 1876, where he spent two years on the Dunboyne Establishment. In 1883 he was appointed professor in the Diocesan College, Sligo, and in 1887 professor of English Literature and French in Maynooth College. The archdeacon he held until he was made Bishop of Elphin.

Ruins of Cistercian Abbey (1161) Boyle, County Roscommon, Ireland

_Élusa_, a titular see of Palestina Tertia, suffragan of Petræ. This city is called Χαλεάς in the Greek text of Judith, i. 9. It is also mentioned by Ptolemy, V, xv, 10 (in Idumæa), Peutinger’s “Table”, Stephano Byzantius (as being formerly in Arabia, now in Palest- ina Tertia), St. Jerome (In Isaiam, V, xv, 4), the pilgrim Theodosius, Antonius of Piacenza, and Joanna Moschus (Pratum Spirituale, cix). In the fourth century, as is to be learned from St. Jerome’s life of St. Hilarioun, there was at Élusa a great temple of Aphrodite; the saint seems to have introduced Chris- tianity there (“Vita Hilarionis” in P. G., XXIII, 41). Finally in the following century a Bishop of Élusa, redeeming the son of St. Nilus, who had been carried off from Mount Sinai by the Arabs, ordained both him and his father (P. G., LXXIX, 373-403). Other bishops known are Theodulius, 451; Aretas, 451, Peter, 518; and Zenobius, 559 (Lequien, Or. christ., III, 752). Today the ruins of the city are seen at El-Khalasa (Khalasa), about nineteen miles south of Bersabe, in a large plain belonging to nomad tribes. Many inscriptions have been found there (Revue Biblique, 1908, 246-48, 253-55). In the vicinity, according to the Targums, was the desert of Sura with the well at which the angel found Agar (Gen., xvi, 7). (See Revue Biblique, 1906, 597.)

The ancient See of Élusa (Elæze) in Gaul was united with that of Auch (q. v.) probably in the ninth cen- tury.

Reland, Palestina (Utrecht, 1714), II, 717, 755-757; Robinson, Biblical Researches in Palestine (London, 1860), I, 201-246; Palmer, The Desert of the Exodus (Cambridge, 1885); Gelzer, Georgii Cyprii descriptio orbis Romani (Leipzig, 1890), 199.

S. Vailhée.

_Élvira_, Council of, held early in the fourth century at Elliberis, or Iliberis, in Spain, a city now in ruins not far from Granada. It was, so far as we know, the first council held in Spain, and was at- tended by nineteen bishops from all parts of the Pen-
insula. The exact year in which it was held is a matter of controversy upon which much has been written. Some copies of its Acts contain a date which corresponds with the year 324 of our reckoning; by some writers the council has accordingly been assigned to that year. It is true that the emperor Diocletian, Hefele 305 or 306. Recent opinion (Duchesne, see below) would put the date considerably earlier, from 300 to 303, consequently previous to the persecution of Diocletian. The principal bishop attending the council was the famous Hosius of Cordova. Twenty-six priests and also several sitting with the bishops. It is eighty-one canons were, however, subscribed only by the bishops. These canons, all disciplinary, throw much light on the religious and ecclesiastical life of Spanish Christians on the eve of the triumph of Christianity. They deal with marriage, baptism, idolatry, fastings, and yetonialy, excommunication, the cemeteries, usury, vigils, frequentation of Mass, the relations of Christians with pagans, Jews, heretics, etc. In canon xxxii we have, says Hefele (op. cit. below), the oldest positive ecclesiastical ordinance concerning the celibacy of the clergy. Canon xiii is the institution of the clergy of the Virgin (virginis Domini), so long familiar to Spain. Canon xxxvi (placuit picture) in ecclesia sive non debere ne quod coluit et adoraret in parietibus deponat) has often been urged against the veneration of images as practised in the Catholic Church. Binterim, De Rossi, and Hefele interpret this prohibition as directed against the use of images in over-ground churches only, lest the pagans should caricature sacred scenes and ideas; Von Funk, Turmel, and Dom Leclercq opine that the council did not pronounce as to the licency or non-licency of the use of images, but as an administrative measure simply forbid them, lest new and weak converts from paganism should incur thereby any danger of relapse into idolatry or be scandalized by such superstitions excesses in no way approved by the ecclesiastical authority. (See Von Funk in "Tübingen Quartalschrift", 1883, 270-79; Nolte in "Rev. des Sciences ecclésiastiques", 1877, 273-84; Turmel in "Rev. des Sciences ecclésiastiques" 1906, XIV, 508.) Several other canons of this council offer much interest to students of Christian archaeology. (See text and commentary in Hefele-Leclercq, "Hist. des Conciles", I, 212 sqq.)

**Arthur S. Barnes.**

**ELY (ELIA or ELYS), ANCIENT DIocese of (ELiais), in England. The earliest historical notice of Ely is given by Venerable Bede who writes (Hist. Eccl., IV, vii): "Ely is in the province of the East Angles, an island of about six hundred families, in the centre of an island, enclosed either with marshes or waters, and therefore it has its name from the great abundance of eels which are taken in those marshes." This district was assigned in 649 to Etheldreda, or Audrey, daughter of Anna, King of the East Angles, as a fief for her marriage with Tonbert of the Saxon race and Girwy. After her second marriage to Egfrid, King of Northumbria, she became a nun, and in 673 returned to Ely and founded a monastery on the site of the present cathedral. As endowment she gave it her entire principality of the Isle, from which subsequent Bishops of Ely derived their temporal power. Etheldreda died in 679, and her shrine became a place of pilgrimage. In 970 the monastery was restored by King Edgar and Bishop Ethelwold it was a foundation for monks only. For more than a century the monastery flourished, till about the year 1105 Abbot Richard suggested the creation of the See of Ely, to replace the enormous Diocese of Lincoln. The pope's brief erecting the new Bishopric was issued 21 Nov., 1108, and in Oct., 1109, the king granted his charter, the first bishop being Harvey, formerly Bishop of Bangor. The monastery church thus became one of the "conventional" cathedrals. Of this building the transepts and two bays of the nave already existed, and in 1170 the nave as it stands to-day (a complete and perfect specimen of late Norman work) was finished. As the bishops succeeded to the principality of St. Etheldreda they enjoyed palatine power and great resources. Much of their wealth they spent on their cathedral, with the result that Ely can show beautiful examples of Gothic architecture of every period, including two unique features, the un-rivalled Galilee porch (1198-1215) and the central octagon (1322-1328) which rises from the whole breadth of the building and towers up until its roof forms the only Gothic dome in existence. The western tower (215 feet) was built between 1174 and 1197, and the octagon was added to it in 1900. Of the cathedral as a whole it is true that "a more vast, magnificent and beautiful display of ecclesiastical architecture and especially of the different periods of the pointed style can scarcely be conceived" (Winkles, English Cathedrals, II, 46). It is fortunate in having perfect specimens of each of the successive styles of Gothic architecture: the Early English Galilee porch, the Decorated lady-chapel (1321-1349), and the Perpendicular chantry of Bishop Alcock (c. 1500).

The original cathedral was much smaller than the present Anglican see and consisted of Cambridge-shine alone, while even of this county a small part belonged to Norwich diocese. The bishops of Ely usually held high office in the State and the roll includes many names of famous statesmen, including eight lord chancellors (marked * ) and six lord treasurers (marked + ). Two bishops—John de Fontibus and Hugh Belsham—were reputed as saints, but never received formal cultus; the former was commemorated on 19 June. The following is the list of bishops:

- Harvey, 1109
- Nigal, 1133+
- Geoffrey Riddell, 1174
- William Longchamp, 1188
- Eustace, 1198*
- John de Fontibus, 1220+
- Geoffrey de Burgh, 1225
- Hugh Norwold, 1229
- William de Kilkenney, 1256*
- Hugh Belsham, 1257
- John Kirkby, 1260+
- William de Louth, 1290
- Ralph Walpole, 1290
- Robert Orford, 1302
- John Kesteven, 1310
- John Hotham, 1316+
- Simon Montague, 1337
- Thomas de Lisle, 1445
- Simon Langham, 1362*
- John Barnet, 1396†

**INTERIOR OF ELY CATHEDRAL, LOOKING WEST FROM CHOIR**
Showing famous octagon and lantern.
Elymos. See Barjeus.

Elzar of Sabran, Saint, Baron of Ansouis, Count of Ariano, b. in the castle of Saint-Jean de Robians, in Provence, 1285; d. at Paris, 27 September, 1323. After a thorough training in piety and the sciences under his uncle William of Sabran, Abbot of St. Victor at Marseille, he acceded to the wish of Charles II of Naples, who desired the virtuous Bishop of Glandéves. He respected her desire to live in virginity and joined the Third Order of St. Francis, vying with her in the practice of prayer, mortification, and charity towards the unfortunate. At the age of twenty he moved from Ansouis to Puy-Michel for greater solitude, and formulated for his servants rules of conduct that made his household a model of Christian virtue. On the death of his father, in 1309, he went to Italy and, after subdued by kinship his subjects who despised the French, he went to Rome at the head of an army and aided in expelling the Emperor Hohenstauzen. Returning to France, he made a vow of chastity with his spouse, and in 1317 went back to Naples to become the tutor of Duke Charles and later his prime minister when he became regent. In 1323 he was sent as ambassador to France to obtain Marie of Valois in marriage for Charles, edifying a worldly court by his heroic virtues. He was buried in the Franciscan church in the castle of the Minor Conventuals at Apt. The decree of his canonization was signed by his godson Urban V and published by Gregory XI. His feast is kept by the Friars Minor and Conventuals on the 27th of September, and by the Capuchins on the 20th of October.


Gregory Carr.

Emanationism, the doctrine that emanation (Lat. emanare, "to flow from") is the mode by which all things are derived from the First Reality, or Principle.

I. The term emanation, being itself a metaphor, has been, still, used in many senses, and frequently by writers who are not emanationists. Others, without using the word, really hold the doctrine of emanation. Furthermore, emanationism is always interwoven with different opinions on various subjects; to separate it from these so as to arrange its fundamental elements is more or less arbitrary. Taking emanationism in the sense commonly received to-day, it is not primarily a theological, but rather a cosmogonic system, not a direct answer to the question of the nature of God, but to that of the mode of origin of things from God. In general it holds that all things proceed from the same Divine substance, some emanations or descendants. All beings form a series, the beginning of which is God. The second reality is an emanation from the first, the third from the second, and so on. At every step the derived being is less perfect than its source; but, by giving rise to other beings, the source does not lose any of its perfections. The first source, then, from which everything flows, remains; its perfection is neither exhausted nor lessened.

Emanationism is frequently referred to as a form of pantheism; but while this latter is primarily a system of reality, identifying all things as modes or appearances of the one substance, emanationism is concerned chiefly with the mode of derivation. Nor does it necessarily affirm the substantial identity of all things; it may assert the distinct, though dependent, substantiality of emanated realities. It is true that emanation is conceived by some in a pantheistic sense, as an expansion of the substance, but the substance itself is unaffected. Hence, not only some forms of pantheism are not emanationistic, but also many emanationists—with more or less consistency—revert pantheism. For the latter who admit that matter is eternal and independent of God, God cannot be more than an architect, who arranges pre-existing materials. In the doctrine of complete emanationism, all things, from the highest spiritual substances to the lowest forms of matter, come from God as their first origin, matter being the last and the most imperfect emanation. Some views, however, combine the theory of the eternity of matter with the theory of emanation.

The doctrine of creation teaches that all things are distinct from God, but that God is their efficient cause. God does not produce things from His own substance or from any pre-existing reality, but by an act of His will brings them out of nothing. According to emanationism, on the contrary, the Divine substance is the reality from which all things are derived, not by any voluntary determination, but by a necessity of nature. And God does not produce all things immediately; the lower steps are more distant, and are separated from Him by necessary intermediaries. (It may be noted, however, that sometimes the word emanation is used in a broader sense including also creation. Thus St. Thomas: "Quaritur de modo emanationis rerum a primo principio qui dictur creatio"—Summa, I, Q. xiv, a. 1.)

Evolution implies the change of one thing into something else, whereas a reality from which another emanates remains identical with itself. The process of evolution—at least in its totality—is generally considered as an ascent, a movement upwards towards a greater perfection. Emanation is a descent; it begins with the infinitely perfect, and at every step the emanating beings are less perfect, less perfect, less divine. The Infinite is postulated as a starting-point, instead of being the goal which the universe is ever striving to realize. Some comparisons used by emanationists, though only metaphors, and consequently misleading if taken literally, may give a clearer idea of the system. Things proceed from God as water from a spring or an overflowing vessel; as the stem, branches, leaves, etc., from the root ; as the web from the spider; as the heat from the sun or a fire; as the doctrine from the teacher. It is easy to see that all such comparisons are deficient in many points. They are intended simply to illustrate that which is above human comprehension.

II. Vague indications of emanationism are found in ancient mythologies and religions, especially those of
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India, Egypt, and Persia. Thus in the Upanishads things are said to issue from their eternal principle as the webs from the spider, the plant from the earth, the hair from the skin. But, while these and other comparisons and expressions may be interpreted in the sense of emanationism, they are not sufficiently explicit to serve as a basis for the assertion that such systems of philosophy or religion are emanationistic. Philo's teaching on this point is not much clearer. His thought was influenced by two distinct currents: Greek philosophy, especially Platonism, and Judaism. In his endeavour to reconcile them, he sometimes falls into inconsistencies, and his system is confused. According to him, God, infinitely perfect, cannot act on the world immediately, but only through powers or forces (δύναμες) which are not identical with Him, but proceed from Him. The primitive Divine force is the Logos. Whether the Logos is a substance or only an attribute, remains an obscure point. From the Logos the Spirit (πνεῦμα) proceeds. It is the soul, or vivifying principle, of the world. Sometimes God is looked upon as the efficient and active cause of the world, sometimes also as immanent, as the one and the whole (δι' αυτοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁπάντος). The emanationistic expression of emanationism is found in the Alexandrian school of Neo-Platonism. According to Plotinus, the most important representative of this school, the first principle of all things is the One. Absolute unity and simplicity is the best expression by which God can be designated. The emanation proceeds in a determined and systematic order. Neither a distribution nor a determination would introduce both limitation and multiplicity. Even intelligence and will cannot belong to this Primal Reality, for they imply the duality of subject and object, and duality presupposes a higher unity. The One, however, is also described as the First Cause, the Light, the Universal Cause. From the One all things proceed; not by creation, which would be an act of the will, and therefore incompatible with unity; nor by a spreading of the Divine substance as pantheism teaches, since this would do away with the essential oneness. The One is not the unity of all things, but before all things. Emanation is the process by which all things are derived from the One. The infinite goodness and perfection "overflows", and, while remaining within itself and losing nothing of its own perfection, it generates other beings, sending them forth from its own superabundance. Or again, as brightness is produced by the rays of the sun so everything is a radiation (πνεῦμα ἐκ σωμάτος) from the Infinite Light. The various emanations form a series every successive step of which is an image of the preceding one, though inferior to it. The first reality that emanates from the One is the Nous (Νοῦς), a pure intelligence, an immanent and changeless thought, putting forth no activity outside of itself. The Nous is an image of the One, and, coming to recognize itself as an image, introduces the first duality, that of subject and object. The Nous includes in itself the intellectual world, or world of ideas, the Universal Cause. From the Nous emanates the Soul of the world, which forms the transition between the world of ideas and the world of the senses. It is intelligent and, in this respect, similar to the ideal world. But it also tends to realize the ideas in the material world. The World-Soul generates particular souls, or rather plastic forces, which are the "forms" of all things. Finally, the soul and its particular forces beget matter, which is of itself determined and becomes determined by its union with the form. With a few variations in the details, the same essential doctrine of emanation is taught by Iamblichus and Plotinus. While Pseudo-Dionysius identifies the One with the Good, he assumes an absolutely first One, anterior to the One, and utterly ineffable. From it emanates the One from the One, the intelligible world (ideas); and from the intelligible world, the intellectual world (thinking beings). According to Proclus, from the One come the unities ( Monadēs), which alone are related to the world. From the unities emanate the triads of the intelligible essences (being), the intelligible-intellectual essences (life), and the intellectual essences (thought). These again are further distinguished. Matter comes directly from one of the intelligible triads.

Gnostics teach that from God, the Father, emanated numberless Divine, supra-mundane Αόνα, less and less perfect, which, taken all together, constitute the fullness (αὐξημα) of Divine life. Wisdom, the last of these, produced an inferior wisdom named Achemoth, and also the psychic and material world. With the Logos, the idea of creation is made manifest. Whether Creation, as in the case of Pseudo-Dionysius, and the later Neo-Platonists, especially Proclus, frequently borrowing their terminology. Yet he endeavours to adapt his views to the teachings of Christianity. God is primarily goodness and love, and other beings are emanations from His goodness, a light is an emanation from the sun. John Scotus Eriugena takes his doctrine from Pseudo-Dionysius and interprets it in the sense of pantheistic emanationism. There is only one Being who, by a series of substantial emanations, produces all things. Nature has four divisions, or rather there are four stages of the one nature: (1) The immaterial which is not created, is in His primordial, incomprehensible reality, unknown and unknowable for all beings, even for Himself. God alone truly is, and He is the essence of all things.

(2) The created and creating nature, i.e., God considered as containing the ideas, prototypes, or, to use Eriugena's expression, the primordial causes of things. It is the ideal world. (3) The nature which is created, but does not create, is the world of things existing in time and space. All flow, proceed, or emanate from the first principle of being. Creation is a procession of things, and God is one and the same reality. In creatures God manifests Himself. Hence the name theophania which Eriugena gives to this process. (4) Nature, which neither creates nor is created, i.e., God as the term towards which everything ultimately returns.

Arabic philosophy—not to speak here of the various forms of Arabian mysticism—is in many points influenced by Neo-Platonism, and generally holds some form of emanationism, the emanation of the different spheres to which all things celestial and terrestrial belong. According to Alfarabi, from the First Being, conceived as intelligible (in this Alfarabi departs from Plotinus), the intellect emanates: from the intellect, the cosmic soul; and from the cosmic soul, matter. Avicenna teaches that matter is eternal and uncreated. From the First Cause comes the intelligentia prima, from which follows a series of processes and emanations of the various species of celestial sphere and the earthly sphere. For Avicenna the intellect is not individual, but identical with the universal spirit, which is an emanation from God. Interests is a comparison found in one of the later mystics, Ibn Arabi. Water that flows from a vessel becomes separated from it; when this comparison is defective, for things that issue from God are not separated. Emanation is illustrated by the comparison of a mirror, which receives the features of a man, although the man and his features remain united.

In Jewish philosophy, influences of Neo-Platonism
are apparent in Avicenna and Maimonides. In the Cabbala the famous doctrine of the Sephiroth is essentially a doctrine of emunations. It was developed and systematized especially in the thirteenth century. The Sephiroth are the necessary intermediaries between God and the universe, between the intellectual and the material world. They are divided into three groups, the first group of three forming the world of thought, the second group, also of three, the world of soul, and the last group, of four, the world of matter.

III. Philosophically the discussion of emanationism supposes God and the universe, the whole problem of the nature of God, especially of His simplicity and infinity. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is contained in the definition of the dogma of the creatio ex nihilo by the Fourth Lateran Council and, especially, the Council of the Vatican.

The latter expressly condemns emanationism (I. De Deo rerum omnium creatore, can. iv.), and anathematizes those “asserting that finite things, both corporeal and spiritual, or at least spiritual, have emanated from the Divine substance”.

The literature on this subject includes the works of the authors mentioned in the course of this work of [name], of philosophy, both general and of special schools and philosophers. Reference is made to the disciplines, for pro. Thes., IV, 329, Hagermann in Kulturkenken., IV, 431.

C. A. Dubray.

Emancipation, Catholic. See England; Roman Catholic Relief Bill.

Emancipation, Ecclesiastical. — In ancient Rome emancipation was a process of law by which a slave released from the control of his master, or a son liberated from the authority of his father (patris potestas), was declared legally independent. The earliest ecclesiastical employment of this process was in the freeing of slaves. The Church, unable to change at once the condition of the slave, was able, however, to gradually substitute for slavery the milder institution of serfdom, and to introduce in place of the elaborate formalities of the emancipation the simpler form of the manusmissio in ecclesia (Cod., De his, qui in ecclesia manumittuntur, i, 13), in which a simple statement to that effect by the master before the bishop and the congregation sufficed. The emancipation of a slave was especially necessary as a preliminary to his ordination (i.e., the Synod of Toledo, 1078, can. viii), X, De filius presbyterorum ordinandis vel non, i, xvii; c. iii (Fourth Synod of Toledo, 683, can. lxxiv), X, De servis non ordinandis et eorum manumissioni, i, xviii. Similarly, the entrance of a son into a religious order, i.e., the taking of the tonsure, was enjoined, or the profession of religion carried with it in canon law his emancipation from the legal authority (patris potestas) of the father. No positive law, however, can be quoted on this point, nor does modern civil legislation recognize this consequence of religious profession. The canon law recognizes another, purely imitative form of emancipation. This was the release of a pupil of a cathedral school, a domicellarius, from subjection to the authority of the scholastics, or head of the school. This emancipation took place with certain well-defined ceremonies, known in the old German cathedral schools as Koppengang.

The term emancipation is also applied to the release of a secular ecclesiastic from his diocese, or from a regular from obedience and submission to his former superior, because of election to the episcopate. The petition required from the former condition of condition of the or submission, which the collegiate electoral body, or the newly elected person, must present to the former superior, is called postulatio simplex, in contradistinction to the postulatio sollemnis, or petition to be laid before the pope, in case some canonical impediment prevents the elected person from taking the episcopal office. The document granting the dismissal from the former relations is called littera dimissoraria or emancipatoria. It is not customary to use the term emancipation for that form of dismissal by which a church is released from parochial jurisdiction, a bishop from subordination to his metropolitan, a monastery or order from the jurisdiction of the bishop, for the purpose of placing such person or body under the ecclesiastical authority of the pope, or under the pope himself. This act is universally known as excommunication (q. v.).


Johannes Baptist Sigmuller.

Emancipation of Jews. See Jews.

Emard, Joseph. See Valleyfield.

Ember-days (corruption from Lat. Quatuor Tempora, four times) are the days at the beginning of the seasons ordered by the Church as days of fast and abstinence. They were definitely arranged and prescribed for the entire Church by Pope Gregory VII (1031-1085) for the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, after Ash-Wednesday, after Whitsun, and after 1 September (Exaltation of the Cross). The purpose of their introduction, besides the general one intended by all prayer and fasting, was to thank God for the gifts of nature, to teach men to make use of them in moderation, and to assist the needy. The immediate occasion of the practice of the heathens of Rome. The Romans were originally given to agriculture, and their native gods belonged to the same class. At the beginning of the time for secking and harvesting religious ceremonies were performed to implore the help of their deities: in June for a bountiful harvest, in September for a rich vintage, and in December for the seeding; hence their feria sementiva, feria mesnus, and feria vindemiales. The Church, when converting heathen nations, has always tried to sanctify any practices which could be utilized for a good purpose. At first the Church in Rome had fasted in June, September, and December; the exact days were not fixed but were announced by the priests. The "Liber Pontificalis" ascribes to Pope Callistus (212-222) a law ordering the fast, but probably it is older. Leo the Great (440-461) assumed to his ordination (i.e., the Synod of Toledo, 1078) that the four seasons was added cannot be ascertained, but Gelasius (492-496) speaks of all four. This pope also permitted the conferring of priesthood and deaconship on the Saturdays of ember weeks—these were formerly given only at Easter. Before Gelasius the ember-days were perhaps known only in Rome, or rather, his observance spread. They were brought into England by St. Augustine; into Gaul and Germany by the Carolingians. Spain adopted them with the Roman liturgy in the eleventh century. They were introduced by St. Charles Borromeo into Milan. The Eastern Churches do not know them. The present Roman Missal, in the formulary for the Ember-days, retains in part the old practice of lessons from Scripture in addition to the ordinary two: for the Wednesdays three, for the Saturdays six, and seven for the Saturday in December. Some of these lessons contain promises of a bountiful harvest for those that serve God.

Duchene, Christian Worship (London, 1904), 322; Buntzen, Denkgründerkurznoten, IV, 129; Keilner, Heilige Tagen (Freiburg im Br., 1906), 137; Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique (1887), XIV, 337.

Francis Mersham.

Emblems of the Saints. See Iconography.

Embolism (Greek: ἐμβολία, from the verb, ἐμβάλλειν, "to throw in"), an insertion, addition, interpretation. The word has two specific uses in the language of the Church:

I. The prayer which, in the Mass, is inserted between the Our Father and the Fraction of the Bread: "Libera nos, quassumus, Domine, ab omnibus malis", etc. It is an interpretation of the last petition. The
ECONOMY may date back to the first centuries, since, under various forms, it is found in all the Occidental and in a great many Oriental, particularly Syrian, Liturgies. The Greek Liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, however, do not contain it. In the Mozarabic Missal, this prayer is very beautiful and is inserted not only in the Mass, but also after the Our Father at Lauds and Vespers. The Roman Church connects with it a petition for peace in which she inserts the names of the Mother of God, Sts. Peter and Paul, and St. Andrew. The name of St. Andrew is found in the Gelasian Sacramentary so that its insertion in the Embolism would seem to have been anterior to the time of St. Gregory. During the Middle Ages the provincial churches and religious orders added the names of other saints, their founders, patrons, etc., according to the discretion of the celebrant (see Micrologus).

II. In the calendar this term signifies the difference of days between the lunar year of only 354 days and the solar year of 365.2922 days. In the Alexandrian lunar cycle of 19 years, therefore, seven months were added, one each in the second, fifth, eighth, eleventh, thirteenth, sixteenth, and twentieth centuries. Each embolismic year had 13 lunar months, or 354 days. The lunar calendar was called Dionysian, because Dionysius Exiguus, in the sixth century, recommended the introduction of the Alexandrian Easter cycle of 19 years and computed it for 95 years in advance.

Embroidery. Ecclesiastical.—That in Christian worship embroidery was used from early times to ornament vestments, is confirmed by numerous notices, especially the statements of the Liber Pontificalis. For the period before the tenth century no account, even partially satisfactory, has come down to us, either of the methods of producing the embroidery or of the manner and extent of its use. What is incidentally said is not sufficient to make the matter clear, and no embroidery of this period for ecclesiastical purposes has been preserved. The oldest extant examples are the remnants of a manuscript dating from the beginning of the tenth century, in the museum of Durham cathedral, and fragments of an altar-cover of the same century in the National Museum at Ravenna. Vestments magnificently embroidered appeared at the beginning of the eleventh century, such as the chasuble completely covered with pictures embroidered in pure gold, which is preserved in the Bamberg cathedral; the coronation mantle of Hungary, originally also a chasuble, and other specimens of the highest importance not only on account of their costly material and the skill shown in their execution, but even more on account of the deep significance of the pictures. Up to the thirteenth century embroidery in gold thread was the ornamentation mainly used for ecclesiastical purposes. To a certain degree gold embroidery was intended in the place of tapestry or other materials woven with gold thread. Consequently, this embroidery so closely resembles fabrics woven with gold that on superficial examination it could easily be taken for such. At the same time, however, embroidery with silk threads was also practised, as is shown by the vestments preserved at St. Paul in Carinthia.

Ecclesiastical embroidery reached its fullest development in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and the first half of the fifteenth centuries. In this period whatever the name of vestment, wherever means allowed, was more or less richly embroidered. The working materials were gold, silver, and silk threads, small disks and spangles cut with a stamp from silver, plain or gilded, spangles and small disks of enamel, real pearls, precious stones, paste diamonds, and coral. The embroidery of figures was the branch of the art most pursued, purely ornamental embroidery was employed in ornamentation of more symbolic character. The copes and chasubles covered with pictorial embroidery of a deeply religious character, the aurifissa (bands) magnificently ornamented with embroidered figures, that were laid on the liturgical clothing and other vestments, the covers and wall-hangings embroidered in gold, etc. These works of wonderful needlework, all these examples of the art of the needle of that era, still found in large numbers in the church treasuries and museums, show that ecclesiastical embroidery then reached a height never since regained. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries Sicily was famous for its ecclesiastical embroidery; in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the workshops of England were more noted than all others. In this latter period mention of English embroidery, called opus Anglicanum, is found in almost all inventories of the more important churches of the Continent, and most frequently sent from England into other parts of Western Europe was a cope completely covered with a rich embroidery of figures on a background of vine arabesques or elaborate architecture, the background being worked in gold thread; examples of these copes are to be seen at Chartres, Lateran at Rome, at Pienza, Vich, and Daroca in Spain, Salzburg, Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges in France, and elsewhere. A large amount of superb ecclesiastical needlework, splendid specimens of which still exist, was also produced in Germany, France, and Italy; in the last-named country the work of Florence, Siena, Lucca, and Venice was especially noted. In the fifteenth century the finest ecclesiastical embroidery was done in Flanders, where the work most largely produced was that kind in which the gold thread was worked over with coloured silks. The best examples of this are the mass-vestments of the Order of the Golden Fleece preserved in the Hofburg at Vienna. With the close of the Middle Ages ecclesiastical embroidery began to decline. Instead of the flat stitch, use was now made of the more striking raised embroidery, which frequently degenerated into a purely formal highly unsuited in character to ecclesiastical embroidery. There was a continually growing tendency to aim at brilliant effects and a stately magnificence. At the same time pictorial needlework was less and less in vogue owing to the influence of secular embroidery. Needlework for church vestments was limited more and more to purely ornamental designs, taken chiefly from the plant world, and to certain symbolic designs. The art sank to its lowest depths both in design and technic at the commencement of the sixteenth century, during the so-called Biedermeier (honest citizen) period.

Ecclesiastical embroidery flourished in the various provinces of the Byzantine Empire. While the costly needlework produced there was naturally used mainly in the services of the Greek Church, still many being preserved, the same was also used in the eleventh century; in reality, a Greek sangha (vestment of a Greek bishop or priest) already existed, probably, in the latter half of the fourteenth century. At no period has ecclesiastical differed in its technic from secular embroidery. The same varieties of stitches and other art resources have been employed in both cases. No special ordinances have
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ever been issued by the Church in regard to embroidery for vestments, either as to material, colour, use, or design. Good taste, however, requires that the embroidery should harmonize with the character and colour-effect of the vestment, and that it should not be too crowded, or too stiff.

ROCK, Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalters (Bonn, 1889); 1; Rock, Textile Fabrics (London, 1876); F. AND H. MARSHALL, Old English Embroidery (London, 1884); de Frede, Die liturgische Gewandung im Osten (Freiburg, 1907); ibid., Würde für die Anlegung und Verzierungen der Paramente (Freiburg, 1904); DDECUR, Ruhmende Entwicklung der europäischen Weberei und Stickerei (Vienna, 1904).

JOSEPH BRAUN.

EMBROIDERY IN SCRIPTURE.—It is probable that the Israelites learned the art of embroidery during their sojourn in Egypt. The ornamentation of woven fabrics, especially of linen, by needlework in threads of different colours, spun or drawn from various materials, such as wool, flax, or gold, was known to ancient nations. The Greek and Romans acquired the art from the East. The monuments of Assyria and Babylon show that the garments of kings and officials are highly ornamented with what are commonly regarded as embroideries, and specimens of embroidered work have been found in Egyptian tombs. In Ezekiel, xxviii, 7, mention is made of the "fine brodered linen" used for sails on the ship of Tyre. The first record of embroidery in Scripture is found in the Book of Exodus (xxvi, 1, 31, 36) in the directions given to Moses concerning the curtains of the Tabernacle, the veil for the Ark, and the hanging in the entrance to the Holy of Holies. The Douay, following the Vulgate, does not distinguish between the two Hebrew expressions (Ex., xxvi, 1, 31) and the word מַעַט (Ex., xxvi, 36). The former is translated in the Revised Version by "the work of a cunning workman" and seems to refer to the weaving of figured designs from different coloured threads; the latter may have been real embroidery, or needlework, called in the later books מַעַט.

Besides the hanging at the entrance of the Tabernacle (Ex., xxvi, 36), the hanging in the entrance of the court (Ex., xxvi, 16) and the girdle of the high-priest (Ex., xxviii, 39; xxxix, 28) were the work of the same worker, whose work was regarded as the gens of the bride's apparel in Ps. xlv (Heb., xlv), 15, where according to the Hebrew text she is said to be arrayed in embroideries of gold and raiment of needlework. The garments of the faithless spouse, the figure of Israel (Ezech., xvi, 10, 15, 18), were likewise embroidered. In Ezech., xxvi, 16, it is foretold that the princes of the sea shall put off their brodered garments, and brodered stuffs are mentioned among the merchandise of Tyre (Ezech., xxvii, 16, 24).

In the Authorized or King James Version of Ex., xxxix, 28, the word מַעַט of the high-priest's garments is called "a brodered coat"); the Revised Version changed it to "a coat of chequer work"). The Douay has "a straight linen garment" (lineam stricturn in the Vulgate). The Hebrew word מַעַט used here is not found elsewhere in Scripture. It is believed by some to indicate "the work of the exiled archbishop", similar to work still done in Damascus. Even in regard to the nature of מַעַט which is translated "embroidery", authorities are not agreed. Some regard it as painting on cloth, others as an ornamentation produced by sewing on to a stuff pieces of materials of other colours, others as a fabric woven from threads of different colours.

EMERY

Le verre en Vie, Dict. de la Bible, s. v. Broderie; MacKer in Hastings, Dict. of the Bible, s. v.

EMBRUN. See AIX, GAP.

EMERENTIANA, SAINT, virgin and martyr, d. at Rome in the third century. In the old Itineraries to the graves of the Roman martyrs, after giving the place of burial of St. Agnes, speak of St. Emerentiana. Over the grave of St. Emerentiana there was once a church, according to the Itineraries, established to the north of the church erected over the place of burial of St. Agnes, and somewhat farther from the city wall. In reality Emerentiana was interred in the cemeterium majoris located in the vicinity far from the cemeterium Agnetis. Armellini believed that he had found the original burial chamber of St. Emerentiana in the former cemeterium. According to the legend of St. Agnes Emerentiana was her foster-sister. Some days after the burial of St. Agnes Emerentiana, who was still a catechumen, went to the grave to pray, and while praying she was suddenly attacked by the pagans and killed with stones. Her feast is kept on 23 January. In the "Martirologium Hieronymianum" she is mentioned under 18 September, with the statement: In cemeterio maiore. She is represented with stones in her lap, also with a palm or lily.


J. P. KIRSCH.

EMERIC. See EYMERIC, NICHOLAS.

EMERITUS OF JULIA CAESAREA. See DONATISTS.

EMERY, Jacques-André, Superior of the Society of St-Sulpice during the French Revolution, b. 26 Aug., 1732, at Gex; d. at Paris, 28 April, 1811. After his preliminary studies with the Carmelites of his native town and the Jesuits of Mâcon, he passed to the Seminary of St. Irenæus at Lyons and completed his studies at St-Sulpice, Paris, where he became a member of the society of that name and was ordained priest (1758). He taught with distinction in the seminaries of Lyons and Lyons, and, later, in the diocese of Besançon (1770), and of the clergy, too, he enlarged the rights of the Holy See with firmness and ability, yet with due courtesy, before the archbishop, Mgr. de Montazel, a prelate of Jansenistic tendencies. Partly on the recommendation of the archbishop, he was made superior of the seminary at Angers (1779), and later became vicar-general of the diocese; and of both capacities marked powers of governing. In 1782 he was elected Superior-General of the Seminary and Society of St-Sulpice. His rule began in the last days preceding the French Revolution, and Father Emery showed himself indefatigable in his zeal for the reform of the seminaries, and for the training of a clergy fit to cope with existing evils and prepared for the troublous times which, to some extent, he foresees. After the Revolution broke forth, he watched its terrible progress without despair; he was, perhaps, during that period, the coolest head among the churchmen of France. His wide acquaintance among the priests and bishops, many of whom, in the course of his thirty years of teaching and ruling in the seminaries, had been under his authority, and his position as administrator of the Diocese of Paris during the absence of the bishop, and his, to some extent, liberal views, brought many to him for advice. He was, says the historian Sicard, "the chief and the arm" of the party whose counsels were marked by moderation and good sense; "a man who was rarely endowed in breadth of learning, in knowledge of his time, in the clearness of his views, in the calmness and energy of his decisions; the oracle of the clergy, consulted on all sides less by
reason of his high position than of his superior wisdom. M. Emery was called by Providence to be the guide throughout the long interregnum of the episcopate during the revolution" (L'Ancien Clergé, III, 549). And Cardinal de Bausset declares that he was the "keeper of the clergy during twenty years of the most violent storms ".

The decisions of the Archepiscopal Council at Paris concerning the several oaths demanded of the clergy, inspired by Emery, were accepted by large numbers of priests and violently assailed by others. To their acceptance was due whatever practice of cult remained in France during the Revolution; to their rejection was due, in large part, the cessation of worship and the opinion which came to regard the clergy as "the irreconcilable enemies of the republic". Emery did not, like many others, mistake purely political projects for vital questions of religion. "He felt free to take the "Oath of Liberty and Equality", but only as concerning the civil and political order; he upheld the lawfulness of declaring submission to the laws of the Republic (30 May, 1796), and of promising fidelity to the Constitution (28 Dec., 1799). He lent his influence to Mgr. Spina in his efforts to obtain the resignation of the new bishop of Pinerolo to the wishes of Pius VII (15 Aug., 1801). While ready, for the good of religion, to go so far as the rights of the Church permitted, he was stanch in his opposition to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy (1790). Public religious services were suspended during the Revolution, and the seminaries closed. St-Sulpice was taken over by the revolutionists, and Father Emery was imprisoned and several times narrowly escaped execution. His faith, courage, and good humour sustained many of his fellow-prisoners and prepared them to meet death in a brave and Christian spirit; the gaolers, in fact, came to view his presence because it saved them from prisoners condemned to death. The closing of the seminaries in France led Father Emery, on the request of Bishop Carroll, to send some Sulpicians to the United States to found the first American seminary at Baltimore (St. Mary's, 18 July, 1811). The future religion of the country, he wrote to Father Nagot, the first superior, depended on the formation of a native clergy, which alone would be adequate and fit for the work before it. Despite the discouragements of the first years, he continued the support of the institution and welcomed the foundation of the college at Pigeon Hill, and then at Emmitsburg, for young aspirants to the priesthood. At one time, however, Bishop Carroll feared the withdrawal of the Sulpicians, but his arguments and above all the advice of Pius VII convinced Father Emery that the good of religion in America required their presence.

After Napoleon came into supreme control, Father Emery re-established the Seminary of St-Sulpice. His defence of the pope against the emperor caused Napoleon to expel the Sulpicians from the seminary; this, however, did not daunt Father Emery, who defended the papal rights in the presence of Napoleon (17 March, 1811) and gained the emperor's admiration, if not his good will. "He was", remarks Sicard, "the only one among the clergy from whom Napoleon would take the truth."

The death of Father Emery occurred a month later. He left many writings which have been published by Migne in his collection of theological works. They deal chiefly with the politico-religious questions of the day. He is best remembered, perhaps, by his dissertation on the mitigation of the sufferings of the damned. He wrote also on Descartes, Leibniz, and Bacon, and published from the writings of the father of philosophy his "Catholic Doctrine", and his "History of the Episcopacy in England".


JOHN F. FEYNLON.

Emessa, a titular see of Phoenicia Secunda, suffragan of Damascus, and the seat of two Uniat archidioeceses (Greek Melchite and Syrian). Emessa was renowned for its temple of the sun, adored here in the shape of a black stone, whose priests formed a powerful aristocracy. One of them, Bassianus, became Roman emperor under the name of Elagabalus (a. d. 218). A native Arab dynasty ruled over the city between 65 n. c. and A. D. 73, from which period the series of Emessa coins dates. Emessa was the birthplace of the philosopher Longinus (c. a. b. 210), the friend of Queen Zenobia, and St. Romanus, the great Byzantine hymnographer (in the sixth century).

Among twelve Greek bishops, known from the fourth to the eighth century, are: St. Silvanus, a martyr under Maximinus in company with the physician Julian (c. 312); Eusebius, a famous rhetorician suspected of Arianism; Nemeseus (fourth century); and Paul, bishop of old friends of St. Basil and St. Cyril of Alexandria (Le- quien, Or. christ., II, 537). Another, whose name is unknown, was burned by the Arabs in 666 (Lamens in "Mélanges de la faculté orientale de Beyrouth", 1906, 3-14). The diocese was never suppressed and no longer exists for the Greek Melchites, both non-Catholic and Uniat (Echos d' Orient, 1907, 223, 226). It was raised to the rank of an autocephalous archbishopric in 152, when the supposed head of St. John the Baptist was found at the monastery of the Speslon, and it was made a metropolitan see with four suffragan sees in 1571, when the relic was transferred to the cathedral (Echos d' Orient, 1907, 93-96, 142, 368). Sozomen (Hist. eccl., III, xvii) speaks of this church as a marvel; the Arabs on capturing the city in 636 took over half of it; later it was changed into a mosque. In 1110 Emessa was taken by the Crusaders, and in 1187 suffered severely from an earthquake. The modern city, which the Arabs call Homs (Hems, Hums), built on the Orontes in sand-coloured basalt, is the chief town of a cazaa, in the sanjak of Hamah, vilayet of Damascus. The population is about 50,000 including some 50,000 weavers. There are 33,000 Mussulmans, 1,000 Greeks, 1,000 Jacobites, 500 Greek Catholics, 350 Maronites, and a few Catholics of other rites. The Orthodox Greek metropolitan and the Jacobite bishop live at Homs. (For lists of ancient Jacobite bishops see Lequien, op. cit., II, 1141, and " Revue de l'Orient chrétien", 1901, 196, 199.) The Greek Melchite metropolitan resides at Hlab; he has jurisdiction over 8000 faithful, 20 priests, 12 churches, 7 schools, and 2 monasteries of Shooerites. The Syrian Catholic archbishop resides at Damascus; his diocese includes 2000 faithful, with 4 parishes and 5 churches. The Jesuits have a residence and school at Homs, and native Marianist Sisters conduct a school for girls.

Emigrant Aid Societies.—Records of the early immigration to the North American colonies are indefinite and unsatisfactory. The first legislation on the subject was the Naturalization Act of the United States, 1790. On 2 March, 1819, when Congress provided that a record be kept of the number of the immigrants arriving from abroad, their ages, sex, occupations, and nativity, Ireland has always supplied a large proportion of those landed at American ports, the steady
commencing in the first years of the eighteenth century. These immigrants were then nearly all Presbyterians, few Catholics being among those taking passage prior to the Revolution. Arthur Young, in his "Tour in Ireland" (1776–79), declares that "the spirit of adversity in England appears to be contending with the religious and economic circumstances, the Presbyterian religion and the linen manufacture. I heard of very few emigrants except among manufacturers of that persuasion. The Catholics never went; they seemed not only tied to the country, but almost to the parish in which their ancestors lived." In a message to the "Representatives of the Freemen of the Province of Pennsylvania and the Three Lower Counties" Lieutenant Governor Patrick Gordon declared, on 17 December, 1728, that he had "positive orders from Britain to provide by proper law against these crowds of Foreigners who are yearly power'd upon us. It may also require thoughts to prevent the importation of Irish Papists and convicts, of whom some of the most notorious, I am credibly informed, have of late been landed in this River."

The earliest American organization for the care of immigrants was the Charitable Irish Society of Boston, Massachusetts, founded 17 March, 1797. Says its charter: "Several Gentlemen, Merchants and Others of the Irish Nation residing in Boston in New England from an Affectionate and Compassionate concern for their countrymen in these parts, who may be reduced to distress, Shipwreck and accidents, Infirmities and unforeseen Accidents, Have thought fitt to form themselves into a Charitable Society for the relief of such of their poor and indigent Countrymen."

The Managers, according to the rules, were to be "Native of Ireland, or Natives of any other part of the British Dominions of Irish Extractions being Passengers and inhabitants of Boston". This anti-Catholic rule did not last long, for representatives of the Faith were members of the Society in 1742, and to-day they are in the majority on its roll.

In Philadelphia the Hibernian Society for the Relief of Emigrants from Ireland was organized on 3 March, 1790. Mathew Carey was its secretary, and Commodore John Barry, Jasper Moyal, George Meade, and other Catholics prominent in those days were among its first members. The Hibernian Society "for the relief of distressed emigrants" was started at Savannah, Georgia, in March, 1812, and emigration from Ireland being constantly on the increase, other societies were formed in New York, notably the Emigrant Assistance Society in 1817, with Dr. William James Maceneven, one of the United Irishmen of 1798, at its head. It was in the canal-and-railroad-building era, and the aim of this society was to take care of the new arrivals and direct them where to find employment. It was the predecessor of the Irish Emigrant Society founded, also in New York, in 1841, through the efforts of Bishop Hughes, with Gregory Dillon as its first president.

Out of this organization ten years later came the Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, which in subsequent years developed into one of the greatest financial institutions in the country.

An American was the great entrepôt for aliens, the Legislature, by act of 5 May, 1847, created the Board of Emigration of the State of New York to protect from fraud and imposition alien passengers arriving at New York, and to care and provide for the helpless among them. The president of the Irish Emigrant Society was made a member of the board, and its agents were recognized officially in their arrangements for the care of the incoming immigrant. In addition to looking out for the welfare of the immigrant a banking department was organized by the society to transmit money to Europe, to secure passage tickets over the ocean and the railways, to exchange the money brought in by the immigrants, and safeguard their material interests generally. In this way many millions of dollars, as well as several millions of immigrants, have been safely cared for through the instrumentality of this society. The discounts and commissions in this financial, and an usurpation of the powers of Congress. In the twenty-nine years of its existence it had collected by a head-tax from the immigrants the sum of $11,230,329. The responsibility of caring for the immigrants was then taken over by the Federal Government, in July, 1891.

The State emigration was abolished, Castle Garden abandoned, and the United States landing station established on Ellis Island under the supervision of the Treasury Department. Here, as under the State control, the representatives of the Emigrant Aid Societies are accorded all facilities for protecting and assisting the immigrants who need their help in starting out in the New World.

For the protection of Irish immigrant girls the Mission of Our Lady of the Rosary was founded in New York in 1881, through the efforts of Charlotte Grace O'Brien, daughter of William Smith O'Brien, the Irish Utopian. At the instigation of Father O'Brien, who had been a Jesuit missionary in Ireland, and until several years later a Catholic—Cardinal McCloskey—suggested the Rev. John J. Riordan chaplain at Castle Garden, and he began there the work of the mission which exercises a moral influence over the steamship companies to protect the girls on board their vessels, and watch over and assist the girls at the landing depot. From its opening to the end of 1905, fully 100,000 girls were cared for by the mission, all free of charge. It is supported by voluntary contributions.

The increase of immigration having thus been recognized as a fact calling for charitable action, the German Society of New York offered advice and systematic assistance to German immigrants, but took no interest in their religious welfare. Its president was ex officio a member of the State Emigration Commission. In 1868, at the Catholic Congress held at Trier, Peter Lahm, a prominent merchant of Frankfort and Prussia, suggested the establishment of the St. Raphael Society for the systematic protection of German immigrants, both at the point of departure and the port of landing. Three years later the plan was adopted at the Congress which met at Bamberg in Bavaria, and was taken up with much energy throughout Germany. By 1905 the Society had been established through the Central Verein, which, at its convention in New York, in 1868, created a committee of five for emigrant affairs. The agents of this body looked after the affairs of the immigrants at New York, but received only a warning support from their fellow Germans.

In 1883 Peter Paul Cahensly crossed the ocean to New York, travelling, as Miss O'Brien had done, in the steerage, so that he might learn by personal experience the wants and hardships of the immigrant. At his suggestion a branch of the St. Raphael Society was formed in New York, with Bishop Winand M. Wigger of Newark as its president. Not much progress was made by this society until 1882, when the Rev. John Reuland was sent over from Germany to manage its bureau at New York. As an adjunct to it, a German telegraph office was established in 1883, a Hungarian one in 1885, a French one in 1886, and a Russian one in 1887. At the suggestion of the Leo House, which is the residence of the chaplain in attendance on the German immigrants. From 1889 to 1 November, 1909, there were 51,719 immigrants cared for by the St. Raphael Society. Since the decline of German immigration after 1895, the Leo House has also enter-
tained natives of France, Poland, Bohemia, and other Slavonic sections of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The St. Raphael Society has its agents at Bremen, Hamburg, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Havre, Liverpool, and London, representatives in every diocese in Germany and Belgium, and stations in the large cities of the United States and of South America.

The Austrian Society of New York was founded in 1871 by a number of former Austrians to aid the newly arrived immigrants at Ellis Island, and to maintain a home under its supervision for the purpose of boarding them free of charge until they can afford to pay a nominal fee. Advice and help to employment is given free not only to the newcomers, but also to Austrians who have been in the country for any length of time. The Society is supported by the dues of the members and by donations including an annual subsidy of $5000 from the Austrian Government. Among the members are twenty-one priests. The Austrian Society employs three agents at Ellis Island; one of them is the missionary who leads before the board of inquiry for the unfortunate detained, cares for the sick, and looks after the spiritual needs of all. In the ten years of its existence 72,000 persons were entertained at its immigrant house. To maintain the charitable character of the home and of the Austrian Society at large, as originally intended by the Emperor of Austria, it has from the start been chiefly interested in the Catholic immigrants, but all others are welcome to its care and facilities.

Polish priests ministering in the Eastern section of the United States established at New York, in 1803, the St. Joseph's Society, for the aid and care of the immigrants of that nationality. Its chaplain and agents work on the same lines as those of other societies of the Government and its stations are open to the Filiarion Sisters, and its accommodations are free. Its support is derived from voluntary contributions and a yearly grant of $1000 from the Austrian Government on account of the Poles from Galicia who may seek the assistance of the home.

Under the auspices of the Fathers of Mercy the Jeanne d'Arc Home for the protection of French immigrant women was opened in 1895, in New York. It was founded through the generosity of Miss C. T. Smith, who gave the home as a memorial to her mother Mrs. Jeanne Durand Smith. Two years later the Sisters of Providence took charge of it, and they have since managed its affairs. Since its establishment 6800 women have received its care. It is supported by voluntary contributions. The inmates pay if they can, most of them are taken care of gratuitously. Employment is found for them and they are taught useful domestic arts.

As part of the great work in behalf of Italian immigrants undertaken by Bishop Scalabrini of Piacenza, Italy, members of his Congregation of St. Charles Borromeo established the Society of St. Raphael for Italian Immigrants at New York in 1891. Its charge is managed by the Sisters of Charity (Pallottine). Only women and children are kept there; men are given meals and advice, but lodge elsewhere. The chaplain and agent meet the immigrants at Ellis Island. A branch of this society was organized at Boston, in 1899. Archbishop Blink of Amsterdam appointed an Italian priest as chaplain to look after immigrants from Italy and open a home for them. Work here is carried on by the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

The Society for Italian Immigrants is a secular corporation organized in New York in 1901 for the aid and protection of immigrants. It has no religious affiliations. The Italian government makes it an annual appropriation equal to the amount received from all other sources, and its income is derived from the subscriptions of those interested in philanthropic work. Its home has accommodations for 200. It has founded four schools in Italian labor camps to prevent the demoralization usually attending those communities. The enormous volume of Italian immigration during recent years may be realized from the fact that from 1880 to 1908 it amounted to 2,500,000. In 1910 it was about 1000, in 1900 about 4,000; in 1907, 286,000. It is estimated that 250,000 aliens arrived in the United States between 1789 and 1820. From 1820, when the official records begin, to the end of the fiscal year, 30 June, 1907, the number of immigrants arriving was 25,985,237.

The Association for the Protection of Belgian and Dutch Immigrants was organized 4 June, 1907, at Chicago, Illinois, by priests in charge of congregations in various sections of the United States, made up of those nationalities. Other priests interested in the spiritual and temporal welfare of the Catholic immigrants from Belgium and Holland assisted in its progress.


Thomas F. Meehan.

Emiliani, Girolamo, Saint. See Jerome Emiliani, Saint.

Emyl, Diocese of. See Cashel.

Emyl, Lord. See Monsell, William.

Emmanuel (Sept., Εµµανουήλ; Heb. שְׁמַעְיָא, A V. "Emmanuel") signifies 6 God with us (Matt., i, 23), and is the name of the child predicted in Is., vii, 14: "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel". The various views advanced as to the identity of the child cannot be fully explained and discussed here; the following observations must suffice: (1) The child is not a merely ideal or metaphorical person; he cannot be identified with the regenerate people of Israel (Hoffmann), nor with religious faith (Porter), for "he shall eat butter and honey". (2) The Prophet does not refer to a child in general, but points to an individual (cf. Roorda, Kuenen, W. R. Smith, Smed, Dubin, Cheyne, Marti); both text and context require this. (3) The child is not a son of the Prophet Isaiah (cf. Hitzig, Reuss); Is. viii, 1-4, shows that the Prophet's son has a name different from that of Emmanuel. (4) The child is not a son of Achaz (cf. Lagarde, McCurdy); for Ezechias did not possess the most essential characteristics of Emmanuel as described by Isaiah. (5) The Emmanuel is the Messiah foretold in the other prophecies of Isaiah. In Is., vii, 8, Palestine is called the land of Emmanuel, though in other passages it is termed the land or the inheritance of Yahweh (Is., xiv, 2, 25; xv, 10, 14, etc.), so that Emmanuel and Yahweh are identified. Again, in the Hebrew text of Is., viii, 9, 10, the Prophet predicts the futurity of all the enemies' schemes against Palestine, because of Emmanuel. In ix, 6, 7, the characteristics of the child Emmanuel are so clearly described that we can doubt no longer of his Messianic mission. The eleventh chapter pictures the Messianic blessings which the child Emmanuel will bring upon the earth. Moreover, St. Matthew (i, 23) expressly identifies the Emmanuel with Jesus the Messiah, and Christian tradition has constantly taught the same doctrine. The question why the Messiah was called Emmanuel, or "God with us", admits of a double answer: the name is a pledge of Divine help, and also a description of the nature of the Messiah. King Achaz had not believed the Prophet's first promise of deliverance from...
his enemies, Rasin, King of Syria, and Phæce, King of Israel (Is., vii, 1–9). And when the Prophet tried a second time to restore his confidence, Achaz refused to ask for the sign which God was ready to grant in confirmation of the prophetic promise (vii, 10–12). The Prophet, therefore, forces, in a way, King Achaz to confess to God, showing that the Messias, the hope of Israel and the glory of the house of David, implies by his very name “Emmanuel”, or “God with us”, the Divine presence among his people. A number of the Fathers, e.g. St. Irenæus, Laetantius, St. Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret, regard the name “Emmanuel”, not merely as a pledge of Divine assistance, but also as an expression of the mystery of the Incarnation by virtue of which the Messias will be “God with us” in very deed.


A. J. MAA.

Emmaus, a titular see in Palestina Prima, suffragan of Cesarea. It is mentioned for the first time in 166–165 B.C., when Judas Machabeus defeated there the army of Gorgias (I Mach., iii, 40, iv, 35). A little later, the Syrian general Baechides fortified and garrisoned it (Josephus, Ant. Jud., XIII, 1, 3). In A.D. 4, during the rebellion of A throngus against the Romans, the inhabitants left their city, which was nevertheless destroyed by Varus (Josephus, “Ant. Jud.”, XVII, x, 7–9; Iren., “Bel. Jud.”, II, iv, 3). It soon rose again, for Josephus (Bel. Jud., III, iii, 5) and Pliny (Hist. nat., xiv, 3) rank it amongst the “toparchies” of the country. Vespasian took it at the beginning of his campaign against the Jews, stationed a legion in the neighbourhood, and named it Nicopolis (Sosom., Hist. eccl., V, xxii). According to Eusebius and St. Jerome, this name was given to it only in 223, by Julius Africanus, its governor and most illustrious son, and this is the name commonly used by Christian writers. Here a spring in which Christ is said to have washed His feet, and which was reputed to cure all diseases, was closed up by order of Julian the Apostate (Sosom., Hist. eccl., V, xxii). Four Greek bishops are known, from the fourth to the sixth century (Lequien, Or. christ., III, 593). At the beginning of the Arab conquest the plague broke out in the city, and the inhabitants fled; they must have soon returned, however, for Emmaus remained a very important town. It was the last station of the Crusaders on their way to Jerusalem in June, 1099. Eubel (Hierarch. cath., II, 223) has a list of eleven Latin titular bishops, but only for the fifteenth century. Thus Emmaus (the native name) is a Muslim village about eighteen miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Jaffa. There are still visible ruins of a beautiful basilica built in the fourth or the fifth century, and repaired by the Crusaders. Near ‘Amwas, at El-Atroun, the Trappists founded a priory in 1890.

In the opinion of many ‘Amwas is the Emmaus of the Gospel (Luke, xxiv, 13–35), where Christ manifested Himself to two of His Disciples. Such is, indeed, the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem, attested as early as the fourth century by Eusebius of Cesarea, Titus of Bostra, and St. Jerome, a tradition confirmed by all pilgrims, at least to the time of the first Crusade; it may even date back to the third century, to Julius Africanus and Origen. It is also supported by many Biblical commentaries, some of which are as old as the fourth or the fifth century; in these the Emmaus of the Gospel is said to have stood at 160 stadia from Jerusalem, the modern ‘Am was being at 176 stadia. In spite of its antiquity, this tradition does not seem to be well founded. Most manuscripts and versions place Emmaus at only sixty stadia from Jerusalem, and they are more numerous and generally more ancient than those of the former group. It seems, therefore, very probable that the number 160 is a correction of Origen and his school to make the Gospel text agree with the Palestinian tradition of their time.

Moreover, the distance of 160 stadia would imply about six hours’ walk, which is inadmissible, for the Disciples had only gone out to the country and could return to Jerusalem before the gates were shut (Mark, xvi, 12; Luke, xxiv, 33). Finally, the Emmaus of the Gospel is said to be a village, while ‘Am was the flourishing capital of a “toparchy”. Josephus (Ant. Jud., VII, vi, 6) mentions at sixty stadia from Jerusalem a village called Emmaus, where Vespasian and Titus stationed 800 veterans. This is evidently the Emmaus of the Gospel. But it must have been destroyed at the time of the fall of the city of Bar-Cocbeba (A. D. 132–35) under Hadrian, and its site was unknown as early as the third century. Origen and his friends merely placed the Gospel Emmaus at Nicopolis, the only Emmaus known at their time. The identifications of Koubbeh, Abou Ghosh, Koubelieh, Beit Mizheh, etc., with Emmaus, as proposed by some modern scholars, are inadmissible.

RELAND, Palæstina (Utrecht, 1714), 425–50, 758–90; Palæstine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement, 1876, 1878, 1881, 1883, 1884, 1885, etc.; BABB, Emmaus, città della Palæstina (Turin, 1888); BUSSELL, L’Emmaus evangelico (Milan, 1885); DOMENICHIEL, L’Emmaus della Palæstina (Leghorn, 1890); GUILLEMET, Emmaus-Nicopolis (Paris, 1886); SCHIPPERS, Emmaus, das am meisten der Euvres de Jean Baptiste des Libres, 100 Stück aus der Bibliothek von Encke (Freiburg im Br., 1889); Revue biblique (1903), 26–40; VAN KASTEREN, Emmaus-Nicopolis et les autres arabe, ibid. (1902), 80–99, 645–649; HENRY in Dictionnaire de la Bible, s. v.; MUSMANN, L’église d’Emmaus, L’Emmaus-Nicopolis et l’église de Qoubbeh, L’Emmaus de saint Luc (Jerusalem, 1902); VAUHIN in Échos d’Orient (1905), 407–408; VINCENT, Les ruines d’Emmaus in Revue biblique (1903), 571–99.

S. VALIÉHÉ.

Emmeram, Saint, Bishop of Poitiers and missionary to Bavaria, d. at Poitiers in the first half of the seventh century; martyred at Ascheim (Bavaria) towards the end of the same century. Of a noble family in Con- taine, he received a good education and was ordained priest. According to some authors Emmeram occupied the See of Poitiers, but this cannot be verified, for his name does not appear among the Bishops of Poitiers. He probably held the see for a short time, from the death of Did (date unknown) to the episcopate
of Ansaldo (671). Having heard that the inhabitants of Bavaria were still idolaters, he determined to carry the light of the Faith to them. Ascending the Loire, crossing the Black Forest, and going down the Danube, he reached Ratisbon in a region then governed by Duke Thaddo. For three years he laboured in Bavaria, preaching and converting the people, acquiring also a renown for holiness. He then turned his steps towards Rome, to visit the tombs of Sts. Peter and Paul, but after a five days' journey, at a place now called Kleinhefendorf, south of Munich, he was arrested by command of the Duke of Bavaria, who tortured him cruelly. He died shortly afterwards at Aschheim, about fifteen miles distant. The cause of this attack and the circumstances attending his death are not known. According to the legend related by Aribo, Bishop of Freising, the first to write a life of St. Emmeram, Otto, daughter of the Duke of Bavaria, who had been seduced by Sigwald, an important personage of her father's court, fearing her father's wrath, confessed her fault to the bishop. Moved with compassion, he advised her to name herself, whom every one respected, as her seducer, and it was in consequence of this accusation that Theodo ordered him to be found and put to death. Of the tale, the details of the saint's martyrdom, which are certainly untrue, and the fantastic account of the prodigies attending his death show that the writer, infected by the pious mania of his time, simply added to the facts imaginary details supposed to redound to the glory of the martyr.

All that is known as to the date of the saint's death is that it took place on 22 September, some time before St. Rupert's arrival in Bavaria (896). At Kleinhefendorf, where he was tortured, there stands to-day a chapel dedicated to St. Emmeram, and at Aschheim, where he died, is also a martyr's chapel built in his honour. His remains were removed to Ratisbon and interred in the church of St. George, from which they were transferred about the middle of the eighth century by Bishop Gawibaldus to a church dedicated to the saint. This church having been destroyed by the Sea in 1442, the saint's body was found under the altar in 1645 and was encased in a magnificent reliquary. The relics, which were canonically recognised by Bishop Ignaz de Senestrey in 1833, are exposed for the veneration of the faithful every year on 22 September. It is impossible to prove that Emmeram occupied the See of Ratisbon, for the official episcopal list begins with the above-mentioned Gawibaldus, who was consecrated by St. Boniface in 739 and died in 764.


LÉON CLUGNET.

Emmeram, ABBEY OF SAINT, a Benedictine monastery at Ratisbon (Regensburg), named after its traditional founder, the patron saint of the city. The exact date of foundation is unknown. St. Emmeram flourished in the middle of the seventh century and 652 is given by most authorities as the approximate date of the establishment of this monastery. It began with a chapel in which certain much venerated relics were preserved, and which, in 697, was enlarged and beautified by Theodo, Duke of Bavaria, who built at the same time a new monastery for Benedictine monks, of which Appollonius was first abbot. It was still further enlarged by Charlemagne about the year 800 and was endowed with extensive possessions and many privileges. When St. Boniface, in 739, divided Bavaria into four dioceses, the first Bishop of Ratisbon fixed his see at the Abbey of St. Emmeram, but later on it was removed by a subsequent bishop to the old Cathedral of St. Stephen, which stands beside the present one. In 830, the then bishop obtained from Louis, King of Bavaria, the administration of the abbey for himself and his successors, and for upwards of a hundred years the Bishops of Ratisbon ruled the monastery as well as the diocese, but in 968 St. Wolfgang restored its independence. For a long time, and from that time forward it enjoyed the rule of its own abbots. For some centuries it was customary to elect as bishop a canon of St. Stephen's and a monk of St. Emmeram's alternately. Many of the early bishops of Ratisbon were buried in the abbey church and their tombs are still to be seen there, as also is that of the Emperor Arnulf (d. 899). The abbots held the rank of prince of the Empire, and as such had a seat in the Imperial Diet. The present church, which is a Romanesque basilica, dates from the thirteenth century, but was restored in a somewhat debased style in the eighteenth. It is one of the few German churches with a detached bell-tower. The cloisters date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and are in a fair state of preservation. The monastery was suppressed early in the nineteenth century and in 1809 the conventual buildings became the palace of the Prince of Thurn and Taxis, hereditary postmaster-general of the old German Empire, and the Prince (1809) reside there. The cloister garth, in the centre of which is a modern mortuary chapel, is now used as the family burial-place.

Migne, Dict. des Abbayes (Paris, 1850).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.
Then followed what she dreaded on account of its publicity, an episcopal commission to inquire into her life and the reality of these wonderful signs. The examination was very strict, as the utmost care was necessary to furnish no pretext for ridicule and insult on the part of the enemies of the Church. In general, the famous Overberg, and three physicians conducted the investigation with scrupulous care and became convinced of the sanctity of the "pious Beguine", as she was called, and the genuineness of her stigmata. At the end of 1818 God granted partially her enemies' prayer to be relieved of the stigmata, and she was cured of her wounds in her hands and feet closed, but the others remained, and on Good Friday were all wont to reopen. In 1819 the government sent a committee of investigation which discharged its commission most brutally. Sick unto death as she was, she was forcibly removed to a large room in another house and kept under the strictest surveillance day and night for three weeks, away from all her friends except her confessor. She was insulted, threatened, and even flattered, but in vain. The commission departed without finding anything suspicious, and remained silent until its president, Schmoller, declared that there was fraud, to which the obvious reply was: in what respect? and why delay in publishing it? About this time Klemens Brentano, the famous poet, was induced to visit her; to his great amazement she recognized him, and he found her, put it out to her as the man who was to enable her to fulfill God's command, namely, to write down for the good of innumerable souls the revelations made to her. He took down briefly in writing the main points, and, as she spoke the Westphalian dialect, he immediately rewrote them in ordinary German. He wrote what he wrote to her, and change efface until she gave her complete approval. Like so many others, he was won by her evident purity, her exceeding humility and patience under sufferings indescribable. With Overberg, Sailer of Ratisbon, Clement Augustus of Cologne, Stollberg, Louis Hassel, etc., he reverenced her as a chosen bride of Christ.

In 1853 appeared the first-fruit of Brentano's toil, "The Dolorous Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ according to the Meditations of Anne Catherine Emmerich" (Sulzbach). Brentano prepared for publication "The Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary", but this appeared at Munich only in 1852. From the MS. of Brentano Father Schmoeger published in three volumes "The Life of Our Lord" (Ratisbon, 1858–60), and in 1881 a large illustrated edition of the same. They reprinted her life in two volumes (Freiburg, 1867–70, new edition, 1884). Her visions go into details, often slight, which give them a vividness that strongly holds the reader's interest as one graphic scene follows another in rapid succession as if visible to the physical eye. Other mystics are more concerned with ideas, she with events; others stop to meditate aloud and to guide the reader's thoughts, she lets the facts speak for themselves with the simplicity, brevity, and security of a Gospel narrative. Her treatment of that difficult subject, the twofold nature of Christ, is admirable. His humanity stands out clear and distinct, but through it shines always a gleam of the Divine. The rapid and silent spread of her works through Germany, France, Italy, and elsewhere speaks well for their merit. Strange enough they produced no controversy. Dom Guéranger extols her merits in his "Lettres chrétiennes" (Le Monde, 1860).

Sister Emmerich lived during one of the saddest and least glorious periods of the Church's history, when revolution triumphed, impurity flourished, and several of the fairest provinces of its domain were overrun by infidels and cast into such ruinous confusion that the Faith was about to be extinguished. Her mission in part seems to have been by her prayers and sufferings to aid in restoring Church discipline, especially in Westphalia, and at the same time to strengthen at least the little ones of the flock in their belief. Besides all this she saved many souls and recalled to the Christian world that the supernatural is around about to a degree sometimes forgotten. A body has been caused to be opened six weeks after her death. The body was found fresh, without any sign of corruption. In 1892 the process of her beatification was introduced by the Bishop of Münster.

Empiricism (Lat. empiric, the standpoint of a system based on experience.)—Primarily, and in its psychological application, the term signifies the theory that the phenomena of consciousness are simply the product of sensuous experience, i.e., of sensations variously associated and arranged. It is thus distinguished from Nativism or Innatism, which hold, that these sensations are caused by a supernatural agency. In its logical (epistemological) usage, it designates the theory that all human knowledge is derived exclusively from experience, the latter term meaning, either explicitly or implicitly, external sense-percepts and internal representations and inferences exclusive of sensory material, interior sensations. In this connexion it is opposed to Intellectualism, Rationalism, Apriorism. The two usages evidently designate but two inseparable aspects of one and the same theory, the epistemological being the application of the psychological to the problem of knowledge.

Empiricism appears in the history of philosophy in three principal forms: (1) Materialism, (2) Sensism, and (3) Positivism.

(1) Materialism in its crudest shape was taught by the ancient atomists (Democritus, Leucippus, Epicurus, Lucretius), who, reducing the sum of all reality to atoms and motion, taught that experience, whereof they held knowledge to be constituted, is generated by images reflected from material objects through the sensory organs into the soul. The soul, a mere complex of the finest atoms, perceives not the objects but their effluent images; or, 2d, by modern materialists (Helvetius, D'Holbach, Diderot, Feuerbach, Moret, Büchner, Vogt, etc.), knowledge is accounted for either by cerebral secretion or by motion; while Haeckel looks on it as a physiological process effected by certain brain cells. Avenarius, Willy, Mach, etc., substitute for visible images an external cause, as to reduce all experience to internal (empirio-criticism).

(2) Sensism.—All materialists are of course sensists. Though the converse is not the case, nevertheless, by denying any essential difference between sensations and ideas (intellectual states), sensism logically involves materialism. Sensism, which is found with Empedocles and Protagoras amongst the ancients, was given its first systematic form by Locke (d. 1704), though Bacon (d. 1626) and Hobbes (d. 1679) had prepared the data. Locke derived all simple ideas from external experience (sensations), all compound ideas (modes, substances, relations) from internal experience (reflection). Substance and cause are simply associations of subjective phenomena; universal ideas are mere mental figurings. Locke admits the existence, though he denies the demonstrability, in man of an immortal principle, the soul, as Berkeley (d. 1753), accepting the teaching of Locke that ideas are only transfigured sensations, subjectivizes not only the sensible or secondary qualities of matter (sensibili propria, e. g. colour and sound) as his predecessor had done, but also the primary qualities (sensibili communis, extension), which Locke held to be objective. Berkeley denies the objective basis of universal ideas and indeed of the
whole material universe. The reality of things he places in their being perceived (esse rei est percipi), and this “perceivability” is effected in the mind by God, not by the object or subject. He still retains the substance-reality of the human soul and of spirits generally, God included. Hume and Condillac (d. 1780) eliminated entirely the subjective factor (Locke’s “reflection”) and sought to explain all cognitional states by a mere mechanical, passive transformation of external sensations. The French sensist retained the spiritual soul, but his followers disposed of it as Hume had done with the Berkeleyan soul relic. The Herbartians confound the image with the idea, not the idea with the image. Condillac makes a distinction between primitive ideas (empirische Begriffe, representations of individual objects) and the image: “Denken ist Phantasieren in Begriffen und Phantasien ist Denken in Bildern”.

(3) Positivism.—Positivists, following Comte (d. 1857), deny the subjective; they declare the soul unknowable; the one source of cognition, they claim, is sense-experience, experiment, and induction from phenomena. John Stuart Mill (d. 1873), following Hume, reduces all knowledge to series of conscious states linked by empirical associations and enlarged by inductive processes. The mind has no certainty of an external world, but only of “a permanent possibility of sensations” and antecedent and anticipated feelings. Spencer (d. 1903) makes all knowledge relative. The actual existence of things is their persistency in consciousness. Consciousness contains only subjective feelings. The relation supposes the absolute, but the latter is unknowable to us; it is the object of faith and religion (Agnosticism). All things, mind included, have resulted from a continual process of mechanical evolution wherein they are still involved; hence all concepts and principles are in a continuous flux.

The Teaching of Catholic Philosophy is that sense-experience is a source, and indeed the primary source, of human knowledge, but it holds that there are other sources beyond sensations. There is nothing in the intellect that had not its birth in sense; this is one of the generalizations of the Schol. Moreover, though every intellectual concept is accompanied by sensory motion, and especially by some sense representation (phantasma, image) differing essentially from the idea produced in and by the intellect, which is an immortal, supersensuous and superorganic power or faculty. The theory here proposed may be called empirico-intellectualism since it conjoins a sensible factor with the purely intellectual or immaterial agency. The genesis of knowledge is then considered as follows: (a) Ideas represent the natures or essences of things, not the mere sensual qualities, the phenomena of things, but the underlying subject and cause thereof, e. g. substance, life, cause, truth, etc.; while ideas of sensual qualities as such represent them in the ideatum and as universal: e. g. light. (b) The mind possesses ideas of things (substances and accidents), immaterial, invisible, possible, and impossible, etc., e. g. ideas of God, spirit, etc.—ideas which cannot be formed from purely sensuous presentations or images. (c) We make clear-cut distinctions between the essential and accidental or contingent properties and attributes of things. (d) Every predicate idea represents not a congeries of sensual qualities, but what the subject is (its essence), under some particular aspect. Now none of these peculiarities of the idea can be discovered in any sensation or image, which always represents existent, concrete, sensible; Locke’s “reflection” and Condillac’s “process” of association” will not suffice to transmute sensations into ideas, since these two states are essentially, because objectively (representatively), different. Positivists inadvertently slip in an immaterial agency, thereby indeed they confound the question when they appeal to induction to explain the genesis of knowledge; the inductive process involves universal abstract principles and logical laws which are constituted of ideas that essentially transcend sensations. The supersensuous character of ideas follows equally from their “extension” or range of applicability. Ideas are representative of essences, are available as predicates, and are the terms whereof absolutely universal principles are constituted. Hence ideas are universal, whereas sensations and images can represent only objects that affect the sensory organs, i.e. individual, physically existing objects. Moreover, ideas represent objects as abstract—physically abstract, e. g. individual sensible qualities; mathematically abstract, e. g. extension and number; metaphysically abstract, e. g. mind, nature, spirit, etc. And indeed unless ideas were of the abstract there could be no science, physical, mathematical, or philosophical; all these sciences consider their objects apart from individual determinations. No intellectual judgment whatsoever would be possible, since every predicate is a universalized term and hence in some degree abstract. Sensation cannot represent an abstract object; for though the sight, etc., perceives colour apart from sound, nevertheless (a) no sense can abstract from the subject-matter—from the existence and individuality of its proper object; the eye does not see colour as such and abstracted, but the coloured object physically and individually existing; (b) no sense can abstract from its proper object, its appropriate stimulus or object-quality; nor from its common object (quantity, the extended object); (c) a fortiori, no sense can perceive one dimension of extension or a mathematical point, or things non-existent, or abstract forms like man and humanity. How does the common image suffice to explain the universal idea as Locke and the Herbartians suppose, for the common image, though indistinct, remains always in some way concrete and sensible; since the imagination as primarily reproductive can represent only what the senses have reported. Consciousness attests this; for if the imagination represent e. g. a triangle, it is always of some certain size and shape; it cannot represent a triangle which is neither rectangular, obtuse, nor acute; while the idea of a triangle precedes from every size or shape. Besides the image there is therefore the thought, the intellectual concept, the latter differing essentially from the former. Hence the common image is not predicative of the individuals distributively, because it is still somehow concrete, singular, sensible, material, and represents only quality. Nor can it be predicated as confusedly blending all the inferences, because the predicate of a judgment is attributed according to comprehension rather than extension. At best, moreover, the image is like to things; the concept is identical with the subject of which it is predicated. According to the empiricists the common image results from a comparison of representations, so that what is common to them, i.e. some prominent quality, stands out from all the rest; the intellect would thus have to immediately perceive and compare the images, which is impossible; nor could it form a concept unless a number of sense perceptions and representations of a thing or things of the same species had preceded. We know, however, that we
immediately form a concept of a thing, even though perceived but once. Furthermore, in order to form the common image a concept of the object must have preceded; for in order to compare similar things we must previously have perceived their likeness. Now, to perceive their likeness means to perceive some common motive or motive aspect wherein the similar things agree, while differing in other aspects. But this the senses cannot perceive; hence there must precede an intellectual perception of the note of agreement common to the objects represented by the images, i.e. a universal idea must precede the common image. The common image therefore does not precede but follows the common concept, whereof it is a sort of shadow. This is specially so in the case of the productive imagination, which re-arranges in new forms previously compared images and hence supposes reflection and judgment, operations which no sense can perform.

Sensism implies septicism. (a) For if we do not immediately perceive external objects but only our subjective sensuous modifications, then, since these differ with different individuals (e.g. the varying judgments of distance, heat, cold, etc., which varying judgments require intellectual reflection whereof the senses are incapable), there could be no certain and objective truth, each individual would be the measure of truth, there would be no objective criterion of certitude, no universal truths. (b) In order to pass from a subjective affection to a knowledge of its object we must, in the principle of causality, either reject sensism, either the concept of cause is not objective or cause is not perceived at all; therefore the principle of causality is either rejected or is pronounced doubtful. Hence there can be no certitude of the objective existence of things. Hume was but logical when he deduced universal scepticism from the theory of Locke.

Sensism involves the destruction of all science. (a) Science is the knowledge of things in and by their causes; but the senses cannot perceive causes. (b) Positivists claim that by their method the sciences have made wonderful progress, that by employing observation and induction the laws of nature have been discovered. Now, observation of phenomena entails universal ideas whereby the phenomena are classified under groups or species, while induction, to be legitimate and certain, postulates the principle of causality. Therefore the physical sciences suppose physical abstraction; the mathematical, mathematical abstraction, the metaphysical, metaphysical abstraction (primitive, i.e. direct, and reflective; ontological, logical, psychological). The negation of universal, necessary, immutable ideas essentially different from sensations means the destruction of even physical science, a fortiorem of mathematical and philosophical sciences.

Sensism destroys the foundations of morality and religion. For, as sensists and positivists admit, their theories leave no proof of the soul's spirituality and immortality; of the existence of moral law, its obligation and sanction in a future life; of the existence of God and His relation to man. Now, history bears witness that these truths are fundamental for man's real moral life.

**EMS**

**EMS** Congress of a meeting of the representatives of the German Archbishops Friedrich Karl von Erthal of Mainz, Maximilian Franz of Cologne, Clemens Wenceslaus of Trier, and Hieronymus von Colloredo of Salzburg, at the little town of Bad-Ems, near Cologne, in August, 1786, for the purpose of protesting against papal interference in the exercise of episcopal powers and fixing the future relations between these archbishops and the Roman pontiff.

The Gallican principles concerning the relation between the bishops and the pope, which had been disavowed by the Council of Lyons, had been violated by the Archbishop of Trier (1748-1790), in his treatise "De statu ecclesiæ et legitimâ potestate Rom. Pontificiæ" (1783) under the pseudonym "Febronius", were shared by some of the most influential archbishops of Germany. The archbishops became convinced in the position which they took toward the pope by the encouragement and support of Emperor Joseph II, who arrogated to himself both temporal and spiritual jurisdiction. As early as 1769 the representatives of the Elector-Archbishops of Mainz, Cologne, and Trier, at a meeting held in Coblenz, had drawn up a list of thirty-one articles, most of which were directed against the Roman Curia. The proximate occasion of the Congress of Ems was the erection of an Apostolic nunciature in Munich (27 Feb., 1785) and the appointment of Zoglio, titular Archbishop of Athens, as nuncio (27 June), with jurisdiction over the entire territory of the Elector Karl Theodor (wherein the core of Bavaria, with the Rhine Palatinate and the former Duchies of Julich and Berg. Pius VI erected this nunciature upon the urgent request of the Elector of Bavaria, who was loath to have parts of his territory under the spiritual jurisdiction of bishops who, being electors like himself, were rather his subordinates than his superiors. He had previously suggested to the Elector-Archbishops of Mainz, Cologne, and Trier to appoint special vicars-general for their districts in his territory. Upon their refusal he requested Pius VI to erect separate dioceses for his territory, but in deference to the wishes of the three elector-archbishops, the pope also refused. Finally the Elector of Bavaria asked for the above-mentioned nunciature, and despite the protests of the archbishops his wish was granted.

Meanwhile Beilisomi, the nuncio at Cologne, was transferred to Lisbon, and Pacca, the then Archbishop of Damietta, was appointed to succeed him at Cologne. Maximilian Franz, Archbishop of Cologne (a brother of Emperor Joseph II), refused to see him, and none of the three elector-archbishops honoured his credentials. Despite protests, both Pacca and Beilisomi began to exert their influence by putting forward the support which Emperor Joseph II had promised, the three elector-archbishops and the Archbishop of Salzburg planned concerted action against Rome and set their representatives to Ems to hold a congress. Von Erthal of Mainz, who was the soul of the proceedings, was represented by his auxiliary bishop, Valentine Heimes; Maximilian Franz of Cologne, by his privy councillor Heinrich von Tauphuius; Clemens Wenceslaus of Trier, by his privy councillor and official representative in temporal matters, Joseph Ludwig Beck; Colloredo of Salzburg, by his consistorial councillor, Johann Michael Boncke. On 25 August, 1786, these archiepiscopal representatives signed the notorious "Punctuation of Ems", consisting of twenty-three articles which aimed at making the German archbishops practically independent of Rome. For the text of the articles see Munich, "Sammlung aller älteren und neuerer Concordiae" (Leipag, 1881), I, 404-423.

Assuming that Christ gave unlimited power of binding and loosing to the Apostles and their successors, the bishops, the "Punctuation" maintains that all legislatives and reservation of ternary powers connected with the primacy during the first three centuries owe their origin to the Pseudo-Isidore decreets, universally acknowledged as false, and, hence, that the bishops must look upon all interference of the Roman Curia with the exercise of their episcopal functions in their own dioceses as encroachments on their rights. Upon these schismatic principles the four archbishops...
based their demands, which may be summarized as follows: all direct appeals to Rome must be discontinued; all exempt monasteries must become subject to the bishops in whose districts the monasteries are situated; no German monasteries must have generals, provinces, or other superiors, who do not reside in Germany; the bishops need not obtain quinquennial faculties from Rome, because by virtue of their office they can dispense from abstinence, from matrimonial impediments, including the second degree of consanguinity and the second and first degrees of affinity, from voided religious vows and the obligations resulting from Holy Orders; priests of all orders and officials of the Roman Curia are binding in each diocese only after the respective bishop has given his place; all Apostolic nunciatures must be abolished; the manner of conferring benefices and the procedure in ecclesiastical lawsuits must be changed in favour of the bishops; the episcopal oath must be changed so that it shall not appear to be the oath of a vassal, etc.

It may easily be seen that the articles of the "Punctation" lower the papal primacy to a merely honorary one and advocate an independence of the archbishops in regard to the pope which is entirely incompatible with the dignity and authority of the Church of Christ. Still the "Punctation" was immediately ratified by the four archbishops and sent to Emperor Joseph II with an humble request for his support. The emperor was pleased with the articles and would have pledged his unqualified support if his councillors, especially his chancellor, Kranitz, had not dissuaded him otherwise. In his reply of 16 Nov., 1786, the emperor wisely makes his support dependent on the condition that the archbishops gain the consent of their suffragan bishops, the superiors of the exempt monasteries, and the estates in whose districts their spiritual jurisdiction extends. The suffragan bishops, especially the pious and learned prince-bishops August von Styrum of Speier and Franz Ludwig von Erthal of Würzburg-Bamberg (a brother of the Archbishop of Mainz), protested against the schismatic tendency of the "Punctation" and saw in the anti-papal procedure of the archbishops merely an attempt to increase their own power to the detriment of their suffragans. The Elector of Bavaria likewise remained a zealous defender of the pope and his nuncio at Munich, and even the Protestant King Frederick II of Prussia was an opponent of the "Punctation" and favoured the uncease Pacea at Cologne.

Still the archbishops insisted on their demands. When the nuncio at Cologne by authority of the pope granted a monarchical dispensation from the second degree of consanguinity to Prince von Hohenlohe-Bartenstein and Countess Blankenheim, Archbishop Maximilian Franz of Cologne addressed to him a strong protest forbidding him for the future the exercise of all jurisdiction in the Archdiocese of Cologne. The archbishops themselves now began to grant dispensations from such degrees of relationship as were not contained in the ordinary dispensations of faculties, just as if the "Punctation of Ems" were in full force. When the nuncio at Cologne, by order of the pope, informed the pastors that all marriages contracted by virtue of such dispensations were invalid, the archbishops ordered their pastors to return the circular to the nuncio and to obtain all future dispensations directly from their ordinary, the archbishop. The Church in Germany was now near to a schism. Fortunately, von Erthal of Mainz needed the services of Rome. He desired Karl Theodor von Dalberg as coadjutor, and, to obtain the consent of Rome, he with due prudence, apparently, found the "Punctation" and obtained a renewal of his quinquennial faculties from Rome on 9 Aug., 1787. Similarly the Archbishop of Trier asked for quinquennial faculties as Bishop of Augsburg, but not as Archbishop of Trier. Von Erthal's submission to Rome was only a pretended one. He continued his opposition and on 2 June, 1788, requested Emperor Joseph II, in the name of himself and the three other archbishops, to bring the affair concerning the German nuncios before a diet. But soon the archbishops discovered that all the estates were opposed to the "Punctation" and that a diet would rather retard than accelerate the execution of their wishes. For this reason they addressed a letter to Rome (1 Dec., 1788) asking the pope to put an end to the unifying ecclesiastical dissensions in Germany by withdrawing the faculties from the nuncios and by sending representatives to the German estates with authority to come to favorable agreements with the other demands of the archbishops. In answer to this request appeared the publication of a memorable document composed by order of the pope and entitled: "Sanctissimi Domini nostri Pii Papae VI respon- sio ad Metropolitanos Moguntinum, Trevirensen, Coloniasen et Salisburgensem super Nunciaturis Apostolicis" (Rome, 1789). It was a masterpiece in form and contents of Apostolic firmness and paternal reproof. After presenting a dispassionate and objective view of the whole litigation, the document refutes all the arguments of the archbishops against papal authority, and enjoining the archbishops to rebel against papal authority, explains that the pope cannot send representatives to worldly estates who have no right to pass judgment on ecclesiastical affairs, and admonishes the archbishops to give up their untenable position towards the Holy See for political reasons.

The papal writing was not without effect. Archbishop Wenceslaus of Trier, who had long desired an amicable settlement of the odious affair, into which, it appears, he was drawn against his will, publicly withdrew from the "Punctation" on 29 Feb., 1790, and admonished his colleagues to follow the same example. They, however, continued their opposition and on occasion of the imperial capitulation of Leopold II (1790) and that of Francis II (1792) obtained the promise that their complaints concerning the nunciatures would be attended to as soon as possible by a decree of the diet. The threatening progress of the French Revolution finally changed the attitude of the Archbishops of Cologne and Salzburg, but the Archbishop of Mainz clung to the "Punctation" until the victorious French army invaded his electorate, and he was deprived of all his authority as "Punctation" and was expelled from the Rhine, at the peace of Campo Formio, in 1797.

**Steginger, Die Errichtung der papal. Nuntiatur in München und der Emscher Congress (Ratisbon, 1867); BRUCK, Die römischen Bischöfe in Deutschland im katholischen Zeitalter (Köln, 1863); SERGIO, II Papa in Germania dal anno 1520 al 1754 (Rome, 1882); FELLER, Coop-e'mel sur le Congrès d'Ems (Düsseldorf, 1777); GERARD OTT, Michael Ott.**

**Emser, Hieronymus**, the most ardent literary opponent of Luther, b. of a prominent family at Ulm, 20 March, 1477; d. 8 Nov., 1527 at Strasbourg. At the University of Tübingen, whither he went in 1493, he acquired a thorough knowledge of Greek and Latin, but in 1497 he began the study of law and theology at the University of Basle. Through the good offices of his friend Christoph, later Bishop of Utenheim, he barely escaped imprisonment at Basle for his participation in the satirical verses of his countryman, Bebel, in a volume which was circulated among the students. The legate, Cardinal Raymond Peraudi of Gork, who seems to have been the judge in this trial, shortly after engaged him as secretary. In 1500 he published a medi- tation on the censure of Erasmus and was generally supposed to have fallen from heaven. Four years later he began a series of brilliant lectures at Erfurt on Reuchlin's "Sergius vel Caput Capitis" and numbered Martin Luther among his hearers. On account of his triumphs at Erfurt he always claimed the
distinction of having been one of the pioneers of classical humanism in Germany. Despite his renown and brilliant manner of teaching, Emser's lectures at Leipzig on the classics, in 1505, aroused little admiration. Disgusted at his failure he turned to the study of theology at the degree of bachelor, whereupon he befriended him in a financial way during these and subsequent years. Dissatisfied with the methods of teaching theology then prevalent, Emser applied himself earnestly to canon law, and on the completion of his studies served George of Saxony as secretary. At the request of the latter he composed a Latin ode in honour of St. Benno of Meissen, who had just been canonized. This canonization was largely due to the efforts of Emser at Rome, whether he went in 1510 at the express wish of George of Saxony, who saw in this solemn act a source of glory for his realm. The life of the new saint, which Emser wrote in faultless Latin on his return in 1512, is worthless from a critical point of view.

About this time Emser received Holy orders and two prebends at Dresden and Meissen. While preaching by command of George of Dresden, he became better acquainted with Luther. Emser admired the fiery Augustinian; Luther, the accomplished literature.

But in 1519 they parted. At the disputation in Leipzig, Luther, to the express dissatisfaction of George of Saxony, who was present with Emser, gave utterance to Hussele opinions of a radical sort regarding the pope. Emser was deeply pained at this; and on learning that the Bohemians, who had been in some form or other admired by Luther, had called a second Hüs in Luther, he declared in a letter to John Zack that Luther had reprimanded the Bohemians for their attitude towards the pope, and had upheld the papal supremacy as a necessary means to prevent division. Emser added a very lucid explanation based on these considerations, as the origin, and in a subjoined poem dealt a severe blow to the calumnies against the pope. Luther soon learned the contents of this letter and, regarding it as an attempt to discredit him among the Bohemians, replied in his "Ad agogoratorem Emserianum M. Lutheri additum", where abuse of all kind was heaped upon the Church. Emser answered with an equally violent though not scurrilous work: "A venatoine lutheriană agogoratio Asser- tio", in which he portrayed the certain scandal arising from the words and conduct of a refractory monk. He did not limit his scriptures in a way or another to the arbitrary interpretation of Luther. The letter closes with a history of his life, which was intended to offset the aspersions cast on his probity by his opponent. Luther replied by burning at Wittenberg this letter and other writings of Emser, together with the Bull "Quotannis: communication and the "Corpus juris canon- nici" (10 Dec., 1520). This insult did not provoke Emser. But as Luther displayed an incredible literary activity in 1520, Emser wrote eight polemical works in 1520 and 1521 which abound in personalities and invective, yet defend the Faith in a masterly way and clearly point out the logical results of the new teaching. In 1522 he translated the address which the Englishman, John Clark, delivered on handing over to Pope Leo X the book written by Henry VIII against Luther. (O'Donovan, The Defence of the Seven Sacraments by Henry VIII, New York, 1908, pp. 110-17.) Among other works may be mentioned the German translation of the New Testament with a laudatory preface by George of Saxony. Emser showed in this work the liberties taken by Luther with the Scriptures and refuted his errors.

WEBER, "Nachricht von H. Emser's Leben und Schriften" (Wiesbaden, 1866). SCHRAB F. Gesch. des deutschen Volkes (1889). III. 469 sqq.; SCHRAB IN Kirchenle., IV. 479. — The following are noteworthy: the anonymous Emser, Halle, 1600; the anonymous Emser, Halle, 1600; and the anonymous Emser, Halle, 1600. Of Maren, H. Emser der Vorkämpfer Roma gegen die Reformation (Halle, 1890). KEFFERER, "Der Luststand in den Bibelüber- setzungen der Reformationszeit" (Halle, 1886). EMSEN'S polemical writings of 1521 against Luther were edited in two small volumes by Ewends (Halle, 1890-92).

THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.
ENCISO

Martín Fernández de, navigator and geographer, b. at Seville, Spain, c. 1470; d. probably about 1528 at Seville. It is not known when, why, or with whom he went to America, but in 1508 he was living on the island of Santo Domingo, where he had accumulated a fortune in the practice of law. In 1509 Alonzo de Ojeda (or Hojeda) had been granted the government of Terra Firme (the region about the Isthmus of Darien), but he lacked the funds necessary to colonize the country. He then applied to Enciso, who had the reputation of being rich and able, and adven-turous. The latter agreed to provide a vessel with men and provisions. Ojeda set out in advance in 1509, and it was agreed that Enciso was to equip his vessel and follow him in 1510. When the latter arrived, he found that Ojeda, having been beset by the Indians, and having exhausted his supplies and ammunition, had returned without him. Taking the survivors of Ojeda’s expedition, Enciso founded the town of Santa María la Antigua del Darién (1510). Among his followers was one Vasco Núñez de Balboa who afterwards became famous for his discovery of the Pacific Ocean, then called the South Sea (Márquez) and who had joined the expedition without Enciso’s knowledge or authority, seeking to escape his creditors.

Soon after the founding of the new city, Balboa stirred up rebellion among the men, and was able to depose Enciso, whom he banished to Spain. Here, the latter complained of the arbitrariness of the Emperor Charles V, and, having partly owed to these accusations, sent Pedrarias Dávila to America in 1514 as Governor of Darién, with instructions to have the wrongs of Enciso righted. Enciso accompanied the expedition as “alguen mayor” and continued to oppose Balboa until the latter’s execution by Dávila, 1517. He then afterwards returned to Spain where he published his “Suma de Geografía que trata de todas las partidas del mundo”, the first account in Spanish of the discoveries in the New World. The work was published in 1519 at Seville and was reprinted in 1530 and in 1549. It is dedicated to the Emperor Charles V, and in it, according to Navarrete, Enciso has embodied all that was then known of the theory and practice of navigation. The geographical portion is given with great care, and contains the first descriptions of the lands discovered in the western seas, that is, the results of the explorations of the Spaniards up to 1519. It is, on the whole, a more accurate work than the other early works of its kind.

MICHAELIS, BIOG. UNIV. (Paris, 1850); HELPE, HISTORY OF SPANISH CONQUEST IN AMERICA (1850-1861).

VENTURA FUENTES.

ENCRIPTIONS

Enclosure. See Cloister.

Encolpion (Gr. ἐκλόπων, that which is worn on the breast), the name given in early Christian times to a species of reliquary worn around the neck, in which were enclosed such relics as fragments of cloth stained with the blood of a martyr, small pieces of parchment with texts from the Holy Scriptures, particles of the True Cross, etc. The custom of bearing on the person objects of this character was evidently derived from the pagan practice of wearing bullae, containing amulets, round the neck as a protection against enchantment; the Church endeavoured to purify this usage from superstition by substituting objects venerated by Christians for those to which they had been accustomed before conversion. According to St. Jerome, however (in Matt. vii. 26), in his day attached a superstitious importance to these aids to piety; he censures certain classes of women who seem to have, in some degree, identified sanctity with an exaggerated veneration for sacred relics: “Hoc quod apud nos superstitione muliebrius in parvis evangelios et in cruces ligno et linum modi rebus, quae habent quidem zelum Dei, sed non secundum scientiam, factant” (That which superstitious women amongst us, who have a certain zeal for God but not of right knowledge, do in regard to little copies of the Gospels, the wood of the cross, and things of that kind). Enkolpios were of various forms, oval, round, four-cornered, and of various materials ranging from gold to glass. In 1571 two gold enkolpios, square in form, were found in tombs of the ancient Vatican cemetery, engraved on one side with the monogram of Christ between the Alpha and Omega, and on the other a cross and a bird. Another is mentioned in the tomb of Maria, wife of the Emperor Honorius, bearing the names of the imperial couple with the legend vivat is and the monogram. The famous treasure of Monza contains the theca persica, enclosing a text from the Gospel of St. John, sent by Pope St. Gregory the Great (590-604) to Queen Theodolinda of the Ostrogoths. Another of the gifts of this pope to the Lombard queen was a cruciform enkolpios containing a portion of the True Cross. Probably the most interesting relicary of this form is a gold pectoral cross discovered at Rome in 1863, in the basilica of St. Lorenzo fuori le mura, on the breast of a corpse. On one side it bears the inscription: EMMANOU ThH NOBISCUM Deus (Emmanuel, God with us), and on the other: CRUX EST VITA MHI, MORS INIMICE TII (To me the Cross is life; to thee, O enemy, it is death). To the category of enkolpios belong also the vials or vessels of clay in which were preserved such esteemed relics as oil from the lamps that burned before the Holy Sepulchre and the golden keys with filigree from St. Peter’s chains, one of which was sent by St. Gregory the Great to the Frankish King Childericht.


MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Encratiæ (ἔκρατεῖς) (Irenæus) ἔκκρατεῖς (Clement Alex., Hippolytus), literally, “abstainers” or “persons who practised continency”, because they refrained from the use of wine, animal food, and marriage. The name was given to an early Christian sect, or rather to a tendency common to several sects, chiefly Gnostic, whose asceticism was based on heretical views regarding the origin of matter.

HISTORY. Abstinence from the use of some creatures, because they were thought to be intrinsically evil, is much older than Christianity. Pythagorism, Esseniism, Indian asceticism betrayed this erroneous tendency, and the Indian ascetics are actually quoted by Clement of Alexandria in one of the sections of the Encratites (Strom., i. xxv). Although St. Paul refers to people, even in his days, “forbidding to marry and abstaining from meats” (1 Tim., iv, 1-5), the first mention of a Christian sect of this name occurs in Irenæus (I, xxviii). He connects their origin with Saturninus and Marcion. Rejecting marriage they implicitly accuse the Christian sect of both male and female. Refraining from all ἐσώρια (animal food and intoxicants), they are ungrateful to Him Who created all things. “And now”, continues Irenæus, “they reject the salvation of the first man [Adam]; an opinion recently introduced among them...
by Tatian, a disciple of Justin. As long as he was with Justin he gave no sign of these things, but after his martyrdom Tatian separated himself from the Church. Elated and puffed up by his professorship, he established some teaching of his own. He fabled about some invisible world of the Valentinians (Philos., V, 100), and professed marriage to be corruption and fornication, as Marcion and Saturninus do, but he made the denial of Adam's salvation a specialty of his own. The Encratites are next mentioned by Clement Alex. (Paed., II, ii, 33; Strom., I, xv; VII, xxi). The whole of the third book of the Stromata is devoted to their fanaticism, though a special sect of Encratites is not there mentioned. Hippolytus (Philos., VIII, xiii) refers to them as "acknowledging what concerns God and Christ in like manner with the Church; in respect, however, of their mode of life, passing their days inflamed with pride", "abstaining from animal food, being water-drinkers and forbidding to marry", "estimated Cynics rather than Christians". On the strength of this passage it is supposed that some Encratites were perfectly orthodox in doctrine, and erred only in practice, but the later books of the Adversus Haereses do not include the whole of Christian doctrine. Somewhat later this sect received new life and strength by the accession of a certain Severus (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., IV, xxii), after whom Encratites were often called Severians. These Severian Encratites accepted the Law, the Prophets, and the ; but rejected the book of the Apocalypse, the Epistle to St. Paul and his Epistles. But the account given by Epiphanius of the Severians rather betrays Syriac Gnosticism than Judaistic tendencies. In their hatred of marriage they declared woman the work of Satan, and in their hatred of intoxicants they called wine and drugs the venom from the devil (Philos., iv, xlv). Epiphanius states that in his day Encratites were very numerous throughout Asia Minor, in Pisidia, in the Adustain district of Phrygia, in Isauria, Pamphylia, Cilicia, and Galatia. In the Roman Province and in Antioch of Syria they were found scattered here and there. They shut up into a number of smaller sects, of whom the Apostolic (q.v.) were remarkable for their condemnation of private property, the Hydroprastate for their use of water instead of wine in the Eucharist. In the Edict of 382, Theodosius pressed for the execution of death cases those who took the name of Encratites, Saccophori, or Hydroprastate, and commanded Florus, the Magister Officiorum, to make strict search for these heretics, who were Manichaeans in disguise. Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., X, i) tells of an Encratite of Ancyra in Galatia, called Bussiris, who was severely punished. In the Acts of Persecution, and who under Theodosius abjured his heresy and returned to the Catholic Church. On the other hand, we learn from Macarius Magnus (about 403—Apoec., III, xiii) of a certain Dositheus, a Cilician, who about the same time wrote a work in eight books in defence of Encratite errors. About the middle of the fifth century they disappear from history, absorbed, probably, by the Manicheans, with whom they had so much in common from the first.

II. Writings.—The Encratites developed a considerable literary activity. P. Theodoret (Hist. Eccl., III, xi, xii) mentions five works of Dositheus; one of them is now lost. P. Dositheus probably was Tatian in his book "Concerning Perfection according to the Saviour", which Clement of Alexandria quotes and refutes in Strom., III, xi. Almost contemporary with him (about A.D. 150) was Julius Cassianus, known as the founder of Docetism (s仪表性). He wrote a treatise on "Concerning Abstinence and Contency", of which Clement and St. Jerome have preserved some passages (Strom., I, xii; Euseb., Praep. Ev., X, xii; Strom., III, xiii; Jerome, ad Gal., VI, viii). Concerning the eight books of Dositheus we know only that he maintained that, as the world had its beginning by sexual intercourse, so by continency (enerateia) it would have its end; and that he inveighed against wine-drinkers and flesh-eaters. Among the apocryphal works which originated in Encratite circles must be mentioned: The Gospel according to the Egyptians, referred to by Clement (Strom., III, ix, 13), Origen (Hom. in 1 Luc.), Hippolytus (Philos., V, 100), which between Jesus and Salome specially appealed to the Encratites in condemnation of marriage (to This Gospel the recently discovered "Logia" probably belong); the Gospel of Philip, of Thomas, the Acts of Peter, of Andrew, of Thomas, and other Apocrypha, furnishing Gnostic-Encratite views.

Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., IV, 12, 28) says that *Muranus* (A.D. 170 or 210) wrote a most elegant book addressed to some brethren who had fallen into the heresy of the Encratites. Theodoret (Hær. Fab., I, xxi) says that Apollinarius of Hierapolis in Phrygia (about 171) wrote against the Severian Encratites.


Encyclical (Lat. Litterae Encyclicae).—According to its etymology, an encyclical (from the Greek έγκλεις, meaning a circle) is nothing more than a circular letter. In modern times, usage has confined the term to those papal documents which do not differ in their technical form from the ordinary style of either Bulls or Briefs, and which in their superscription are explicitly addressed to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the Universal Church in communion with the Apostolic See. By exception, certain letters, addressed to the archbishops and bishops of a particular country. This name is given to the letter of Pius X (6 Jan., 1907) to the bishops of France, in spite of the fact that it was published, not in Latin, but in French; while, on the other hand, the letter "Longinquae Oceani" (5 Jan., 1896) addressed by Pius IX to the archbishops and bishops of the United States, is not styled an encyclical, although in all other respects it exactly observes the forms of one. From this and a number of similar facts we may probably infer that the precise designation used by the church is not based on the nature of the case encyclicals addressed to the bishops of the world are generally concerned with matters which affect the welfare of the Church at large. They condemn some prevalent form of error, point out dangers which threaten faith or morals, exhort the faithful to constancy, or prescribe remedies for evils foreseen or already existing. In form an encyclical at the present day begins thus:—we may take the encyclical "Pascendi" on Modernism as a specimen:—

"Sanctissimae Domini Nostri Papae Pii Divinæ Providentiae Pape X Litteræ Encyclæid ad Patriarchas, Præmatres, Archiepiscopos, Episcopos aliisque locorum Ordinariorum pæcem et communionem cum Apostolica Sede habitantes de Modernistarum Doctrinis. Ad Patriarchas, Præmatres, Archiepiscopos, Episcopos aliisque locorum Ordinariorum, pæcem et communione cum Apostolica Sede habentes, Primas et patriarchas populisque..."

The conclusion takes the following form:—"Nos vero, pignus caritatis Nostre divinæ in adversis solutæ, Apostolice Benedictionem vobis, cleris, ac populisque vestris semper reddimus et redderimus,... Datum in Rome, aput Sanetum Petrum, die VIII Septembris MCMVII, Pontificatus Nostri anno quinto. Pius PP. X."
encyclopedia, an abridgment of human knowledge in general or a considerable department thereof, treated from a uniform point of view or in a systematized summary. Although the word, used technically, dates only from the sixteenth century, encyclopedia (ordo et libri) as a treatise on the sciences, and, beginning with the Middle Ages, artes liberales (see arts, the seven liberal). According to their form, systematic encyclopedias are divided into two classes: (a) those which present all branches of knowledge, arranged uniformly and organically according to some fixed system of connection, and (b) the lexicographical encyclopedias, which treat of the same matter arranged according to an alphabetical system. Such, in the tenth century, compiled an encyclopedia of the latter type, which became common only in the seventeenth century after the appearance of encyclopedic dictionaries dealing with particular sciences. Aristotle was the first in ancient times to attempt a summary of human knowledge in encyclopedic form. Compared with Aristotle's work, which is built up on a philosophic basis, the compilations along this line by Marcus Porcius Cato (294-149 B. C.), Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 B.C.), in his "Disciplinarum libri IX," Piny (A. D. 23-79), in his "Historia naturalis," and Martianus Capella (fifth century), in his "Satyricon," or "De Nuptiis Philosophiae et Mercurii," used during the Middle Ages as a textbook for the liberal arts, to perished. The lack of a philosophic basis and the mechanical stringing together of facts without an organic principle give to most of these works an unsatisfactory and tentative character.

The first attempt to compile an encyclopedia in the real sense of the word is evident in the "Etymologica sive origines" of Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636), re-arranged and more or less independently supplemented by Rabanus Maurus (756-856) in his "De Universo," by Honorius Augustodunensis in his "Imago Mundi," and by others. The most astonishing of these compilations, from the viewpoint of wealth of material and complexity of detail, is the work of Vincent of Beauvais (died c. 1264), which groups the entire knowledge of the Middle Ages under three heads: "Speculum naturale," "Speculum doctrinale," and "Speculum historiale." The following are examples of encyclopedic works in the later Middle Ages: "Liber de natura rerum" of Conrad of Meigenberg (d. 1374); the "Imago Mundi" of Pierre d'Alluy (died c. 1420); the "Margarita philosophica" of Gregor Reisch, O. Cart. (Freiburg, 1503); and at a later date the encyclopedias of Ringelberg, "Luechraniones vel potius absolutissima synes" (Basle, 1541). Paul Scalich, "Encyclopedia seu Orbis Disciplinarum tum sacrarum tum profanarum" (Basle, 1559); Martini, "Ideas methodicus et brevis encyclopediae sive adumbriat universitas" (Herborn, 1600); Alsted's "Scientiarum omnium encyclopediae tomis XIII," 1620; 24th ed. 1702. All the above-mentioned works are simply collections of facts showing no mastery of the material by the writer, much less any critical research or an organic system of compilation.

The first to attempt a work founded on the philo-
phy and interrelation of sciences was Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, in his incomplete "Instauratio Magna", the second part of which was the "Novum organum" (London, 1620), and his "De dignitate et augmentis scientiarum" (1623). His immediate successors, however, were not satisfied merely with such beginnings. In the middle of the eighteenth century, the transition from the old-fashioned compilation of dry facts suited only for general instruction or as works of reference for scholars, e.g., the "Fama librorum juvenilium" of Wagenseil (Altdorf, 1695), Chevigny's "La science de l'homme de cœur d'épée et de robe" (18 vols., Amsterdam, 1752), and David Morhoö's "Polybius" (Altdorf, 1717 and 1747). A clearer idea of the proper organic construction of an encyclopedia work is first apparent in J. M. Gesner's "Prima lineae isagoges in eruditionem universalum" (3rd ed., Gottingen, 1786), and J. G. Sulzer's "Kurzer Begriff aller Wissenschaften" (Leipzig, 1745; Eisenach, 1778). The way had been prepared, however, by two earlier works, which mark an important advance in the conception of what is proper to an encyclopedia. Both works, but especially the second, exerted a far-reaching influence on the whole intellectual life of the time. These were: Daniel Boullon's "Encyclopedie historique et critique" (Leipzig, 1796), and "Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers", compiled by Diderot and d'Alembert (28 vols., Paris, 1751–72, with 7 supplementary vols., 1760–80). While in these works the matter is arranged on an alphabetical system, the author of Sulzer's essays essayed a systematic presentation of sciences on the old plan, e.g., Adelung, "Kurzer Begriff menschlicher Fertigkeiten und Künste" (Leipzig, 1778; Reimarus, "Encyklopädie" (Hamburg, 1775); Büsch, "Encyk. der mathematischen Wissenschaften" (Hamburg, 1782); Reuss, "Encyklopädie" (Berlin, 1791); Buder, "Encyklopädie" (Lemgo, 1790). A successful attempt in this direction, based on Kantian principles, was made by J. J. Eschenburg in his "Lerhrbuch der Wissenschatzkunde" (Berlin, 1792; 3rd ed., 1808).

In competition with this, Krug's introduction of a new method in "Versuch einer systematischen Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften" (Leipzig, 1796–97; Züllichau, 1804–19) was unsuccessful. Not to mention Habel, Rüf, and Strauss, the following imitators of Eschenburg gained no little reputation: Heffter, "Die philosophische Daseinslehre oder System der Wissenschaften" (Leipzig, 1806); Burdach, "Organismus der menschlichen Wissenschaften und Kunst" (Leipzig, 1809); Krauss, "Encyklopädische Ansichten" (Königsberg, 1809); and the followers of Kant, E. Schmidt, "Allgemeine Encyklopädie und Methodologie der Wissenschaften" (Jena, 1810), and K. A. Schaller, "Encyk. und Methodologie" (Mudgbeburg, 1812). The increase in knowledge and the demands for specialization which are noticeable from the beginning of the nineteenth century, destroyed even the possibility of presenting completely all the departments of human knowledge or even a single branch of any great extent. The last attempts made in this direction (and they deserve some attention) were Kirchner's "Akademische Propädeutik" (Leipzig, 1842) and "Hodegetik" (1852), also Schleiermacher's "Bibliographisches System der gesamten Wissenschaften" (Dresden, 1854; 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1886; Hommel, "Semitische Völker und Sprachen" (Leipzig, 1883—); Schmitz's work on the modern languages; Körtig's works on English and Romance philology (Heilbronn, 1883—); Gröber, "Grundris der roman. Philol." (Strasbourg, 1888—); Paul, "Grundris der german. Philol." (Strasbourg, 1889–93); Elze, "Grundrisser der engl. Philol." (Halle, 1887); Geiger-Kuhn, "Grundris der iranischen Philologie" (Strasbourg, 1896—); Bühler-Kriehorn, "Grundrisser der indisch-iranischen Philologie" (Strasbourg, 1896—); Jagie, "Grundris der persisch-iranischen Philologie" (Hamburg, 1896—). Recent reference work has been completed and has been published in a similar manner in the course of the nineteenth century, especially by Arndt, "Jurist. Encyk. u. Methodologie" (Stuttgart, 1843; 10th ed., 1901); Bühme, "Encyk. der in Deutschland geltenden Rechte" (Bonn, 1847–58); Heine, "Juristische Encyk." (2nd ed., Bonn, 1892). Theology was also augmented by the Catholics: Staudenmaier, "Encyk. der theol. Wissenschaften" (2nd ed., Mainz, 1840); Wirhmttuer, "Encyk. der kath. Theologie" (1874); Klee, "Encyk. der Theologie" (1832); Kuhn, "Encyk. und Methodologie der Theologie" (1892); Krieg, "Encyk. der theolog. Wissenschaften" (1896); by Protestants: Zöckler, "Handbuch der theolog. Wissenschaften" (Munich, 1882–85); Hagenbach, "Encyk. und Methodologie der theolog. Wissenschaften" (3rd ed., Leipzig, 1889); Heinri, "Theol. encyk." (1893); Kähler, "Juristische Encyk." (1899); Parry, "Encel. der gesamten Theologie" (1895); and von Molt, "Encel. der gesamten Theologie" (1904). The "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1885; vols. since republished separately). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1885; vols. since republished separately). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1885; vols. since republished separately). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1885; vols. since republished separately). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1885; vols. since republished separately). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1885; vols. since republished separately). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1885; vols. since republished separately). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1885; vols. since republished separately). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1904). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1904). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1904). Among the various attempts to treat history in this manner may be mentioned Oncken's "Allgemeine Gesch. in Einzeldarstellungen" (40 vols., Berlin, 1879–93). Nearly every branch of classical learning, treated by specialists, "Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft" (Munich, 1904).
The encyclopedia of Diderot and d'Alembert who were assisted in their work by numerous champions of rationalism, e.g. Voltaire, d'Holbach, Rousseau, and Grimm. "Encyclopédie "Dictionnaire raisonné des arts et des sciences" (28 vols., Paris, 1751–72, with 5 supplementary volumes, Amsterdam, 1776–77, and 2 vols. of analytical index, Paris, 1780). This resembles the German work in breadth of scope, but had much greater influence on European thought, popularizing as it did the empiricism, sensism, and materialism of Locke. The first edition of 30,000 copies was followed by many later editions.

The encyclopedia of Diderot paved the way for the alphabetic encyclopedia. It was not only frequently reprinted but was re-arranged as a system of separate dictionaries by Panckoucke (1849) and by Agasse in the "encyclopédie méthodique ou par ordre des matières" (166 vols. of text and 51 vols. of illustrations; Paris, 1782–1839). In Germany the first encyclopedia modelled on Diderot's, by Köster and Roos, only reached K n o t (23 vols., Frankfort, 1778–1804); the third edition, however, made by Ersch and Gruber, proved a success. This is considered the most scientific German encyclopedia, "Allgemeine E n c y c l o p ä d i e Wissenschaften und K ü n s c h e n" begun by Professor Johann Samuel Ersch in 1813 and continued by Professors Hufeland, Gruber, Moser, Brockhaus, Müller, and Hoffmann. The work is divided into three sections: Section I, A to G, 99 vols. (1818–82); Section II, H to N, 43 vols. (1827–90); Section III, O to Z, 25 vols. (1830–50). Equally ambitious in scope is the "Oekonomisch-technolog. Encyk." (24 vols., Berlin, 1773–1838), planned by K r ü n i t z as a dictionary of economies and technology, but gradually enlarged by his successors Fr ö c k e, K o r t h, and C. O. Hoffmann into a general encyclopedia. Outside of the encyclopedia of Ersch and Gruber, the most ambitious encyclopedia work of the 19th century, the modern development, is the Brockhaus "Konversationslexikon" which took its name from H ü b e r, and from Bayle's "Dictionnaire" its arrangement and plan of presenting the results of scientific research and discovery in a popular form. H ü b e r gave as the reason for naming his work "Reale-Niels-Zeitungs-und Konversations-Lexikon" the fact that "it was to contain no professorial learning but all items of refined learning needed in daily intercourse with educated people." As it was printed chiefly to satisfy people of a curious turn of mind, it was confined principally to geography, while history was excluded as a special science. The first encyclopedia according to modern ideas was begun by L ö b el in 1796 (6 vols., Amsterdam, 1808; 2 supplementary vols., 1810). In 1800 the publishing rights were acquired by Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus; the firm of Brockhaus completely altered the original plan and is still engaged on the work (14th ed., 1901—abridged ed., 2 vols., 4th ed., 1888). Constructed on the same lines as the encyclopedia of Brockhaus is P i e r e r 's "Universallexikon" (26 vols., 1824–56; 7th ed., 12 vols., 1888–93), to which were added the P i e r e r "Jahrbiicher der Wissenschaften, K ü n s c h e n und Gewerbe" (1856–75); similar works are M e y e r 's "Konversations-Lexikon" (37 vols., Leipzig, 1840–52; 6th ed., 20 vols., 1902; 7th ed., abridged, 6 vols., 1907) and S p a m e r 's "Illustriertes Konversations-Lexikon" (24 vols., 1840–70; 2 supplementary volumes, 1879–82; 2nd ed., 1841–91). These works were inspired by a superficial rationalism, if not by conscious hostility to everything Catholic. Early attempts were made to counteract this propaganda of religious indifference by the publication of encyclopedias from the Catholic point of view, such as the "Allgemeine Religions-Lexikon für das katholische Deutschland" (13 vols., 1846–49; 4th ed., 1880–90); and Herder's "Konversations-Lexikon" (5 vols., Freiburg, 1853–57); neither proved a thorough success. The third edition of the latter (8 vols., 1901–08), through its preservation of Catholic interests, by its impartiality, thoroughness, and comprehensiveness gained general favor. Encyclopedias have since been compiled in all civilized countries. In France were published the "Encyclopédie des gens du monde" (22 vols., 1833–43); "Encyclopédie du XIX. siècle" (7 vols., 1837–59; 3rd ed., 1867–72; continued as "Annuaire encyclopédique moderne" (1846–51; new ed., 30 vols., 12 suppl. vols., atlas, 2 vols., 1856–62); "Dictionnaire de la conversation et de la lecture" (16 vols., 1851–58); "La Grande Encyclopédie" compiled by Bertholet, Derenbourg, and others (31 vols., 1855–1900); "Dict. univ. & Encycl." ed. Larousse (17 vols., 1885–90; new ed., 1915); "Nouveau Dictionnaire de la langue française" ed. Claude Augé (1898–1904); Larousse, "Dict. complet illustré" (129th ed., 1903). The chief Spanish encyclopedias are "Enciclopedia moderna", ed. Melados (34 vols., 3 vols. of charts, Madrid, 1848–51); "Dicionario universal enciclopédico", ed. Montt, Valparaiso (Barcelona, 1844–62); "Enciclopedia universal ilustrada europeo-americana" (Barcelona, 1907—), edited along Catholic lines; Portugal: "Dicionario popular hist. geogr. mytholog. biograph." (16 vols., Lisbon, 1876–90); "Dictionnaire universel encyclopédique", ed. Conti; "Enciclopedia portuguesa ilustrada", ed. Leite (254 nos. to 1903). Italy: "Nuova Enciclopedia popolare italiana" (14 vols., Turin, 1841–51; 6th ed., 25 vols., 1875–89; suppl., 1889–99); "Enciclopedia popolare economica", ed. Berri (Milan, 1871); "Dizionario universale di scienza, lettere ed arti", ed. Lessons and Valle (Milan, 1874–1883); "Piccola Enciclopedia" (Milan, 1891). Rumania: "Enciclop. Română" (3 vols., Hermannstadt, 1896–1903). England: "Encyclop. Britannica" (1771; 9th ed., 24 vols. and index, 1857–59, suppl., 11 vols. and atlas, 1902–1907); "New Encyclopedia of Universal Sciences" ed. of Rees, London, 1802–20); "Encyclopædia Metropolitana", ed. Smedley (30 vols., 1818–45); "English Cyclopaedia", ed. Knight (30 vols., 1840–73); "Chambers's Encyclopædia" (10 vols., London, 1800–68; new ed., 1901). France: "Encyclopédie Dictionnaire", ed. Hunter (7 vols., London, New York, 1879–88). United States: "The American Cyclopædia" (16 vols., New York, 1858–63; new ed., 1873–76); "Deutsch-Amerikanisches Konversations-Lex." ed. Schlem (New York, 1870–74); "Johnson's New Universal Enyc." (4 vols., New York, 1874–84; new ed., 1893–95); "Dictionary of the American Language" (New York, 1903–06); "The New International Encyclopædia" (17 vols., New York, 1902–04); "The Jewish Encyclopædia" (1906—). The Netherlands: "Nieuwenhuis' Woordenboek van kunsten en wetenschappen" (Leyden, 1851–68); "De algemene Nederlandse Encyclopedie" (15 vols., Zutphen, 1865–90); "Geïllustreerde Encyclopedie", ed. Winkler Prins (15 vols., 1868–82); "Woordenboek voor kennis en kunst", ed. Sijthoff (Leyden, 1891). Denmark and other northern countries: "Nordisk Konversations-leksikon", ed. Mollerup (3rd ed., Copenhagen, 1858–1903); "Store Illustreret Konversations-lexicon", ed. Blangert (12 vols., Copenhagen, 1891–1901); "Norsk Haandbog", ed. Johnsen (1879–88); "Nordisk Familjebog" (Stockholm, 1879–94); "Konversations-leksikon", ed. Meijer (1858–94); Russia: "Entziklopedicheskij Slovar"; ed. Brockhaus and Efron (55


Hungary: “Pallas Nagy Lexikona” (16 vols., Budapest, 1893–97; suppl., 1900); an Arabian encyclopedia was discontinued when it reached the ninth volume (Beirut, 1876–87).

In addition to these works, which were prepared for the sake of the people, there were three encyclopedias of great perfection during the nineteenth century. There is hardly a science or department of knowledge which is not fully covered in some work of this kind. In the province of general theology Migne has published in his “Encycl. théologique” (Paris, 1844–75), a series of over 100 special lexicons treating the different branches of theology: dogmas, heresies, liturgy, symbolism, archaology, councils, cardinals, etc.

Another comprehensive encyclopedia, dealing especially with theology and church history, is the “Dictionnaire d'érudition storioc-célestiastique de Gaspard Moreau (index vols., Paris, 1840–79).”


the mathematical sciences. Diderot (1713–84) had not yet written any original work except the "Pensées philosophiques" (1746), in which the foundations of Christianity are examined and undermined, revelation rejected, and reason proclaimed independent. The threat that the book had ordered Diderot to publish, "Promenade d'un sceptique" was written in 1747, but not published before the author's death. Diderot also had published a translation of Stanyan's "Grecian History" (1743) and an adaptation of Shaftesbury's Inquiry concerning Virtue and Merit under the title "Principes de la politique, ou Essai sur le mérite et la vertu" (1745). His main recommendation as editor of the new Encyclopédie, however, was the "Dictionnaire universel de médecine" (1746–1748), a translation of Dr. Robert James's "Medical Dictionary". D'Alembert (1717–83) was already famous as a mathematician. At the age of twenty-two he had presented two studies to the Académie des Sciences, "Sur la réfraction des corps solides" (1730), and "Sur le calcul intégral" (1740). The following year he was elected a member of the Académie. He had acquired a still greater reputation by his "Traité de dynamique" (1743) and the "Histoire et la générale des vents" (1747), the latter winning for him the prize the offer published by the Berlin Academy and membership in that body.

While the articles were being printed Diderot was imprisoned at Vincennes, 29 July, 1749, for his "Lettres sur les aveugles", of 1748, which he considered an immoral article, rather than a passage in it which had displeased Madame Dupré de Saint-Maur. After four months his publishers obtained his release; in November, 1750, the Encyclopédie was announced in a prospectus by Diderot, and, in July, 1751, the first volume was published. It opened with a "Discours préliminaire" by d'Alembert, in which the problem of the origin of ideas is solved according to Locke's sensationalism, and a classification of sciences is proposed which, except in a few minor points, is that of Bacon. In the prospectus Diderot had already said: "If we succeed in this vast enterprise our principal debt will be to Chancellor Bacon who sketched the plan of a universal dictionary of sciences and arts at a time when there were, so to say, neither sciences nor arts." D'Alembert acknowledges the same indebtedness. Thus, British influence was considerable both in shaping the doctrine of the "Encyclopédie" and in the "illumination" movement, and may be grouped together because of a certain community of opinions on philosophical, religious, moral, and social questions.

I. THE ENCYCLOPÉDIE AND THE ENCYCLOPÉDISTES.

The Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers, par une société de gens de lettres, mis en ordre et publié par M. Diderot... et quant à la partie mathématique par M. d'Alembert..." in the complete original edition comprises 35 volumes as follows: 17 vols. of text (Paris, 1751–1765); 11 vols. of plates (Paris, 1759–1772); 5 vols. of supplement, i.e. 4 of text and 1 of plates (Amsterdam and Paris, 1776–1777); 2 vols. of analytical index prepared by Pierre Mouchon (Amsterdam and Paris, 1780). In 1745, a French translation of Chambers's "Cyclopaedia", prepared by John Mills with the assistance of Gottfried Sellius, was to be published in Paris by the king's printer, Le Breton. After the necessary royal privilege had been obtained, a number of difficulties between Mills and Le Breton caused the failure of the enterprise, and Mills returned to England. Le Breton asked Jean-Paul de Gua, professor in the Collège de France, to assume the editorship. But again misunderstandings and disputes obliged de Gua to resign. Diderot was then called upon to complete the preparation of the manuscripts. At his suggestion, however, it was decided to undertake a more original and more comprehensive work. Diderot's friend, d'Alembert, agreed to edit the Encyclopédistes.
were to be published together. After Diderot had corrected the proof-sheets, Le Breton, fearing new vexations, suppressed passages likely to be objectionable and to cause friction with the authorities. Diderot noticed the changes too late to prevent them. The articles were mutilated to an extent which it was now next to determine by all manuscripts and proof-sheets were immediately destroyed. At last, in 1765, volumes VIII–XVII were published, completing the text of the Encyclopédie.

It is not possible to mention here all the contributors (about 160) to the work. Diderot himself wrote almost every one of the articles concerning religious, moral, or moral, but especially on the arts and trades. Great care was taken in the treatment of the mechanical arts. No trouble was spared to obtain minute descriptions of various machines and the means of using them. All this was explained in the text and illustrated in the plates. D'Alembert's articles, with few exceptions, are on the mathematical and physical sciences. From the beginning Rousseau (1712–1778), then known as the author of several musical works and compositions, agreed to write the articles on music. He also wrote the articles on mathematics and astronomy. The collaboration of Buffon (1707–88) who had promised to write on "Nature" is announced in the second volume, but it is doubtful if that article, as printed, is from him. Most of the topics in natural history were treated by Daubenton (1706–82). D'Alembert's articles on d'Holbach, Lavoisier, Fréron, Macart, Borda, are announced in the third volume. The fourth introduces Voltaire (1694–1778) as the author of some literary articles, and says of him: "The Encyclopédie, on account of the justice which it has rendered and which it will always continue to render him, was worthy of the interest which he now takes in it." In the "Discours préliminaire," d'Alembert had praised him as occupying a "distinguished place in the very small number of great poets," and extolled him for his qualities as a prose writer. Condorcet, Grinn, Quesnay, Turgot, Necker contributed articles or memos. D'Alembert furthered the cause of the Encyclopédie not only by his numerous articles and his constant interest, but also by his attitude and reputation. Far from sharing the materialistic and atheistic tendencies of many of his co-workers, he was at the same time friendly to the Encyclopédists and to plans of their enemies. Montesquieu at his death (1755) left an unfinished article on Taste (Goût); but his "Lettres persanes" (1721) and "Esprit des lois" (1748) inspired many of the social and political articles in the Encyclopédie.

SOURCE AND INFLUENCE OF THE ENCYCLOPÉDIE.—The expression spirit of the Encyclopédie may at first seem to be a misnomer. In that vast compilation, the profound knowledge of subjects and even of views on the same subjects. The writers of the articles belong to all professions and to all classes of society. Names of military men, lawyers, physicians, artists, clergymen, scientists, philosophers, theologians, statesmen, etc. appear on the lists of contributors given at the beginning of each volume. The articles are of unequal value; proportion is lacking, each contributor speaking with a bias in favor of what he thinks fit, obscurity is a prominent defect, and, at times, the authors indulge in endless digressions. Voltaire repeatedly asked for brevity and better method. (See Letters to d'Alembert, esp. in 1766.)

The articles seem to have been gathered together from sources without any preconceived plan, without any unity or sufficient supervision. Under these conditions the spirit of the Encyclopédie might denote merely one special tendency, or one group of tendencies, which, at first manifested along with many others, gradually became important and finally predominant. To some extent it is that, but it is also more than that. The Encyclopédie was not intended only as a great monument to record the progress realized in sciences, arts, civil and religious institutions, industry, commerce, and all other lines of human endeavour; the Encyclopédists purposed moreover to prepare the future and indicate the way to further progress. The Encyclopédie was birthed, but it would also be a standard; not a mere onlooker, but a leader. In fact, appearing as it did in the third quarter of the eighteenth century, it is a mirror in which the events of the whole century are focused.

At the time of the publication of the Encyclopédie, the French Government was, owing to many causes and influences, already considerably weakened, and still weakening. Dissatisfaction and unrest, though not yet well defined, were spreading among the people. Existing institutions and customs, both religious and political, had recently been denounced in several publications. The "philosophers" were favourably received in the salons of the aristocracy. On the other hand, Jansenism, with the endless discussions of which it had been the source or the occasion, and also with the lack of knowledge and looseness of morals among some members of the clergy, had prepared the way for a reaction. There were neither less direct, perhaps, and more remote, yet influential in bringing about a break with the past. In Descartes one may find unequivocal gorms of the neglect, contempt even, of tradition in philosophy, especially when immediate evidence, the idée claire, is made the criterion instead of the thing. The influence of these philosophers was far from tending to check the growth of rationalism. Nor can we overlook the influence of the famous "Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes," as it is known in the history of French literature. In the last two decades of the seventeenth century it was one of the main centres of attention. To this discussion, which resulted in a victory for those who favoured the "modern," Brunetière traces back three important consequences; first, the meaning of tradition becomes gradually identified with that of superstition; second, progress is conceived as an emancipation from, and an abjuration of, the past; finally, this is still more important, education in all its stages consists more and more in derision of the past. True, recent times everywhere offered masterpieces in art, literature, and science. Whatever side we may take of the old quarrel to-day the Encyclopédists and all critical and more impartial views may be, we can at least understand the attitude of those who succeeded the great men of the age of Louis XIV.

Another important factor was the scientific progress. After being too frequently confined to idle a priori conceptions, science was asserting its rights, and these rights soon came to be recognized, while it failed to recognize the rights of others. Reason gradually freed itself from the superstition of the past and claimed absolute independence. Ancient, or rather Christian, conceptions of God and the world were not even deemed worthy of the serious consideration of a "thinker." Efficient causes alone were recognized, final causes proscribed. In nature science always dealt with immutable laws: soon the possibility of miracles and revelation was denied, while mysteries were regarded as breaking the balance of nature. Thus, in the Encyclopédia, new ideas were introduced, tending to rationalism, materialism, naturalism, and desir. On positive points there was but little agreement; the tendency was primarily negative. It was an opposition to received dogmas and institutions, an effort to establish a new theoretical and practical system for the philosophy of life on naturalistic principles. Nothing is truer than d'Alembert's statement in the "Discours préliminaire," that "our century believed itself destined to change all kinds of laws". Towards the middle of the eighteenth century the representatives of this movement were the "philosophers," and they were about to centralize their efforts in the Encyclopédie. Great prominence
was necessary, and it was used. Some men who were known for their conservative opinions were asked to contribute articles, and the Encyclopédie contained some unexceptionable doctrines and moderate views on religious, ethical, and social problems; moreover, the authors of the articles themselves and those who shared their views frequently concealed or disguised their true convictions. As Voltaire says, they were in the sad necessity of "printing the contrary of what they believed" (Letter to d'Alembert, 9 October, 1756).

More was insinuated than was clearly expressed, and at times a sarcastic remark was used with better effect than a definite statement of belief. The main article to which one would naturally turn for information containing nothing objectionable, other articles, less likely to attract attention, expressed different and more "philosophic" views. That such was the condition of affairs is attested by a significant passage in a letter of d'Alembert to Voltaire (21 July, 1757).

To the latter's criticism of certain articles he replies: "No doubt we have had articles in theology and metaphysics; but with theologians for censors, and a privilege, I defy you to make them any better. There are other articles less exposed to the daylight in which all is repaired. Time will enable people to distinguish what we have thought from what we have said." Hence, although the Encyclopédie itself contains many articles in which anti-Christian principles are openly professed, the true, unrestrained encyclopédic spirit was found in the meetings of the "philosophers," and in its members, where they were recognizable. To-day it is to be found in the later works of the Encyclopédists and chiefly their letters and memoirs. In the impious and cynical d'Alembert, for instance, as known from his correspondence with Voltaire, one would fail to recognize the student and respectable gentleman. To a large extent undoubtedly it was not the source, but only the reflection, of the religious and social views of the time. Not the Encyclopédie so much as the Encyclopédists exerted a real influence. Since their spirit was antagonistic to the Church and, in many respects, also to the State, one may ask why its manifestations were not suppressed; why in particular its organ, the Encyclopédie, was allowed to proceed, notwithstanding the warnings of its adversaries and its repeated condemnation by the civil authorities. In a word, what was done to check its influence or to oppose its doctrines, it may be said little was done, and, under the circumstances, perhaps little could be done. The defenders of the Faith were not idle; they wrote books and articles in refutation of the "philosophers"; but their voice was not heard, and their scattered efforts were of little avail against the organized forces and the powerful protectors of their adversaries. The Jesuits, the secular clergy, especially Archbishop Christophe de Beaumont, of Paris, and Bishop Le Frére de Pompignan, of L.'Puy, who wrote pastoral on the subject, and several other writers and preachers denounced the Encyclopédie. With them they declared they had no objection to having its publication and sale prohibited by the Government. The suspensions were only temporary. The Encyclopédists were under the patronage of high personages at the Court; they were protected especially by Malesherbes, the director of the Libraire, who controlled, among other things, the granting of privileges for new publications and the censuring of books, and by Sartine, the chief of police, on whom depended the enforcement of laws and ordinances concerning the printing and sale of books. Malesherbes always showed himself to be not only of the Encyclopédie, but also of the Encyclopédists. Owing to this friendship, many works were published notwithstanding the official opposition of the Government.

In 1759, after the decision of the council had revoked the privilege formerly granted, it was Malesherbes who warned Diderot that his papers were to be seized the next day. As it was too late to look for a place of safety where they could be taken, Malesherbes had them sent to his own house.

Thus the Government secretly favored an enterprise which it officially censored, and, under this protection the Encyclopédie was begun and completed.

Partly for the same reason, partly also for deeper reasons concerning the religious and civil conditions in France, the efforts to combat the Encyclopédie were not rewarded with much success. Moreau in the "Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Caciques" (1757), Paleis, in his "Petites lettres sur le grand ordre aux philosophes" (1757-9), and "Les philosophes" (1760), tried to use the weapons of ridicule and satire which some of the "philosophers," especially Voltaire, wielded with greater skill. Fréron, in the "Anneau littéraire," was at times sarcastic, and always ready to give and take blows. Constantly at war with the Encyclopédie, he placed himself at a disadvantage, for they enjoyed Malesherbes' protection, whereas for him the censure was always very severe. Thus he was hardly allowed to write on Voltaire's "Écossaise" (1760), in which he had been publicly insulted on the stage. The Jansenists, in the "Nouveaux Jésuites," did little more than repeat the Encyclopédists. In the "Journal de Trévoux," the Jesuits, and among them especially Berthier (1704-82), who was director of the Journal from 1745 till the suppression of the Society of Jesus, wrote frequent criticisms. But notwithstanding all this opposition the spirit of irreligion was steadily gaining. Too often the criticism was weak, the attack unskilful. In some cases even, the anti-Encyclopédists, instead of harming their opponents, rather contributed to their success by giving them notoriety and affording them an opportunity for using their influence. The Jesuits were expelled from France in 1762; this gave a new victory and a new prestige to the "philosophers" D'Alembert, who wrote "La destruction des Jésuites en France" (1763), looks upon this expulsion as the just punishment of their hostility towards the Encyclopédie. Gradually the people were becoming accustomed to the new spirit, and thus it was that, whereas the first volumes had created a great stir in France, the appearance of the last volumes was scarcely noticed.

Unknown or little known in 1750, the "philosophers" had now won their battle, and were the recognized victors. Their success made them bolder in declaring openly what fear had frequently obliged them to veil in their former works and in the Encyclopédie. These doctrines had also been made more familiar by the publication of several works before the completion of the Encyclopédie, the most important being Diderot's "Pensées sur l'interprétation de la nature" (1754); Helvétius's "De l'esprit" (1758); Rousseau's "Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes" (1753), "Contrat social" (1762), and "Emile" (1762); Voltaire's "Dictionnaire philosophique" (1753), "d'origine de la langue française" (1759), and "Dictionnaire de l'Académie" (1770). Hence, on 8 July, 1765, Voltaire could write to d'Alembert: "They clamour against the philosophers, and are right; for, if opinion is the ruler of the world, this ruler is governed by the philosophers. You can hardly imagine how their empire is spreading."
Steadily the new current of thought gained in volume and power, until nothing could stop its destructive course. The French Revolution, following closely upon the publication of the Encyclopédie and the other works of the Encyclopédistes, was the practical general spirit while that of the Botanists; the A. (Munich in dependence of Austria Wiener Folio the Botanists); the A. (London, 1826, 4, 51; Sachs, Geschichte der Botanik (Munich, 1872); Wurmbach in Abbildungen. Loco, des Kaisermanns (Vienna, 1858), IV, contains a list of his writings; Die botanischen (Leipzig, 1809-1810), a work: "Annalen des Naturwissenschaften" (Vienna, 1859), 4, contains a portrait of Endlicher.

Joseph Rompel

Endowments. See MAN.

Endowment (Ger. Stiftungen, Fr. Fondation, It. Fondazioni, Lat. fundationes), a property, fund, or revenue permanently appropriated for the support of any person, institution, or object. A student, a hospital, school, hospital, the term is more frequently applied to the establishment of endowments for private endowment. In ecclesiastical circles the word is employed also in a more restricted sense, signifying a conditional donation, i.e., the establishment of a fund, by the provisions of a last will or otherwise, in order to secure permanently, or at least for a long time, some spiritual benefit, as, for instance, the offering and application of a monthly or annual Mass.

For the early Christians were lavish in their support of religion, and frequently turned their possessions over to the Church [Lallemand, "Hist. de la charité" (Paris, 1903), II; Uhlforn, "Hist. of Christ. Charity"; Hefele, "Christentum u. Wohlthätigkeith" in his "Zentralbegriffe", I, 175. The Emperor Justinian (Nov. 28, 528) was allowed to build churches to en- dow them; and about the same time, ecclesiastical legislation prescribed that no cleric was to be ordained for a church without proper provision for his maintenance (Coun. of Epaon, 517, c. xxv). Whoever desired to have a parish church on his estate was obliged to set aside a sufficient landed endowment for its clerics (IV Coun. of Arles, 541, c. xxxiii); while a bishop was forbidden to consecrate a church till the endowment had been properly secured by a deed or charter (II Coun. of Braga, 572, c. v). If one who was a fide from the king's estate to his churches, the bishop was required to procure the royal confirmation of the gift (III Coun. of Toledo, 589, c. xv). Ancient and noble Roman families, as well as others of less means, inspired by feelings of love and gratitude, made large bequests to the Church. In the fifth century, in countries inhabited by German tribes, the Church was endowed especially with lands. These possessions were lost during the political and social upheaval that followed the Germanic invasions, known as the Wanderings of Nations. Towards the end of Charlemagne's reign the regenerated peoples contributed once more with liberality and generously to the support of ecclesiastical institutions.
In England, both under Saxon and Norman domination the generous zeal of the faithful prompted them to secure by endowments a permanent priesthood, and to provide for the dignity and even splendour of Divine worship. A considerable portion of the privileges that existed in England were squandered or confiscated during the Reformation of Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth, while the remainder, by virtue of the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy, was transferred to the Anglican Church, which still retains it. The conditions of the Catholics of England since the Reformation in temporal matters, have been subjected to any extent to the re-establishment of endowments, though instances have not been wanting and are on the increase. In Ireland and Scotland likewise the old foundations of the Church have been lost or diverted from their purpose. In Ireland the Protestant Church, which had received during the Reformation the lands and monies of the Catholic Church, was disestablished and nominally disendowed by the Act of 1692, but so liberal were the compensations allowed that they amounted practically almost to a re-endowment. In Scotland the Presbyterians of the disestablished Church, owing to the immense influence of Knox in the sixteenth century, still possess what is left of the ancient endowments of the Catholic Church. Ecclesiastical endowments in France have undergone many vicissitudes, particularly from the year 1789, when a yearly income of about $14,000,000 was allowed to the clergy and unprofessed religious; but the revival of the French Revolution was felt elsewhere, especially in Germany, where by the fifty-fifth article of the Resolutions of the Deputation of the Empire (1803) “all property belonging to the foundations, abbeys and monasteries was committed to the free and full disposal of the respective rulers, who were to provide for the expense of public worship, of instruction, of founding useful public institutions, and of lightening their own financial embarrassments.” In Italy the annihilation of the States of the Church in 1539, 1800, and 1870 by the “King of United Italy” was also followed by the introduction of anti-ecclesiastical laws, the robbery of the Church, and the spoliation of her institutions. The endowments that remain are for the most part administered by the Government. Foundations in America are not numerous and are no special attention. Canon law lays down strict regulations regarding the acceptance and management of endowments as well as the observance of the obligation arising therefrom. They are to be accepted only by those whose interests are at stake, as, for instance, the rector of a church, the administrator of an institution. The consent of the ordinary, if they are presented to a diocesan institution, or of the competent religious superior, if given to regulars, is requisite. The superior in question should assure himself that the income accruing from the investment is a sufficient recompense for the service demanded. Once the conditions of acceptance have been established, they are unchangeable, and it is incumbent on the bishop or religious superior, as above, to procure the fulfilment of the obligation imposed. A catalogue or table of these obligations assumed by a church is to be posted conspicuously in the church and must be disposed of the revenue in the chancery office while among the parochial books is one in which the satisfaction of these obligations is noted. The supreme law to be observed in this matter is the will of the founder of an endowment, to fulfill which the zealous vigilance of the Church is ever directed. If, however, the funds of an endowment entirely disappear through no fault of the church, the latter is exempt from its part of the contract. If a disproportion arise between the service required and the recompense, a proportionate reduction of the obligation entailed is permitted, under certain conditions, by the Holy See. Bishops are not allowed to lessen the original obligation, e.g., to reduce the number of Misses to be offered annually, though where the mind of the donor is not sufficiently clear, they may determine minor details, such as the hour of the service, or the altar at which it is to take place. Founders of churches were reserved to themselves, with the approbation of Rome, the right to administer the temporal concerns of such foundations and to suggest candidates for vacant benefices in said churches (see PATRONAGE), though ordinarily these trusts are under the supervision of a corporation of board of trustees.

Addis and Arnold, A Catholic Dictionary (London, 1908), s. v.: PERMANENT and SPIN IN Kirchenz., s. v. DUPLEX, Glossarium, s. v. READER, A Dictionary of Ecclesiastical, Historical, and Other Terms, etc., EIGENTRIBER-HOLLWEG, Lehrb. des kath. Kirchenw. (Freiburg, 1905), 875-77; MEKKER, BRIGL und BENGH. der kathl. Stühle (Düsseldorf); WERD, Jus Decret., III, 218-26; manuals of canon law, e. g., VERING, Lehrb. des kath. pastoral. und jur. Kirchenw. (Freiburg, 1894), s. v. MILLING, which treats of special conditions and question in Germany, Austria, and Hungary.

Andrew B. Meahan.

Energy. See DEMONICS.

Energy, the Law of the Conservation of.—Amongst the gravest objections raised by the progress of modern science against Theism, the possibility of miracles, free-will, the immateriality of the human soul, its creation and immortality, are, according to many thoughtful men, those based on the Law of the Conservation of Energy. Consequently, if a full treatment of this topic in its philosophical aspects as the limits of space will allow, is here attempted.

Explanation of the Doctrine.—The word energy comes from the Greek ἐργα, “action,” “activity,” and is itself a compound of αὐτός, “himself,” and ἐργα, “work.” In modern physical science the motion of energy is associated with mechanical work. It is commonly defined as “the capacity of an agent for doing work.” By “work” scientists understand the production of motion against resistance. Such energy, whilst existing in many forms, is considered especially in two generically distinct states known as kinetic energy, or energy of motion, and potential energy, or energy of position. The power of doing work in the former case is due to the actual motion possessed by the body, e. g., a cannon-ball on its course, or a swinging pendulum. Potential energy, on the other hand, is exemplified by a wound-up spring, or by the bob of a pendulum when at its highest point; as the bob swings upwards its velocity and kinetic energy continuously diminish, whilst its potential energy is increasing. When at its highest point its potential energy is at a maximum, and kinetic is nil; when, moving downwards, it reaches its lowest point, it will have recovered its maximum kinetic energy, whilst its potential will have vanished. Energy is also recognized in the heat of a furnace, or the fuel of the same, in explosives, in an electric current, in the radiations of the other which illuminates and warms the earth. Now, it has been found that these different forms of energy can be changed into one another. Further, the amount of a sum of energy in different forms can be measured by the quantity of work it can accomplish. A weight suspended over a pulley can be employed to lift a stone; the stone's potential energy is a measure of the energy of the stone. The heat of a metal spring as it expands, heat as it passes to a cooler body, electric current as it is expended, and chemical compounds in the course of decomposition. On the other hand, a corresponding amount of work will be required in order to restore the original condition of the agents. Perhaps the most fruitful and immediate achievement of modern physical science during the past century has been the establishment of a law of quantitative equivalence between these diverse forms of energy measured in terms of work. Thus a certain amount of heat will produce a definite amount of motion in a body, and conversely this quantity of motion may be made to...
reproduce the original amount of heat—assuming that in the actual process of transformation there were no waste. In other words, it is now accepted as established that, in any "conservative" or completely isolated system of energies, whatever changes or transformations take place among them, so long as no external agent intervenes, the sum of the energies will always remain constant. The Principle or Law of the Conservation of Energy has been thus formulated by Clerk Maxwell: "The total energy of any body or system of bodies is a quantity which can neither be increased nor diminished by any mutual action of those bodies through time, though it may be transformed into any of the forms of which energy is susceptible" (Theory of Heat, p. 93). Thus stated, the law may be admitted to hold the position of a fundamental axiom in modern physics; the nature of the evidence for it, we shall consider later. But there is further generalization, advancing a considerable way beyond the frontiers of positive science, which affirms that the total sum of such energy in the universe is a fixed amount "immutable in quantity from eternity to eternity" (Von Helmholtz). This is a proposition of a very different character; and to it also we shall return. But first a brief hint of the origin of the law of the doctrine of the Conserved Energy of Matter. The doctrine of the conservation of energy was long preceded by that of the Constancy of Matter. This was held vaguely as a metaphysical postulate by the ancient materialists and positively formulated as a philosophical principle by Galileo, and Francis Bacon. Descartes assumed in a somewhat similar a priori fashion that the total amount of motion (MV) in the universe is fixed—

*certain am tamen et determinatum habet quantitatem* (Princip. Philos., II, 36). But the effort to establish such an assumption by accurate experiment was later abandoned. According to many we have the principle of the conservation of energy virtually formulated for the first time in Newton's Scholion developing his third law of motion (action and reaction are equal and opposite), though his participation in the current erroneous conception of heat as a "caloric", or independent substance, prevented his clearly apprehending and explicitly formulating the principle. Others would connect it with his second law. Huyghens, in the seventeenth century, seems to have grasped, though somewhat vaguely, the notion of momentum, or *vis viva* (MV?). This was clearly enunciated by Leibniz later. The fundamental obstacle, however, to the recognition of the constancy of energy lay in the prevalent "caloric theory". Assuming heat to be some sort of substance, its origin and disappearance in connexion with friction, percussion, and the like, was explained by the law of conservation of energy, without any hypothesis of the constancy of energy. As early as 1789, Lavoisier and Laplace, in their "Mémoire sur la chaleur", show signs of approaching the modern doctrine, though Laplace subsequently committed himself more deeply to the caloric theory. Count Rumford's famous experiments in measuring the amount of heat generated by the boring of cannon and Sir Humphry Davy's analogous observations (1799) on the heat caused by the friction of ice, proved the death-blow to the caloric theory. For the view was now beginning to receive wide acceptance among scientists, that heat was "positive vibration of the corpuscles of bodies tending to separate them". Dr. Thomas Young, in 1807, employed the term *energy* to designate the *vis viva* or active force of a moving body, which is measured by its mass or weight multiplied by the square of its velocity (MV^2). Sadi Carnot (1824), though still labouring under the caloric theory, advanced the problem substantially in his remarkable paper, "Réflexions sur la puissance motrice du feu", by considering the question of the relation of quantity of heat to amount of work done, and by introducing the concept of a machine with a reversible cycle of operations. The great epoch, however, in the history of the doctrine occurred in 1812, when Julius Robert Mayer, a German physician, published his "Remarks on the Forces of Inanimate Nature", originally written in a series of letters to a friend. In this little work, "contemplatively presented by the leading journals of physics of that day" (Poinsot), Mayer explicitly enunciated the principle of the conservation of energy in its widest generality. His statement of the law was, however, in advance of the existing experimental evidence, and he was led to it partly by philosophical reasoning, partly by consideration of physiological questions, the nature of the heat, as discovered by the chemist, was engaged in determining by accurate experiments the dynamical equivalent of heat—the amount of work a unit of heat could accomplish, and vice versa; and "cooling was contributing important papers on the same subject to the Royal Scientific Society of Copenhagen, so that no particular man can be described as the Father of the doctrine of the Conservation of Energy" (Preston). Between 1848 and 1851, Lord Kelvin (then Sir William Thomson), Clausius, and Rankine developed the application of the doctrine to sundry important problems of the science of heat. About the same time, Carnot, Henry, and Auguste de La Place, Laplace, addressing the subject from the mathematical side, and starting from Newton's Laws of Motion, with certain other assumptions as to the constitution of matter, deduced the same principle, which he termed the "Conservation of Forces". Subsequently, Faraday and Gay-Lussac and others, in greater detail the extent and variety of the transformation and correlation of forces, not only heat being changed into work, but light occasioning chemical action, and this generating heat, and heat producing electricity, capable of being once more converted into motion, and so on round the cycle. Among the important results of this work, the total capacity for work diminishes owing to this dissi- pation or degradation of energy. This general fact is formulated in what has been called the principle of Carnot or of Clausius. It is also styled the second law of thermodynamics and has been made the basis of very important conclusions by the Frenchman and the Englishman. The last word on the rate of transformation of heat into work is Lord Kelvin. He thus enunciates the law: "It is impossible by means of inanimate material agency to derive a mechanical effect from a portion of matter by cooling it below the temperature of the earth's surface".

LIVING ORGANISMS.—The successful determination of the quantitative equivalent of one form of energy in some other form, obviously becomes a far more difficult problem when the subject of the experiment is not inanimate matter in the chemical or physical laboratory, but the consumption of substances in the living organism. Scientific research has, however, made some essays in this direction, endeavouring to establish by experiment that the principle of the constancy of energy holds also in vital processes. By the nature of the case the experimental evidence is of a rougher kind, more or less accurate chemical analysis, and the actual consumption of substances by the living body seems to have corresponded rather closely to that resulting in laboratory experiments; hence it is affirmed that the observations all point to the conclusion that "the sole cause of animal heat is a chemical process".
of motion. The principle of causality, according to others, is its parent. Mayer himself quotes ex nihilo nil fit, and argues that creation or annihilation of a force lies beyond human power. Even Joule, who laboured so diligently to establish an experimental law of energy, would reinforce the latter with the further argument that "it is manifestly absurd to suppose that the powers with which God has endowed matter can be destroyed." Preston judiciously observes: "The general principle of the conservation of energy is not to be proved by mathematical formulae. A law of nature must be founded on experiment and observation, and the general agreement of the law with facts leads to a general belief in its probable truth. Further, the conservation of energy cannot be absolutely proved even by experiment, for the proof of a law requires a universal experience. On the other hand, the law cannot be said to be untrue, even though it may seem to be contradicted by certain experiments; for in these cases energy may be dissipated in modes of which we are yet unaware" (p. 90). In view of the extravagant conclusions some writers have attempted to deduce from the doctrine, it is useful to note these serious divergencies of opinion as to what is its true foundation—whether this be in the whole universe or in the part of it that is subject to the hypothesis.

We shall best approximate to the truth by distinguishing three different parts of the doctrine of energy: the law of constancy; the law of transformation; and the law of dissipation or degradation of energy. The transformation, that all known forms of material energy may be transmuted into each other, and be convertible, is a general fact which can only be ascertained and proved by experience. There is no a priori reason requiring it. The law of dissipation, that as a matter of fact, in the course of the changes which take place in the present universe there is a constant tendency for portions of energy to become unusable, owing to the equal diffusion of heat through all parts of the system—this truth similarly seems to us to rest entirely on experience. Finally, with respect to the principle of quantitative constancy, the mean power must be experience—but experience in a broad sense. It has been shown by positive experiments with portions of inanimate matter that the more perfectly we can isolate a group of material agents from external interference, and the more accurately we can calculate the total quantity of energy possessed by the system at the beginning and end of a series of qualitative changes, the more perfectly our results agree. Further, modern physics constantly assumes this principle in most complex and elaborate calculations, and the agreement of its deductions with observed results verifies the assumption in a manner which would seem to be impossible were the principle not true. In fact, we may say that the assumption of the truth of the law, when correctly formulated, lies now at the basis of all modern physical and chemical theories, just as the assumption of inertia or the constancy of mass is fundamental to mechanics.

In this connection we must not forget the hypothetical character of the conditions postulated, and the limitations in its application to particular concrete problems. Bearing this in mind, even if there occurs some novel experience, as, e.g., the fact that radium seemed capable of sustaining itself at a higher temperature than surrounding objects and of emitting a constant supply of heat without any observable diminution of its own store of energy, science does not therefore immediately abandon its fundamental principle. Instead, it rightly seeks for some hypothesis by which this apparently rebellious law can be reconciled with the others. And this hypothesis is so simple that it seems almost as if the discovery of the law—as, for example, the hypothesis that this eccentric substance possesses a peculiar power of constantly collecting energy from the neighbouring ether and then dispensing it in the form of heat; or, that the high complexity of the molecular constitution of
radium enables it, while slowly breaking down into simpler substances, to continue expending itself in heat for an extraordinarily long time. Such an exception, however, is a useful reminder of the unwarranted rashness of those who, ignoring the true character and limitations of the law, would in all cases assume its unalloyed supremacy, rule out of existence, whether in living beings or in the universe as a whole, every agent or agency which may condition, control, or modify in any way the working of the law in the concrete. As we have before indicated in regard to some changes of a chemical and mechanical character in the living, into the principle of conservation may hold in the same way as in non-living matter; whilst, in regard to other physiological or psycho-physical processes, the necessary qualifications and limitations may be of a different order. The kind of evidence most cogent in regard to inanimate matter—both direct experiment and verified deduction—is wanting here; and many of the vital processes, especially those connected with consciousness, are so unlike mechanical changes in many respects that it would be scientifically unjustifiable to extend the generalization so as to include them. The possibility of reversion, for instance, applies to those changes in inanimate matter, is here unthinkable. We could conceivably recover the gaseous and solid products of exploded gunpowder and convert them into their original condition, but the effort to imagine the reversion of the process of the growth of a man or a nation brings us face to face with an absurdity.

**Philosophical Deductions.**—The philosophical conclusions which some writers have attempted to deduce from the law affect the question of God's existence and action in the world, the possibility of Divine intervention in the form of miracles, the nature of the human soul, its origin and relation to the body, and its moral freedom.

The Materialistic Mechanical Theory, which seeks to conceive the world as a vast self-moving machine, self-existing from all eternity, devoid of all freedom or purpose, perpetually going through a series of changes, each new state necessarily emerging out of the previous and passing into the subsequent state, claims to find its justification in this law of the conservation of energy. To this it may be replied in general, as in the case of the objections to the constructibility of matter, that the constancy of the total quantity of energy in the world or the convertibility of different forms of material energy, does not affect the arguments from the evidences of intelligent design in the world, the existence of self-conscious human minds, and the moral law. These things are realities of the first importance which every philosophical creed that pretends to be a rational system of thought must attempt to explain. But the mere fact that the sum of material energies, kinetic and potential, in any isolated system of bodies, or even in the physical universe as a whole, remains constant, if it be a fact, affords no rational account or explanation whatever of these realities.

**Herbert Spencer's Doctrines.**—As Spencer is the best-known writer who attempts to deduce a philosophy of the universe from the doctrine of energy, we shall take him as representing the school to which the term force is confined by physicists to a narrower and well-defined meaning—the rate of change of energy per distance—Spencer identifies it with energy, and styles the conservation or constancy of energy the "Law of Force." To this, he tells us, an ultimate analysis of all our sensible experience brings us down, and on this a rational synthesis must build up. Consequently, from this principle his "Synthetic Philosophy" seeks to deduce all the phenomena of the evolution of the universe. With respect to its proof he assures us that "the principle is deeper than demonstration, deeper than definite cognition, deep as the very nature of the mind. Its authority transcends all other whatever, for not only is it given in the constitution of our consciousness, but it is impossible to imagine a consciousness so constituted as not to give it." (First Principles, p. 162). The value of this assertion may be gauged from the fact that Newton and all the ablest scientists down to the middle of last century were ignorant of the principle, and that it required the labour of Mayer, Joule, Helmholtz, and others to convince the scientific world of its truth.

Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of which the living pass from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation. Owing to the ultimate principles the transformation among all kinds of existence cannot be other than we see it to be. The redistribution of matter and motion must everywhere take place in those ways and produce those traits which celestial bodies, organisms, societies alike display, and it has to be shown that this universality of process results from the same necessity which determines each simplest movement around us. In its great arena of evolution Spencer's principle "the fact deduced from the Persistence of Force!" Spencer's proof is merely a description of the changes which have taken place. He does not show, and it is impossible to show, from the mere fact that the quantity of energy has to remain constant, that the particular changes in which it has appeared—the Homeric process, Shakespeare's plays, and Mr. Spencer's philosophy—must have appeared. The principle can only tell us that a constant quantitative relation has been preserved amid all the qualitative transformations of the physical universe, and that it will be preserved in the future. But it furnishes no reason for the fact that a seemingly intelligent design which abounds, and it offers not the faintest suggestion of an explanation why the primitive nebula should have evolved into life, minds, art, literature, and science. To describe the process of building a cathedral is not to draw a masterpiece of architecture from so many tons of stone and mortar. To show even that the law of gravitation prevailed during every event in the history of England would not be a deduction of the history of England from the law of gravitation. Yet this is precisely what Spencer based on the "Law of Force." "Synthetic Philosophy" is committed to in seeking to deduce the present world from the conservation of energy, and so to dispense with an intelligent Creator. The same holds for every other project of a similar kind. A more remarkable feature still in Spencer's handling of the subject is the self-created "Pelagian Philosophy." This view is the very basis of his "Persistence of Force" in the Absolute itself. It really "means the persistence of some Power which transcends our knowledge and conception. . . the Unknown Cause of the phenomenal manifestations" of our ordinary experience. This is a complete misconception, misrepresentation, and misuse of the principle of conservation, as known to science. Mayer and Joule never attempted to establish that some numerical power or unknown cause behind the phenomena of the universe has a constant quantity of energy in itself. Nor is it a self-evident datum of our consciousness. Where there are processes, its phenomena must be always quantitatively the same "throughout all past and future time". The scientific principle merely affirms constant quantitative equivalence amid the actual transmutations of certain known and demonstrable general principles of body, and rest. This, however, would afford no help towards an explanation of the universe. Consequently, its law of conservation would still be $\sum_{\text{sum}}$ of $\sum_{\text{energy}}$ with the additional hypothesis of a Divine Creator, the rest. This, however, would afford no help towards an explanation of the universe. Consequently, it would have to be transformed into something very different to serve as the basis of the Synthetic Philosophy.

Professor Ostwald, on the other hand, apparently opposed to mechanical theories, carries us a little farther...
by his special doctrine of energy. Matter, the supposed vehicle or support of energy, he rejects as a useless hypothesis. Every object in the universe is merely some manifestation of energy of which the total amount retains a constant value. Energy itself is not capable of being anaerated, or converted back into work. It is the universal substance of the process of change in the world. Mass is merely capacity for energy of movement, density is volume-energy. All we can know of the universe may be expressed in terms of energy. To accomplish this is the purpose of the art. Hypotheses are to be abandoned as worthless crutches; and the aim of science is to catalogue objects as forms of energy. But surely this is merely to abandon all attempt at explanation. The mere application of a generic common name to diverse objects furnishes no real account of their qualitative differences. We do not advance knowledge by the easy process of assigning new properties to energy, any more than the ancients did by the liberal allotment of occult qualities. The simple truth is that the quantitative law of constancy supplies not the faintest clue to the fundamental problem, how and what generate the various a priori derived allographic forms of reality have come into existence.

THE LAW AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.—Not only does the modern scientific doctrine of energy fail to provide a foundation for a materialistic theory of a mechanical self-existing universe, but a most important part of the first law—the second law of thermodynamics—its consequences—presents us with the materials for a very powerful argument against that theory. Lord Kelvin, the most eminent authority on this point, working from data established by Carnot and Clausius, has shown that "although mechanical energy is in inexhaustible, there is a universal tendency to dissipation, which produces throughout the system a gradual augmentation and diffusion of heat, cessation of motion and exhaustion of the potential energy of the material universe" (Lectures, Vol. II, p. 536). The heat becoming thus diffused at an equally low temperature throughout the entire universe, all living organisms will perish of cold. In fact, the conclusion which Kelvin deduces from the modern scientific doctrine of energy is that the physical world, so far from being a self-existing machine endowed with perpetual motion, must more closely resemble a clock winded up at birth and left together and wound up at some definite date in the past and will run down to a point at which it will stop dead in the future.

CONSERVATION OF ENERGY AND THE HUMAN SOUL.—According to the ordinary Catholic doctrine, philosophic, and theological, the soul is a spiritual principle, distinct from matter, yet, by its union with the organism constituting one substantial being, the living man. It is the source of spiritual activities, thought, and volition. It is endowed with free will, originates and controls bodily movements. In its origin it has been created; at death it is separated from the body and passes away from the material universe. Now if the soul or mind, though itself not a form of material energy, acts on the body, originates, checks, or modifies bodily movements, then it seems to perform work and so to interfere with the constancy of the sum of work, or what arises out of work, or is converted energy individual souls are created and introduced into this material universe and subsequently pass out of it, then their irruptions seem to constitute a continuous infringement of the law. For clearance we will handle the subject under separate heads.

The soul or mind either modifies or modifies in any way movements of matter, or changes in the forms of energies of the material world? Yes, assuredly; the soul through its activities, does thus act on matter—Clifford, Huxley, Hodgson notwithstanding. The thoughts, feelings, and volitions of men have had some influence on the physical events which have constituted human history. All the movements of every material particle in the world would not have been precisely the same if there had been no sensation or thought. Art, literature, science, invention have had their origin in ideas, and they involve movements of the mental states. The feelings and desires have really influenced war and trade. If these feelings and ideas had been different, war, trade, art, literature, and invention would have been different. The movements of some portions of matter would have been other than they have been. The mind, the soul, therefore, act on the body.

II. Is the soul, or the activities by which it acts on the body, for instance its conscious states, merely a particular form of energy interconvertible with the other material forms of heat, motion, electricity, and the rest? Or is the soul and psychic activity something distinct in kind, not interchangeable with any form of material energy? Yes. That mental or psychical states and activities are realities, utterly distinct in kind from material energy, is the judgment of philosophers and scientists alike. These states are subjective phenomena perceptible only by the internal consciousness of the individual to whom they belong. Their existence depends on their being perceived. In fact, their esse is percipere. They are not transmutable into any material energy. As Tyndall says, "the chasm between the two orders of reality is intellectually impassable." The phenomena of consciousness, though equally amenable to some systematic and profound qualitative measurement, they seem to grow extensively and intensively and to rise in quality in the world. Wundt, indeed, embodies this in his contrasted principle of the increase of psychic energy, a law of qualitative value, which he attaches as the reverse or subjective condition of the quantitative law of physical energy. The psychical increase, being indefinite, holds only under the condition that the psychical processes are continuous. Mental states or activities are thus proved on the one hand to exert a real influence on the movements of matter, whilst on the other hand they are different in nature from all material energies and unconvertible with any of the latter. The soul, mind, or whatever we call the subject or source of these immaterial states or activities, must be therefore some kind of hyperphysical agent or power.

III. This brings us to the central crux of the subject. If the soul, or mind, or any of its activities causes or modifies the movement of any particle of matter, then it seems to have produced an effect equivalent to that of a material agent, to have performed "work", and thereby to have augmented or diminished the previously existing quantity of energy in the system within which the disturbance took place. The vital question then arises: Can this real influence of the soul, or of its activities, on matter be squared with the law of conservation? At all events, if it cannot, then so much the worse for the law. The law is a generalization from experience. If its present formulation conflicts with any established facts, we must accept the facts; we must either reformulate the law in more qualified terms. If our experience of radium seems to contradict the law of conservation, we are at liberty to deny the existence of radium, or to deny that it emits heat. We must either give up the universality of the law, or devise some hypothesis by means of which the law and the new fact may be reconciled. Now we are certain that volition and thought do modify the working of some material agents. Consequently, we must devise some hypothesis by which the new fact may be reconciled with the law, or else alter the expression of the law.

Diverse solutions, however, have been advanced.

1. Some writers simply deny the application of the law to living beings, or at least its rigorous accuracy, if referred to the entire collection of vital and psychical phenomena. They urge with much force that
the living, conscious organism, endowed with the power of self-direction, differs fundamentally in nature from a mere machine, and that it is therefore illegitimate to extend the application of the law to organisms in precisely the same sense as to inanimate matter until this extension is rigidly justified by experimental evidence. But evidence of this quantitative accuracy is not forthcoming—not at all likely to be. As a consequence, scientists of the first rank, such as Clerk Maxwell and Lord Kelvin, have always been careful to exclude living beings from their formulation of the law. Moreover, however, they observe that, in certain respects, the animal structure resembles a very delicate mechanism in which an extremely minute force may initiate or transform a relatively large store of latent energy preserved in a very unstable condition, as, e.g., the pressure of a hair-trigger may explode a powder magazine.

(2) Again, many physicists of high rank (Clerk Maxwell, Tait, Balfour Stewart, Lodge, Poynting), who suppose, for sake of argument, the strict application of the law even to living beings, claim to harmonize the real action of the soul on the body with the law by this action as a form of a guiding or directing force. They generally do so, moreover, in connexion with the established truth of physics that an agent may modify the direction of a force, or of a moving particle, without altering the intensity of its energy, or adding to the work done. Thus, a force acting at right angles to another force can alter the direction of the latter without affecting its intensity. The pressure of the rail on the side of the wheel guides the tram-car; the tension of gravitation keeps the earth in its elliptical course round the sun without affecting the quantity of energy possessed by the moving mass. If the enormous force of gravitation were suddenly extinguished, say, by the annihilation of the sun, the earth would fly away at a tangent with the same energy as before. The axiom of physics, that a deflecting force may do no work, is undoubtedly helpful towards conceiving a reconciliation, even if it does not go the whole way to meet the difficulty.

(3) At the same time, the philosophy of Aristotle and St. Thomas provides us with a clue which assists us farther than any modern theory towards the comprehension of the problem. For this, four distinct factors must be kept in mind:

(a) The entire quantity of the work done by the living being must in this view be accounted for by the material energies—mechanical, chemical, electrical, etc.—stored in the bodily organism. The soul, or mind, or vital power merely administers these, but does not increase or diminish them. The living organism is an extremely complex collection of chemical compounds stored in blood and cellular tissue. Many of these are in very unstable condition. A multitude of qualitative changes are constantly going on, but the quantity of the work done is always merely the result of the using up of the material energies of the organism. The soul, within limits, regulates the qualitative transformation of some of these material energies without altering the sum total.

(b) The action of the soul, whether through its conscious or its merely vegetative activities, must be conceived as primarily directive.

(c) But this is not all. The soul not only guides but initiates and checks movements. The most delicate hair-trigger, it is urged, requires some pressure to move it; this is work done by the trigger, too, presses with equal reactive force against the finger, and through this emits some of its energy back to another part of the universe. Consequently, any action of the soul upon the body, even if the pressure or tension be relatively small, involves, it is said, a double difficulty: the pressure communicated by the soul to the body and that returned by the body to the soul. In reply:

First, what is needed in order to originate, guide, or even inhibit a bodily movement is a transformation of the quality of some of the energy located in certain cells of the living organism. Whilst physics, which seeks to reduce the universe to atoms, is primarily interested in quantity, qualitative differences cannot be ignored or ultimately resolved into quantitative differences. Direction is the qualitative element in simple movement, and it is as important as velocity or duration. Now, although the initiation of movement, or of the or of the Scholastic theory the soul, as "form", determines the qualitative character of the material with which it coalesces, while it con-
serves the living being in its specific nature. A "form" endowed with consciousness exerts a control, partly voluntary, partly involuntary, over the qualitative character of the constituents of the organism, and in this way it would occasion qualitative changes in some of these by a merely liberative act, without adding to or taking from the quantity of physical energy contained in the material constituents of the organism. The illustration is of course imperfect, like all such analogies. It is given merely to aid towards a conception of the relations of mind and body in the Aristotelian view.

(d) Finally, in this theory, the action of the soul, or vital principle, upon the material energies of the living organism, must be conceived not as that of a foreign agent, but as of a co-principle uniting with the former to constitute one specific being. This most important factor in the solution is not sufficiently emphasized, or indeed realized, by many physiologists who seek to harmonize the law with the real action of the soul. Accepting the philosophy of Descartes, many of these adopt a very exaggerated view of the separateness and mutual independence of soul and body. In that point of view body and soul appear as two independent beings merely accidentally connected or joined. The action of either upon the other is that of an extrinsic agent. If an angel or a demon set a barrel rolling down a hill by even a slight push, the action of such a spirit would involve the invasion of the system of the material universe by a foreign energy. But this is not the way the souls act, according to the philosophy of St. Thomas and Aristotle. Here the soul is part of the living being, a component principle capable of liberating and guiding the transformation of energies stored up in the constituents of the material organism, and along with itself combines to form a complete individual being. This point is a vital element in the solution, whether the basis of the difficulty is the conservation of energy, the conservation of momentum, or Newton's third law. The directing influence of the soul is not exerted as the pressure of one material particle on another outside of it. The soul is in the body which it animates and in every part of it. Neither is "outside" the other.

This solution obviously provides an answer at the same time to the objections deduced from the conserving law of energy against the creation of human or the freedom of the will. If the souls were a fount of energy distinct from and added to the material energies of the organism, and if the freedom of the will involved incursions of a foreign physical force into the midst of existing material energies, then infringement of the law of constancy would seem inevitable. But if the soul merely directs the transformation of existing reserves of energy in the manner indicated, no violation of the law seems necessary. Similarly, the departure of such an immortal soul from the physical universe would not involve any withdrawal of material energy from the total sum. Finally, if human thought and volition can interfere in any degree with the movements of matter and exercise a guiding influence on any of the processes of the bodily organism, a fortiori must it be possible for an Infinite Intelligence to intervene and regulate the course of events in the material universe; and if the human mind can effect its purposes without infringement of the law of conservation of energy, assuredly this ought to be still more within the powers of a Divine Mind, which, according to the Scholastic philosophy, sustains all beings in existence and continuously co-operates with their activity.

The extensive literature of the subject may roughly be distinguished as scientific and philosophic, though the two grade into each other.

Among those of mainly scientific character are:—The Correlation and Conservation of Forces, ed. YOUNG (N.Y., 1884). This is a collection of the original papers of Helmholtz, Mayer, Grove, Faraday, Liebig, and Carpenter on the subject. Joule, Scientific Papers (2 vols., London, 1841, 1847); Helmholtz, Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects (tr. London, 1875); Kytting, Popular Lectures and Addresses (2 vols., Ne. York and London, 1845); also Tatt, Recent Advances in Physical Science (London, 1875); Maxwell, ed. Rayleigh, The Theory of Heat (London, 1902); Stewart, The Conservation of Energy in Intermolecular Forces (London, 1890); also Tappan, Interfacing of Physical and Vital Forces in Quot. of Science (1850); Idem, Mutual Relations of the Vital and Physical Forces in Transactions of the Philosophical Society of New York, 1865); also Tappan, Interfacing of Physical and Vital Forces in Quot. of Science (1850); Idem, Mutual Relations of the Vital and Physical Forces in Transactions of the Philosophical Society of New York, 1865); also Tappan, Interfacing of Physical and Vital Forces in Quot. of Science (1850); Idem, Mutual Relations of the Vital and Physical Forces in Transactions of the Philosophical Society of New York, 1865).

Among the philosophical works on the subject are: Confucius, La Liberté et la conservation de l'énergie (Paris, 1827); Mercier, La Pensée et la loi de la conservation de l'énergie (Louvain, 1900); de Mennycke in Revue Thomiste (May, 1907), a useful article; Winder, Life (London and St. Louis, 1908); Lapin, Philosophy of Mind (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New York, 1905); V. Maior, Psychology (London and New Year...
Engel, Ludwig, canonist, b. at Castle Wagnerin, Austria, d. at Grillenberg, 22 April, 1674. He became a Benedictine in the monastery of Molk (Melk), 10 September, 1654, and, at the order of his abbot, applied himself to the study of law at the University of Salzburg, where theological studies were committed to the care of the Benedictines. He was proclaimed doctor of civil and canon law in 1657, ordained priest in the following year, and was soon professor of canon law at this university. His profound knowledge and personal qualities procured him the most honourable functions. In 1669 he was unanimously chosen vice-chancellor of the university. He left Salzburg in 1674 at the invitation of the Abbot of Molk, who was desirous that Engel should be known and appreciated by the religious of this monastery, in order to be chosen as his successor. The death of Engel, which occurred in the same year, prevented this plan from being realized. His principal works are: "Manuale procurationum" (Salzburg, 1661); "Forum competens" (Salzburg, 1663); "Tractatus de privilegiis et juriibus monasteriorum" (Salzburg, 1664); and especially his "Collegii universi juris canonici", etc. (Salzburg, 1671-1674), a work remarkable for its conciseness, clearness, and solidity. It has placed its author in the first rank among Benedictine canonists. The fifteenth edition appeared in 1770. A compendium or summary of this work was published in 1720 by Mainardus Schwartzs.

Engelberg, Abbey of, a Benedictine monastery in Switzerland, formerly the Diocese of Constance, but now in that of Chur. It is dedicated to Our Lady of the Angels and occupies a commanding position at the head of the Nidwalden valley in the Canton Unterwalden. It was founded in 892 by Blessed Conrad, Count of Seldenburg, the first abbot being Blessed Adalbert, a monk of the Abbey of St. Blasien in Germany. St. Black Forest, under whom the founder himself received the habit and ended his days there as a monk. Numerous and extensive rights and privileges were granted to the new monastery by various popes and emperors, amongst the earliest being Pope Callixtus II, in 1121, and the Emperor Henry IV. The abbey was placed under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See, which condition continued until the formation of the Swiss Confederation in 1492, when Engelberg united with the other monasteries of Switzerland and became subject to a president and general chapter. In spiritual matters the affairs of Engelberg exercised quasi-episcopal jurisdiction over all their vassals and dependents, including the town which sprang up around the walls of the abbey, and also enjoyed the right of collation to all the parishes of the Canton. In temporal matters they had supreme and absolute authority in a large territory embracing over two hundred and fifteen towns and villages, which were incorporated under the abbatial rule by a Bull of Pope Gregory IX in 1236. These and other rights they enjoyed until the French Revolution, in 1798, when most of them were taken away. The prominent position in Switzerland which the abbey occupied for so many centuries was seriously threatened by the religious and political disturbances of the Reformation period, especially by the rapid spread of the Zwinglian heresy, and for a time its privileges suffered some curtailment. The troubles and vicissitudes, however, through which it passed, were happily brought to an end by the wise rule of Abbot Benedict Sigrist, in the seventeenth century, who is justly called the restorer of his monastery. Alienated possessions and rights were recovered by him and the good work he began was continued by his successors, under whom monastic discipline and learning have flourished with renewed vigour. The library, which is said to have contained over twenty thousand volumes and two hundred choice MSS., was unfortunately pillaged by the French in 1798. The abbey buildings were almost entirely destroyed by fire in 1720 but were rebuilt in a substantial, if not very beautiful style and so remain to the present day. The monastery is now (1909) in a very flourishing state, having a community of about fifty and a school of over a hundred boys. The monks have charge of the parish of two thousand souls attached to the abbey and also minister to the needs of seven convents of nuns in the vicinity. In 1873 a colony from Engelberg founded the Abbey of New Engelberg, at Conception, Missouri, U. S. A. Abbot Leodegar Seherer, elected in 1901, was the fifty-third abbot of the monastery.

Engelbert of Cologne, Saint, archbishop of that city (1126-1225); b. at Berg, about 1155; d. near Schwellen, 7 November, 1225. His father was Engelbert, Count of Berg, his mother, Margaret, daughter of the Count of Gelderland. He studied at the cathedral school of Cologne and while still a boy was, according to an abuse of that time, made provost of the churches of St. George and St. Severin at Cologne, and of St. Mary's at Aachen. In 1199 he was elected provost of the cathedral at Cologne. He led a worldly life and in the conflict between Archbishops Adolf and Bruno sided with his cousin Adolf, and waged war for him. He was in consequence excommunicated by the pope together with his cousin and deposed in 1206. After his submission he was reinstated in 1208 and, to atone for his sins, joined the crusade against the Albighenses in 1212. On 29 Feb., 1216, the chapter of the cathedral elected him archbishop by an unanimous vote. In his appearance he was tall and handsome. He possessed a penetrating mind and keen discernment, was kind and clement; and loved justice and peace, but he was also ambitious and self-willed. His archiepiscopal see had passed through severe struggles and suffered heavily, and he worked strenuously to repair the damage and to restore order. He took care of its possessions and revenues and was on that account compelled to resort to arms. He defeated the Duke of Limburg and the Count of Cleves and defended against them also the Counts of Berg, which he had inherited in 1218 on the death of his brother. He
restrained the impetuous citizens of Cologne, broke the stubborness of the nobility, and erected strongholds for the defence of his territories. He did not spare even his own relations when guilty. In this way he gained the universal veneration of his people and increased the number of his vassals from year to year. Although in exterior bearing a sovereign rather than a bishop, for which he was blamed by pious persons, he did not disregard his duties to the Church, but strove to uplift the religious life of his people. The mendicant orders, which had been founded shortly before his accession, settled in Cologne during his administration, the Franciscans in 1219, the Dominicans in 1221. He was well disposed towards the monasteries and insisted on strict religious observance in them. Ecclesiastical affairs were regulated in provincial synods. Blameless in his own life, he was a friend of the clergy and a helper of the poor.

In the affairs of the empire Engelbert exerted a strong influence. Emperor Frederick II, who had taken up his residence permanently in Sicily, gave Germany to his son, Henry VII, then still a minor, and, in 1221 appointed Engelbert guardian of the king and administrator of the empire. When the young king reached the age of twelve, he was crowned on 8 May, 1222, by Engelbert, who loved him as his own son and honoured him as his sovereign. He watched over the king's education and governed the empire in his name, careful above all to secure peace both within and without the realm. At the Diet of Nordhausen (21 Sept., 1223) he made an important treaty with Denmark; in the rupture between England and France, he sided with England and broke off relations with France. The poet Walther von der Vogelweide extols him as "Master of sovereigns", and "True guardian of Cologne, they extol his virtue and call our imperial chancellor those like has never been".—Engelbert's devotion to duty, and his obedience to the pope and to the emperor were eventually the cause of his ruin. Many of the nobility feared rather than loved him, and he was obliged to surround himself with a body-guard. The greatest danger threatened him from among his relations. His cousin, Count Frederick of Isenberg, the secular administrator for the nuns of Essen, had grievously oppressed that abbey. Honorius III and the emperor urged Engelbert to protect the nuns in their rights. Frederick wished to forestall the archbishop, and his wife induced him to commit murder. Even his two brothers, the Bishops of Münster and Osnabrück, were suspected as privy to the matter. Engelbert was warned, commended himself to the protection of Divine Providence, and amid tears made a confession of his whole life to the Bishop of Minden. On 7 Nov., 1225, as he was journeying from Nesselau to Schwelm to consecrate a church, he was attacked on a dark even by Frederick and his associates in a narrow defile, was wounded in the thigh, torn from his horse and killed. His body was covered with forty-seven wounds. It was placed on a dung-cart and brought to Cologne on the fourth day. The young king was bitterly over the remains, put the murderer under the ban of the empire, and saw him broken on the wheel a year later at Cologne. He died contrite, having acknowledged and confessed his guilt. His associates also peri lud miserably within a short time. The crime, moreover, was disastrous for the German Empire, for the young king had now lost his best adviser and soon met a very sad fate, to the misfortune of his house and country.

Engelbert, by his martyrdom made amends for his human weaknesses. His body was placed in the old cathedral at Cologne. 24 Feb. 1226, by Conrad von Urach, Archbishop Ferdinand ordered that his feast be celebrated on 7 November and solemnly raised his remains in 1232. In the martyrlogy Engelbert is commemorated on 7 Nov. as a martyr. A conven for nuns was erected at the place of his death. By order of Engelbert's successor, Henry I, Casarius of Heisterbach, who possessed good information and a ready pen, wrote in 1226 the life of the saint in two hundred and forty-three verses and eight miracles. (See Suria, "Vita Sanctorum", 7 Nov.)

**Engelbert**

Engelbert, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Admont in Styria, b. of noble parents at Völkendorf in Styria, e. 1220; d. 12 May, 1331. He entered the monastery of Admont about 1267. Four years later he was sent to Prague to study grammar and logic. After devoting himself for two years to these studies he spent nine years at the University of Padua studying philosophy and theology. In 1297 he was elected Abbot of Admont, and after ruling thirty years he resigned this dignity when he was almost eighty years old, in order to spend the remainder of his life in prayer and study. Engelbert was one of the most learned men of his day, and there was scarcely any branch of knowledge to which his versatile pen did not contribute its share. His literary productions include works on moral and dogmatic theology, philosophy, history, political science, Holy Scripture, the natural sciences, pedagogy, and music. The Benedictine, Berhard Pez, mentions thirty-eight works, and says he published partly in his "Thesaurus ancius damorum novissimus" (Augsburg, 1721), partly in his "Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo nova" (Ratisbon, 1723-5). The best known of Engelbert's works is his historical treatise "De virtute regis et imperii", which was written during the reign of Henry VII (1308-1313). It puts forth the following political principles: a ruler must be a learned man; his sole aim must be the welfare of his subjects; no unjust ruler may be justly deposed; emperor and pope are, each in his sphere, independent of one another. The Holy Roman Empire is a Christian continuation of the pagan empire of ancient Rome; there should be only one supreme temporal ruler, the emperor, to whom all other temporal rulers should be subject. He bewails the gradual decline of both imperial and papal authority, prophesies the end of both, and wishes for the union of the Holy Roman Empire and a wholesale desertion of the Holy See. The work was published repeatedly, first according to the revision of Cluten (Offenbach, 1610); finally it was re-edited by Schott and printed in the Supplement to the "Bibliotheca Patrum" (Col-ogne, 1722) and in "Maxima Bibliotheca veterum Patrum" (Lyons, 1677). Following are the most important of the other works of Engelbert which have been printed: "De gratia et virtutibus beatae et gloriosae semper V. Marie" (Pez, "Thesaurus", I, pt. 1, 503-792); "De libero arbitrio" (ib., IV, pt. 2, 121-147); (ib., IV, pt. 1, 437-502); "De providentia Dei" (Pez, Bibliotheca ascetica, VI, 51-150); "De statu defunctorum" (ib., IX, 113-195); "Speculum virtutis pro Alberto et Ottone Austrie ductibus" (ib., III, entire); "Super passionem secundum Mathaum" (ib., VII, 67-112); "De regimine principum", a work on political science, containing sound suggestions on education in general, edited by Husnagel (Ratisbon, 1725); "De summo bono hominum in hac vita", "Dialogus concupiscientiae et rationis", "Utrum sapienti competat ducere uxorem" (the last three valuable works on ethics were done 1273-1275); "Clementissimi celeberrimi Engelberti", (Ratisbon, 1725); "De musice tractatus", a very interesting treatise on music, illustrating the great difficulties with which teachers of music were beset in consequence of the complicated system of the hexachord with its solmization and mu-
England.—This term is here restricted to one constituent, the largest and most populous, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Thus understood, England (taken at the same time as including the counties of Wales) is the third part of the United Kingdom, and of Great Britain which lies south of the Solway Firth, the River Liddell, the Cheviot Hills, and the River Tweed; its area is 57,668 square miles, i.e. 10,048 sq. m. greater than that of the State of New York, but 11,067 sq. m. less than that of Missouri; its total resident population in 1901 was 22,386,593, or 78.2 per cent of the population of the United Kingdom. The history of England will be considered in the present article chiefly in its relations with the Catholic Church.—I. Before the Reformation; II. Since the Reformation. The concluding section will be III. English Literature.

Before the Reformation.—For the history of England down to the Norman Conquest the reader may be referred to the article Anglo-Saxon Church. We begin our present account of pre-Reformation England with the new order of things created by William the Conqueror.

Although the picture of the degradation of the English Church in the first half of the eleventh century which has been drawn by some authorities (notably by H. Boehmer, "Kirche und Staat", 79) is very exaggerated, there is nevertheless certain that even King Edward the Confessor, with all his saintliness, had not been able to repair the damage caused partly by the anarchy of the last ten years of Danish rule, but not less surely, if remotely, by the disorders which for many generations past had existed at the centre of Christendom. Of the prevalence of simoniacal practices, of a scandalous and widespread neglect of the liturgy, of a gross profanation of the sacred vessels, and even of a general subordination of the ecclesiastical order to secular influences, there is no room for doubt. These evils were at that time almost universal. In 1065, the year of St. Edward's death, things were no better in England than on the Continent of Europe. Probably they were rather worse. But the forces of reform, the forces to purify and renovate the Church were already at work. The monastic reform begun in the tenth century at Cluny had spread to many religious houses of France and among other places had been cordially taken up in the Norman Abbey of Fécamp, and later at Bec. On the other hand this same asceticism with all its rigour was much to form the character both of Brun, Bishop of Toul, who in 1049 became pope, and is known as St. Leo IX, and of Hildebrand his chief counsellor, afterwards still more famous as St. Gregory VII. Under the auspices of these two popes a new era dawned for the Church. Effective legislation was adopted to restrain clerical incontinence and avarice, while a great struggle began to secure the bishops from the imminent danger of becoming mere feudatories to the emperor and other secular princes. William the Conqueror had established relations of Ricel by the Holy See. He came to England armed with the direct authorization of a papal Bull, and his expedition, in the eyes of many earnest men, and probably even his own, was identified with the cause of ecclesiastical reform. The behaviour of Normans and Saxons on the night preceding the battle of Hastings, when the former prayed and prepared for Communion while the latter cursed, was in a measure significant of the spirit of the two parties. Taken as a whole, the Conqueror's dealings with the English Church were worthy of a great mission. All the best elements in the Saxon hierarchy he hasted and supported. The Wolstan was confirmed in the possession of the See of Worcester. Leofric of Exeter and Siward of Rochester, both Englishmen, as well as some half-dozen prelates of foreign birth who had been appointed in Edward's reign, were not interfered with. On the other hand, Stigand, the intriguing Archbishop of Canterbury, with the support of two other bishops, probably his supporters, were deposed. But in this there was no indecent haste. It was done at the great Council of Winchester (Easter, 1070), at which three papal legates were present. Strong legislation was adopted to secure celibacy among the clergy, though not without some temporary mitigation for the old rural priests, a mitigation which proves perhaps better than any thing else that in the existing generation a sudden and complete reform seemed hopeless. Further, several episcopal sees were removed, e.g. at Winchester, from the mere villages to more populous centres. Thus bishops were transferred from Sherborne to Salisbury, from Selsey to Chichester, from Lichfield to Chester, and not many years after from Dorchestcr to Lincoln, and from Thetford to Norwich. These and the like changes, and, not perhaps least of all, the drafting of Lanfranc's new constitutions for the Christ Church
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monks, were all significant of the improvement introduced by the new ecclesiastical regime. With regard to Rome, the Conqueror seems never to have been wanting in respect for the Holy See, and nothing like a breach with the pope ever took place during his lifetime. In 1071 the archbishops who went to Rome in order to receive their pallium, and when (c. 1078) a demand was made through the papal legate, Hubert, for the payment of arrears of Peter's pence, the claim was admitted, and the contribution was duly sent. Gregory, however, seems at the same time to have called upon the King of England to do homage for his kingdom, requests in the payment of which Edward was acting upon the precedent of vassalage, as in some cases, e.g. that of the Normans in Apulia (see Jensen, "Der englische Peterspfennig", p. 37), it undoubtedly was. But on this point William's reply was clear. "One claim [Peter's pence] I admit," he wrote, "the other I do not admit. To do so I have not been willing in the past, nor am I willing now, inasmuch as I have never promised it, nor do I discover that my predecessors ever did it to your predecessors." It is plain that all this had nothing whatever to do with the recognition of the pope's supramundane, and in fact the king says most explicitly in the concluding sentence of the letter: "Pray for us and for the good estate of our realm, for we have loved your predecessors and desire to love you sincerely and to hear you obediently before all" (et vos pre omnes omnibus sincere diligite et obedienter audire desideramus). Possibly the incident led to some slight difference of opinion, and was, for example, in the negative attitude of Lanfranc towards the antipope Wibert at a later date (see Liebermann in "Eng. Hist. Rev.", 1901, p. 328), but it is also likely that William and his archbishop were only careful not to get entangled in the strife between Gregory and the Emperor Henry IV. In any case, the more strictly ecclesiastical policy of the great pontiff was cordially furthered by them, so that St. Gregory, writing to Hugh, Bishop of York, remarked that although the King of England does not bear himself in all things as religiously as he might be wished, still, as much as he does not destroy or sell the churches, rules peacefully and justly, refuses to enter into alliance with the enemies of the Cross of Christ (the partisans of Henry IV), and has compelled the priests to give up their wives and laymen to pay arrears of tithe, he has proved himself worthy of special consideration. As has been recently pointed out by an impartial authority (Davis, "Eng. under Normans and Angevins", p. 54) "Lanfranc's correspondence and career prove that he and his master conceded important powers to the Pope not only in matters of conscience and faith but also in administrative questions. They admitted for example the necessity of obtaining the pallium for an archbishop and the Pope's power to invalidate ecclesiastical elections. They were scrupulous in obtaining the Pope's consent when the deposition or resignation of a bishop was in question and they submitted the time-honoured quarrel of York and Canterbury to the decision of Rome. No doubt a strong centralized government was then specially needed in Church as well as State, and we need not too readily condemn Lanfranc as guilty of personal ambition because he insisted on the primacy of his own see and exacted a profession of obedience from the Archbishop of York. The recent attempt that has been made to fasten a charge of forgery upon Lanfranc in connexion with this incident (see Bohmer, "Falschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks") breaks down at the point where the personal responsibility of the great archbishop is involved. Undoubtedly many of the documents upon which Canterbury's claims to supremacy were based were forgeries, and forgeries of the precise period, but there is no proof that Lanfranc was the forger or that he acted otherwise than in good faith (see Walter in "Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen", 1905, 52; and Salter in "Revue des Sciences Ecclesiées", 1907, p. 123). Well was it for England that William and Lanfranc, without any violent overthrow of the existing order of things, either in Church or State, had nevertheless introduced systematic reforms and had provided the country with good bishops. A struggle was now at last being openly and openly waged which probably more momentous than any other event in his reign down to the time of the Reformation. The struggle is known as that about Investitures, and we may note that it had already been going on in Central Europe for some years before the question, through the action of William II and Henry I, sons of the Conqueror, reached an acute phase. As a result of the eleventh century it may be said that, though the election of bishops always supposed the free choice, or at least the acceptance, of their flocks, the procedure was very variable. In these earlier ages bishops were normally chosen by an assembly of the clergy and people, the neighbouring bishops and the king or civil magnates exercising more or less of influence in the selection of a suitable candidate (see Imbert de la Tour, "Les élections épiscopales"). But from the seventh and eighth century onwards it became increasingly common for the local Churches to find themselves in some degree of dependence upon the central authority of the popes. The ancient principle of "no land without a lord" it was easy to pass to that of "no church without a lord", and whether the bishopric was situated upon the royal domain or within the sphere of influence of one of the great feudatories, men came to regard each episcopal see as a mere fief which the lord was free to bestow upon whom he would, and for which he duly exacted homage. This development was no doubt much helped by the fact that as the parochial system grew up, it was the oratory of the local magnate which in the great majority of cases became the parish church, and it was his private chapel which was transformed into the parish priest. Thus the great landowner became the patronus ecclesiae, claiming the right to present for ordination any cleric of his own choice. Now the relationship of a sovereign towards his bishops came in time to be regarded as precisely analogous. The king was held to be the lord of the lands from which the bishop derived his revenues. Instead of the possession of these lands being regarded as the appanage of the spiritual office, the acceptance of episcopal consecration was looked upon as the special condition or service upon which these lands had been bestowed from the king. Thus the temporal sovereign claimed to make the bishop, to show that he did so, he "invested" the new spiritual vassal with his fief by presenting to him the episcopal ring and crosier. The episcopal consecration was a subordinate matter which the king's nominee was left to arrange for himself with his metropolitan and the neighbouring bishops. Now, as long as the supreme authority was wielded by religiously-minded men, princes who took thought for the spiritual well-being of their kingdoms, no great harm necessarily resulted from this perversion of right order. But when, as too often happened during the iron age, the monarch was godless and unprincipled, he either kept the see vacant, in order to enjoy the revenues, or else sold the office to the highest bidder. It must be obvious that such a system, if allowed to develop unchecked could only lead in the course of a few generations to the utter demoralization of the Church. When the bishops, the shepherds of the flock, were themselves licentious and corrupt, it would have been a moral miracle if the rank and file of the clergy had not degenerated in an equal or even greater degree. Upon the bishop depended ultimately the admission of candidates to ordination, and he also was ultimately responsible for their education and for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline.

Now the fact cannot be disputed that in the tenth century a very terrible laxity had come to prevail almost everywhere throughout Western Christendom,
The great monastic reform of Cluny and many individual saints like Ulric, at Augsburg, and Dunstan and Æthelwold, in England, did much to stem the tide, but the times were very evil. Worldly minded men, often morally corrupt, were promoted by sovereigns and temporal magnates to the most important seats of the Church, many of them obtaining that promotion by the payment of money or by simoniacal compacts. The lower clergy as a rule were grossly ignorant and in many cases unchaste, but under such bishops they enjoyed almost complete immunity from punishment. No doubt the corruptions of the age were exaggerated by writers of the stamp of H. C. Lea, Michelet, and Gregorovius, but nothing could more conclusively prove the gravity of the evil than the fact that for two centuries the Church had to struggle with the abuse by which benefices threatened to become hereditary, descending from the priest to his children. Happily help was at hand. Many individual reformers strove to introduce higher religious ideals and met with partial success, but it was the merit of the great pontiff, St. Gregory VII, to go straight to the root of the evil. It was useless to institute decrees against bishops and priests and against their neglect of their spiritual functions if the great feudal lords could still nominate unworthy bishops, bestowing investiture by ring and crosier and enforcing their consecration at the hands of other bishops as unworthily as the candidates. Gregory was firm in the principle that no permanent jurisdiction could be exercised until the system of lay investitures was utterly overthrown. Those who have accused Gregory of insufferable arrogance, of a desire to exalt without measure the spiritual authority of the Church and to humble all secular rulers to the dust, make little allowance for the gravity of the evil he was fighting against. His desperate nature of the struggle. When feudalism seemed on the point of so completely swallowing up all ecclesiastical organization, it was pardonable that St. Gregory should have believed that the remedy lay not in any compromise or balance of power, but in the unqualified acceptance of the principle that the Church was above the State. If, on the one hand, he considered that it was the function of the Vicar of Christ to direct and, if need be, chastise the princes of the earth, it is also clear from the history of his life that he despaired of the power and justice of the State. In England the struggle over investitures developed somewhat later than on the Continent. If, in the matter of the election of bishops, Gregory VII forbore to press the claims of the Church to extremities under such a ruler as William the Conqueror, this was surely not for any lack of audacity. But bishops were appointed to the see and abbeys against the wishes of the abbot, with the result that bribery and the expenses of litigation became the order of the day. The Church was reduced to the condition of a great corporation, the members of which appointed its chief officers and lived at the expense of the State. The Pope's power was in danger. The result was that William Rufus, when he became king, had to be satisfied with the crown of England, and that the possession which belonged to the Church at the time of Lanfranc's death, the king soon returned to his evil ways. In particular he still clung to the theory that by accepting investiture Anselm had become his liege man (ligatus hominum), liable to all the incidents of vassalage. When Anselm died, he was rewarded with the war in Normandy, Anselm at first refused. Then, not wanting to provoke a conflict, he offered 500 marks; but when this sum was rejected as insufficient, he distributed the money to the poor. Early in 1085 the archbishop asked permission to go to Rome to receive the pallium. Rufus objected that, while the antipope Clement III was still disputing the title, it was for him and his Great Council to decide which pope should be recognized. When asked to recognize the jurisdiction of this council, Anselm replied: "In the case that I appeal, the king will tender obedience to the Vicar of St. Peter; in things of earthly dignity of my lord the King I will to the best of my ability give him faithful counsel and help." The other bishops seem to have been cowed by Rufus and to have supported the king's claim to decide which pope should be recognized. But Anselm refused in any way to surrender the allegiance of England, when Abbob of Bec, he had sworn to Urban. He recognized no right of king or bishops to interfere, and he declared he would give his answer "as he ought and where he ought". These words, writes Dean Stephens (History of The English Church, II, 99), were understood to mean, that, as Archbishop of Canter-
bury, Anselm "refused to be judged by any one save the pope himself, a doctrine which it seems no one was prepared to deny." Through the saint's firmness Urban was recognized, and the pallium brought from him to England; but a little later Anselm again asked leave of Rome, and when he was refused he declared in the plainest terms that he must go without leave, for God was to be obeyed rather than man. Pope Urban received him with all possible respect, and publicly spoke of him as "alterius orbis papa," a phrase much quoted by Anglicans, as though it implied the recognition in the Archbishop of Canterbury of a jurisdiction independent of Rome.

But the whole lesson of Anselm's life centred in his belief that it lay with the pope to decide what course was to be followed in matters affecting the Church even at the risk of the king's displeasure, and despite any pretended national customs. Neither does it appear that the rest of the English bishops maintained the contrary as a matter of principle, though they considered that Anselm's attitude was needlessly provocative and uncompromising. There are not wanting signs that Eadmer's desire to exalt his own beloved master had led him to be somewhat less than consistent, and Anselm's suffragans and to the Holy See itself. The archbishop remained in exile until after the death of Rufus, when Henry, who succeeded, made generous promises of freedom to the Church, explicitly renouncing any sort of payment or relief for the appointment of bishops or abbots, and promising that no revenues should not be seized during vacancies. He recalled Anselm to England, but came into conflict with him almost immediately over the same old question of investitures. At the Councils of Bari (1098) and Rome (1099), at which the saint had personally assisted, anathema had been pronounced on all bishops or abbots who received investiture at the hands of laymen. Anselm accordingly refused either to do homage himself for the restitution of the possessions of the archbishopric or to consecrate other bishops who had received ring and crosier from the king. Eventually, by the consent of both parties, the matter was referred to Rome. In three different embassies that were sent, the pope upheld Anselm's view, despite the efforts made by Henry's envoys to extort some concession. Then Anselm himself went to Rome (1108) while a fresh set of royal emissaries were dispatched to work against him at the papa. Nothing was settled, for Henry still held out, and Anselm accordingly remained abroad. But at last, when Anselm was on the point of launching an excommunication against the king, the latter, being in political straits, accepted such modified terms as his emissaries could obtain from the Holy See. Anselm was allowed to consecrate those who had previously received investiture, but the king at a great council (1107) renounced for the future the claim to invest bishop or abbot by ring and crosier. On the other hand it was tacitly admitted that bishops might make homage to the king for temporal provision of their see. The settlement of the investiture question in England was fifteen years earlier than that arrived at on very similar lines between Pope Calixtus II and the Emperor Henry V. The importance of the struggle can hardly be exaggerated, for, as already pointed out, the whole ecclesiastical order was in danger of being reduced to the status of vassals sharing all the vices of secular princes. Moreover this resolute stand made by St. Anselm and the popes was not without its political importance. The clergy as a body had now become sufficiently independent to take a leading part in that remarkable negotiation with the papacy during the next two centuries were to owe their most fundamental liberties. During all this time England as a whole was in no wise in sympathy with the monarch in his quarrel with the pope. As Dr. Gairdner writes of a later period, "It was a contest not of the English people, but of the King and his government with Rome."

As regards national feeling, the people evidently regarded the cause of the Church as the cause of liberty" (Lollards and the Reformation, i, 6). Nothing contributed so much to win the confidence of the nation as the independence shown by the Church in these struggles as those that are associated with the names of St. Anselm, St. Thomas Becket, and Cardinal Stephen Langton. St. Anselm died peacefully at Canterbury in 1109, but Henry I lived on until 1135. During the reign of his son, Stephen I, the struggle with Rome and the independence which prevailed under the rule of Stephen (1135-1154), good bishops were for the most part elected. The chapters were ostensibly left free in their choice, though they no doubt responded in some measure to the known preferences of the king. In any case simoniacal compacts are no longer heard of, while the Holy See had generally much to say to the formal acceptance of the archbishops and of the more important prelates. A certain impatience of dictation from Rome, shown, for example, in occasional unwillingness to receive a legate or to allow appeals to the pope, may be dated from this period, but the principle of papal authority was never questioned. For example, the pallium, "taken from the body of Blessed Peter," a symbol of archiepiscopal jurisdiction which still appears in the arms of the English Sees of Canterbury and York, was personally fetched from Rome or at any rate originally petitioned for by cardinal Langton in the Anglo-Saxon Church from the very beginning. In cases when the pall was brought to England instead of being conferred at the papal court, archbishops like St. Anselm and Ralph d'Escures went to meet it barefoot. To legates of the Holy See, notwithstanding the fact that their presence was not always desired, extreme deference was shown. Even a mere priest like Cardinal John of Crema, when he came to the country as papal legate, took precedence of the two archbishops in the Council of Westminster (1125). Moreover, when protests were made against the sending of legates, it was not so much that the presence of a papal representative in England was resented, as because men believed that such legatine powers, by old tradition, ought to be conferred on the Archbishop of Canterbury, as had been done, for example, in the case of Tewaine, Plegmund, and Dunstan. As Eadmer records (Hist., c. 88), "I, from an ambassado in Britannia... quemlibet hominem supra se vices apostolicea gerere nisolum archiepiscopum Cantuarias" (It was surely an unheard-of thing in Britain that any man should bear the Apostolic delegation over him except only the Archbishop of Canterbury). In the spirit of this protest Archbishop William de Corbeil almost immediately after Crema's departure eagerly sought the office of legate for himself, and from that time, though Henry, Bishop of Winchester, was made legate by Innocent II in 1129, the Archbishop of Canterbury was usually constituted to hold the legatus a latere position in their see. This term was used in contradistinction to the legatus a latere dispatched on extraordinary occasions "from the side" of the sovereign pontiff in Rome. But in any case the significance of the ordinary legatine appointment, first associated with the person of William de Corbeil (d. 1136), is unmistakable. It was, as Dean Stephens truly observes, "an acknowledgment of the supreme authority of the Pope. The primate shone with a reflected glory, his preeminence was not inherent but derivative" (Hist. of the Eng. Church, ii, 142).

Evil as were the times during the first half of the twelfth century the people of England were lacking in vivifying influences. This was the period of the chief development in England of the Cluniac Order (see Cluni, Congregation of), a great Benedictine reform already alluded to, of which the first English house, that of Lewes, had been established by
William de Warrenne and Gundrada his wife c. 1077. But the priory of Lewes later on became the mother of several other Cluniac priories, of which the best known are those of Wenlock, Thetford, Bermondsey, and Pontefract. Still more intimately associated with England was the Cistercian Order, another of the great centres of learning, more particularly in the collection and multiplication of books, and they were not only patrons of art but they provided in many cases the nearest approach to schools for architecture, painting, sculpture, embroidery, and other useful arts. If their works were now lost, another day, another time, they might be remembered, were their charities. Neither would it be easy to imagine a more worthy object upon which to expend the superfluous wealth of the country than in the erecting of those magnificent abbeys and churches which the monastic builders left to posterity. By this movement the order of religious houses grew, and it is said that no more misplaced charge was ever made than that which describes their members as idle and useless. Of all the sections of the community they alone almost in that day were profitably busy. The industrious man-at-arms, the industrious lawyer, the industrious forester, huntman, or jongleur were too often only a scrouge to the land in which they lived.

For this reason we conceive that a quite unnecessary outlay has been raised by a number of Anglican writers against a practice which undoubtedly became very prevalent in the twelfth century, namely that of making the canons of the parish church a religious house. It was a mistake if the saw that no more misplaced charge was ever made than that which describes their members as idle and useless. Of all the sections of the community they almost alone in that day were profitably busy. The industrious man-at-arms, the industrious lawyer, the industrious forester, huntman, or jongleur were too often only a scrouge to the land in which they lived. For this reason we conceive that quite an unnecessary outlay has been raised by a number of Anglican writers against a practice which undoubtedly became very prevalent in the twelfth century, namely that of making the canons of the parish church a religious house. It was a mistake if the saw that no more misplaced charge was ever made than that which describes their members as idle and useless. Of all the sections of the community they almost alone in that day were profitably busy. The industrious man-at-arms, the industrious lawyer, the industrious forester, huntman, or jongleur were too often only a scrouge to the land in which they lived.
With the accession of Henry II, in 1154, England, after years of strife, once more passed into the hands of a strong and capable ruler. Without being a whit less selfish or more patriotic than other princes of that age, Henry had the sense to see that good government must go hand in hand with legal reforms and the new machinery of justice which he brought into being are of the highest possible importance to the jurist and to the student of constitutional history, but they do not specially concern us here. Henry at the beginning of his reign seems to have been well viewed in Rome of his ability, and when, in 1153, his ambassador to the Council of their own accord declared the Bull ‘Laudabiliter’ is unquestionably genuine (see Adrian IV, and cf. ‘The Month’, May and June, 1906), the religious mission entrusted to the king, no doubt upon his own representations, in the proposed conquest of Ireland, bears a close resemblance to the pretense advanced for William the Conqueror’s invasion of Great Britain. In both cases also, the Roman pontiff seems to have claimed dominion, granting the land to the invader as a fief upon payment of a certain tribute. The fact, that, according to the Bull ‘Laudabiliter’, Henry himself had admitted (quod uerum et verba recognoscit) that ‘Ireland and the other islands upon which Christ, the Sun of Justice, has shown himself the prerogative of St. Peter and the Holy Roman Church’, deserves to be borne in mind in connexion with King John’s formal surrender of his kingdom to the Holy See at a later date.

More centrally interesting, however, is the dispute between the king and Thomas, his archbishop, culminating, in 1170, in the martyrdom of the latter. Thomas Becket, a clerk in the household of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, having been strongly recommended to Henry, had been recommended to his intimate friend, and had been consecrated to the See of Canterbury, an office which he had discharged with splendid ability for seven years. After the death of Theobald, Thomas, at the instance of the king himself, was elected Archbishop of Canterbury. He vainly tried to escape from the proposed dignity, but, once appointed, his consecration marked the beginning of a complete change of life. He renounced the chancellorship and all secular pursuits, while he devoted himself to the practice of rigorous asceticism. It was not long before he found himself in conflict with the king, as indeed he had foreseen from the first. The opposition which he raised opened a breach between them of a purely secular nature. Henry demanded that a certain tax called ‘the sheriff’s aid’ should be paid directly into the Exchequer. Thomas, in a Great Council, declared that he was willing to make his contribution to the sheriff’s aid, if he had been customary, but absolutely refused to pay if the money was to be added to the revenue of the Crown. Whether this tax was really the Danegeld, as Bishop Stubbes supposed, is very questionable, but in any case we may share his admiration for this, ‘the first instance of any opposition to the King’s will in the matter of taxation which is recorded in our national history’, and, as he adds, ‘it would seem to have been, formally at least, successful’ (Const. Hist., I, 463). This incident, however, was soon thrown into the shade by the more serious quarrel over the Constitution of Clarendon. What was not to be surmounted by the king was the forefront of the dispute was the alleged inadequacy of the punishment meted out to clergies who were guilty of criminal offences. The statement then made that a hundred homicides had been committed by clergies within ten years rests on no adequate evidence, nor do the cases of which there are definite particulars much more satisfactory (see Morris, ‘Life of St. Thomas’, pp. 114 sqq.). It may be that the king was honestly intent on a scheme of judicial reform, and that he found that the growing jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts (the publication of the ‘Decretum Gratiani’ and the increased study of the canon law had made them very popular) was an obstacle in his way. But Becket, who knew him well, suspected that Henry was deliberately striking at the privileges of the Church, and the manner in which a promise was extorted from the bishops to observe the ‘avita consuetudines’ before the latter were made public, as well as the pretence that the Constitutions of Clarendon represented nothing but the customs said to have been observed in the time of Henry I, do not leave the impression of straightforward dealing. The general purport of the Constitutions, when they were last made public, was two main causes. For example, those regarding presentations to benefices, from the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical to that of the King’s Courts, to restrain appeals to Rome, to prevent the excommunication of the king’s officers and great vassals, and to sanction the king’s appropriation of the revenues of bishops and abbacies. On one clause, that dealing with criminous clerks, much misconception has prevailed. It was formerly supposed that Henry wanted all clerks accused of crimes to be tried in the King’s Courts. But this impression, as F. W. Maitland has shown (Roman Canon Law, pp. 132-3), is quite wrong. Rather every ecclesiastical establishment was to be attacked so that any new form of ecclesiastical jurisdiction which the king might desire could be introduced. A principle of clerical privilege, to degrade a man first and to hang him afterwards was to punish him twice for the same offence. Once degraded, he lost all his rights, and if he committed another crime he might then be punished with death like any other felon. And here also it must not be forgotten that ‘the forces of the state were at St. Thomas represented not only the respect which men feel for a bold fight for principle, but also that blind struggle against the hideous punishments of the age, of which the assertion of ecclesiastical privilege, covering widows and orphans as well as clerks and laity, was a natural expression’ (W. H. Hutton in "Social England", I, 394). After a moment of weakness in the earlier stage of the discussion, St. Thomas, in spite of Henry’s fury, refused to have anything to say to the Constitutions. Among the rest of the bishops he met with little help, but the pope, Alexander III, loyally supported him. The rest of the story is well known. The archbishop soon found himself compelled to leave the kingdom. For nearly six years he remained abroad, an exile and bereft of his revenues. In 1170 a hollow reconciliation was patched up with the king, and Becket returned to Canterbury. But in a few years Canterbury had become a place of pilgrimage throughout Europe. No one who studies carefully the history of the time can escape the immense moral force which such an example lent to the cause of the weak and to the liberties both of the Church and the people, against all forms of absolutism and tyranny. The precise quarrel for which St. Thomas gave his life was relatively a small matter.
What was of supreme importance was the lesson that there was something higher, stronger, and more enduring than the will of the most powerful earthly despot.

The life of the Carthusian, St. Hugh, whom Henry II himself caused to be elected Bishop of Lincoln in 1186, forms an admirable pendant to that of St. Thomas. It may be noted in the first place, in view of the outcry raised a little later against the provision of foreigners to English sees, that St. Hugh was a Burgundian, who even at the end of his life hardly understood the language of the people. But no such rules his diocese better, no man was more beloved alike by his own secular canons of Lincoln and by the numerous religious in his diocese; while, owing to his holiness, his fearlessmness, and his merry humour, he was the only bishop who without yielding an inch of his high prerogatives, preserved his respect and enjoyed the friendship of three such monarchs as Henry II, Richard Cœur de Lion, and John. Very memorable was his firm refusal in the national council to grant Richard an aid in knights and money for foreign warfare. Though the reign of Richard, like that of his predecessors, was still continued to be a period of compromise in law, it was also a period of unparalleled exactions in money. In this case the great Justiciar, Hubert Walter, who was also Archbishop of Canterbury, had made himself the instrument of the king’s designs. Though all the temporal lords submitted, St. Hugh refused. Taken as a whole, these refusal’s “for the convenience sake may be called the national element, was less homogeneous. It comprised the king, the new nobility which represented mainly the great officials of the Crown appointed under Henry I and Henry II, and with these the bishops and clergy almost to a man. Taken as a whole, the two put the advantage of a centralized government and sympathized with the native population, wishing their rights to be respected and justice to be done. Now it was the work of John’s lawful and despotic rule, especially after the restraining influences of Hubert Walter’s withdrawal and death, to break up this combination and to unite all parties against himself. In this the action of Pope Innocent III, culminating in the Interdict and the sentence of deposition pronounced against John, played a most vital part. It is needless to recapitulate the story of the election of Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury, over which John’s quarrel with the Holy See practically began. But it is well to recall that Langton, who rendered such splendid service to the liberties of his country, and whose name is impossibly associated with Magna Charta, was the pope’s own nominee, and was invested with the episcopal consistory before his death, and would have been consecrated with the full Christ Church monks who had been dispatched to Rome. Under stress of the Interdict and of John’s exactions, the old feudal lords, the clergy, and the new “ministerial” nobility gradually drew together. John found that he had more enemies than he had expected at his investiture. He placed them upon whom he could count, and Philip of France with a great following threatened invasion to enforce the pope’s sentence of deposition. Under these circumstances John made his submission to the legate, Pandulf, promising to receive all the exiled bishops and to make restitution for the injuries and losses the Church had sustained. A few days later, on 13 May, the vigil of the Ascension, 1213, he went even further, for he surrendered his crown and kingdom into the hands of the legate to be received back from him as a fief which he and his successors were to hold of the pope for an annual rent of one thousand marks. It is not unnatural, perhaps, that this transaction should have been denounced by historians in the language of unmeasured indignation. Even Lingard in his day described it as “heaping everlasting infamy on the memory of John”, but the considerations he puts forward in explanation of the act have not been without weight with later students. It may be said to be now generally acknowledged that the idea of such a surrender probably did not originate with the pope, but with John himself (see Davis, England under the Normans and Angevins, p. 190, 1905; 369; Norgate, “Jehan Lackland” 1902, p. 181). As the second of these two writers explains, there is a quite intelligible motive for
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The execution of the Charter, but they were far from retaining the sympathy of all. "Before the conference at Runnymede came to an end," says Mackechnie, "confidence in the good intentions of the 25 executors, drawn it must be remembered entirely from the section of the barony of England, whom a papal fetif (Lingard, II, 333; Rymer, I, 185), and it was certainly contrary to feudal usage for a vassal to contract obligations of this serious kind without reference to the overlord.

That the papal condemnation was not directed in principle against English popular liberties, may be inferred from the fact that the Charter was confirmed in November, 1216, upon the accession of the child king, Henry III, at a time when the papal legate Guazo was all-powerful, and was strongly supported by the new pope, Honorius III. The long reign which began, despite the death of Henry, was a period of much distress in England. The king's weakness and his partiality for foreign favourites involved him in a vast expenditure, while, on the other hand, the taxation thus necessitated could only have been carried through without discontent among the barons, and the latter was entirely lacking. Tales and intrigues of all kinds abounded, and the situation was complicated by constant demands for money made by the Holy See. The exactions of the various legates and the never ending "provisions" of papal nominees to canonries and minor benefices, and the strong feeling at the time, and have formed the favourite theme of historians ever since. It would be useless to deny the existence of very serious abuses, more especially the fact that a large number of French and Italian clergy provided to English barons never visited the country at all, and were content with simply drawing the revenues. But on the other hand there is much to be said in extenuation of the papal action, which unfortunately has been set before English readers in the most unfavourable light, owing to the selectivity of the sources. English chronicler, Matthew Paris. How much Paris's judgment was warped by his prejudices, may be clearly seen in his unfriendly references to the friars, though they were then, at least relatively, in their first fervour. Lingard says of him that he seems to have collected and preserved every scandalous anecdote that would gratify his censorious disposition, and he adds a very strong personal expression of opinion regarding Paris's untrustworthiness (Hist. of Eng., II, 479). It is not wonderful that in that outspoken age Matthew Paris and others like him, finding their pockets touched by the papal demands, should have raised an outcry which went a good deal beyond the actual damage inflicted. This very period, when England, it is alleged, was ground under the heel of papal tyranny, "was in all other fields of action, except the political, an epoch of unexampled progress" (Tout in "Polit. Hist. of England", III, 81). Again, the pope's need of money, owing to the life-and-death struggle with the Hohenstaufen, was real enough. In the eyes of Gregory IX and Innocent IV the wars with the excommunicated German emperor were as genuine a crusade in behalf of the Church of God as that undertaken against the Turks. Moreover, with regard to foreign rulers, to foreigners to English benefices, even after making all allowances for the bitter feeling against aliens which manifested itself so often in the reign of Henry III, it is impossible to deny that the world in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and especially the ecclesiastical world, was cosmopolitan to a degree of which we
can now form no conception. In the early part of the thirteenth century nearly all the oldest and most influential men in England had made at least part of their studies in Paris. The two Archbishops of Canterbury, Stephen Langton and St. Edmund Rich, both men of pure English birth, might be instanced as conspicuous examples, and if Englishmen, had been familiar with the names of many foreign ecclesiastics provided for in England, it must not be forgotten that there was quite a considerable number of Englishmen occupying foreign sees and other positions of emolument on the Continent. This fact is indisputable, and it is produced as Englishmen formed a large proportion of the freebooters who roamed through Italy a century later and accepted the pay of anyone who would hire them—but it is interesting to find it proudly insisted upon by Matthew Paris, who in his indignation at the nomination of foreign ecclesiastics to English benefices, declares that England has no occasion to go abroad to beg for suitable candidates, seeing that she herself was rather accustomed to supply dignitaries for other distant lands ( 44. See ed. Anglia extra fines suis in remotis regionibus personas regiminii ecclesiastrum idoneas, quas debuit alios sequi suas ministrationem.—Historia Major, I, 61).

The cosmopolitan tendencies just alluded to were very much increased in the thirteenth century by one of the greatest religious revivals which the world has seen, viz., that resulting from the foundation and rise of mendicant orders. The reason is no reason to suppose that the effects produced by the preaching of the Franciscan and Dominican friars, who first came to England in 1224 and 1221 respectively, were more remarkable in this country than abroad, but all historians are agreed that the impressions made by this populace of religious mendicants were very marked. The work of spiritual regeneration which they performed at the first was wonderful, and they were warmly encouraged by such holy men and patriotic prelates as the great Bishop Grosseste. It is perhaps more important to note that, despite the accusations of that age, and whatever moral meaning it may be said that at a later date, their zeal was not extinguished, even if it flagged. An impartial historian who has given special attention to the subject says: “For more than three hundred years the mendicant Friars in England were on the whole a power for good up and down the land, the friends of the poor and the evangelisers of the masses. During all that long time they were supported only by the voluntary offerings of the people at large—just as the hospitals for the sick and mireable are supported now,—and when they were driven out of their houses and the churches were looted in common with those of the monks and nuns, the Friars had no broad acres and no manors, no real property to seize, and very little was gained by the spoiling of their goods, but inasmuch as they were at all times the most devoted servants and subjects of the Pope of Rome, they had to go at last, when Henry VIII had made up his mind to rule over his own kingdom and to be supreme head over State and Church” (Jesopp, “History of England”, 34).

It was during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that the relations between the medieval English Church and the Holy See assumed their final shape. At least this was the period when with such an outstanding champion as the great Bishop Robert of Lincoln (Grosssteote), or later, under so masterful a ruler as Edward I, or, again, under the growing independence of Parliament, encouraged by such promoters of ecclesiastical action as Wykeford and John of Gaunt in the reign of Edward III, the “Ecclesia Anglicana”, according to the theory recently most prevalent, began to assert herself and resolutely set out to work to put the pope in his place. And here it may be said once for all that not the unnatural impatience of papal supervision and papal interference which was often shown by strong kings like Edward I, and also at times by the clergy themselves, proves absolutely nothing against the acceptance of the pope’s supreme authority as head of the Church. That subordinates should wish to be left free to enjoy a large measure of independence than the ancient Englishmen’s example, may be, for example, may be quite loyal. They may fully recognize in principle the supreme right of the imperial Government, and yet any dictation from home which goes beyond what is customary, and especially when it is of a kind which touches the colonial pocket, provoke resistance and even disobedience. Even a fervent religious order a proposed visitation of some outlying house or province may be met with remonstrance and an appeal to precedent on the part of those who, however doyle, are doubtful of the ability of a foreign authority to understand local conditions. An entire acceptance of the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See is not the least inconsistent with the belief that an individual pontiff, and still more the officials who form the entourage of that pontiff, may be influenced by mercenary or unworthy motives. There is not any form of authority in the world which has not been disobeyed and defied under more or less specious pretexts by those who fully recognize in principle their own subordination. Thus it happens that the supporters of Anglican Continuity theories are able to quote many utterances of medieval writers that sound on one tone, they appeal to many individual acts of disobedience, but they fail altogether in producing any, even the faintest, repudiation in principle of the pope’s spiritual supremacy by the accredited representatives of the pre-Reformation Church. By no historian has this truth been more clearly recognized than the distinguished jurist, F. W. Maitland. Challenging the statement of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission of 1883, which, largely under the guidance of the eminent historian, Bishop Stubbs, reported that “papal law was not binding in [medieval] England even in questions of faith and morals unless it had been accepted by the national authorities”, Professor Maitland, with an irrefragable array of illustrations drawn mainly from the classical canon-law book of the English pre-Reformation Church, the “Ponvincia” of Bishop Lyndwood (1435), maintains the exact contrary. According to Lyndwood, as Dr. Maitland clearly proves, “The Pope is above the law, . . . to dispute the authority of a papal decretal is to be guilty of heresy, at a time when deliberate heresy was a capital crime”. “The last”, Dr. Maitland continues, “is no private opinion of a glossator, it is a principle to which all bishops, bishops and clergy of the province of Canterbury have adhered by solemn words” (Roman Canon Law, 17). As the same authority goes on to show, not only did the pope claim and obtain recognition of his right to take into his own hands the judgment of every ecclesiastical cause over the head of the bishop, but it was largely through the questions and appeals of English bishops to Rome, asking for decisions, that the fabric of Roman canon law was built up (loc. cit., 53, 66, etc.). In full accord with this we find Archbishop Peckham telling such a monarch as Edward I that the laws given authority in the persons of the popes, and that all kings are bound by those decrees. So we find the Archbishop of Canterbury with all his suffragans writing a joint letter to the pope and telling him that all bishops derived their authority from him as rivulets from the fountainhead (Sandby’s Register). We find the pope carving a big slice from the jurisdiction of English bishoprics, as in the case of the Abbey of St. Albans or of Bury St. Edmunds, and making it absolutely and entirely exempt from episcopal authority. We find the very kings who are supposed by their Statutes of Provisors and Premonastrie to have
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shaken off their allegiance to Rome, begging the sovereign pontiff in most respectful language to issue letters of provision or Bulls of confirmation in favour of such and such an ecclesiastic who enjoys the royal favour. No doubt these statutes of Provisors and Provosts do in some measure carry an important word in the history of the English Church during the fourteenth century, though it is admitted that they were so continually set aside that the permanent result of the legislation was greatly to strengthen the development of the king's dispensing power. The Statutes of Provisors, of which the first was passed in 1351, claimed for the existing bodies and persons the right to elect to prevent freely to the benefices in their gift, and moreover declared invalid all appointments brought about by way of papal "provision", i.e. nomination. Two years later this legislation was supplemented by the first Statute of Praemunire, which enacted that those who brought matters cognizable in the King's Courts before foreign courts should be liable to forfeiture and outlawry. It has been maintained that these acts prove that the English Church did not acknowledge any providing power in the Holy See. To this we may reply (1) that, like all the other English bishops, Grosseteste, like Grosseteste, who is so constantly represented as the champion of English resistance to papal authority, in this matter fully recognized the right in principle, though he protested against abuses in the use of it; (2) that the legislation at least professed to be passed not in a spirit of hostility to Rome, but as a remedy against abuses caused by benefice-providers.—priests thronging to Rome and importing the Holy See for benefits. It was the lay patrons of livings whose interests suffered by the papal provisions who were the chief promoters of the Acts. (3) That the bishops refused to consent to the Acts (Stubbs, "Corr. Hist.", III, 340) and contended to be entered on the rolls of Parliament; (4) that the bishops and clergy petitioned spontaneously and repeatedly for their repeal (ibid., 342), that the universities, in 1399, declared that the Acts operated to the injury of the Church, and that in 1415 the Commons also petitioned the king for the abolition of the Statute of Provisors; (5) that the kings themselves disregarded the Acts and constantly asked the popes to provide to the sees; (6) that it is universally admitted that papal provisions were more numerous after the passing of the Acts than before. In 1302, preceding the Reformation 313 bishops are known to have been provided by the popes; of these 47 were before the passing of the Statute, 266 after it (see Moyes in "The Tablet", 2 Dec., 1893). One thing is certain, that England in several instances owed some of its best and holiest prelates to the action of the popes in providing to English sees in opposition to the known wishes of the king. Stephen Langton, in 1205, St. Edmund Rich, in 1232, and John Peckham, in 1279, are conspicuous examples. We have already said above that a reaction against current Anglican theories regarding the position of the pope in the medieval English Church has been steadily growing during the last quarter of a century. The complete agreement of such writers as Professor F. M. Maitland, Dr. James Gairdner, and Mr. H. Rashdall, approaching the subject along quite different lines of research, is very remarkable. The following passage from one of the most distinguished of the younger school of English historians, Prof. Tout, of Manchester, states the case as frankly as it could have been stated by Lingard himself. After insisting that the Statutes of Provisors and Praemunire, like that of Labourers, or the statutes of bodies and persons in the same regal practice, and after declaring that to the average clergyman or theologian of the day the pope was the one Divinely appointed source of ecclesiastical authority, the shepherd to whom the Lord had given commission to feed His sheep, Prof. Tout continues: "The anti-papal laws of the fourteenth century were the acts of the secular not of the ecclesiastical power. They were not simply antipapal, they were also anti clerical in their tendency, since to the man of the age an attack on the Pope was an attack on the Church. . . . The Englishman, though at no time an important advocate of the curialists, still believed that the Pope was the divinely appointed autocrat of the Church universal. Being a man, a Pope might be a bad Pope; but the faithful Christian, though he might lament and protest, could not but obey in the last resort. The papacy was so essentially interwoven with the whole Church of the Middle Ages, that few ignorant people have less historical basis than the notion that there was an antipapal Anglican Church in the days of the Edwards" (Polit. Hist. of Eng., III, 379). No one who carefully studies the language and acts of such a man as Grosseteste can fail to realize the truth that in spite of all his fearless criticism of the Roman Curia, his attitude of mind is thoroughly reverential to papal authority. The most famous, as being the least temperately worded, of all his pronouncements is now known to have been addressed, not, as formerly thought, to Pope Innocent IV himself, but to one of his subordinates. On the other hand, as Mr. Maitland points out, Grosseteste throughout his life proclaimed in the strongest terms his belief in the plenitude of the papal power. "I know", he says, "and I affirm without any reserve that there belongs to our lord the Pope, and to the Holy Roman Church, the power of disposing freely of the ecclesiastical benefices bestowed by benefactors." And language, acknowledging, for example, the pope to be the sun from which other bishops, like the moon and stars, receive whatever powers they have to illuminate and fructify the Church, was not only maintained by Grosseteste to the end (see "The Month", March, 1896), but re-echoed by Bishop Arundel nearly two centuries afterwards.

So again the occurrences which followed the publication by Boniface VIII of the Bull "Clerici laicos", in the days of Edward I and Archbishop Winchelsea, tend to show that even when the attitude of a position which was too extreme and from which he was forced ultimately to retire, the English Church was not less, but more, loyal to the Apostolic See than other, Continental nations. Nothing could be less true to the facts of history than the idea that England stood apart from the rest of Christendom, with an ecclesiastical law, a theology, or in any essential matter even a ritual, of her own. The cosmopolitanism of the religious orders, especially the mendicants, and of the universities, would alone have sufficed to render this isolation impossible. England's isolation began when she broke away from the Roman obedience, suppressed the religious orders, banished every Catholic priest, and adopted a pronunciation of Latin which no Continental scholar could understand.

The great disturbing force in the ecclesiastical life of England during the fourteenth century, much more than the Statutes of Provisors or even the Black Death, was the rise and spread of Lollardy. We may perhaps doubt if the significance of the movement in this country was by any means as great as that which historians, partly on account of the Bohemian upheaval under John Hus which grew out of Wyclif's doctrines, partly through the favourite modern theory that Lollardy produced the Reformation, have generally attributed to it. Dr. James Gairdner, however, who has recently investigated the whole movement and its sequel with a thoroughness and knowledge of original materials to which no previous historian could lay claim, has brought into light views which tend very seriously to modify the views hitherto very commonly received. In his idea the novelty and the socialistic tendency of the opinions so boldly proclaimed by Wyclif did constitute a grave political danger, a danger which was not, perhaps, so acute in
the reformer’s lifetime because the most startling of his views developed late, only ten years or less before his death (1384), but which were eagerly caught up and even exaggerated by ignorant disciples at a time of weak rule and political unrest. The fact that the Great Schism followed upon the death of the pope before Wyclif’s death added to the complications by leaving the greater part of Christendom in a state of uncertainty as to which of the rival popes had the better claim to men’s allegiance, and to this cause most probably is due the fact that Wyclif was left during his last years to propagate his doctrines entirely undisturbed. That his doctrines were utterly revolutionary, as judged by any standard of opinion tolerated up to that time it would be absurd to deny. No one can fail to see the danger of teaching that there was no real dominion, no real authority, no real ownership of property without the grace of God. From this he deduced the conclusions that a man in mortal sin had no right to anything at all, that among Christians there ought to be community of goods, and that, as to the clergy having property of their own, it was a gross abuse. Similarly he held that every layman had created rights for priest, bishop, and pope; that the pope was only to be obeyed when he taught according to Scripture, and that a king might take away all the endowments of the Church. With these were combined in his later years theological opinions regarding the sacraments and Transubstantiation which were offered at the council and in the Litany of the exiles of the year of the great Peasants’ War of 1381. Wyclif, no doubt, in his philosophical teaching provided safeguards which mitigated the practical consequences of the principles he held, but these were subtleties which were lost upon the more ignorant and fastening on his followers, more or less, on their master’s death. The points that they clearly understood were that tithes were pure alms, and that if the parish priests were not good men the tithes need not be paid; that a priest receiving any annual allowance by compact was simoniacal and excommunicated; that a priest who said Mass in mortal sin did not validly consecrate, but rather committed idolatry; that any priest could hear confessions (without faculties), and in fact that any holy layman proclaimed by God was competent to administer the sacraments without ordination. Such opinions as these, debated among learned men, were not, in the true sense of the word, religious opinions, nor were they primarily intended as such, but based on a constant railing against devotional practices, such as pilgrimages, and against the Roman Court, the fiefs and all ecclesiastical authority, were obviously full of danger to social order at a time when the Black Death was at its height, and the question of villegaigne which resulted from it, had already provided many elements of disturbance.

Speaking of the proceedings against the foremost representative of Lollard opinions, Sir John Oldcastle, in 1413, Dr. Gairdner says: “It seems to have been a life-and-death struggle between established order and heresy”; and Bishop Stubbs, while doing too much honour by far to the fanatic creed of the Wycliffite leader, remarks: “Perhaps we shall most safely conclude from the tenor of history that his doctrinal creed was far sounder than the principles which guided either his moral or his political engagements, and which really sum up the situation. The Wycliffite heresy became for a while a real danger to the peace of the country, as Oldcastle’s insurrection proved. On the other hand, there was very little that was either sane or inspiring in the dreams which inspired the leaders, and which were imparted to their often very ignorant followers. Given the ideas then, and long after, universally prevalent in regard to heresy and the measures of repression necessary to prevent infection from spreading, there was nothing exceptionally cruel or intolerant about the statute “De hereticis ordin predictis” of 1401, which provided that heretics convicted before a spiritual court, and refusing to recant, were to be handed over to the secular arm and burnt. There can be no doubt that before this extreme measure was resorted to much provocation had been given by the preaching of doctrines which all Christians then deemed blasphemous, and which were not confined to Lollardy. Perhaps the greatest of the clerical party saw in the insurrection of the clergy, but touched upon the sanctity of marriage and the observance of Sunday as a day of rest. Dr. Gairdner, after a very careful survey of all the evidence, is satisfied that Archbishop Arundel and his suffragans acted in the interests of public order and discipline. There was a strong temptation to prosecute the leaders of such a movement as Wyclif’s heresy with the greatest possible severity; but the statement is somewhat surprising that there is no evidence of the movement being either supinely or tyrannically. In point of fact after the suppression of Oldcastle’s insurrection and his execution at the stake, Lollardy was no longer to be feared as a political power. Wyclif’s ideas had little hold in England among men of any weight or consideration. They lingered on for a while and perhaps never entirely died down, though prosecutions for heresy became very rare long before the end of the fifteenth century, but they certainly cannot be regarded as a direct and primary cause of the religious changes which took place in the reign of Henry VIII. Perhaps the most important in its practical consequences of all Wyclif’s tenets was the supreme importance which he attributed to Holy Scripture. In his treatise “De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae”, written about 1378, he practically adopts the position that Scripture is the sole rule of faith. It followed in his mind that the word of God, as he understood it, was not accessible to all, and that all men were free to interpret it for themselves. We are told, moreover, by a contemporary and hostile authority, the chronicler Knighton, that Wyclif himself translated the Gospel into English. Upon this and other evidence it is commonly supposed that Wyclif was the first to bring the Bible to the knowledge of English readers and that the medieval Church uniformly adopted the practice of withholding the Scriptures from the laity. It is to the credit of modern students of medieval history that the grave misrepresentations involved in this traditional Protestant view are now generally abandoned (see e.g. Gairdner, “Lollardy“, 1, 100–17; “Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Literature”, i, 56–82). We may summarize from the former of these writers the following conclusions, which represent what is best worth recalling upon this subject. The English Church was not opposed to all principles of the use of vernacular translations. Undoubtedly, translations into English of separate books of Scripture existed as far back as in the days of Bede. It is improbable, however, that a whole Bible in English, as distinct from Anglo-Saxon, was translated into English by Wyclif’s time; neither was it much required, for nearly all who could read, could read the Bible either in the Latin of the Vulgate, which the Church preferred, or in French. There was, however, no express prohibition to translate the Scriptures into English until the publication of the Provincial Synod of Oxford, which was published in 1409. This prohibition was not seemingly occasioned by corrupt renderings or anything liable to censure in the text, but simply by the fact that it was composed for the general use of the laity, who were encouraged to interpret it in their own way without the aid of the Church. These engagements were not to the advantage of the Church and were to be condemned. In fine, Dr. Gairdner concludes: “To the possession by worthy laymen of licensed translations the Church was never opposed, but to place such a weapon as an English Bible in the hands of men who had no regard for authority, and who could use it, without being instructed to use it properly, was dangerous not only to the souls of those who read, but to the peace and order of the Church."
ity and existing probably before Wycli's time. There are not wanting arguments in support of such a contention, but the difficulties are also serious, and the theory cannot be said to have found general acceptance.

The fifteenth century, owing mainly to the long minority of King Henry VI, and to the Wars of the Roses, was a period of political disturbance, and it does not add much to the ecclesiastical history of the country. We shall do well, however, to note that the invention of printing in England, as elsewhere, was cordially welcomed by the Church, and that it was under the shadow of the English Abbeys of Westminster and St. Albans that the earliest presses were erected. Despite the religious indifference which is supposed to have heralded the Reformation, the tone of the literature given to the world at these presses seems to bear witness to the prevalence of a very genuine spirit of piety.

As the story of the English Reformation is more fully told in the second part of this article, while many separate articles are to be found in The Catholic Encyclopedia dealing with particular phases and leading personalities, it is well here to put the general outline of the change as it will suffice to conclude this sketch of pre-Reformation England. Catholic historians and all others, except a small minority representing a particular school of Anglicanism, are agreed that, so far as England was concerned, even after the Wycli movement, the spirit of the dispensation of the Church was rendered impossible by the stirrings of the revival of learning which had done its worst, the position of the Church under the jurisdiction of Rome remained as secure as it had ever been. Lollardry no doubt had inculcated a certain section of the nation, and there were here and there stirrings indicative of a doctrine of spiritualism and of a desire for a reversion to the early days of the Church of St. Peter, but with an episcopate thoroughly loyal to the Holy See and with the support of the king, the strong government, these tremblings threatened no danger to the religious peace of the kingdom at large. Neither does there seem to have been any great decay of moral standards, even during the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII, but with an episcopate thoroughly loyal to the Holy See and with the support of the king, the strong government of the Church, the Church in England was able to maintain itself and to set up the foundation of its future greatness.

The public opinion of the learned world has in all substantial respects endorsed Abbot Gasquet's vindication of the doctrine of the Roman Church as being the true Church, and the decisions of the Church in England during the reign of Henry VIII are indicative of this. The Church of England was able to maintain itself and to set up the foundation of its future greatness.
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many minds. A great part of Germany was already in revolt, and England was not so isolated but that the echoes of controversy reached her shores. All these things had made Henry's task easier, but for the severance of England from the obedience of the pope he, and he alone, was responsible. So far as Parliament had any share in the matter, the Parliament was Henry's to rule. This estimate of the situation, which was long ago put forward by such writers as Dodd and Lingard, has impressed itself of late years with ever-increasing force upon Anglican opinion and will nowhere be found in the writings of Dr. Brewer and Dr. James Gairdner, who, on the contrary, have written on the other side of the question. It is true that the first-hand acquaintance with all the manuscript materials for the reign of Henry VIII, are entitled to speak with supreme authority.

The fact that Henry was himself an amateur theologian and had vindicated against Luther the Catholic doctrine of the sacraments, thereby earning from Leo X the title of "Defender of the Faith," was probably fraught with tremendous consequences in the situation created by his attempted divorce from Queen Catherine. Profoundly impressed with his own dialectical abilities, and with that keen sense of the immense sound of law, and this probably carried him, almost without his being aware of it, into positions from which no retreat was possible to a man of his temperament. It was in 1529 that the papal commission to Wolsey and Campeggio, to pronounce upon the validity of the dispensation granted to Henry, and the humane and practical reform of learning which he was Freemason and Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell, were ready at hand to second his designs, skilfully anticipating and furthering the king's wishes. To Cranmer is undoubtedly due the suggestion that Henry might obtain sufficient authority for treating his marriage as null if only he procured a number of opinions to that effect from the universities of Christendom. This was acted upon, and, by various arts and after the expenditure of a good deal of money, a collection of highly favourable answers was obtained. From Cromwell, on the other hand, the idea came that the king should make the charge of the most grievous charge, the Church in England and thus get rid of the imperium in imperio. This was ingeniously contrived by the outgoing pretence that the clergy had collectively incurred the penalties of Pramunire by recognizing Wolsey's legislative jurisdiction; though this, of course, had been exercised with the royal knowledge and authority. Upon this preposterous pretext the clergy in convocation were compelled to make a huge grant of money and to insert a clause in the preamble of the vote acknowledging the king as "Protector and Supreme Head of the Church of England, as far as the law of Christ allows." This last clause was only inserted after much debate, though it seems that at that time Henry was willing that the phrase "Supreme Head" should be understood in a way that was not inconsistent with the supremacy of the pope. At any rate, even after this, bishops still continued to receive their Bulls from Rome, and the royal divorce still continued to be pleaded there. Early in 1532 another move was made. The Commons were persuaded to frame a supplication against the clergy of which drafts remain in the handwriting of Cromwell, showing from whom it emanated. This, after various negotiations and a certain number of clauses in the "Submission of the Clergy," by which they promised not to legislate for the future without submitting their enactments for the approval of the king and a mixed committee of Parliament. To bring pressure to bear on the pope, the king caused Parlia-
ment to leave it in Henry’s power to withhold from the Holy See altogether the payment of annates, or first-fruits of bishoprics, which consisted in the amount of the first year’s revenue. By such gradual steps the breach with Rome was brought about, though even as late as January, 1533, application in a form most discreditably insincere was still made to Rome for the Bull of the new Archbishop of Canterbury, Cranmer, who had been elected on Warham’s death, and who took the oaths of obedience to the pope, though he had previously declared that he regarded them as null and void. Almost immediately afterwards Cranmer pronounced sentence of divorce between Henry and Catherine. The king then had Anne Boleyn crowned, and an Act of Succession was passed next year with a preamble and an oath to be taken by every person of lawful age. Parliament all submitted and took the oath, but More and Fisher refused and were sent to the Tower. The climax of the whole work of disruption may be considered to have been reached in November, 1534, by the passing of the Act of Supremacy, which declared the king Supreme Head of the Church of England, this time without any qualification, and which annexed the title to his imperial crown.

A reign of terror now began for all who were unwilling to accept exactly that measure of teaching about matters religious and political which the king thought fit to impose. Fisher and More had been sent to the block, and others, like the Carthusians, who rallied themselves under Cranmer, were dispatched by that ghastly and more ignominious death-penalty assigned to cases of high treason. In virtue of this martyrdom these and many more are now venerated upon our altars as beatified servants of God. The rising in the Midlands known as the Pilgrimage of Grace followed; and, when this dangerous movement had been frustrated by the astuteness and unscrupulous perjury of the king’s representatives, fresh horrors were witnessed in a repression which knew no mercy. Previous to this had taken place the suppression of the smaller monasteries; and that of the larger houses soon followed, while an Act for the dissolution of chantries and free hospitals was passed in 1545, which there was not time to carry entirely into execution before the king’s death. Probably all these things, even the destruction of shrines and images, reflect a certain incapacity in the king’s nature rather than hostility to what would now be called popish practices. In his sacramental theology he still clung to the positions of the “Assertio septem sacramentorum,” the book he had written to refute Luther. Both in the Six Articles and in the “Necessary Doctrine” the dogma of Transubstantiation is insisted upon; and indeed more than one unfortunate reformer who denied the Real Presence was sent to the stake. It was on this side that Henry’s task was hardest. Against the Papalist sympathizers amongst his own subjects he consistently maintained a resolute policy, neither did nor permitted to be cowed into submission. Towards men of Calvinist and Lutheran tendencies, who were represented in high places by Cranmer, Cromwell, and many more, the king had intermittently shown favour. He had used them to do his work. They had been of the greatest assistance in prejudicing the cause of the pope, and even the most violent and scurrilous had rendered him service. True, the railing translation of the New Testament by Tyndale, which had been printed and brought to England as early as 1526, was prohibited, as was Coverdale’s Bible later on, in 1546, very near the close of his reign. It is plain that the security of the maples was not regarded by him as dangerous to public order. Very remarkable are the words used by Henry in his last speech in Parliament, when he deplored the results of promiscuous Bible-reading: “I am very sorry to know how that most precious jewel, the Word of God, is disputed, rhymed, sung and jangled in every alehouse. I am equally sorry that readers of the same follow it so faintly and coldly in living; of this I am sure, that charity was never so faint among you, and virtuous and godly living was never less used, and God Himself among Christians was never less revered, and served.”

If ever a moral and religious cataclysm was the work of one man, most assuredly the first stage of the Reformation in England was the work of Henry VIII. One could wish we knew that the sense of his own personal responsibility for the evils he had done or carried home to him before the hour, when, on 28 January, 1547, he was summoned to his account.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature in the religious condition of England during the last year of Henry’s reign was the fact that besides the king himself, there were probably not a score of persons who were contented with the existing settlement. One large section of the nation was in complete sympathy with the doctrines of the German reformers, and to them the Mass, confession, communion in one kind, etc., which had been preserved untouched throughout all the changes, were simply as gall and wormwood. The greatest advantage, on the other hand, was remarka-

ble in the more remote and thinly populated districts, longed for the restoration of the old order of things. They wished to see the monks back, St. Thomas of Canterbury and the shrines of Our Lady once more in honour, and the pope recognized as the common father of Christendom. During the two short reigns which then intervened before Elizabeth came to the throne each of these parties alternately gained the ascendant. Under Edward VI, the Protector Somerset, and after him the Duke of Northumberland, in full harmony with Cranmer, Hooper, and other bishops even more Calvinistically minded, abolished all remnants of popery. Chantry and guilds were suppressed, and their revenues confiscated, images in the churches, and then altars and vestments were removed and destroyed, while the material desecration was only typical of the outrages done to the ancient liturgy of Catholic worship in the first and second Books of Common Prayer. (See Anglicanism; Anglican Orders; Book of Common Prayer.) The bishops who were more Catholic-minded, like Bonner and Gardiner, were sent to the Tower. Princess Mary was subjected to the meanest and most petty forms of persecution. But it can be maintained that those in power were anointed by any disinterested devotion to Reformation principles. Spoliation in its most vulgar form was the order of the day. It is only of late years that fuller historical research has done justice to what seemed the one redeeming feature in the general work of destruction—the foundation of the grammar.
schools which are known by the name of King Edward VI. We have now learned that not one of these schools was originally of Edwardian creation (see Leach, "English Schools at the Reformation"). Educational resources had already been seriously impaired under Henry VIII, and the death of the King left the name of Edward VI owe nothing to him or his government but a more economic establishment. A good many of them had been chantry schools, for if the chantry priest of old wasted his time in singing for souls he not infrequently did good work as a schoolmaster. So says a judicious summarizer of Mr. Leach's researches.

There can be no doubt that these violent measures provoked a reaction. Already in 1549 there had been serious insurrections all over the country, and more particularly in Devonshire and in Norfolk. On the death of the boy king, in June, 1553, an attempt was made by Northumberland to secure the succession for Lady Jane Grey, but Mary, at least for the time, had the people completely with her, and now it was the turn of Bonner, Gardiner, and the Catholic reaction. Overtures were made to the reigning pope, Julius III, and to the Cardinal Pole, whose mission as envoy to England was unfortunately delayed by the Emperor Charles V for diplomatic reasons connected with the marriage of Queen Mary to his son Philip II, reached England in November, 1554, where he was warmly received. After the Houses of Parliament through the king and queen, and appointed humbly to the reconciliation with the Holy See, Pole, on St. Andrew's day, 30 November, 1554, formally pronounced absolom, the king and queen and all present kneeling to receive it. The restoration of ecclesiastical property confiscated during the previous reign was not insisted upon, so that Mary himself, chiefly remebered by the severity with which the statutes against heresy, now revived by Parliament, were put into force. Crammer had been previously sentenced to death for high treason, and the sentence seems to have been politically just, but it was not of one extended. There seems to have been no desire upon the part of Mary or any of her chief advisers for cruel reprisals, but the reactionary forces always at work seem to have frightened them into sterner measures, and, as a result, Crammer, Latimer, Ridley, and a multitude of lesser Protestant prelates and clergymen, and would not of their own accord have refused to recant their heresies, were condemned and executed at the stake. No one has judged this miserable epoch of persecution more leniently than the historian who of all others has made himself alive in the spirit of the times. Dr. James Gasquet, stanch Anglican as he is, in his latest work, "Lollardy and the Reformation", seems only to press farther the apology which he has previously offered for their terrible measures of repression. Thus he says: "With all this one might imagine that it was not easy for Mary to be tolerant of the new religion, and yet tolerant she was at first, as far as she well could be. The case was simply that there were a number of persons determined not to demand mere toleration for themselves, but to pluck down what they called idolatry everywhere and to keep the Edwaridine service in the parish churches in defiance of all authority, and even the sentences of their fellow parishioners. In short, there was a spirit of rebellion still in the land which had its root in religious bitterness; and if Mary was to reign in peace, and order to be upheld, that spirit must be repressed. Two hundred and seventy-seven persons are recorded to have been burnt in various counties during the first nine months, from the time the persecution began to the death of Mary. But the appalling number of the sufferers must not blind us altogether to the provocation. Nor must it be forgotten that if it be once judged right to pass an Act of Parliament it is right to put it in force." And as the same authority elsewhere says, "Amongst the victims no doubt, there were many true heroes and really honest men, but many of them would have been persecutors if they had had their way." Queen Mary died 17 November, 1558, and Cardinal Pole passed away on the same day twelve hours later.

Todidactic at any length the monastic chronicles, the charters, rolls, and other records which constitute the ultimate sources of our information regarding the medieval history of England in this particular article can in any case be made of the many serviceable works which have been published in recent years. It will be convenient then to follow first the names of some Catholic authors in which the reader is likely to find generally useful, and then to select a section of miscellaneous works, from a standpoint which is at any rate not distinguishedly Catholic.


Non-Catholic Works.—Of general histories, three different series produced within the last few years may be recommended as representative of the best modern scholarship and as conscientiously impartial in the treatment of religious questions: The Political History of England, of which the five volumes reaching from 54 B.C. to A.D. 1547 are written respectively by T. Horne, G. B. Adams, T. E. Tout, C. Oman, H. A. L. Fisher (London, 1904—1955).—Mr. Tout's volume in particular is excellent. A History of Religion in Six Volumes.—The first four volumes, reaching from the beginning to the age of Elizabeth, are written respectively by C. M. Davis, Owen Edwards, and A. D. Innes (London, 1960—1966). By far the best contribution in this series is that of Mr. Davis. The first history on which extend to the death of Queen Mary, have respectively for authors W. H. Hunt, Dean Stanley, A. F. Pollard, and G. A. Gardiner (London, 1901—1902). Dr. Gardiner's work is indispensable to the student of the Reformation period.—The works of the late Bishop Stubbs have a large influence on historical study in England. The most noteworthy are the Constitutional History (5 vols.); the Select Charters, and the histories of the relations to various communities; to which Mr. Hodge, W. E. H. Lecky, W. H. St. John Hope, and C. A. M. Huse, among others, have added their comments. Of these, most published separately, the years during the Norman period are now somewhat out of date, but the chief defect of his work from a Catholic point of view is adherenee to the fiction of a national English Church independent of Rome.—Freeman, Norman Conquest (5 vols.) and William Rufus (2 vols.) show an immense command of detail, but are biased by the author's rather eclectic and imperialist, many of the less reliable conclusions of Stubbe and Freeman will be found corrected in the works of Tailleurs.
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which are of primary importance in more than one field. His 
Roman Canon Law in the Church of England (1898) is of 
the very high value as correctly stating the position of the 
Church in regard to the Holy See. His History of English Law 
(1896), Domestic Book and Beyond (1897), and various con-
tributions to Past and Present, Social Studies and Journal 
(1901), are of great importance. His book, especially from a 
legal and constitutional point of view. For the later period ending in the reign of Henry VIII or Mary, the work 
of S. Brading, particularly the Prefaces to the Calendars 
treated under the title of The Reign of Henry VIII (to the 
Death of Wolsey) (1896), is a valuable and important, es-
pecially as correcting the inaccurate uncorrectness of 
Froude. Dr. Gardiner in particular has recently published 
works on the Reformations (2 vols., 1900), which do 
juest full justice to the Catholic position.

Among other works of note may be mentioned: Böhmer, 
Kings and their Last in England and in the Normandie (Leipzig, 
1890); Id., Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks (Leipzig, 
1890), and others have shown; Hallam’s Feudal England (London, 1895); Norgate, England under the 
Anglo-Saxon Kings (2 vols., London, 1897); Id., John Lackland (London, 1895); Stevenson, Robert Grosseteste (London, 1899); 
Bliss and Tawney, Calendars of Entries in Papal Registers 
Relating to Great Britain and Ireland (8 vols., already published); 
Jennings, Dr. englisch-Petersburg (Heidelberg, 1903); 
Chadwick, Historical Essays (London, 1903); Id., Historical 
Lectures (London, 1903)—both these able works are much biased by 
the writer’s Anglican standpoint; Jevons, The Coming of the 
Froats (London, 1899); Brewer, Preface to the Monuments 
Franciscans in R. S., and to the works of Geraldus Cambren-
isis; Makower, Constitutional History of the Church of England 
(Leipzig, 1896). While, History of England under the Tudor 
(4 vols. 1892–96); Workman, John Wyclif (London, 1902); 
Dr. Gasquet and the Old English Bible in the Church Quarterly 
Review, 1894; Id., The Maid of France (London, 1906); 
Gardiner, The Poston Letters (3 vols., London, 1872–75); 
Inson, History of the Church of England from 1529 to 1660; 
Lond., 1892); Id., Essex, Rom. Doh., zur Geschichte der 
Reformation in England (2 vols., 1903); Id., Heinrichs VIII (Padborn, 1902)—a Cath. work. Of the 
Dissolution of the Monasteries, there is a study 
Tyttler, England under Edward VI and Mary (2 vols., London, 1899); Leigh, 
English Schools at the Reformations (London, 1898); Pocock, on 
The Reign of Edward VI in English Historical Review, July, 1895.

For social and economic condition of England, see Ashley, 
An Economic History of England (1898); Arnold, Social Studies 
(1902); Id. Economic History of England (1902); Brown, 
(2 vols., Camb. 1898); Tawney, Religious History of 
England, Agriculture and Prices (6 vols., London, 1866–87); Id., Six 
Centuries of Work and Wages (2 vols., 1891); Rashdall, 
Universities of Eng. (Eng. ed., 3 vols., Oxford, 1903); Chambers, The Medi-

HERBERT THURSTON.

ENGLAND SINCE THE REFORMATION—The Protestant 
Reformation is the great dividing line in the 
history of England, as of Europe generally. This 
monumental Revolution, the outcome of many causes, 
assumed varying shapes in different countries. The 
Anglican Church sits on which no one has ventured to 
remove, and the Church of England, as it stood in the 
time of the Reformation, is the Anglican Church today, 
with the same important, the same peculiarities, 
the same ecclesiastical and civil government, 
the same authority, the same organization. Lord Macaulay is well warranted in 
saying in his essay on Hallam’s “Constitutional His-
tory”, that “of those who had any important share 
in bringing it about, Ridley was, perhaps, the only 
man who did not consider it a mere political job”, 
and that the Archbishops did not play a part. 
We shall now proceed, first, to trace the 
history of the so-called Reformation in England, 
and then to indicate some of its results.

It was not until the twenty-sixth year of the reign of 
Henry the Eighth—the year 1535—that the Eng-
lish Schism was consummated. The instrument by 
which that consummation was effected was the “Act 
concerning the King’s Highness to be the Supreme 
Head of the Church of England, and to have authority 
to reform and redress all errors, heresies and abuses in 
the same.” The Act was not, as Shakespeare 
has it, that which makes her a whole, is the right of the 
civil power to be the supreme judge of her doctrine.” 
(Allies, “See of S. Peter”, 3rd ed., p. 54.) The Act of 
Supremacy was the outcome of a struggle between 
Henry VIII and the pope, extending over six years. 
Assuredly no such measure was originally contem-
plated. The narrow reformist spirit of Wolsey 
manifested a devotion to the Holy See which Sir 
Thomas More thought excessive (Roper’s Life of 
More, p. 66). The sole cause of his quarrel with 
the See of Rome was supplied by the affair of the 
socalled Divorce. On 22 April, 1530, he ascended the 
English throne, being then eighteen years old; and on 3 June 
the following he was wedded, by dispensation of 
Pope Julius, to the Spanish princess, Catherine, who 
had previously gone through the form of marriage with his 
e Elder brother Arthur. That prince had died in 1502, 
at the age of sixteen, five months after this marriage, 
which was held not to have been consummated; and 
so Catherine, at her nuptials with Henry, was arrayed 
not as a widow, but as a virgin, in a white robe, with 
her hair falling over her shoulders. Henry cohabited 
with her for sixteen years, and had issue three sons, 
who died at their birth or shortly afterwards, as well 
as a daughter, Mary, who survived him. In that 
time, and until several years after the death of his 
wife, Henry, never a model of conjugal fidelity, 
conceived a personal repulsion for his wife, who was 
six years older than himself, whose physical charms 
had faded, and whose health was impaired; he also 
began to entertain scruples as to his union with her. 
Whether, as an old prude, he did not suspect that 
her scruples were suggested to him by Cardinal Wolsey, 
or whether his personal repulsion prepared the way for 
them, or merely seconded them, is uncertain. But 
certain it is that about this time, to use Shakespeare’s 
phrase, “the King’s upon some errant too tender 
body”, that lady being Anne Boleyn. Here, again, 
each chronololgy is impossible. We know that in 
1532 Cardinal Wolsey repelled Lord Percy from a 
project of marriage with Anne on the ground that “the 
King intended to prefer her to another”. But there is 
no evidence that Henry then desired her for himself. 
However that may have been, several years elapsed 
befre his passion for her, whatever the date of its 
origin, gathered that overmastering force which led 
him to resolve with fixed determination to put away 
Catherine in order to possess her. For marriage was 
now almost generally considered as a fruitless 
enterprise by experienced persons. Henry’s relations with her family had been 
scandalous. There is evidence, strong if not abso-
lutely conclusive—it is summed up in the Introduction 
to Lewis’ translation of Sander’s work, “De 
Schismate Anglicano” (London, 1877)—that he had 
had an intrigue with another ghost, fastened on the 
royal crest, at one time widely credited, that she was his own 
daughter. It is certain that her sister Mary had been his mistress, and had been very poorly provided for 
by him when the liaison came to an end, a fact which 
doubtless put Anne in a very unpleasant position. 
That the king had contrived precisely the same affinity with her, 
by reason of this intrigue, as that which he alleged to be the 
cause of his conscientious scruples with regard to Cath-
tine, did not in the least weigh with her, or with him. 
The first formal step towards the putting away of 
Catherine appears to have been taken in 1537, when 
Henry caused himself to be cited before Cardinal Wol-
sey and Archbishop Warham on the charge of living 
incestuously with his brother’s widow. The pro-
cedings were secret, and the Court held three sessions, 
then adjourning sine die for the purpose of consulting 
with the pope; but the matter was not referred to the 
church courts, and the question whether marriage with a deceased brother’s wife was lawful. The majority of the replies were in the affirmative, with the proviso that a papal dispensation 
had been obtained. Henry, thus baffled, then deter-
mined to proceed in common form of law, and Sir 
Francis Gurry in his learned work, “Marrige, and 
Family Relations”, has summed up the proceedings as
follows: "By a process well known to Ecclesiastical Law, the King wished to institute his suit in the Appeal Court for this purpose given original jurisdiction. With this object, instead of, as originally intended, suing in an English Consistory or Arches Court, from which he had to Rome, otherwise called the Roman Curia, occupied by the armies of Charles V, a commission from Pope Clement, dated June 9, and confirmed by a pollicitatio dated July 13, 1528, was obtained constituting the two cardinals a Legata Papal Court of both original supreme and ultimate jurisdiction and to proceed judicially. The Court opened July 21, 1528, there followed citation, advocates, examination, and publication, and on Friday, July 23, 1529, the cause was ripe for judgment. At that day Campejus [Campeggio] adjourned his October, on the ground that the Roman vacation, which he was bound to observe, had already begun. But in September the advocate of the cause to Rome, and inhibition of the Legata Court, given by Clement contrary to his written promise on the word of a Pope, had arrived in England, and the Court never sat again. Henry waited for more than three years, negotiating to have the suit brought to judgment till last, in November, 1532, the
ried Act, 1532, and, in the following year, May, 1533, Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, gave sentence of nullity. At Rome the cause dragged on,
there is a gap at this epoch in the report of the Rota, and it does not appear if there was any argument of the side of the Norman, or 'answer' of the defendant. At any rate, the defence by the defendant, - till at last, on March 25, 1534, the Pope, in a Consistory of Cardinals, of whom a minority voted against the marriage, pronounced the marriage with Katherine valid, and ordered restitution of conjugal rights.

The Act of 1535 (26 Hen. VIII, c. 1) above quoted - it is commonly called the Act of Supremacy - which transferred to the king the authority over the Church in England hitherto exercised by the pope, may be regarded as Henry's answer to the papal sentence of 1534. But, as Professor Brewer remarks, "to this result the king was brought by slow and silent steps". The Act of Supremacy was in truth simply the last of a series of enactments whereby, during the whole progress of the matrimonial cause, the king sought to intimidate the pontiff and to obtain a decision favourable to himself. Seven statutes in particular may be noted as preparatory or leading up to the Act of Supremacy. The 21 Hen. VIII, c. 13, prohibited, under pecuniary penalties, the obtaining from the Holy See of licences for pluralities or non-residence. The 23 Hen. VIII, c. 9, forbade the citation of a person out of the diocese wherein he dwelt, except in certain specified cases. The 23 Hen. VIII, c. 6, which is entitled "Concerning the restraint of payment of annates to the See of Rome", was not only an attempt to intimidate, but also to bribe the pope. It forbade, under penalties, the payment of firstfruits to Rome, provided that, if the Bulls for a bishop's consecration were in consequence denied, he might be consecrated without them, and authorized the king to disregard any consequent ecclesiastical censure of "our Holy Father the Pope" and to cause Divine service to be continued in spite of the same; and further empowered the King by letters patent, or of商 his assent to the Act, and at his pleasure to suspend, modify, annul and enforce it. The Act was in
fact what Dr. Lingard has called it, "a political experiment to try the resolution of the Pontiff". The experiment failed, and in the next year the royal assent was given to the Act by letters patent. In the same year a Bill passed the Statute, 24 Hen. VIII, c. 12, prohibiting appeals to Rome in testamentary, matrimonial, and certain other causes, and requiring the clergy to continue their ministrations in spite of ecclesiastical censures from Rome. The next year witnessed the passing of the Act (25 Hen. VIII, c. 19) "for the submission of the clergy to the King's Majesty", which prohibited all appeals to Rome. The Act following this in the Statute Book abolished annates, forbade, under the penalties of prenunire, the presentation of bishops and archbishops to "the Bishop of Rome", and the procuring from him of Bulls for their consecration, and established the method still existing in the Anglican Church (of which more will be said later on) of electing, confirming, and consecrating bishops. It was immediately followed by an Act forbidding, under the same penalties as above, the holding of Bulls to the Pope, or the Roman see, for "licenses, dispensations, faculties, grants, rescripts, depositions or other instruments or writings", to go abroad for any visitations, congregations, or assembly for religion, or to maintain, allow, admit, or obey any process from Rome. The net effect of these enactments was to take away from the pope the headship of the Church of England. That headship the Act of Supremacy conferred on the king.

This sudden falling away of a whole nation from Catholic unity, is an event so strange and so terrible as to require some further explanation than Macaulay's, who refers to it as the "brutal passion of Boleyn", and "the policy" of Henry VIII. In fact the struggle between that monarch and the pope was the last phase of a contest between the papal and the royal power which had been waged, longer or briefer truces, from the late middle ages to the conquest. The Second Henry was no less desirous than the Eighth to emancipate himself from the jurisdiction of the supreme pontiff, and the destruction and pillage of the shrine of St. Thomas a Becket was not merely a manifestation of uncontrollable fury and unscrupulous greed; it was also Henry VIII's way of redressing a passage of nearly four hundred years' standing. The reason why Henry VIII succeeded where Henry II, a greater man, had failed must be sought in the political and religious conditions of the times. Von Ranke has pointed out that the state of the world in the sixteenth century was "directly hostile to the papal domination. The civil power would no longer acknowledge any higher authority" (Die römischen Päpste, I, 39). In England the monarch was virtually a tyrant. The Wars of the Roses had destroyed the old nobility, formerly an effective check upon regal despotism. Brewer writes, "Thus opened the way for Henry, in theory as well, was absolute both in theory and practice. Government was identified with the will of the Sovereign; his word was law for the conscience as well as for the conduct of his subjects. He was the only representative of the nation. Parliament was little more than an institution for granting subsidies" (Brewer, Letters and State Papers, II, Part I, p. excii, Introduct.). The lax lives led by too many of the clergy, the abuses of pluralities, the scandals of the Consistorial Courts, had tended to weaken the influence of the priesthood; "the papal authority", to quote again Brewer, "had ceased to be more than a mere form in observation."

The influence of the ecclesiastical order as a check upon arbitrary power was extinct at the death of Wolsey. "Thus it was that the royal supremacy was now to triumph after years of effort, apparently fruitless and often purposeless. That which had been present to the English mind was now to come forth in a distinct consciousness, armed with the power that nothing could resist. Yet that it should come forth in such a form is marvellous. All events had prepared the way for the King's temporal supremacy: opposition to Papal authority was familiar to men; but a spiritual supremacy, and the ecclesiastical headship of England, separated Henry VIII from all his predecessors by an immeasurable interval, so was it without precedent and at variance with all tradition" (Brewer, Letters and State Papers, I, cvii, Introduct.). Henry VIII made full proof of his ecclesiastical
ministry. In 1535 he appointed Thomas Cromwell his vicegerent, vicar-general, and principal official, with full power to exercise all and every that authority appertaining to himself as head of the Church. The vicar-general's function was, however, confined to ecclesiastical discipline. The settlement of doctrine Henry took under his own care and, as is related in the preamble to the "Act abolishing diversity of opinions" (31 Hen. VIII, c. 14), "most graciously vouchsafed, in his own princesly person, to descend and come into his High Court of Parliament" and there expounded his theological views, which were embodied in that Statute, commonly called "The Statute of the Six Articles". It was in 1539 that this Act was passed. It asserted Transubstantiation, the sufficiency of communion under one kind, the obligation of clerical celibacy, the validity "by the law of God" of vows of chastity, the excellence of private masses, the necessity of the sacrament of penance. The penalty for denial of the first article was the stake; of the rest imprisonment and forfeiture as of felony. But while thus upholding, after his own fashion, Catholic doctrine, Henry had possessed himself of a vast amount of ecclesiastical property by the suppression first of the smaller and then of the larger religious houses, thus laying the foundation of English pauperism.

After the death of Henry (1547) the direction of ecclesiastical affairs passed chiefly into the hands of Thomas Cranmer. Lord Macaulay has described him accurately as "a supple, timid, interested courtier, who rose into favour by serving Henry in the disgraceful affair of his first divorce", who was "equally false to political and religious obligations", and who had been drawn up by the aid of ecclesiastical property by the suppression first of the smaller and then of the larger religious houses, thus laying the foundation of English pauperism.

After the death of Henry (1547) the direction of ecclesiastical affairs passed chiefly into the hands of Thomas Cranmer. Lord Macaulay has described him accurately as "a supple, timid, interested courtier, who rose into favour by serving Henry in the disgraceful affair of his first divorce", who was "equally false to political and religious obligations", and who had been drawn up by the aid of ecclesiastical property by the suppression first of the smaller and then of the larger religious houses, thus laying the foundation of English pauperism.

After the death of Henry (1547) the direction of ecclesiastical affairs passed chiefly into the hands of Thomas Cranmer. Lord Macaulay has described him accurately as "a supple, timid, interested courtier, who rose into favour by serving Henry in the disgraceful affair of his first divorce", who was "equally false to political and religious obligations", and who had been drawn up by the aid of ecclesiastical property by the suppression first of the smaller and then of the larger religious houses, thus laying the foundation of English pauperism.
of the Holy Ghost.” Notwithstanding this encomium, it was superseded, within four years, by a second Cranmerian Prayer Book, not similarly commended in the Act prescribing it, in which the slight outward similarity to the Mass, preserved in the Communion Service of the 1549 First Prayer Book, was obliterated. The Ordinal underwent similar treatment; the sacrificing priest, like the Sacrifice, was abolished. Another of Cranmer’s exploits was the compilation of Forty-two Articles of Religion which, reduced to Thirty-nine and slightly recast, still form the Confession of Faith of the Anglican Communion. In 1556, under Mary, he modified the Act, taking with the stake, after various by copious recantations—Sander avers that “he signed them seventeen times with his own hand”—to save his life. This severity, though doubtless impolitic, can hardly be deemed unjust if his career be carefully considered. But his work lived after him and formed the basis of the ecclesiastical legislation of Elizabeth, when Mary’s brief reign came to an end, and with it the ineffectual endeavour to destroy the new religion by the fagot. Mary’s fiery zeal for the Catholic Faith failed to undo the work of her two predecessors, and unquestionably did ill service to the Catholic cause. It would be foolish to blame her for not practicing a toleration utterly alien from the temper of the times. But there can be no question that Green is well warranted in writing that to her is due “the bitter remembrance of the blood shed in the cause of Rome which, had she tolerated and respected, or must lawfully have used and exercised, by authority of his supremacy, before that date”. Elizabeth, by the first Act of Parliament of her reign, repealed this Statute, and revived the last six of the seven Acts against the Roman pontiff passed between the 21st and 26th year of Henry VIII of which she had given an account, and also certain other anti-papal Statutes passed subsequently to the enactment of Henry’s Act of Supremacy. That Act was not revived, doubtless because Elizabeth, as a woman, shrank from assuming the title of Supreme Head of the Church bestowed by it on the sovereign. But, although she did not take to herself that title, she took all the authority implied therein by this first Act of her reign. It vests the plenitude of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Crown and the Queen's Highness, who is described as “the only Supreme Governor of this realm as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things as temporal, and it prescribes the oath recognizing her to be so for all holding office in Church and State. The next Act on the Statute Book is the Act of Uniformity. It orders the use in the churches of the second Prayer Book of Edward VI, in the place of the Catholic rites, and provides penalties for ministers disobeying this injunction. It also enforces the attendance of the laity at the parish church on Sundays and holidays, for the new service. This was the definite establishment of the new religion in England, the consummation of the revolution initiated by Henry VIII. The bishop of Kitchen of Llandaff, refused to accept it, as did about half the clergy. The majority of the laity passively acquiesced in it, just as they had acquiesced in the ecclesiastical changes of Henry, and Edward, and Mary. Its effect was, virtually, to reduce the Church of England to a department of the State. The Anglican bishops became, and are still, nominees of the Crown, election by the dean and chapter, where it exists—in some of the newer dioceses there are no chapters, and the bishops are appointed by Letters Patent—a mere formalism of which Emerson writes: “An Act of the Dean and Canons a congé d’élire, or leave to elect, but also sends them the name of the person whom they are to elect. They go into the Cathedral, chant and pray; and after these invocations invariably find that the dictates of the Holy Ghost agree with the recommendation of the King.” If they arrived at any other conclusion, they would be involved in the ruinous results of a prelature. The Convocations of York and Canterbury are similarly fettered. They cannot proceed so much as to discuss any project of ecclesiastical legislation without “Letters of Business” from the Crown. The sovereign is the ultimate arbiter in causes, whether of faith or morals, within the Anglican Church, and his decisions of them given by the voice of his Privy Council, are irrefutable. But of course in these days the sovereign practically means the Legislature. “The National Church”, Cardinal Newman writes in his “Anglo-Catholicism”, “is part of the Nation, just as the Law or the Parliament is part of the Nation.” “It is simply an organ or department of the State, all ecclesiastical acts really proceeding from the civil government.” “The Nation itself is the sovereign Lord and Master of the Prayer Book, its interpreter.”

Queen Elizabeth’s Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity form, in the words of Hallam, “the basis of that restrictive code of laws which pressed so heavily, for more than two centuries, upon the adherents of the Roman church”. It is not necessary here to describe in detail that “restrictive code”. An account of it will be found in the first chapter of “A Manual of the Law specially affecting Catholics”, by W. S. Lilly and J. P. Wallis (London, 1893). But we may observe that the queen who originated it was animated by very different motives from those which influenced her father in his revolt against Rome. Sander has correctly said, “he gave up the Catholic faith for no other reason in the world than that which came from his lust and wickedness”; and, indeed, while severing himself from Catholic unity, and pillaging the possessions of the Church, he was as far as possible from sympathising with the doctrines of Protestantism and savagely repressed them. Elizabeth, by the very necessity of her position, was driven—we speak ex humano die—to espouse the Protestant cause. No doubt, as Lingard writes, “it is pretty evident that she had no settled notions of religion”; and she freely exhibited her contempt for her clergy on many occasions—notably on her death-bed, when she drove away from her presence the Archbishop of Canterbury and certain other Protestant prelates of her own making, telling them “she knew full well that they were hedge priests, and took it for an indignity that they should speak to her” (Dissenting Church History). But, like Cranmer, if she had no religious convictions, she had the conviction of her interests. Her lot was plainly cast in with the Protestant party. Rome had declared her mother’s marriage null, and her own birth illegitimate. Catholics, in general, looked upon Mary Queen of Scots as the rightful claimant to the throne which she occupied. Throughout her reign Church policy and State policy are conjoint: But Janus-faces, looking different ways.

The Anglican Church, as established by her, was a mere instrument for political ends; in her own phrase, she “tuned her pulpit, but the stake which was religio, was currently accepted in her time. It seemed according to the natural order of things that the people should profess the creed of the prince. Elizabeth is not open to the charges made against her sister of religious fanaticism. But she was given up to that
“self will and self worship” which Bishop Stubbs justly attributes to her father. And, in the well-weighed words of Hallam, “she was too deeply imbued with arbitrary principles to endure any deviation from the mode of worship she should prescribe.”

It was the Feast of St. John Baptist, 1559, that this statute took effect which abolished throughout England the old worship, and set up the new. Thenceforth Catholic rites could be performed only by stealth, and at the risk of severe punishment. But during the first decade of the queen’s reign Catholics were treated with comparative lenity, occasional fines, and imprisonment being the severest penalties employed against them. Camden and others assert that they enjoyed “a pretty free use of their religion”; but this is too strongly put. The truth is that a vast number were Catholic at heart temporized, resorting to the new worship more or less regularly, and attending secretly, when opportunity offered, Catholic rites celebrated by the Marian clergy commonly called “the old priests.” Of these a considerable number remained scattered up and down the country, being generally found as chaplains in private houses. These occasions of worship were supported by the vague hope of political change which might give relief to their consciences. Elizabeth and her councillors calculated that when the old priests dropped off, through death and other causes, people generally would be won over to the new religion. But it did not turn out as was expected. As the occasions of the supply of Catholic clergy began to engage the minds of those to whom they had ministered. Moreover, stricter conceptions of their duty in respect of heretical worship were gaining ground among English Catholics, partly on account of the decision on the question of the temporal powers of the Church in Trent, that attendance at it was “grievously sinful,” inasmuch as it was “the offspring of schism, the badge of hatred of the Church.” Then a man appeared whom Father Bridgett rightly describes as “the father, under God, of the Catholic Church in England after the destruction of the ancient hierarchy,” to whom “principally, we owe the continuation of the priesthood, and the succession of the secular clergy.” That man was William Allen, afterwards cardinal. He conceived the idea of an apostolate having for its object the perpetuation of the Faith in England, and in 1568 he founded the seminary at Douai, then belonging to Spanish Flanders, which was for so many generations to minister to the wants of English Catholics. It is notable as the first college organized according to the rules and constitution of the Council of Trent. They were missionaries, full of zeal, and not counting their lives dear, who were sent out from this institution, revived the drooping spirituals of the faith in England and maintained the standard of orthodoxy. Elizabeth viewed with much displeasure this frustration of her hopes, nor was the Bull “Regnans in excelsis,” by which, in 1570, St. Pius V declared her deposed and her Catholic subjects released from their allegiance, calculated to mollify her. Increased severity of the penal laws marks the rest of Elizabeth’s reign. By the Act of Supremacy Catholics offending against that statute had been made liable to capital punishment or to the banishment of priests and clerks. Thus they were forced to escape the odium attaching to the infection of death for religion. Few will now dissent from the words of Green in his “Short History”: “There is something even more revolting than open persecution in the pernicious brands every Catholic priest as a traitor, and all Catholic worship as disloyalty.” But during the time, the policy succeeded, and the martyrs who suffered for no other cause than that their Catholic faith were commonly believed to have been put to death for treason. In 1581 this offence of spiritual treason was the subject of a far more comprehensive enactment (23 Eliz., c. 1). It qualified as traitors all who should absolutely or reconcile others to the See of Rome, or willingly be so absolved or reconciled. Many English historians (Hume is the most considerable of them) have affirmed that “sedition, revolt, even assassination were the means by which seminary priests sought to compel their adherents to adhere to the new religion.” This sweeping accusation is not true. No doubt Cardinal Allen, the Jesuit Persons [see PERSONS (PARSONS), ROBERT], and other Catholic exiles were cognizant of, and involved in, plots which had for their end the overthrow, not would some of the conspirators have shrunk from taking her life any more than the queen’s? But the relation of a vast number of the exiles, the whole Society of which Persons was a foremost representative, and desired the exclusion of Jesuits from English Colleges and from the English mission. When the Armada was expected they repaired in every county to the standard of the Lord Lieutenant, and being now not be suspected of plotting against the national independence for their religious belief. They received from Elizabeth a characteristic reward. “The Queen,” writes Lingard, “whether she sought to satisfy the religious animosities of her subjects, or to display her gratitude to the Almighty by removing remnants of His enemies, reconciled her triumph with the immolation of human victims” (History of England, VI, 255). In the four months between 22 July and 27 November, of 1588, twenty-one seminary priests, eleven laymen, and one woman were put to death for their Catholic faith. In the second year of Elizabeth’s reign twenty-eight of her subjects groaned under persecuting, in which one special note was the systematic use of torture. “The rack seldom stood idle in the Tower during the latter part of her reign,” Hallam remarks. The total number of Catholics who suffered under her was one hundred and eighty-nine, one hundred and twenty-eight of them being priests, fifty-eight laymen, and three women. To them should be added, as Law remarks in his “Calendar of English Martyrs” (London, 1870), thirty-two Franciscans who were starved to death.

Notwithstanding the severities of Elizabeth, the number of Catholic clergy on the English missions in her time was considerable. It has been estimated that at the end of the sixteenth century they amounted to three hundred and sixty-six, fifty being survivors of the old Marian priests, three hundred priests from Douai and the other foreign seminaries, and sixteen priests of the Society of Jesus. On the queen’s death the eyes of the persecuted remnant of the old faith turned hopefully towards James. Their hopes were doomed to disappointment. That prince took himself seriously as head of the English Church. He chose rather to be the successor of Elizabeth than the avenger of Mary Stuart, and continued the savage policy of the late queen. The year after his accession an Act was passed “for the due execution of the Statutes against Jesuits, Seminary priests and other Dissenters”, which took their effect by compelling Catholics of sending their children to be educated abroad, and of providing schools for them at home. In the course of the same year a proclamation was issued banning all missionary priests out of the kingdom. The next year is marked by the Gunpowder Plot, “the conspiracy”, as Tierney but, for the observant persons of desperate fortunes, who, by that means, brought an odium upon the body of Catholics, who have ever since laboured under the weight of the calumny, though no way concerned.” Soon afterwards a new oath of allegiance was devised, rather for the purpose of dividing than of relieving Catholics. It
was incorporated in "An Act for the better discovery and repression of Popish recusants" (a recusant Catholic was simply one who refused to be present at the new service of the Protestant religion in the parish church), and was directed against the depressing power. Then, and dispersal in the course of time, some Catholics had among them being Blackwell the Archpriest. Twenty-eight Catholics, of whom eight were laymen, suffered under James I, but that prince was more concerned to exact money from his Catholic subjects than to slay them. According to his own account he received a net income of £26,000 a year from the fines of recusants. But "Let not virtue seek remuneration for the thing it was" is a lesson written on every page of the history of the Stuart's Catholics. Hume, in a paper presented to the House of Lords by Lord Arundell of Wardour, that they might receive the benefit of the Declaration of Breda. Charles was inclined to give them "liberty of conscience", but Lord Chancellor Hyde, afterwards Earl of Clarendon, we read in Kenneth's "Register and Chartulary", was of the point, that His Majesty was obliged to yield rather to his importunities than his reasons". The king, who, as himself expressed it, was not minded to set out again on his travels, recognized that there was in the nation a strong anti-Catholic feeling, and bowed to it, though himself intellectually convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion. The laws against Papists remained on the statute book, and, from time to time, proclamations—they were, it is true, for the most part brutum fulmen—were issued requiring Jesuits and other priests to quit the kingdom under the penalty of expulsion. A singular instance of over masterying anti-Catholic prejudice prevailing in the nation is supplied by the monument erected by the Corporation of London to commemorate the Great Fire of 1666. It bore an inscription in which Catholics were accused of being the authors of that calamity, a monstrous assertion to which no shrive of evidence was ever adduced. Where London's column pointing to the skies, Like a tall bully lifts its head and lies, Pope had the courage to write. But not until the nineteenth century was well advanced was the column erased. It is not possible here to follow, even in briefest outline, the course of Charles II's reign. We may, however, point out that two things are necessary to a right view of it: to understand the character and aims of Charles II, and to recognise the calamity that befell the English nation. Idle, voluptuous, and good-humoured edly cynical, Charles certainly was; but he possessed deep knowledge of human nature, great political tact, and remarkable tenacity of purpose. That he preferred the Catholic religion to any other, is certain; and it is only fair to him to say that he sincerely believed in the Church of Rome. But he recognized the strong Protestant feeling of the people over whom he ruled, and was not prepared to imperil his crown by defying it. He was, however, really desirous to do what he could, without risk to himself, for the relief of Catholics; and this was the motive of his Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, by which he ordered "that all manner of penal laws on matters ecclesiastical against whatever sort of Non-conformist or recusants" should be suspended, and gave liberty of public worship to all dissentents, except Catholics, who were allowed to celebrate the rites of religion in private houses only. This declaration was sovereignly displeasing to all parties in the House of Commons, who answered it by a resolution "that penal statutes in matters ecclesiastical cannot be suspended except by consent of Parliament", and refused supplies until the declaration was recalled. That was a convincing argument to Charles. He recalled the declaration forthwith. Parliament then proceeded to pass a bill—it went through both Houses without opposition, and Charles dared not refuse his royal ascent to it—which required every one in the civil and military employment of the Crown to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and to receive the Eucharist according to the rites of the Church of England. One effect of this Act (13 Car, II, St. 2, c. 1) was to deprive James, Duke of York, who had become a Catholic, of his office of Lord High Admiral.
During the next nine years the struggle between the king and the Parliament continued. The popular leader was Ashley, Earl of Shaftesbury—for some time Chancellor—whose character has been delineated
by Daniel Defoe with merciless severity, but with substantial accuracy, in "Abraham the Achipothel". Ashley's statesman's own Protestantism was of the holiest kind, but he was zealous, from political motives, for the national religion, and for that reason was bent upon excluding the Duke of York from the succession to the throne. To accomplish this end, he fought strenuously and unremittingly, and was any weapon too vile for his use. The Second Test Act, passed through his exertions in 1678, rendered Catholics incapable of sitting in Parliament, and thus deprived twenty-one Catholic peers of their seats in the House of Lords; but the king contrived to procure the insertion of a clause exempting the Duke of York from the operation of the Statute. It was in this same year that Titus Oates appeared on the scene with his pretended Popish Plot. There is no evidence that Ashley was the instigator of the colossal villainy, but he did not scruple to employ it for his own purposes. "The origin of the Popish Plot," says a recent well-informed writer, "is clouded with mystery. "Blackwood's Magazine" (May, 1908), "is a mystery. We know no more than that the English people, being mad, interrupted the course of justice, insisted that the judges should condemn every man brought before them, suspected of papistry, and easily believed the falsehoods of a hired perjurer, and that Oates himself contrived the death of Sir Edmund Godfrey." However that may have been, certain it is that the calumnies of Oates and his confederates and imitators awakened the Elizabethan Statutes into fresh activity. The king was not too shrewd to give evidence of his connivance. Macaulay has well called "a hideous romance resembling rather the dream of a sick man than any transaction which ever took place in this world." But he was powerless to save the victims of popular fanaticism; "I cannot pardon them," he said, in a letter of June 1678. And so, in 1679, the horrors of 1688 were repeated, eight priests of the Society of Jesus, two Franciscans, five secular priests, and seven laymen being put to death, while many more died in their foul prisons. The next year witnessed the judicial murder of Lord Stafford, his peers being unable to withstand the madness of the people. In 1681, the Earl of Plunket, the Archbishop of Armagh, was executed at Tyburn, after a mock trial. His was the last blood shed for the Catholic religion in England. The persecution, which had begun with the execution of the three saintly Carthusian friars in the twenty-sixth year of Henry VIII, had lasted, with intermissions, for a century and a half. Three hundred and forty-two martyrs had sealed their faith with their blood, while some fifty confessors, in the reign of Elizabeth and her successors, ended their lives in prison. The king's long struggle with the popular party ended in his complete victory. No more consummate master of political strategy ever perhaps existed; and the violence of the party led by Shaftesbury played into his hands. Shaftesbury himself was arrested on a charge of suborning false witnesses to the Plot; although the Grand Jury of Middlesex ignored the bill of his indictment, he saw that the tide of popular feeling, which had begun to ebb with the execution of Lord Stafford, was now turned completely against him, and at the end of 1682 he fled to Holland, where, two months afterwards, he died.

Charles II was the most pugnacious of kings during the last years of his reign, and he was careful not to mar his popularity by illegal acts or by measures opposed to the feeling of the nation. The statute for the regulation of printing, passed immediately after the Restoration, had expired in 1679; Charles made no attempt for its renewal. In the same year the Habeas Corpus Act—that great charter of the liberty of the subject—was passed; Charles acquiesced in it. He did indeed infringe the Test Act by the Duke of York's readmission to the Council and restoration to the office of lord high admiral. But, in the recrudescence of loyalty, this tribute to fraternal affection was forgotten; and when the king was thronged with crowds praying that God would raise him up again to be a father to his people; and on his death, in February, 1685, all sorts and conditions of his subjects made great lamentation over him.

In the first year of the reign of James II Dr. Leyburn was appointed to the Holy See as vicar Apostolic. In the next year Dr. Giffard received a like appointment, as did Dr. Ellis and Dr. Smith the year after that, England being divided into four districts: the London, the Midland, the Western, and the Northern, in each of which the papal vicar exercised all the authority possessed by an ordinary. The new king came to the throne with advantages which he could hardly have hoped for. He inherited, in some sort, the popularity of his brother, and his religion was forgotten in his blood. He began his reign by a solemn pledge to keep the laws inviolate and to protect the liberty of the nation, but it was hard to believe "We have the word of a king", it was said, "and of a king who was never worse than his word." The saying, whoever was its author, went abroad. It expressed the general conviction, and his first Parliament made proof of exuberant loyalty, granting to the nation, without a division, a revenue of two millions for life. Argyll's rebellion in the North and Monmouth's in the West but served to bring out the devotion of the nation at large to the sovereign. But the cruelties of Kirke and the savageries of Jeffreys in the "Bloody Circuit" caused a change in the general feeling. The king's popularity cooled, and the measures to which he now resorted soon put an end to it. Monmouth's revolt was made the pretext for raising the army to twenty thousand men, and it soon appeared that James supposed himself able, with that force at his command, to place himself above the law. He attempted to nullify the provisions of statutes by the exercise of his dispensing powers. Judges who refused to fall in with his plans were dismissed; and it was held by a bench packed with his creatures that his dispensation could be pleaded in bar of an act of Parliament. In 1681, the Earl of Clarendon, almost the king proceeded to set aside the disabilities of Catholics and the restraints upon the exercise of their religion. They were admitted to civil and military offices closed to them by the law; members of religious orders appeared in the streets of London in their habit; the Jesuits, with little interference, were allowed to reside; the king, for raising the army to twenty thousand men, and it soon appeared that James supposed himself able, with that force at his command, to place himself above the law. He attempted to nullify the provisions of statutes by the exercise of his dispensing powers. Judges who refused to fall in with his plans were dismissed; and it was held by a bench packed with his creatures that his dispensation could be pleaded in bar of an act of Parliament. In 1681, the Earl of Clarendon, almost the
see that if James attempted to promote the interests of his religion by illegal and unpopular measures, his attempt would fail: the hatred with which the heretical islanders regarded the true faith would become fiercer and stronger than ever; and an indissoluble association would be created in men's minds between Protestantism and civil freedom, between Popery and arbitrary power. This is precisely what happened. And indeed it is not too much to say that British Catholics have, in great measure, to thank the two last Catholic sovereigns for the strong feeling which so long existed against them throughout the nation, and which, even now, has not wholly disappeared. The severities of Mary appeared to give countenance to the popular Protestant opinion that Catholics rely chiefly on the argument from fire and are always ready, if they can, to burn dissenters from their religious belief. The conduct of James II seemed an object less confirming of the vulgar belief that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with heretics, and that any violation of law, any "crooked and indirect bye-ways," are justifiable means to the end of advancing the Catholic religion.

The reign of James II lasted only three years. It is not too much to say that before two of them were out he had succeeded in alienating the devotion of the entire nation. The famous Declaration of Indulgence supplied the supreme proof of his folly and was the immediate occasion of his downfall. The gist of it was that by the royal authority all laws against all dissenters, or Nonconformists, were to be suspended, but religious tests imposed upon them by statute as a qualification for office were abrogated. Only an absolute monarch could claim to exercise such a prerogative. It is true that the Declaration was full of professions of love of liberty of conscience—professions which came oddity from a monarch with James's record. Moreover, as we now know, upon the very eve of publishing it he had written to congratulate Louis XIV upon his revocation of the Edict of Nantes, an example which B питания, a very competent judge, thought would have only too gladly followed if he had been able. Those hollow and palpably false professions deceived no one, and the failure of the Declaration to conciliate the support of those who would have chiefly benefited by it, might have suggested caution to a wiser man. But James would brook no opposition; and on 27 April, 1688, he ordered the Anglican clergy to read his Declaration of Indulgence during divine service on two successive Sundays. Nearly all the clergy refused to obey, and Sancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, with six of his suffragans, addressed to the king a respectful and temperate protest. The document was treated as a libel, and the famous trial of the seven bishops was the result. The acquittal of the prelates was greeted throughout the country with a tumult of acclaim, which was the signal for the Revolution, whereby the ancient liberties of England were vindicated, and a Parliamentary title to the crown was substituted for an hereditary one.

The disfavour with which Catholics were viewed when William and Mary were placed on the throne vacated by James II, was natural enough. They shared in the hatred inspired by the perfidy, cruelty, and tyranny of the desponded sovereign. William, indeed, would have gladly extended to them the same measure of toleration which, in spite of Tory opposition, he was able to secure for Protestant Nonconformists. He was under great obligations not only to the emperor, but also to the pope, whose sympathy and diplomatic support had been of much help to him in his perilous enterprise. He was, by temperament, averse from religious persecution. Moreover, as Hallam justly observes, "no measure would have been more politic, for it would have dealt to the Jacobite cause a more deadly wound than any which double taxation or penal laws were able to effect."

And this, no doubt, was one of the reasons why the High Tories persistently opposed it. But the Legislature did not content itself with leaving on the statute book the former statutes against Catholics; it enacted new disqualifications and penalties. The Bill of Rights provides that no member of the reigning house who is a Catholic, or has married a Catholic, can succeed to the throne, and that the sovereign, on becoming a Catholic, or marrying a Catholic, thereby forfeits the crown. This article of the constitution was confirmed by the Act of Settlement (12 & 13 Will. III, c. 5, s. 2), which conferred the succession on the Electress Sophia, a daughter of James I, being Protestants. Another statute, of the first year of William and Mary, prohibited Catholics from residing within ten miles of London and empowered justices to tender to reputed Papists "the oath appointed by law," providing that any who refused it, and yet remained within ten miles of London, was to be seized and suffer as a Papist recusant convict. A third Act of the same year (1 W. & M., c. 15) provides that no suspected Papist who shall neglect to take the oath appointed by law, when tendered to him by two justices of the peace, and who shall not appear before them upon notice from one authorized under their hands and seals, shall keep any arms, ammunition, or horse above the value of five pounds in his possession, and in that of any other person to his use (other than such as shall be allowed him by the sessions for defence of his house and person); that any person who shall conceal such arms, ammunition, or horse, he shall be imprisoned for three months and shall forfeit to the king the value of such arms, ammunition, or horse. The 7 & 8 Will. III, c. 24, closed to Catholics the professions of counsellor-at-law, barrister, attorney, and solicitor; and the 7 & 8 Will. III, c. 27, declared that no person who refuses to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, when lawfully tendered, should be liable to suffer as a Papist recusant convict; and that no person who should refuse the said oath should be admitted to give a vote at the elections of any member of Parliament. In 1700 an Act was passed which, "in Burke's words, "cannot be read without astonishment." It incapacitated every Roman Catholic from inheriting or purchasing land, unless he abjured his religion upon oath; and on his refusal it vested his property, during his life, in his next of kin being a Protestant. He was even prohibited from sending his children abroad, to be educated in his own faith. And while his religion was thus proscribed, his civil rights were further restrained by the oath of abjuration. It prescribed imprisonment for life for all Catholic priests, and enacted that an informer, in the event of their being convicted of saying Mass, was to receive a hundred pounds as one of his wages. Concerning this Act of William III Hallam remarks, "So unprovoked, so unjust a persecution is the disgrace of the Parliament that passed it." But he goes on to add, "The spirit of Liberty and tolerance was too strong for the tyranny of the law and this statute was not executed according to its purpose. The Catholic landholders neither renounced their religion nor abandoned their inheritance. The judges put such constructions upon the clause of forfeiture as eluded its efficiency."

No doubt this is generally true. But, as Charles Butler tells us in his Historical Memoirs of London, 1819–21, "the many prosecutions which deprived Catholics of their landed property were enforced." He adds that "in other respects they were subject to great vexation and contumely. They were a very small and very unpopular minority in an age when a common creed was regarded, in every
European country, as the chief bond of civil polity and dissidents from it were more or less rigorously repressed. As a matter of fact, it is to a great English magistrate that we owe the ruling which placed an almost insuperable difficulty in the way of the tribe of informers. At the trial of the Rev. John Wesley, in the 25th of June, 1768, at Westminster, at the suit of a notorious common informer named Payne, Lord Mansfield told the jury that the defendant could not be condemned "unless there were sufficient proof of his ordination." Such proofs, of course, were not forthcoming. Lord Mansfield, as Charles Butler relates in his above-mentioned "Historical Memoirs," discon- tented with the prosecution of Catholic priests and took care that the accused should have every advantage that the form of proceedings, or the letter or spirit of the law, could allow. And at that period the same temper animated English judges generally.

As the second half of the eighteenth century wore on, English Catholics ceased to be regarded by the Government as politically dangerous. A certain number of them had taken part in the rising of 1715, and in the far more serious rising of 1745, and had in some cases been executed for their guilt. In 1758 the Old Pretender died, and the Young Pretender, upon whom his claim devolved, had ceased to excite either dread or enthusiasm. Men no longer took him seriously, and English Catholics in time—it was no very long time—acquiesced in the Revolution of 1782. But they did some thing more than quiesce. In 1778 an address was presented to George III, bearing the signatures of the Duke of Norfolk and nine other peers, and of one hundred and sixty-three commoners, on behalf of the Catholic body. It represents to the sovereign their "true attachment to the civil constitution of the country which has been perpetuated through all changes of religious opinions and establishments, has been at length perfected by that Revolution which has placed your Majesty's illustrious house on the throne of these kingdoms, and inestimably united your titles with the crown of the law and liberties of your people." In this year, 1778, the first Catholic Relief Act was passed. It repealed the worst portions of the Statute of 1699 above mentioned, and set forth a new oath of allegiance which a Catholic could take without denying his religion. The word "Pretenders" was struck out of the oath, and the word "relief" was added. This was a measure extremely distasteful to some bigoted Protestants, among whom it is distressing to find the name of John Wesley. But in truth Wesley—it is not a rare case—was no less ignorant and narrow-minded than zealous and devout, as is sufficiently evident from his "Letter concerning the Principles of Roman Catholics." In this document, besides other equally foolish assertions, he alleges that they hold an oath not binding if administered by heretics, and that they believe in the remission of future sins through the Sacrament of Penance. The conclusion he draws is that no government "ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion." There can be no doubt that the dis- likes of Wesley and his followers largely swelled the agitation for the repeal of the Act of 1778, which was conducted by the Protestant Association, and which issued in the Bill of 1780. Lord George Gordon, "the Catholic Committee was utterly discarded, the inoffensive Irish oath of 1778, with slight variations, being substituted for it. Catholics taking this oath were relieved from the penalties of the Statutes of Recusancy and from the obligation of taking the oath in the form prescribed by the Statute of William and Mary. Various disabilities were removed, and toleration was extended to Catholic schools and worship. Shortly after this Act was passed the Catholic Committee turned itself into the Cisalpine Club and continued under that name, for thirty years, to trouble more or less the vicars Apostolic.

There can be little doubt that the passing of the Relief Act was facilitated by the outbreak of the Revolution in France. Another result, at first extremely prejudicial to the Catholic Church in England, was that great upheaval of the civil servitudes on the Continent, which had furnished to that country a supply of priests. Drouin was seized by the French Revolutionary Government in 1793. The English Benedictine houses in France also disappeared. The closing of the English Catholic colleges was to some extent compensated by the influx of clergy from that country. No less than eight thousand of these confessors of the Christian Faith sought the hospitality of Protestant England, and it was ungrudgingly given. The King's House at Winchester sheltered a thousand of them, and for several years a considerable sum was voted for their relief by Parliament and was largely supple-
mented by voluntary subscriptions. A certain number of these priests sought and found work on the English Mission. By far the greater part of them returned home when Napoleon had concluded his Concordat with the Holy See and re-established Christian worship in France. Those who remained a few were conciliably dissatisfied with the new ecclesiastical arrangements in their country. They were known as Clericalists, from their leader Blanchardi, and were a source of much annoyance to the vicars Apostolic. The heroic Milner was especially prominent in combating them, and in asserting the rights of the Holy See. The Roman Catholic majority of the Board of Education at the same time, to contend with Catholics of his own nationality. The spirit which had animated the Catholic Committee and the Cisalpine Club was by no means extinct, and led to the formation, in 1828, of what was called a "Select Board," which professed as its object the organization of an association for the "general advantage of the Catholic body." That "general advantage" turned out to be the further removal of Catholic disabilities, and the price which the Select Board was prepared to pay for such removal was the vesting in the Crown of an effectual negative upon the appointment of any bishop, commonly called the Veto. The Irish episcopate unanimously opposed this arrangement, and passed a vote of thanks to Dr. Milner for his "apostolic constancy" in withstanding it. On 30 April, 1831, Gratian brought forward a Catholic relief bill in the House of Lords, which substantially repeated the veto. It was thrown out on the third reading. Eight years later a similar bill passed the House of Commons, but was rejected by the House of Lords. Of the eventual emancipation of Catholics Dr. Milner had no doubt. Twelve years before his death, which he always confessed, he assured the pope that it was certain to come. But he would not purchase it by the slightest sacrifice of Catholic principle. In 1829 a declaration was put forward by all the vicars Apostolic of England explanatory of various articles of the Catholic Faith great majority of which were expressed in the veto. It was widely read and doubtless helped to remove prejudice. In the same year Sydney Smith published his masterly "Letter on the Catholic Question." Not, however, till March, 1830, was the long desired boon conceded to Catholics. It was wrung, so to speak, from statesmen who had long been opposed to it. The Clare election convinced Peel and the Duke of Wellington, who were then in power, that the settlement of the Irish question was a political necessity. The Duke reminded the House of Lords that when the Irish Rebellion of 1798 had been suppressed the Legislative Union had been proposed in the next year mainly for the purposes of introducing this very measure of concession, and not obscurely intimated his opinion that further to refuse it must lead to civil war. This relief bill passed both Houses by large majorities. The king's consent was reluctantly given, and the Emancipation Act became law. It should be noted that before the passing of the Emancipation Act the friction of which we have been obliged to speak between certain prominent members of the Catholic laity and the vicars Apostolic, was virtually at an end. The Cisalpine Club still existed; but, as Monsignor Ward remarks (Catholic London: A Century Ago, p. 381), "there was very little Cisalpinism in it." This was largely due to the personal influence of Dr. Powley, Vicar Apostolic of the London District, whose gentleness and meekness triumphed where the fiery zeal of Milner failed.

When the nineteenth century opened, the Catholics of Great Britain were, to quote Cardinal Newman's words, "a gens lucifuga, found in corners and alleys and cellars and the house-tops, or in the recesses of the country." Their chapels were few and far between, and were purposely placed in quarters where they were unlikely to attract observation. It was common to locate them in news, and in their exterior they were hardly distinguishable from the adjoining stables. George Eliot has well remarked in Felix Holt, "Tell the agitation about the Catholics in '98, rural Englishman, is that they are very much afraid that the Catholics of England than of the fossil marmots." Their political emancipation was the beginning of a great change in their social condition. "The steps were higher that men took;" their ostracism began to pass away. Moreover, the reaction which had followed the French Revolution had told in favour of Catholicism even in England. Chateaubriand's "Génie du christianisme" had world-wide influence, and some of the historical novels of Sir Walter Scott, however deficient in accuracy, presented a much kinder view of the ancient faith than it had been commonly taken in Protestant countries. In the history of the Catholic Church in England since 1829 two events require special notice. One was the rise of what is called "The Oxford Movement." Cardinal Newman used to date that movement from the year 1833, when Keble preached at Oxford his famous assize sermon on "National Apostacy." But indeed it was simply the body forth of tendencies which had been long in the air. The old notion of the medieval period as a "millennium of darkness" had passed away; and from the contemplation of its masterpieces in architecture and painting men proceeded to study its intellectual and spiritual life. They were also led to investigate, in the light of facts and first principles, the claims of Anglicanism. No doubt the "Essay on the History and Structure of the Prayer Book of the Church of England" delivered by Dr. Lloyd, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, set many of his hearers thinking, Newman among them. The defence of the Oxford Movement by its originators at its beginning was not to examine, but to defend, the Anglican Church. This was the intention of the "Tracts for the Times," begun in 1833. It is not here possible, or indeed necessary, to follow the course of the movement, which, as it went on, departed ever more and more widely from the standards—ever the highest—of Anglicanism, and approached ever more and more closely to the Catholic ideal. It culminated in the famous "Tract XC," the theme of which was that the Thirty-nine Articles were susceptible of a Catholic interpretation and could be accepted by one who held all the dogmas of the Council of Trent. Of course the movement greatly interested Catholics, and by no one was it more closely and anxiously followed than by Dr. Wiseman, who had made the acquaintance of Newman and Froude upon the occasion of their visiting Rome in 1833. In September, 1840, Wiseman arrived at Oscott from Rome—where almost all his previous life had been spent—to take up his residence as president of that college and Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District. He felt from the day of his arrival there, as he wrote in a memorandum eight years afterwards, that a new era had commenced in England. A new era was certainly the Oxford movement, to which his great gifts and his large heart were utterly devoted. The majority of hereditary English Catholics were much prejudiced against the Tractarians. Dr. Lingard warned Bishop Wiseman not to trust them. Dr. Griffiths, the Vicar Apostolic of the London District, used similar language. But Wiseman did trust them. He held that Catholic principles, if honestly entertained, must lead to the Catholic Church, and he fully believed in the honesty of Newman and Newman's followers. How Newman was influenced by a paper of his on the Donatists, published in the Dublin Review in 1839, is well known. It had been directed to the impossible aim of unprotesting the Anglican Church. Newman and many of his friends came gradually to see that the aim was impossible. The kindly light which they had so faithfully followed step by step led them to Rome.
Wiseman testified: "The Church has not received at any time a convert who has joined her in more docility and simplicity of faith than Newman."

Wiseman had earnestly desired "an influx of fresh blood" into the Catholic Church in England. The accession of the converts due to the Oxford Movement brought it. And no doubt it accelerated the restoration of the hierarchy which had been so strongly desired by generations of Catholics. In 1840 Gregory VI had increased the number of English vicars Apostolic from four to eight. Ten years afterwards Pius IX decreed that "the hierarchy of Bishops ordinary, taking their titles from their sees, should, according to the usual rules of the Church, again flourish in the Kingdom of England". The whole of the country was divided into four provinces consisting of the metropolitan See of Westminster, and the twelve suffragan sees of Southwark, Plymouth, Clifton, Newport and Menevia, Shrewsbury, Liverpool, Salford, Hexham and Newcastle, Beverley, Nottingham, Birmingham, Northampton. This restoration of the hierarchy was certainly not designed as an act of war; it was indeed "unattended by any suspicion that it would give offence to others". But it did give dire offence, and the country resounded with denunciations of what was called "The Papal Aggression". An "insolent and insidious aggression", Lord John Russell, the premier, pronounced it to be, and shortly afterwards it was introduced into the House of Commons a bill by which the Catholic bishops were prohibited, under penalties, from assuming the territorial titles conferred upon them by the pope. The bill became law after long and angry debates, but was, from the first, a dead letter. There can be no question that Cardinal Wiseman's appeal to the people of England largely contributed to allay the popular passion which his pastoral letter "From without the Flaminian Gate" had had no small share in exciting. Though a somewhat lengthy pamphlet, it was printed in extenso in "The Times" and in four other London newspapers, and its circulation was immense. The cardinal appealed to the "manly sense and honest heart" of his countrymen, to "the love of honourable dealing and fair play, which is the instinct of an Englishman", and he did not appeal in vain.

Cardinal Wiseman filled the metropolitan See of Westminster from 1850 to 1886, and it would be hard to overrate the greatness of his services to the Catholic cause in England. Manning truly said in the sermon preached at his funeral: "When he closed his eyes he had already seen the work he had begun expanding everywhere, and the traditions of three hundred years everywhere dissolving before it." When he began that work, there were less than five hundred priests in England; when he ceased from it there were some fifteen hundred. The number of converts during these fifteen years had increased tenfold, and fifty-five monasteries had come into being. But more statistics give no sufficient notion of the progress made by the Catholic Church under Wiseman's rule, a progress directly due to him in large measure. Not the least important item of his service to religion was the way in which he presented the Church to his countrymen.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward is well warranted when he writes: "Wiseman may claim to have been the first effectively to remind Englishmen in our own day of the historical significance of the Catholic Church, which so much impressed Macaulay, and which affected permanently such a man as Comte, which kindled the historical enthusiasm of a De Maistre, a Gobres and a Frederick Schlegel." The organization of the Catholic Church, as it now exists in England, may be said to be due to him. He himself drew up, almost entirely, the decrees regarding it for the First Provincial Synod, held at Oscott (1852). His work, indeed, was not done in the tranquility which he loved. "Without were fightings, within were fears." Some of the converts did not fuse with the hereditary Catholics, "the little remnant of Catholic England", whom they judged to be ill-educated and behind the times, and this prejudice Wiseman regarded as ungenerous, even if, to some extent, it was not unfounded. He deprecated strongly the spirit of party and sought in all gentleness, to put it down and to guide his flock into the way of peace. On the other hand, some of the old clergy, taking their stand upon the ancient ways, regarded with distrust certain innovations of discipline and devotion introduced by the more zealous of the converts. They looked upon the Oratorians as extravagant. They viewed Monsignor Manning with suspicion. It is unnecessary to enter into the dissensions which embittered Wiseman's declining years. The last two, indeed, were passed in comparative quiet, but amid much physical suffering. Not long before he died he said: "I have never cared for anything but the Church. My sole delight has been in everything connected with her."

Cardinal Wiseman's successor in the See of Westminster—the successor he desired—was the provost of his chapter, Monsignor Manning, whose episcopate lasted until 1892. They were twenty-seven years of fruitful activity, through evil report and through good report. For some time he was certainly unpopular, not only among his Protestant fellow countrymen but among his own clergy, who did not like his strict discipline and some of whom by no means sympathized with what was called his "ultra-papalisn". But gradually the prejudice against him wore off, and his great qualities obtained general recognition. It was the victory of his faith unfeigned, his deep devotion, his spotless integrity, his indomitable courage, his singleness of aim, his entire devotion to the cause which, in his heart of hearts, he believed to be the only cause worth living for. One who knew him well said of him: "He was an Archbishop who lived among his people", "the door-steps of his house were worn with
the footsteps of the fatherless and the widow, the poor, the forlorn, the tempted and the disgraced, who came to him in their hours of trouble and sorrow." No doubt he made mistakes, some of them grave enough—as, for example, his persistent opposition to the frequentation of scholastic reform, what he not only as a great philanthropist and a great churchman, but also as a statesman of no mean order. It was said by an able writer, upon the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration: "To him, more than to any man, it is due that English Catholics have at last outgrown the narrow cramped life of their past of persecution, and stand in all things upon a footing of equality with their fellow countrymen." No doubt this happy result was largely due to Manning; but perhaps it was more largely due to another. The revelation of his inner life which John Henry Newman through himself obliged to put in order to vindicate himself from the wanton attacks of Charles Kingsley, in 1864, came like a revelation to multitudes of what Catholicism as a religion really is. The "Apologia pro Vita Sua" was like a burst of sunlight putting to flight the densest mists of Protestant prejudice, and the "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk" (1854), in reply to Gladstone's pamphlet on the Vatican Decrees which appeared in 1854, may be said to have made an end of the old error that a loyal Catholic cannot be a loyal Englishman. It may be said for Newman to affirm that there was no incompatibility between the two character. His countrymen believed him on his word. Lord Morley of Blackburn, a very competent judge, writes: "Newman raised his Church to what would, not so long before, have seemed a strange and incredible rank in the mind of Protestant England." (Miscellanies, Fourth Series, p. 161.)

Herbert Vaughan, who succeeded Cardinal Manning in the See of Westminster, ruled the diocese as archbishop, and the province as metropolitan for nearly eleven years. It was reserved for him to take up a work which his predecessor had put aside—the erection of a cathedral for Westminster. No act which Manning had to perform after his nomination to the archbishopric—it was even before his consecration—was to preside over a meeting summoned to promote the building of a cathedral in memory of Cardinal Wiseman. He declared on that occasion: "It is a work which I will take up and will to the utmost of my power promote—when the work of the poor children in London is accomplished, and not till then." This work for the poor children of London—provision for their education in their religion—was Manning’s life work, and before he passed away, as bishop of Oxford, he had consented to the building in the city of Oxford. When he died, he left his diocese, as he announced in 1874, to his successor. The magnificent fabric conceived by the genius of John Francis Bentley may, in some sort, be considered as Cardinal Vaughan’s monument, as being the outcome of his energy and zeal. It is a memorial of him, as well as of Cardinal Wiseman.

So much must suffice regarding the history of Catholicism in England from the so-called Reformation to the present day. We now proceed to give some account of the actual position of the Church in that country. We have already seen that in 1830 Pope Pius V restored the dignity of the English see, and placed the three ecclesiastical provinces under the metropolitan See of Westminster, with the twelve suffragan sees of Southwark, Hexham and Newcastle, Beverley, Liverpool, Salisbury, Newport and Menevia, Clifton, Plymouth, Nottingham, Birmingham, and Northampton.

In 1878 the Diocese of Beverley was divided into the Dioceses of Leeds and Middleborough; in 1882 the Diocese of Southwark was divided into the Dioceses of Southwark and Portsmouth, and in 1895 Wales, excepting Glamorganshire, was separated from the Diocese of Shrewsbury, and the Vicariate Apostolic of Wales. Three years later this vicariate was erected into the Diocese of Menevia, so that the Archbishop of Westminster now has fifteen suffragans. Hitherto, since the Reformation, England had been regarded as a missionary country and had been immediately subject to the Congregation of Propaganda. But Pius X, by his Constitution "Spontani Consilii", transferred (1908) England from that state of tutelage to the common law of the Church.

The number of priests, secular and regular, in England, according to the most recent list, is three thousand five hundred and twenty-four, and the number of churches, chapels, and institutes, one thousand seven hundred and thirty-six. Of the regulars who are over a thousand in number, many are French exiles, and a considerable number of them are not engaged in parochial or missionary work. There are two monasteries for monks and one monastery for nuns, but some hundred and eighty-three convents, a great increase during the half-century which has passed away since 1851, when there were only seventeen monasteries and fifty-three convents. During the same period many churches of imposing proportions, adorned with marble and glass, have been erected. Among them is the cathedral of Westminster of which mention has been already made. It is in the Byzantine style and is certainly one of the noblest of modern religious edifices. Nearly two hundred and fifty thousand pounds have already been expended on it, and, although still unfinished, it has been open for daily use since Christmas, 1903.

Catholics in England are still subject to various legal disabilities. We have already seen that by the Bill of Rights (11 Will. and Mary, sec. 2, c. 2) no member of the reigning house who is a Catholic, or has married a Catholic, can succeed to the throne, the sovereign, on becoming a Catholic, or marrying a Catholic, thereby forfeits the crown, and that the Act of Settlement (12 and 13 Will. III, c. 2, c. 2), by which the succession was confined to the descendants of the Electress Sophia, being Protestants, confirms this article of the Test-Acts. The first-mentioned statute further enacts "that whosoever shall after this time come to the possession of the Crown of England shall join in communion with the Church of England as by law established". The Emancipation Act (10 Geo. IV, c. 7), which was largely a disabling Act, provides that nothing contained in it "shall extend or be construed to enable any person otherwise than he is now by law entitled, to hold the office of Lord Chancellor of England or Lord Lieutenant of Ireland", and the common opinion is that Catholics cannot now fill these great positions, but this view appears questionable. The question is discussed at length in Lilly and Wallis's "Manual of the Law specially affecting Catholics", pp. 36-43. The Emancipation Act also contains sections imposing fresh disabilities upon "Jesuits and members of other religious orders, communities or Societies of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows". These sections have never been put in force; still, as they remain on the statute book, they have the serious effect of disabling religious orders of men from holding property. An Act of 1860 (23 and 24 Vict., c. 134) has, however, somewhat mitigated this hardship, as also a late Act of 1877, making English law for the dead. Such bequests are held by English law to be void, but the Irish courts do not follow the English on this point. It should be noted that up to the passing of the Emancipation Act, trusts for the promotion of Catholic charities were held to be illegal.
Nor did that enactment expressly refer to them, so that three years later, in order to remove all doubts concerning them, the Roman Catholic Charities Act was passed, by which such charities were made subject to the same laws as Protestant Dissenting charities. The English law as to the status of all orders of the Church of Rome is capable of being elected to serve in Parliament as a Member of the House of Commons. This disability is shared by the clergy of the Church of England, who, however, can escape from it by the legal process vulgarly, though incorrectly, called renouncing their orders, but not by Protestant Dissenting ministers.

It should be noticed that in England provision is made for securing religious liberty for pauper and criminal Catholics. In every workhouse a creed register is kept in which the religion of every inmate is entered; and the master, upon the application of the Guardians of the Poor, may be empowered to appoint Catholic clergymen, suitable salaries, to minister to the Catholic paupers. Similarly, Catholic chaplains may be appointed in public lunatic asylums. Catholic pauper children may be transferred from the workhouse to schools of religious purposes, and these boarded out, provision is made for their attending the Catholic church. Catholic ministers to prisons are appointed by the Home Secretary, and are duly remunerated. There are sixteen commissioned army chaplains paid by the State. In the Navy there are twenty-two Catholic chaplains, and a hundred and thirty priests receive capitation allowances.

We go on to say some words on Catholic education in England since the Reformation. Of course it hardly existed when the penal laws were enforced in their full rigour. The clergy, as we have seen, were trained abroad at Rome, at Douai, at Liége, at Valladolid. The young laity benefited in intermittent and uncertain fashion by the teaching of the priests. Shakespeare, whom there is strong reason for accounting a Catholic (see Lilley's "Studies in Religion and Drama", 1919), was "for the most part reared in an old tradition, by an old Benedictine monk, Dom Thomas Combe, or Coombes. In Pope's time a few Catholic schools were found here and there, and he was sent to one of them, a "Roman Catholic seminary", it is called, at Twyford, kept by Thomas Deane, an ex-fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. But these "seminaries" were carried on with difficulty, being illegal, and it was not until the outbreak of the French Revolution that much was effected for the cause of Catholic education in England. The professors and pupils of the University of Douai, after enduring many hardships, returned to England in 1795, some going to Herefordshire, in the South, and some to Tudiéo, in the North. The Herefordshire establishment developed in time into St. Edmund's College. The school founded at Tudiéo, and removed first to Crook Hall, and then to Edgbaston, was expanded into the great college of Ushaw. For the first thirty years, it was in danger of being suppressed at any moment, and was only saved by the personal intervention of the Bishop of Durham, and of the Prince of Wales, who had been educated there. This school, which is now known as St. John's College, Ushaw, was founded in 1798. The first headmaster was Rev. Thomas Corbitt, a Jesuit. The second was Rev. Joseph Fothergill, a Jesuit. The third was Rev. James H. Fothergill, and the fourth was Rev. Edward Bagshaw, a Jesuit. The school was opened in 1798. The first pupils were 210, and the latter were 300. The school was closed in 1847. The present buildings were completed in 1881. The school is now called St. John's College, Ushaw.

The school was founded by the Jesuits, who were expelled from their country in 1603. The monks fleeing from the fury of the French Revolution were received at Acton Burnell in Shropshire by Sir Edward Smith who had been one of their pupils. It was in 1814 that they settled at Downside. The great college of Oscott is now a seminary in which priests are trained for the southern dioceses and is under the joint direction of the Archbishop of Westminster and the Bishops of Birmingham, Coventry, Liverpool, Manchester, Menevia, Newport, Northampton, and Portsmouth. St. Joseph's Missionary College was founded by Cardinal Vaughan, who ever took the deepest interest in it, and who is buried in the grounds. Of Catholic higher schools two deserve special mention; at Edgbaston, founded by Cardinal Newman, and that at Beaumont, established by the Jesuits. Until 1895 Catholic young men were discouraged—nay were inhibited, without special permission of the ecclesiastical authorities—from frequenting the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, but in that year a letter from the Congregation of Propaganda to Cardinal Vaughan announced that the Holy See had removed this restriction, the bishops, however, being enjoined to make proper provision for Catholic worship and instruction for Catholic young men resorting to these ancient seats of learning. Elementary education has also been largely provided by the Catholic Church. Before the Protestant Reformation all the great monasteries had, attached to them, primary schools for poor children. These of course disappeared with the monasteries. In the eighteenth century a number of Protestant charity schools were founded, but it was not until the first quarter of the nineteenth century that provision for elementary public instruction began to be recognized as a public duty. In 1833 a Parliamentary grant was first made "for the purpose of education." It was divided between two Protestant societies, the British and Foreign School Society, which ignored Catholicism, and the National, which represented the Church of England. In 1847 Catholic elementary schools, which had much increased in numbers, were admitted to share in the government grant, and the Catholic Poor School Committee was founded to supervise and direct them, on duty which this body, now called the Catholic Education Council, still fulfils.

Catholic journalism in England is zealously represented by "The Tablet," newspaper, which was founded so long ago as 1840. It is published weekly. The "Catholic Journal," the "Catholic Weekly," the "Catholic Herald," the "Catholic News," and the "Universe." The chief Catholic review is the "Dublin Review," founded by Cardinal Wiseman, long edited by W. G. Ward, and now by his son Mr. Wilfrid Ward. It is published quarterly. The "Monthly" is the "Monthly Magazine of General Literature," edited by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, is issued monthly, as its name denotes. An extremely important publication is the "Catholic Directory," which in its present form dates from the year 1838. But for nearly a century previously there had been a Directory which, however, in its earliest issues was not only an Ordo, or Calendar, for the use of priests reciting Office. It remains now to speak of certain Catholic societies existing in England. In the first place, mention must be made of the Catholic Union of Great Britain, founded in 1871. It has the object of securing for Catholics, and particularly for British Catholics, as far as possible, the rights of British citizens. The establishment of the society was sanctioned by the archbishops and bishops of England and by the vicars Apostolic of Scotland (the hierarchy in that country was not restored until 1878), and was emphatically approved by Pius IX. In the rules of the Catholic Union the following means of effecting its objects are specified: "1. By meetings of
the Union and of the Council; 2. By public meetings; 3. By petitions or memorials, or deputations to the Authorities; 4. By local branches; 5. By correspondence with similar societies in other countries; 6. By procuring and publishing information on subjects of interest to Catholics; 7. By cooperation with approved Confraterritutes, Institutions, and Charitable Associations, for the furtherance of their respective objects; which cooperation shall, in each case, be sanctioned by the Bishop of the Diocese; 8. By any other mode approved of by the Council and the Bishop. Over the thirty-seven years the Catholic press has worked steadily and successfully on the lines thus indicated. It has also been of great utility in affording advice and assistance to Catholics, especially the clergy, in matters of doubt and difficulty, legal and administrative. It is governed by a president and council elected by the general body of members. From the first the office of president has been held by the Duke of Norfolk, and for many years the Marquis of Ripon has been the vice-president. On its list of members will be found most British Catholics of position and influence.

The Catholic Truth Society was founded in 1884 by the late Cardinal Vaughan, then rector of the Foreign Missionary College at Mill Hill, and has since had a career of much usefulness. Its main objects are to disseminate among Catholics small and cheap devotional works; to assist the uneducated poor to a better knowledge of their religion; to spread among Protestants information about Catholic truth; to promote the circulation of good, cheap, and popular Catholic books. It holds every year a Conference for the elucidation and discussion of questions affecting the work of the Catholic Church in England. During the twenty years of its existence it has issued publications cheap and small, at the rate of about a million a year. It has formed a lending library of books for the blind; and it has a collection of about forty sets of pamphlets, with accompanying readings on subjects connected with Catholic faith and history. It has been copied by societies bearing the same names in Scotland and Ireland, in the United States, Canada, Bombay, and Australia.

The Catholic Association was originally founded in 1891. Its objects are stated in its Rules as being "(I) To promote unity and good fellowship among Catholics by organizing concerts, excursions, whist tournaments, excursions, and other gatherings of a social character, and (II) to assist, whenever possible, in the work of Catholic organization, and in the protection and advancement of Catholic interests. It has been particularly successful in the organization of pilgrimages to Rome and other places of Catholic interest.

We cannot better bring to an end this brief survey of the career of Catholicism in England since the Protestant Reformation than in some eloquent and touching words with which Abbot Gasquet concludes his "Short History of the Catholic Church in England":—"When we recall the state to which the long years of persecution had reduced the Catholic body at the dawn of the nineteenth century, we may well wonder at what has been accomplished since then. We are told how it has converted our poverty, for example, have been found the sums of money for all our innumerable needs! Churches and colleges and schools, monastic buildings and convents, have all had to be built and supported; how, the Providence of God can alone explain. . . . From this the great century of books, when the principle 'suffer it to be' was applied to the English Catholic Church, there have been signs of the dawn of the brighter, happier days for the old religion. Slight indeed were the signs at first, slight but significant, and precious memories to us now, of the workings of the Spirit, of the rising of the sap again in the old trunk, and of the bursting of bud and bloom in manifestation of that life which, during the long winter of persecution, had been but dormant. Succeedia virescit. Cut down almost to the ground, the tree planted by Augustine has manifested again the divine life within it. It has put forth again more roots and leaves, and gives promise of abundant fruit."


W. S. LILLY.

English Literature.—It is not unfruitful to compare English Literature to a great tree whose far spreading and ever fruitful branches have their roots deep down in the soil of the past. Over such a tree, since the small beginnings of its growth, many vicissitudes of climate have passed; periods of calm, of sunshine, and of rain; of bitter winds and of genial life-bearing breezes; each change leaving its trace behind in the growth and development of the living plant. It is obvious, then, that to present the complete history of such an organism in a few pages is impossible; all that can be attempted in this article is to describe the main lines of its life.

It should not be forgotten, at the outset, that English literature has been no isolated growth. It has sprung from the common Aryan root, has branched off from the primal stem, and has received, and continues to receive, influences from other literatures growing up around it, as well as from those of an earlier time. Yet, as Freeman said, "We are ourselves, and not somebody else," and one of the most remarkable things about English literature is its power of assimilating all that is the fruit of the following scenes, the discussions, the writings, of the world. Latin, French, and Spanish, Greek, Spanish, and French literatures, to name only a few, have poured their influences upon us, not once only, but time after time leaving their trace, and yet our character, our language, our literature, remain unmistakably English. The ancestors of the English (the Teutonic tribes of Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and some Frisians) spent nearly
one hundred and fifty years (455 to 600) in the conquest of the island from the British tribes who had been abandoned by the Roman colonizers nearly fifty years earlier, in 410. Little by little these fierce and hardly heathen tribes, after much fighting among themselves for the supremacy, settled down, and a slow process of civilization made itself felt among them. Christianity, preached by St. Augustine in 597, bringing in its train education, science, and the arts, was the main factor in this refining change. Such British tribes as had escaped the English destroyer remained for a time almost entirely apart, though they and their literature were afterwards to have no small influence upon the literary development of England.

It is not unlikely that the written literature may have begun as early as the sixth century, but at any rate, by the middle of the seventh century the traces of it are clear in the work of Cædmon, according to the testimony of Bede. Between this date and the Norman Conquest, Anglo-Saxon or Old English writers (recent scholars often prefer the latter term as preserving the idea of continuity) produce a body of literature in prose and verse such as was furnished by no other Teutonic nation either in amount or quality during the same centuries. There are extant at least 20,000 lines of verse, and of prose somewhat more. It is almost certain, too, that a good deal has been lost. The language in which we possess it is English of the oldest form, before any notable foreign admixture had taken place. This work, with rare exceptions, is of the Teutonic alliterative type. Speaking generally, this body of literature may be classified under two great periods; the first, when the monasteries of Northumbria were the homes of learning, between about 670 and 800, when, according to the legend, Cædmon, a lay brother of Whitby, received the gift of poetry and passed it on to not unworthy followers; and the second, from the time of King Alfred (871), with some spaces of interruption, to the early part of the eleventh century, when literature, driven from the North by the Danes, came South and spoke in prose of the vernacular. In all this work, more particularly in the verse, there is great variety. Growth may be traced and changes of style.

Putting aside minor verse we come first upon the “Beowulf”, a narrative poem which, together with a few other fragments, is all we have of the old English epic. It seems clear that the matter of it is much older than its present form. It is a storehouse of the thinking and feeling of the forefathers of the English people when they were still heathen and before they came to Britain, even though the poem may not have been actually put together in its present form until the next century. It gives a picture of a very great interest of certain aspects of the actual life of the people. The English temper of mind at its best, enduring and heroic, pervades it throughout.

But this was before Christianity and the monasteries. After the introduction of the new religion the first important record of literature comes under the patriarchal name of Cædmon. It is clear from recent research that Cædmon himself only wrote a very small portion of the so-called Cædmonian poems, but the story of his vision, given by Bede, even if only legend, testifies clearly that the first poetry produced in England began among the people and in religion. The chief interest of the work lies, not only in the actual subject-matter, Scriptural paraphrase, but in the way the matter is treated, a Teutonic aspect being frequently given to the narrative. The craving for freedom, the exultation in war, the longing for moral goodness, the respect for women, all these and many other things come out in the rendering of the “Fall of the Angels”, the “Temptation of Man”, and elsewhere. It is quite clear that several hands have worked at the Cædmonian poems, but in the next great group, a hundred years later, we come upon one individual poet who has signed at least four poems with his name, Cynewulf, and he insists upon his knowing him as the Ancient Mariner constrained the Wedding Guest. He reveals his personality, he becomes real to us. His poems are religious, and among them the finest is the “Christ”. He is a poet of high order. Among the rest of Old English poetry the elegies and the war poems stand out as the most original.

Old English prose, if we except St. Bede’s lost translation of St. John’s Gospel, groups itself round two names, those of Alfred and Ælfric. Alfred (849-901) was eager for his people’s education, and his literary work consists chiefly of translations of important books of his time—Gregory the Great’s “Pastoral Care”, Orosius’s “History of the World”, Boethius’s “Consolation of Philosophy”, and (probably done under his supervision) Bede’s “Ecclesiastical History” and Bishop Wærfrith’s “Dialogues”. To some of these he added prefaces and notes in simple, unaffected English, which make us realize his remarkable and lovable character, both as man and king.

Many years after, Ælfric (c. 955-1025), Abbot of Eynsham, a much more cultivated scholar, and a more finished, though not more attractive, prose writer than Alfred, put forth volumes of homilies, saints’ lives, translations of books of the Old Testament, and other works, which were greatly and justly prized by his hearers and readers.

The “Old English Chronicle”, of which there are seven MSS., a record of events in England from the sixth century to 1154, was meanwhile being written in the monasteries, undisturbed by the many changes passing over England. It is almost certain that Alfred encouraged this work and set it on a surer foundation, perhaps himself adding portions of the record where it concerned his own reign. One other piece of prose literature must be mentioned. In Wulfstan’s “Address to the English” we find there a touch of the suffering of the people from the Danes, the author is often as impassioned as an English reformer might be over the abuses of present-day society. It brings us up in date to the last half-century before the Norman Conquest.

The Norman Conquest is as important in the history of English literature as in that of England's political
and social life. It brought a new and invigorating influence to bear upon the English genius, though in the immediate present of the eleventh century it seemed a crushing disaster for the nation. For nearly one hundred and fifty years the race, the language, and the literature of the people were, so far as external appearance went, it seemed as if everything became Norman-French. But as long as the down-trodgen English kept life in them the springs of poetry and art could not dry up; and though Robert of Gloucester says that only "low men" held to English at this time, yet there were a good many of these "low men", and we have proof that the native population had still their songs and their wandering bards, while in certain of the monasteries the monks went on chronicling events in their mother tongue as much as they had done when a Saxon king had ruled England. The continuity of native verse and prose was never really broken, and just as the English race was at last to absorb its foreign conquerors, and to gain infinitely more than it had suffered from them, so English language and literature were by the same means to be enriched and ennobled to an extent no one then looking on could have dreamed of.

Yet at first literature was apparently silenced, and until the beginning of the thirteenth century there is no writing of much importance except the "Old English Chronicle", which ends in 1154. There were, of course, writings in Latin and in French, and the French was even looked upon by some as likely to be more enduring than the Latin. But the Latin writing was in reality no enemy to English; it was the tongue, then as now, of the Church, and it was the medium for communication between scholars and the language of nearly all books of scholarship. The native work, however, never quite disappearing, revives unmistakably at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and between that date and the death of Chaucer in 1400 there is produced a great mass of literature of endless variety but of varying value.

We come then to the Middle Ages, called "of Faith"; the age of the Crusades, "of cathedrals, tournaments, old coloured glass, and other splendid things" — the age to which, in times of dryness, artists, lovers of romance, as well as pious souls of all kinds, have often looked back and have drawn from it fresh inspiration. It has stimulated in modern times new and noble movements in art and in poetry, and its power of inspiration is not yet exhausted. It was an age of contrasts, of faith and of unbelief, of extraordinary saintliness and of strange wickedness, of reverence and of ribaldry. It was the great Catholic age, when the sacred robe of the Church, spotted though it might be in places through human frailty, was still unrent, whole, and she herself was everywhere acknowledged in Europe as the Divinely appointed mother of men. The history of English literature from the beginning of the thirteenth century onward is the history of the transition (up to about 1250), then of development for about eighty years, in which the work is largely anonymous, finally, a period of achievement, the second half of the fourteenth century, in which individual writers of power begin to emerge, and among them one supreme artist, Geoffrey Chaucer. We trace, too, during these ages the rise of the drama in the miracle and morality-plays.

On the threshold of the revival stand two works: "The Brut" (1265), a poem of 30,000 lines concerning the history of Britain, written by Layamon, an alliterative poet; and "The Four Champions of the World", an alliterative romance, apparently written between 1200 and 1230, and translated into English in the thirteenth century. The latter is marked by a strong assertion of the national spirit, and in literature there is a curious reappearance of the Old English alliterative verse after 300 years of apparent neglect. Amongst other poems in this metre there are four by an anonymous writer of high
poetic power, one of them, "The Pearl", of great beauty and of deep religious feeling. To this alliterative class belongs too the well-known "Piers the Plowman". Chaucer's work, coming almost at the same time, has to some extent overshadowed this poem, but an analysis of the society and ideals of the time it forms a complement to Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales". In "Piers the Plowman" we have that grave outlook upon life which marks the English character at its best, carried almost to excess. The author (or authors, we ought now to say, for it has been recently proved that at least three of the writers must have had a hand in its making) looks upon the society of his time as a "realist". He describes the world almost entirely upon its dark side, and though the remedies he offers are good ("Love is the physician of Life"), and though he never altogether loses his belief in a Divine over-ruling order, yet there is an accent of uncertainty and sometimes of despair in his voice. Chaucer (1340-1400), on the other hand, does not care for problems of life or dark thinking. His picture of society is, on the whole, from its bright side, when men are out on holiday, and when over-seriousness would seem out of place. Poetically, and in its structure, "Piers the Plowman" is much below Chaucer's work, but its forcefulness, its power, its originality, its grim humour, its realistic descriptiveness, and its dramatic moments make it a great poem. Chaucer's work marks the full flowering of English literature in the Middle Ages, and it was he who first raised English poetry to a European position. It is the custom of historians of literature to divide the literary life of Chaucer into a French, an Italian, and an English period, according as his work was influenced by the maturer national literature. This division represents a fact if it be remembered that he carried on, all through his career, certain of the lessons he had learned from the foreign source in the earlier time. There is little doubt that the impulse to write verse came to Chaucer from France. Old English literature was practically unknown to him, but he was saturated with French poetry, for the literature of France was then, outside the classics, the most influential in Europe. Among many shorter poems of this early time, the very first of which is a hymn to the Blessed Virgin, the translation (in part) of the long French allegorical poem of the "Romance of the Rose", and his original and most interesting elegy on the "Death of Blanche the Duchess", are the most important. It is, however, after he has come upon the literature of Italy—Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio—that his true genius begins to show itself. "The Parliament of Fowles", "The House of Fame", and "The Legend of Good Women" (the two last unfinished), as well as some of the "Canterbury Tales", belong to this time. They show him as a true artist, feeling his way through experiment to greater perfection of work and developing his unique sense of humour. Then, in the later years of his life, he strikes upon the fruitful idea of the Canterbury pilgrimage as a framework in which to show the full power of his art in his picture of the life of his own, and, to some extent of all, time; and into this frame he fitted tales he had already written, as well as new ones. But, of it all, nothing exceeds the power and truth of the "Prologue" to the "Tales". His picture of life and the commentary upon it comes straight out of his own observation and character. As he saw men so he fearlessly portrays them, the good, the bad, the indifferent. A few of his tales reflect the coarseness of the time, and it is just possible that the apology placed at the end of the MS. of "The Parson's Tale" is written by himself at the close of his life. But, however that may be, over all he writes he throws his own sunny humour and wide charity, and in this as in the width of his sympathies he is not unworthy to be named with Shakespeare. He is the one supreme literary artist before Spenser, and the best brief summary of him and his work is given in that proverb quoted by Dryden in his criticism of Chaucer, "Here is God's plenty". The name of John Gower (1330-1408) is linked by custom with that of Chaucer, but we recognize now what his contemporaries did not, that Gower's lengthy books in verse are the work rather of an expert journeyman than of a genius. But we may legitimately class together the two writers in the influence on the language. Both being widely read, they helped to make the East Midland dialect in which they wrote the literary language of England, and their choice or rejection of French words welded the language into greater stability and unity. The English language, at the end of the fourteenth century, had to assume nearly that modern form we know. People, language, and literature had now become wholly English. After reviewing this brilliant half-century of poetry, the prose of the same time seems a poor matter. There is no great progress to record, nothing really original of importance was written, and the style follows Latin models rather than the simpler natural manner of the Old English prose. Chaucer wrote prose which in its mediocrity is a curious contrast to his poetry. Sir John Mandeville's "Travels" was a translation of an amusing book, and Wyclif's translation or paraphrase of the Vulgate (in which, however, several other hands than his own had a share), together with his vigorous but heretical tracts and sermons, form the chief prose of this period. After the death of Chaucer, poetry declined in quality with strange swiftness. For the next one hundred and fifty years there is no great poet; the art of poetry, chiefly owing to the scarcity of native poetical genius, but also partly to the swift change the language was undergoing and to the careless attention to the task of the poet, became careless and neglected. The tradition of Chaucer almost disappeared. In the earlier part of the fifteenth century Lydgate (1370-1431?) and Hoccleve (1370-1450?) tried to follow in the footsteps of the master they revered, but frankly recognized their own failure. Their voluminous and mediocre work, especially Lydgate's, is not without
interest to the student, but certain anonymous poets, such as the authors of "The Flower and the Leaf" and "London Lickpenny" (formerly given to Lydgate), succeeded better than they, and the latter poet shows that Chaucer's power of social satire had not disappeared, and in their place a rich imaginative period of verse, came to the front as subject-matter for verse, and later in the century the scathing verse of John Skelton (1460?-1529), though poor as art, is of interest in the light it throws upon the social life of the times. This poet and Stephen Hawes (d. 1519), who tried the "Pastime of Pleasure" to revive the old allegorical style, are the only English names of any note in verse in the latter part of the century. In Scotland, however, the followers of Chaucer, of whom the chief were King James I, Dunbar, Henryson, and Gawain Douglas, were producing and continued to produce poetry worthy of immortality.

Fifteenth-century prose was less barren than the poetry of the age. Since the Conquest, nearly all serious subject-matter, with few exceptions, had been written of in Latin, but with the invention of printing and as the power to read and write spread downwards, English prose became more widely recognized as a medium for the expression of men varied as well as more popular kinds of matter. Four names—Peckock, Fortescue, Caxton, Malory—are recognized as leaders of this movement, but out of their work only Sir Thomas Malory's has become classic. His "Morte D'Arthur", which draws together as many stories and series of stories about King Arthur as he could lay hands upon, is a work of genius, and remains a living book. Its matter is of great intrinsic value and interest, but it is the beauty of its strange childlike style, its un-self-conscious appreciation of lovely and noble things in man and nature, and its underlying religious mysticism, which make it a book of the first order.

The medieval drama, which grew up during these centuries, was, with one or two exceptions, not the work of poets or literary artists, yet it was one of the most educative influences of the time. Beginning in connexion with the liturgy of the Church, there gradually developed a whole cycle of religious plays, showing forth the history of the world from the Creation to the Last Judgment. These, acted in a series, in public places of the towns, at certain great church festivals, provided as much instruction as amusement. There is no doubt that, in spite of passages in them which may now seem to us materialistic or irreverent, these simple and rude dramatic representations, both miracle-plays and the later developed moralities, pressed home great religious truths upon the people. From the point of view of the development of drama, we may say that English tragedy and comedy have, at least to some extent, their roots in these crude plays in doggerel verse.

Leaving the Middle Ages behind us, we come now to the threshold of the most fateful epoch in the history of the English people—the disruption of the Church, or the so-called "Reformation". This was preceded and accompanied by the earlier movement called the "Renaissance", which, having opened up fresh branches of classical learning, more especially that of Greek poetry and philosophy, awakened and stimulated the human mind both to good and to evil. In England the "New Learning" movement, in the hands of men like More and Colet tended to enlightenment and true learning. The "Utopia" of Sir Thomas More, a book of the noblest ideals, represents its spirit at the best. But the effect of the Reformation on the manners and morals of those Englishmen who came back imbued with its intoxication from Italy, was much lamented by contemporary writers, as we find in Ascham's "Schoolmaster". Yet it is to this acquaintance with Italy and its literature that we owe the revival of English poetry after its long relapse since the death of Chaucer. In the work of Sir Thomas Wyatt and of the Earl of Surrey, young men who had studied and felt the beauty and power of the great Italian poets, we discover a new beginning, a new poetic art. It was yet uncertain of itself, experimental, hesitating, and not engaged with deep or very noble subject-matter, but, while observing certain common laws of scansion and diction which the last one hundred years had ignored, attempted new and better melodies.

The publication of Tottel's "Miscellany" in 1557, which contains the work of these two poets, marks an epoch in literature. It set up a standard of poetic art below which no future work could sink. The literary field of that age was known as the aesthetic expectation looking for a new poet who should embody still more fully the poetic ideals of the time.

The new poet came in Edmund Spenser (1552-1599). Selden has a young writer been so immediately recognized and acclaimed by the accredited literary judges of his own time as Spenser was. And posterity has agreed with their judgment. He forms the second great landmark in English poetry after Chaucer, from whom he received inspiration. He had been bred in the stimulating atmosphere of the new learning and was greatly influenced by classic and Italian literature, but he also appreciated earlier English literature, and the only master he openly acknowledged was Chaucer. Spenser's poetry is throughout of wonderful beauty in its art, and is marked by nobility of aim, purity of spirit, and reverence for religion. His "minor poems" are many, and as Professor Saintsbury remarks, would be "major poems" for any smaller poet. He was, for example, a satirist of no mean order and a sonneteer, but in the general judgment, and rightly, Spenser is the poet of the "Faerie Queene". All his special powers are shown there, and all his character, one might almost say all his history. The large allegorical ground-plan of the "Faerie Queene", not half completed, interesting as it is, does not form the great attraction of the poem. That lies in the pure and appealing beauty of the Latin translation, in the varied and glorious description, often minutely detailed, in the wealth of imagination, and in the impassioned love of everything beautiful which enthralls the reader as it did the poet. That there are flaws in the poem goes without saying, more especially as Spenser died leaving it half finished.

The complete plan of the work cannot be gathered from the poem itself. Spenser's letter to Sir Walter Raleigh, prefixed to all editions, is necessary to make it clear. "The centre falls outside the circle." For Catholics, too, the historical allegory is seriously marred by the anti-Catholic bias of the poet's time.
In places, the Church is bitterly assailed, though in other passages Spenser clearly deprecates the desecration of monasteries, churches, altars, and images as the work of the "Blatant Beast of Calumny". Nor does he give by any means undiluted approval to the Anglican Church or the Puritans. Modern criticism, however, places little emphasis upon any portion of the historical allegory, regarding it as an antiquated hindrance rather than a living help to the true appreciation of the poem. The most purely spiritual elements of the allegory, such as the struggles of the human will against evil, aided by Divine power, are those which are valued by discerning readers. Considered in its essential aspect, the "Faerie Queene" is "the poem of the noble powers of the human soul struggling towards union with God". Spenser holds the supreme place among a multitude of other poets of as real though of less genius than his in the sixteenth century, and the work of these, outside the drama, is perhaps seen at its best in the song and the sonnet, two forms which had now an extraordinary vogue. Nearly a dozen anthologies of Elizabethan lyrics, of which the finest is England's "Helicon" (1600), remain to show us the sweetness and rarity of these songs. The sonnet, one of the new Italian poetic forms, introduced by Surrey and Wyatt, are less original, and many of them are translations from foreign sources, but those of Sidney and Shakespeare, at least, stand out by their exceptional force and beauty.

Among the many lesser poets of the time Michael Drayton (1563-1631) has been singled out as especially representative of the general character of Elizabethan genius. He wrote every sort of poetry that was the fashion except moral allegory. His work deserves more notice than is often given to it, and his name is sometimes only associated with his long historical poem of the "Polyhymnia". This type of poetry reflects the patriotism of the age, and Samuel Daniel and William Warner, both poets of some genius, also worked at it. The huge "Mirror for Magistrates," begun in 1555, and not in its final edition until James I's reign, had encouraged this kind of verse. Poetry of an argumentative and philosophic type was produced towards the end of the century, but very little of value that was religious, except the work of Robert Southwell. This heroic young Jesuit and martyr wrote with a high object: to show to the brilliant young poets of his time, whose love poems often expressed unworthy passion, "how well verse and virtue sort together". And he did this by using the literary manner of the age, "weaving", as he himself says, "a new web in their old loom". His book had a distinct influence on contemporary and later poetry, touching even Ben Jonson and perhaps Milton himself. Its quaintness of wit (allying it somewhat to the "metaphysical" school of the next generation) are shot through with warm human feeling which makes its direct appeal to the reader. And sincerity is the very root of it all.

But it is, of course, in the drama that we find all the well-known poets—with the one exception of Spenser—putting forth their greatest force. The sudden rise of the drama in the latter half of the sixteenth century is the most remarkable phenomenon of this supremely remarkable literary age. It has never been fully accounted for. Many of the contemporary records concerning plays and the theatre have been lost, so that we have to form our own judgment of Elizabethan dramatic literature and its causes, upon comparatively speaking, insufficient grounds. Out of some 2000 plays known to have been acted, only about 500 exist, as far as we know, and discoveries of new contemporary testimony or work might revolutionize our judgment on the history of Elizabethan drama. However that may be, the facts, as we have them, are that in the earlier half of the sixteenth century we find scarcely any dramatic work that would enable us to foresee the rise of the great romantic drama. Miracle-plays were acted up to 1579, but clearly no great development could come from these, and still less, perhaps, from the scholarly movement towards a so-called classical drama, imitations of the Latin comedies of Plautus and Terence, such as "Ralph Roister Doister", named the "first English comedy", or of the dramas of Seneca, or of "Pyramus and Thisbe" in the "Midsummer Night's Dream"), but this was no more prophetic than the others.

Then suddenly there appear between 1580 and 1590 plays with life, invention, and imagination in them, often faulty enough, but living. The predecessors of Shakespeare were, Greene, Kyd, and others, but most of all that wild and poetic genius, Marlowe, whose raptures were all fire and air", and who practically created our dramatic blank verse, prepare the way for Shakespeare. Rejecting, gradually, by a sort of instinct, those elements in the drama of the past that were alien to the English genius, they struck out, little by little, the now well-known type of Elizabethan romantic drama which in Shakespeare's hands was to attain its highest perfection. And Shakespeare's genius made of it not only a vehicle for the expression of Elizabethan ideals of drama and of life, but a mouthpiece of humanity itself.

Shakespeare belongs not to England but to the whole world, and most modern nations have vied with each other in acute and wondering appreciation of his genius. A mass of critical literature has grown up round his name, discussing problems literary, artistic, personal, of every kind, and continues to grow. Shakespeare and his work furnish inexhaustible matter for meditation upon almost every human interest and problem. After his time there are some fine dramatists, but none can approach him in completeness and height of genius. Ben Jonson, Chapman, Webster, Ford, Massinger, and Shirley—the two last Catholic converts—with others, carry on the line of dramatic writing, with genius, skill, and the glory gradually departs until one is led to think that if the theatres had not been closed in 1641 on account of
the civil war they would have ceased of themselves for want of good plays. Not only had the technical skill in versification, dialogue, and plot decayed, but the moral tone had so much degenerated that most of the hard charges brought against the drama by the Puritans at the time seem well justified.

When we turn to Elizabethan prose we find it a much inferior and less practised form of art than verse. No standard of good prose towards which writers might aim was recognized, and the masterpieces of the Elizabethan age are few. Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," thus rightly, by its weighty argument and its grave eloquence, won a place among classics. Lyly in his two volumes of "Euphues" was the first, perhaps, to treat prose as equally worthy with poetry of artistic elaboration, and his book, a medley of story-telling and modifying, often most excellent as well as interesting in its ethical museing, instituted a fashion of speech and writing from which for some years few writers stood aloof. Sir Philip Sidney's "Arcadia," a long pastoral romance of sentiment, however, broke the spell and in its turn created a vogue. The novels of this time follow the "Euphues" or the "Arcadia" in most examples, but there is also a third type in the work of the novel of the wildest and reckless adventure, which was afterwards to be the fame of the age. This we find in greater work of Smollet. Criticism of poetry, history, often in the form of chronicles, geography, and adventure, such as in Hakluyt's collection of "Voyages," which is innumerable translations from classical and modern authors, were some of the matters treated in prose. In the novel, as in the drama, the foreign influences, especially those of Spain and Italy, are easy to trace. Though not of the first order of art, the Elizabethan prose is yet most attractive, for it reflects the varied interests of the complex character of the strange and wonderful time of the sixteenth century, and it exhibits in its early stages certain forms of literature, such as criticism and the novel, which were afterwards to develop into orders of the first importance. It is scarcely needful to say that Catholics, of necessity, in this epoch, for them, of disaster and persecution, took little part in the great output of literature.

From one point of view the history of English poetry would seem to be a record of action and reaction, of a struggle between one type of poetry and another, between that in which the matter delivered is all important, and that where correctness of form is the chief end at which the poets aim—between, in fact, the romantic and the classical schools. This general trend may be most clearly seen in the work of the crowd of secondary poets in any age, but the few who excel will be found to combine self-consciousness in themselves, more or less, the opposing elements; though, naturally, both small and great poets will exhibit some individual bias, however slight, towards one type of work or another. This statement is practically true of the seventeenth century. In the very heart of the romantic poets the immediate successors of the Elizabethans, there arose, in the early years of the century, a few young men who began to write verse of another kind altogether, whose work was not developed to its full meaning; however, until Dryden took it up. Meanwhile, one matchless poet, John Milton, living through the greater part of the century, went his own way ("his soul was like a star and dwelt apart"), taking little notice of prevailing types or subject-matter, fusing romantic and classical elements into one splendid kind of work that we can find no name for but "Miltonic.

Before looking in any detail at seventeenth-century verse, it is well to glance at the general character of the age. It is a contrast to that which had preceded it. The Elizabethan time had been exuberant almost to intoxication, rejoicing in the great range of possibilities for human life that new knowledge, exploration, and learning seemed to open out before it. But over this mood at the end of the century there passed a change. Questioning succeeded the brilliant joy in things as they had appeared; self-consciousness followed with the almost impersonal delight in life; the very foundations of religion, politics, and social life were called up for investigation. There had in reality always been a good deal of unrest beneath the surface, even after the settlement of these matters attempted and apparently in part accomplished by Elizabeth. Now the unrest increased, and a sceptical spirit, light or dark, according to the author's temperament, pervaded much of the most capable writing. At the same time there are religious writers who express both in prose and verse the best spirit of the age. When, for instance, under the sway of Archbishop Laud, and now there rises also to its full height the great Puritan movement (already, however, split up into a growing number of sects), strongly and narrowly affirmative of certain views concerning Divine and human things, passing oftener than not into intolerance and wild fanaticism. Milton, on the whole, represents this movement at its best, though his weaknesses may be discovered, especially in his prose work, even in his religious works.

At the beginning of the reign of James I we find the group of poets whose inspiration was Spenser, amongst whom the chief are the two Fletchers, William Browne, and George Wither. All have a sweetness and fullness in their work which links them to the Elizabethans. Passing on to the reign of Charles I, we are struck by a more widely spread order of poets, men who, at their best, are all more or less touched by the desire to find behind material objects an imaginative idea, "the search for the after-sense," and who in trying to express that which they thought they found used an over-abundance of imagery, sometimes beautiful, but often pedantic and fantastic to the point of absurdity. To these Dr. Johnson gave the name of "metaphysical", and to see them at their worst one should look at his quotations from them in his "Life of Cowley." The movement was not confined to England: Italy, France, and Spain had authors of the same order. John Donne (whose verse belongs in date to the reign of Elizabeth) is reckoned as the founder of this school in England. Herrick and the amours known as "Cavalier Lyristes" form one group in it, and Crashaw, Herbert, and Vaughan, religious poets, together with Herrick, are the only ones still held fast in earlier years. Crashaw, a fervent Catholic convert, whose religious verses are often very beautiful, shows in a marked degree the great strength and the great weakness of this school. Professor Saintsbury, the most discerning critic of this poetical group, has said that if Crashaw "could but have kept himself at
his best he would have been the greatest of English poets.” Of another Catholic poet, William Habington, Crashaw’s contemporary, but less than he, though occasionally writing fine passages, the same critic remarks that he is “creditably distinguished” from too many other shakers by a very serious and remarkable decency of thought and language.

But this was poetry which could not develop; it was a kind of second crop from the Elizabethan field, and it gradually withered away. Some time before its end, certain young poets, several of whom had been in France, exiled with the Queen Henrietta Maria, and had caught a new spirit, turned to fresh ways of verse. Edmund Waller (1605–1687) led the way as early as 1620. Denham, Cowley, and Davenant (a Catholic and romantic, brought up in the house of Lord Brooke, Sir Philip Sidney’s friend) followed him in varying degrees. These young poets initiated a change of far-reaching effect. In their hands poetry took on another aspect. It discarded nearly all forms of metre except the heroic couplet, refused to use any but rather commonplace imagery, and turning away from all passionate emotion, tended to treat of subjects which belonged to the intellect rather than to imagination or feeling. Satire or didactic poetry gradually underwent such a change in taste. But this was not accomplished in full until Dryden came. It was he who stamped this school with its leading marks, and gave the couplet its “long resounding march and energy divine.” Yet the restricted and prosaic subject-matter of this verse—satire, didactic, and argumentative work on religion (“The Hind and the Panther” was written in the cause of the Church) and politics—and has made some critics deny it, unjustly, the name of poetry. It is poetry of a certain restricted kind.

John Dryden (1631–1700), had he lived in a time more favourable to imaginative work, would have written verse more purely poetic. He had about him something of the amplitude, inventiveness, and freedom of the Elizabethans, and the history of his poetic development shows him passing from stage to stage of excellence. Though he was the crown and chief of the so-called “classical school,” he was indeed deeply tinged with romantic feeling, and he himself knew and acknowledged that poetry was capable of a higher flight and wider range than it had ever taken in his own day. He was, moreover, a man of many powers. He was a prolific dramatist, and his critical writings have made an epoch in the history of English prose. In the course of his life he changed his politics and his religion; and though doubts have been cast upon his good faith in this respect, the most recent criticism is of opinion that he had nothing but spiritual ends to gain by his conversion to Catholicism. It is unfortunate that we cannot exonerate him as an author from the charge of that sensuality which mars a good deal of his dramatic writing—it is no better and sometimes worse than the immoral by the religious, and often brilliantly witty drama of his time. He himself at the close of his life wrote a full apology for this trait in his work.

Dryden’s lines on Milton show the exalted estimate he had formed of his greater and earlier contemporary, and time has proved the general truth of it. The poetry of Milton (1608–1674) has become an English classic, and “Paradise Lost” has been translated into many tongues. It is regarded as the one great epic in English, and its fame has somewhat overshadowed that of Milton’s earlier work—“L’Allegro,” “Il Penseroso,” “Comus,” and “Lycidas”—poems within their own limits as perfect as anything he ever did. It is when we turn to his prose that the amazing contrast; the incomparable difference between it and his verse, how comparatively low the received standard of prose must have been. “Milton, the great architect of the paragraph and the sentence in verse, seems to be utterly ignorant of the laws of both in prose, or at least utterly incapable or careless of obeying the laws.” Yet it is the splendid passages more like poetry than prose, but the controversial matter which is the subject of most of it—to say nothing of its often violent manner—is scarcely interesting to the present generation. Prose in the seventeenth century had an eventful history, and in spite of the lack of a high devotional works appeared among the which the sermons of Jeremy Taylor stand high, and John Bunyan in “The Pilgrim’s Progress” produced a master-piece of English. Nor must we forget the Author of the Bible, in 1611—a work of a wonderful prose style, eclectic, drawn from many sources, and yet having the appearance of absolute naturalness and simplicity. Preaching was a notable feature of the time, and the very long sermons of Tillotson, Barrow, Stillingfleet, and others make good literature. Presumably Archbishop Tillotson as his master in prose, and it is when we come to Dryden’s own work in the latter half of the century that we find prose beginning to take its place as “the other harmony” of verbal artistic expression. On the whole, it is the mark of Restoration prose to become conversational, and we may say that modern prose, easy, flexible, and fitted for general use, arose in Dryden’s critical prefaces.

Dryden died in 1700, and with the opening of the eighteenth century we pass into an age of strongly marked characteristics. The Revolution by which the Stuart dynasty was displaced had been accomplished, involving, naturally, great changes in the fortunes of religious and political life, particularly disastrous to the Catholic Faith in England. In its earlier stages the century is filled by the party strife of Whigs and Tories, and the trivialities by the religious, and is known as Methodism and Deism—two strange opposites. In the upper classes there was a general lowering of spiritual and emotional temperature—to be enthusiastic was “bad form”—and religion and literature equally suffered. The growing middle class seems to some extent to have escaped this tendency, and the preaching of Methodism touched their hearts.
The “Church of England,” now the State “established” Church, was, however, in a state of spiritual poverty—many of her best clergy having left her for conscience’ sake at the time of the Act of Uniformity. As far as the current stream of poetry was concerned, it was still an affair of a circle of leisurely and fashionable people. A great admiration prevailed for the classics and classical principles, seen generally through the eyes of French critics.

The century opened badly for literature. For years there had not been such a barren literary time. Dr. Johnson first died, and though much verse was being written, it was mostly poor. In prose, there were few men of any mark. The only work showing power was the drama, in the brilliant and immoral comedies of Congreve, Vanburgh, and Farquhar. But within ten years there was a remarkable change. Pope came to the front in verse, and for many years poetry was to be almost synonymous with his name. In prose there was a galaxy of genius, Swift (1667–1746), Addison (1672–1719), Steele (1672–1729), Berkeley (1685–1753), to mention only a few, in whose hands modern prose—mature, varied, capable, combining, when at its best, strength, sweetness, grace, and magnificence—becomes henceforth a secure possession of English literature. But this was not all the change. Pope had first to go through a discipline from the hands not only of writers just mentioned, together with the great novelists in the first half of the century, but from Johnson and those who followed him, especially the historians Gibbon and Robertson. It thus took on a certain formality and stateliness unknown before.

Pope and Johnson are the two names that dominate almost tyrannically the first and second half respectively of the eighteenth century. Most of the elements of his age are more or less represented in the work of Alexander Pope (1688–1744), though, as a Catholic, his religious sympathies lay in another direction than those of his day. His first important poem, the “Essay on Criticism,” lays down rules for the guidance of critics according to the prevalent classical ideals; his “Rape of the Lock,” perhaps his best poem, gives a brilliant and witty picture of the high society of his time; his translation of Homer is a Greek story told in an eighteenth-century manner; his “Essay on Man” is a versifying of Shaftesbury’s philosophy; and the “Essays and Epistles” and the “Dunciad” are didactic and satiric. Dryden and Pope share between them the chief honours of English satire. Pope’s picture of Atticus (Addison) and Dryden’s of Zimri (Buckingham) have no equals in our satirical literature. The subject-matter of Pope’s poetry may sometimes fail to interested, but the ver-sification always claims attention. Pope refined and polished and super-refined the heroic couplet until it became the most perfect instrument for satiric verse. It has not the original vigour and variety of Dryden’s couplet, but it has a finer finish and a more subtle thrust.
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The structure of the Southerners, however, at this time went into prose, and the prose writers contemporary with Pope are men of genius, with Swift by far the greatest of them. His “Tale of a Tub” and “Gulliver’s Travels”—to mention only the two greatest of his writings—show a power of intellect and imagination worthy to be employed upon much finer subjects—always prevent their becoming household companions as Scott and Dickens have become. Smollett and Sterne continue the life of the novel, and Goldsmith, in his masterpiece, “The Vicar of Wakefield”, has earned the gratitude of all readers. Biography, philosophy, and history have a large and distinguished place in the prose of this time. Samuel Johnson (1709–1784) accomplished many kinds of literature. His earliest attempt as well as his latest is biography; of essays he wrote many, but his genius is not best suited to that form, and the work is too often ponderous and mannered; novel and ethical treatise are combined in the delightful pages of “Rasselas”. His great dictionary is philology with an autobiographical flavour; his lives of the poets are partly biographical, but mainly critical, while criticism fills a good space in his edition of Shakespeare. But it is not only the range and value of all this work which makes it so attractive, but—in spite of its limitations—the sincere, strong, kindly character that animates every line of it.

“That fellow calls forth all my powers,” said Johnson of Burke. Edmund Burke (1729–1797) is now looked upon as England’s greatest political philosopher, and his writings belong in subject-matter to history and politics, rather than to literature. Their style, however, rich, imaginative, full of energy, varied to suit its theme, moving among worlds of knowledge, and selecting just the right word and illustration in each place, puts him among the great liter-
ary writers of the century. Both Johnson and Burke are touched with the romantic spirit, but Johnson would have vigorously repudiated any charge of romanticism in his work, and indeed he stood as a great bulwark against the flood of new thought and feeling which, becoming apparent after the death of Pope, had been rising little by little, especially in poetry, ever since the twenties. The great romantic movement was so difficult to define, and yet so easy to trace, becomes the supreme point of interest for the literary historian in the later eighteenth century. There is no class of poetry written during this time that stands in some relation to it, and its influence, as we have said, may be seen, though less clearly, in many of the prose writings. This movement was for the widening and deepening of literature. New fields of subject-matter were taken in hand, and the treatment of these gradually became more imaginative and emotional than it had been since the Elizabethan age. Nature and human life, after suffering from somewhat frigid treatment at the hands of the classical school, seemed to un sist and to become warm, living, and natural with the romantic writers. But this was a very gradual process, and began in the very heart of the classical movement; we may even see traces of it in the unrealized longings of Pope himself, of Spenser, and of who wished he could write a fairy tale. We see the change coming in the gradual rise of fresh metres, and especially of blank verse, in opposition to the heroic couplet; in the struggle of romantic against classic centred to some extent round these two forms.

But just as marked is the change of literary subject-matter. “Nature for her own sake”—natural description imbedded in other matter, or even forming the sole subject of poems—now occupy the writer. An aspect of life neglected by the school of Pope, begins to assert itself. And all this new matter, treated first in a melancholy moralizing spirit, gradually grows in imaginative strength, simplicity, and naturality, until we reach the poetry of Wordsworth and Coleridge, in which the movement is brought to its height and at the same time takes on a new freshness and impetus. James Thomson (1700–1748) published his blank-verse poem of “The Seasons” in 1726–30, and, even though there are many traces in it of the school of Pope, it sounds the first clear note of revolt. It is the first blank-verse poem of importance in the century, and the first important poem devoted to natural description. Many new elements are found in it, too, such as the interest in the poor and the labouring class, and in lands beyond England, as well as a new feeling and affection for animals. In 1748, the year of his death, Thomson published his “Castle of Indolence”, the best imitation of Spenser’s verse and manner that exists, and this was another sign of change. There were many poems written in blank verse or in Spenserian stanza between this poet and the first, whose contribution to the romantic movement is seen perhaps most clearly in his translations from the Icelandic and Gaelic, where he opened up a new field of subject-matter for the interest of readers and the use of poets. And Gray’s poems, small in quantity, but exquisitely finished, were not his only work; as a prose writer he gives us in his letters and journals first-hand and beautiful descriptions of nature in unaffected English. But his poetry is less simple, and, with its restraint of manner, might in some aspects be claimed by the classical school. It is in the decade after his death that we find the movement towards the more natural style expressing itself unmistakably in the half-romantic prose of Macpherson’s rhetorical prose “translations” of the Celtaic poetry of Ossian, in the poems of the unhappy boy-genius (hatterton), and in the collection of “Percy Bulleid”.

Following on these, however, there is a strong attempt at reaction in the poetry of Dr. Johnson, Churchill, and Goldsmith—though Goldsmith’s charming poems are more romantic than he knew. But in the next few years the battle is quickly won for romance by four poets: Burns, Cowper, Crabbe, and Blake, whose significance in the movement is more fully recognized now than it was then. Burns, who wrote the best of his poetry in a mixed Scottish dialect, had been nourished on the best English poets of the past, and the clearness and precision of his verse as well as its satirical and didactic subject-matter belongs to the school of Pope at its best. But, on the other hand, the essential spirit of his satire, in contrast with the detached coldness of Pope’s, is a consuming fire, as Swinburne has pointed out. His early verse, Ossian, and unfulfilled dreams, full of melody and passionate feeling, though all in the line of previous Scottish poetry, were new as regards England, and were truly romantic in tone and manner. Here are poems and passages of verse that we wish Burns had never written, but the largest part of his work belongs to our great literary stock of things noble and humane.

In William Cowper (1731–1800) we come to a poet whose influence is more and more recognized as of first importance in the reaction of eighteenth-century poetry. Living the most retired of lives, and not writing much until over fifty years of age, he has left a body of poetry marked with his own gentle, affectionate, humorous, and sometimes tragic genius, much of which has become classic in English. His best long poem, “The Task”, in blank verse, contains his most original work in the clear and simple descriptions of natural scenery. He also, like Gray, was one of the best of our letter-writers. George Crabbe (1754–1832) wrote nearly all his poetry in the heroic couplet, but used that form with more freedom than his contemporaries. Much of his work is of the story kind, and some of his poems are like novels in verse. Though he chose a hackneyed form for his work, and though all his sketches and stories tend to edification in a didactic way, he is never dull, and his analysis of motive and temperament and his realism are strangely modern in the antiquated setting of the heroic couplet. His work deserves more notice than English readers as a rule give it. William Blake (1757–1827), the fourth of these poets, is one of those geniuses who belong to no one time or place. Some of his most beautiful and charming poems in his two best-known little volumes, “Songs of Innocence” and “Songs of Experience”, might have been written by an Elizabethan, while his long mystical works in verse, not truly poetical, show him in the light of a dreamer whose dreams are rooted in some spiritual reality which only a very few readers can discern with him. But his poetry, as a whole,
though scarcely heeded at all by the public of his own
day, has been found, as it has received more attention
recently, to contain within itself the germ of many
later developments of thought and feeling in society
and literature. He was an engraver and painter as
well as a poet, and his work in these capacities
ought not to be neglected if one wishes to understand the character
of this genius.

Crabbe and Blake carry us on into the nineteenth
century, but before their death Wordsworth and Cole-
ridge accomplished the first of their epoch-making
work. With these three names we enter upon the story
of our modern literature. Wordsworth and Coleridge
are still in some sense with us, as their predecessors of
the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are not. All
English modern poets are directly or indirectly influ-
cenced by them. They deliberately determined to be
missionaries in poetry, and they accomplished a mis-
sion in the face of great discouragement and opposi-
tion. The small volume of "Lyrical Ballads" pub-
lished in 1798, when they were young men together
under thirty, made a revolution in poetry and was the
fulfillment of nearly all that the romantic writers had
been trying half unconsciously to bring about. The
"Lyrical Ballads" of 1800, which opened the book, and the
"Tintern Abbey Lines", which closed it, to say nothing
of the many successes and few failures which fill up
the space between, were alone enough to set up a poetic
standard of high and peculiar significance. In these
poems Wordsworth gave accurate nature-description of the best kind, shot through with the poet's own imagina-
tion and feeling; there was love of, and interest in,
vivid human life, regardless of class or country; there
was weighty ethical matter without dullness. It is
perhaps in this seriousness with which life is viewed
that we find one of the key-notes of the romantic litera-
ture of the later Victorian age. It has been said of
William Wordsworth (1770-1850) that he wrote of
"what is in all men", and the leading ideas of his poetry
are indeed those in which all natural and sane
human beings can join. The healing and joy-giving
poetry of nature, the earth, beauty, and paths of the
simplest human affections, more especially, as seen
in the less sophisticated men and women of the poorer
classes in the country, may be realized by all. But
Wordsworth had also a philosophy of nature and her
relationship to human beings which was the foundation
of all his teaching, and which he expanded after poem
in poem, in passages of very great beauty, and in
much variety of style. It may be here noticed that
Wordsworth's style varies more than the ordinary
judgment gives him credit for. In his eagerness for
freedom from conventional phrasing, he strove, as he
himself tells us in his prose critical prefaces to the
poems, for utter simplicity of language which to us
at times seems bare and even puerile in its effect; but
he is capable more than most of a richness of style and
diction, especially in his blank verse, that is the very
opposite of his own theory. He has many styles, and
not only the making up of his manner is ever quite satisfactory to the Wordsworthian who realizes this.

The poetry of Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834)
does not represent the poet with anything like the
same fullness as does that of Wordsworth. Those of
Coleridge's poems which are of the first order of poet-
ical art are few, but they are inimitable and perfect of
their kind, and have a melody of peculiar witchery. Cole-
ridge was a greater, wider genius than Wordsworth,
and his deepest thoughts went into pedantic prose.
He has left only fragmentary work on philosophy and
criticism behind him, but even that has affected and
still affects the thought of our own time. Had Cole-
ridge possessed the will-power and endurance of
Wordsworth in addition to his own genius, no one can
tell to what heights he might have attained. His
career is a tragedy of character.

On these two poets when young men, as well as on
Southey and others, the altruistic philosophy of the
French revolutionary movement had a profound
effect, and in Wordsworth's "Prelude" we may see to
some extent the extraordinary and stimulating influ-
ence of these ideas upon some of the young and gener-
ous spirits of the English mind. But in spite of much
that was true in it, the elements of error, inadequacy
and crudeness in this philosophy became apparent,
especially in the course of the French Revolution, and
a revulsion from it fell upon both Coleridge and Words-
worth. Wordsworth alone of the two emerged from
the trial unscathed, and, thanks to nature, and to his
sister Dorothy—though how much to his life this
crisis was has himself told us. No one can properly
understand the poetry of this time, nor of the follow-
ing age of Shelley, Byron, and Keats, if he does not to
some extent realize the high and generous hopes raised
by the ideas of the Revolution in certain ardent minds
in England. They saw countless evils and oppression in
the social life of the time, and, in the working out of
the ideas of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, seemed
a full remedy. The three poets just mentioned lived
in the reaction from these hopes. Byron was embittered,
partly from personal causes, partly because of the
state of the society in which he lived, and he found
no redemption at hand. Shelley was fired by the
revolutionary principles as he found them interpreted
by the rationalism of Godwin, even while he shared,
too, in the reaction caused by the excesses of France.
But Wordsworth never entered into these matters at all, but turned by a sort of instinct away from the dreaminess of
life, as he saw it around him, to nature and beauty.

But there is one great writer who was untouched
either by the action or reaction of the revolutionary
ferment. Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832) loved the
poet and believed in it, and to the end of his lite he
was conservative in religion and politics. In his novels
and in much of his poetry he made popular those
romantic elements in the life of the past which are
more particularly associated with the Ages of Faith.
His close and affectionate description of the Scottish
seenery he loved so much was a strength in develop-
ing the care for natural scenery which has become
one of the leading marks of the nineteenth century.
His poetry at its very best is found in many of his short
songs and ballads, and in detached passages of his
longer poems, and it is verse not unworthy to be
comparatively fine work of the time. But his best-known
narrative poems—"The Lay of the Last Minstrel", "Marmion", and "The Lady of the Lake"—have all
taken through a great and special charm, and their
dream, clear, rapid, full of energy, together with their
almost faultless diction, make them worthy of their place among our classics. The popular-
ity of Scott's narrative poetry was overshadowed,
however, by the narrative work of Lord Byron, but to
our gain, since this led Scott to turn to another form
of art and to produce "The Waverley Novels".

Of the three young poets of genius whose short lives
accomplished such reception—Wordsworth, Lord
Byron (1788-1824) is now perhaps the least influen-
tial, though at the time his fame overshadowed every
other writer of verse. His extraordinarily vigorous
satires, marked by his study of Pope, whose poetry he
championed in a literary controversy of the time, is
unique in the energy of their style and the strength
and sting of their wit. It is unfortunate that a large
part of them are marred, for the ordinary reader, by
their extreme voluptrousness. His verse tales of
romantic adventure are imaginative, but pall upon us by
their tendency to sentimentality. His songs and oc-
casional pieces, together with his stock of capital
pieces, of which have fine nature-description—show him in a
more agreeable poetic light. His many dramas are
not truly dramatic, but are rather the outpouring of
his own powerful mind seeking an outlet. If we are
inclined to take an anti-Byronic attitude, it is well to
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remember, first, that his brilliant, undisciplined, passionate work, though it never reached the height of the noblest art, yet taught a lesson of force, vitality, and sincerity to an age which, in spite of its good, was marked by much artificiality, callousness, and insincerity in both life and literature. He did this in a rude and melodramatic way, but he did it. And secondly, let those who judge Byron's wild private career not forget to read the last poem that he wrote, and realize that a change of temper, aspiration towards nobler things, was awakening in him before he died.

Keats and Shelley invite our comparison; their difference and their likeness are equally striking. They lived the same length of time, did all their work before thirty, dying young and with tragedy. They left behind them poetry of the highest order—their lyrics are masterpieces—containing the promise of still finer work. They were the devoted lovers of beauty, believing in it as the supreme reality, and were in earnest over their art, both of them leaving behind great poems expressing their unfinished, and therefore often unsatisfactory and misleading, philosophy of life. Each poet also has written remarkable prose. It is a great fault to consider Percy Bysshe Shelley (1822) as the "ineffable angel" sketched by Matthew Arnold. He was quite half human, and not at all ineffective. His most ethereal lyrics will be found to possess a basis of logical thought, while his prose writings show him as a thinker quite capable of keeping the highest place in her place. We are justified in claiming that the development of his work was that he was growing more and more capable of preserving the balance of the intellect and the imagination. The work that he accomplished in his short life is much and varied. Putting aside his early poems, there is the almost perfect "Adonais," the grave and beautiful lyrical ode to "Prometheus Unbound," in which he states his hopes (not always well grounded and apparently anti-Christian, though he revered certain elements in Christianity) for the future of the world; there is a crowning of short and exquisite lyrics—the highest watermark of English poetry of this kind—as well as the fateful and mystic "Triumph of Life," to say nothing of many others, and amongst them some fine dramatic work in blank verse. And he was only twenty-eight when he was drowned. Upon his errors of thought and style we need not particularize. They are but to be excused, if excusable, as mistakes of youth. Outside his literary work, and, now and then intruding into it, a certain crudity of youth appears. But all he does and says is in good faith, and for his errors he suffered bitterly during his short life. One of the noblest and most discerning of the "thieves" ever paid to his genius has been lately published from the pen of the now well-known Catholic poet, Francis Thompson. John Keats (1795–1821) accomplished less actual work, but had in him, it is generally allowed, greater potentiality of genius. He started life handicapped in circumstance and physical health, while he had no influence or following in his own short lifetime, and "it is the copious perfection of work accomplished so early and under so many disadvantages which is the wonder of biographers." His odes on "The Nightingale," "A Grecian Urn," and "An Ode on a Grecian Urn," are supreme art. Some of his narrative poems are among the best of their kind and his fragment of "Hyperion" shows what he might have accomplished had he lived to practise this graver type of poetry. His fame, however, is now established, and his poetic influence has been one of the strongest in the nineteenth century.

After the death of Keats poetry seems for a time to have exhausted itself. There is little to chronicle except the chirping of small poets until the great age of Victorian poetry opens with Tennyson and Browning.

But, to fill up the early years of the century, there is fine work in prose. The great series of Sir Walter Scott's novels extend from 1814 to 1831, and many smaller efficient writers are ranged round this central figure. The wild enthusiasm with which the Waverley novels were received can perhaps never be renewed. A multitude of causes have tended to divert and disturb the public taste for these great books; and it now lies with the public to decide whether they have yet grown as great as they appeared to be. Amongst these, Francis Thompson (1859–1907), in the opinion of most, takes the commanding place. The appreciation of him by well-known and most able critics has been extraordinarily unanimous and unstinted. He seems to have reached the peaks of Parnassus at a bound."

ENGLAND 469 ENGLAND
with almost every great previous English poet, and whatever may be the more balanced verdict of the future, his poetic immortality is assured. And his Catholic religion was his deepest inspiration.

The prose which grew up around the greatest Victorian epoch was, however, of the highest quality. A brilliant group of writers, as well as of thinkers in many spheres of knowledge and art appeared, and in this respect the age has surpassed the Elizabethan. The development of the novel is the most distinguishing mark of Victorian prose literature. Dickens and Thackeray followed in Scott's footsteps, with a host of other novelists, men, and women, of varying grades of power, who come up to our own day. Greater forms of literature also have been many and splendid. There are the essayists, with Lamb and Hazlitt as the chief; the historians with Macaulay and Carlyle; Froude, Freeman, and Green; Ruskin, with his immense and varied work upon art, economics, and the conduct of life, and whose influence, all for good, in spite of the vagaries of literary taste, is still strong and growing. The enormous extent and range of theological literature is a remarkable feature of the last fifty years, and here the writings of John Henry Newman (q. v. stand out as a supreme "literary masterpiece." Newman touched poetry with imagination, grace, and skill, but it is by his prose that he is recognized as a great master of English style. While all critics agree that the "Apologia" is a masterpiece, and that "nothing he wrote in prose or verse is superluous," there is some difference of opinion as to the reserve literary value of his earlier and later work. R. H. Hutton, however, one of his acutest non-Catholic critics, considers that "in irony, in humour, in imaginative force, the writings of the later portions of his career far surpass those of his theological apprenticeship."

Catholic writers are now many. After long years of repression they have their full freedom in the arena of literature, and there is more than a promise that when the history of the twentieth century comes to be written many Catholic names will be found in the highest places on the roll of honour.

K. M. WARRIN.

ENGLAND, Established Church of, Sec Anglican.

England, John, first Bishop of Charleston, South Carolina. U. S. A.; b. 22 September, 1788, in Cork, Ireland; d. at Charleston, 11 April, 1842. He was educated in Cork until his fifteenth year, was then taught privately for two years, and entered Carlow College, 31 August, 1803. In his nineteenth year he began to deliver catechetical instructions in the parish church and zealously instructed the soldiers in garrison at Cork. He also established a female reformatory together with male and female poor schools. Out of these schools grew the Presentation Convent. He was ordained priest in Cork, 10 October, 1809, and was appointed lecturer at the cathedral. Wherever he preached people thronged to hear him. Pending the opening of the Magdalen Asylum he maintained and ministered to many applicants. In the same year he published the "Religious Repository," established a circulating library in the parish of St. Mary, Shandon, and attended the city jail. In the elections of 1812 he fearlessly exerted his influence, maintaining that, "in vindicating the political rights of his countrymen, he was but asserting their liberty of conscience." In the same year he was appointed president of the new diocesan College of St. Mary, where he taught theology. In 1814 he vigorously and successfully assailed what was termed the impostor measure which threatened disaster to the Church in Ireland. Next to O'Connell's influence was the greatest in the agitation which culminated in Catholic Emancipation. To help this cause he founded "The Chronicle" which he continued to edit until he left Ireland. In 1817 he was appointed parish priest of Bandon. (The bigotry and prejudice of this city at that time may be conjectured from the inscription over its gates: "Turk, Jew or Atheist may enter here, but not a Papist.")

In spite of the prejudices which he found there, he soon conciliated men of every sect and party.

He was consecrated Bishop of Charleston at Cork, 21 Sept., 1820, and refused to take the customary oath of allegiance to the British Government, declaring his intention to become a citizen of the United States as soon as possible. He arrived in Charleston 30 Dec., 1820. Conditions were most uninviting and unpromising in the new diocese, which consisted of the three States of South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. The Catholics were scattered in little groups over these States. The meagre number in Charleston consisted of very poor immigrants from Ireland and ruined refugees from San Domingo and their servants. In 1822, after twelve years of labour, Bishop England estimated the Catholics of his diocese at eleven thousand souls: 7500 in South Carolina, 3000 in Georgia, and 500 in North Carolina. South Carolina was settled as a royal province by the Lords Proprietors, who brought with them the religion of the Established Church, and it was only in 1790 that the enactments imposing religious disabilities were expunged from the constitution of the new State. Religious and social antecedents and traditions, and the resultant public opinion, were unfavourable, if not antagonistic, to the growth of Catholicism. The greatest need was a sufficient number of Catholic clergy. This sparsely settled section, with scattered and impoverished congregations, had not hitherto attracted many men of signal merit and ability. Bishop England faced these unfavourable conditions in a brave and determined spirit. The day after his arrival he assumed formal charge of his see, and almost immediately issued a pastoral and set out on his first visitation of the three States comprising his diocese. No bishop could be more regular and constant in these visitations. He went wherever he heard there was a Catholic, organized the scattered little flocks, ministered to their spiritual needs, appointed persons to teach catechism, and wherever possible urged the building of a church. During these visitations he preached in halls, court houses, State houses, and in chapels and churches of Protestant sects, sometimes at the invitation of the pastors. When in Charleston he preached at least twice every Sunday and delivered several courses of lectures besides various addresses on special occasions. He successfully advocated before the Legislature of South Carolina the granting of a charter for his diocesan corporation, which had been strongly opposed through the machinations of the disaffected trustees. In 1826 he delivered, by invitation, an eloquent discourse before the Congress of the United States. It was the first time a Catholic priest was so honoured. He was chiefly instrumental in having the First Provincial Council of Baltimore convened, and pending this, formulated a constitution for his diocese defining its relations to civil and canon law. This was incorporated by the State and adopted by the several congregations. He
also organized conventions of representative clergy and laity in each of the States in his diocese, to meet annually. In 1840 these were merged into one general convention. He held a synod of the clergy, 21 Nov., 1831, and in 1832 established a seminary and college under the name of "Philosophical and Classical Seminary of Charleston", hoping with the income from the collegiate department to maintain the seminary. Notwithstanding his many and varied duties he devoted himself to this institution as teacher of classics and professor of theology. Organized bigotry soon assailed it, reducing the attendance from one hundred and thirty to thirty; but he continued and it became the alma mater of many eminent laymen and apostolic priests.

In the words of Chancellor Kent, "Bishop Englefield revived classical learning in South Carolina". In 1832 he organized and incorporated a Book Society to be established in each congregation, and in the same year his indefatigable energy and zeal led him to establish the "United States Catholic Miscellany", the first distinctively Catholic newspaper published in the United States. It continued to be published until 1851 and is a treasury of instructive and edifying reading. He compiled a catechism and prepared a new edition of the Missal in English with an explanation of the Mass. He was an active member of the Philosophical Society of Charleston, assisted in organizing the Anti-duelling Society, and strenuously opposed Nullification in a controversy where it was vehemently advocated. His intense loyalty to his faith led him into several controversies which he conducted with a dignity and charity that commanded the respect of his opponents and elicited touching tributes from some of them at his death.

In 1830 he established in Charleston the Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy "to educate females of the middle class of society; also to have a school for free colored girls, and to give religious instruction to female slaves; they will also devote themselves to the service of the sick". Subsequently their scope was enlarged, and branch houses were established at Savannah, Wilmington, and Santee. In 1834 he further promoted education and charity by the introduction of the Ursulines. In 1835 Rev. William Clancy arrived from Ireland as the coadjutor of Bishop England, but, after a year during which he requested and obtained a transfer to another field, Bishop England had originally asked for the appointment of the Rev. Dr. Paul Cullen, then rector of the Irish College, Rome (afterwards the first Irish cardinal), as his coadjutor.

A striking phase of Bishop England's apostolic character was manifested in his spiritual care of the negroes. He celebrated an early Mass in the cathedral for them every Sunday and preached to them at this Mass and at a Vesper service. He was accustomed to deliver two afternoon sermons; if unable to deliver both, he would dispatch the rich and cultured who flocked to hear him, and preach to the poor ignorant Africans. In the epidemics of those days he exhibited great devotion to the sick, while his priests and the Sisters of Mercy volunteered their services in the visitations of cholera and yellow fever. His personal poverty was pitiable. He was known to have walked the streets of Charleston with the bare soles of his feet to the ground. Several times the excessive fatigue and exposure incurred in his visitations and ministrations prostrated him, and more than once he was in danger of death. Twice he visited Hayti as Apostolic Delegate. In 1827 he was asked to take charge of East Florida and, having been given the powers of vicar-general, made a visitation of that territory.

In the interests of his impoverished diocese he visited the chief towns and cities of the Union, crossed the ocean four times, sought aid from the Holy Father, the Papaganda, the Leopoldine Society of Vienna, and made appeals in Ireland, England, France, Italy, wherever he could obtain money, vestments, or books. After Easter, in 1841, he visited Europe for the last time. On the long and boisterous return voyage there was much sickness, and he became seriously ill through exposure to the weather. Though not well, notwithstanding, on his arrival in Philadelphia, he preached seventeen nights consecutively, also four nights in Baltimore. With his health broken and his strength almost exhausted, he promptly resumed his duties on his return to Charleston, where he died, sinecured and loved by every race and every party. His apostolic zeal, saintly life, exalted character, profound learning, and matchless eloquence made him a model for Catholics and an ornament of his order.

Most of his writings were given to the public through the columns of the "United States Catholic Miscellany", in the publication of which he was aided by his sister, a woman of many-sided ability and talents. His successor, Bishop Reynolds, collected his various writings, which were published in five volumes at Baltimore, in 1849. A new edition, edited by Bishop England, Archbishop S. B. Healy of Milwaukee, was published at Cleveland in 1908.


P. L. DUFFY.

Englefield, FELIX, a Franciscan friar, d. 1767. He was the younger son of Henry Englefield of White Knights, Reading, and Catherine, daughter of Benjamin Poole of London. His elder brother, Henry, succeeded their cousin Charles as sixth baronet in 1765. It is uncertain whether his own baptismal name was Charles or Francis. He joined the Franciscans at Douai and was ordained there, probably about 1732, when he was approved for preaching and hearing confessions. He had been teaching philosophy there before ordination, and from 1734 to 1740 he taught theology. In 1744 and 1745 he was titular guardian of York, but remained in residence at Douai. From 1746 to 1749 he acted as definator, and at the end of that period he was in England, for in March, 1749, he was sent to Rome on behalf of his own order and other regulars to procure the repeal of the papal decree of 1744 dissolving the relations between the vicars Apostolic and the regulars. In this he failed, as Benedict XIV supported the vicars Apostolic by the "Rules of the English Mission", issued in 1758. In 1749 Father Felix was titular guardian of Oxford, and in the following year he attended the general chapter at Rome in place of the provincial, Father Thomas Holmes, who was too infirm to undertake the journey. In 1750-1751 he was titular guardian of Greenwich; custos 1752-1755, and finally, on 19 Aug., 1755, he was elected provincial, and held that office till 1758, living at Horton in Gloucestershire. While provincial he drew up a valuable list of all the Franciscans then (1758) in England, with their addresses. Father Thaddeus, O.F.M. (op. cit. inf., p. 14) states that he was the reputed author of the "Miraculous Powers of the Cross of Christ", published in 1808. But this was really written by William Walton, afterwards Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District, whose name appears on the title-page of a subsequent issue. Father Englefield died probably at Douai, though one account says he was on the English mission at the time.

ENGWIN BUTON.
ENGELFIELD

ENGELFIELD, Sir Henry Charles, Bart., antiquary and scientist, b. 1752; d. 21 March, 1822. He was the eldest son of Sir Henry Englefield, sixth baronet, by his second wife, Catherine, daughter of Sir Charles Bucke, Bart. His father, who was the son of Henry Englefield, 5th Viscount White Knights, by Sarah Reading, his 17th son, succeeded to the title and the Englefield estates at Wootton Basset, Wilts; so that Henry Charles inherited both White Knights and Wootton Basset on the death of his father, 25 May, 1780. He was never married and devoted his entire life to study. In 1778 at the age of twenty-six he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, and in the following year Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. For many years he was vice-president of the latter, and succeeded the Marquess Townshend as President. Owing, however, to his being a Catholic, objection was taken to his re-election, and he was replaced by the Earl of Aberdeen. Under his direction the society produced between 1797 and 1818 the series of engravings of English cathedrals, to which series he contributed the dissertations on Durham, Gloucester, and Exeter. In 1781 Englefield joined the Dilettanti Society and acted as its secretary for fourteen years. Besides his antiquarian studies, which resulted in many contributions to "Antiquologia," he carried on research in chemistry, mathematics, astronomy, and geology. His "Discovery of a Lake from Madder" won him the gold medal of the Society of Arts. He took no part in public life, owing to Catholic disabilities, but was intimate with Charles Jenkin's, and his cheerful conversation won him many friends. His portrait was painted by Sir Thomas Lawrence, and two bronze medals were struck bearing his likeness.

In Catholic affairs Englefield took a prominent part. In 1782 a member of the Catholic Committee, he served by the duty for the Southampton Catholic interests, a body which subsequently found itself in conflict with the Vicars Apostolic. In the early stages of this dispute he was one of the moving spirits and contributed the pamphlet, mentioned below, in answer to Dr. Horsley's Anglican attack. The latter afterwards became the friend of the Catholics, and it was through his influence that the Catholic Relief Bill of 1791 was modified to suit the requirements of the bishops. Throughout the dispute Englefield took an independent line, and at times went rather far in his opposition to the Vicars Apostolic, as in 1792, when he was prepared to move a strong resolution at the general meeting of English Catholics. He was dissuaded at the last moment by the three who undertook to act as "Gentlemen Mediators" between the two parties. During his latter years his eyesight failed; he died at his house, Tinley St., London, the barometer thereupon becoming extinct. His works are: "Tables of the Apparent Places of the Comet of 1661" (London, 1788); "Letter to the Author of "The Review of the Case of the Protestant Dissenters"" (London, 1790); "On the Determination of the Orbits of Comets" (London, 1793); "A Walk Through the Southampton (Southampton, 1801); "Description of a New Transit Instrument, Improved by Sir H. Englefield" (London, 1814); "The Andrian, a Verse Translation from Terence" (London, 1814); "Description of the Principal Beauties, Antiquities and Geological Phenomena of the Isle of Wight," with engravings from his own drawings, and a portrait (London, 1816); "Observations on the Probable Consequences of the Demolition of London Bridge." (London, 1821). Gillow has printed (op. cit. infra) a list of papers contributed to the transactions of the Society of Antiquaries, Royal Society, Royal Institution, Society of Physicians, and the Royal Geographical Society, as well as "Nicholson's Journal" and "Tillock's Philosophical Magazine".

---
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ENGLISH College, The, in Rome.—I. FOUNDATION.

The English College, like other Colleges of missionaries (e.g. Douai, II, 168, following Polydore Virgilius Harradine, Spain, 1549), have traced the origin of the English College back to the Saxon school founded in Rome by Ina, King of the West Saxons, in 727. To an antiquity so great, however, the college, venerable though it be, has no just claim. It dates from about the middle of the fourteenth century, when the Savoy of St. Thomas of Canterbury was founded. This hospice owed its establishment to the jubilee, which brought pilgrims to the Holy City from every country of Europe. Those who arrived from England in 1350 to perform their devotions, found it difficult to obtain suitable accommodation and hospitality. The archives of the English College seem to point to the establishment of a guild of laymen, which acquired certain property in the Via Monserrato, the principal persons who took part in the transactions being members of the Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths, who devoted themselves and their fortunes to the service of the pilgrims in the hospice, and William Chandler, chamberlain, Robert de Pina, syndic, and John Williams, officials of the community and society of the English of the city. The deeds show that the property acquired in which therefore may be taken as the date of the foundation of the hospice. But from the time of Henry VIII the hospice began to decline. After the persecution had broken out anew under Elizabeth, many of the clergy went into exile. Some of these, who found their way to Rome, were received into the hospice, and formed a permanent community therein. During Dr. William Allen's visit to Rome in 1576, it was arranged with Pope Gregory XIII that a college should be founded there for the education of priests for the English Mission. As soon as he returned to Douai (30 July, 1576) he sent ten students to Rome to form the nucleus of the new college: six more went in 1577, and again six in 1578. Dr. Gregory Martin, writing on 26 May, 1578, to Father Campion, tells him that twenty-six students are living either in the hospice itself, or in the house next door, which has internal communication with the hospice (Douai Diaries, Appendix, p. 316). Indeed, the Pope had already determined to convert the hospice into a seminary; and at Christmas, 1578, "There came out a Breve from the Popes Holines commanding all the old Chaplains to depart within 15 days, and assigning all the rents of the Hospital unto the use of the Seminary, which was presently obeyed by the said Priests" (Father Persons's Memoirs: Catholic Record Society, II, 144). Unfortunately, however, Cardinal Morone, the Protector of England, and therefore also of the College, appointed as its rector Dr. Clenock, the warden of the hospice, who was assisted by two Jesuit Fathers as prefect of Studies and procurator. Dr. Gregory Martin, again writing to Father Campion, 18 Feb., 1579 (from Reims), informs him that there are in the college in Rome "at the present moment forty-two of our students, most of whom are divines, one rector, three fathers of your Society, and six servants. They live in the hospital and the adjoining house. The revenues of the hospital have been transferred to the seminary, except what is required for the entertainment of the pilgrims" (Douai Diaries, ivii, and Appendix, p. 319). For some years, internal dissensions arose. Most of the students of the college were, of course, English; but there were also seven or eight Welshmen, for no national distinction was made between the Cambrian and the Saxon, all being considered as English for the purposes of the institution.
The Welsh rector was accused of favouring his fellow-countrymen; and finally the English students broke out into open mutiny. They petitioned the Holy Father that the college should be entrusted to the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, and declared that they would rather leave the college than remain under Dr. Clenock.

The students were ordered by the Cardinal Protector to submit under pain of expulsion; but they preferred to go, and began to make preparations for the journey back to Douai and Reims, or to England. Meanwhile, however, was shown for them in Rome, and, intercession being made with the Pope on their behalf, they were reinstated in the college after two days, and their petition was granted. Dr. Clenock was removed from the rectorship and the government of the college handed over to the Jesuits, the famous Father Robert Persons being given temporary charge till the appointment of the first permanent Rector, Father Alphonse Agazzari, on 23 April, 1579.

This day is the real birthday of the English College in Rome; for on this day the Bull of Foundation was signed by Pope Gregory XIII; on this day the students were restored to the administration of their college by the Pope. Thus the academic life of the college was to proceed to England when it should seem good to their superiors; and on this day the College Register begins. The Bull, however, was not published till 23 Dec., 1580. Under this date, the entry occurs in the College Annals (Liber Ruber), II, 12, of which the following is a translation: "A.D. 1580, Dec., to the praise and glory of the most Holy Trinity and of St. Thomas the Martyr, was expedited the Bull of the Foundation of this College, which, though it was granted by Pope Gregory XIII in April last year, did not reach our hands before the above date, and in which, as besides many faculties and spiritual and temporal favours all the goods of the English Hospice were united with the College, we received possession of it on the 29th, Dec., which is dedicated to St. Thomas the Martyr, and which, although it does not explicitly appear in the Bull what the Pope declared by word of mouth that this College was bound to receive and maintain the English pilgrims according to the statutes of the said Hospice. This Bull has been deposited in the College Archives." Thus the English College, the oldest but one of all the Colleges of Rome, (as the Colleges of Rhetorics are antedates it by a few years), was launched on its career, the number of students at the time in the college being fifty, a number which later rose to seventy-five. That the college did its work efficiently, and fulfilled the purpose for which it was founded, is abundantly attested by the lists of names of the priests sent into the mission-field, and especially by the roll of its martyrs. During the period 1632-1695, under the Cardinal Protector Howard, O.P., the greater part of the college was rebuilt.

The eighteenth century was a period of decline. Contrary to the original constitutions of the college, boys were admitted for the course of humanities, and some even, of very tender years, for more elementary studies. In August, 1773, the Society of Jesus was suppressed, and the administration of the college was handed over to Italian secular priests. During this period the students were ill-treated, the college was mismanaged, and a large portion of the archives sold for waste-paper. "At the time of the suppression, the number of Students was reduced to four divines, three philosophers, and three grammarians... Of these, four were Jesuits, six have been Bishop, and thirty-six declared Venerable. The former are: Ralph Vaughan, John Short, Luke Kirby, Laurence Richardson (vere Johnson), William Laey, and William Hart. Short was the first missionary priest from the college to enter England. The Venerables are: George Haylock, Thomas Hemerford, John Milford, John Lowe, Robert Morton, Richard Leigh, Christopher Burton.

The famous Father Robert Persons was rector of the college in 1598, and again from 1598 till his death in 1610. Father Muzio Vitelleschi, afterwards General of the Society of Jesus, held the rectorship from 1592 to 1594, and again from 1594 to 1598. Cardinal Wall, who came to the college in 1597, became rector in 1598, and was made bishop in 1610. The English College may claim as teachers the great Jesuit theologians of the Roman College: Bellarmine, Suarez, Vasquez, in the distant past; and in modern times Perrone, Franzen, Ballerini, Billot.

The Society of Jesus in England.—The college shares with Douai and the other continental seminaries, the honour of having kept alive the lamp of the Faith in England during the dark days of persecution. Without these colleges the supply of priests for the English Mission would have entirely failed. Moreover, the college in Rome was for English Catholics a connecting link with the centre and Head of Christendom, and the missionaries sent thence formed a visible and tangible bond of union with the Holy See for the supremacy of which the faithful in England were suffering too much. When we turn to the nineteenth century, it suffices to mention the name of Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, the "Man of Providence," who had the greatest share in the work of the re-establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in England in 1850, and, as his head, by his genius reconciled the English Catholics to the Pope, and thus they lost the first reason for their "Papal Aggression." It was he who put the Church in England on a firm basis, and, under God, whom we have to thank for the "Second Spring." But Wiseman was not alone. Of the rectors of the nineteenth century, all but two were made bishops, and in every part of the country the English College alumni may be found in positions of responsibility, vicars-general, canons, and especially professors of the ecclesiastical colleges and seminaries, whence the purity of the Roman Faith is diffused throughout the length and breadth of the land.


CHARLES J. CROTTY.

English Confessors and Martyrs (1534-1739).—Though the resistance of the English as a people to the Reformation compares very badly with the resistance offered by several other nations, the example given by those who did stand firm is remarkably interesting and instructive. (1) They suffered the extreme penalty for maintaining the unity of the Church and the supremacy of the Apostolic See, the doctrine which was repudiated by the Reformation in all lands and at all times. (2) They maintained their faith almost entirely by the most modern methods, and they were the first to maintain it, i.e. by education of the clergy in seminaries, and of Catholic youth in colleges, at the risk, and often at the cost, of life. (3) The tyrants, they had to withstand was, as a rule, not the sudden violence of a tyrant, but the continuous oppression of laws, sanctioned by the people in Parliament, passed on the specious plea of political and national necessity, and operating for centuries with that almost irresistible force which the law acquires when acting for generations in conservative and law-abiding countries. (4) The study of their causes and their acts is easy. The number of martyrs is many; their trials are spread over a long time. We have in many cases the papers of the prosecution as well as those of the defense, and the voice of the Roman Curia is England of Rome.

The Cause of the Beatification of the English Martyrs is important not only for England, but for all missionary countries, where its precedents may possibly be followed. The English cause is a very ancient one. Pope Gregory XIII, between 1580 and 1585, made several important vicissitudes. Rules of these martyrs might, in default of others, be used for the consecration of altars, a Te Deum might be publicly sung on the receipt of the news of their martyrdoms, and their pictures with their names attached might be placed in the church of the English College, Rome. These permissions were given with the condition that we keep the name of Urban VIII, in 1642, commenced an inquiry, and though the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 postponed indefinitely the public progress of the cause, a list of martyrs was drawn up by the then vicar Apostolic, Dr. Richard Brook, Bishop of Chalcedon, which was subsequently amplified and published by Dr. Richard Challoner. It was not till 1853 that the cause was revived, when Canon John Morris (a Jesuit after 1809) became its apostle. After several unsuccessful petitions, as that of the Third Synod of Westminster in 1839, to obtain an immediate sanction of their cultus by a papal decree, a formal "ordinary process" was held in London, June to September, 1874. The work was one of much difficulty, firstly because nothing of the sort had been attempted in England before, and secondly because of the multitude of the martyrs. Largely, however, through the public spirit of the Fathers of the London Oratory, who devoted themselves to it untiringly, success was achieved both in gathering together a large body of evidence and in fulfilling the multifarious ceremonial preliminaries on which the Roman jurists so strongly insist. After the cause had been for twelve years in the Roman courts, two depositions by Dr. Challoner, who repeatedly speaking, gave full force and efficacy to the two ancient papal ordinances before mentioned (see Beatification and Canonization).

Thus Pope Gregory's concession resulted in the equivalent beatification of sixty-three martyrs mentioned by name in the pictures (at first, in 1858, fifty-
four were admitted: in 1895 six more were added, with one not in the Roman pictures), while the lists drawn up by Bishops Smith and Challoner led to the "admission of the cause" of 241 martyrs (all but twelve post-Gregorian), who are therefore called "Venerables." They are left with their state still in suspense and are called Dilati. Except seven, these are all "Confessors," who certainly died in prison for their faith, though it is not yet proven that they died precisely because of their imprisonment. There is yet another class to be described. While the foregoing cause was pending, great progress was being made with the arrangement of papers in the Public Record Office of London, so that we now know immeasurably more of the persecution and its victims than before the cause began. In short, over 230 additional sufferers seemed possibly worthy of being declared martyrs. They are called the Proterum, because they were passed over in the first cause. A new cause was thereupon held at Westminster (September, 1888, to August, 1889), and the proceedings have been sent to Rome. For reasons which it is not necessary to touch upon here, it was thought best to include every possible detail, and even those of which there has been no definite information, and the far-reaching cause of Queen Mary Stuart. This, however, proved a tactical mistake. An obscure cause needs much attention as a clear cause, or more. Moreover, the Roman courts are, on the one hand, so short-handed that they give much to a work to which much will lead to little result, and, on the other hand, they are overwhelmed with causes which certainly need attention. In order to facilitate progress, therefore, the cause has been split up: the case of Queen Mary has been handed over to the hierarchy of Scotland, and other simplifications have been attempted; nevertheless, the cause of the Proterum so far hangs fire. Apostolic letters for a Processus de Scriptis were issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites on 21 March, 1899, ordering the then Archbishop of Westminster to gather up copies of all the relevant writings of the men so declared Venerable. This proved a lengthy task, and when complete the collection comprised nearly 500 scriptis, and over 2000 pages. It was not completed till 17 June, 1901. Then, by special concession, four censors were appointed to draw up a preliminary censura in English which was forwarded to Rome. However, further consideration, a decree was drawn up and confirmed by the pope on 2 March, 1906, declaring that none of the writings produced would hinder the cause of the martyrs now under discussion. In the course of the same year a further decree was obtained, allowing the cause for the beat; but not without many restrictions.

I. BEATI.—The sixty-three Blessed will be noticed in detail elsewhere, and the principal authorities will be there noted. Their names are here arranged in companies when they were tried or died together.


II. VENERABLES.—Separate notices will be given of the more notable martyrs and groups of martyrs. But, though they all died heroically, their lives were so retired and obscure that there is generally little about them. However, it is certain that, being educated in most cases in the same seminaries, engaged in the same work, and suffering under the same procedure and laws, the details which we know about some of the more notable martyrs (of whom special biographies are given) are generally also true for the more obscure. The authorities, too, will be the same in both cases.

(1) Under King Henry VIII. (12.)—1537-38: Anthony Brookby, Thomas Belcham, Thomas Cort, Franciscans, thrown into prison for preaching against the royal supremacy. Brookby was strangled with his own girdle, the others died of ill treatment. 1539: Friar Waire, O.S.F., and John Griffith p. (generally known as Griffith Clarke), Vicar of Wandsford, for supporting the papal legate, Cardinal Pole, drawn and quartered (8 July) at St. Thomas Watersings; Sir Thomas Dingley, hanged and quartered, 7 July, with Bl. Adrian Fortescue, q. v. John Travers, Irish Augustinian, who had written against the supremacy; before execution his hand was cut off and burnt, but the writing fingers were not consumed, 30 July. 1540: Edmund Brindolme p., of London, and Clement Philp p., of Calais, attainted for having "adhered to the Pope of Rome," hanged and quartered at Tyburn, 4 Aug., 1540; Sir David Gonsen (also Genson and Gunston), Knight of St. John, son of Vice-Admiral Gonsen, attainted for "adhering" to Cardinal Pole, hanged and quartered at St. Thomas Watersings, 1 July, 1541; John Ireland p. once a chaplain to More, condemned and executed with Bl. John Larke, 1544; Thomas Ashby l. q. v., 29 March, 1544.


May, Tyburn. 1654: John Southworth p., q.v. 28 June, Tyburn.


III. The Forty-four Dilators.—These, as has been explained above, are those "put off" for further proof. Of these the majority were confessors, who probably suffered a comparatively short period of imprisonment, though definite proof of their death ex armenias is not forthcoming. (1) Under Queen Elizabeth (18).—Robert Dimock, hereditary champion of England, was arrested at Mass, and perished after a few weeks' imprisonment at Lincoln, 11 Sept., 1580; John Cooper a young man, by the breath of the air, Dr. Nicholas Harpsfield, and probably a distributor of Catholic books, arrested at Dover, and sent to the Tower, died of "hunger, cold and stench," 1580; Mr. Allworth (Aylward), probably of Passage Castle, Waterford, who admitted himself to Mass at his house, was arrested, and died after eight days, 1580: William Chaplin p., Thomas Cotemore p., Robert Holmes p., Roger Wakeman p., James Lomax p., perished in 1584. Cotemore was a bachelor of Oxford in 1536; of Wakeman's sufferings several harrowing details are obtainable. Thomas Crowther p., John Jetter p., and Laurence Vaux p., q.v., perished in 1585; John Harrison p., 1586; Martin Sherson p., and Gabriel Thimbelby p., 1587; Thomas Metham, S.J., 1592; Eleanor Hunt and Mrs. Wells, gentlewomen, on unknown days in 1600 and 1602. (2) Under the Commonwealth (8).—Edward Wilkes p., died in York Castle before execution in 1642; Boniface Kempe (or Francis Kipton) and Ildophene Hesketh (or William Hanson), O.S.B., professed of Montserrat, seized by Puritan soldiery in Yorkshire, and warned to disband, 26 July (7), 1644; Richard Bradley, S.J., b. at Burying Hall, Lancs., 1605, of a well-known Catholic family, seized and imprisoned, but died before trial at Manchester, 20 Jan., 1645; John Felton, S.J., visiting another Father in Lincoln, was seized and so badly used that, when released (for no one appeared against him), he died within a month, 17 Feb., 1645; Thomas Manby, O.S.B., of Courtfield p., and Thomas Blount p., imprisoned at Shrewsbury, d. at unknown dates; Robert Cox, O.S.B., d. in the Clink Prison, 1650. (3) During the Oates Plot (10).—Thomas Jesson, S.J., d. after twelve months' imprisonment, 27 Sept., 1678. He had renounced a handsome inheritance, and had been living apostatized, turning king's evidence against him. William Lloyd, d. under sentence of death at Brecknock, 1679. Plaice Alidham or John Adland (O.S.B.), a convert clergyman, chaplain to Queen Catherine of Braganza, d. under sentence in 1679. William Atkinson, S.J., condemned at Stafford, was too deaf to hear the sentence. When it was shouted in his ear, he turned and thanked the judge; he was reprimed and d. in bonds, 7 March, 1681. Richard Birkett p., d. 1680 under sentence in Lancaster Castle; but our martyrlogists seem to have made some confusion between him and John Richardson, and John Birkett (see Gillow, Catholic Rec. Soc., IV, pp. 431-40). Richard Lacey (Prince), S.J., Newgate, 11 March, 1680; William Allison p., York Castle, 1681; Edward Turner, S.J., 19 March, 1681, Gatehouse; Benedict Constable, O.S.B., probably at Lamspring, 1689, 11 Feb.; Richard Mason, 1683, Durham; John Beale, S.J., 30 October, 1692, Liecester Gaol under William III. (1) Others Put off for Various Causes. (8).—John Mawson, assigned to 1614, is not yet sufficiently distinguished from John Mason, 1601; there is a similar difficulty between Matthias Harrison, assigned to 1599, and James Harrison, 1602; William Tyrwhitt, named by error for his brother Robert; likewise the identity of Thomas Dyer, O.S.B., has not been fully proved; James Atkinson, killed under torture by Topcliffe, but evidence is wanted of his constancy to the end. Father Henry Garnett, S.J., q.v.; was he really used ex oculo fidei, or was he advanced in the Powder Plot, by merely human misjudgment, not through religious prejudice? The case of Lawrence Hill and Robert Green at the time of the Oates Plot is similar. Was it due to odium fidei, or an unprejudiced error?

ENGLISH

Various Years (2) Thomas Gabbyt. P. Cist. 1575; William Hambleton p. 1583; Roger Martin p. 1582; Christopher Dixon, O. S. A. 1616; James Laburne, 1683; Edward Arden, 1594.


V. The Eleven Bishops.—Since the process of the Prætermittis has been held, strong reasons have been shown for including on our list of sufferers, whose causes ought to be considered, the eleven bishops whom Queen Mary had expelled under certain conditions. Sir Edmund Bonner, or under some form of confinement. Their names are: Cuthbert Turnstall, b. Durham, died 18 Nov., 1559; Ralph Boyle, b. Lichfield, d. 18 Nov., 1559; Owen Golethorpe, b. Carlisle, d. 31 Dec., 1559; John White, b. Winchester, d. 12 Jan., 1560; Richard Pate, b. Worcester, d. 23 Nov., 1565; David Poole, b. Peterborough, d. May, 1568; Edmund Bonner, b. London, d. 5 Sept., 1568; Gilbert Bourne, b. Bath and Wells, d. 10 Sept., 1599; Thomas Thirlby, b. Ely, d. 20 Aug., 1570; James Turbervile, b. Exeter, d. Nov., 1570; Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York, d. Dec., 1578.


J. H. Pollen.

English Ladies. See Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

English Versions of the Bible. See Versions of the Bible.

Enniscorthy. See Ferns, Diocese of.

Ennodius. MAGNUS FELIX, rhetorician and bishop, b. probably at Arles, in France, d. at Pavia, Italy, 17 July, 521. When quite young he went to Pavia, where he was educated, was betrothed, and eventually became a priest, his fiancee at the same time becoming a nun. It does not appear certain that he ever married. Shortly after the death of his benefactor, Epiphanes (106), he moved to Antwerp, where he was bishop of that city. Soon he was ordained deacon and taught in the schools. About this time (529) two popes were elected simultaneously, the decan Symmachus and the archpriest Laurentius. King Thoericius was in favour of the former, and convened a council at Rome in 501, the famous Synod of Pavia, to settle this question and put an end to much scandal. On this occasion Ennodius acted as secretary to Laurentius of Milan, who was the first to sign the decrees of the council. The adherents of the archpriest Laurentius, who was rejected by the council, wrote against the decisions of the latter. Ennodius answered them and defended the synod in a still extant work entitled "Libellus adversus qui contra synodum scribere pressumpsissent". After returning to the objections urged against the incompetency and irregularity of the council, he attacks the enemies of Symmachus and proclaims the inability of human judges to decide matters pertaining to popes: "God no doubt consorted to the affairs of men being settled by men; He reserved to Himself the passing of judgment upon the pontiff of the supreme see" (Libellus, 98). In 513 Ennodius was still at Milan, but shortly afterwards he was made Bishop of Pavia. In 513 and 517 he headed two successive embassies which Pope Hormisdas sent to Emperor Anastasius at Constantinople, both of which, however, were barren of results. The unrelenting enmity of the emperor endangered the lives of the envoys, and a message was sent to the Emperor in 517. Of the remaining years of his life nothing is known. His epitaph, found by accident, gives the date of his death.

The works of Ennodius comprise poems for special occasions and epigrams, particularly inscriptions for churches or other religious monuments. His defence of the synod of 502, often known as "Libellus pro Synodo", his autobiography (Enchasticium), his panegyric on King Theoricus, and the biographies of his predecessor Epiphanius of Milan, and a monk, Antonius of Lerins, are interesting from an historical point of view; the first four especially. As much can be said of his numerals as his addresses and epigrams to contemporaries. Notwithstanding their verbosity, they contain much useful information concerning the addresses and the customs of the time. Ennodius is the last representative of the ancient school of rhetoric. His "Farenisia didascalía" (511) celebrates
Enthronization—A superstructure which lies horizontally upon the columns in classic architecture. It is divided into three parts: the architrave (the supporting member carried from column to column); the frieze (the decorative portion); and the cornice (the crowning and projecting member). Each of the orders has its appropriate entablature, of which both the general height and the subdivisions are regulated by a scale of proportion derived from the thickness of the column. It is occasionally used to complete, architecturally, the upper portion of a wall, even when there are no columns, and in the case of pilasters or detached or engaged columns is sometimes profiled round them.

Paul Lejay.

Ensignen (Ensinien), Ulrich, belonged to a family of architects who came from Eisingen near Ulm, Württemberg, and who shared as master-builders in the construction of the most important Gothic buildings of the fifteenth century in Southern Germany. Ulrich, the founder of the family, is known from the year 1391; d. at Strasbourg, 10 Feb., 1419. Apparently he learned his craft in the stonemason's guild of Ulm, and was also, perhaps, a pupil of Master Heinrich Fugger, who was well acquainted with the work of the Ulm cathedral, and must have taken charge of the work on the Ulm cathedral, which was begun in 1391. Ulrich seems to have been a man of great ability, and his work is marked by a careful and precise execution.

(2) Kaspar Ensingen was the eldest son; very little is known of him.

(3) Matthias Ensingen, another son, d. 1398.

(4) Matthias Ensingen, the youngest and most gifted son, was trained as a master-builder for life, and received the title of Master of the Cathedral. He was appointed master-builder for life in 1420 and at Eisingen in 1436. He was younger brother of Caspar Ensingen, and was placed in the cathedral of Ulm in 1427. He was appointed master-builder for life in 1436.

Minster at Berne. The cornerstone of this was laid in 1421, and Matthias conducted the work until 1449. In addition he had his father's position as architect at Eisingen (1419-1463). It can be proved that he was engaged on the cathedral of Ulm from 1446, but it was not until 1451 that he had charge of its construction as master-builder; before this last appointment he worked (1449-51) on the cathedral at Strasbourg without occupying any well-defined position. On the Ulm cathedral he completed the vaulting of the choir and built the tower as high as the nave. During his last years he was for a short time again at Eisingen (1452-60) with Vincenz Ensingen, son of Matthias, employed at Berne from 1418; during 1462-66 he worked at Constance, and in 1472 he built the small cloister at Basle.


Joseph Sauer.

Enthronization (Greek ἐνθρώνισμος, to place on a throne).—This word has been employed in different meanings: (1) formerly, it meant the solemn placing of the relics upon the altar of a church which was to be consecrated; hence a newly consecrated church was called naos enthronismenon ( ναὸς ἐνθρωνίσμενος). (2) In the Middle Ages we find the inthronizatio matrimonii, or enthronization of marriage, which was the taking of the nuptial Mass (beneficio nuptiarum). (3) In the East it was employed, but seldom, to denote the induction into a parochial benefice. (4) It was used especially to designate the ceremony of enthronization which accompanies the consecration of a bishop. After receiving episcopal consecration, the newly consecrated bishop was solemnly conducted to the episcopal throne, of which he took possession. He received the kiss of peace and listened to the reading of a passage of Holy Scripture, whereupon he pronounced an address or sermo enthronisticus. The letters which it was customary for him to send to the other bishops in token of his being in communion with them in the same faith, were called litterae inthronisticæ, or syllabae enthronisticæ (συλλαβάς ἐνθρώνιστικῆς), and the gifts which it was customary for him to present to the bishops with whom he had consecrated himself and to those who had taken part in the ceremonies were called the inthronisticæ (ἐνθρώνιστικαὶ). At present, after the consecration has taken place, the new bishop is conducted by the consecrating bishop and one of the assistants to the throne occupied by the consecrator during the ceremony, or to the seat usually taken by the bishop if the consecration has taken place in the cathedral church. The enthronization can also take place independently of the consecration; in this case, the bishop, after taking his seat upon the throne, receives there the homage of all ecclesiastics present in the cathedral. These ceremonies have no longer the
slightest juridical importance (see Bishop). (5) The enthronization of the pope in the Chair of St. Peter, Cathedral Petri, was formerly a very important ceremony, which took place at St. Peter’s in Rome, or, exceptionally, in the church of St. Peter ad Vincula, where there was also a Cathedral Petri. This ceremony was performed immediately after the election, if the latter had taken place in the church of St. Peter, or before the coronation. It was an object to proclaim to the Christian world that the newly elected pope was the lawful successor of St. Peter. Before this ceremony had taken place, he was forbidden to take part in the administration of the Church. In 1059 Pope Nicholas II declared that the omission of the enthronization did not prevent the pope from administering the Church. This custom disappeared in the thirteenth century, owing to the fact that in that period the popes seldom resided in Rome. Equivalent to enthronization is the abdication of the pope by the cardinals, which is performed in St. Peter’s after the election of the pontiff. It does not differ from the slightest right. (6) The Roman Pontifical mentions enthronement amongst the ceremonies which accompany the solemn consecration of a king. It is still practised in the Anglican Episcopal Church at the coronation of the King of England (see enthronization).

**Enthusiasts.** See Messiahs.

**Eoghan, Saints.** (1) Eoghan of Ardsraw was a native of Leinster, and, after presiding over the Abbey of Kilmanagh (Co. Wicklow) for fifteen years, settled in the valley of Mourne (Co. Tyrone), his mother’s country, about the year 756. He was followed by many disciples including St. Kevin of Glendalough, who completed his studies under this saint. As a boy he had been carried off to Britain, and subsequently he was taken captive to Brittany, together with St. Thaumaturgus. He is best known for his foundation of the Abbey of Clones, Co. Monaghan. So great was the fame of the sanctity and learning of St. Eoghan, at Mourne, that he was consecrated first Bishop of Ardsraw about the year 811. It is difficult to give his chronology with any degree of exactness, but the Irish annals place the date of his consecration in the year 811. His name is generally latinized as Eugenius, but the Irish form is Eoghan (Owen), hence Tir Eoghan, or Tyrone.

Ardsraw continued as an episcopal see until 1150, when it was translated to Rathmole and subsequently to Maghery, but in 1254 it was definitely removed to Derry. In all these changes St. Eoghan was regarded as the clan patron, and hence he is the tutelary guardian of the See of Derry to this day. His feast is celebrated on 23 August.

(2) Eoghan of Cloncullen, Co. Tipperary, has been identified with Eoghan, son of Sarin of Cloncullen, for whom St. Ailbe of Emly composed a rule. He is mentioned in the Martyrologies of Tallaght and Donegal, and is venerated on 15 March.

(3) Eoghan, Bishop, is commemorated in the Martyrology of Tallaght on 18 April, and is included by the Bollandists under that date, but the particulars of his life are scanty in the extreme.

(4) Eoghan the Sage (Sapiens) finds a place in the Irish martyrologies, and he is also included in the "Acta Sanctorum," but no reliable data as to his life is forthcoming. His feast is celebrated on 28 May.

(5) Eoghan of Cranfield (Co. Antrim) has been described as Abbot of Moville, but there is reason to believe that he is to be identified with the saint of the same name, especially as the Bollandists style him *Episcopus et Sapientes de Mogh-crnechaille.* A St. Erman of Crennae (Cranfield) is honoured on 21 May, but this is also the feast day of St. Eoghan. However, "Erman" may be a scribal error for "Eoghan," and this would account for the sending misapplying of name in regard to the patron of Cranfield.

There are other Irish saints of this name, but their history is somewhat obscure, and it is not easy to reconcile their chronology.

*Acta Sanct. Hb. (Louvain, 1845); Todd and Reeves, Martyrology of Donegal (Dublin, 1864); O’HANLON, Lives of the Irish Saints (Dublin, s. d.); O’LAVERTY, Down and Connor (Dublin, 1884), III.

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

**Epact.** (Gr. έπαξ, English *epact: Lat. dies adjecti,* the solstitial days of the solar year relative to the lunar year; hence, more freely, the number of days in the age of the moon on 1 January of any given year. The whole system of epacts is based on the Metonic Lunar Cycle (otherwise known as the Cycle of Golden Numbers), and serves to indicate the days of the year on which to commence new moons occurring in the so-called paschal moon. It is evident, then, that an exact anniversary of Easter is impossible except in years in which the seventeenth day of the paschal moon falls on Sunday. In the early days of Christianity there existed a difference of opinion between the Eastern and Western Churches as to the day on which Easter ought to be kept, the former keeping it on the fourteenth day of the month, and the latter on the Sunday following. To secure uniformity of practice, the Council of Nicaea in 325 decreed that the first seven days of the month following the eastern new moon were to be counted from Easter on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the month should be adopted throughout the Church, believing no doubt that this mode fitted better with the historical facts and wishing to give a lasting proof that the Jewish Passover was not, as the Quarte-deciman heretics believed, an ordinance of Christianity.

As in the Julian calendar the months had lost all their original reference to the month, the early Christians were compelled to use the Metonic Lunar Cycle of the Greeks to find the fourteenth day of the paschal moon. This cycle in its original form continued to be used until 582, when it was revised and embodied in the Gregorian calendar. The Church claims no astronomical exactness for her lunar calendar; we shall show presently the confusion which would necessarily result from an extreme adherence to precise astronomical data in determining the date of Easter. She wishes merely to ensure that the fourteenth day of the calendar moon shall fall on or shortly after the real fourteenth day but never before it, since it would be chronologically absurd to keep Easter on or before the Passover. Otherwise, as Clavius plainly states (Romani Calendarii a Gregorio XIII P.M. restitutio, cap. V, § 13), the Church wishes merely to ensure that the fourteenth day of the moon be kept, without regard for the exactness of the moon's occurrence on the day before or after their proper seats and cares much more for peace and uniformity than for the equinox and the new moon. It may be mentioned here that Clavius's estimate of the accuracy of the calendar, in the compilation of which he took such a leading role,
part, is extremely modest, and the seats assigned by him to the new moons tally with strict astronomical findings in a degree which he seems never to have anticipated. The impossibility of taking the astronomical moons as our sole guide in finding the date of Easter will be best understood from an example: let us suppose that Easter is to be kept (as is at least implied by the British Act of Parliament regulating its date) on the Sunday after the astronomical full moon, and that this full moon, as sometimes happens, occurs just before midnight on Saturday evening in the western districts of the United States of New York. Then this moon will therefore happen a little after midnight in the eastern districts, so that Easter, if regulated strictly by the paschal full moon, must be kept on one Sunday in the western and on the following Sunday in the eastern districts of the same city. Lest it be thought that this is carrying astronomical exactness to extremes, we may say that, if Easter was dependent on the astronomical moons, the feast could not always be kept on the same Sunday in England and America. Seeing, therefore, that astronomical accuracy must at some point give way to convenience and that an arbitrary decision on this point is necessary, the Church has been drawn up a lunar calendar which maintains as close a relation with the astronomical moons as is practicable, and has decreed that Easter is to be kept on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the paschal moon as indicated by this calendar.

LUNAR CYCLE OR CYCLE OF GOLDEN NUMBERS.—In the year now known as 432 B.C. Meton, an Athenian astronomer, discovered that 235 lunations (i.e. lunar months) correspond with 19 solar years, or, as we might express it, that after a period of 19 solar years the new moons occur again on the same days of the solar year. He therefore drew up the calendar into periods of 19 years, which he numbered 1, 2, 3, etc. to 19, and assumed that the new moons would always fall on the same days in the years indicated by the same number. This discovery found such favour among the Athenians that the number assigned to the current year in the Metonic Cycle was henceforth written in golden characters on a pillar in the temple, and, whether owing to this circumstance or to the importance of the discovery itself, was known as the Golden Number of the year. As the 19 years of the Metonic Cycle closely approximate (i.e. 235 exact number of lunar months) and contained in the aggregate 235 lunations, it was clearly impossible that all the years should be of equal length. To twelve of the 19 years 12 lunations were assigned, and to the other seven 13 lunations, the thirteenth lunation being known as an embolismic or intercalary month.

Length of the Lunations.—The latest calculations have shown that the average duration of the lunar month is 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 3 seconds. To avoid the difficulty of reckoning fractions of a day in the calendar, all computors, ancient and modern, have assigned 30 and 29 days alternatively to the lunations of the year, and regarded the ordinary lunar year of 12 lunations as lasting 354 days, whereas it really lasts some 8 hours and 46 minutes longer. This under-estimation of the year is compensated for in two ways: (1) by the insertion of one extra day in the lunar year (as in the solar calendar) every fourth year, and (2) by assigning 29 days to six of the seven embolismic lunations, although the average lunation lasts only about 294 days. A comparison of the solar and lunar calendars for 76 years (one cycle of 19 years is unsuitable in this case, since it contains sometimes 4, sometimes 5, less years) will make this clearer:—76 solar years=2,365+19, i.e. 2,384 days. Therefore 940 calendar lunations (since 19 years equal 235 lunations) contain 27,759 days (29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 3 seconds). But 940 lunations averaging 294 days equal only 27,730 days. Consequently, if we assign 30 and 29 days uninterruptedly to alternate lunations, the lunar calendar will, after 76 years, anticipate the solar by 29 days. The intercalation of the extra day every fourth year in the lunar calendar reduces the divergence to 10 days in 76 years, i.e. 23 days in 19 years. The divergence is removed by assigning to the seven embolismic months, only the former is spoken of here. It has just been said that seven of the 19 years of the lunar cycle contain a thirteenth, or embolismic, month, consisting in six cases of 30 days and in the seventh of 29 days. Granted that the first solar and lunar years begin on the same day (i.e. that the new moon occurs on 1 January), it is evident that, as the ordinary lunar year of 12 lunations is 11 days shorter than the solar, the lunar calendar will, after three years, anticipate the solar by 33 days. To the third lunar year, then, is added the first embolismic month of 30 days, reducing the divergence between the calendars to 20 days. After three further years, i.e. at the end of the sixth year, the divergence will have mounted to 36 (5×11+3) days, but, by the insertion of the second embolismic lunation, will be reduced to six days. Whenever, then, the divergence between the calendars amounts to more than 30 days, an embolismic month is added to the lunar year.

The length of the thirteenth, or embolismic, month is kept the same in the nineteen years of the solar cycle. This is done by allowing the moon to gain 1 day on the sun from the second to the last year of the cycle, and by deducting 1 day from the lunations in the remaining years. The average length of the lunations, therefore, is 29 days, and the length of the year averages 354 days, or 365+1/4. Days.

MANNER OF INSERTION OF THE EMBOLISTIC MONTHS.—As the Gregorian and Metonic calendars differ in the manner of inserting the embolistic months, only the former is spoken of here. It has just been said that seven of the 19 years of the lunar cycle contain a thirteenth, or embolismic, month, consisting in six cases of 30 days and in the seventh of 29 days. Granted that the first solar and lunar years begin on the same day (i.e. that the new moon occurs on 1 January), it is evident that, as the ordinary lunar year of 12 lunations is 11 days shorter than the solar, the lunar calendar will, after three years, anticipate the solar by 33 days. To the third lunar year, then, is added the first embolismic month of 30 days, reducing the divergence between the calendars to 20 days. After three further years, i.e. at the end of the sixth year, the divergence will have mounted to 36 (5×11+3) days, but, by the insertion of the second embolismic lunation, will be reduced to six days. Whenever, then, the divergence between the calendars amounts to more than 30 days, an embolismic month is added to the lunar year.

The length of the thirteenth, or embolismic, month is kept the same in the nineteen years of the solar cycle. This is done by allowing the moon to gain 1 day on the sun from the second to the last year of the cycle, and by deducting 1 day from the lunations in the remaining years. The average length of the lunations, therefore, is 29 days, and the length of the year averages 354 days, or 365+1/4. Days.
19 solar years averaging 365^{1/4} days equal 6093^{1/4} days. But later computators found that the average lunation lasts 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 3 seconds, consequently:

255 calendar lunations (one Lunar Cycle) equal \[ \frac{6093^{1/4} \times 16.5 \times 31.5 \times 15}{28.5 \times 15} \] days. 

We thus see that the average Lunar Cycle is about 1\frac{1}{4} hour too long, and that, though the new moons occur on the same dates in successive cycles, they occur, on an average, 1\frac{1}{4} hour earlier in the day. The astronomers entrusted with the reformation of the calendar calculated that after a period of 3124 years (310 years is according to our figures a closer approximation) the new moons occur on the day preceding that indicated by the Lunar Cycle, that is, that the moon is one day older at the beginning of the year than the Metonic Cycle, if left unaltered, would show, and they removed this inaccuracy by adding one day to the age of the moon (i.e., the Epaets) every 300 years seven times in succession and then one day after 400 years (i.e., eight days in 8\times3124 or 2500 years). The addition of one to the Epaets is known as the Lunar Equation and occurs at the beginning of the years 1500, 2100, 2400, 2700, 3000, 3300, 3600, 3900, 4500, 4600, etc. A second disturbance of the Epaets is caused by the occurrence of the non-bissextile centurial years. We have seen above that the assigning of 6093^{1/4} days to 19 lunar years leads to an error of one day every 3124 years, and that within these limits the lunar calendar must not be disturbed; but the assigning of 6093^{1/4} days to every 19 solar years amounts to an error of 3 days every 400 years, and it is therefore necessary to omit one day from the solar calendar in every centurial year not divisible by 400. Consequently, since this extra day in February every fourth year is an essential part of the lunar calendar, the new moons will occur one day later in the non-bissextile centurial years than indicated by the Lunar Cycle (e.g., a new moon which under ordinary circumstances would have occurred on 20 February will occur on 1 March), and the age of the moon will, after the omission of the day, be one day less on all succeeding days of the solar year. As the fact that the January and February moons are not properly indicated is immaterial in a system whose sole object is to indicate as nearly as practicable the following month on the first day of March, the subtraction of one from the Epaets takes place at the beginning of all non-bissextile centurial years and is known as the Solar Equation. In the following table, +1 is written after the years which have the Lunar Equation, and -1 after those which have the Solar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lunar Equation</th>
<th>Solar Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clavius continued this table as far as the year 300,000, inserting the Lunar Equation eight times every 2500 years and the Solar three times every 400 years. As he thus treats the year 3200 as a leap year his table is untrustworthy after 5199.

**Indication of New Moons.**—Before proceeding further, it will be convenient to consider the method devised by Lilius of indicating the new moons of the year in the Gregorian calendar. As the first lunation of the year consists of 30 days, he wrote the Epaets *XXIX, XXVIII, ..., I* opposite the first thirty days of January; then continuing, he wrote *opposite the thirty-first, XXIX opposite the first of February and so on to the end of the year*, except that in the case of the lunations of 29 days he wrote the two Epaets XXV, XXIV opposite the same day (cf. 5 Feb., 4 April, etc. in the Church calendar). From this arrangement it is evident that if, for example, the Epaet of a year is X, the new moons will occur in that year on the days before which the Epaet X is placed in the calendar. One qualification must be made to this statement. According to the Metonic Cycle, the new moon can never occur twice on the same date in the same nineteen years (the case is exceedingly rare even in the purely astronomical calendar); consequently, whenever the two Epaets XXV and XXIV occur in the same nineteen years, the new moons of the year whose Epaet is XXV are indicated in the months of 29 days by Epaet XXVI, with which the number 23 is for this object associated in the Church calendar.

**How to Find the Epaet.**—We have already seen that the Church used the Metonic Cycle until the year 1582 as the only practical means of determining the date of the fourteenth day of the paschal moon. Now, this cycle has always been regarded as starting from the year 1 B.C., and not from the year of its introduction (432 B.C.), probably (although all the authors we have seen appear to have overlooked the point) because such a change was found necessary if the leading characteristic of the Metonic Cycle were to be retained in changing from a lunar to a solar calendar, viz., that the first lunar and solar years of the cycle should begin on the same day. That two nations with calendars so fundamentally different as those of the Greeks and the Romans should regard the solar year as beginning with the same phases of the sun would be highly improbable, even if there were no direct evidence that such was not the case. But we have shown that when the solar and lunar years begin on the same day, the Epaets of the successive years of the cycle are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Golden Numbers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epaets</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>xi</td>
<td>xii</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxv</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epaets</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epaets</td>
<td>xv</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, if we divide the calendar into cycles of 19 years from 1 B.C., the first year of each cycle will have the Epaet *, the second the Epaet XI and so on, or, in other words, the Epaet of any year before 1582 depends solely on its Golden Number. The Golden Number of any year may be found by adding 1 to the year and dividing by 19, the quotient showing the number of complete cycles elapsed since 1 B.C. and the remainder (or, if there be no remainder, 19) being the Golden Number of the year. Thus, for example, the Golden Number of 1484 is 3, since 1484 + 1 = 78, with 3 as remainder; therefore the Epaet of the year 1484 is XXII.

In the course of time it was found that the pasehal moon of the Metonic Cycle was losing all relation to the real paschal moon, and in the sixteenth century (c. 1576) Gregory XIII entrusted the task of reforming the calendar to a small body of astronomers, of whom Lilius and Clavius are the most renowned. These astronomers having drawn up the table of equations to show the changes in the Epaets necessary to preserve the relations between the ecclesiastical and astronomical calendars, proceeded to calculate the
propers Epacts for the years of the Lunar Cycle after 1502. These they found to be as follows:—

Golden Numbers: 1 2 3 4
Epacts: XII XXIII 1V 2V 3V 4V 5V 6V 7V 8V 9V 10V

Golden Numbers: 11 12 13 14
Epacts: XXI XXII XXIII XXIV

Now the essential difference between the Metonic Cycle and the Gregorian system of Epacts lies in this, that whereas the sphere of application of the former was held to be unlimited, that of the latter is bounded by the Lunar and Solar Equations. Since, then, a Solar Equation occurs in 1700, the Cycle of Epacts just given holds only for the period 1502–1699, after which a new cycle must be formed. To understand the reason of the changes we must remember (1) that by treating 365 days as equivalent to one solar year and to 12 lunations plus 11 days, we under-estimate the solar year by about 5½ hours and the lunations by 8½ hours; (2) that in consequence of this under-estimation of the solar year, one day must be inserted in every fourth solar year except in the case of the centurial years not divisible by 400; and (3) that the under-estimation of the lunations by 6 hours every year (the additional 2 hours are compensated for in the embolismic months and by the Lunar Equation) necessitates the insertion of one extra day in the lunar calendar every fourth year without exception. To take an example: the Epact of 1696 (its Golden Number being 6) is XXVI, and since this Epact is found opposite 4 February in the Church calendar we know that in 1696 the new moon happened on that date and that consequently 23 February was the twentieth day of the calendar moon. But, since the under-estimation of the lunations amounts to one day in every four years, the following day (our 24 Feb.) was only nominally the twenty-first day of the moon and the proper twenty-first was our 25 February. The Church therefore inserted an extra day after 23 February and treated this as the real 24 Feb. (our 24 and 25) as one continuous day in both the solar and lunar calendars, and consequently 25 February (our 26) was again legitimately regarded as the twenty-second day of the moon and the fifty-sixth day of the solar year. Coming now to the year 1700, we find its Epact to be X; consequently the new moon occurred on 19 February and 25 February was the fifth day of the calendar moon. But, since no extra day could be inserted in February, 1700, the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth of this month had to be treated as the sixth day of the moon, and the age of the moon on every subsequent day of the year 1700 was one day less than indicated by the Epact X. As the moons of January and February are of very secondary importance in the Church calendar, we may say that the age of the moon in 1700 and all subsequent years was one day less than indicated by the above Cycle of Epacts, and thus the Epacts for the years of the Lunar Cycle after 1700 are:—

Golden Numbers: 1 2 3 4
Epacts: XI XXII XXIII XXIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Golden Numbers</th>
<th>Epacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>11 12 13 14</td>
<td>XXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>15 16 17 18 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table may, with the help of the table of equations, be continued to 5199.

Examples.—(1) To find the Epact of the year 3007. Golden Number is 1, since 3007 + 1 = 163, with 1 as remainder. Epact corresponding to Golden Number 1 after 2000 is XXV; therefore the Epact of 3007 is XXV.

(2) On what Sunday will Easter fall in the year 2459? Golden Number of 2459 is 9, and Epact of ninth year of Lunar Cycle after 2400 is XXVI. Since the Epact of 2459 is XXVI, the new moons of this year will occur on the days before which XXVI is placed in the Church calendar (e.g. in the Breviary). Now, since the paschal moon is that whose fourteenth day falls on or next after 21 March, the paschal new moon can never happen before 8 March. The first day after 8 March to which the Epact XXVI is prefixed in the Church calendar is 4 April; consequently the paschal new moon in the year 2459 will occur on 4 April,
Counting 14 days from 1 April, which we include in our reckoning, we find the fourteenth day of the paschal moon to be 17 April. In 2459, therefore, Easter will be kept on the Sunday after 17 April, which with the help of the Dominical Letters is found to be 20 April. (See DOMINICAL LETTER.)

For bibliography see DOMINICAL LETTER.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Eparchy (ἐπαρχία) was originally the name of one of the divisions of the Roman Empire. Diocletian (284–305) and Maximian divided the empire into four great Prefectures (Gaul, Italy, Illyricum, and the East). Each was subdivided into (civil) Dioceses, and these again into Eparchies under governors (presides, ἑγεμόνες). The Church accepted this division as a convenient one for her use. The Prefectures of Gaul, Italy, and Illyricum made up the Roman Patriarchate; the Prefecture of the East was divided (in the fourth century) between the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch and three exarchates. The Diocese of Egypt was the Patriarchate of Alexandria, the Diocese of the East (not to be confused with the Prefecture of the East) became that of Antioch. Asia was under the Exarch of Ephesus, Pontus under Capadocia, and Thrace under Heraclia. Under these patriarchates and exarchates came the eparchies under metropolitans;

they had under them the bishops of the various cities. The original ecclesiastical eparchies then were provinces, each under a metropolitan. The First Council of Nicaea (325) accepts this arrangement and orders that: "the authority of appointing bishops shall belong to the metropolitans in each eparchy" (can. iv). That is to say that in each such civil eparchy there shall be a metropolitan bishop who shall have authority over the others. This is the origin of our provinces. Later in Eastern Christendom the use of the word was gradually modified and now it means generally the diocese of a simple bishop. The name Eparchy is, however, not commonly used except in Russia. There it is the usual one for a diocese. The Russian Church now counts eighty-six eparchies, of which three (Kiev, Moscow, and St. Petersburg) are ruled by bishops who always bear the title "Metropolitan," and fourteen others are under archbishops.

HINSCHIUS, Kirchenrecht, I, 558, 578; FORTECUE, The Orthodox Eastern Church (London, 1907), 22, 23, 297.

ADRIAN FORTECUE.

Épée, CHARLES-MICHEL DE L', a philanthropic priest and inventor of the sign alphabet for the instruction of the deaf and dumb; was b. at Versailles, 25 November, 1712; d. at Paris, 23 December, 1789. He studied theology; but, having refused to sign a condemnation of Jansenism, was denied ordination by Christophe de Beaumont, Archbishop of Paris. He then studied law, but no sooner had he been admitted to the Bar than the Bishop of Troyes consented to ordain him. This bishop died shortly afterwards, whereupon the Abbé de l'Épée returned to Paris, and began to occupy himself with the education of two deaf and dumb sisters who had been recommended to him by Father Vanin, of the Congregation of the Christian Doctrine. He endeavored to develop the mind of his pupils by means of certain conventional signs constituting a complete alphabet. Succeeding in this attempt, he resolved to devote himself to the education of the deaf and dumb, and founded a school for their instruction at his own expense. His method is based on the principle that "the education of deaf mutes must teach them through the eye the way what other people acquire through the ear." Several other methods had been tried, previous to this time, to enable the deaf and dumb to communicate with one another and with the rest of mankind, but there can be no doubt that he attained far greater success than Pereira, Bulver, Dalgarino, Dr. John Wallis, or any of his predecessors, and that the whole system now followed in the instruction of deaf mutes virtually owes its origin to his ingenuity and devotion. His own system has, in its turn, been replaced by a newer method, which teaches the pupils to recognize words and, in time, to utter them, by closely watching, and afterwards imitating, the motions of the lips and tongue in speech, the different portions of the vocal organs being shown by means of dia-

No contribution by JEAN LEBAIRE.

Epérie, Diocese of (Ephriennsis Ruthenorum), of the Greek Ruthenian Rite, suffragan to Gran. De-
tached in 1818 from the Diocese of Munkács, this diocese has had the following bishops: Gregory Tarkovics (1818–41); Joseph Garganees (1843–75); Nicholas Toth (1876–81); John Vályi (1882). The city of Eperies, called by the Slovaks Pressova, was founded by a German colony in the 13th century; by all accounts Tárca, a tributary of the Danube, and is now the capital of the county of Sáros, Hungary, with a population of 11,000. It is famous for its sugar factories, its mineral waters, and its rock salt mine situated at Sóvar, several miles distant. The diocese contains 187,000 Austrian Catholics; 22 priests (nine married); 190 parishes scattered over the territory of six counties; 190 churches, 25 chapels, 24 parochial schools, with 28,000 pupils, a college for boys, 2 convents of Basilians, and a theological seminary with 40 students. The episcopal residence, the seminary, and most of the diocesan institutions are situated at Eperies.

Nilles, Symbols ad illustrandum historiam ecclesiae orientalis in terris coronae S. Stephani (Innsbruck), II, 909–12; Missiones cath. (Rome, 1897), 706.

S. VALHÉ.

Ephesians, Epistle to the.—This article will be treated under the following heads: I. Analysis of the Epistle; II. Special Characteristics: (1) Form; (a) Vocabulary; (b) Style; (2) Doctrines; III. Object; IV. To Whom Addressed; V. Date and Place of Composition; Occasion; VI. Authenticity: (1) Relation to other writings of the New Testament; (2) External factors; (3) Tradition. I. ANALYSIS OF THE EPSTELE.—The letter which, in the MSS. containing the Epistles of St. Paul, bears the title "To the Ephesians" comprises two parts distinctly separated by a doxology (Eph., iii, 20 sq.). The address in which the apostle introduces himself, therefore, is not followed by a prologue; in fact, the entire dogmatic part develops the idea which is usually the subject of the prologue in the letters of St. Paul. In a long sentence that reads like a hymn (Eph., i, 3–14), Paul praises God for the blessings which He has bestowed upon all the faithful in accordance with the eternal plan of His will, the sublime plan by which all are to be united under one head, Christ, a plan which, although heretofore secret and mysterious, is now made manifest to believers. Those to whom the Epistle is addressed, having heard it in their turn, been made partners of these blessings, and the Apostle, having recently learned of their conversion and their faith, assures them that He ceases not to give thanks to Heaven for the same (Eph., i, 15, 16) and that, above all, He prays for them. The explanation of this prayer, of its object and motives, constitutes the remainder of the dogmatic part (cf. Eph., iii, 1, 14). Paul asks God that His readers may have a complete knowledge of the hope of their calling, that they may be fully aware both of the riches of their inheritance and the greatness of the Divine power which guarantees the inheritance. This Divine power manifests itself first in Christ, Whom it raised from the dead and Whom it exalted in glory above all creatures and established head of the Church, which is His body. Next, this power and goodness of God was evidenced in the readers, whom it rescued from their sins and raised and exalted with Christ. But it shone forth, above all, in the establishment of a community of salvation welcoming within itself both Jews and Gentiles without distinction, the Death of Christ having broken down the middle wall of partition, i.e. the Law, and both sections of the human race have been reconciled and united with Christ. But it shone forth to form but one body, one house, one temple, of which the apostles and Christian prophets are the foundation and Christ Himself is the chief cornerstone. (Eph., i, 16–li, 20.) Paul, as his readers must have heard, was the minister chosen to preach to the Gentiles of this sublime mystery of God, hidden from all eternity and not revealed even to the angels, according to which the Gentiles are made coheirs with the Jews, constitute a part of the same body, and are joint partakers in the same promises (Eph., iii, 1–13). Deeply imbued with this mystery, the Apostle implores the Father to contribute to the perfection of the Christian state and the complete knowledge of Divine charity (Eph., iii, 14–19), continuing the same prayer with which he had begun (Eph., i, 16 sq.).

Having praised God anew in the solemn doxology (Eph., iii, 20 sq.), Paul passes on to the moral part of his letter. His exhortations, which he bases more than is his wont on dogmatic considerations, revert to that of chapter iv, verse 1, wherein he entreats his readers to show themselves in all things worthy of their vocation. First of all, they must labour to preserve the unity described by the author in the first three chapters and here again brought into prominence; One Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God. There is, of course, a diversity of ministries, but the respective offices of apostles, prophets, etc. have all been instituted by the same Christ exalted in glory and all tend to the perfection of the society of saints in Christ. From these social duties, Paul proceeds to the consideration of individual ones. He contrasts the Christian life that his readers are to lead, with their pagan life, insisting above all on the avoidance of two vices, immodesty and covetousness (Eph., iv, 17–v, 3). Then, in treating of the details of this life, the apostle, in keeping with the plan of his epistle, proceeds through the persons and functions of husbands and wives, whose union he likens to that of Christ with His Church, and the duties of children and servants (v, 21–vi, 9). In order to fulfil these duties and to combat adverse powers, the readers must put on the armour of God (vi, 10–20). The Epistle closes with a special mention of the holy apostles and prophets, wherein the Apostle tells his correspondents that he has sent Tychicus to give them news of him and that he wishes them peace, charity, and grace.

II. SPECIAL CHARACTERS.— (1) Form.—(a) Vocabulary.—This letter, like all those written by St. Paul, contains hapax legomena (αραξ λεγώμενα), about seventy-five words which are not found in the Apostile's other writings; however, it was a mistake to make this fact the basis of an argument against Pauline authenticity. Of these words nine occur in the quotations from the New Testament and only five of them, in current language or else designate things which Paul elsewhere had had no occasion to mention. Others, again, are derived from roots used by the Apostle and besides, in comparing these hapax legomena (αραξ λεγώμενα) one with another, it is impossible to receive in them a characteristic vocabulary that would reveal a distinct personality. (Cf. Brunet, "De l'authenticité de l'Epître aux Ephésiens; preuves philologiques", Lyons, 1897; Nägele, "Der Wort-schatz des Apostels Paulus", Göttingen, 1905.)

(b) Style.—This Epistle, even more than that to the Colossians, is remarkable for the length of its periods. The first three chapters contain hardly more than three sentences and these are overlaid with relative or participial clauses that are simply strung together, frequently without being connected by the logical particles that occur so frequently in St. Paul's style. Such participle clauses are particularly encumbered with numerous prepositional modifiers (especially with ἐπί and ἐν) of which it is difficult to state the exact meaning. Often, too, several synonyms are in juxtaposition and in very many cases a noun has an explanatory genitive, the sense of which differs but very little from the meaning of the noun itself. For all of these reasons the language of the Epistle, heavy, diffuse, and languid, seems very different from the dialectical, animated, and vigorous style of the Apostle's uncontestted letters. It is important to note that in the moral part of the Epistle these peculiarities of style do not appear and hence they would seem to depend more on the matter...
treated rather than on the author himself; in fact, even in the dogmatic expositions in the great Epistles, St. Paul’s language is frequently involved (cf. Rom., ii, 13 sq.; iv, 16 sq.; v, 12 sq.; etc.). Moreover, it must be observed that all these peculiarities spring from the same source, viz., they all indicate a certain inducement or idea surging in upon a deep and tranquil meditation on a subjicite subject, the various aspects of which simultaneously appear to the author’s mind and evoke his admiration. Hence also the lyric tone that pervades the first three chapters, which constitute a series of prayers, benedictions, thanksgivings, and prayers; a sort of rhythmic composition has been pointed out in chapter i (cf. T. Innitzer, “Der Hymnus im Eph., i, 3-14” in “Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,” 1904, 612 sq.), and in chapter ii traces of liturgical hymnology have been observed (Eph., iii, 20), but they are no more striking than in I Cor. and are not to be compared with the liturgical language of I Clement.

(2) Doctrines.—The doctrines on justification, the Law, faith, the flesh, etc., that are characteristic of the great Pauline Epistles, are not totally lacking in the Epistle to the Ephesians, being recognizable in chapters ii and iii. However, the apostle is careful to lead him to develop these particular doctrines. On the other hand, he clearly indicates, especially in chapter i, the supreme place which, in the order of nature and grace, is allotted to Christ, the author and centre of creation, the point towards which all things converge, and the source of all grace, even through his great Epistles, St. Paul sometimes touches upon these doctrines (cf. I Cor., viii, 6; xv, 45 sq.; II Cor., v, 18 sq.), they constitute the special object of his letter to the Colossians, where he develops them to a much greater extent than in that to the Ephesians. In fact, this Epistle treats more of the Church than of Christ. (On the doctrine of the Church in the Epistle to the Ephesians see W. L. Meirian in “Revue biblique,” 1898, pp. 343 sq., and W. H. Griffith Thomas in the “Expositor,” Oct., 1906, pp. 318 sq.) The word church no longer means, as is usual in the great Epistles of St. Paul (see, however, Gal., i, 13; I Cor., xii, 28; xv, 9), some local church or other, but the one universal Church, an organic whole uniting all Christians in one body of which Christ is the head. Here we find the systematized development of elements insinuated from time to time in the letters to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans. Thus it appears that there is now neither Jew nor Greek but that all are one in Christ Jesus (Gal., iii, 28); that in each Christian the life of Christ is made manifest (Gal., ii, 20; II Cor., iv, 11 sq.); that all are led by the Spirit of God and of Christ (Rom., viii, 2-14); that each one of the faithful has Christ for head (I Cor., xi, 3), could, by combining these elements, easily come to consider all Christians as forming but one body (Rom., xii, 5; I Cor., xii, 27), animated by one spirit (Eph., iv, 4), a single body having Christ for head. To this body the Gentiles belong by the same right as the Jews. Only they are more justified of sin than the Jews were, according to the Epistle to the Ephesians, made manifest to all the Apostles, a declaration which, moreover, the Epistle to the Galatians does not contradict (Gal., ii, 3-9); however, this revelation remains, as it were, the special gift of St. Paul (Eph., iii, 3-9). The right of pagans seems to be no longer questioned, which is easily understood at the close of the Apostle’s life. At the death of Christ the wall of separation was broken down (cf. Gal., iii, 13), and all have since had access to the Father in the same spirit. They do not meet on the Jewish ground of the abolished Law but on the ground of the transaction in the Church established by Christ. The Church being thus constituted, the author contemplates it just as it appears to him. Besides, if in the extension of the Church he beholds the realization of the eternal decree by which all men have been predestined to the same salvation, he is not obliged to repeat the religious history of mankind in the way he had occasion to describe it in the Epistle to the Romans; neither is he constrained to explain the historical privileges of the Jews, to which he nevertheless alludes (Eph., ii, 12), nor to connect the new economic with the old (see Eph., iii, 8), nor indeed to introduce, at least into the dogmatical expositions, the sins of the pagans, whom he is obliged to accuse of having lacked intimate communion with God (Eph., ii, 12). For the time being all these points are not his main subject of meditation. It is rather the recent and subjective facts of the life in the Church, the body of Christ, that he brings into prominence (I Cor., the Apostle contemplates Christ Himself in His actual influence over this body and over each of its members; hence it is only occasionally that he recalls the tokens of the God’s power of Christ’s Death. (Eph., i, 7; ii, 5, 6). From heaven, where He has been exalted, Christ bestows His gifts on all the faithful without distinction, commanding, however, that in His Church certain offices be held for the common welfare. The hierarchical terms used so constantly later on (πρεσβυτέροι, ἐπίσκοποι, διάκονοι) are not met with in the letters of St. Paul, those who have seen Christ and who bear His name are not held to occupy a position different from those who are not (cf. Eph., v, 15). However, it is for the same purpose that the prophets in the Epistle to the Ephesians used the charisma, or spiritual gifts described in I Cor., xii-XIV. The evangelists, who are not noticed in Eph., ii, 20, or iii, 5, are inferior in dignity to the apostles and prophets in connexion with whom they are, nevertheless, mentioned (Eph., xi, 11). In his first letters St. Paul had no occasion to allude to them, but they belong to the Apostolic age, as at a later epoch they are never referred to. Finally the “pastors and doctors” (A. V., pastors and teachers), who are clearly distinguished (Eph., iv, 11) from the apostles and prophets, founders of the church, seem to be those local authorities already indicated in I Thess., v, 12; I Cor., xvi, 15 sq.; Acts, xx, 28. While the attention given to these different ministers forms a distinctive note in the Epistle to the Ephesians, we cannot therefore admit (with Klopper, for example) that the Church is in process of degeneration, or that the jurisdiction of the hierarchy as such. The unity of the Church, a point that he clearly emphasizes, is not so much the juridical unity of an organized society as the vital unity that binds all the members of the body to its head, the glorified Christ. Nor is it true that the author already predicts centuries of future existence for this Church (Klopper) as, properly speaking, the ages to come, referred to in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ii, 7), are to come in the Kingdom of Heaven (cf. ii, 6). On the other hand we know that St. Paul’s hope of soon witnessing Christ’s second coming kept constantly diminishing, and therefore the vision of a Church still progressive with the Christ, he might well define (Eph., v, 22 sq.) the laws of Christian marriage, which at an earlier period (I Cor., vii, 37 sq.) he regarded only in the light of the approaching advent of Christ.

The exposition that we have given of the doctrines proper to the Epistle to the Ephesians has been so made as to show that none of these doctrines taken separately contradict the theology of the great Pauline Epistles and that each one individually can be connected with certain elements disseminated in these Epistles. It is nevertheless true that, taken in its entirety, this letter contains in the doctrinal system, the Pauline authenticity of which can only be critically defended by pointing out circumstances in consequence of which the Apostle was able thus to develop his first theology and profoundly to modify his manner of setting it forth. Naturally
this leads us first of all to try to ascertain the object of the letter to the Ephesians.

III. OBJECT.—It has been said that St. Paul combated immoral doctrines and an antinomian propaganda that especially endangered those to whom the letter was addressed (Pfeiffer). But this might not explain the dogmatic part of the Epistle, and even in the hortatory part nothing betokens polemical preoccupation. All the warnings administered are called forth by the pagan origin of the readers, and when the author addresses his prayers to Heaven in their behalf (Eph., i, 17 sqq.; iii, 14 sqq.) his whole aim is that his readers, or the persons to which he has addressed these prayers, or persons to whose church he would have God deliver their Christian life. Köppler thought that the author had Judeo-Christian in view, still denying converted pagans their full right in the Church, and Jaquier gives this as an additional motive. Others have said that the Gentile-Christians of the Epistle had to be reminded of the privileges of the Jews. But not one word in the letter, even in the section containing exhortations to unity (Eph., iv, 2 sqq.), reveals the existence of any antagonism among those to whom the Apostle writes, and there is no question of the old order or re-establishment of unity. The author never addresses himself to any save converted pagans, and all his considerations tend solely to provide them with a full knowledge of the blessings which, despite their pagan origin, they have acquired in Christ and of the greatness of the love that God has showered on them. Apart from the general assumption, or personal hypothesis, it is not by way of defending it against attacks but of expressing all his gratitude for having been called, in spite of his unworthiness, to announce the great mystery of which he had sung the praises. Briefly, nothing in the letter allows us to suppose that it responds to any particular need of those to whom it is addressed, nor that they, on their side, had given the author any particular occasion for writing it. In so far as either its dogmatic or moral part is concerned, it might have been addressed to any churches whatever founded in the pagan world.

IV. TO WHOM ADDRESSED.—To whom, then, was the Epistle addressed? This question has evoked a variety of answers. There are critics who maintain the traditional opinion that the Epistle was written to the Ephesians (Dahl, Cornely), but the greater number consider it in the light of Paul’s letter. Some maintain that it was addressed to Ephesus and the churches of which this city was, so to speak, the metropolis (Michelis, Harless, and Hendl), while others hold that it was sent to the Seven Churches of the Apocalypse (H. Holtzmann) or to the circle of Christian communities within and around Colossae and Laodicea (Goelet, Haupt, Zahn, and Belser): or again to the faithful of Asia Minor (B. Weiss) or to all the Gentile-Christian Churches (Von Soeden). The question can only be solved by comparing the Epistle with the knowledge possessed of the life and literary activity of the Apostle. Those who deny the authenticity of the letter must certainly grant that the Pseudo-Paul (i, 1) was careful to conform to literary and historical probabilities; and if not, since the letter vouchsafes no direct indication as to the correspondents whom he supposed the Apostle to be addressing, it would be idle to imagine who they were.

The words εν Εφέσω, in the first verse of the Epistle, do not belong to the primitive text. St. Basil attests that, even in his day, they were not met with in the ancient MSS; in fact they are missing from the Codices B and M (first hand). Moreover, the examination of the Epistle does not warrant the belief that it was addressed to the church in which the Apostle had sojourned longest. When St. Paul writes to one of his churches, he constantly alludes to his former relations with it (see Thess., Gal., Cor.), but here there is nothing personal, no greeting, no special recommendation, no allusion to the author’s past. Paul is unacquainted with his correspondents, although he has heard them spoken of (Eph., i, 15), and they have heard of him (Eph., iii, 2; cf. iv, 21). When addressing himself to any particular church, even be it at the time still a stranger to him as, for instance, Rome or Colossae, the Apostle always assumes a personal tone; hence the abstract and general manner in which he treats his subject from the beginning to the end of the Epistle to the Ephesians can best be accounted for by beholding in this Epistle a circular letter to a group of churches equally unknown to Paul. But the explication founded on the encyclical character of the Epistle, loses its value if the Church of Ephesus is numbered among those addressed; for, during his three years’ sojourn in this city, the Apostle had frequent intercourse with the neighbouring Christian communities, and in this case he would have had Ephesus especially in view, just as in writing to all the faithful of Achaia (II Cor., i, 1) it was chiefly to the Church of Corinth that he addressed himself.

Nevertheless, it was to a rather restricted circle of Christian communities that Paul sent this letter, as we infer both from the all and bring them all and bring him (Eph., vi, 21 sqq.), which fact precludes the idea of all the churches of Asia Minor or of all the Gentile-Christian churches. Moreover, since Tychicus was bearer of the Epistle to the Colossians and that to the Ephesians at one and the same time (Col., iv, 7 sqq.), the letter was addressed to persons who had been far from Colossae, and we have every reason to suppose them in Asia Minor. However, we do not believe that the Epistle in question was addressed to the churches immediately surrounding Colosse, as the perils which threatened the faith of the Colossians virtually precludes the notion that the apostolic communities, and wherefore, then, two letters differing in tone and object? Having had no personal intercourse with the Colossians, the Apostle would have been satisfied to address to them and their Christian neighbours an encyclical letter embodying all the matter treated in both Epistles. Hence it behooves us to seek elsewhere in Asia Minor, towards the year 60, a rather limited group of churches still unknown to St. Paul. Now, in the course of his three journeys, Paul had traversed all parts of Asia Minor except the northern provinces along the Black Sea, territory which he did not reach prior to a later visit. Notwithstanding, the First Epistle of St. Peter shows us that the Faith had already penetrated these regions; hence, with the historical data at our disposal, it is in this vicinity that we may reasonably seek the church to whom the Epistle was addressed. These Christians must have been named in the authentic text of the inscription of this Epistle, as they are in all of St. Paul’s letters. Now, whenever the substantive participle appears in one of these inscriptions, it serves the sole purpose of introducing the mention of locality. We are therefore authorized to believe that, in the address of the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph., i, 1: τοῖς ἀγίας σοιν καὶ πατοῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), this participle, so difficult to understand in the received text, originally preceded the designation of the place inhabited by the readers. One might assume that the line containing this ascription was omitted from the text, but at any rate the connection on the part of the first copyist; however, it would then be necessary to admit that the mention of locality, now in question, occurred in the midst of qualifying adjectives applied by the Apostle to his readers (ἀγίας τοῖς ἀγίας καὶ πατοῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), and this is something that has never been verified by the editors of the text. What may have been, or may be supposed, is, in this address, the indication of place was corrupted rather than omitted, and this paves the way for conjectural restorations. We ourselves have proposed the following: τοῖς ἀγίας τοῖς ἀγίαις καὶ "Προς τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. (Laduee in Revue biblique, 1902, pp. 573 sq.) Grammat-
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ally, this phrase corresponds perfectly with the Apostle's style (cf. Gal. i, 22; I Cor., i, 2; Phil., i, 1) and palaeographically, if transcribed in ancient capitals, it readily accounts for the corruption that has certainly been produced in the text. The Epistle to the Ephesians was written in the second place to distant churches located perhaps in various provinces [Pontus, Galatia, Polemonium (the kingdom of Polemon)] and, for this reason, requiring to be designated by a general term, but all situated along the River Iris.

These churches of the north-east of Asia Minor are mentioned in the obscure part in the first century. When we first collect the churches of the second, a collection on which the entire textual tradition of these letters depends (cf. Zahn, Geschichte des N. T. Kanons, I, ii, p. 229), it was Ephesus that furnished the copy of this Epistle, having obtained it when Tychicus landed at that port, thence to set out for Colossae and in the direction of Pontus, and in this copy the text of the address had already been corrupted. Having come from Ephesus, this letter quickly passed for one to the Ephesians, the more so as there was no other letter by the Apostle to the most celebrated of churches. This explains why, from the beginning, all except Marcion, even those who do not read the words to Ephesians in the first verse (Origen, Tertullian), look upon this letter as an Epistle to the Ephesians, and why, in all MSS., it is transcribed under this title.

The Second Place of Composition; Occasion.—Like the Epistles to the Colossians, to the Philippians, and to Philemon, that to the Ephesians was written during the leisure hours of one of the Apostle's imprisonments (Eph., iii, 1; iv, 1; vi, 20), when he had little reason to resort to the services of a disciple to write in his name (De Wette, Ewald, and Revis). Lisco (Vinuela Sancetorum, Berlin, 1900) is the only one nowadays who claims that these letters antedate the great captivity of St. Paul, maintaining that the Apostle must have written them while a prisoner in Ephesus in 57 and prior to those which he sent to the Corinthians and Romans. But we are not acquainted with any of the details of this captivity at Ephesus. Moreover, the doctrine set forth in the letters in question belongs to an epoch subsequent to the composition of the Epistle to the Romans (58); hence they were not written previously to the captivity in Cæsarea (60). On the other hand, the author is not the first persecution, to which the author makes no allusion when describing the armour and combats of the faithful; wherefore they cannot be assigned to the last captivity. It consequently remains for them to be ascribed to a period between 58 and 63, but whether they were produced in Cæsarea or in Rome (61-63) is still a much mooted question. The information gleaned here and there is very vague and the arguments brought forward are very doubtful. However, the freedom allowed Paul, and the evangelical activity he displays at the time of writing these letters, when he is retaining and of his head-quarters and his line of work, and we behold him at Rome and Cæsarea connected with new Christian centres. It is, therefore, easy to understand why his style should savour of the Christian language used in these later books, when we recall that their object has so much in common with the matter treated in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Whatever may now and then have been said on the subject, the same phenomenon is noticeable in the Epistle to the Colossians. If, indeed, the Epistle to the Ephesians agrees with the Acts in more instances than does the Epistle to the Colossians, it is because the former has the apostolic object, namely, the constitution of the Church by the calling of the Jews and Gentiles. The relationship between the Epistle to the Ephesians and 1 Peter is much closer. The letter to the Ephesians, unlike most of the Pauline Epistles, does
not begin with an act of thanksgiving but with a hymn similar, even in its wording, to that which opens I Peter. Besides, both letters agree in certain typical expressions and in the description of the duties of the domestic life, which terminates in both with the same exhortation to the multitude. With the majority of critics, we maintain the relationship between these letters to be literary. But I Peter was written last and consequently depends on the Epistle to the Ephesians; for instance, it alludes already to the persecution, at least as impending. Sylvanus, the Apostle’s faithful companion, was St. Peter’s secretary (cf. I Peter v, 12), and it is but natural that he should make use of a letter, recently written by St. Paul, on questions analogous to those which he himself had to treat, especially as according to us, those addressed in both of these Epistles are, for the greater part, identical (cf. I Peter, i, 1).

The attacks made upon the authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians have been based mainly on its similarity to the Epistle to the Colossians, although some have maintained that the latter depends upon the former (Mayerhoff). In the opinion of Hitzig and Harnack, the letters are thoroughly living efforts, and already imbued with Gnosticism used an authentic letter, written by Paul to the Colossians against the Judæo-Christians of the Apostolic Age, in composing the Epistle to the Ephesians, in conformity to which he himself subsequently revised the letter to the Colossians and put it in the form it now bears. Wette and Ewald looked upon the Epistle to the Ephesians as a verbose amplification of the uncontroversial parts of the letter to the Colossians. However, it is only necessary to read first one of these documents and then the other, in order to see how exaggerated is this view. Von Mohl finds a great similarity between the two letters but nevertheless holds that several sections of the Epistle to the Ephesians are but a servile paraphrase of passages from the letter to the Colossians (Eph. iii, 1–9 and Col., i, 23–27; Eph. v, 21–vi, 9 and Col., iii, 18–iv, 1) and that still more frequently the later author follows a purely mechanical process by taking a single verse from the letter to the Colossians and using it to introduce and conclude, and serve as a frame, so to speak, for a statement of his own. Thus, he maintains that in Eph. iv, 25–31, the first words of verse 8 of Col., iii, have served as an introduction (Eph. iv, 25) and the last words of the same verse as a conclusion (Eph. iv, 31). Evidently such methods could not be attributed to the Apostle himself. But, neither are we justified in ascribing them to the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians. For instance, the duties of husband and wife are well set forth in Col., iii, 18, 19, but in these verses there is no comparison whatever between Christian marriage and that union of Christ with His Church such as characterizes the same exhortation in Eph., v, 22 sqq.; consequently, it would be very arbitrary to maintain the latter text to be a vulgar paraphrase of the former. In comparing the texts quoted, the phenomenon of framing, to which von Soden called attention, can be verified in a single passage (Eph., iv, 2–16, where verse 2 resembles Col., iii, 12 sq. and where verses 13, 16, are like Col., ii, 19). In fact, throughout his entire exposition, the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians has no more profound meditation on his ideas and even particular expressions that occur in the letter to the Colossians, and yet neither a servile imitation nor any one of the well-known offenses to which plagiarists are liable, can be proved against him.

Moreover, it is chiefly in their hortatory part that these two letters are so remarkably alike and this is only natural if, at intervals of a few days or hours, the same author had to remind two distinct circles of readers of the same common duties of the Christian life. In the dogmatic part of these two Epistles there is a change of subject, treated with a different intention and in another tone. In the one instance we have a hymn running through three chapters and celebrating the call of both Jews and Gentiles and the union of all in the Church of Christ; and in the other, an exposition of Christ’s dignity and of the adequacy of the means He vouchsafes us for the obtaining of our salvation, as also thanksgiving and exhortation. Besides, if in his letter to the Ephesians, St. Paul reproduces the ideas set forth in that to the Colossians, this is certainly less astonishing than to find a like phenomenon in the Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans, as it is very natural that the characteristic expressions used by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Colossians should appear in the letter to the Ephesians, since both of these were written at the same time. In fact it has been remarked that he is prone to repeat typical expressions he has once coined (cf. Zahn, Einleitung, I, p. 363 sq.). Briefly, we conclude with Sablat that: ‘These two letters come to us from one and the same author who, when writing the one, had the other in mind and, when composing the second, had not forgotten the first.” The vague allusions made in the latter to the Epistles to the Ephesians to some of the doctrinal questions treated in the Epistle to the Colossians, can be accounted for in this manner, even though these questions were never proposed by those to whom the former Epistle was addressed.

**Difficulties Arising from the Form and Doctrines.**—The denial of the Pauline authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians is based on the special characteristics of the Epistle from the viewpoint of style as well as of doctrine, and, while differing from those of the great Pauline Epistles, these characteristics allow those passages to resemble those of the letter to the Colossians. But we have already dwelt upon them at sufficient length.

The circumstances under which the Apostle must have written the Epistle to the Ephesians seem to account for the development of the doctrine and the remarkable change of style. During his two years’ captivity in Caesarea, Paul could not exercise his Apostolic functions, and in Rome, although allowed more liberty, he could not preach the Gospel outside of the house in which he was held prisoner. Hence he must have made up for his want of external activity by a more profound meditation on his theology of justification, of the Law, and of the conditions essential to salvation, he had already brought to perfection, having systematized it in the Epistle to the Romans and, although keeping it in view, did not require to develop it any further. In his letter to the Romans (viii–x, xvi, 25–27) he had come to the investigation of the eternal counsels of Providence concerning the salvation of men and had expounded, as it were, a philosophy of the religious history of mankind of which Christ was the centre, as indeed He had always been the central object of St. Paul’s faith.

Thus, it was on Christ Himself that the solitary meditations of the Apostle were concentrated; in the quiet of his prison he was to develop, by dint of personal intellectual labour and with the aid of new revelations, this first revelation received when “it pleased God to manifest His Son in him.” He was, indeed, to announce the news brought him from time to time by some of his disciples, as, for instance, by Epaphras, that, in certain churches, errors were being propagated which tended to lessen the role and the dignity of Christ, by setting up against Him other intermediaries in the affairs of the other half; and to combat the vulgar and especially popular ideas which had grown from the faithful and having no longer to travel constantly from one church to another, the Apostle was able to embrace in one sweeping glance all the Christians scattered throughout the world. While he resided in the centre of the immense Roman Empire which, in its unity, comprised the world, it was the one
universal Church of Christ, the fulfilment of the mysterious decree revealed to him, the Church in which it had been his privilege to bring together Jews and pagans, that presented itself to him for contemplation. These subjects of habitual meditation are naturally introduced in the letters that he had to write at that time. To the Colossians he speaks of Christ's dignity; to the Ephesians, and we have seen why, of the unity of the Church. But in these Epistles, Paul addresses those who are unknown to him; he no longer speaks as in preceding letters, to convert theories which undermined the very foundation of the work and to refute enemies who, in their hatred, attacked him personally. Accordingly, there is no further occasion to use the serried argumentation with which he not only outweighed the arguments of his adversaries but turned them to the latter's confusion. There is more question of setting forth the sublime considerations with which he is filled than of discussions. Then, ideas so crowd upon him that his pen is overtaxed; his sentences teem with synonyms and qualifying epithets and keep taking on new propositional formations, as in preceding letters, to combat theories which undermined the very foundation of the work and to refute enemies who, in their hatred, attacked him personally. Hence we can understand why, in these letters, Paul's style grows dull and sluggish and why the literary composition differs so widely from that of the first Epistles. When writing to the Colossians, he had one part, and certain errors to refute, whereas, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, he addressed himself at one and the same time to a group of unknown churches of which he had received but vague information. There was nothing concrete in this and the Apostle was left entirely to his own devices and to his own proposal. This is the reason why the special characteristics already indicated in the Epistle to the Colossians appear even more pronounced in that to the Ephesians, particularly in the dogmatic part.

(3) Traditions. If we wish to keep in mind the circumstances under which Paul wrote both of these letters, their peculiar character seems no obstacle to their Pauline authenticity. Therefore, the testimony which, in their inscriptions (Col., i, 1; Eph., i, 1), they themselves render to this authenticity and the very anecdotage which unmanfully attributes to the Apostle preserve all their force. From the traditional viewpoint the Epistle to the Ephesians is in the same class as the best attested letters of St. Paul. Used in the First Epistle of St. Peter, in the Epistle of St. Polycarp, in the works of St. Justin, perhaps also in the Didache and Clement, it appears to have been really well known towards the end of the first century. Marcion and St. Irenaeus ascribe it to St. Paul, and it seems that St. Ignatius, when writing to the Ephesians, had already made use of it as Pauline. It is also to be noted that if the authenticity of this Epistle has been denied by most of the liberal critics since Schleiermacher's day, it is nevertheless conceded by many modern critics, Protostants among them, and held at least as probable by Harnack and Jülicher. In fact the day seems to be approaching when the whole world will recognize as the work of St. Paul, this Epistle to the Ephesians, of which St. John Chrysostom admired the sublime sentences and doctrines: "νομοθέτην μουσῆι. . . θησαυρόν και δομάτων." Consult Introductions to the New Testament. We shall content ourselves here with indicating the latest commentaries, in which the subject is more extensively treated.


P. Ladeuze

Ephesus, a titular archiepiscopal see in Asia Minor, said to have been founded in the eleventh century B.C. by Androcles, son of the Athenian King Codrus, with the aid of Ionian colonists. Its coinage dates back to 700 B.C., the period when the first money was struck. After belonging successively to the kings of Lydia, the Persians, and the Syrian successors of Alexander the Great, it passed, after the battle of Magnesia (190 B.C.), to the kings of Pergamum, the last of whom, Attalus III, bequeathed his kingdom to the Roman people (133 B.C.). It was at Ephesus that Mithridates (88 B.C.) signed the decree ordering all the Romans in Asia to put to death, in which situation 100,000 persons perished. Four years later Sulla, again master of the territory, slaughtered at Ephesus all the leaders of the rebellion. From 27 B.C. till a little after A. D. 286, Ephesus was the capital of the proconsular province of Asia, a direct dependency of the Roman Senate. This is of the utmost importance for Ephesus was noted for its extensive commerce. Many illustrious persons were born at Ephesus, e.g., the philosophers Heraclitus and Hermodorus, the poet Hippox, the painter Parrhasius (all in the sixth or fifth century B.C.), the geographer Antimandros, the astronomers Aratus and charlatan, both in the second century of the Christian Era, and the historian and essayist, Xenophon. Ephesus owed its chief renown to its temple of Artemis (Diana), which attracted multitudes of visitors. Its first architect was the Cretan Ephasius (seventh to sixth centuries B.C.) but it was afterwards enlarged. It was situated on the bank of the River Selinus and its precincts had the right of asylum. This building, which was looked upon in antiquity as one of the marvels of the world, was burnt by Herodatus (386 B.C.) the night of the birth of Alexander the Great; and it was after this event that it was, almost in the same proportions, by the architect Diocletians. Its construction is said to have lasted 120 years, according to some historians 220. It was over 400 feet in length and 200 in breadth, and rested upon 128 pillars of about sixty feet in height. It was stripped of all its pillars by Nero and was finally destroyed by the Goths (A. D. 262).

It was through the Jews that Christianity was first introduced into Ephesus. The original community was under the leadership of Apollo (1 Cor., i, 12). They were disciples of St. John the Baptist, and were converted by Aquila and Priscilla. Then came St. Paul, who lived three years at Ephesus to establish and organize the new church; he was wont to teach in the schola or lecture-hall of the rhetorician Tyranus (Acts, xix, 9) and performed there many miracles. Eventually he was obliged to depart, in consequence of a sedition stirred up by the goldsmith Demetrius and other makers of ex-voto for the temple of Diana (Acts, xviii, 24 sqq.; xix, 1 sqq.). A little later, on his way to Jerusalem, he sent for the elders of the community of Ephesus to come to Miletus and bid them there a touching farewell (Acts, xx, 17-35). The Church of Ephesus was almost completely ruined by the invasion of the Goths and the Vandals. After the withdrawal of the Goths, Timothy, a native of the city (1 Tim., i, 3; II Tim., i, 18; iv, 12), the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians was not perhaps addressed directly to them; it may be only a circular letter sent by him to several churches. The sojourn and death of the Apostle St. John at Ephesus are not mentioned in the New Testament.
but both are attested as early as the latter part of the second century by St. Ireneus (Adv. Haer., III, iii, 4), Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., V, xxii), Clement of Alexandria, the "Acta Ioannis", and a little earlier by St. Justin and the Montanists. Byzantine tradition has always shown at Ephesus the tomb of the Apostle. Another tradition, which may be trustworthy, though less ancient, makes Ephesus the scene of the death of St. Mary Magdalen. On the other hand, the opinion that the Blessed Virgin died there rests on no ancient testimony; the opinion is, but ambiguous text of the Council of Ephesus (431), means only that there was at that time at Ephesus a church of the Virgin. (See Ramsay in "Expositor", June, 1906, also his "Seven Cities of Asia"). We learn, moreover, from Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V, xxiv) that the three daughters of the Apostle St. Philip were buried at Ephesus.

About 110 St. Ignatius of Antioch, having been greeted at Smyrna by messengers of the Church of Ephesus, sent to it one of his seven famous epistles. During the first three centuries, Ephesus was, next to Antioch, the chief centre of Christianity in Asia Minor. In 293, when its bishop, St. Bishop, was called to consider the paschal controversy and declared himself in favour of the Quartenodean practice; nevertheless the Ephesian Church soon confirmed in this particular to the practice of all the other Churches. It seems certain that the sixth canon of the Council of Nicea, confirmed for Ephesus its ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the whole "diocese" or civil territory of Asia Minor, i.e. over eleven ecclesiastical provinces; at all events, the second canon of the Council of Constantinople (381) formally recognized this authority. But Constantinople was already claiming the first rank among the Churches. The Church of Ephesus was thus trying to annex the Churches of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus. To resist these encroachments, Ephesus made common cause with Alexandria. We therefore find Bishop Menon of Ephesus siding with St. Cyril at the Third Ecumenical Council, held at Ephesus in 431 in condemnation of Nestorianism, and another bishop, Stephen, supporting Dioscorus at the so-called Robber Council (Lactacianum Ephesinum) of 449, which approved the heresy of Eutychus. But the resistance of Ephesus was overcome at the Council of Chalcedon (451), when a council at Ephesus in 431 placed the twenty-eighth ecclesiastical provinces of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Henceforth Ephesus was but the second metropolis of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, nor did it ever recover its former standing, despite a council of 475 in which Paul, the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria restored its ancient rights. Egyptian influence was responsible for the hold which Monophysitism gained at Ephesus during the sixth century; the famous ecclesiastical historian, John of Asia, was then one of its bishops. The metropolis of Ephesus in those days ruled over thirty-six suffragan sees. Justinius, who imitated Constantine in stripping the city of many works of art to adorn Constantinople, built there a magnificent church consecrated to St. John; this was set a famous place of pilgrimage.

Ephesus was taken in 655 and 717 by the Arabs. Later it became the capital of the theme of the Thracians. During the Iconoclastic period two bishops of Ephesus suffered martyrdom, Hypatius in 735 and Theophilius in the ninth century. In the same period a number of religious houses were founded, providing monks, or monastic churches were converted into monasteries for monks and nun's, or into convents for both men and women. During the Middle Ages, Ephesus, or Aya Sofia, as it was called, was one of the most magnificent churches in the world. It was 150 m. long and 100 m. wide, with a central dome 40 m. in diameter and 39 m. high, supported on four double columns. The interior was covered with mosaics representing the life of Christ and the Virgin Mary, and the exterior was decorated with marble and gold. The church was destroyed in 1204 by the Seljuk Turks, but it was later restored. In 1861, the site of the church was excavated by the German archaeologist F. von Bissing, who found remains of the original structure. In 1862, the site was purchased by the British government and excavations were carried out by the British Society of Antiquaries. The excavations revealed the remains of the original church, including the foundations of the central dome, the columns of the nave, and the mosaics on the walls.

Ephesus, Council of, the third ecumenical council, 431. The idea of this great council seems to have been due to Nestorius, the Bishop of Constantinople. St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, accused him to Pope St. Celestine of heresy, and the pope had replied on 11 August, 430, by charging St. Cyril to assume his authority and give notice in his name to Nestorius that, unless he recanted within ten days, he was to be considered by his own side and by the rest of the churches the heretic. Nestorius, therefore, was accused of heresy, and the council of 431 was called to determine the case. The council was summoned by the Emperor Theodosius II, who invited to summon a general council to judge the difference between the
Patriarch of Alexandria and himself, and he worked so well that the letters of invocation were issued by the emperor to all metropolitans on 19 November, some days before the messengers of Cyril arrived. The emperor was able to take this course without seeming to favour too much, because the matter of the capital, whom Nestorius had excommunicated for their opposition to his heretical teaching, had also appealed to him to call together a council. Nestorius, therefore, paid no attention to the pope's ultimatum, and refused to be guided by the advice to submit with his friend John, the Patriarch of Antioch, volunteered.

The pope was pleased that the whole East should be united to condemn the new heresy. He sent two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, to represent himself and his Roman council, and the Roman priest, Philip, as his personal representative. Philip, therefore, takes the first place, though, not being a bishop, he could not preside. It was probably a matter of course that the Patriarch of Alexandria should be president. The legates were directed not to take part in the discussions, but to give judgment on them. It seems that Chaleedon, twenty years later, set the precedence by opening the session. The legates should always be summoned presidants at an ecumenical council, and this was henceforth looked upon as a matter of course, and Greek historians assumed that it must have been the case at Nicaea. For his emperor was anxious for the presence of the most venerated prelate of the whole world, Augustine, and sent a special messenger to that great man with a letter in honourable terms. But the saint had died during the siege of Hippo in the preceding August, though the troubles of Africa had prevented news from reaching Constantine. The emperor wrote an angry letter to Cyril, and a temperate one to the council. The tone of the latter epistle and of the instructions given to the imperial commissioner, Count Candidian, to be absolutely impartial, are ascribed by the Coptic Acts to the influence exercised on the emperor by the Abbot Victor, who had been sent to Constantinople by Cyril as his agent at the Court on account of the veneration and friendship which Theodosius was known to feel for the holy man. Nestorius, with sixteen bishops, and Cyril, with fifty, arrived before Pentecost at Ephesus. The Coptic tells us that the two parties arrived on the same day, and that in the evening Nestorius proposed that all should join in the Vesper service together. The other bishops refused. Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, was afraid of violence, and sent his clergy only to the church. The mention of a Flavian, who seems to be the Bishop of Philippa, casts some doubt on this story, for that bishop did not arrive till later. Memnon of Ephesus had forty suffragans present, not counting twelve from Pamphylia (whom John of Antioch calls heretics). Juvenal of Jerusalem, with the neighbouring bishops whom he looked upon as his suffragans, and Flavian of Philippa, with a contingent from the countries which looked to Thessalonica as their metropolis, arrived soon after Pentecost. The Patriarch of Antioch, John, an old friend of Nestorius, wrote to explain that his suffragans had not been able to start till after the Council of Constantinople. (The Coptic Acts say that he was a flamine at Antioch.) The journey of thirty days had been lengthened by the death of some horses; he would accomplish the last five or six stages at leisure. But he did not arrive, and it was said that he was loitering because he did not wish to join in condemning Nestorius. Meanwhile the heat was great, and all the bishops were ill. Two or three died. John of Antioch's metropolitan, those of Apamea and Hierapolis, arrived and declared that John did not wish the opening of the council to be deferred on account of his delay. However, these two bishops and Theodoret of Cyrus, with sixty-five others, wrote a memorial addressed to St. Cyril and Juvenal of Jerusalem, begging that the arrival of John should be awaited. Count Candidian arrived, with the imperial decree, and he took the same view. But Cyril and the majority determined to open the council on 22 June, sixteen days having elapsed since John had declared himself too ill. It was clear to the majority that this delay was intentional, and they were probably right. Yet it is regrettable that all possible allowance was not made, especially as no news had yet come from Rome.

For Cyril had written to the pope with regard to an important question of the Nestorians recanted within the ten days fixed by the pope, and he was consequently treated as excommunicate by the majority of the bishops. Was he to be allowed a fresh trial, although the pope had already condemned him? Or, on the other hand, was he to be merely given the opportunity of explaining or excusing his contumacy? One might have presumed that Pope Celestine, in approving of the council, intended that Nestorius should have a full trial, and in fact this was declared in his letter which was still on the way. But as no reply had come to Cyril, that saint considered that he had no further right to treat the pope's letter as a matter for further discussion, and no doubt he had not much wish to do so. The council assembled on 22 June, and St. Cyril assumed the presidency both as Patriarch of Alexandria and as filling the place of the most holy and blessed Archbishop of the Roman Church, Celestine. In order to carry out his own ideas, he was anxious for the presence of the whole world, and Augustinian, and sent a special messenger to that great man with a letter in honourable terms. But the saint had died during the siege of Hippo in the preceding August, though the troubles of Africa had prevented news from reaching Constantine. The emperor wrote an angry letter to Cyril, and a temperate one to the council. The tone of the latter epistle and of the instructions given to the imperial commissioner, Count Candidian, to be absolutely impartial, are ascribed by the Coptic Acts to the influence exercised on the emperor by the Abbot Victor, who had been sent to Constantinople by Cyril as his agent at the Court on account of the veneration and friendship which Theodosius was known to feel for the holy man. Nestorius, with sixteen bishops, and Cyril, with fifty, arrived before Pentecost at Ephesus. The Coptic tells us that the two parties arrived on the same day, and that in the evening Nestorius proposed that all should join in the Vesper service together. The other bishops refused. Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, was afraid of violence, and sent his clergy only to the church. The mention of a Flavian, who seems to be the Bishop of Philippa, casts some doubt on this story, for that bishop did not arrive till later. Memnon of Ephesus had forty suffragans present, not counting twelve from Pamphylia (whom John of Antioch calls heretics). Juvenal of Jerusalem, with the neighbouring bishops whom he looked upon as his suffragans, and Flavian of Philippa, with a contingent from the countries which looked to Thessalonica as their metropolis, arrived soon after Pentecost. The Patriarch of Antioch, John, an old friend of Nestorius, wrote to explain that his suffragans had not been able to start till after the Council of Constantinople. (The Coptic Acts say that he was a flamine at Antioch.) The journey of thirty days had been lengthened by the death of some horses; he would accomplish the last five or six stages at leisure. But he did not arrive, and it was said that he was loitering because he did not wish to join in condemning Nestorius. Meanwhile the heat was great, and all the bishops were ill. Two or three died. John of Antioch's metropolitan, those of Apamea and Hierapolis, arrived and declared that John did not wish the opening of the council to be deferred on account of his delay. However, these two bishops and Theodoret of Cyrus, with sixty-five others, wrote a memorial addressed to
either deny the Godhead [θεότης] of the Only-begotten to have become man, or else admit the same of the Father and of the Holy Ghost." (Nestorius means that the Divine Nature is numerically one—and if Nestorius really said θεότης, and not θεοτάτης, he was wrong.) The Arians were further accused of him of uttering the heresy that the Son who died is to be distinguished from the Word of God. A series of extracts from the holy Fathers was then read, Peter I and Athanasius of Alexandria, Julius and Felix of Rome (but these papal letters were Apollinarian forgeries). Theophylact, Cyril's uncle, Cyril's friend, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Atticus, Amphiloctius. After these, contrasting passages from the writings of Nestorius were read. These were of course pieces justificatives brought forward by Cyril, and necessary to inform the council as to the question at issue. Hefele has wrongly understood that the bishops were examining the doctrine of Nestorius afresh, without accepting the condemnation by the pope as necessarily correct. A fine letter from Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, and primate of a greater number of bishops than any of the Eastern patriarchs, was next produced, in the midst of the devastation of Africa by the Vandals, and naturally could neither hold any synod nor send any bishops. No discussion followed (and Hefele is wrong in suggesting an omission in the Acts, which are already of extraordinary length for a single day), but theAmythias of Nestorius was now complaining of Count Candian and his soldiers, as the other side did of Memnon and the populace. Both parties sent their report to Rome. The emperor was much distressed at the division, and wrote that a collective session must be held, and the matter put to the test. The letter of Palladius who brought this epistle took back with him many letters from both sides. Cyril proposed that the emperor should send for him and five bishops, to render an exact account.

At last on 10 July the papal envoys arrived. The second session assembled a few hours later, in the episcopal residence. The legate Philip opened the proceedings by saying that the former letter of St. Celestine had been already read, in which he had decided the present question; the pope had now sent another letter. This was read. It contained a general exhortation to the council, and concluded by saying that the legates had instructions to carry out what the pope had formerly decided; doubtless the council would agree. The Fathers then cried:

"This is a just judgment. To Celestine the new Paul! To the new Paul Cyril! To Celestine, the guardian of the Faith! To Celestine, the foreigner! To Celestine, the Synod gives the Synod of our most holy father and colleague Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church, with many tears have arrived at the following grievous sentence against him: Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who has been blasphemed by him, has defined by this holy synod that the same Nestorius is excluded from all episcopal dignity and from every assembly of bishops." 

This sentence received 198 signatures, and some more were afterwards added. A brief notification addressed to "the new Judas" was sent to Nestorius. The Coptic Acts tell us that, as he would not receive it, it was affixed to his door. The whole business had been concluded in a single long session, and it was evening when the result was known. The people of Ephesus, full of rejoicing, escorted the fathers to their houses with torches and incense. Count Candidian, on the other hand, had the Arians buried down, and silenced the cries in the streets. The council wrote at once to the emperor and to the people and clergy of Constantinople, though the Acts had not yet been written out in full. In a letter to the Egyptian bishops in the same city and to the Abbot Basil of the Coptic community, the Abbot Victorius, Bishop of Rome, made a appeal to the emperor, declaring that what the pope required had been done, and it is an accurate account of the work of the first session and the sentence; canonical refers to the words of the sentence, necessarily obliged by the canons, and Apostolic to the words "and the sentence of the Synod".

The legate Arcadius expressed his regret for the late arrival of his party, on account of storms, and asked to see the decrees of the council. Philip, the pope's personallegate, then thanked the bishops for adhering to their acclamations as holy members to their holy head—"for your blessedness is not unaware that the Apostle Peter is Westerns, had spoken of the violence of the people, egged on by their bishop Memnon who (so the heretic said) had shut the churches to him and threatened him with death.

Five days after the first session John of Antioch arrived. The party of Cyril and Nestorius was deputation to meet him honourably, but John was surrounded by soldiers, and complained that the bishops were creating a disturbance. Before he would speak to them, he held an assembly which he designated "the holy synod". Candidian deposed that he had disapproved of the assembling of the bishops before John's arrival. He attended the session and read the emperor's letter (of this not a word in the Acts, so Candidian was apparently lying). John accused Memnon of violence, and Cyril of Arian, Apollinarian, and Eunomian heresy. These two were deposed by forty-three bishops present; the members of the council were to be forgiven, provided they would condemn the twelve anathematisms of Cyril. This was absurd, for most of these could not be understood in anything but a Catholic sense. But John, who was not a bad man, was in a bad temper. It is noticeable that not a word was said at this session about the refusal of John to receive the assembled bishops. This party of Cyril was now complaining of Count Candidian and his soldiers, as the other side did of Memnon and the populace. Both parties sent their report to Rome. The emperor was much distressed at the division, and wrote that a collective session must be held, and the matter put to the test. The letter of Palladius who brought this epistle took back with him many letters from both sides. Cyril proposed that the emperor should send for him and five bishops, to render an exact account.

At last on 10 July the papal envoys arrived. The second session assembled a few hours later, in the episcopal residence. The legate Philip opened the proceedings by saying that the former letter of St. Celestine had been already read, in which he had decided the present question; the pope had now sent another letter. This was read. It contained a general exhortation to the council, and concluded by saying that the legates had instructions to carry out what the pope had formerly decided; doubtless the council would agree. The Fathers then cried:

"This is a just judgment. To Celestine the new Paul! To the new Paul Cyril! To Celestine, the guardian of the Faith! To Celestine, the foreigner! To Celestine, the Synod gives the Synod of our most holy father and colleague Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church, with many tears have arrived at the following grievous sentence against him: Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who has been blasphemed by him, has defined by this holy synod that the same Nestorius is excluded from all episcopal dignity and from every assembly of bishops." 

This sentence received 198 signatures, and some more were afterwards added. A brief notification addressed to "the new Judas" was sent to Nestorius. The Coptic Acts tell us that, as he would not receive it, it was affixed to his door. The whole business had been concluded in a single long session, and it was evening when the result was known. The people of Ephesus, full of rejoicing, escorted the fathers to their houses with torches and incense. Count Candidian, on the other hand, had the Arians buried down, and silenced the cries in the streets. The council wrote at once to the emperor and to the people and clergy of Constantinople, though the Acts had not yet been written out in full. In a letter to the Egyptian bishops in the same city and to the Abbot Basil of the Coptic community, the Abbot Victorius, Bishop of Rome, made a appeal to the emperor, declaring that what the pope required had been done, and it is an accurate account of the work of the first session and the sentence; canonical refers to the words of the sentence, necessarily obliged by the canons, and Apostolic to the words "and the sentence of the Synod". The legate Arcadius expressed his regret for the late arrival of his party, on account of storms, and asked to see the decrees of the council. Philip, the pope's personallegate, then thanked the bishops for adhering to their acclamations as holy members to their holy head—"for your blessedness is not unaware that the Apostle Peter is
the head of the Faith and of the Apostles." The Metropolitan of Ancyra declared that God had shown the justice of the synod's sentence by the coming of St. Celestine's letter and of the legates. The session closed with the reading of the pope's letter to the emperor.

On the following day, 11 July, the third session took place. The legates had read the Acts of the first session and now demanded only that the condemnation of Nestorius should be formally read in their presence. When this had been done, the three legates severally pronounced their confirmation in the pope's name. The exordium of the speech of Philip is celebrated: "It is doubtful to none, nay it has been known to all ages, that holy and blessed Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, the column of the Faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the Kingdom, and that to him was given the power of binding and loosing sins, who until this day and for ever lives and judges in his successors. His successor in order and his representative, our holy and most blessed Philip, Bp. of Antioch, spoke in word and in deed, with words such as these before their eyes that Greek Fathers and councilors spoke of the Council of Ephesus as celebrated "by Celestine and Cyril". A translation of these speeches was read, for Cyril then rose and said that the synod had understood them clearly; and now the Acts of all three sessions must be presented to the legates and the synod. Arcadius replied that they were of course willing. The synod ordered that the Acts should be set before them, and they signed them. A letter was sent to the emperor, telling him how St. Celestine had held a synod at Rome and had sent his letter to Alexandria. John had set up a placard in the city accusing the synod of the Apollinarian heresy. He is again cited, and this is counted as the third canonical summons. He would pay no attention. In consequence the council suspended and excommunicated him, together with thirty-four bishops of his party, but refrained from deposing them. Some of John's party had already deserted him, and he had gained only a few. In the letters to the emperor and the pope which were then dispatched, the synod described itself as now consisting of two hundred and ten bishops. The long letter to Celestine gives full and the whole of the synod, and mentions that the pope's decrees against the Pelagians had been read and confirmed. At the end of the sixth session, which dealt only with the case of two Nestorianizing priests, was made the famous declaration that no one must produce or compose any other creed than that of 731, and "contrary to?" the Nicene, and that anyone who should propose any such to pagans, Jews, or heretics, who wished to be converted, should be deposed if a bishop or cleric, or anathematized if a layman. This decision became later a fruitful source of objections to the decrees of later councils. The letter was sent to the bishops of the so-called Constantinopolitan Creed; but that creed itself would be abolished by this decree if it is taken too literally. We know of several matters connected with Pamphylia and Thrace which were treated by the council, which are not found in the Acts. St. Leo tells us that Cyril reported to the pope the intrigues by which Juvenal of Jerusalem tried at Ephesus to carve himself a patriarchate out of that of Antioch, in which he see lay. He was to succeed in this twenty years later, at Chalcedon. In the seventh and last session on 17 July (it seems) the bishops of Cyum pressed the council to approve their claim of having been ancienly and rightly exempt from the jurisdiction of Antioch. Six canons were also passed against the adherents and supporters of Nestorius.

The history of the intrigues by which both parties tried to get their side de-tailed here. The orthodox were triumphant at Ephesus by their numbers and by the agreement of the papal legates. The population of Ephesus was on their side. The people of Constantinople rejoiced at the deposition of their heretical bishop. But Count Candidian and his troops were on the side of Nestorius, whose friend Count Irenaeus, was also at Ephesus, working for him. The emperor had always championed Nestorius, but had been somewhat shaken by the reports of the council. Communication with Constantinople was impeded both by the friends of Nestorius there as Candidian and reports of the letter. A letter was taken to Constantine at last in a hollow cane, by a messenger disguised as a beggar, in which the miserable condition of the bishops at Ephesus was described, scarce a day passing without a funeral, and entreaty was made that they might be allowed to send representatives to the emperor. The holy abbot, St. Candidian, to whom the letter was addressed, together with his clergy, people of A
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Ephesius, Robber Council of (Lattrocinium).—The Acts of the first session of this synod were read at the Council of Chalcedon, 451, and have thus been preserved to us. The remainder of the Acts (the first session being wanting) are known only through a Syriac translation by a Monophysite monk, published from the British Museum MS. Addit. 14, 530, written in the year 535. On the events which preceded the opening of the council, 8 August, 449, see Dioscorus. The emperor had convoked it, the pope had agreed. No time had been left for any Western bishops to attend, except a certain Julius of an unknown see, who, together with a Roman priest, Renatus (he died on the way), and the deacon Hilarus, afterwards pope, represented St. Leo. The Emperor Theodosius II gave to Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, the presidency —τὴν ἀδελφίαν καὶ τὴν πρωτείαν. The legate Julius is mentioned, but when this name was read by the emperor, the bishops cried: “He was cast out. No one represented Leo.” Next in order was Juvenal of Jerusalem, above both the Patriarch of Antioch, Domnus, and St. Flavian of Constantinople. The number of bishops present was 127, with eight representatives of Alexandria. The session is not noted, but the name of the notary Duleitius. The question before the council by order of the emperor was whether St. Flavian, in a synod held by him at Constantinople in November, 448, had justly deposed and excommunicated the Archimandrite Eutyches for refusing to admit two natures, and laterly Flavian and six other bishops, who had been present at his synod, were not allowed to sit as judges in the council. The brief of convocation by Theodosius was read, and then the Roman legates explained that it would have been contrary to custom for the pope to be present in person, but he had sent a letter by them. In this letter St. Leo had appealed to his dogmatic letter to Flavian, which he intended to read at the council and accepted by it as a rule of faith. But Dioscorus took care not to have it read, and instead of it a letter of the emperor, ordering the presence of the council of the fifth session at Constantinople, was read. The question of faith was next proceeded with. Dioscorus declared that this was not a matter for inquiry: they had only to inquire into the recent doings. He was acclaimed as a guardian of the faith. Eutyches then was introduced, and declared that he had held the Nicene Creed, to which nothing could be added, and from which nothing could be taken away. He had been condemned by Flavian for a mere slip of the tongue, though he had declared that he held the faith of Nicea and Ephesus, and had appealed to the present council. He had been in danger of his life. He now asked for judgment against the censures which had been brought against him.

The accuser of Eutyches, Bishop Eusebius of Dorylaum, was not allowed to be heard. The bishops agreed that the Acts of the condemnation of Eutyches, at a council held at Constantinople in November, 448, should be read, but the legates asked that the pope’s letter might be heard first. Eutyches interrupted with the complaint that he did not trust the legates; they had been to dine with Flavian, and had received much courtesy. Dioscorus decided that the Acts of the fifth session at Constantinople should have proceeded in his name, and so the letter of St. Leo was never read at all. The Acts were then read in full (for an account of them see Eutyches), and also the account of an inquiry made on 13 April into the allegation of Eutyches that the synodal Acts had been incorrectly taken down, and of another inquiry on 27 April into the accusation made by Eutyches that Flavian had drawn up the sentence against him beforehand. While the trial was being related, cries arose of belief in one nature, that two natures meant Nestorianism, of “Burn Eusebius”, and so forth. St. Flavian rose to complain that no opportunity was given him of defending his own action. On the question of the Acts of the Robber Council now give a list of 114 votes in the form of short speeches absolving Eutyches. Even three of his former judges joined in this, although by the emperor’s order they were not to vote. Barsanus added his voice in the last place. A petition was read from the monastery of Eutyches, which had been communicated by Flavian. On the question of the monks that they agreed in all things with Eutyches, and with the holy Fathers, the synod absolved them.

Next in order to establish the true Faith an extract was read from the Acts of the first session of the Council of Ephesus of 431. Many of the bishops, and also the deacon Hilarus, expressed their assent, some adding that nothing beyond this faith could be allowed. Dioscorus then spoke, declaring that it followed that Flavian and Eusebius must be deposed. No less than 101 bishops gave their votes orally, and the signatures of all the 135 bishops were signed. The last 34 Eusebius had previously interposed an appeal to the pope and to a council under his authority. Their formal letters of appeal have been recently published by Ameli. The evidence given at Chalcedon is conclusive that the account in the Acts of this final scene of the session is not to be trusted. The act of the bishops had been violently prevented from taking notes. It was declared that both Barsanus and Dioscorus struck Flavian, though this may be exaggeration. But we must believe that many bishops threw themselves on their knees to beg Dioscorus for mercy to Flavian, that the emperor was inclined to introduce also the Alexandrian Parabolas, and that a scene of violence ensued; that the bishops signed under the influence of bodily fear, that some signed a blank paper, and that others did not sign at all, the names being afterwards filled in of all who were actually present.

The appeal of Eutyches uttered a single word in Latin, Contradictitur, annulling the sentence in the pope’s name. He then escaped with difficulty. Flavian was deposed into exile, and died a few days later in Lydia. No more of the Acts was read at Chalcedon. But we learn from Theodoret, Evagrius, and others, that the legates Tarquinius, Domnus, and Ibas. The Syriac Acts take up the history where the Chalcedonian Acts break off. Of the first session only the formal documents, letters of the emperor, petitions of Eutyches, are known to be preserved in Syriac, though not in the same MS. It is evident that the Monophysites editor thoroughly disapproved of the first session, and purposely omitted it, not because of the high-handed proceedings of Dioscorus, but because the Monophysites as a general rule condemned Eutyches as a heretic, and did not wish to remember his rehabilitation by a council which they considered to be oecumenical.

In the next session, according to the Syriac Acts, 113 were present, including Barsanus. Nine new names appear. The legates were sent for, as they did not appear, but only the notary Duleitius could be found, and he had made a mistake. The first case was that of the Bishop of Edessa. This famous champion of the Antiochian party had been accused of crimes before Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, and had been acquitted, soon after Easter, 448. His accusers had gone to Constantinople and obtained a new trial from the emperor. The bishops Photius of Tyre, Eustathius of
Berytus, and Uranis of Imeria were to examine the matter. These bishops met at Tyre, removed to Berytus, and returned to Tyre, and eventually acquitted Ibas once more, together with his fellow-accused, Daniel, Bishop of Harran, and John of Theodosianopolis. This was in February. The bishops had been too kind, Cherea, Governor of Osroene was now ordered to go to Edessa to make a new inquiry. He was received by the people on 12 April with shouts (the detailed summary of which took up some two or three pages of his report), in honour of the emperor, the governor, the late Bishop Rabula, and against Nestorius and Ibas. Cherea went to Constantinople, with two letters of his own, an elaborate report, detailing all the accusations he could manage to rake together against Ibas. The emperor ordered that a new bishop should be chosen. It was this report, which provided a history of the whole affair, that was now read at length by order of Diorescus. When the famous letter of Ibas to Maris was read, cries arose such as "These things pollute our ears... Cyril is immortal. Let Ibas be burnt in the midst of the city of Antioch. Exile is of no use. Nestorius and Ibas should be burnt together!" A final indictment was made in a large document of Edessa, and Ibas named Eulogius. The sentence was finally given against Ibas of deposition and excommunication, without any suggestion that he ought to be cited or that his defence ought to be heard. It is scandalous to find the three bishops who had acquitted him but a few months previously, only anxious to the concurrence. He was quietly deposed by the agreement of all the council. He was, of course, not present and could not defend himself.

It was next the turn of Irenaeus, who as an influential layman at the former Council of Ephesus had shown much favour to Nestorius. He had later become Bishop of Byblos, but had never been consecrated. Irenaeus, Bishop of Byblos, because he had been consecrated by Irenaeus and was his friend, was next deposed. Sophronius, Bishop of Jerusalem, was a cousin of Ibas. He was therefore accused of magic, and his case was reserved for the judgment of the new Bishop of Edessa—a surprisingly mild decision. The council turned higher game. The great Theodoret, whose learning and eloquence in the pulpit and with the pen were the terror of the party of Dioscorus, had been confined by the emperor with his own diocese in the preceding year, to prevent his preaching at Antioch; and Theodosius had twice written to prevent his coming to Ephesus to the council. It was not difficult to find reasons for deposing him in his absence. Far as he was from Ephesus, he had been a friend of Nestorius, and for more than three years (431-4) the most redoubtable antagonist of St. Cyril. But the two great theologians had come to terms and had celebrated their agreement with great joy. Theodoret had tried to make friends with Dioscorus, but his advances had been rejected with scorn. A monk of Antioch now brought forward a volume of extracts from the works of Theodoret. First was read Theodoret's fine letter to the monks of the East (see Mansi, V, 1023), then some extracts from a lost "Apology for Dioscorus and Theodoret," the very name of this work of Theodoret in the Greek, the Greek to be pronounced. Dioscorus pronounced the sentence of deposition and excommunication.

When Theodoret in his remote diocese heard of this absurd sentence on an absent man against whose reputation not a word was uttered, he at once appealed to the pope in a famous letter (Ep. cxii). He wrote also to the legate Renatus (Ep. cxvii), being unaware that he was dead. The council had a yet bolder task before it. Domnus of Antioch is said to have agreed in the first session to the acquittal of Eutyches. But he relented, on the plea of the emperor, to appear any more at the council. He seems to have been more terrified, or both, at the tyranny exercised by Dioscorus. The council had sent him an account of their actions, and he replied (if we may believe the Acts) that he agreed to all the sentences that had been given and regretted that his health made his attendance impossible.

It is almost incredible that immediately after receiving this message, the council proceeded to hear a number of petitions from monks and priests against Domnus himself. He was accused of friendship with Theodoret and Flavian, of Nestorianism, of altering the form of the Sacrament of Baptism, of intruding an immoral bishop into Emess, of having been unnaturally appointed himself, and in fact of being an enemy of Dioscorus. Several pages of the MS. are unfortunately lost; but it does not seem that the unfortunate patriarch was cited to appear, or given a chance of defending himself. The sentence was worse than Ibas. He was deposed by a vote of the council, and with this final act of injustice the Acts come to an end. The council wrote the usual letter to the emperor (see Perry, trans., p. 431), who was charmed with the result of the council and confirmed it with a letter (Mansi, VII, 495, and the Acts). Dioscorus sent an encyclical to the bishops of the East, with a form of adhesion to the council which he was to sign (Perry, p. 375). He went to Constantinople and appointed his secretary Anatolius in charge of the great council. In a panic he had become his tool; he had deposed the Patriarch of Antioch and Constantinople; but one powerful adversary yet remained. He halted at Nicea, and with ten bishops (no doubt the ten Egyptian metropolitan whom he had brought to Ephesus), "in addition to all his other crimes he extended his madness against him who had been entrusted with the guardianship of the Vine by the Saviour"—in the words of the bishops at Chalcedon—and excommunicated the pope himself.

Meanwhile St. Leo had received the appeals of Theodoret and Flavian (of whose death he was unaware), and had written to the Bishop of Tarsus and to the empress that all the Acts of the council were null. He communicated all who had taken part in it, and absolved all whom it had condemned, with the exception of Domnus of Antioch, who seems to have had no wish to resume his see and retired into the monastic life which he had left many years before with regret. (For the results of the Robber Council, or Latrocinum,—the name given to it by St. Leo—see Chalcedon, Eutyches, and Leo I, Pope.)

The Acts of the first session of the council will be found in those of the Council of Chalcedon, in Mansi, Harcouin, and the other collections. The Syrian Acts were published in the 'Summary' of Perry, Nat. Hist. of the First Council of Ephesus, a copy of an original at Oxford (1875): tr. from The Second Synod of Ephesus from Syriac MSS. (Dartford, 1881). For French and German versions and other literature, see Bishop.

John Chapman.

Ephesus, The Seven Sleepers of.—The story is one of the many examples of the legend about a man who falls asleep and years after wakes up to find the world changed. It is told in Greek by Symeon Metaphrastes (q. v.) in his "Lives of the Saints" for the month of July; Gregory of Tours did it into Latin. There is a Syriac version by James of Sarv (Life of Charyas, cxii). There is a French version by Jerome of Durham (lxxii), and from the story of the council for a description of the story. There is a Latin version by Lucilius (lxxii), and in other Eastern languages. There is also an Anglo-Norman poem, "Li set dormanz," written by certain Chaddry, and it occurs again in Jacobus de Vorge's "Golden Legend" (Legenda aurea) and in an Old-Norse fragment. Of all these versions and re-editions
it seems that the Greek form of the story, which is the basis of Symeon Metaphrastes, is the source. The story is this: Decius (249–251) once came to Ephesus to enforce his laws against Christians—a gruesome description of the horrors he made them suffer follows—here he seven noble youths were named Diomedes, Jamblichos, Martin, John, Dionysios, Exakostodianos, and Antoninos (so Metaphrastes; the names vary considerably; Gregory of Tours has Achillides, Diomedes, Diogenus, Probatos, Stephanus, Sambatus, and Quiriacus), who were Christians. The emperor tried them and then gave them a short time for consideration, till he came back again to Ephesus. They gave their property to the poor, took a few coins only with them and went into a cave on Mount Anchilos to pray and prepare for death. Decius came back after a journey and inquired after these seven men. They heard of his return and then, as they said their last prayer in the cave before giving themselves up, fell asleep. The emperor told his soldiers to find them, and when found asleep in the cave he ordered it to be closed up with huge stones and sealed; thus they were buried alive. But a Christian came and wrote on the outside of the cave the names of the martyrs and their dates. Years passed, the empire became Christian, and Theodosius [either the Great (379–395) or the Younger (408–450), Koch, op. cit. infra, p. 12] reigned. In his time some heretics denied the resurrection of the body. While this controversy went on, a rich landowner named Diomedes, the possessor of which he rented, as a cattle-stall. Then they awake, thinking they have slept only one night, and send one of their number (Diomedes) to the city to buy food, that they may eat before they give themselves up. Diomedes comes into Ephesus and the usual story of cross-purposes follows. He is as an act of God crosses over churchyards. The second part of the ephod, which immediately followed, was adorned with a border of pomegranates "of violet, and purple, and scarlet twice dyed, with little bessels set between", whose sound was to be heard while the high-priest was ministering. The "rational of judgment" was a breastplate fastened on the front of the ephod, adorned in material of the high-priest: it was a span in length and width, and was ornamented with four rows of precious stones on which were inscribed the names of the twelve tribes. It held also the Urim and Thummim (doctrine and truth) by means of which the high-priest consulted the Lord. The third part of the ephod was a breastplate of shoulder-pieces, or suspenders, fastened to the bodices in front and behind, and passing over the shoulders. Each of these straps was adorned with an onyx stone engraved with the names of six of the tribes of Israel, so that the high-priest while ministering wore the names of all the tribes, six upon each shoulder (Ex., xxviii, 9–12; xxx, 7; xxxv, 9; xxxix, 16–19). The third part of the ephod was the cincture, of the same material as the main part of the ephod and woven in one piece with it, by which it was girt about the waist (Lev., vii, 7). Some authors maintain that the correct Hebrew reading of Ex., xxviii, 8, speaks of this band of the ephod; the contention agrees with the Syriac and Chaldee versions and with the rendering of Josephus (cf. Ex., xxxvii, 27 sq.; xxxix, 5; xxxix, 20 sq.). It must not be imagined that the ephod was the ordinary robe of the high-priest: he wore it while performing the duties of his ministry (Ex., xxviii, 4; Lev., vii, 7; I K., ii, 28) and when consulting the Lord. Thus David learned through Abiathar's ephod the disposition of the people of Cedia (I K., xxii, 11 sq.) and the best plan of campaign against the Amalecites (I K., xxx, 7 sqq.). In I Par., xiv, 18, it appears that Saul wished the priest Achias to consult the Lord by means of the Ark; but the Septuagint passage of this reading, its context (I K., xiv, 3), and the text of Josephus (Ant. Jud., vi, 5) plainly show that in I Par, xiv, 18, we must read "the ephod" instead of "bring the ark." The Common Ephod.—An ephod was born by Samuel when serving in the time of Heli (I K., ii, 18), by the eighty-five priests slain by Doeg in the sanctuary of Nobe (I K., xxiii, 18), and by David dancing before the Ark (II K., vi, 14). The linen ephod; its general form may be supposed to have resembled the ephod of the high-priest, but its material was not the celebrated fine white linen, nor does it appear to have been adorned with the variegated colours of the high-priest's ephod. The Septuagint translators seem to have intended to emphasize the difference between the ephod of the high-priest.
and that worn by David, for they call this latter the idolatrous ephod.

The Idolatrous Ephod.—According to Judges, viii, 26 sq., Gedeon made an ephod out of part of the spoils taken from the Midianites, their golden ear-rings, jewels, and gold chains of gold. All the people paid idolatrous worship to this ephod, so that it became a ruin to Gedeon and all his house. Some writers, following the Syriac and Arabic versions, have explained this ephod as denoting a gold casing of an oracle image. But there is no other instance of such a figurative meaning of the Hebrew verb used to express the placing of the ephod on the part of Gedeon in Judges, vi, 37, the spreading of the fleece of wool. The opinion that Gedeon’s ephod was a costly garment like that of the high-priest, is, therefore, preferable.

HAGEN, Lexicon Biblicum (Paris, 1907), II, 188 sq.; LESLIE in Vito, Dict. de la Bible, s. v.; Driver in Hast, Dict. of the Bible, s. v.; MATER in Kirchenlex., s. v.

A. J. MAAS.

Ephraem (Ephrem, Ephrāim), Saint, b. at Nisibis, then under Roman rule, early in the fourth century. He was taught by Abnīl or Abibal. His mother was a native of Amid. Ephraem was instructed in the Christian mysteries by St. James, the famous Bishop of Nisibis, and was baptized at the age of eighteen (or twenty-eight). Then he became more a student than a bishop, who availed himself of the services of Ephraem to renew the moral life of the citizens of Nisibis, especially during the sieges of 338, 341, and 350. One of his biographers relates that on a certain occasion he cursed from the city walls the Persian hosts, whereupon a cloud of flies and mosquitoes settled on the army of Sapor II and compelled it to withdraw. The adventurous campaign of Julian the Apostate, which for a time menaced Persia, ended, as is well known, in disaster, and his successor, Jovianus, was only too happy to rescue from annihilation some remnant of the great army which his predecessor had led across the Euphrates. To accomplish even so much the emperor had to sign a disadvantageous treaty, by the terms of which Rome lost the Eastern provinces conquered at the end of the third century; among the cities retroceded to Persia was Nisibis (363). To escape from his persecutions the Syrian saint fled to Persia, most of the Christian population abandoning Nisibis en masse. Ephraem went with his people, and settled first at Beet-Garbaya, then at Amid; finally at Edessa, the capital of Osroene, where he spent the remaining ten years of his life, a hermit remarkable for his severe asceticism. Nevertheless he took an interest in all matters that closely concerned the population of Edessa. Several ancient writers say that he was a deacon; as such he could well have been authorized to preach in public. At this time a certain heretical sect was active in Edessa: Ephraem contended with it, and with all the disciples of the illustrious philosopher Bardeanes. To this period belongs nearly all his literary work; apart from some poems composed at Nisibis, the rest of his writings—sermons, hymns, exegetical treatises—date from his sojourn at Edessa. It is not improbable that he is one of the chief founders of the theological "School of the Persians," so called because its first students and original masters were Persian Christian refugees of 363. At his death St. Ephraem was borne without pomp to the cemetery of the "foreigners" in the Armenian monastery of the St. Sergius and Bacchus in Persia to possess him of his body.

The aforementioned facts represent all that is historically certain concerning the career of Ephraem (see BOUVY, "Les sources historiques de la vie de S. Ephrāim" in "Revue Augustiniennè", 1903, 155-64). All details added later by Syrian biographers are at best of double value. To this class belong not only the legendary and occasionally puerile traits so dear to Oriental writers, but also others seemingly reliable, e. g. an alleged journey to Egypt with a sojourn of eight years, during which he is said to have confuted publicly certain Arian heretics, and of certain relations of St. Ephraem and St. Basil are narrated by very reliable authors, e. g. St. Gregory of Nyssa (the "Pseudo?" and Sozomen, according to who the hermit of Edessa, attracted by the great reputation of St. Basil, resolved to visit him at Caesarea. He was actually received and ordained deacon by St. Basil; four years later he refused both the priesthood and the episcopate that St. Basil offered him through delegates sent for that purpose to Edessa. Though Ephraem seems to have been quite ignorant of Greek, this meeting with St. Basil is not improbable; some good critics, however, hold the evidence insufficient, and therefore reject it, or at least withhold their adhesion. The life of St. Ephraem, therefore, offers not a few obscure problems; only the general outline of his career is known to us. It is certain, however, that while he lived he was very influential among the Syrian Christians of Edessa, and that his messages were accepted by all, Orthodox, Monophysites, and Nestorians. They call him the "sun of the Syrians," the "column of the Church," the "harp of the Holy Spirit." More extraordinary still is the homage paid by Greeks who rarely mention Syrian writers. Among the works of St. Gregory of Nyssa (Hist. Ecel., XLI. 819) is mentioned (though not acknowledged by some) which is a real panegyric of St. Ephraem. Twenty years after the latter’s death St. Jerome mentions him as follows in his catalogue of illustrious Christians: "Ephraem, deacon of the Church of Edessa, wrote many works (opuscula) in Syriac; these became so famous that his writings are publicly read in some churches after the Sacred Scriptures. I have read in Greek a volume of his on the Holy Spirit; though it was only a translation, I recognized therein the sublime genius of the man" (De viris illust., c. cxv).

Theodore of Cyrus also praised his poetic genius and theological knowledge (Hist. Eccl., IV. xxvi). Sozomen pretends that Ephraem wrote 3,000,000 verses, and gives the names of some of his disciples, some of whom remained orthodox, while others fell into heresy (Hist. Eccl., III. xvi). From the Syrian and Byzantine Churches the fame of Ephraem spread among all Christians and the Biblical Martyrology mentions him on 1 February. In their menologies and synaxaria Greeks and Russians, Jacobites, Chaldeans, Copts, and Armenians honour the holy deacon of Edessa.

WORKS OF ST. EPHRAEM.—The works of this saint are so numerous and important that it is impossible to treat them here in detail. Let it suffice to consider briefly: (1) the text and the principal versions and editions of his writings; (2) his exegetical writings; (3) his poetical writings.

(1) Texts and Principal Versions and Editions.—The Syriac original of Ephraem’s writings is preserved in many manuscripts, one of which dates from the fifth century. Through much transcription, however, his writings, particularly those used in the various liturgies, have suffered no little interpolation. Moreover, many of his exegetical works have perished, or at least have not yet been found in the libraries of the Orient. Numerous versions, however, console us for the loss of the originals. He was still living, or at least not long dead, when the translation of his writings into Greek began. Armenian writers seem to have undertaken the translation of his works in part, and Russian versions are perhaps more numerous. The Syriac manuscripts cited in part these commentaries and hold the Armenian version as very ancient (fifth century). The Monophysites, it is well known, were wont from an early date to translate or adapt many Syriac works. The writings of Ephraem were eventually translated into Arabic and...
Ethiopian (translations as yet unedited). In medi-
Ephraem. His minor works were translated
tal times some of his minor works were translated
from the Greek into Slavonic and Latin. From these
versions they were eventually made French, German,
Italian, and English adaptations of the ascetic writings
of St. Ephraem. The first printed (Latin) edition
was based on a translation from the Greek done by
Ambrogi Traversari (St. Ambrose of Canadoli),
and issued from the press of Bartholomew Guldenbeek
of Sultz, in 1475. A far better edition was executed
by Gerhard Vossius (1589–1619), the learned provost of
Tongres, at the request of Gregorii XIX, in 1679.
Edward Thwaites edited, from manuscripts in the
Bodleian Library, the Greek text, hitherto known only
in fragments. The Syriac original was unknown in
Europe until the fruitful Oriental voyage (1706–07)
of the Maronites Gabriel Eva, Elias, and especially
Joseph Simeon Assermani (1716–17), which resulted
in the discovery of a precious collection of manuscripts
in the Nitrian (Egypt) monastery of Our Lady.
These manuscripts found their way at once to the Vatican
Library. In the first half of the nineteenth century
the British Museum was notably enriched by similar
founds of Syriac versions of Lord Burydall (1828),
Camaldoli (1829), and Tattam (1839, 1841).
All recent editions of the Syriac original of Ephraem’s writings are based
on these manuscripts. In the Bibliothèque Nationale
(Paris) and the Bodleian (Oxford) are a few Syriac
fragments of minor importance. Joseph Simeon
Assermani was employed to make the best use of his
found manuscripts and proposed at once to Clement
XII a complete edition of the writings of Ephraem in
the Syriac original and the Greek versions, with a new
Latin version of the entire material. He took for his
own share the edition of the Greek text. The Syriac
text was entrusted to Father Peter Mohar (Benedictus),
a native Maronite. After the death of Moharak, his labours were continued by Stephanus
Evodius Assemani. Finally this monumental edition
of the works of Ephraem appeared at Rome (1752–46)
in six folio volumes. It was completed by the labours
of Overbeck (Oxford, 1865) and Bickell (Carmina
Nisibena, 1866), while other savants edited newly
found fragments (Zingerle, P. Martin, Rubens Duval).
A splendid edition (Mechlin, 1882–902) of the hymns
and sermons of St. Ephraem is owing to the late
Mr. J. Lamy. However, a complete edition
of the vast works of the great Syriac doctor is yet
to be executed.

(2) Exegetical Writings.—Ephraem wrote
commentaries on the entire Scriptures, both the Old
and the New Testament, but much of his work has been
lost. We have here in Syriac his commentary on
Genesis and on a large portion of Exodus; for the other
books of the Old Testament we have a Syriac abridg-
ment, handed down in a catena of the ninth century
by the Syriac monk Severus (851–61). The
commentaries on Ruth, Ezdras, Nehemia, Esther, the
Psalms, Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles, and Ecclesi-
isticius are lost. Of his commentaries on the New
Testament there has survived only an Armenian
version. The Scriptural canon of Ephraem resembles
our own very closely. It seems doubtful that he
accepted the deutero-canonical writings; at least no
commentary of his on these books has reached us.
On the other hand he accepted as canonical the apoc-
ryphal Third Epistle to the Corinthians, and wrote a
commentary on it. The Scriptural text used by
Ephraem is the Syriac Peshito, slightly differing,
evertheless, from the translated text of the Vulgate.
The New Testament was known to him, as to all
Syrians, both Eastern and Western, before the time
of Rabulas, in the harmonized “Diatessaron” of Tatian;
it is also this text which serves as the basis of his
commentary. His text of the Acts of the Apostles
appears to have been closely related to that called
the “Occidental”. (J. R. Harris, “Fragments of the
Commentary of Ephrem Syrus upon the Diatessaron”,
London, 1905; J. H. Hill, “A Dissertation on the
Gospel Commentary of St. Ephraem the Syrian”.
Edinburgh, 1896; F. C. Burkitt, “St. Ephraem’s
Quotations from the Gospel, Corrected and Arranged”,
Oriental Texts and Studies (Latin), ed. G. W. Traversari,
Cambridge, 1901, VII.)
Ephraem wrote in prose not few Sermon
pieces, which were later divided into homilies and
hymns. The homilies (Syriac meané, i.e. discourses) are written in seven-syllable
verse, often divided into two parts of three and four
syllables respectively and used at feasts of Our Lord and of the saints; sometimes he
enlarges a Scriptural narrative or takes up a spiritual
or edifying theme. In the East the Lessons for the
ecclesiastical services (see Office, Divine; Breviary)
were often taken from the homilies of Ephraem. The
hymns (Syriac mahtras; i.e. melodious) are
written for the choir service of nuns, and were
destined to be chanted by them; hence the division into stro-
phes, the last verses of each strophe being repeated
in a kind of refrain. This refrain is indicated at
the beginning of each hymn, after the manner of an
antiphon; there is also an indication of the musical
key in which the hymn should be sung. The following may
serve as an illustration. It is taken from an Eiphany
hymn (ed. Lamy, I, p. 4).—Air: Behold the month.
(1) Hymn: Glory to Thee, O Lord; Glory to Thee
of Thy manifestation. Strophe: He has renewed
the heavens, because the foolish ones had adored
all the stars: He has renewed the earth which had lost
its vigour through Adam. (2) A new creation was made
by His spittle! And He Who is all-powerful made straight
both the earth and the Heavens—Redrain: Glory to Thee, O Lord;
Ephraim’s hymns are incited to wonder at the enthui-
asm of his admirers in the ancient Syriac Church. His “lyricism” is by no means what we understand by
that term. His poetry seems to us prolix, tiresome,
colourless, lacking in the personal note, and in general
devoid of charm. To be just, however, it must be
remembered that his poems are known to most readers only in versions, from which of course the original rhythm has disappeared—precisely the charm and most striking feature of this poetry. These hymns, moreover, were not written for private reading, but were to be sung by alternating choirs. We have only to compare the Latin psalms as sung in the choir of a Benedictine monastery with the private reading of them by the priest in the recitation of his office. Nor must we forget that literary taste is not everywhere and at all times the same. We are influenced by the Greek thought in two ways: we are aware or like to admit. In literature we admire most the qualities of lucidity, sobriety, and varied action. Orientals, on the other hand, never weary of endless repetition of the same thought in slightly altered form; they delight in pretty verbal niceties, in the manifold play of rhythm and accent, rhyme and assonance, and acrostic. In this respect it is scarcely necessary to remind the reader of the well-known peculiarities and qualities of Arabic poetry.

As stated above there is no complete edition of the works of St. Ephraim. Satisfactory life of the great doctor. Mention has been made of the Assemani edition of his works: Opera omnia quae extant gravis syriacae latinae in sex tomas divisi (1732-46). It is considered imperfect from the textual standpoint, while the Latin translation is rather a paraphrase. Overbeck, S. Ephraem Syri opera selecta (Stuttgart, 1856-59). Bickell, Carmina Minus (Leipzig, 1866, 1891). LAMY, Hymni et Sermones (Mehlin, 1882—96 and 1902). Among the various versions of the Armenian version is that introduced by the Mechitarists (Venice, 1856, 1893). See also Bickell, Conspicuum rei Syriorum literarum (Munster, 1871); WRIGHT, A Short History of Syriac Literature (London, 1894); GÉRASER in Kirchenlex., s. v. Ephraim; especially BARDENHEWER, Patrology, tr. SHAHAI (Freiburg in., 1908), 587-92, excellent apparatus.

Ephraim of Antioch (Ἐφραίμ), one of the defenders of the Faith of Chalcedon (451) against the Monophysites, b. at Amida in Mesopotamia; d. in 545. He was Count of the East (Comes Orientis) under Justinian I. In 527 he succeeded Euphrasius as Patriarch of Antioch. Most of his many works are lost. We know the titles of them, however, from Anastasius Sinaita (c. 700), St. John Damascene (d. about 754) or whoever was the author of the “Sacra Parallela”, and especially Photius (d. 891). Anastasius (P. G., LXXV, 1185-1188) quotes passages from a work of Ephraim against Severus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch (512-519). The “Sacra Parallela” give a short passage from “St. Ephraim, Archbishop of Antioch”, taken from a work “On John the Baptist and the Synod” (Tit. Ixi, cf. P. G., LXXVI, 2, 2104—d. 89). Photius (P. G., 1027-1024) speaks of four books by Ephraim. The first consisted of sermons and letters, the second and third contained a treatise against Severus in three parts and an answer to five questions about Genesis addressed to the author by a monk named Anatolius. The fragments quoted by Photius represent practically all that is left of Ephraim’s writings. Cardinal Mai was able to add a few more from a Ms. Catena in the Vatican library (P. G., LXXVI, loc. cit.). Krumbacher (Byz. Litt., loc. cit.) mentions a few other fragments in the Paris library, etc., and considers that Ephraim was not more than a single person. Leontius of Antioch in 545, if more of his work had been preserved. He had an extensive knowledge of Greek Fathers and follows chiefly St. Cyril of Alexandria in his Christology. KRUMLACHER, Byzantinische Literatur (Munich, 1897), 57; BARDENHEWER, Patrology, tr. SHAHAI (Freiburg in., 1908), 580.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Epicureanism.—This term has two distinct, though cognate, meanings. In its popular sense, the word stands for a refined and calculating selfishness, seeking not power or fame, but the pleasures of sense, particularly of the palate, and those in company rather than solitude. An epicure is one who is extremely choice and delicate in his viands. In the other sense, Epicureanism signifies a philosophical system, which includes a theory of nature, and of mind.

History.—Epicurus, from whom this system takes its name, was a Greek, born at Samos 341 b. c., who, in 307 b. c., founded a school at Athens, and died 270 b. c. The Stoic School, diametrically opposite to this, was founded about the same time, probably 310 b. c. It is said of them that they were roving for their respective watchwords Pleasure and Duty, sprang together with the first generation after Aristotle (d. 322 b. c.), each of them holding a half-truth and by exagerration turning it into falsehood. The Epicurean School was rather a practical discipline than a habit of speculation. The master laid down his principles dogmatically, as if they must be evident as soon as stated, to any one not foolish. His disciples were made to learn his maxims by heart; and they acquired a spirit of unity more akin to that of a political party, or of a sect, than to the mere intellectual agreement of a school of philosophers. And a quarter of a century after the death of its founder, the system was introduced into Rome, and there, as well as in its native country, it attracted in the course of time a number of adherents such as moved the astonishment of Cicero. It had the fortune to be adopted by the finest Greek rhetoricians, Lucretius, and was grounded in him in a poem (De rerum natura) with a beauty of expression and a fervour of eloquence worthy of a noble theme. In the latter half of the second century, when Marcus Aurelius was founding chairs of philosophy at Athens, that emperor, himself a Stoic, recognized the Epicurean pleasure, hut he never understood in it the beauty of expression and a fervour of eloquence worthy of a noble theme. In modern times Epicureanism has had many theoretical as well as practical adherents. In the seventeenth century, when Aristotelianism and Scholasticism were assailed by the champions of the new sciences, Gassendi (q. v.) selected Epicurus for his master; but he seems to have been attracted chiefly by the physics, and to have aimed at reforming the moral system as to make it tolerable to a Christian. The numerous editions of the poem of Lucretius which the present age is producing may be taken to indicate a sympathy with the philosophy expounded in it.

Epicurean Ethics.—Philosophy was described by Epicurus as “the art of making life happy”, and he says that “prudence is the noblest part of philosophy”. His natural philosophy and epistemology seem to have been adopted for the sake of his theory of life. It is, therefore, proper that his ethics should first be explained. The purpose of life, according to Epicurus, is personal happiness; and by happiness he means not that state of well-being and perfection of which consciousness is accompanied by pleasure, but pleasure itself. Moreover, this pleasure is sensuous, for it is such only as is attainable in this life. This pleasure is the immediate purpose of every action. “Habitate yourself”, he says, “to think that death is nothing to fear for all good and evil is in feeling; now death is the privation of feeling. Hence, the right knowledge that death is nothing to us makes us enjoy what there is in this life, not adding to it an indefinite duration, but eradicating the desire of immortality.” His idea of the pleasurable differs from that of the Cyrenaic school which preceded him. The Cyrenaics looked to the momentary pleasure of joy and excitement. The pleasure of Epicurus is a state, equally diffused, “the absence of [bodily] pain and [mental] anxiety”. “That which begets the pleasurable life is not [sensual indulgence], but a sober reason which searches for the grounds of choosing and rejecting, and which bat-
ishes those doctrines through which mental trouble, for the most part, arises." The wise man will accordingly desire "not the longest life, but the most pleasant life. It is for the sake of this condition of permanent pleasure, or tranquillity, that the virtues are desirable. We cannot live pleasurably without living prudently, gracefully, and justly, without living pleasantly, in consequence; for "the virtues are by nature united with a pleasurable life; and a pleasurable life cannot be separated from these. The virtues, in short, are to be practised not for their own sake, but solely as a means of pleasure, "as means of use for the sake of health". In accordance with this view, he says that "friendship is to be pursued by the wise man only for its utility; but he will begin, as he sows the field in order to reap". "The wise man will not take any part in public affairs"; moreover, "the wise man will not marry and have children". But "the wise man will be humane to his slaves". "He will not think all sinners to be equally bad, nor all philosophers to be equally good." That is, apparently, he will not have any very exacting standard, and will neither believe very much in human virtue, nor think human condition was ever discovered by human frailty. In this system, "prudence is the source of all pleasure and of all virtue."

The defects of this theory of life are obvious. In the first place, as to the matter of fact, experience shows that happiness is not best attained by directly seeking, but the self is the selfish, than, the unselfish. In the next place, the theory altogether destroys virtue as virtue, and eliminates the idea and sentiment expressed by the words "ought", "duty", "right", and "wrong". Virtue, indeed, is such a thing as true and highest pleasure; all such pleasure, so far as it depends upon ourselves, depends upon virtue. But who he practises virtue for the sake of the pleasure alone is selfish, not virtuous, and he will never enjoy the pleasure, because he has not the virtue. A similar observation may be made upon the Epicurean theory of friendship. Friendship for the sake of advantage is not true friendship in the proper sense of the word. External actions, apart from affection, cannot constitute friendship; that affection no one can feel merely because he judges it would be advantageous and pleasureable, in fact he cannot know the pleasure he first feels the affection. If we consider the Epicurean condemnation of patriotism and of the family life, we must pronounce a still severer censure. Such a view of life is the meanest form of selfishness leading in general to vice. Epicurus, perhaps, was better than his theory; but the theory itself, if it did not originate in coldness of heart and meanness of spirit, was extremely well suited to encourage them. If sincerely embraced and consistently carried out, it undermined all that was chivalrous and heroic, and even all that was ordinarily virtuous. Fortitude and justice, as such, ceased to be objects of aspiration, and tranquillity sank into a mere matter of calculation. Even prudence itself, dissociated from all moral quality, became a mere balancing between the pleasures of the present and of the future.

Theology.—Epicurus said that "it was not impiety to deny the gods of the multitude, but it was impiety to think of the gods as the multitude thought:" a sound principle, but one which he wrongly applied, since he got rid of what was true as well as of what was corrupted in the vulgar religion. Fear of the gods was an evil to be eradicated, as incompatible with tranquillity. As to the gods, the nature, the gods are immortal, but material, like every other being. He seems to have held that there was one supreme being; but this god was not the creator, scarcely the orderer, of the universe, the gods being only a part of the All. Nor is there a Providence, for an interest in human affairs would be inconsistent with perfect happiness. In short, the gods are magnified Epicurean philosophers.

Natural Philosophy.—The physics of Epicurus are in a general sense atomic. He claimed originality for his theory, asserting that it began with his reflections upon a passage in Hesiod. As he read in old age, he asked, What is chaos? —a question which his teacher could not answer. It is generally held, however, that he really learned his atomism from the Democritean philosophy, modifying it in one important respect; for he supposes that the atoms in falling through empty space collide by virtue of a self-determinating motion, or rather a position aetition owing to which it is possible for them by chance to swerve a little from the vertical direction.

Biology.—In this Epicurus simply followed the view of Empedocles, that, first, all sorts of living things and animals, well or ill organized, were evolved from the earth and that those survived which were suited to preserve themselves and reproduce their kind.

Anthropology.—The anthropology of Lucretius may be supposed to have been derived, like his physics and biology, from Epicurus. According to the Lucretian theory men were originally savage; the primitive condition was one of war; in which condition men were like the wild beasts in strength and cunning; civil society was formed under the pressure of the evils of anarchy. The reader recognizes here the ideas indicated by the eighteenth-century phrases "state of nature" and "social contract". The "golden age" is a dream.

Logic.—The Epicurean logic is criterional. The test of truth practically is the pleasant and the painful belief. Theoretically, their criterion is sensation. Sensation never is deceptive; the error lies in our judgment. Dreams, the ravings of fever or lunacy, the delirium of the drunkard, are true in itself. Besides sensation the human mind has also notions, or anticipations (πρόληψεις), as when, seeing an object at a distance, one wonders whether it is a man or a tree. These notions are the results left by previous sensations. The notion does not supersede the opinion, but the internal sense of a brute, such as enables a dog, for example, to welcome strangers belonging to the profession of his master, and to bark furiously at a beggar that he has never seen before. The understanding, then, does not differ essentially from the internal senses.

Psychology.—The human soul is non-mortal, being composed of a finer kind of atoms, resembling those of air or fire, but even more subtle. It is the bodily organism that holds together the atoms composing the soul. Yet the human will is free. "Better were it to accept all the legends of the gods, than to make ourselves slaves to the fate of the natural philosophers." Fatalism, which to minds of a stoical disposition seemed a source of strength, was to those of an Epicurean temper simply a source of unpleasantness and helplessness. The freedom asserted by the Epicureans is not rational freedom in the true sense of the word. It does not consist in the power of choosing the right and the noble in preference to the pleasant. It is little better than physical contingency, and may be described as Casualism. The whole philosophy may well be described in a trenchant phrase of Macaulay as "the silliest and meanest of all systems of natural and moral philosophy".

The "Volumina Herculanensia" (first series, Naples, 1793–1855; and 2nd series, Naples, 1861–1878), 1–XI, contain many fragments of treatises by Epicurus and several members of the school. Fragments of Epicurus's Physics, De natura rerum, De quaest. phys., De sensibus, De motu, De placitis et nipiis, De substantially new, have been published by Orelli, after Rosen (Leipzig, 1818). Also A Description of the Oxford Copies of the Heracles (Oxford, 1890); D'Agostini, Dwight, De Vita et Doctrina Philosopher, X (from which almost every quotation in this article is taken); Lycopolus, De Reechavet, that especially the edition with notes by Moreau, 2 vols. (London, 1898–1900); Arbell, Discours d'Epicure, I, xxii; II, xxii; III, vi; Athen. Molar, Quaest. phys. 1 vii; Posit. spec. 1 vii; De potestas securim; Epicur. decret. I, vii; De Beneficia, IV, vii; Cicero, De Fin., I, vii; II, vii, xxx; xxx, xxxii;
EPIKLESIS

Epicurus. See Epicureanism.

Epidaurum. See Ragusa.


Epikeia. See Law.

Epiklesis (Gr. έπικλήσις; Lat. invocatio) is the name of a prayer that occurs in all Eastern liturgies (and originally in Western liturgies also) after the words of Institution, in which the celebrant prays that God may send down His Holy Spirit to change this bread and wine into the Body and Blood of His Son. This form has given rise to one of the chief controversies between the Eastern and Western Churches, inasmuch as the former, except in certain services (rare at present), do not use the Epiklesis, and not the words of Institution, is the essential form (or at least the essential complement) of the sacrament.

Form of the Epiklesis. It is certain that all the old liturgies contained such a prayer. For instance, the Liturgy of St. James the Apostle (Constantinople, immediately after the recital of the words of Institution, goes on to the Anamnesis—"Remembering therefore His Passion . . .")—in which occur the words: "Thou, the God who lackest nothing, being pleased with them (the Offerings) for the honour of Thy Christ, and sending down Thy Holy Spirit on this sacrifice, we witness the Passion of the Lord Jesus, to manifest (τροφονδηθησαί) this bread as the Body of Thy Christ and this chalice as the Blood of Thy Christ . . ." (Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, I, 21).

So the Greek and Syrian Liturgies of St. James (ibid., 54, 88-89), the Alexandrine Liturgies (ibid., 134, 17b), the Abyssinian Rite (ibid., 233), those of the Nestorians (ibid., 287) and Armenians (ibid., 439). The Epiklesis in the Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is said thus: "We offer to Thee this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice; and we beg Thee, we ask Thee, we beseech Thee that Thy Holy Spirit on us and on these present gifts" (the Deacon says: "Bless, Sir, the holy bread") "make this bread into the Precious Body of Thy Christ" (Deacon: "Amen. Bless, Sir, the holy chalice"); "and that which is in this chalice, the Precious Blood of Thy Christ" (Deacon: "Amen. Bless, Sir, both") "changing [μεταβαλλώ] them by Thy Holy Spirit" (Deacon: "Amen. Amen, Amen."). (Brightman, op. cit., I, 386-387.)

Nor is there any doubt that the Western rites at one time contained similar invocations. The Gallican Liturgy contains variable forms according to the feast. That for the Circumcision was: "Hae nos, Domine, instituta et praeposita retinetae supplianti oramus ut hoc sacrificium suscipere et beneficere et sanctificare digneris: ut fiat nobis eucharistia legitima in tuo Filioque tui nomine et Spiritus sancti, in transformatione corporis sanctae eucharistiae in corpore sanctorum et conscriptis membris tuorum et sanctis operibus, ut in te possit perfecta eucharistia. Amen." (Duchesne, "Origines du culte chrétien", 2nd ed., Paris, 1900, p. 208, taken from St. Germanus of Paris, d. 576). There are many allusions to the Gallican Invocation. For instance St. Isidore of Seville (De ecclesiis, I, 15, etc.). The Roman Rite at one time had an Epiklesis after the words of Institution. Pope Gelasius I (492-496) refers to it plainly: "Quo modo ad divini mysterii consecrationem colendis Spiritus adveniere, si sacerdos omnem plenius actionibus reprorpetur?" ("Epp. Fragm.", vii, in Thiel, "Epp. Rom. Pont.", I, 865). Wetterich (Der Konsekationsmoment im h. Abendmahl, 1080, pp. 133 sqq.) brings other evidences of the old Roman Invocation. He (p. 166) and Drews (Entstehungsge- schichte des Kanons, 1902, p. 294) believe that several secrets in the Leontine Sacramentary were originally Invocations (see article CANON OF THE MASS). Of this Invocation we have now only a fragment, with the essential clause left out—our prayer: "Supplie- res to rogamus" (Duchesne, op. cit., 173-5). It seems that an early insistence on the words of Institution as the form of Consecration (or, for instance, "De mysteriis", "De sacramentis", IV, 4, 14-15, 23; St. Augustine, Sermo ccxxvii, in P. L., XXXVIII, 1900) led in the West to the neglect and mutilation of the Epiklesis.

Origin. It should be noticed that the Epiklesis for the Holy Eucharist is only one of many such forms. In other sacraments and blessings similar prayers were used, to ask God to send down His Holy Spirit to sanctify the matter. There was an Epiklesis for the water of baptism. Tertullian (De bapt., iv), Optatus of Mileve ("De saecismo. Don. III, i, 6; VI, iii, in Corp. Script. pec. lat. vol. II, 69, 148, 149). St. Jerome (Contra Lucif., vi, vii), St. Augustine (De bapt., V, xxvii), in the West; and St. Basil (De Spirit. Nuncio, xv, 35), St. Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. cat. magn. xxiil), and St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat. iii, 3), in the East, refer to it. In Egypt especially, Epikleses were used to bless wine, oil, milk, etc. In all these cases (including that of the Holy Eucharist) the idea of invoking the Holy Ghost to sanctify is a natural one derived from Scripture (Joel, ii, 32; Acts, ii, 21: "et effusae sunt de Domino spiritus"; cf. Rom. v, 13; I Cor., i, 2). That in the Liturgy the Invocation should occur after the words of Institution is in fact the case of many which show that people were not much concerned about the exact instant at which all the essence of the sacrament was complete. They looked upon the whole Consecration-prayer as one simple thing. In it the words of Institution always occur (with the doubtful exception of the Nestorian Rite); they believed that Christ would, according to His promise, do the rest. But they did not ask at which exact moment the change takes place. Besides the words of Institution there are many other blessings, prayers, and signs of the cross, some of which came before and some after these words, sending them down, as it were, with the other words themselves combine to make up the one Canon of which the effect is Transubstantiation. So also in our baptism and ordination services, part of the forms and prayers whose effect is the sacramental grace comes, in order of time, after the essential words. It was not till Scholastic times that theologians began to discuss the minimum of form required for the essence of each sacrament.

The Controversy. The Catholic Church has decided the question by making us kneel and adore the Holy Eucharist immediately after the words of Institution, and by letting her dogma be visibly disappear. On the other hand Orthodox theologians all consider the Epiklesis as being at least an essential part of the Consecration. In this question they have two schools. Some, Peter Moglias, for instance, consider the Epiklesis alone as consecration in itself. Monumenta fidei ecc. orient. I, 1865, 1, 180, so that probably the words of Institution might be left out without affecting the validity of the sacrament. But the greater number, and now apparently all, require the words of Institution too. They must be said, not merely historically, but as the first part of the essential form; they must be the words of Institution forth and is perfected by the Epiklesis. Both elements, then, are essential. This is the theory defended by their theologians at the Council of Florence (1439). A deputation of Latins and Greeks was appointed then...
to discuss the question. The Greeks maintained that both forms are necessary, that Transubstantiation does not take place till the second one (the Epiklesis) is pronounced, and that the Latin "Supplices te rogamus" is a true Epiklesis having the same effect as the other form. The Dominican Juan de Torquemada defended the Western position that the words of Institution alone and at once consecrate (Hardouin, IX, 977 sqq.). The decree of the council eventually defined this ("quod illa verba divina Salvatordominum virtutem transsubstantiationis habent", ibid.; see also the decree of the Armenians: "forma hæc sacramenti sunt verba Salvatoris") in December 10th ed., no. 698-old no. 593). Cardinal Bessarion afterwards wrote a book (De Sacramento Eucharistiae et quibus verbis Christi corpus conficitur, 1402, in P., VI, XI, 494-525), to whom Marcus Eugenius of Ephesus answered in a treatise with a long title: "That not only by the sound of the Lord's words are the divine gifts sanctified, but (in addition) by the prayer after these and by the consecration of the priest in the strength of the Holy Ghost'.

The official Euchologion of the Orthodox Church has after the words of Institution to explain that: "Since the demonstrative pronoun: This is my body, and again: This is my blood, do not refer to the Offerings that are present, but to those which Jesus, taking in His hands and blessing, gave to His Disciples; therefore those words of the Lord are repeated as [Ayerqmvicam, Dosithei, in Kimmel, op. cit., I, 431], and is superfuous to show the Offerings (by an elevation) and indeed contrary to the right mind of the Eastern Church of Christ" (ed. Venice, 1898, p. 63). This would seem to imply that Christ's words have no part in the form of the sacrament. On the other hand Dosithei in the Synod of Jerusalem (1679) apparently requires both words of Institution and Epiklesis: "It [the Holy Eucharist] is instituted by the essential word [pjuata iapparipwv, i.e. Christ's word] and sanctified by the invocation of the Holy Ghost" (Conf. Dosithei, in Kimmel, op. cit., I, 431), and this seems to be the common theory among the Orthodox Church in our time. Their arguments for the necessity of the Epiklesis as at any rate the perfecting part of the form are: (1) that the context shows the words of Institution to be used only as a narrative; (2) that otherwise the Epiklesis would be superfluous and deceptive: its very form shows that it effects a change. The first and second points are not difficult to answer. The words of Institution are certainly used historically ("qui pridie quam pateretur, sumpset panem et vinum", viz. dixit: hoe est enim corpus meum, as well as all Eastern forms, is an historical account of what happened (at the Last Supper); but this is no proof that they may not be used effectively and with actual meaning too. Given the intention of so doing, they necessarily would be so used. The second point is already answered above: the succession of time in sacramental prayers necessarily involves nothing but a dramatization of what has already reas taken place in one instant (this point is further evolved by Fortescue, "The Orth. Eastern Church", loc. cit.), true as it is. The Euchologion of the Orthodox Church with the appearance of the Eucharistic liturgy, which is customary in the East, the consecration of the consecrating, as early as St. Augustine, and the disappearance of any real Epiklesis in our Liturgy confirms this. Among Eastern Fathers there is less unanimity. Some, notably St. Cyril of Jerusalem, refer the consecration to the action of the Holy Ghost (as does the Mass of the West). But this is the moment (St. Cyril, CST, xix, 7; xxvii, 3; xxviii, 7; 19; cf. Basel, "De Spir. Sancto", xxvii sqq.); others, as St. John Chrysostom (Hom. i, De prod. Iudae, 6: "He [Christ] says: This is my body. This word changes the offering"; cf. Hom. ii, in II Tim. ii), quite plainly refer Consecration to Christ's words. It should be noted that these Fathers were concerned to defend the Real Presence, not only to explain the moment at which it began, that they always thought of the whole Eucharistic prayer as one form, containing both Christ's words and the Invocation, and that a statement that the change takes place by the power of the Holy Ghost, but not necessarily by the words of Institution, is the change to this special prayer. For instance St. Irenæus says that "the bread which receives the Invocation of God is not common bread, but a Eucharist," (Adv. haer., IV, xviii, 5), and, yet immediately before (I, xxi, 4) he explains that that bread is the Body of Christ over which the Invocation is said. The final argument against the Epiklesis as Consecration-form is the account of the Last Supper in the Gospels. We know what Christ did then, and that He told us to do the same thing. There is no hint of an Epiklesis at the Last Supper. It may finally be noted that later, in the West too (since the sixteenth century especially), this question aroused some not very important discussion. The Dominican Ambrose Catharinus (sixteenth century) thought that our Consecration takes place at an Epiklesis that precedes the recital of Christ's words. If the Epiklesis he thinks to precede the prayer "Quam oblata est?". A few others (including Renaudot) more or less shared his opinion. Against these Hoppe (op. cit. infra) showed that in any case the Epiklesis always follows the words of Institution and that our "Quam oblata est?" is to be considered one form. A few others suggest a mitigated theory, according to which the Invocation (in our case the "Supplices te rogamus") belongs not to the essence of the sacrament, but in some way to its (accidental) integrity. John of Torquemada at the Council of Florence (Hardouin, IX, 978), Suarez (De Sacramentis, disp. iv, 1), Dillmann (De Euch., iv, 14), Lugo (De Euch., disp. xi, 1) explain that the Invocation of the Holy Ghost is made rather that He may sanctify our reception of the Holy Eucharist. This is a theoretical explanation sought out to account for the fact of the Epiklesis, without giving us our insistence on the words of Institution as alone consecrating. Historically and according to the text of the old invocations they must rather be looked upon as dramatically postponed expressions of what happens at one moment. There are many like cases in our rite. (examples quoted in "The Orth. Eastern Church", loc. cit.).

Zorny, Dissertatio historico-theologica de Epiklesis (Rostock, 1765); Horppa, De Epiklesia der griech. u. orient. Liturgien u. Konsekrationsvorschriften in Schaffhausen, 1840; De eucharistische Konsekrationsmoment (Würzburg, 1873); Form, Die eucharistische Epiklesis (Rostock, 1874); Epiklesis, Liturgie des IV Jahrhunderts u. ihrer Reform (Münster, 1893); Watterich, Der Konsekrationsmoment im hl. Abendmahl (Heidelberg 1896); Lingen, Die eucharistische Konsekrationsform in Zeitschrift für kath. Theol. (Innsbruck, 1897), pp. 51-106.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Epiphania, a titular see in Cilicia Secunda, in Asia Minor, suffragan of Anazarbus. This see is mentioned by many ancient writers, Ptolemy, Pliny, Stephanus Byzantius, etc. It was formerly called Omiandos and afterwards Epiphania, after Antiochus IV Epiphanes, King of Syria (175-161 B. C.). Cicero once encamped there, and Pompey settled there some of the pirates he had subdued. The civil era beginning in A. D. 37 (Barthelemy, Numismatique ancienne, 247). Seven bishops of Epiphania are known, from 325 to 692 (Lequien, Orients christ., ii, 895). The first, St. Amphion, suffered during the persecution of Diocletian and was present at the Council of Nicaea. (325). The name Epiphanes was the birthplace of a Gea, the usurping Bishop of Alexandria in the fourth century. Its ruins stand near Pyi,as, in the sanjak of Djebel-i-Bereket, vilayet of Adana; there are remains of walls, a temple, an acropolis, an aqueduct, and many houses, all built in basilica. Nearby are the celebrated "Cilician Gates" and the battle-
Field of Issus (Ramsay, Asia Minor, 386; Alishan, Sissouan, Venice, 1899, 175). Another Epiphanius was a suffragan of Damascus. It is the modern Hamah, on the Orontes (about 60,000 inhabitants). Jesuits and native Maronites sister care for its Catholic population, who are, for the most part, Greek Melchites. For these and for Catholic Syrians, Hamah is united with Emesa (q. v.).

S. VAILHÉ

Epiphanius, surnamed Scholasticus, or in modern terms, the Philologist, a translator of various Greek works in the middle of the sixth century of the Christian Era. He prepared for Cassiodorus the text of the "Historia Tripartita," a compilation of the works of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. We also have his translation of the commentary of Didymus on the seven Catholic Epistles and that of "Codex encycelus," a list of the admissions of the bishops of the East to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, a list drawn up in 458 by order of the Emperor Leo I. The author made several additions to it. He also translated the commentary of Didymus on the Book of Daniel and that of Epiphanius of Solanina on the Canticle of Canticles. These works are either lost or as yet undiscovered. "He belongs," says Julicher, "to the group who, like Dionysius Exiguus, Mutianus, and many unknown others, satisfied the needs of the Latin to translate Greek theological works."

BARDENSEWER, Patrologia (tr. St. Louis, 1908), 532, 557, 656; JULICHER in Realency. der class. Alterthumswiss. (Stuttgart, 1897), VI, 1, 192.

PAUL LEJAY

Epiphanius of Constantinople, d. 554. Epiphanius succeeded John II (518–20) as Patriarch of Constantinople. It was the time of the reaction against Monophysitism in the Eastern Empire that followed the accession of Justin I (518–27). Justin was Catholic; he let the Henotic (482) of his predecessor Zeno (474–91) quietly drop, and very soon after his accession he caused a synod of forty bishops to meet under John II at the capital, in order to proclaim a general acceptance of the decrees of Chalcedon throughout the empire, the restoration of Catholic, and the deposition of Monophysite, bishops (P. G., LXXVI, I, 783). The same synod reopened negotiations with the East, and even after the schism of 484–54 was closed. The reigning pope was Hormisdas (514–23), and it was on this occasion that he composed his famous formula. On Easter Day, 24 March, 519, the reunion was proclaimed. Severus of Antioch and the other Monophysite leaders fled to Egypt. The papal legates remained at Constantinople till 520. In that year the Patriarch John died, and Epiphanius was elected as his successor. He was then given authority from the pope to reconcile all schismatic and Monophysite who retracted their errors and signed the formula. Epiphanius signed it himself in the first place (Mansi, VIII, 502 sqq.

Four letters from Epiphanius to Hormisdas are extant, with the pope's letters to him (P. L., LXXII). In the first, from Hormisdas to Epiphanius (col. 493), the pope complains that he has received as yet no letter and to announce that he had demanded. In the second letter (I. c.) the pope requires that three repentant Monophysite bishops, Elias, Thomas, and Nicostorus, should be restored to their sees, and he appoints Epiphanius to restore them. Epiphanius then writes to Hormisdas (col. 494–95) to announce his acquiescence to the see of Constantinople, which he had demanded. He excuses himself for his delay by explaining the difficult circumstances and the disorder that still remain since the Monophysite troubles, and protests his exceeding desire for communion with the Roman see: "It is my special prayer, most blessed Father, to be united to you and to embrace the Divine dogmas which were left by the holy Apostles especially to the holy See of Peter, chief of the Apostles; for I count nothing more precious than them" (l. e.). He then draws up a very orthodox profession of faith according to the decrees of Epheus and Chalcedon; he accepts all the dogmas that the Roman see has proclaimed to St. Peter, and declares that he will never name in his dipthongs anyone who is condemned by the pope. His second letter (col. 497–99) to Hormisdas praises the emperor's zeal for the Faith, explains the case of many bishops in the East, appeals to Epiphanius wishing to receive communion now that they have renounced Monophysitism, and mentions a jewelled chalice and other gifts he sends to the pope (this letter is dated 520). Hormisdas answers (col. 505–6), exhorting the patriarch to persevere in reconciling Monophysites and thanking him for his presents. Epiphanius' third letter relates that a number of Eastern bishops have petitioned the emperor for union with Rome (col. 506–7), and the fourth (col. 507) praises Paulinus, whom the pope had sent to Constantinople as his legate. Migne (P. G., LXXVI, Pt. I, 783–96) gives the text of the correspondence of Severus of Antioch and Hormisdas (518–27) and of the synod of Constantinople held under Epiphanius. Assemani (Bibl. Orient., I, 619) gives a list of forty-five canons drawn up by this same synod. Epiphanius was succeeded by Anthimus I.

BRANDT, Die EKIPPANY (Lond., 1880), 11, 157–8; AECIAA ASIA (1741), June, V, 164; BARONIUS, Anz. der, ad ann. 520, 531, 533, 535; CEILLER, Hist. des auteurs eccl. (Paris, 1859–89), s. v.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE

Epiphany, known also under the following names: (1) ἐπιφάνεα, or ἐπιφάνεα, ή μη (rarely ή ἐπιφάνεα, though, e. g., in Athanasius, ή μη ἐπιφάνεα occurs): άναφάνεα: dies epiphaniarum; festivitas declarationis, manifestationis, apparitio: acceptio. (2) ἵματα ἅνα φωτείνα: dies luminis; dies lavarici. (3) παραβάθη, Bithania; etc. (4) Festum trium regum: whence the Dutch Driekoningsdag, Danish Tre-kongedag: etc. (5) Twelfth Day, Swedish Trettende-dagen: etc.—The meaning of these names will be explained below. The feast was called among the Syrians denho (up-going), a name to be connected with the notion of rising light expressed in Luke, i, 78. The name Epiphania survives in Belana, the name of a great fair at Athens, which, after the schism of 484, was held on 6 January, the feast of the Epiphaniarum (Mansi, VIII, 502 sqq.).

Four letters from Epiphanius to Hormisdas are extant, with the pope's letters to him (P. L., LXXII). In the first, from Hormisdas to Epiphanius (col. 493), the pope complains that he has received as yet no letter and to announce that he had demanded. In the second letter (I. c.) the pope requires that three repentant Monophysite bishops, Elias, Thomas, and Nicostorus, should be restored to their sees, and he appoints Epiphanius to restore them. Epiphanius then writes to Hormisdas (col. 494–95) to announce his acquiescence to the see of Constantinople, which he had demanded. He excuses himself for his delay by explaining the difficult circumstances and the disorder that still remain since the Monophysite troubles, and protests his exceeding desire for communion with the Roman see: "It is my special prayer, most blessed Father, to be united to you and to embrace the Divine
Basilidians celebrate Christ’s Nativity and also His Baptism on 6 and 10 January, or did they merely keep His Baptism on these days, as well as His Nativity on another date? The evidence, if not Clement’s actual words, suggest the former. It is certain that the Epiphany services were held in the ancient church in the East as a more or less marked commemoration of the Nativity, or at least of the *Angeli ad Pastores*, the most striking “manifestation” of Christ’s glory on that occasion. Moreover, the first actual reference to the ecclesiastical feast of the Epiphany (Ammonius Marcellinus, XXI, ii. 14, 204) appears to be doubled in Zonaras (XIII, xi) by a reference to the same festival as that of Christ’s Nativity. Moreover, Epiphanius (Hær., ii, 27, in P. G., XLI, 935) says that the sixth of January is *σημείως γενεθλίων τοστιγμόν επιφάνειας*, Christ’s Birthday, i.e. His Epiphany. Indeed, he assigns the Baptism to 12 Abir, i.e. 6 November. Again, in chapters xcvii and xcviii (P. G., XLI, 940 sq.), he asserts that Christ’s Birth, i.e. Theophany, occurred on 6 January, as did the miracle at Cana, in consequence of which water, in various places (Cyzara, for instance), was then yearly by a miracle turned into wine, of which he had charge. It will be evident that does not expressly deny that the Church celebrated the Epiphany in his time at Alexandria, he at least implies that she did not. Still less can we think that 6 January was then observed by the Church as holy. Moreover, Origen, in his list of festivals (Contra Celsum, i, 204, P. G., XI, 1150) makes no mention of it.

Owing no doubt to the vagueness of the name *Epiphany*, very different manifestations of Christ’s glory and Divinity were celebrated in this feast quite early in its history, especially the Baptism, the miracle at Cana, the Nativity, and Baptism. But we cannot for a moment suppose that in the first instance a festival of manifestations in general was established, into which popular local devotion read specified meaning as circumstances dictated. It seems fairly clear that the Baptism was the event predominately commemorated. The Apostolic Constitutions (VIII, xxxiii; cf. V, xii) mention it. Kellner quotes (cf. Selden, De Synodis, III, xv, 204, 220) the oldest Opticis Calendar for the name *Diæ baptismi sanctificatì*, and the later for that of *Immersio Domini* as applied to the *Thermonymian* of Nazianzus (XI, 21). *Hic videbatur* with ἡ ἁγία τοῦ Χριστοῦ γένεσις, but this sermon (Orat. xxxviii in P. G., XXXVI, 312) was probably preached 25 Dec., 380; and after referring to Christ’s Birth, he assures his hearers (P. G., 329) that they shall shortly see Christ baptized. On 6 and 7 Jan., he preached orations xxxix and xl (P. G., loc. cit.) and there declared (col. 349) that the Birth of Christ and the leading of the Magi by a star having been already celebrated, the commemoration of His Baptism would now take place. The first of these two sermons is headed εἰς τὰ ἁγία φως, referring to the lights carried on that day to symbolize the spiritual illumination of baptism, and the day must carefully be distinguished from the Feast of the Purification, also called *Festum lumen* for a wholly different reason. Chrysostom, however, in 386 (see Christmas) preached “Hom. vi in B. Philoegonium” where (P. G., XXXVI, 366 a d. 367) Cassian (Coll., X, 2, in P. L., XLIX, 820) says that this his practice is still observed in the Egyptian monasteries and that the Epiphany is commemorated on 6 January.

At Jerusalem the feast had a special reference to the Nativity owing to the neighbourhood of Bethlehem. The account left to us by Etheria (Silvia) is mutilated at the beginning. The title of the subsequent feast, *Quadragesimae de Epiphania* (Peregrin. Silvius, ed. Geye, c. xxvi), leaves us, however, in no doubt as to what she is describing. On the vigil of the feast (5 Jan.), a procession left Jerusalem for Bethlehem and returned in the morning. At the second hour the services were held in the splendidly decorated Golgotha church, after which that of the Anastasis was visited. On the second and third days this ceremony was repeated; on the fourth the service was offered on Mount Olivet; on the fifth at the grave of Lazarus at Bethany; on the sixth on Sion; on the seventh in the church of the Anastasis. On the ninth in that of the Holy Cross. The procession to Bethlehem was nightly repeated. It will be seen, accordingly, that this Epiphany octave had throughout so strong a Nativity colouring as to lead to the exclusion of the commemoration of the Baptism in the year 385 at any rate. It is, however, by way of actual baptism on this day that the West seems to enter into connexion with the East. St. Chrysostom (Hom. in Bapt. Chr. in P. G., XLVI, 363) tells us how the Antiochians used to take home baptismal water consecrated on the night of the festival, and that it remained for a year on the altar without corruption. On this day, the waters by the dipping into river, sea, or lake of a crucifix, and by other complicated ritual, is a most popular ceremony. A vivid account is quoted by Neale (“Holy Eastern Church,” Introduction, p. 754; cf. the Greek, Syriac, Coptic, and Russian versions, edited or translated by John, Marquess of Bute, and A. Wallis Budge). The people consider that all ailments, spiritual and physical, can be cured by the application of the blessed water. This custom would seem, however, to be originally connected rather with the miracle of the baptism than with the baptism itself. That baptism on this day was quite usual in the West is proved, however, by the complaint of Bishop Himerius of Tarragona to Pope Damasus (d. 384), that baptisms were being celebrated on the feast of the Epiphany. Pope Siricius, who answered (ibid., i, 21, 6), identifies the feasts of *Natalitia Christi* and of *His Apparitio*, and is very indignant at the extension of the period for baptisms beyond that of Easter and that of Pentecost. Pope Leo I (“Ep. xvi ad Sicil. episcopos,” c. i, in P. L., LIV, 701; cf. 696) denounces the practice of baptizing in the church of *Nativitas Domini* as *tartamabilis*; the Council of Tours (canon iv) condemned it in 517, and Victor Vitensis alludes to it as the regular practice of the (Roman-) African Church (De Persic. Vandal., i, xvi, in P. L., LVIII, 216). St. Gregory of Tours, moreover (De gloriam martyrum in P. L., LXXI, 783; cf. cci, xxvii), relates that those who lived near the Jordan were baptized in it that day, and that miracles were then wont to take place. St. Jerome (Comm. in Ez., 1, on verse 3 in P. L., XXV, 18) definitely asserts that it is for the baptism and opening of the heavens that the *dies Epiphaniorum* is still venerable and not for the Nativity of Christ in the flesh, for then *absconditus est, in non apparuit—‘He was hidden, and did not appear.’* That the Epiphany was of later introduction in the West than the Christmas festival of 25 December, has been made clear in the article CHRISTMAS. It is not contained in the Philocalian Calendar, while it was most likely that 25 December was celebrated at Rome before the sermon of Pope Liberius (in St. Ambrose, De virg., iii, i, in P. L., XVI, 219) which may assign to 25 Dec., 354. St. Augustine clearly observes Oriental associations in the Epiphany festivities: “Righly calls” has (Serm. Domin. 2, in Epiph. Domini, in P. L., LXVIII, 1033) “the heretic Donatists always refused to celebrate this day with us; for neither do they love unity, nor are they in communion with the Eastern Church, where that star appeared.” St. Philaeus (Hær., c. cxvi, in P. L., XII, 1273) adds that certain heretics refuse to celebrate the Epiphany, regarding it, apparently, as a needless duplication of the
Nativity feast, though, adds the saint, it was only after twelve days that Christ "appeared to the Magi in the Temple." The dies epiphaniarum, he says (P. L., xii, 1274), is by some thought to be "the day of the Baptism, or of the Transformation which occurred on the same day." Finally, an unknown Syrian father of Balsabiri (Assemani, Bibl. Orient., ii, 163) boldly writes: "The Lord was born in the month of January on the same day on which we celebrate the Epiphany; for of old the feasts of the Nativity and Epiphany were kept on one and the same day, because on that same day He was born. The reason why our fathers changed the solemnity celebrated on 6 January, and transferred it to 25 December follows: It was the custom of the heathens to celebrate the birthday of the sun on this very day, 25 December, and on it they lit lights on account of the feast. In these solemnities and festivities the Christians too participated. When, therefore, the teachers observed that the Christians were inclined to this festival, they took counsel and decided that the true birth-feast be kept on this day, and on 6 Jan., the feast of the Epiphany. Simultaneously, therefore, with this festival the custom prevailed of burning lights until the sixth day of the new moon." It is simpler to say that, about the time of the diffusion of the December celebration in the East, the West took up the Oriental January feast, retaining all its chief characteristics, though attaching overwhelming importance to the mountain-top, as time went on, to the appearance of the Magi. Epiphanius indeed had said (loc. cit.) that not only did water in many places turn into wine on 6 Jan., but that whole rivers, and probably the Nile, experienced a similar miracle; nothing of this sort is noted in the West. The Leonine Sacramentary is defective on this point, but Leo's eighth epistle—"On the Epiphany" (p. l. l. v, serm. xxxii, col. 234, and serm. xxxviii, col. 263)—bear almost wholly on the Magi, while in serm. xxxv, col. 249, he definitely asserts their visit to be the consecration for which the feast was instituted. Fulgentius (serm. iv in P. L., lxxv, 732) speaks only of the Magi and the Innocents. Augustine's sermons (exev-xev in P. L., xxxviii) deal almost exclusively with this manifestation, and the Gelasian Sacramentary (p. l. lxxix, 1062) exclusively, both on the vigil and the feast. The Gregorian Sacramentary makes greater use of Ps. lxxx (A.V. lxxxiii), 10 and mentions the feast with the appearance of the Magi only in the Canon. The Ambrosian, however, refers to all three manifestations in the vigil-precise, and in the feast-precise to Baptism alone. The "Missale Vesperianum" (Næs and Forbes, The A. C. Liturgies of the English Church, p. 328) speaks, in the prayer of Illuminatio, Manifestatio, Declaratio, and composes its Gospel of Matt., iii, 13-17; Luke, iii, 23; and John, i, 1-11, where the Baptism and Cana are dwelt upon. The Magi are referred to on the Circumcision. The Gothic Missal (Næs and Forbes, op. cit., p. 52) mentions the Magi on the vigil, saying that the Nativity, Baptism, and Cana make Christ's Illustratio. All the manifestations are, however, referred to, including (especially) the feeding of the 5000, a popular allusion in the East, where the name fablea Augustine (serm. suppl. xvi, c. i, in P. L., XXXIX, 203) speaks of the feast day 5 of the Jerusalem ritual as on an equality with the other manifestations, whereas in the West the name Bethania occurs. Maxym of Turin admits the day to be of three miracles, and speaks (Hom. vii, in epiph., in P. L., lxxvii, 273) on the historical connexion of date and events. Pseudo-Dionysius, Paulinus of Nola (Pomo. ii, 47; Natal., v, 47, in P. L., l. x. i), and Sedulius (in P. L., lxxiii) all insist on the three manifestations. The Mozarabic Missal refers mainly to the Magi, using of their welcome by Christ the word accepto, a term of "initiation" common to Mithraists and Christians. In 3-4, the Council of Saragossa (can. iv), read together with the Mozarabic Missal's Mass in jejunio epiphaniarum, makes it clear that a fast at this season was not uncommon among the orthodox. "Cod. Theol." (i, viii, 20, xxv, v, 2) forbids the circus on this day in the year 400; "Cod. Just." (iii, xii, 6) makes it a day of obligation. In his "Mithraeum," a treatise of 250 on this sect, Eusebius, it is also laid down that the admission of new initiates should be delayed because of obligation in Spain; in Thrace (if we can trust the "Passio S. Philippi") in Ruinart, "Acta," 440, 2) it was kept as early as 304. Kellner quotes the "Testamentum Jesu Christi" (Mainz, 1899) as citing it twice (i, 28; iv, 67, 100) as a high festival together with Easter and Pentecost.

In the present Office, Crucidis Horeos alludes to the three manifestations; in Nocturn i, the first response for the day, the octave, and the Sunday within the octave, deals with the Baptism, as does the second response; the third response, as all those of Nocturns i and iii, is on the Magi. The antiphon to the Benedictus runs: "To-day the Church is joined to her celestial spouse, because in Jordan Christ doth wash her sins; the Magi hasten with gifts to the royal marriage-feast, and the guests exult in the water turned to wine." O Solo refers to the Magi only. The Magnificat antiphon of Second Vespers of Holy Day is adorned with three miracles: to-day a star led the Magi to the crib, to-day wine was made from water at the marriage, to-day in Jordan Christ willed to be baptized by John to save us." On the Epiphany it was a very general custom to announce the date of Easter, and even a practice ordered by many councils, e.g. that of Orleans in 514 (can. i); Auerre in 558 and 559 (can. ii), and still observed (Kellner) at Turin, etc. Gelasius finally tells us (Ep. ad. episc. Lucan., c. xlii, in P. L., lix, 52) that the dedication of virgins occurred especially on that day. The Pepysator, or Phrygian Montanists, says Sozomen (Hist. Eccl. vii, xxv, in P. G., lxvi, 1473), kept Easter on 6 April; hence (reckoning an exact number of years to the Divine life) Christ's birthday would have fallen on 6 January. But, it may be urged, the first notice we have of the observance of this date, refers to Christ's Baptism. But this (if we may assume, too, to have argued from 6 April) will have fallen on the exact anniversary of the Birth. But why pre-eminently celebrate the Baptism? Can it be that the celebration started with those, of whatever sect, who held that at the Baptism the Godhead descended upon Christ? On this uncertain territory we had better risk no footstep till fresh evidence, if such there be, is furnished us. Nor is this the place to discuss the legends of the Three Kings, which will be found in the article Mosis.
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CYRIL MARTINDALE.

Episcopacy. See Hierarchy.

Episcopal Church. See Anglicanism; Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

Epistemology (ἐπιστημονία), knowledge, science, and θεωρία, speech, thought, discourse), in a most general way, is that branch of philosophy which concerns itself with the value of human knowledge. The name epistemology is of recent origin, but especially since the publication of Ferrier's "Institutes of Metaphysics: the Theory of Knowing and Being" (1854), it has come to be used currently instead of other terms, still sometimes met with, like applied logic, material or
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critical logic, critical or initial philosophy, etc. To the same part of philosophy the name criteriology is given by the authors of some Latin textbooks and by the Louvain School. The exact province of epistemology is as yet but imperfectly determined, the two main correspondents for the two meanings of the Greek word επιστροφή. According as this is understood in its more general sense of knowledge, or in its more special sense of scientific knowledge, epistemology is "the theory of the origin, nature and limits of knowledge" (Baldwin, 'Dict. of Philos. and Psychol."
Nestle, 1901, p. 333; cf. "Gnosology", I, 114); or "the philosophy of the sciences", and more exactly, "the critical study of the principles, hypotheses and results of the various sciences, designed to determine their logical (not psychological) origin, their value and objective import" ('Bulletin de la Société française de Philos.', June, 1905, fasc. no. 7 of the Vocabulaire philosophique, s. v. "Epistémologie", 221; cf. Aug. 1906, fasc. 9 of the Vocabul. s. v. "Gnosologie", 332). The Italian usage agrees with the French. According to Ranzoli ("Dizionario di scienze filosofiche", Milan, 1905, s. v. "Epistemologia", 220; cf. "Epistemology", 2, ed., 1895, fasc. no. 7 of the Vocabulaire des sciences, s. v. "Epistémologie", 221), epistemology "determines the objects of every science by ascertaining their differentiating characteristics, fixes their relations and common principles, the laws of their development and their special methods". Here we shall consider epistemology in its first and broader meaning, which is the usual one. Hence, in applying the theory of knowledge, the German Erkenntnistheorie, i.e. "that part of philosophy which, in the first place, describes, analyses, examines genetically the facts of knowledge as such (psychology of knowledge), and then tests chiefly the value of knowledge and of its various kinds, its conditions of validity and correspondence to the two meanings of knowledge" (Eisler, Wortherbuch der phil. Begriffe, 2d ed., Berlin, 1904, I, 298). In that sense epistemology does not merely deal with certain assumptions of science, but undertakes to test the cognitive faculty itself in all its functions.

**Historical Outline:** The first efforts of Greek thinkers centre around the study of nature. This early philosophy is almost exclusively objective, and supposes, without examining it, the validity of knowledge. Doubt arose later chiefly from the disagreement of the Sophists in determining the primary elements of matter and in discussing the nature and attributes of reality. Parmenides holds that it is unchangeable; Heraclitus, that it is constantly changing; Democritus endows it with an eternal inherent motion, while Anaxagoras requires an independent and intelligent agent. This led the Sophists to question the possibility of certainty, and prepared the way for their sceptical tendencies. With Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, who oppose the Sophists, the power of the mind to know truth and reach certainty is vindicated, and the conditions for the validity of knowledge are examined. But epistemological questions are not yet treated on their own merits, nor kept sufficiently distinct from purely logical and metaphysical inquiries. The philosophy of the Stoics is primarily practical, knowledge being looked upon as a means of right living and as a condition of happiness. As man must act according to guiding principles and rational convictions, human action supposes the possibility of knowledge. Subordinating science to ethics, the Epicureans admit the necessity of knowledge for conduct. And since Epicurean ethics rests essentially on the experience of pleasure and pain, these sensations are ultimately the condition of nature, it was necessary to present the attributes of opinions, the impossibility of demonstrating everything, the relativity of perception, became again the main arguments of scepticism. Pyrrho claims that the nature of things is unknowable, and consequently we must abstain from judging; herein consist human virtue and happiness. The representatives of the Middle Academy also are sceptical, although in a less radical manner. Thus Aecreolaus, while denying the possibility of certain and claiming that the duty of a wise man is to refuse his assent to any proposition, admits nevertheless that a degree of probability suffices for the conduct of life. Again, the Middle Academy develops the same doctrine and emphasizes its practical aspect. Later sceptics, Æneasidemus, Agrippa, and Sextus Empiricus, make no essential addition.

The Fathers of the Church are occupied chiefly in defending Christian dogmas, and thus indirectly in preserving the harmony of revealed truth with reason. St. Augustine goes farther than any other father in his analysis of knowledge and in the inquiry concerning its validity. He wrote a special treatise against the sceptics of the Academy who admitted no certain, but only probable, knowledge. What is probability, he asks in an argument ad hominem, but a likeness of or an approach to truth and certainty? And then how can one speak of probability who does not first admit certainty? On one point at least, the existence of the thinking subject, doubt is impossible. Should a man doubt everything or be in error, the very fact of doubting implies existence. Epistemology as a logical principle also is certain. Although the senses are not untrustworthy, perfect knowledge is intellectual knowledge based on the data of the senses and rising beyond them to general causes. In medieval philosophy the main epistemological issue is the objective nature of knowledge. After Plato and the Scholastics hold that there is no science of the individual as such. As science deals with general principles and laws, to know how far science is legitimate it is necessary to know first the value of general notions and the relations of the universal to the individual. Does the universal exist in nature, or is it a purely mental product? Such was the question raised by Porphyry in his introduction to Aristotle's "Categories". Up to the end of the twelfth century, the answers are limited to two, corresponding to the two possibilities mentioned by Porphyry. Hence if one may speak of Realism at that period, it does not seem altogether correct to speak of Conceptualism or Nominalism in the well-defined sense which these terms have since acquired (see De Wulf, Hist. de la phil. médiévale, 2d ed., Louvain, 1905). Later, a third theory, which St. Anselm introduces to the mind a basis for the exercise of its functions of abstraction and generalization, this moderate Realism, as it is called in opposition to Conceptualism on the one side, and, on the other, to exaggerated, or absolute Realism, is also essentially the doctrine of Duns Scotus; and it prevailed in the School till the period of decadence when Nominalism or Terminism was introduced by Occam and his followers.

In modern times Descartes may be mentioned for his methodical doubt and his solution of it in theCogito, ergo sum, i.e. I think, therefore, I exist. But Locke, in his "Essay Concerning Human Understanding", is the first to give a clear statement of epistemological problems. To begin with ontological discussions is to begin "at the wrong end" and to take "a wrong course" Hence it came to my thoughts that . . . before we set ourselves upon inquiries of the nature of things, it was necessary to examine our abilities, and to see what objects our understandings were, or were not fitted to deal with" (Essay to the Reader). Locke's purpose is to discover the "certainty, evidence and extent" of human knowledge (I, 1, 3), to find "the horizon which sets the bounds between the enlightened and dark parts of things,
between what is, and what is not comprehensible by us” (I, i, 7), and “to search out the bounds between opinion and knowledge” (I, i, 3). One who reflects on the contradictions among men, and the assurance with which every man maintains his own opinion “problem: and have reason to expect that either he is no such thing as truth at all, or that mankind hath no sufficient means to attain a certain knowledge of it” (I, i, 2). This investigation will prevent us from undertaking the study of things that are “beyond the reach of our capacities” (I, i, 4), and will be “a cure of skepticism and idleness” (I, i, 6). Such is the problem the main point in its criticism may be mentioned the following: “We have the knowledge of our own existence by intuition; of the existence of God by demonstration; and of other things by sensation” (IV, ix, 2). The nature of the soul cannot be known, nor does the trustworthiness of the senses extend to “secondary qualities”; a fortiori, substance and essences are unknowable. These and other conclusions, however, are not reached by a truly epistemological method, i.e. by the criticism of the processes and postulates of knowledge, but almost exclusively by the psychological method of mental analysis and speculations in Locke’s way. Proceeding farther, Berkeley denied the objectivity even of primary qualities of matter, and Hume held a universal and radical phenomenalism. Aroused from a “dogmatic slumber” by the scepticism of Hume, Kant took up again the same problem of the origin, validity, and limits of human knowledge. This is the task of criticism, not the criticism of books and systems, but of reason itself in the whole range of its powers, and in regard to its ability to attain knowledge transcending experience. Briefly stated, the solution reached by Kant is that we know things-as-they-appear, or phenomena, but not the noumena, or things-in-themselves. These latter, precisely because they are outside the mind, are also outside the possibility of knowledge. Kant’s successors, identifying the theory of being with the theory of knowing, elaborated this critique into a systematic metaphysics in which the very existence of things-in-themselves was denied. After Kant we reach the present period in the evolution of epistemological problems.

PROBLEMS.—To-day epistemology stands in the forefront of philosophical sciences. The preceding outline, however, shows that it may be constituted as a distinct investigation and to receive a special systematic treatment. In older philosophers are found partial discussions, not yet co-ordinated and regarding only special aspects of the problem. The problem itself is not formulated before Locke, and no true epistemological solution attempted before Kant. In the beginning of philosophical investigation, as well as in the beginning of cognitive life in the individual, knowledge and certitude are accepted as self-evident facts needing no discussion. Full of confidence in its own powers, reason at once rises to the highest metaphysical considerations, and in this reality is often to this reality, is to presuppose knowledge; or, perhaps, revise its conclusions; for contradictions cause doubt, and doubt leads to reflection on the value of knowledge. Throughout history, also, interest in epistemological questions is aroused chiefly after periods characterized by ontological investigations implying the assumption of the validity of knowledge. As the psychology of knowledge develops, philosophers are to be found in epistemology, and therefore their solutions more varied. Originally the choice is almost exclusively between affirming the value of knowledge and denying it. For one who looks upon knowledge as a simple fact, these are the only two possible alternatives. After psychology has shown the complexity of the knowing-process, pointed out its various elements, examined its genesis, and followed its development, knowledge is no longer deemed either valid or invalid in its totality. Certain forms of it may be rejected and others retained; or knowledge may be held as valid up to a certain point. In fact, at present, one would look in vain for absolute and unlimited dogmatism as well as for pure and complete scepticism. Opinions vary between these two extremes; and hence comes, partly at least, the confusion of terms by which various views are designated—a labyrinth in which the most experienced can hardly find their way. Hence a few attempts only were made, and their names used in their most general and obvious sense.

The main problems of epistemology may be conveniently reduced to the following. Starting from the fact of spontaneous certitude, the first question is: Does reflection also justify certitude? Is certain knowledge within man’s power? In a general way Dogmatism gives an affirmative, Scepticism a negative answer. Modern Agnosticism (q.v.) attempts to indicate the limits of human knowledge and concludes that the ultimate reality is unknowable. This leads to the second problem: Does knowledge arise, or what modes of knowledge are valid? Empiricism (q.v.) admits no other trustworthy information than the data of experience, while Rationalism (q.v.) claims that reason as a special faculty is more important. A third question presents itself: What is knowledge? Is it a process within the mind with the special feature of referring to something without the mind, of representing some extramental reality? What is the value of this representative aspect? Is it merely the result of the mind’s inner activity, as Idealism (q.v.) claims? Or is the mind also passive in the act of knowing, and does it in fact reflect some other reality, as Realism asserts? And if there exist such realities, can we know anything about them in addition to the fact of their existence? What is the relation between the idea in the mind and the thing outside the mind? Finally, even if knowledge is valid, the fact of error is undeniable; what then will be the criterion by which truth may be distinguished from error? What signs decide whether certitude in any case is justified? Such systems as Intellectualism, Mysticism, Pragmatism, Traditionalism, etc., have attempted to answer these questions.

Like all other sciences, epistemology should start from self-evident facts, namely the facts of knowledge and certitude. To begin, as Descartes did, with a universal doubt is to do away with the facts instead of interpreting them; nor is it possible consistently to emerge out of such a doubt. Locke’s principle that “knowledge is conversant only with our ideas” is contrary to experience, since in fact it is for the psychologist alone that ideas become objects of knowledge. First to isolate the mind absolutely from external reality, and then to ask how it can nevertheless come to have knowledge, is to presuppose the knowable problem. As to the Kantian attitude, it has been criticized repeatedly for examining the validity of knowledge with the knowing faculty, for making reason its own critic and judge while its rights to criticize and judge are still held in doubt. Epistemology, the science of knowing, is closely related to metaphysics, the science of being, as its necessary introduction, and as gradually leading into it. The main epistemological issues cannot be met without stepping almost immediately on metaphysical ground, since the faculty of knowledge cannot be examined apart from its existence; the contents of knowing, after all, are logic. In its strict sense is the science of the laws of thought: it is concerned with the form, not the matter of knowledge, and in this it differs from epistemology. Psychology deals with knowledge as a mental fact, apart from its truth or falsity; it endeavours to deter-
mine the conditions, not only of cognitive, but of all mental processes and to discover their relations and the laws of their sequence. Thus logic and epistemology complement the work of psychology in two different directions, and epistemology forms a transition from psychology to metaphysics. It is true that epistemology can hardly be overestimated, since it deals with the ground-work of knowledge itself, and therefore of all scientific, philosophical, moral, and religious principles. At the present time especially it is an indispensable requisite for apologetics, for the very foundations of religion are precisely the doctrines and beliefs looked upon by the reach of human intelligence. In fact much recent discussion concerning the value of knowledge has taken place on the ground of apologetics, and for the distinct purpose of testing the value of religious beliefs. If, contrary to the definitions of the Council of the Vatican, the existence of God and some at least of His attributes cannot be demonstrated, it is evident that there is no possibility of revelation and supernatural faith. As Pius X expresses it (Encycl. "Pascendi", 8 Sept., 1907), to confine reason within the field of phenomena and give it no power to go beyond these limits is to make it "incapable of lifting itself up to God and of recognizing His existence by means of visible things. And then all will readily perceive what becomes of natural theology, of the motives of credibility and of external revelation."

(See Scepticism; Certitude; Dogma.)
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C. A. Dubray.

Epistle (in the Mass).—See LESSONS.

Epistle (in Scripture).—Lat. epistola; Gr. ἐπιστολή. In Hebrew, at first only the general term meaning "book" was used, then certain transitional expressions signifying "writing", and finally יִפְרָדָת (of Assyrian or Persian origin), and הָנָה, הָנָהוֹת (of Persian derivation), which are frequent in the Septuagint rendering הָנָהוֹת. In the study of Biblical epistles, it will be found convenient to distinguish between the Old Testament and the New.

The Old Testament exhibits two periods in its idea of an epistle: first, it presents the epistle under the general concept of a book or a writing; secondly, it regards the epistle as a distinct literary form. It may be difficult to point out the dividing line between these two periods with accuracy; in general it may be maintained that the Hebrews developed their notion of epistle as a specific form of writing during the time of the Captivity. The first instance of a written Biblical message is found in II K., xi, 14–15, where we are told about David's letter to Joab concerning Urias; there was need for secrecy in this case as well as in that of Jezabel's order to the ancients and chief men of the city in the matter of Naboth (III K., xxii, 8–9), and the commands sent to Samaria (IV K., iv, 1, 6). It may have been in order to avoid the danger of a personal interview that the Prophet Elias (Eli'eus?) wrote to King Joram concerning his impending punishment (II Par., xxii, 12–13). The desire to be emphatic and peremptory prompted the letter of the king of Syria to the King of Israel (I K., iv, 11). The recovery of Naaman's leprosy (IV K., v, 5–7), and Sennacherib's open letter to Ezecias (IV K., xix, 14; Is., xxxvii, 14; II Par., xxxii, 17), the wish to be courteous seems to have inspired the letter of Merodach Baladan to Ezecias after the latter's recovery from sickness (IV K., xx, 12; Is., xxxix, 1). Similar to the foregoing authoritative letters is the message addressed by Jeremias to the exiles in Babylon (Jer., xxxix, 1 sq.); the Prophet alludes also to letters sent by a prophet from Babylon to Jerusalem with the purpose of undermining Jeremias's authority (ibid., 28, 29).

Thus far letters are relatively infrequent. The importance of epistology in the Bible, and they are not regarded as constituting a distinct class of literature. After their first attestation in the Law, and then in the prophets, letters become, especially in the later periods, a peculiarly important form of writing. The important thing is that the letter, as a form of writing, begins to be marked by a formal address and a distinctly epistolary ending. Instances of such explicit address may be seen in Esd., iv, 7: "To Darius the king all peace"; Esth., xiii, 1: Artaxerxes the great king who reigneth from India...; but even the prophets and governors of the hundred and twenty-seven provinces, that are subject to his empire, greeting"; I Mach., xi, 30: "King Demetrius to his brother Jonathan, and to the nation of the Jews, greeting". An instance of an epistolary conclusion occurs in 2 Mach., xi, 33: "That the hundred and forty-eighth, the fifteenth day of the month of Xanthicus", a similar example may be seen, ibid., 38. But the Old Testament does not furnish us with any model of private correspondence between Hebrews.

The New Testament presents us with a very highly developed form of epistle. Rarely, no doubt, the subject have found it convenient to follow Professor Deissmann in his distinction between the letter and the epistle. The letter is a private and confidential conversation with the addressee, his anticipated answers shaping the course of the writing; the epistle is general in aim, addressed to all whom it may concern, and tends to publication. The letter is a spontaneous product of the writer, the epistle follows the rules of art. If publication be regarded as an essential condition of literature, the letter may be described as a pre-literary form of self-expression. In order to apply this distinction to the New Testament, we may regard the messages contained in, or referred to by, the New Testament Books, we shall group the relevant data as pre-Pauline, Pauline, and post-Pauline

Pre-Pauline.—The Book of Acts (ix, 2; xxii, 5; xxvii, 21) shows that the Jews of Jerusalem sent formal letters to the Synagogue of the Dispersion; Acts, xx, 22–23, gives a parallel instance of a letter written by the Apostles from Jerusalem to the churches in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. We may also infer from the testimony of the New Testament (I Cor., xvi, 3; II Cor., i, 1; Rom., xvi, 2); Acts, xviii, 27) that letters of commendation were of common occurrence. I Cor., vii, 1, informs us that the Corinthian Christians had applied to St. Paul in their difficulties by way of letter.

Pauline.—The Pauline Epistles form a collection which was formerly called ἐπιστολαί. They are called "epistles", though that addressed to the Hebrews hardly deserves the name, being really a theological homily. The Epistles mentioned in I Cor., v, 9, and Col., iv, 16, have not been preserved to us; their accidental loss makes us suspect that other Epistles may have perished. The peculiar form and style of the Pauline Epistles are studied in their respective introductions and commentaries; but we may add that I Tim., II Tim., and Tit. are called Pastoral Epistles; owing to its peculiar style and form, it is supposed by some writers that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not even dictated by the Apostle, but
only expresses his doctrine. Only the three Pastoral Epistles and Philemon are addressed to individuals; all the others are directed to churches, most of which, however, were well known to the writer. They exhibit more of their author's personal character than most of the other books of the New Testament.

Post-Pauline.—Generally speaking, we may describe the so-called Catholic Epistles as Post-Pauline. We need not note here that these Epistles are not named after their addressees, as happens in the case of the Pauline Epistles, but after the inspired author. The Epistle of St. James has an unappropriated salutation; it was meant for a class, not for persons known to the writer. In I John we have a sermon rather than a letter, though its familiarity of language indicates that the readers were known to the writer. The following two Epistles of St. John are real letters in style and form. St. Peter's first Epistle supposes some familiarity with his readers on the part of the writer; this can hardly be said of II Peter or of the Epistle of Jude. What has been said sufficiently shows that Professor Deissmann's distinction between the artistic epistle and pre-literary letter cannot be applied with strict accuracy. Quite a number of the New-Testament Epistles contain those touches of intimate familiarity which are supposed to be the essential characteristics of the letter.

Epistle of the obscure virorum. See Hoo groteschen; Pfefferkorn; Reuchlin.

Epitaphs, Early Christian. See Inscriptions.

Epping, Joseph, German astronomer and Assyriologist, b. at Neuenkirchen, near Rheine in Westphalia, 1 Dec., 1835; d. at Exaeten, Holland, 22 Aug., 1894. His parents died while he was very young and he owed his early education to the fostering care of relations. After completing the usual gymnasium course at Rheine and at Münster he matriculated at the academy in Münster, where he devoted himself particularly to mathematics. In 1859 he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus in Münster and after his philosophical studies was appointed professor of mathematics and astronomy. Maria-Lasch, he spent the years from 1867 to 1871 in the study of theology and was ordained priest in 1870. García Moreno, President of Ecuador, had petitioned the General of the Jesuits in the early seventies for members of the Society to form the faculty of the Polytechnic at Quito, which he had recently founded. A number of German Jesuits responded to the call, among them Epping, who set out in June, 1872, for Quito to become professor of mathematics. He quickly learned Spanish and was able to write a textbook of geometry in that language. He likewise took an active part in all the scientific works of the Fathers. The political disturbances which followed the assassination of Moreno (6 Aug., 1875) made it necessary for the Jesuits to return to Europe, and Epping arrived in Holland in the full of 1876. He spent the remaining years of his life at Biljdenbek, and later at Exaeten, as professor of astronomy and mathematics to the younger members of his order, devoting his leisure to research and literary work.

Epping's first published volume, "Der Kreislauf im Kosmos", appeared in 1852. It was an exposition and critique of the Kant-Laplace nebular hypothesis and an exposition of the pantheistic conclusions which had been drawn from it. His most important work, however, was begun in collaboration with Father Strasmaier who, in connexion with his own studies in Assyriology, had induced him to undertake a mathematical investigation of the Babylonian astronomical observations and tables. After considerable labour the key was found. He discovered the table of differences for the new moon in one of the tablets and identified Guttu with Mars, Sukku with Saturn, and Te-ut with Jupiter (Epping and Strasmaier in "Stimmen aus der Landoer L. Ap. d. 277-292). Eight years later he published "Astronomische Aus Babylon oder das Wissen der Chaldäer über den gestirnten Himmel" (Freiburg in Br., 1881). This work was of much importance both from the standpoint of astronomy and chronology. It concerned an astronomical study of the ancient Babylonians, worked out from their Ephemerides of the moon and the planets. This was supplemented by "Die babylonische Berechnung des Neumondes" (Stimmen aus Maria-Lasch, Vol. XXXI, pp. 225-240). He was also the author of a number of articles in the "Zeitschrift für Assyriologie".

Erasmus, Desiderius, the most brilliant and most important leader of German humanism, b. at Rotterdam, Holland, 28 October, probably in 1466; d. at Basle, Switzerland, 12 July, 1536. He was the illegitimate child of Gerard, a citizen of Gouda, and Margaretha Rogers, and at a later date latinized his name to Desiderius Erasmus. Eventually his father became a priest. Erasmus and an elder brother were brought up at Gouda by their mother. When nine years old he was sent to the school of the celebrated Humanist Hegius at Deventer, where his taste for humanism was awakened and his powers of mind received their bent for life. The most brilliant qualities of his intellect, a wonderful memory and an extraordinarily quick power of comprehension, showed themselves even in his earliest training. His mother died when he was thirteen years old, and a little later his father also; he was now sent by his guardians for two years, and afterwards called two lost years, to the monastery school of Hertogenbosch. Then, after wandering aimlessly about for a time, he was forced, through necessity and the insistence of his guardians, to enter in 1486 the monastery of Einsius, near Gouda, a house of Canons Regular. He felt no true religious vocation for such a step, and in later years characterized this act as the greatest misfortune of his life. As a matter of fact the beginnings of his religious indifferentism and of his weakness of character are to be sought in his joysless youth and in the years spent under compulsion in the monastery. He was left free, however, pursuant to his studies, and devoted himself mainly to the ancient classics, whose content and formal beauty he passionately admired. His religious training was obtained from the study of St. Jerome and Lorenzo Valla. In 1491 a lucky accident freed him from monastic life. The Bishop of Cambrai was minded to visit Italy and chose Erasmus as secretary and travelling companion, attracted by the young man's linguistic attainments; he also ordained him priest in 1492. The journey was never made, but Erasmus remained in the service of the bishop, who, in 1496, sent him to Paris to complete his studies. The scholar's most important position, however, they then prevailed at Paris was so repugnant to him that he spent much of his time travelling through France and the Netherlands, receiving occasionally friendly help; he was also for a while at Orléans, where he worked at his collection of proverbs, the later "Adagia".
money for a trip to England he earned by acting as tutor to three Englishmen, from whom he also obtained valuable letters of introduction. During his stay in England (1498–99), he made the acquaintance of Oxford of Colet, Thomas More, Latimer, and others, with all of whom he acquired the dress of a gentleman and opened into lifelong friendship. Colet showed him how to reconcile the ancient faith with humanism by abandoning the scholastic method and devoting himself to a thorough study of the Scriptures. Consequently, on his return to the Continent he took up with ardour the study of Greek and Latin works, and in 1508 he published the first translations of Erasmus occurred in this early period. In 1500 he was the "Adagia", a collection of Greek and Latin proverbs, in which he expressed the nature of true religion and true piety, but with comments that were biting and antagonistic to the Church; in 1505 Lorenzo Valla’s "Annotationes" to the New Testament, the manuscript of which he had found in a monastery at Brussels. His introduction to this work is important, for in it occurred his first utterance concerning the Scriptures, laying the foundation of the necessity of a new translation, a return to the original text, and respect for the literal sense.

In 1506 he was finally able, by the aid of his English friends, to attain his greatest desire, a journey to Italy. On his way thither he received at Turin the degree of Doctor of Divinity; at Bolongaro, at Padua, and at the academic centres of Upper Italy, he was greeted with enthusiastic honour by the most distinguished humanists, and he spent some time in each of these cities. At Venice he formed an intimate friendship with the famous printer Aldus Manutius. His reception at Rome was equally flattering; the cardinals, especially Giovanni de’ Medici (later Leo X), and Domenico Grimani, were particularly gracious to him. He could not, however, be persuaded to fix his residence at Rome, and refused all offers of ecclesiastical promotion. Henry VIII had just reached the throne of England, and thus awakened in Erasmus the hope of an advantageous appointment in that country, for which he accordingly set out. On his way out of Italy (1509) he wrote the satire known as "The Praise of Folly" ("Morie Encomium", or "Laus Stultitiae"), which in a few months went through seven editions. Outspoken for the future Evangelical Revolution, it scourged the abuses and follies of the various classes of society, especially of the Church. It is a cold-blooded, deliberate attempt to discredit the Church, and its satirical and stinging comment on ecclesiastical conditions are not intended as a healing medicine but a deadly poison.

Erasmus may now be said to have reached the acme of his fame; he was in high repute throughout all Europe, and was regarded as an oracle both by princes and scholars. Every one felt it an honour to enter into correspondence with him. His inborn vanity and self-complacency were thereby increased, and at the point of becoming a disaster; as the same time he sought, often by the grossest flattery, to obtain the favour and material support of patrons or to secure the continuance of such benefits. This was also the period of his greatest literary productivity. He wrote at this time several books of instruction and observation, as well as two pamphlets which later on were a part of the scholastic revolution that was soon to break out. The next five years he spent in England, but never accepted a permanent office; it was only for a short time that he held a professorship of Greek at Cambridge. When the hopes he had based on the friendship of Henry VIII proved vain, he realized only then that Henry’s money was all needed in warlike schemes, Erasmus returned to Brabant, where he became one of the royal councillors of Archduke Charles, later Emperor Charles V. This office gave him a fixed salary, and for his princely patron he now wrote the "Institutio principis christiani", a humanistic portrait of the ideal ruler. The archduke thought of making Erasmus a bishop, wherefore, with the aid of the papal legate Ammonius, the famous scholar obtained a papal Brief releasing him from all obligations to his monastery and also from the censures he had incurred by issuing his work without papal permission. No longer obliged to have permanent residence, Erasmus kept up his wandering life, occupied alternately with the composition and the publication of his works. In order to secure absolute freedom Erasmus refused many brilliant offers, among them an invitation from the King of France to reside at Paris, from Archduke Ferdinand to come to Vienna, and from Henry VIII to return to England. He frequently went to Basle to visit the famous printer Froben, who published henceforth nearly all the writings of Erasmus and procured for them a very wide circulation.

In this way Erasmus came into closer relations with German humanism, and his influence did much to increase its prestige in south-western Germany, inasmuch as the followers of the "new learning" in Basle, Constance, Schlettstadt, and Strasbourg, looked up to him as their leader. One of his chief works at this period, "Carmina Elegiaca" (1513), and "Colloquia" (1514), was issued in an enlarged form in 1526, and often reprinted. It is a kind of textbook for the study of the Latin language, an introduction to the purely natural formal training of the mind, and a typical example of the frivolous Renaissance spirit. The devoted monkish life and spirit was not to be held up to pitiful scorn; moreover, he descends only too often to indecent and cynical descriptions. His edition of the Greek original of the New Testament, "Novum Instrumentum omne" (Basle, 1516), no model of text-critical scholarship, was accompanied by a classical Latin translation destined to replace the Vulgate. Among the notes, partly textual criticism, partly exegetical comments, were inserted sarcastic slurs on the ecclesiastical conditions of the period. In a general introduction he discussed the importance of the Scriptures and the best method of studying them. Although the Complutian edition offered a better text and was also printed, but not published, at an earlier date, yet the edition of Erasmus remained for a long time authoritative on account of his high reputation, and became the basis of the textus receptus or received text. No less instrumental in preparing the way for the Evangelical Revolution by severing the scholastic method and undermining the traditional authority of the Scriptures were the "Paraphrases of the New Testament" (1517 and later). This work was dedicated to various princes and prelates, e. g. the paraphrases of the Evangelists, to Charles V, Francis I, Henry VIII, and Ferdinand I. In these publications the attitude of Erasmus towards the text of the New Testament is an extremely radical one, even if he did not follow out all its logical consequences. In his opinion the Epistle of St. James shows few signs of the Apostolic spirit; the Epistle to the Ephesians has not the vision of St. Paul, and the Epistle to the Hebrews he assigns with some hesitation to Clement of Rome. In exegesis he favoured a cold rationalism and treated the Biblical narratives just as he did ancient classical myths, and interpreted them in a subjective and figurative, or, as he called it, a metaphorical manner.

The literary works issued by Erasmus up to this time made him the intellectual father of the Reformation. What the Reformation destroyed in the organic life of the Church Erasmus had already openly or covertly subverted in a moral sense in his "Praise of Folly" (1509), and he realized it in his "Adagia" and "Colloquia", by his biting sarcasm or by his cold scepticism. Like his teacher Lorenzo Valla, he regarded Scholasticism as the greatest perversion of the religious spirit; according to him this degeneration dated from the primitive Christological controversies, which caused the Church to lose its evangelical simplicity and become the vice-
tim of hair-splitting philosophy, which culminated in Scholasticism. With the latter there appeared in the Church that Pharisaism which based righteousness on good works and monastic sanctity, and on a ceremonialism beneath whose weight the Christian spirit was stifled. In the discipline of devotion to the eternal salvation of souls, Scholasticism repelled the religiously inclined by its hair-splitting metaphysical speculations and its over-curious discussion of unsolvable mysteries. The religious life, he held, was not furthered by discussions concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost, or the cause of the effects, and the character of indebitis of baptism, or gratia gratia data or acquisita; of just as little consequence was the doctrine of original sin. Even his concept of the Blessed Eucharist was quite rationalistic and resembled the later teaching of Zwinglei. Similarly he rejected the Divine origin of the primacy, of confession, the indissolubility of marriage, and other fundamental principles of Christian life and the ecclesiastical constitution. He would replace these traditio inus and constitutio inus hominis by the simple words of the Scriptures, the interpretation of which should be left to the individual judge, the disciplinary ordinances of the Church met with even less consideration; fasts, pilgrimages, veneration of saints and their relics, the prayers of the Breviary, celibacy, and religious orders in general he classed among the perversities of a formalistic Scholasticism. Over against this "holiness of the form," he set the "true orthodoxy of Christ, a purely natural ethical ideal, guided by human sagacity. Of course this natural standard of morals obliterated almost entirely all differences between heathen and Christian morality, so that Erasmus could speak with perfect seriousness of a "Saint" Virgil or a "Saint" Homer. In his edition of the Greek New Testament and in his "Paraphrases" of the same he forestalled the Protestant view of the Scriptures.

Concerning the Scriptures, Luther did not express himself in a more rationalistic manner than Erasmus; nor did he interpret them more rationalistically. The only difference is that Luther said clearly and positively what Erasmus often merely suggested by a doubt, and that the former sought in the Bible, above all other things, the certainty of justification by Christ, while the latter, with an almost Pelagian definiteness, sought therein the model of a moral life. So, of course, the same fundamental principle and arguments were put forth by the representatives of eighteenth-century "Enlightenment" to attain exactly the same results. It must be added, however, that the attitude of Erasmus towards the religious questions of his time was conditioned rather by literary interests than by profound interior convition. His demeanour was apt to be influenced by anxiety for peace and by personal considerations; moreover, in contrast to Luther, it was the refined and scholarly public, not the common people, that he sought to influence by his writings. He, therefore, laboured for a reformation of the Church that should be antagonistic to the pope and the bishops, nor productive of a violent rupture, but which, through the dissemination of a larger enlightenment, would eventually but gradually result in the wished-for reorganization. This was to be the work, however, not of the common people, but of scholars and princes. Hence he tried subsequently to check the Lutheran movement by some kind of peaceful compromise. With a scholar's love of peace, he was from the beginning disinterested to enter deeply into the current religious dispute. For a time his reform ideas seemed to have some prospect of success, especially among the princes of the empire. As soon, however, as the Lutheran movement was seen to mean definitive separation from the Church, it was clear that a rigorous adherence to the latter was the only logical attitude and the one most capable of defence. In the first years of the Reformation many thought that Luther was only carrying out the programme of Erasmus, and this was the opinion of those strict Catholics who from the outset of the great conflict included Erasmus in their attacks on Luther.

Given the wavering character of Erasmus, such attacks were not directed at his equivocal attitude, if not plain double-dealing. He never clearly to understand that he agreed with him, and urged only a less violent manner and more consideration for the pope and ecclesiastical dignitaries. At the same time he felt that the attitude of Luther for easier access on some points more and more from Luther. In 1519 he wrote to Luther: "I observe as strict a neutrality as possible, in order to advance scholarship, which is again beginning to flourish, by my modesty rather than by passion or violence." That close relations between these two fundamentally different characters were maintained as late as the Diet of Worms, though both soon clearly saw the difference in their points of view and their attitudes, was largely due to Melancthon. Though Erasmus had prepared the way for him, Luther was greatly dissatisfied with him because of his strongly rationalistic concept of original sin and the doctrine of grace. As early as 1517 Luther thus warned himself concerning Erasmus: "My liking for Erasmus declines from day to day. . . . The human is of more value to him than the Divine. . . . The times are now dangerous, and I see that a man is not a more sincere Catholic than he who is a Greek or Hebrew scholar." Luther felt hurt, moreover, by the cool and reserved manner in which Erasmus passed judgment on his writings and actions. Nevertheless, Erasmus always opposed any persecution of Luther, and frequently and in no measured terms condemned the Bull of excommunication. At the same time, he declined any association with Luther, and protested his ignorance of the latter's writings and his own complete submission to the highest ecclesiastical authority. But with all this he took the part of Luther in his correspondence with the Elector Frederick of Saxony. He expressed his views concerning Luther's doctrine in twenty-two "Axiomata" addressed to the Elector's court chaplain, Spalatinus, which, to his disgust, were soon afterwards printed. In this memoir and in other writings addressed to the emperor and to friends at Rome, Erasmus proposed arbitration by a court of scholars; moreover, of the violent attacks made on himself by the monks and asserted his absolute neutrality and his fidelity to Rome. The latter assurance was all the more necessary as the papal legate Alexander in his reports to Rome put the authorities on their guard against Erasmus, and accused him of being an accomplice in the religious revolt. "The poison of Erasmus has a much more dangerous effect than that of Luther, who by his notorious satirical and insulting letters has injured his own teaching."

While Erasmus, by his relations with the Roman Curia, was able to checkmate the aforesaid and similar hostile complaints, in Germany he continued to be regarded with distrust and even with hatred, sentiments that acquired new strength when, in spite of repeated entreaties, he refused to appear publicly against Luther. Inquisitions and charges of this kind were brought against him, especially by the theologians of Louvain. Consequently, in 1521, he moved to Basle, where the presence of numerous humanists of the Upper Rhine seemed to assure him a peaceful existence. Even here his attitude continued for a considerable time uncertain. To Duke George of Saxony he expressed his wish to take part in the destruction of Martin Luther and blamed both the Bull of excommunication and the imperial edict against the reformer, yet in his correspondence with the emperor and with Adrian VI he denied all association with Luther, and reverted again to his plan of reconciliation by means
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of a court of arbitration. He also defended with great earnestness his own orthodoxy against Stunica, who wrote the treatise "Erasmi Rotterdami blasphemiae et impietates" (Rome, 1522), to prove that Lutheran errors were to be found in the aforesaid "Annota-
tiones". The New Testament. The same year (1521), the fugitive Von Hutten, on his way to Zurich, attempted, but in vain, to meet at Basle his former friend. Von Hutten revenged himself in his "Expos-
tutatio cum Erasmo" (1523), in which he laid bare with passionate violence all the weaknesses, all the parvitas and idemnitas animi of his former patron. Erasmus replied from Basle with his "Spongia adversus adspersinve Hutteni", in which, with equal violence, he attacked the character and life of his op-
oponent, and defended himself against the reproach of duplicity. He had endeavoured, so he wrote, to hold aloof from all parties; he had, indeed, attacked Ro-
amian abuses, but he had never attacked the Apostolic See or its teaching.

All sympathetic association of Erasmus with the Reformers now ceased, though Melanthon tried to

reach the final rupture. One after another, the leaders of the religious anti-Roman movement withdrew from him; most of them put in an appearance at Zwingli's famous Theological convention at Basle. Shortly before his death he heard the sorrowful news of the execution of two of his English friends, Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher.

Editions of the classics and the Fathers of the Church kept the Reformation on foot during the later period of his life. In 1523 appeared his edition of the Epistles of St. Paul, in 1526 of the St. Irenaeus of Lyons; in 1527 of St. Ambrose; in 1528 of St. Augustine; in 1529 of the St. Cyprian; in 1530 of St. Chrysostom; his edition of Origen he did not live to finish. In the same period he issued the theological and pedagogical treatises: "Ecclesiasticae sive Concinnator Evangeliorum" (1535), a greatly admired homiletic work; "Modus confinden
ti" (1528), a guide to right confession; "Vida christi" (1531); "De civilitate morum puerilium"; "De preparatioj ad mortem", etc.

Opinions concerning Erasmus will vary greatly. No one has defended him without reserve, his defects of character being too striking to make this possible. His vanity and egotism were boundless, and to gratify them he was ready to pursue former friends with defamation and invective; his flattery, where favour and material advantages were to be had, was often repulsive, and he lacked straightforward speech and decision in just those moments when both were nece-
sary. His religious ideal was entirely humanistic: reform of the Church on the basis of her traditional constitution, the introduction of humanistic "enlighten-
ment" into ecclesiastical doctrine, without, how-
ever, breaking with Rome. By nature a cold, schol
arily character, he had no real interest in unconfessional questions connected with his heresy, and a sympathy for the doctrines and destinies of the Church. Devoid of any power of practical initiative he was constitutionally unfit for a more active part in the violent religious movements of his day, or even to sacrifice himself for the defence of the Church. His bi-
gnostic, intellectual, and above all his natural philos-
phy for the Reformation; it spared neither the most sacred elements of religion nor his former friends. His was an absolutely unspeculative brain, and he lacked en-
tirely all power of acute philosophical definition; we need not wonder, therefore, that on the one hand he
was unable to grasp firmly ecclesiastical doctrine or deal justly with its scholastic formulation, while on the other he inveighed with extreme injustice against the institutions of the Church. It must not be forgotten that the grave defects of his character were compensated by qualities which won the universal European fame of the man through several decades, a public esteem and admiration far excelling in degree and extent the lot of any scholar since his day. He had an unequalled talent for form, great journalistic gifts, a surpassing power of expression; for strong and moving discourses, keen wit and covert sarcasm, he was unsurpassed. In him the world beheld a scholar of comprehensive and many-sided learning, though neither profound nor thorough, a man of universal observation, a writer whose diction was brilliant and elegant in the highest degree. In a word, Erasmus exhibits the quintessence of the Renaissance spirit; in him are faithfully mirrored both its good and bad qualities. It cannot be denied that Erasmus was a potent factor in the educational movement of his time. As the foremost of the German humanists, he laboured constantly and effectually for the spread of learning, which imparted to the education of the Renaissance period its content and spirit. By his intercourse with scholars and students, his published satires on existing institutions and methods, and especially his work in editing and translating the Greek and Latin classics he gave a powerful impulse to the study of the classics. But his more direct contributions to education are marked by the inconsistency which appears in his whole career. Some of his writings, e.g. his "Order of Study" (De ratione studii, 1516) and his "Liberal Education of Children" (De pueris instructis et educandis, 1523) were excellent advice to parents and teachers on the care of children, development of individuality, training in virtue and in the practice of religion, with emphasis on the moral qualifications of the teacher and the judicious selection of subjects of study. In other writings, as in the "Colloquia", the tone and the language are just the opposite, so offensive in fact that even Luther in his "Table Talk" declares: "If I die I will forbid my children to read his Colloquies..." See now what poison he scatters in his Colloquies among his made-up people, and goes crafty at our youth to poison them. It is not surprising that he be condemned by the Sorbonne (1526) as dangerous to morals, and was eventually placed on the Index. That in most works on the history of education Erasmus occupies so large a place, while others who contributed far more to the development of educational method (e. g. Vives) are not mentioned, is perhaps due to sympathy with the anti-ecclesiastical attitude of Erasmus, rather than to the intrinsic value of his constructive work (see Stoeckl, Gesch. d. Pädagogik, Mainz, 1876). A complete edition of the works of Erasmus, to which a life of him was added, was issued by Beatus Rhenanus (Basle, 1540—41) in 9 vols.; an edition was also published by Le Clerc (Leyden, 1703—06), 10 vols.; Ruelens, "Erasm. Rott. Silva carminum" (Brussels, 1864). The editions of the letters of Erasmus have been as follows: "Epistulae familiares Erasi" (Basle, 1519); Herzog, "Epistulae fam. ad Bon. Amerbachum" (Basle, 1779); Horwitz, "Erasmi" in the "Transactions of the philosophical-historical section of the Academy of Vienna, vols. XX and XCV (1878—85); Horwitz, "Erasmus and Martin Lipsius" (1882); F. M. Nichols, "The Epistles of Erasmus" (London, 1901—04), 2 vols.; von Muskovski, "Correspondenz des Erasmus mit Polen" (Breslau, 1890); letters from him were published by Reichling, "Ausgew. pädagogische Schriften des Erasmus" (Freiburg, 1896). Information about the life of Erasmus is obtained from his letters to Servatius and granius. Durand de Labour, "Erasme de Rotterdam, précurseur du xvieme siècle de l'esprit moderne" (Paris, 1872); II. Drummond, "Erasmus, his Life and Character" (London, 1891); J. H. Emsley, "Erasmus and Thomas More" (Paris, 1874); Gilly, "Erasmus (Arts, 1879); Richter, "Erasmusstudien" (Dresden, 1901); Fr. Scherbern, "The Oxford Reformers: John Cranach, Thomas More, and John Hus" (1927); Freudenthal, "Life and Letters of Erasmus" (London, 1894); Emeron, "Erasmo" (London, 1899); Fennimore, "Erasmus" (London, 1901); Gilly, "Erasmus, Raphael, and Antonio Panormita" (1902), with a good bibliography, pp. 196—229; concerning the policy of persecution of Erasmos see "Praeambulae Erasiani" (Augsburg, 1527); Kalhoff in Zeitschrift für Reformationsgeschichte, 1 (1904), 1 sqq.; Hartfels, "Erasmus u. die Papias" in "Historisches Jahrbuch" (1898), 1 sqq., 1 tr. of the Papist. I. IV, 472 sqq.; Lévius, "Zur Charakteiristik der relig. Schriften des Erasmus" (1895); Richter, "Das Erasmus u. seine Stellung zu Luther" (Leipzig, 1895); Hermann, Die religiösen Reformbestrebungen des deutschen Humanismus (Frankfurt, 1907); Streichert, "Erasmus von Rotterdam" zur Kirche und zu den relig. Bewegungen seiner Zeit (Leipzig, 1870); Scholz, "Die pädagogischen und didaktischen Grundsätze des Erasmus" (1880); Bach, "Die Lehren von Erasmus über die Erziehung und den ersten Unterricht der Kinder" (1892); Grooten, "Das Ideal der Bildung und Erziehung bei Erasmus" (1890); Hoffmann, "Erasmus über die Studienführung und die Erziehung" (1879); and the "Erasmusiana" (Brussels, 1866); Erasmi, issued by the University of the Geneva (Geneva, 1957-1901). 1-7.

Josef Sauer.

Erasmus and Erastianism.—The name "Erastianism" is often used in a somewhat loose sense, denoting an undue subservience of the Church to the State. This was not, however, the principal question on which the system of Erastus turned, but rather a subsidiary one and a deduction from it. This can be explained by a short account of his life and works. The real name of this secretary was Theodor or Liélier. He used the Latinized form in his works, and accordingly has become known by that name. He was born at Baden, in Switzerland, of humble parents, 7 September, 1524; and died 31 December, 1583. For his education he went to Basle in 1540, and two years after he found a patron and tutor in his father, who was able to enter the university. His zeal for learning may be estimated from the fact that although by disease he lost the use of his right arm, he learnt to write with his left hand, and is said to have been able to take down his notes more fluently than others who had no similar impediment. During his residence at Basle there was an outbreak of plague. Erastus was one of the victims; but he did not suffer severely, and on his recovery, schools having been suspended, he left Basle and proceeded to Bologna, where he studied philosophy and medicine. He was afterwards for a time also at the University of Padua. In 1553 he returned to Germany and obtained an appointment as court physician to the Prince of Hennepen. We next find him in 1558 as court physician to the elector Palatine, Otto Heinrich, and occupying at the same time the chair of medicine in the University of Heidelberg.

Although his work and lectureship were both connected with medicine, the chief interest of Erastus had always been in theology. Heidelberg was at that time the scene of severe controversial strife. Erastus, who was himself a follower of Zwingle, threw himself heart and soul into the conflict against the Lutherans. The Elector Frederick III by whose successor, Otto Heinrich in 1559) was then enforcing the teaching of Calvinistic doctrines, and Beza was actively defending them as against Brenz in Stuttgart. A conference was arranged to take place at the monastery of Maulbronn in 1564, and by request of the elector, Erastus took a prominent part therein. He published a statement defending the doctrine of Zwingle, and on its being attacked, he wrote a second defense the following year. The conference was far from successful in settling the dispute, which continued in an aggravated form. In 1568, Erastus wrote his celebrated "Theses" against what he called the "excommunication fever," which was then spreading everywhere. They were violently attacked by Beza, and Erastus answered the following year by his "Confutation THE". Notwithstanding his efforts, a full presbyterian system was set up in 1570 at Heidelberg and the
council proceeded to excommuni- cate Erastus on the ground of his alleged Unitarianism. After a long further controversy, he succeeded in convincing them that this allegation was false; and the excommunication was removed in 1576; but his position had become difficult. In 57 years later he returned to office. He returned to Basle, where he taught ethics for a short time, until his death. On his tomb in St. Martin’s church he is described as “an acute philosoper, a clever physician, and a sincere theologian”. He left behind him the reputation of an upright life, with great amiability of character, coupled with an absorbing zeal for being right. He took an active part in combating the superstitions of astrology; and he showed that he was not free from the prejudices of his day by advocating the killing of witches.

The great work by which Erastus is known is his “Seventy-five Theses”, to which we have already alluded. They were never printed in his lifetime, but during his last illness he expressed a desire that they should be published, and Castelvetro, who married his widow, carried out his wishes. The “Theses” and “Confirmatio thesium” appeared together in 1589, the printer’s name and place being suppressed from moti- ves of prudence. The context of the “Theses” turned was that of excommunication. The term is not, however, used by Erastus in the Catholic sense as excluding the delinquent from the society or membership of the Church. The excommunication on which he alludes was the exclusion of the defaulter from life in participation in the sacraments. He explains what he means in the introduction to the “Theses” which he wrote at the end of his life. “It is about sixteen years ago”, he writes, “since some men were seized on by a certain excommuniaitory fever, which I then did not admire with the title of ecclesiastical discipline. They affirmed the manner thereunto to be this; that some certain preachers should sit in the name of the whole Church and should judge who were worthy or unworthy to come unto the Lord’s Supper.” The first eight theses are devoted to a detailed explana- tion of the various senses in which the word excommunion is used, and in the ninth Erastus defines the issue with which he is concerned: “This, then, is the question, whether any command or any example can be produced from Holy Scriptures requiring or intimating that such persons [i.e. sinners] should be ex- cluded from the sacraments.” In the following thesis (x) he says: “Our answer is that none such can be found, but rather that many, and even examples, there exists, of an opposite tendency, occur everywhere in the Bible.” The following twenty-eight theses are devoted to developing and maintaining his conclusions, the last half of his work to answer possible objections.

The chief argument on which Erastus bases his whole system is an analogy between the Jewish and Christian Dispensations, and it is exactly here that the folly of his conclusions becomes manifest. A Cathol- ical indeed, ‘would be less likely to fall into the error of looking upon the Sacrament of the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Mass as in any close way analogous to the Sacraments of the Old Law, and the slaying of the paschal lamb; or the relation of the ceremonial law to the golden calf of the Jewish Church, as in any way realizable in the most Christian of states. To a Pro- testant who looked upon the Bible as the sole source of Revelation this was different. Erastus argued that by the Law of Moses no one was excluded from the offering of the paschal sacrifice, but every male was commanded to observe it under pain of death. In the following thesis (lxxiv) that “If that Church and State were both wisely founded, arranged, and ap- pointed, any other must merit approbation which approaches to its form as nearly as present times and circumstances will permit. So that wherever the magistracy is godly, there is no need of any other author- ity under any other pretension or title to rule or
punish the people—as if the Christian magistrate differed nothing from the heathen. I allow indeed the magistrate ought to consult, when doctrine is concerned, those who have particularly studied it; but that there should be any such ecclesiastical tribunal to take the conduct of men's conduct, we find no such thing anywhere appointed in the Holy Scriptures. It must be reasonably asked how the system of Erastus could work in a state which is professedly un-Christian, and the last thesis is devoted to answering that question. "But in those churches, the members of which live under an ungodly government (for example Popish or Mohammedan), under such a government those who in church, according to the precept of the Apostle, to settle disputes by arbitration, compose quarrels, and do other offices of that sort. These men ought also, in conjunction with the ministers, to admonish and reprove them who live unholy and impure lives; and if they do not succeed, they may also punish, or rather recall them to virtue, either by refusing to hold private intercourse with them or by a public rebuke, or by any other such mark of disapprobation. But from the sacraments which God has instituted, they may not deprive any who desire to partake.

The full system of Erastus was never accepted or promulgated by any definite sect or band of followers; but the influence of his opinions was very considerable, both in Germany and in Great Britain. The Presbyterians of course have always vigorously repudiated his doctrine; but in the Westminster Assembly (1643–7) there was a strong Erastian party. A long controversy, a definite resolution, affirming that the Church has its own government distinct from the civil power, was carried almost unanimously, the sole dissenting being the well-known divine, John Lightfoot. On the general questions of the relation between Church and State, it must be admitted that the opinions popularly denoted by the word Erastian have had unmistakable influence on the Established Church of England, though there has always been a party resisting the encroachments of the civil power. We can, perhaps, take Hooker’s "Ecclesiastical Polity" as an authoritative exposition of this phase of Anglicanism. Hooker was a contemporary of Erastus, and in his preface he gives an account of the controversy of the latter with Beza. The eighth volume, however, in which he deals with the question before us did not appear until 1649, many years after his death. Its authenticity has been questioned; but it is now generally conceded that it is based on rough notes made during his lifetime. He adopts the analogy of Erastus between the Jewish nation and a Christian state.

Starting from the truism that a good monarch should look to the spiritual good of his subjects no less than to the temporal, he defends at once the title of the king to be head of the Church. He considers that the consent of the holy is required before an ecclesiastical law can be binding, and looks upon Parliament as their mouthpiece, and accordingly defends the right of Parliament to legislate on ecclesiastical matters. He defends the king’s power of appointing bishops and his jurisdiction over ecclesiastical courts. We may contrast with this the Catholic system of the union of Church and State which has always been the Church’s ideal, and has often been in great measure and in our own day, brought into prominence by the solemn pronouncements of Pius IX. The power of the State is maintained to be of God, either immediately, or mediately through the will of the people; and the civil government exists side by side with the ecclesiastical government. Each is of its own sphere. The pope has “temporal power”, using the term in its true sense, i.e. of his right to certain interference with the temporal government of states when the principles of religion are at stake. On the other hand, any interference on the part of the State with ecclesiastical appointments, as, for example, by nomination of bishops or by veto on such nomination, or even on the election of the pope, such as has sometimes existed in the case of some Catholic powers, is conceded by courtesy, in consideration of services rendered and by no means acknowledged as a right. See Hergenrother, “Catholic Church and State” (4th ed., London, 1870). The “Theses” of Erastus and the “Confirmation Thesaur” were reprinted at Amsterdam in 1649. An English translation of the “Theses”, without the “Confirmation”, appeared in London in 1659—a very literal rendering, in places hardly intelligible. A new and improved translation of the “Theses”, by Dr. Robert Lee, with a valuable preface, was published at Edinburgh in 1844 and is still the standard edition.

ERBERMANN, Erbein, theologian and controversialist, b. 25 May, 1597, at Rendsweisdorf, in Bavaria; d. 8 April, 1675. He was born of Lutheran parents, but at an early age became a Catholic, and on 30 May, 1620, entered the Society of Jesus. After completing his theological studies he taught philosophy and Scholastic theology, first at Mainz and afterwards at Würzburg. Subsequently he was appointed rector of the pontifical seminary at Fulda, which position he held for seven years. His theological attainments and zeal for the Church brought him into conflict with many of the leading Reformers of his time. He watched with a keen interest what in Protestant theological circles is known as “the symmetrical controversy”, and in his frequent encounters with its chief protagonists he must have proved himself a able Catholic. His principal works are: “Anatome Calixtina” (Mainz, 1644), and “Trenico Catholico” (2 vols., Mainz, 1645–46), in which he examines critically the religious tenets of George Caietius; “Interrogationes apologeticae” (Würzburg, 1651); “Examen Examinis Conringiani” (Würzburg 1644), an exposition of the infallibility of the Church against H. Conring; “Anti-Museus, i.e. paralela Ecclesiæ veræ et falsæ” (Würzburg, 1659), and “Anti-Musei paræ altera” (Würzburg, 1661); “Asserta theologica de fide divina” (Würzburg, 1665).

ERNST, BERNARD.  

Ercilla y Zúñiga, Alonso de, Spanish soldier and poet, b. in Madrid, 7 August, 1535; d. in the same city, 29 Nov., 1594. After his father’s death, his mother became lady-in-waiting to the Infanta Maria and made young Alonso a page to Prince Philip. Ercilla received a very thorough education, for besides having the most learned teachers, he enjoyed the advantages of very extensive travelling and of living at court where he came in contact with high personages. When he was only fifteen he accompanied Philip through Italy and Germany; and their travels lasted three years. Later, Ercilla accompanied his mother to Bohemia where he left her and then visited Austria, Hungary, and other countries. Returning to Spain, he soon started out again with Philip. In London he made the acquaintance of Jerónimo de Alderete (1555), whose stories of his thrilling adventures in the New World so fired Ercilla’s imagination that he determined to accompany a New World expedition there, and later obtained leave from Philip, and they set sail for America, 15 Oct., 1555. Soon after their arrival, however, Alderete died (near Panama, April, 1556). Ercilla continued on his way to Peru, and in 1557 joined the forces of García Hurtado de Mendoza, who
had recently been appointed Governor of Chile. During the succeeding two or three years he played a brilliant part in combating an insurrection among the natives of Arauco, a province of Chile, suffering great hardships, and distinguishing himself several times. After a severe illness he returned to Spain in 1562, and for a time resumed his travels through Europe. In 1570, he married Doña María de Bázán, a woman of illustrious family and of intellectual attainments. He died at Madrid neglected and in great poverty.

Ercilla's great work is "La Araucana", an epic poem of thirty-seven cantos, describing the difficulties encountered by the Spaniards during the insurrection in Arauco, and the heroic deeds of the natives as well as his companions. The epic partakes of the character of history, and the author adheres with such strict fidelity to the truth, that subsequent historians characterize his work as thoroughly trustworthy. In it the difficult art of story-telling is carried to perfection. Places are admirably described, dates are given with accuracy, and the customs of the natives faithfully set forth, giving to the narrative animation and colour. The poem was published in three parts, the first appearing in 1569, the second in 1578, and the third in 1590. The best editions are those published by the Spanish Academy in 1776 and 1828.

Arana, Historia general de Chile (Santiago, 1844); Ticknor, History of Spanish Literature (New York, 1857), i.; Ventura Fuentes.

Ercowald, Saint, Bishop of London, d. about 690. He belonged to the princely family of the East Anglian Offa, and devoted a considerable portion of his patrimony to founding two monasteries, one for monks at Chertsey, and the other for nuns at Barking in Essex. Over the latter he placed his sister, St. Eadburg, as abbess. He himself discharged the duties of superior at Chertsey. Ercowald continued his monastic life till the death of Bishop Wini in 675, when he was called to the See of London, at the instance of King Sebbi and Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury. As monk and bishop he was renowned for holiness of life, and miracles were wrought in attestation of his sanctity. The sick were cured by contact with the litter on which he had been carried; this we have on the testimony of Venerable Bede. He was present in 688 at the reconciliation between Archbishop Theodore and Wilfrith. King Ine in the pref. to his "life" calls Ercowald "my bishop". During his episcopate he enlarged his church, augmented its revenues, and obtained for it special privileges from the king.

According to an ancient epitaph, Ercowald ruled the Diocese of London for eleven years. He is said to have eventually retired to the convent of his sister at Barking, where he died 30 April. He was buried in St. Paul's, and his tomb became renowned for miracles. The citizens of London had a special devotion to him, and they regarded with pride the magnificence of his shrine. During the burning of the cathedral in 1087 it is reported that the shrine and its silken coverings remained intact. A solemn translation of St. Ercowald's body took place 14 Nov., 1148, when it was raised above the high altar. The shrine was robbed of its jewels and ornaments in the sixteenth century, and the bones of the saint are said to have been buried at the east end of the choir. The feast is observed by English Catholics on 14 November. Prior to the Reformation, the anniversaries of St. Ercowald's death and translation of his relics were observed at St. Paul's as feasts of the first class, according to an ordinance of Bishop Braybrooke in 1390.


COLUMBA EDMONDS.

ERDINGTON

Edery. See Transylvania.

Erdewicke, Sampson, antiquarian, date of birth unknown; d. 1593. He was born at Sandon in Staffordshire, his father. He descended from Richarde de Vernon, Baron of Shipbrook, in the reign of William the Conqueror. The family resided originally at Erdewicke Hall, in Cheshire, afterwards at Leighton and finally in the reign of Edward III settled at Sandon. Hugh Erdewicke was a staunch Catholic who suffered for his Faith. In 1582 he was reported to the Privy Council by the Anglican Bishop of Coventry as "the sorest and dangerous pest, one of them in all England". His son, Sampson, born in the reign of Henry VIII, entered Brasenose College, Oxford, as a gentleman-commoner in 1593. Leaving Oxford, he returned to Sandon where he spent the rest of his life as a wealthy gentleman under the usual disabilities of a recusant. He devoted himself to antiquarian studies, particularly to the thorough "Survey of Staffordshire". By this work his name is chiefly remembered, but it was not published during his lifetime, and considerable mystery exists as to the original MS. Because the numerous existing copies differ much from one another. A description of these was published by William Salt, F.S.A., in 1844. The "Survey" itself was published by Dugge (1717 and 1723), by Shaw in his Staffordshire (1798), and by Harwood (1829 and 1841). Other unpublished MSS. by Erdewicke are in the British Museum and the College of Arms. Latterly he employed as amanuensis, William Wyrley, a youth whom he had educated and who afterwards published writings of his own. One of these, "The True Use of Armorie", was claimed by Erdewicke as his own work, but he told William Burton the antiquary, that he had given Wyrley leave to publish it under his own name; but Antony à Wood denies this, adding that "Erdewicke being oftentimes crazed, especially in his last day, and fit then for no kind of serious business, would say anything as it came into his mind, as 'tis very well known at this day among the chief of the College of Arms" (Ath. Oxon., Bliss ed., II, 217). Erdewicke married first Elizabeth Dixwell, secondly Mary Digby (24 April, 1593). He died in 1603, but the date usually given, 11 April, must be erroneous, as his will is dated 15 May. He is buried on the right-hand side of Sandon Church, beneath an elaborate monument representing his own recumbent figure. Camden and other antiquaries praise his knowledge and industry, and he is believed to have been elected a member of the Society of Antiquaries founded by Archbishop Parker in 1672.


EDWIN BURTON.

Erdington Abbey, situated in a suburb of Birmingham, Warwickshire, England, belongs to the Benedictine congregation of St. Martin of Beuron, Germany, and is dedicated to St. Thomas of Canterbury. Driven from Germany by the Falk laws, four of these exiled monks went to Erdington at the request of Bishop Ullathorne, O.S.B., and of the Rev. Daniel Haigh, M.A., a convert Anglican clergyman who gave them the splendid Gothic church which he had built and established out of his own private fortune. They dedicated their lives to offering to Almighty God for the gift of the true Faith. Father Haigh's modest presbytery was the first monastery, and here Dom Placid Walter, Arch-Abbot of the Beuron Congregation, Dom Hildebrand de Hempel, later Abbot Primate of the Benedictine Order, Dom Leo Linse, afterwards Abbot of Port Augustus in

EDWIN BURTON.
ERHARD

Scotland, Dom Leodgar Stocker, and a lay brother took up their abode in October, 1876. Dom Pleaid was the first prior. Two years later, Dom Hildebrand succeeded Dom Pleaid, and at once set about building a monastery that would accommodate the community. The first of its kind in the Birmingham, with Dom Wilfrid Wallace, an English priest who had lately joined the community, as head master. Dom Leo Linsie became prior in 1882, and was succeeded in 1886 by Dom Boniface Wolff, who was followed, in turn, by Dom Silvester Schliechte in 1895. On the feast of the Assumption, 1896, the priory was transformed into an abbey by a Brief of Leo XIII, though three years elapsed before it received an abbey. These were years of spiritual and material development. A novitiate was opened and a school for oblates, several members were added to the community, and a large addition made to the monastic buildings. These comprised the abbot's apartments and chapel, rooms for guests, entrance hall, parlours, novitiate, and clerical. They were completed and blessed in 1899. In July, 1899, Dom Anagar Höckelmann was appointed its first abbot, and he was blessed in the abbey on 3 Sept., by Bishop Isliey of Birmingham. Since then a spacious refectory and library have been built, and the community continues to grow.

The Church and Abbey of Erdington, A Record of Fifty Years. 1850-1900 (Birmingham, 1900). PETER NUGENT.

ERHARD, SAINT, bishop of that city in the seventh century, probably identical with an abbot Erhard of Ebersheim in 88 of a Merovingian diploma of 684. Ancient documents call him also Erard and Herhard. The legendary account of his life offers little that is historically certain. The following, however, seems reliable. Erhard was born in Ireland, then known as “Scotia.” Like many of his countrymen he went to the Continent as missionary bishop or archiepiscopal, and coming to the Vosges mountains, Hildulf, said to have been Archbishop of Trier, and who lived there as a hermit (666-671). He is called Erhard’s brother, but very likely spiritual relationship was meant. It is said that each of them founded seven monasteries. Thence Erhard went to Ratisbon and founded the nunnery of Niedermünster. By Divine inspiration he was recalled to the Rhineland to baptize St. Oda, blind from birth, but who received her sight at her baptism. He sent a messenger to her father, Duke Attich, and reconciled him with his disowned daughter. According to another account, St. Oda was baptized by Hildulf, Erhard acting as her sponsor. The year of his death is not known. He was interred in the still-extant Erhard-crypt at Niedermünster, and miracles were wrought at his grave, that was guarded in the Middle Ages by “Erhardintonnen,” a religious community of women who were there a perpetual round of prayer. Otto II, in 974, made donations of property in the Danube valley to the convent “where the holy confessor Erhard rests.” On 7 Oct., 1052, the remains of the holy bishops Erhard and Wolfgang were raised by Pope St. Leo IX in presence of Emperor Henry III and many bishops, a ceremony which was at that time very large, but mention only the raising of Wolfgang, not that of Erhard. At the close of the eleventh century, Paul von Bernried, a monk of Fulda, at the suggestion of Abbess Heilkia of Niedermünster, wrote a life of Erhard and added a second book containing a number of miracles. The learned canon of Ratibson, Conrad of Megenberg (d. 1374), furnished a new edition of this work. The church in Niedermünster, now a parish church, still preserves the crosier of the saint, made of black buffalo-horn. A bone of his skull was enclosed in a precious receptacle in 1806 and is placed upon the heads of the faithful on his feast day. St. Jan. Three ancient Latin lives of the saint are found in the Acta Sanctorum (8 Jan.). The beautiful reliquary is reproduced in Jakob, “Die Kunst im Dienste der Kirche” (illust. 16).

ERIE.

See AMERICA, PRE-COLUMBIAN DISCOVERY OF.

Erie, Diocese of (Eriensia), established 1853; it embraces the thirteen counties of North-Western Pennsylvania, U. S. A.: Erie, Crawford, Warren, McKean, Potter, Mercer, Venango, Forest, Elk, Cameron, Clarion, Jefferson, and Clearfield, an area of 10,627 square miles. This territory enjoys the distinction of having been under three different national and ecclesiastical governments: under the French flag and the See of Quebec from 1753 to 1758; under the English flag and the Vicariate Apostolic of London from 1758 to the Treaty of Paris, 3 September, 1783, and the erection of the See of Pittsburgh in 1789; under the American flag since the Treaty of Paris and a part of the See of Baltimore until the establishment of the Diocese of Philadelphi in 1808. In August, 1814, when the Diocese of Pittsburgh was formed, it included all that part of the State of Pennsylvania west of a line running along the eastern border of Bedford, Huntingdon, Clearfield, Elk, McKean, and Potter counties, and consequently, the territory of the present Diocese of Erie. In 1853 the Right Rev. Michael O'Connor, the first Bishop of Pittsburgh, petitioned the Holy See, through the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore, for a division of his diocese, and took for himself the poorest part, and thus became the first Bishop of the Diocese of Erie. When Bishop O'Connor assumed the government of the diocese, 29 July, 1853, there were only twenty-eight churches with eleven secular priests and three Benedictine Fathers to attend to the wants of the Catholics scattered throughout the thirteen counties. At the urgent request and petition of the priests and people of Pittsburgh, Bishop O'Connor was restored to them, having governed the Diocese of Erie for the short period of seven months.

His successor at Erie was the Rev. Josue Moody Young a member of an old Puritan, New England family, born 29 Oct., 1808, at Shapleigh, Maine. He became a convert from Congregationalism and was baptized in October, 1828, by the famous New England missionary, Father Charles D. French, O.P., when he then changed the Moody of his name to Maria. He was ordained priest 1 April, 1838, and consecrated second Bishop of Erie, in Cincinnati, by Archbishop
The outlook at his accession was gloomy. Many of the priests who were affiliated with Pittsburgh before the division, returned there with Bishop O'Connor. Among those who cast their lot with the new diocese the most noteworthy were the Very Revs. John D. Conaty, Revs. Anthony C. Hartman, M. A. De La Roque, John Berbegier, Andrew Skopek, Kieran O'Bonnigan, and also Messrs. John Koch and Thomas Lonnergen, at that time studying for the priesthood. There were but two churches in Erie city, St. Patrick's, the pro-cathedral, and St. Mary's, built for a German congregation by Rev. John Hartman. Outside the city there were twenty-eight churches, with eleven secular priests and three Benedictines for a Catholic population of 12,000.

The church buildings outside the city of Erie were mostly wooden structures. There was only one Catholic school. The discovery of petroleum on Oil Creek, 28 August, 1859, gave a great impetus to both secular and religious progress throughout the diocese. To accommodate the settlers that located in the valleys of Oil Creek and the Allegheny River, where towns sprang up as by magic, churches were hastily erected, but the number of priests was still inadequate. Almost no roads and Bishop Young's labours were in the beginning very heavy. He died suddenly 18 September, 1866. At his death the Catholic population had more than doubled, and several new churches and schools had sprung into existence.

The vicar-general, Very Rev. John D. Conaty, governed these during the first year, the third bishop, the Rev. Tobias Mullen, was consecrated, 2 August, 1868. He was born in the County Tyrone, Ireland, 4 March, 1818, and was ordained priest at Pittsburgh, 1 Sept., 1844, having gone there with Bishop O'Connor from Maymouth the previous year as a volunteer for the American mission. Under his direction a new era began; priests were ordained, new parishes sprang up, churches and schools were built, regular conferences for the clergy were held. Religious orders were introduced and new institutions arose for the maintenance and spread of religion, and for enlightenment, and comfort, and shelter of suffering humanity. The frame churches gave place to brick and stone structures. The bishop himself was a tireless worker and infused his own spirit into his priests. A Catholic weekly, the "Lake Shore Visitor", was issued, edited and written by the bishop himself, in the midst of labours that called him to every part of his extensive diocese. The Poles, the Slavs, the Hungarians, and the Italians had churches and priests provided for them, the orphans a large new home, the sick were provided with two large hospitals, and finally his crowning work, St. Peter's Cathedral, was finished, cleared of debt, and consecrated in 1893, the twenty-fifth anniversary of his consecration. In the following year he celebrated the golden jubilee of his priesthood. His strong active mind and body began to fail and on 19 May, 1897, he suffered a paralytic stroke and a convulsion, the Rev. John F. Fitz Maurice, president of St. Charles's Seminary, Overbrook, Philadelphia, was chosen by the Holy See and consecrated titular Bishop of Amisus with right of succession in Philadelphia, 24 February, 1898. Bishop Mullen resigned, 10 August, 1899, and died, 27 April, 1900. Bishop Fitz Maurice succeeded as fourth bishop of the diocese, on 19 September, 1899, and the good work inaugurated under the late bishop went on quietly and steadily. He was born at Newtown-Sandes, County Kerry, Ireland, 9 Jan., 1840, and ordained priest in Philadelphia, 21 Dec., 1862. After residing in several parishes he was appointed rector of the cathedral, 1886.

The religious orders in the diocese are the Benedictines, the Redemptorists, the Brothers of Mary, the Benedictine Nuns, the Sisters of St. Joseph, the Sisters of Mercy, and the Felician Sisters. At one time the Franciscans, the Bridgettines, and the Sisters of the Humility of Mary had houses in the diocese. The Benedictines settled at St. Mary's, Elk county, under Bishop O'Connor and in 1858 took charge of St. Mary's, Erie. The Redemptorists in 1875 began their foundation, purchasing a Presbyterian college—at New Orleans—which they made a seminary and college for young men who intended to join their order. They have 142 students.

The Sisters of St. Joseph entered the diocese in 1860, and have charge of the orphan asylum, the home for the aged, the two hospitals, the Academy of Villa Maria, the mother-house in the diocese, and of fifteen parochial schools. The Sisters of Mercy, who entered the diocese 24 September, 1870, besides the academy in Titusville, the mother-house, have charge of eight parochial schools. The Sisters of St. Benedict (St. Mary's, Penn.) (22 July, 1852) have St. Benedict's Academy, the mother-house at St. Mary's, and teach seven schools. The ( Erie) Sisters of St. Benedict, besides the academy and school of St. Mary's Church, teach five parochial schools, and also conduct an academy in Sharon. The Felician Sisters teach St. Stanislaus' Polish school, in the city of Erie.

There are in the diocese 100 churches, with resident priests, 46 missions with both churches, and 11 chapels; 160 priests—135 secular, 25 regular; 45 parochial churches, 3 academies for young ladies, 1 orphan asylum with 216 orphans, making a total of young people under the care of the Church, 10,385; two hospitals, and one home for the aged. The Catholic population of the diocese is estimated at 121,108.

Eriugena, John Scottus, an Irish teacher, theologian, philosopher, and poet, who lived in the ninth century.

Name.—Eriugena's contemporaries invariably refer to him as John Scottus or Ierugena. In the MSS. of the tenth and subsequent centuries the forms Eriugena, Ierugena, and Erigena occur. Of these, the oldest and most acceptable, philologically, is Erigena, which, as it was perhaps sometimes written Eriugena, was changed into Eriugena. It means 'a native of Ireland'. In the Oaths of the Popes, the name Eriugena occurs to signify the birthplace of the abbot Jodo, in his attempt to connect the first part of the name with the Greek word Ερηγέω and means 'a native of the Island of Saints'; the combination Joan(es) Scottus Erigena cannot be traced beyond the sixteenth century.

Birthplace.—At one time the birthplace of Eriugena was a matter of dispute. Eriugena in Wales and Ayr in Scotland claimed the honour, and each found advocates. Nowadays, however, the claim of Ireland to be considered the birthplace of John is universally admitted. All the evidence points that way, and leads us to conclude that when his contemporaries tauntingly referred to his having come to France from Ireland they meant not only that he was educated in the Isle of Saints but also that Ireland was his birthplace. Whatever doubt there may have been about the meaning of Scottus, there can be none as to the signification of the surname Erigena.

Life.—What is known of the life of Eriugena is very soon told. About 847 he appeared in France at the court of Charles the Bald, was received with special favour by that prince, appointed head of the palace school, which seems to have had some kind of permanent location at Paris, and was commissioned by the royal patron to translate the works of Pseudo-Dionysius into Latin. This translation brought him into prominence in the world of letters and was the occasion of his entering into the theological controversies of the day, especially into those concerning predestination and the Eucharist. His knowledge of
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Greek is evident from his translations, and is also proved by the poems which he wrote. It is doubtful, on the other hand, whether he possessed the knowledge of Hebrew and other Oriental languages which is sometimes ascribed to him. In any case there is no evidence of his having travelled extensively in Africa and Asia Minor. After leaving Ireland he spent the rest of his days in France, probably at Paris and Laon. There was, as we know from the MSS., an important colony of Irish scholars at the latter place. The tradition that after the death of Charles the Bald he went to England at the invitation of Alfred the Great, that he taught for some time at Malmesbury, and was there set to death by his pupils, has no support in contemporary documents and may well have arisen from some confusion of names on the part of later historians. It is probable that he died in France, but the date is unknown.

From the evidence available it is impossible to determine whether he was a cleric or a layman, although it is difficult to deny that the general conditions of the time make it more than probable that he was a cleric and perhaps a monk.

Writings.—1. Translations of the works of Pseudo-Dionysius: “De Coelesti Hierarchia”; “De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia”; “De Divinis Nominebus”; “De Mystica Theologia”; “Epistola”; translations of the “Ambigua” of St. Maximus.—2. Commentaries: “Homilia in prolugum S. Evangelii sec. Joannem”, and a commentary on the Gospel of St. John, of which a few fragments only have come down to us; comments on the “Celestial Hierarchies” and the “Ecclesiastical History” of Pseudo-Dionysius; glosses on the work of Martianus Capella (still in MS.), and on the theological opuscula of Boethius (Rand ed., Munich, 1906), with which is connected a brief “Life” of Boethius (Pieper ed., “Consolatio Philosoph.”, Leipzig, 1871).—3. Theological works: “Liber de Predestinatione”, and very probably a work on the Eucharist, though it is certain that the tract “De Corpore et Sanguine Domini”, at one time believed to be Eriugena’s, is the work of Paschasius Radbertus.—4. Philosophical works: “De Divisione Nature”, his principal work, and a treatise, “De Egressu et Regressu Animae ad Deum”, of which we possess only a few fragments.—5. Poems: These are written partly in Latin and partly in Greek. Many of them are dedicated to Charles the Bald. The most complete edition of Eriugena’s works is that of Dr. Foss, which is printed as Vol. XXII of Migne’s P. L. A new edition embodying the results of recent discoveries of manuscripts is often spoken of, and will doubtless be forthcoming before long.

Doctrines.—Although the errors into which Eriugena fell both in theology and in philosophy were many and serious, there can be no doubt that he himself abhorred heresy, was disposed to treat the heretic with no small degree of harshness (as is evident from his strictures on Gotteschalk), and all through his life believed himself an unwaveringly loyal son of the Church. Seeking for grist for the mill, the works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, he considered that the doctrines he discovered in them were not only philosophically true, but also religiously acceptable, since they carried with them the authority of the distinguished Athenian convert of St. Paul. He did not for a moment suspect that in those writings he had to deal with a loosely articulated system of thought in which Christian teachings were mingled with the tenets of a subtle but profoundly anti-Christian pantheism. To this remark should be added another in order that we may fully understand Eriugena’s attitude towards the philosophy accused by his contemporaries of leaning too much towards the Greeks. And, in fact, the Greek Fathers were his favourite authors, especially Gregory the Theologian, and Basil the Great. Of the Latins he prized Augustine most highly. The influence of these on the temperament of the venturesome Celt was towards freedom and not towards restraint in theological speculation. This freedom he reconciled with his respect for the teaching authority of the Church as he understood it. However, in the actual exercise of the freedom of speculation which he allowed himself, he fell into many errors which are incompatible with orthodox Christianity.

The “De Predestinatione” seems to have been written after the translation of the works of Pseudo-Dionysius. Nevertheless there is in it only one allusion to the authority of the Greek Fathers and very little of the burden of thought which Eriugena felt was abounding in the later works. It deals with the problem raised by Gotteschalk regarding the doctrine of predestination, and, more specifically, undertakes to prove that predestination is single, not double—in other words, that there is no predestination to sin and punishment but only to grace and eternal happiness. The authority of Augustine is used very extensively in the philosophical setting of the problem. However, the discussion of the true nature of evil—Eriugena appears to go back farther than St. Augustine and to hold the radical neo-Platonic view that evil is non-existent—this view is used as far as it goes, but it is rejected far further than St. Augustine in rejecting the doctrine of a double predestination. That he exceeded the bounds of orthodoxy is the contention of Prudentius of Troyes and Florus of Lyons who answered the “Liber de Predestinatione” in works full of bitter personal attacks on Eriugena. Their writings were printed in the Councils of Valencia (855) and Langres (859), in which Eriugena’s doctrine was condemned.

While the “De Corpore et Sanguine Domini” is not Eriugena’s, though ascribed to him, there can be no doubt that in some work, now lost, on that subject he maintained doctrines at variance with the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. From the fragment which has come down to us of his commentary on St. John we infer that he held the Eucharist to be merely a type or figure. At least he insists on the spiritual, not the exclusion, nature, of the physical, “eating of the Flesh of the Son of Man.”

In the “De Divisione Nature”, his most important and systematic work, Eriugena treats in the form of a dialogue the principal problems of philosophy and theology. The meaning of the title is evident from the opening sentences in which he outlines the plan of the work: “Nature”, he says, “is divided into four species”; (1) “Nature which creates and is not created”—this is God, the Source and Principle of all things; (2) “Nature which is created and creates”—this is the world of primordial causes or (Platonic) ideas; (3) “Nature which is created and does not create”—this is the world of phenomena, the world of contingent, sense-perceived things; (4) “Nature which neither creates nor is created”—this is God, the Term to which all things are returning.

(1) “Nature”, then, is synonymous with reality, and also with God. “Codificacy,” whatever reality the world of ideas and the world of phenomena possess, is, in the truest and most literal sense, the reality of God Himself. “The being of all things is the over-being of God” (esse omnium est superesse Divinitatis) is a saying which he never tires of quoting from the works of Pseudo-Dionysius. So supremely perfect is the essence of the Divinity that God is incomprehensible not only to us but also to Himself. For if He knew Himself in any adequate sense He should place Himself in some category of thought, which would be to limit Himself. God is above all categories. When, therefore, we speak of orthodoxy in this (paraenest) mode of predication. That is, we are safer in predicated what He is not than in venturing to predicate what He is. If we have recourse to positive predication, we must use the prefix hyper and say God is hypersubstantia, i.e. more-than—
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substance, etc. Similarly, when we say that God is the "Creator" of all things we should understand that predicate in a sense altogether distinct from the meaning which we attach to the predicate "maker" or "producer" when applied to finite agents or causes. The "creator" sense of the world is in reality a theopoietic one, or giving forth of the Essence of God in the things created. Just as He reveals Himself to the mind and the soul in higher intellectual and spiritual truth, so He reveals Himself to the senses in the created world around us. Creation is, therefore, a process of unfolding of the Divine Nature, and if we retain the word Creator we must also make the impossible, impossible, that is, the sense of nothing", we must understand that God "makes" the world out of His own Essence, which, because of its incomprehensibility, may be said to be "nothing"

(2) Nature in the second sense, "Nature which creates and is created", is the world of primordial causes, or ideas, which the Father "creates" in the Son, and which in tura, "create", that is determine the generic and specific natures of concrete visible things. These, says Eriugena, were called "prototypes", θέα θεϊκάτα, and "ideas", by the Greeks. Their function is that of exemplar and efficient causes. For since they are, though created, identical with God, and since their locus is the Word of God, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, they are operative causes and not merely static types. They are coeternal with the Word of God. From this, however, it is not necessary to infer, as some critics have done, that according to Eriugena there are primordial causae in the Word. As examples of primordial causes Eriugena enumerates goodness, wisdom, intuition (insight), understanding, virtue, greatness, power, etc. These are united in God, partly separate or scattered in the Word, and fully separate or scattered in the world of phenomena. For there is underlying the doctrine of the origin of things the image to which he often referred, namely, that of a circle, the radii of which are united at the centre. The centre is God, the radii at a point near the centre are the primordial causes, the radii at the circumference are phenomena.

(3) These phenomena are "Nature" in the third sense, "which is created and does not create". The stream of reality, setting out from the centre, God, passing through the ideas in the Word, passes next through all the genera suprema, media, and infima of logic; then enters the region of number and the realm of space and time, where the locus, the mundus, the image of all Eriugena's ideas. The radii of the circle, to which he refers, are the seens, the appearances of reality, that is phenomena. In the region of number the ideas become angels, pure incorporeal spirits. In the realm of space and time the ideas take on the burden of matter, which is the source of suffering, sickness, and sin. The material world, therefore, of our experience is composed of ideas clothed in matter—here Eriugena attempts a reconciliation of Platoism with Aristotelian notions. Man, too, is composed of ideas and matter, soul and body. He is the culmination of the process of things from God, and with him, as we shall see, begins the process of return of all things to God. He is the image of the Trinity in so far as he unites in one soul being, wisdom, and love. In the state of innocence in which he was created he was perfect in his work as man and independent of bodily needs, and without differentiation of sex. The dependence of man's mind on the body and the subjection of the body to the world of sense, as well as the distinction of male and female in the human kind, are all the results of original sin. The tendency of the soul towards the abstractions of mental existence has only one remedy, Divine grace. By means of this heavenly gift man is enabled to rise superior to the needs of the sensuous body, to place the demands of reason above those of bodily appetite, and from reason to ascend through contemplation to ideas, and thence by intuition to God Himself. The three faculties here alluded to as reason, contemplation, and intuition are designated by Eriugena as internal sense (διάνοια), rationization (λόγος), and intellect (νοῦς). These are the three degrees of mental perfection which man must attain if he is to free himself from the bond of sin. The bond was cast by sin, and attain that union with God in which salvation consists.

(4) Not only man, however, but everything else in nature is destined to return to God. This universal resurrection of nature is the subject of the last portion of Eriugena's work. He teaches that the nature which neither creates nor is created". This is God, the final Term, or Goal, of all existence. When Christ became man, He took on Himself body, soul, senses, and intellect, and when, ascending into Heaven, He took these with Him, not only the soul of man but His senses, His body, the animal and the vegetative natures, and even the elements were redeemed, and the final return of all things to God was begun. Now, as Heraclitus taught, the upward and the downward ways are the same. The return to God proceeds in the inverse order through all the steps which marked the downward course of the processes of nature. The elements become light, light becomes life, life becomes sense, sense becomes reason, reason becomes intellect, intellect becomes ideas in Christ, the Word of God, and through Christ returns to the oneness of God from which all the processes of nature began.

This "incorporation" of Christ takes place by means of Divine grace in the Church, of which Christ is the invisible head. The doctrine of the final return of all things to God shows very clearly the influence of Origen. In general, the system of thought just outlined is a combination of neo-Platonic mysticism, emanationism and pantheism which Eriugena was the first to articulate and reconcile with Aristotelian empiricism, Christian creationism, and theism. The result is a body of doctrines loosely articulated, in which the mystic and idealistic elements predominated, and in which there is much that is irreconcilable with Catholic dogma.

Influence.—Eriugena's influence on the theological thought of his own and immediately subsequent generations was doubtless checked by the condemnation to which his doctrines of predestination and of the Eucharist were subjected in the Councils of Valen-cia (859), Langres (859), and Verceil (1030). The doctrine of the "De Divisione Naturae" was formally condemned. The Council of Paris (1225) coupled the condemnation of Eriugena's work with the previous condemnations (1210) of the doctrines of Amalric of Chartres and David of Dinant, and there can be no doubt that the pantheists of that time were using Eriugena's treatise. While the great Scholastic teachers, Abelard, Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas, and Albert the Great knew nothing, apparently, of Eriugena and his pantheism, certain groups of mystical theologians, even as early as the thirteenth century, were interested in his writings, especially in his treatise on the Albigenese, too, sought inspiration from him. Later, the Mystics, especially Meister Eckhart, were influenced by him. And in recent times great transcendental idealists, especially the Germans, recognize in him a kindred spirit and speak of him in the highest terms.
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WILLIAM TURNER.

ERLAU. See AGRIA.

Ermland, or Ermland (Varangia, Warmia), a district of East Prussia and an exempt bishopric. St. Adalbert of Prague (d. 1019) and St. Bruno of Querfurt (d. 1099) converted the pagan inhabitants of the region, the heathen Prussians, to Christianity and two centuries later Teutonic Knights and members of the Cistercian Order introduced civilization also into the land. Among these latter was the saintly Bishop Christian of Oliva (d. 1215). In 1243 the territorial possessions of the Teutonic Knights were divided into the Dioceses of Culm, Pomesanien, Ermland, and Samland. Albert of Suerbeer, who came from Cologne, and who had been Archbishop of Armagh, Ireland, was appointed Archbishop of Prussia. In 1251 he took Riga for his see, a choice which was confirmed by Avignon in 1253, who in 1255 appointed bishop of the four dioceses just mentioned. A priest of the Order of Teutonic Knights, Heinrich of Strateich, was selected as the first Bishop of Ermland, but he was not able to enter upon his office. It was not until 28 August, 1251, that the first actual Bishop of Ermland, Anselm of Meissen, who was also a priest belonging to the Order of Teutonic Knights, was consecrated at Valenciennes by the papal legate Pietro of Albano. The diocese included the whole of the old Prussian districts of Warmien, Nutzgen, Barten, and Galindien, the northern part of Pomesanien and the southern homes of Niedersachsen and Samland. The bishops were given one-third of this territory as personal property for his support, and in this district he was the secular ruler and a prince of the Holy Roman Empire; these rights of the bishop were confirmed in the Golden Bull of the Emperor Charles IV. In 1260 Bishop Anselm founded a chapter of sixteen canons attached to the cathedral of St. Andreas at Braunsberg and transferred to the chapter the right of electing the bishop. But Braunsberg was ravaged by the heathen Prussians in 1262. And the second bishop, Heinrich I (1279–1300), was obliged in 1290 to transfer the chapter to Frauenberg where it has remained ever since.

From the thirteenth to the fourteenth the Ermland was one of constant wars. Repeated rebellions of the native Prussians, incursions of the Lithuanians, and frequent wars with Poland, in which the bishop was always the faithful ally of the Teutonic Order, checked the development of Christianity and the cultivation of the soil. To these disorders were added the constant encroachments and violence of the Teutonic Knights who sought to bring Ermland, like the other Prussian dioceses, under the domination of the order. Ermland, however, maintained its rights with great determination against such efforts, and would not allow the order to influence in any way the election of the bishops and the chapter. Yet in everything else the bishops held faithfully to the order, even when its star began to decline, and the whole territory ruled by the knights revolted in the so-called War of the Cities (1154–66). It was in this period that the celebrated Cardinal Enea Silvio de Piccolomini (Enea Silvius) was elected (1457) Bishop of Ermland; in the following year, however, he ascended the papal throne as Pius II. The Peace of Tewes (1460) removed the danger to the territory of the Teutonic Knights and placed it under the sovereignty of the King of Poland. This transfer caused the discord to break out afresh, for the King of Poland claimed for himself in Ermland the same right he exercised in the rest of his kingdom, that of naming the bishop. Bishop Nikolaus of Tungen (1467–89) and especially the determined Lukas Watzelrode (1489–1512) energetically opposed these unjust claims and guided the right of a free election of the bishop. In 1512 the latter bishop obtained from Pope Julius II the release of his suffragan connexion, always a loose one, with the metropolitan See of Riga. When this relationship was dissolved Ermland was declared an exempt bishopric and has remained such ever since. Bishop Watzelrode was equally successful in regulating the internal affairs of his diocese. In 1517, he held a diocesan synod at Heilsberg, where the bishops ruled until 1600; in 1503 he made new laws for his domain, reorganized the cathedral school at Frauenburg, selecting for it excellent teachers, among whom was his celebrated nephew Copernicus, published the Breviary (Nuremberg, 1514) and the Missal (Strasbourg, 1517). His work successor Fabian of Lonazine (1512–23), however, in the Treaty of Piotrkow (7 December, 1512), conceded to the King of Poland a limited influence in the election of bishops. Existing conditions were, however, entirely changed by the defection to Protestantism of Albrecht of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights, and the breaking of the order of the order who ruled Samland and Pomesanien, and the secularization of the dominion of the order by the Peace of Cracow (1525). Two-thirds of the former 220 parishes of Ermland went to the two apostate bishops. In these troubled times excellent episcopal rulers saved the diocese from complete decay. Among these bishops was the energetic Moritz Ferber (1523–37), who by the ordinances issued in 1536 restored order to his desolated territory; another such bishop was Joannes Dantisius (1537–48), a noted poet and diplomat, whose attention at the time of his duties as bishop and raised the intellectual life of his clergy (concerning Dantisius cf. Daplicki, De vitæ et carminibus J. de Curia Dantisici, Breslau, 1855; Geistliche Gedichte des Dantisicus übersetzt und herausgegeben von Franz Hipke, Münster, 1857).

But the bishops who deserve the greatest praise for holding the diocese to the Catholic Faith when threatened by the surrounding Protestantism were Stanislaus Hosius (1551–79), later a cardinal, who was distinguished for learning and virtue, and Martin Kromer (1579–89), a noted historian. Among the means successfully used for the preservation of the faith were the assembling of various diocesan synods, of which the most important was the one held by Hosius in 1565 for the purpose of carrying out the decisions of the Council of Trent; yearly visitations, and above all the founding of the Jesuit College at Braunsberg in 1565 (cf. Duhl, Geschichte des Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge (Freiburg im Br., 1897), I, 179 sqq., 307 sqq.). In addition to these the Congregation of St. Catherine (Katharinerinnen), founded at Braunsberg in 1571 by Regina Prothmann, did effective work in the instruction and training of girls; since the an- nouncement of the right in 1768, however, by the legal decree of the Kulturkampf the congregation has devoted itself almost entirely to the nursing of the sick. In the seventeenth century (1626–30, 1655–56), and at the beginning of the eighteenth century (1703–09), the diocese was repeatedly ravaged by the Swedes, who forcibly suppressed the Catholic Church services and carried away its literary and artistic treasures. At the time of the First Partition of Poland (1772) the whole of Ermland fell to the share of the Kingdom of Prussia. In the Treaty of Warsaw (18 September, 1773), King Friedrich II, it is true, guaranteed the Catholic Church the privileges of the annexed provinces, nevertheless all schools and institutions for education and training under religious control were gradually suppressed, and the landed property of the Church secularized.

The Bull "De salute animarum", of 16 July, 1820,
ernan, name of four Irish saints. O'Hanlon enumerates twenty-five saints bearing the name Ernan, Erin, or Erin; it is, therefore, not surprising that their acts have become confused.

(1) St. Ernan, Son of Sogann, d. about 610. He is mentioned in the Martyrology of Tallagh on 1 January. He was a nephew of St. Columba, Feilim or Feidlimidh (St. Columba's father) being his paternal grandfather. Owing to this relationship, some writers have mistaken our saint for Erin of Hinba, an uncle of St. Columba. His monastery in Llandow was at Drum-Tomna in the district of Drumhome, County Donegal. Adamnan relates the wonderful vision he had on the night St. Columba died (Vit. S. Col., III, 23). Ernan, with some companions, was fishing in the River Finn, in Donegal. Suddenly at night he beheld a wondrous glory of the saint and was greatly astonished. Looking towards the east he perceived an immense pillar of fire shewing as the sun at noonday. This marvellous light then passed into the heavens, and a great darkness followed, as after the setting of the sun. This wonderful occurrence was related to Adamnan by Ernan, who at the time is described as "a very old man, a servant of Christ, whose name may be rendered Ferreolus, but in Irish Erine (of the clan Mucuirroide), who, himself also a holy monk, is buried in the Ring of Tomna (Drumhome) among the remains of St. Columba, awaiting the resurrection of the saints". Some writers style this St. Ernan, Abbot of Drum Tomna. It is uncertain whether he visited Scotland, nevertheless he is regarded as patron saint of Killermore, in Ross-shire; and it may be that the dedications of Kilveenough (church of the son of Eogan) in Mull, and of Killearmadale in Jura, Argyleshire, are in his honour. In the "Scottish Calendars", collected by Bishop Forbes, his name appears as Eranus, and his commemoration is assigned to 21 and 22 December (pp. 170, 222, 243).


(2) St. Ernan, Abbot of Hinba, lived in the sixth century. He was uncle of St. Columba, and one of the twelve who accompanied him from Ireland to Iona. He was brother of Ethne, St. Columba's mother, and son of Dima, the son of Noe of the race of Cathair Ivor (Reeves, notes, p. 263). St. Columba appointed him superior of the community which he himself had established on the island of Hinba. The identity of Hinba has not been established with certainty. It may be Cana, about four miles N. W. of Rum (ibid., p. 264); but more likely it is Illeean-na-Naomh, one of the Gavleoch Isles, between Scarba and Mull (Fowler's Adamnan, p. 87). Hinba was a favourite place of the Holy Mysteries had been completed (Adamnan, III, xvi). On another occasion, while visiting St. Ernan's monastery in Hinba, St. Columba was favoured with heavenly visions and revelations which lasted three days and nights (Adamnan, III, xviii). The death of St. Ernan was tragic. Being seated on an image, he desired to be carried to Iona. St. Columba, greatly
rejoiced at his coming, started to meet him. Ernan likewise hastened, but when he was twenty-four paces from his nephew he fell to the earth and died. Thus was the prophecy of St. Columba fulfilled, that he would never again see Ernan alive (Adamnan, I. xiv.).

Ernan died in 1748, and here the monkish chronicle says: "He has been deposed from his seat and is sitting in the house of death."

He was a man of considerable influence and was chosen by the people of the island of Tallagh. His demise was a great loss to the island, and he is commemorated in the island's records. The monastery was later moved to another location.

The monastery at Tallagh was later moved to another location.

Joseph Schroeder.

Ernulf, architect, b. at Beauvais, France, in 1010; d. 1124. He studied under Lanfranc at the monastery of Bec, entered the Benedictine Order, and lived long as a brother in the monastery of St.-Loup de Creuse. At the suggestion of Lanfranc he went to England, sometime after 1070, and joined the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury. He was made prior by Archbishop Anselm, and in 1107 Abbot of Peterborough; in 1114 he was appointed Bishop of Rochester.

While at Canterbury, he had taken down the eastern part of the church which Lanfranc had built, and erected a far more magnificent structure. This included the famous crypt (Our Lady of the Undercroft), as far as Trinity Tower. The chancel was finished by his successor Conrad. The chapel of St. Andrew is also part of Ernulf's work. At Peterborough and Rochester, Ernulf had the old buildings torn down and erected new dormitories, refectories, chapter house, etc. He is the author of "Textus Roffensis" (a large collection of documents relating to the church of Rochester), "Collectanea S. Andrew" and "Martyrology" in P. L., CLXIII, 1443 sqq., also of several canonical and theological treatises in D'Achéry, "Spicileg. III., 404 sqq.

Ernst, William, priest, founder of Sedgley Park School, b. 17 July, 1716; d. 28 September, 1768. He was the son of Mark Errington of Wiltshire, a descendant of the Erringtons of Walwick Grange, Northumberland; his mother's maiden name was Martha Baker. In 1737 he went to Douai, took the mission oath 28 December, 1741, and was ordained a priest in December, 1747. He was made a canon at Douai afterwards as Bishop of Wells and successor to Bishop Petre. Kirk states that Dr. Challoner "had a high opinion of Mr. Errington, both as an active and zealous missionary and as a man of business." He was on account of these qualities that when the bishop wished to found a good middle-class school in England he induced Errington to undertake the work. It was a most difficult undertaking, and Errington made three unsuccessful attempts, the first in Buckinghamshire, the second in Wales, and the third at Betley near Newcastle-under-Lyne in Staffordshire, before he succeeded in founding a permanent school at Sedgley Park in the neighbourhood of Wolverhampton. On Lady-Day, 1763, he opened this school with twelve boys in the house known as the Park Hall, till then the residence of John, Lord Ward, afterwards Viscount Dudley and Ward. The little foundation was at one attacked in Parliament, but Lord Dudley successfully defended himself, and the school was permitted to proceed. It developed into the famous Sedgley Park School which did good service to the Church for over a century, and is now represented by St. Wilfrid's College, Oakmoor, near Cheddle. Having founded the school, Errington's work there was done, and as soon as he secured the appointment of the Rev. Hugh Kendall as head-master in May, 1763, he returned to
Bishop Challoner in London. He was appointed archdeacon and treasurer of the "Old Chapter" and held offices till his death.


EDWIN BURTON.

Error, redundatively regarded, is in one way or another the product of ignorance. But besides the lack of information which it implies, it adds the positive element of a mental judgment, by which something false is held to be true, or something true avowed to be false. The subject-matter of error so far as morals go, like that of the want of knowledge whence it proceeds, is either (1) the law itself, or (2) a fact, or circumstance of a fact. In the first instance, one is astray in affirming or denying the existence of a law, or at any rate the inclusion of some individual case under its operation. In the second, one is labouring under an equal misapprehension, but with regard to some fact or aspect of a fact. Thus, for example, a Catholic, who in some unaccountable way would persuade himself that there was no law of abstinence on Friday, would be in error as to the law. If, although without avowed the precept of the Church, he is of the mistaken impression that a particular day, which happens to be Friday, is not Friday, he is in error as to the fact.

Taking account of the person in whom the error exists, it is said to be either venial or invincible. Error is deemed to be invincible when, in spite of what is called moral diligence in the premises, it still persists. This may happen either because one has never been touched with any doubt as to the validity of one's stand, or as to the necessity of an inquiry, or it may be that, having, with full honesty of purpose, used such efforts as are demanded by the importance of the question at issue, is nevertheless unable to discover the truth. Much depends on the value to be attached to the phrase "moral diligence". It is not easy to state in any set formula, unless it be this, that it is the diligence which prudent persons are accustomed to bring to bear upon the settlement of like matters. This notion may be set forth in more detail by the following considerations: (1) The moral diligence required does not mean that a person is to have recourse to every conceivable expedient. (2) It does imply that the errors made by an agent, to set himself right, should be such as are not produced by the serious involvements or business involved, as well as bear a proper ratio to his capacity and resources. Error is reckoned morally venial as often as it is chargeable to the failure to exercise these ordinary and necessary precautions.

When an agent deliberately omits means calculated to dispel his error, or purposely fosters it, it is called affected. It is not so styled to indicate that it is simulated, but rather to point out that the erroneous tenet has been studiously aimed at. When the error is the offspring of sheer unrelieved negligence, it is termed the influence of error on moral responsibility may be determined as follows. An act done in invincible error, whether the latter regard the fact or the law, is never impeachable as a sin. The reason is that, in this hypothesis, there is no knowledge of, consequently no volition of, evil. On the contrary, what is done in morally venial error is improperly imputed to the agent. This is so, because the error itself is then of the agent's own choosing and he is therefore accountable for its outcome. It is obvious, however, that the moral delinquency which has its rise in venial error will have various degrees of guilt, in proportion to the greater or lesser culpability of the error itself.

LURIN, Opus Theologico Morale (Prato, 1898); MAYER, Institutions Juris Naturalis (Freiburg, 1885); OTTENI, Synopsis Rerum Moralium et Juris Pontificii (Prato, 1903).

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

Erskine, CHARLES, Cardinal, b. at Rome, 13 Feb., 1739; d. at Paris, 20 March, 1811. He was the son of Colin Erskine of the Erskine family, who were Earls of Kellie and Mar; his mother was Agatha Gigi of the noble family of Gigi of Anagni. He was educated by Cardinal Henry, Duke of York, at the Scots College, Rome, and was afterwards a successful advocate, becoming Doctor of Laws in 1770. Pope Pius VI made him pro-auditor and Promoter of the Faith in 1782, also a domestic prelate, canon of St. Peter's, and dean of the college of consistorial advocates. He was ordained subdeacon, 28 August, 1763. In October, 1793, he was sent as papal envoy to England. By his tact and ability Mgr. Erskine established excellent relations with the Court and the ministry, diminished the dissensions among Catholics, and avoided stirring up any anti-Catholic demonstration against himself. During his stay in London the pope named him auditor, and in 1795 gave him additional powers as envoy extraordinary. He left London in 1801 and returned to Rome, where in January, 1803, he was created cardinal. As a member of the Propaganda he was especially useful to English Catholics, and was made protector of Scotland. On the French invasion of Rome in 1808 he was made pro-secretary of Briefs, and was shut up in the Quirinal with the pope. When Pius VII was taken prisoner Erskine was allowed to go free, but his property was now lost and he would have been reduced to beggary, but Protestant relations had not made him an allowance. In 1809 Napoleon ordered him to Paris and though ill he was forced from Rome in January, 1810. Shortly after his arrival in Paris he fell into a gradual decline and soon died. He was buried in the church of Saint-Geneviève, now the Pantheon.


EDWIN BURTON.

Erthal, FRANZ LUDWIG VON, Prince-Bishop of Würzburg and Bamberg, b. at Lohr on the Main, 16 September, 1730; d. at Würzburg, 16 February, 1795. After studying theology at Mainz, Würzburg, and Rome, and jurisprudence at Vienna he became president of the secular Government of Würzburg in 1762. When he was sent in 1768 as Ambassador to get the imperial investiture for Adam Friedrich, Count von Seinsheim, the Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, Emperor Joseph II made him imperial privy councilor and inspector of the Imperial Chamber (Supreme Court of the empire) at Wetzlar. In 1776 he took part as imperial commissioner in the Diet of Ratisbon. He succeeded Adam Friedrich as Prince-Bishop of Würzburg, 18 March, 1779, and as Prince-Bishop of Bamberg on the following 12 April. His rule was a blessing for Church and State. Being himself deeply religious, he endeavoured to imbue his clergy and people with the spirit of true faith and piety. As far as the Church and his episcopal position permitted, he yielded to the rationalistic tendencies of the age, but was a staunch defender of papal rights against the adherents of Febronianism. As temporal ruler he never allowed his personal considerations to outweigh the interests of the people, and used his private means for the erection and improvement of charitable institutions. At Bamberg he founded a hospital which at that time was a model of its kind, and at Würzburg he greatly improved and partly rebuilt the already existing hospital of St. Juliane. He improved the public education system, bettered the economic conditions of rural life and of the civil administration, and set the finances of his
principally on a firm basis. Von Erthal is the author of a work in German, refuting the revolutionary prin-
ciples of his age, which is entitled: "Über den herr-
schenden Geist dieser Zeiten und über das Verhalten des
rechtschaffenen Christen bei denselben" (Würz-
burg, 1798). Some of his sermons were collected and
published after his death (Bamberg, 1797).
Lerch, Franz Ludwig von Erthal, Fürstbischof von Bam-
burg und Würzburg, Herzog von Franken (Bamberg, 1894);
Erected biographies were written by Sprenke (Würzburg, 1829),
Bernhard (Tübingen, 1852), Rothlauf (Bamberge, 1885), Müller (Passau, 1889).

Michael Ott.

Erthal, Friedrich Karl Joseph, Freiherr von, last Elector and Archbishop of Mainz, b. 3 Jan., 1719,
at Mainz; d. 25 July, 1802, at Aschefenburg. He was an unworthy brother of Franz Ludwig, the Prince-
Bishop of Bamberg and Würzburg, received his educa-
tion at Reims, held prebends in Bamberg and Mainz at
an early age, became canon at the cathedral of
Mainz in 1733, rector of the university in 1754, presi-
dent of the Aulic Council in 1758, and custos of the
cathedral in 1765. From 1769-1774 he was plenipot-
entiary of the Electorate of the Palatinate at the
imperial court of Vienna. On 18 July, 1774, he succeeded
the deceased von Breidbach-Bürresheim as Elector and
Archbishop of Mainz and eight days later as Prince-
Bishop of Worms. He was ordained priest on 11
Sept., 1774, and received episcopal consecrations on 14
August, 1774, on the cathedral steps. At the begin-
ing of his reign it appeared as if he would try to stem the tide of
rationalism which had swept over the Church
of Mainz during the weak rule of von Breidbach-Bür-
resheim. One of his first acts as bishop was the dismis-
sal of the free-thinking councillors of his prede-
cessor. Soon, however, he became one of the most
notable supporters of free-thought in theology and of
Febronianism in the government of the Church.
(George Förster, a Protestant, became his librarian and
William Heine, another Protestant, and author of the
the learned journal "Arzneibüchel" was his official
reader. Erthal suppressed the Carthusian monastery
and two nunneries of Mainz and used their revenues to
meet the expenses of the university, in which he ap-
pointed numerous Protestants and free-thinkers as
professors. Notorious unbelievers such as Anthony
Frayn were invited to the university in 1784 to
supplant the Jesuits in the faculty of theology.

As a spiritual ruler, Erthal was guided by the prin-
ciples of Febronianism. In union with the Arch-
bishops Max Franz of Cologne, Clemens Wenzelhaus of
Trier, and Hieronymus Joseph of Salzburg he con-
voked the Congress of Embruns at which twenty
antipapal articles, known as the "Punctation of Enms", were
drawn up and signed by the plenipotentiaries of
the four archbishop on 25 August, 1786. The pur-
pose of the Punctation was to lower the papal dignity
to a merely honorary primary and to make the pope a
prince inter pares, with practically no authority over
the territories of the archbishops. In order to
increase his political influence he joined (25 October,
1785) the Confederation of Princes which was estab-
lished by King Frederick the Great. In 1787 he ap-
parently receded from the schismatical position of
Punctation of Emns and applied to Rome for a renewal
of his quinquennial faculties and for the approbation
of his new coadjutor, Karl Theodor von Dalberg.
Somewhat later, however, he resumed his opposition
to papal authority and continued to adhere to the
Punctation even after the other archbishops had re-
jected it. His opposition was made futile by the rev-
olutionary wars which raged in his electorate from
1792-1801. By the treaty of Campo-Formio in 1797
Erthal was deprived of his possessions west of the
Rhine and by the Concordat of 1801 he lost also spiritual
jurisdiction over that part of his diocese. The
negotiations concerning the reimbursement of Erthal
for the loss of his territory west of the Rhine were not
yet completed when he died.

Friedrich, Geschichte der deutschen Erhal, auf Friedrich Karl Joseph,
(Leipzig, 1805); BAUM, Erhal, Geschichte der kath. Deutschl. (Mainz, 1865); IDRE, Gesch. der kath. Kirche
in Deutschland im neunzehnten Jahrh. (Mainz, 1892), I. s. sqq.
BAUM, Geschichte d. kath. Kirche in Deutschland (Mainz, 1895); IDRE, Die Restaurierung der Mitreis der
erzbisch. Kirche (Mainz, 1880); REIM, Erhal, Geschichte d. Erhal (Mainz, 1879); REIM, HANDBUCH, Der
Dom zu Mainz (Mainz, 1877), III, 220 sqq.

Michael Ott.

Erwin of Steinbach, one of the architects of the
Strasbourg cathedral, date of birth unknown: d, at
Strasbourg, 17 January, 1318. According to a tradition
which arose in a later age he was called Erwin of Stein-
bach, and a monument has been erected to him in
the village of Steinbach near Baden-Baden. Two of his
sons, Erwin and Johannes, after him; von Erwin, Gerlach, from 1341-71 and, up to 1382, another son of
the family named Kunte, were also superintending
architects. Hence they were heads of the Strasbourg
guild of stone-masons, the influence of which extended
as far as Bavaria, Austria, and the borders of Italy.
It is written account exists as to the training for his
work which the elder Erwin received. It must, how-
ever, be taken for granted that he had proved his
abilities as a master-builder in other places before he
was entrusted with the construction of the façade of
the cathedral of Strasbourg about the year 1277.
His work shows the influence of the French Gothic. When Erwin took charge of the con-
struction the cathedral was completed except the
porch of the tower, and reflected in its parts the de-
velopment of architectural styles from the first quarter
of the fourteenth century. As a matter of fact, the west
front was now built by three masters, of whom one was
Erwin. At the same time a part of the nave that had
been badly damaged by fire in 1288 had to be repaired.
Three plans of the façade are still in existence; ac-
ording to Dehio the best design belongs to Erwin, to whom
it is customary to ascribe the entire construction.
Eichborn, it is true, has tried to prove that Erwin
drew the weakest of the three plans. In any case the
three master-architects by their joint work do
in some measure the praise that, especially since Goethe, has been assigned to Erwin alone; they are not responsible, however, for the ungraceful central order of the university build-
ing between the towers, nor for the pinnacle of the north
tower. This front offers a happy combination of hori-
zontal members in the French style with the German
principle of daring height. The rose-window, also
French in design and placed in the central one of the
nine towers, is a welcome point of rest to the eye.
The somewhat peculiar ornamentation consists of a
double tracery of bars and geometrical designs which
covers the façade like a net dividing and filling the
large surfaces. By the novelty and the daring of the
new style the individual members of this façade are
in marked contrast to the older parts of the building; the
front, moreover, is connected directly with the body
of the cathedral. The ornamental sculpture of the build-
ing, which is richer than that ordinarily found in German
cathedral, is attributed to Erwin's workshop,
from which came also the monument to Conrad of
Lichtenberg in the chapel of St. John. In this chapel
the early Gothic forms correspond to the carving in
the chapter-hall. Erwin's last work was the construc-
tion of the beautiful chapel of the Blessed Virgin. The
legend of the woman sculptor, Savina, who, it is as-
serted, was a daughter of Erwin, rests on a mistaken
interpretation of the sculptural emblems. These
emblems referring to Erwin, which along with tradition
are our only sources of information, have also given
rise to various doubts.

Wolfgang, Geschichte der deutschen Kunst im Elsass (Leip-
gzig, 1877); IDRE, Geschichte der deutschen Kunst in der
Kunstwissenschaft (1876); I. KRAUS, Geschichte der malerei
und Bildhauerkunst im Elsass-Lor. (1877);
Erythre, a titular see in Asia Minor. According to legend the city was founded by colonists from Crete. The name must have been derived from the red stone common in the country. Ruled by kings at first, the city passed through periods of oligarchy and democracy, became tributary to Creusus and Cyrus, submitted to Athens, then to Sparta, and finally obtained independence. After Alexander, it had various masters until 101 B.C., when it took sides with the Romans, though still preserving its autonomy. Finally it was incorporated with the province of Asia. Erythre was famous for its Sibyl Herophile and its temples of Heracles, Athena Polias, etc. At an early date it became a suffragan of Ephesus; to the bishops mentioned by Lequien (Or. christ., I, 727): Eutychius (+491), Dracomius (+541), Theoctistus (+553), Eustathius (+787), Arsaphius (+808), may be added Michael in 1229 (Revue des études grecques, VII, 80). By the sixteenth century the see had disappeared, together with the city and its port. A new village has arisen on its site, Litri or Rihri, not far from Tades, in the vilayet of Aidin or Smyrna. The ruins include walls which are about three miles in circuit, a theatre, aqueducts, columns, and a Byzantine fortress.

Textier, Asia Minor, 300-309; Lampricht, Die Dualen Kroatenkronen pub- liques (Berlin, 1871); Gsell, Erzerum (Berlin, 1882); Buerchner in Paucty-Visslow, R. Empire, s. v.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Greg. (London, 1875), I, 555-56.

S. Vaille.

Ezrum (Theodosopolis), Diocese of (Erzerumisens Armienorum). The native name, Garin (Gr. Kapareus; Ar. Kalkelej), is still used by the Armenians. The kings of Armenia established there their summer residence. Later Garin fell into the power of the Byzantines, who named it Theodosopolis (+415), under which title it is still a Latin titular see. It became then a Greek bishopric, suffragan to Cæsarea of Cappadocia. Three bishops are known at this period, Peter (+448), Manasses (+451), and another Peter (+553). (See Lequien, Or. christ., I, 437.) This ecclesiastical situation lasted at least until the ninth century. In the eleventh century, owing to a confusion with another Theodosiopolis in Mesopotamia, the see passed under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch. From 622 to 663, a great council, which brought about a temporary union of the Armenian and Greek Churches, was held at Garin; the Emperor Heraclius attended with the Armenian and Greek patriarchs and many bishops of both Churches (Hetele, III, 73, 152). In 1201 the city was plundered by the Soljuk Turks, who renewed Erzerum, which appears to mean "the country of the Romans", that is to say of the Greeks, though some think that the name is a corruption of Arzen er-Roum, Arzen being an ancient Armenian city in the neighbourhood. Erzerum was captured in 1214 by the sultans of Iconium, in 1387 by Timur-Leng, in 1450 by the Osmanli Turks. In 1450 it fell into the power of local dynasties, which held it under the hegemony of Persia until 1514, when it passed again to the Osmanlis. In 1828 and 1878 it was occupied by the Russians. In 1850 it was almost destroyed by an earthquake.

Erzerum is built at an altitude of over six thousand feet on a hill, which is surrounded by mountains of some ten thousand feet in height. The climate is healthful, but rigorous. Winter lasts eight and summer only four months. The Western Euphrates (Kara Su) is about four miles from the city. Garin is the capital of a vilayet and has a population of about 40,000, of whom 27,000 are Turks, the rest Armenians, and a few Europeans (about 900 Catholics, mostly Armenians). The city is divided into three parts: the citadel, near the centre of the city, the city proper surrounded by a double wall, and four suburbs. There are 65 mosques, many churches, and several large bazaars. The chief industries are blacksmiths' and coppersmiths' work. Besides the Greek metropolitan, still subject to the Patriarch of Antioch, Gregorian and Catholic Armenian bishops reside at Erzerum. The Diocese of Theodosopolis (Erzerum) was re-established in 1850 and on 10 July, 1883, divided into the Dioceses of Erzerum and Mush. The former diocese has (1900) 10,000 faithful, 38 priests, 30 parishes, 66 churches or chapels, 4 convents, 19 schools with about 1000 pupils, and a hospital. Armenian Sisters of the Immaculate Conception have a monastery. Two Capuchins conduct the Latin mission.

Curtis, A Visit to Erzerum (London, 1854); Millingen, La Turquie sous Abd-ul-Aziz (1868), ch. xvi. Cognet, La Turquie d'Asie (Paris, 1892), 1, 190-191; Missio-nes catholiques (Rome, 1907), 1, 534; Wattenwyl, Kirche in Armenien (Freiburg, 1908), 386.
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Esau (493), hairy, the eldest son of Isaac. The twin-brother of Jacob. The name of the twin-brother of the two brothers, when still within Rebecca's womb, was prophetic of the lifelong opposition, deepening at times into hatred, which marked the relations between Esau and Jacob. "Coming faint out of the field", and much moved by the sight and savour of the pottage boiled by his brother, Esau said to Jacob, "Give me this red pottage!". Esau, who came forth first, when grown up, became a skilful hunter, and was much loved by Isaac, who ate of his hunting (Gen., xxv, 24-28). The name of a red hound. Esau not only exchanged his first birthright for the red pottage, but even confirmed the sale by an oath, saying, "Lo, I die; what will the first birthright be to me, if I hold in taking bread and the pottage of lentils, he ate, and drank, and went his way; making little account of having sold his first birthright!" That this transaction was widely known is justly inferred from the very name (Ezrom, red), which, though rarely given to Esau himself, is almost universally applied to his descendants. "Esau, being forty years old, married wives, Judith, the daughter of Beeri the
Hethite, and Basemath the daughter of Elon of the same place" (Gen., xxvi, 34). This selection of Chanaanite wives, who "both offended the mind of Isaac and Rebecca" (Gen., xxvi, 35), seemed to have caused peculiar suffering to Rebecca, who, speaking with her husband, declared, "I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth: if Jacob take a wife of the stock of this land, I choose not to live" (Gen., xxvii, 46). Old and with eyes so dim he could not see, Isaac ordered Esau to take quiver and bow, so that after having prepared a savoury dish with the fruit of his hunting, he mightly speak of as partaking, belonging to the eldest son, Esau, yielding ready obedience, went into the field to fulfill his father's commandment" (Gen., xxvii, 1-5). Meanwhile, clothed with the very good garments of his older brother, with hands and neck so carefully covered under the tender hides of the kids as to resemble the hairy skin of Esau, Jacob, following in every detail the advice of Rebecca, knelt before Isaac, offered the savoury dish, and begged and obtained the coveted blessing. Great then was the astonishment, and genuine the indignation, of the disappointed Esau, who went out with a great weeping", on hearing received Isaac declare, "thy brother came deceitfully and got thy blessing'. Though sympathizing with his grief-stricken son, Isaac, realizing more fully the import of the oracle communicated to Rebekah, felt impelled to add: "I have blessed him, and he shall be blessed; I have appointed him lord, and have made all his brethren his servants' (Gen., xxvi, 6-37). The restraining influence of the father's presence is admirably portrayed in the few words uttered by Esau: "the days will come of the mourning of my father, and I will kill my brother Jacob" (Gen., xxvii, 41). The journey revealed a deeper purpose, the evident anxiety of Rebecca, the hasty flight of Jacob to Haran, and his long stay with his uncle Laban, clearly demonstrated. (Gen., xxvii, 42-xxx, 38.) Indeed, even after a self-imposed exile of twenty years, the carefully instructed messengers sent to Esau in the land of Seir (Gen., xxxii, 3) and the strategic division of his household and flocks and into two companies clearly indicate Jacob's abiding sense of distrust (Gen., xxxiii, 1-8).

After extending a cordial welcome to his returning brother, Esau parted from Jacob and returned, the day being "to Seir" (Gen., xvii, 16), where he and his descendants become exceedingly rich (Gen., xxxv, 1-8). The very name Edomite, given to the descendants of Esau (Edom), has served to perpetuate the remembrance of the circumstances attending Esau's birth and the sale of his birthright. From the noteworthy preference of Jacob to Esau (Gen., xxxv, 22 sq.), St. Paul (Rom., ix, 4-16) shows that in the mystery of election and grace God is bound to no particular nation and is influenced by no prerogative of birth or antecedent merit. When Isaac, old and full of days, had died, we find Esau with Jacob at Hebron, there to bury their father in the cave of Machpelah (Gen., xxv, 28-29).

DANIEL P. DUFFY.

ESCH (ESCHIUS), NICOLAUS VAN, a famous mystical theologian, b. in Oisterwijk near Hertogenbosch (Bois-le-Duc), Holland, in 1507; d. 19 July, 1578. In 1580, after having studied the classics in the school of the Hieronymites, he entered the philosophical faculty at Louvain, but refused to take his doctor's degree. In 1538 he was ordained priest, and then settled in Cologne in order to devote himself to higher studies and the practice of Christian perfection. At the same time he became the private tutor of a number of young men, mainly university students. Blessed Peter Canisius and Lawrence Sturius are the most celebrated of his pupils.

In Cologne, too, he contracted a close friendship with several members of the Carthusian Order, among whom Johann Landsberger, Gerhard Hamontanus, and Theodorich and Bruno Loher are worthy of special mention. Though his feeble health did not allow him to pursue his studies, he fixed in his mind the example of the Order, and, having retired to a Carthusian monastery for a time, at least, and followed its rule of life as closely as possible. In 1538 Nicolaus was appointed pastor of the Béguines at Diest; after a year he surrendered his charge for a time, but took it up again with such success that after his death he was conferred the title of Father of the Order. He was also instrumental in founding several diocesan seminaries according to the rules laid down by the Council of Trent. Among his literary works the following are worthy of note: "Introductio in vitam inviroseram", which is really an introduction to a new edition of the "Templum animae" (Antwerp, 1563 etc.); "Exercitatio theologiae mysticae, seu exercitia quaedam pia, quae compendio hominem ad vitam perfectam instiituendum juvare possunt" (Antwerp, 1563). EUTER, Nomenclator (Freiburg, 1592); HERMANNI IN KILOBREDIAZON (Freiburg, 1592), IV, 488.

A. J. MAAS.

ESCHATOLOGY, that branch of systematic theology which deals with the doctrines of the last things (apokatastasis). The Greek title is of comparatively recent introduction, but in modern times it has been plante...
Tongas; while the Greenlanders, New Guinea negroes, and others seem to hold the possibility of a second death, in the other world or on the way to it. The next world itself is variously located—on the earth, in the skies, in the sun or moon—but most commonly underground; and there is given either as a dull and shadowy and more or less important existence, or as an active continuation in a higher or idealized form of the pursuits and pleasures of earthly life. In most savage religions there is no very high or definite doctrine of moral retribution after death; but it is only in the case of one of the most degenerate races that the condition is admitted to be the result of degeneration, that the notion of retribution is claimed to be altogether wanting. Sometimes mere physical prowess, as bravery or skill in the hunt or in war, takes the place of a strictly ethical standard; but, on the other hand, some savage religions contain unexpectedly clear and elevated ideas of some primary moral duties.

(2) Coming to the higher or civilized races, we shall glance briefly at the eschatology of the Babylonian and Assyrian, Egyptian, Indian, Persian, and Greek religions. Confucianism can hardly be said to have an eschatology, except the very indefinite belief involved in the worship of ancestors, whose happiness was held to depend on the conduct of their living descendants. Mohammedan eschatology contains nothing distinctive except the glorification of barbaric sensuality.

(a) Babylonian and Assyrian.—In the ancient Babylonian religion (with which the Assyrian is substantially identical) eschatology never attained, in the historical period, any high degree of development. Retribution is confined almost exclusively to the present life, virtue being rewarded by the Divine bestowal of strength, prosperity, long life, numerous offspring, and the like, and wickedness punished by contrary temporal calamities. Yet the existence of an hereafter is believed in. A kind of semi-material ghost, or shade, or double (ekimmu), survives the death of the body, and when the body is buried (or, less commonly, cremated) the ghost descends to the underworld to join the company of the departed. In the "Lay of Ishtar" this underworld, to which she descended in search of her deceased lover and of the "waters of life," is described in gloomy colours; and the same is true of the other classical descriptions. It is the "pit," the "land of no return," the "house of darkness," the "place where dust is their bread, and their food is mud"; and it is infested with demons, who, at least in Ishtar's case, are empowered to inflict various chastisements for sins committed in the upper world.

Though Ishtar's case is held by some to be typical in this respect, there is otherwise no clear indication of a doctrine of moral penalties for the wicked, and no promise of rewards for the good. Good and bad are involved in a common dismal fate. The location of the realm of the deceased is a subject of controversy among Assyriologists, while the suggestion of a brighter hope in the form of a resurrection (or rather of a return to earth) from the dead, which some would infer from the belief in the "waters of life" and from references to the Nergal, Marduk, or Mesopotamian, as death is a kind of trial, is an extremely doubtful conjecture. On the whole there is nothing hopeful or satisfying in the eschatology of this ancient religion.

(b) Egyptian.—On the other hand, in the Egyptian religion, which for antiquity competes with the Babylonian, we meet with a highly developed and comparatively elevated eschatology. Leaving aside such difficult questions as the relative priority and influence of different, and even conflicting, elements in the Egyptian religion, it will suffice for the present purpose to refer to what is most prominent in Egyptian eschatology taken at its highest and best. In the first place, then, life in its fullness, unending life with Osiris, the sun-god, who journeys daily through the underworld, even identification with the god, with the right to be called by his name, is what the pious Egyptian looked forward to as the ultimate goal after death. The degenerate religion of the "chest of the living," and the tomb the "lord of life." It is not merely the disembodied spirit, the soul as we understand it, that continues to live, but the soul with certain bodily organs and functions suited to the conditions of the new life. In the elaborate anthropomorphism which underlies Egyptian eschatology, we find the most highly developed system of personality. For, in the human soul, doctrine, we find the most carefully distinguished the soul of the human being, and the other constituent elements of the person are distinguished, the most important of which is the Ka, a kind of semi-material double; and to the justified who pass the judgment after death the use of these several constituents, separated by death, is restored.

This judgment which each undergos is described in detail in chapter xxv of the Book of the Dead. The examination covers a variety of personal, social, and religious duties and observances; the deceased must be able to deny his guilt in regard to forty-two great categories of sins, and his heart (the symbol of conscience and moral character) must stand up to be weighed in the balance against the image of Maat, goddess of truth and justice. The new life that begins after a favourable judgment is not at first any better or more spiritual than life on earth. The justified is, like a wayfarer with a long and difficult journey to accomplish before he reaches bliss and security in the fertile fields of Aaru. On this journey he is exposed to a variety of disasters, for the avoidance of which he depends on the use of his revivified powers and on the knowledge he has gained in life of the directions and magical charms recorded in the Book of the Dead and also, and perhaps most of all, on the aids provided by surviving friends on earth. It is they who secure the preservation of his corpse that he may return and use it, who provide an indestructible tomb as a home or shelter for his Ka, who supply food and drink for his sustenance, offer up prayers and sacrifices for his benefit, and aid his memory by inscribing on the walls of the tomb, or writing on rolls of papyrus enclosed in the wrappings of the mummy, chapters from the Book of the Dead. It does not, indeed, appear that the dead were ever supposed to reach a state in which they were independent of these earthly aids. At any rate they were always considered free to revisit the earthly tomb, and in making the journey to and fro the blessed had the power of transforming themselves at will into various animal-shapes. It was this belief which formed the degenerate stage at which he encountered it, Herodotas mistook for the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. It should be added that the identification of the blessed with Osiris ("Osiris N. N." as a usual form of inscription) did not, at least in the earlier and higher stage of Egyptian religion, imply pantheistic absorption in the deity or the loss of individual personality. Regarding the fate of those who fail in the judgment after death, or succumb in the second probation, Egyptian eschatology is less definite in its teaching. "Second death" and other expressions applied to them might seem to suggest annihilation; but it is clear from the evidence and from the notion that continued existence in a condition of darkness and misery was believed to be their portion. And as there were degrees in the happiness of the blessed, so also in the punishment of the lost (see Book of the Dead, tr. Budge, London, 1901).

(c) Indian.—In the Vedas, the earliest historical form of the Indian religion, eschatological belief is simpler and purer than in the Brahministic and Buddhist forms that succeeded it. Individual immortality is dearly taught. There is a kingdom of the dead under the rule of Yama, with distinct realms for the good and the wicked. The good dwell in a realm
of light and share in the feasts of the gods; the wicked are banished to a place of "nethermost darkness". Already, however, in the later Vedas, where these beliefs find developed expression, retribution begins to be ruled more by ceremonial observances than by strict justice. On the one hand, therefore, the Sanskrit law contains every trace as yet of the dreary doctrine of transmigration, but critics profess to discover the germs of later pantheism.

In Brahmism (q. v.) retribution gains in prominence and severity, but becomes hopelessly involved in transmigration, and is made dependent either on sacrificial observances or on theological knowledge. Though after death there are numerous heavens and hells for the reward and punishment of every degree of merit and demerit, these are not final states, but only so many preludes to further rebirths in higher or lower forms. Pantheistic absorption in Brahma, the world-soul and only reality, with the consequent extinction of individual personality—this is the only final solution of the problem of existence, the only salvation to which man may ultimately look forward. But it is a salvation which only a very few can attain: to reach after the close of the present life, the few who have acquired a perfect knowledge of Brahma. The bulk of men who cannot rise to this high philosophic wisdom may succeed, by means of sacrificial observances, in gaining a temporary heaven, but they are destined to further births and deaths.

In Zoroastrianism (Avesta, Persia) a great prophet was to bring a second and final reform of the world. In his Name, Ahura Mazda, the Holy One, the Unconditioned, the Perfect, the Immortal, the Eternal, the All-Pervading was to be worshipped. Ahura Mazda is the highest real of the universe; he is the supreme deity above all Ahriman and Ormuzd. Morality has its sanction not merely in future retribution, but in the present assurance that every good and pious deed is a victory for the cause of Ahura Mazda; but the call to the individual to be active in this cause, though vigorous and definite enough, is never quite free from ritual and ceremonial conditions, and as time goes on becomes more and more complicated by these observances, especially by the laws of purity. Certain elements are holy (fire, earth, water), certain other unholy or impure (the body, and all that leaves the body, etc.; and to defile oneself or the holy elements by contact with the impure is one of the deadliest sins. Consequently corpses could not be buried or cremated, and were accordingly exposed on platforms erected for the purpose, so that birds of prey might devour them. When the soul leaves the body it has to cross the bridge of Chinvat (or Kinavd), the bridge of the Gatherer, or Accountant. For three days good and evil spirits contend for the possession of the soul, after which the reckoning is taken, and the just man is rejoiced by the apparition, in the form of a fair maiden, of his good deeds, words, and thoughts, and passes over safely to a paradise of bliss; while the wicked man is confronted by a hideous apparition of his evil deeds, and is dragged down to hell. If the judgment is neutral the soul is reserved in an intermediate state (so at least in the Pahlavi literature) till the decision of the last day, as it appears in the later literature, has certain remarkable affinities with Jewish Messianic and millennial expectations.

A time during which Ahriman will gain the ascendancy is to be followed by two millennial periods, in each of which a great prophet will bring a better conception of the world, a "prophetic" period in which the good and the evil spirits are in conflict, and of which the latter will perish, all except Ahriman and the serpent Azhi, whose destruction is reserved to Ahura Mazda and Seroshah, the priest-god. And last of all hell itself will be purged, and the earth renewed by purifying fire.

(b) Greek.—Greek eschatology as reflected in the Homeric poems remains at a low level. It is only very vaguely retributive and is altogether cheerless in its outlook. Life on earth, for all its shortcomings, is the highest good for the individual: to save a dreary and endless cycle of deaths and rebirths is not a desirable end. Yet death is not extinction. The ψυχα survives—not the purely spiritual soul of later Greek and Christian thought, but an attenuated, semi-material ghost, or shade, or image, of the earthly man; and the life of this shade in the underworld is a dull, impoverished, almost functionless existence. Nor is there any distinction of fates either by way of happiness or of misery in Hades. The judicial office of Minos is illusory, and has nothing to do with earthly conduct; and there is only one allusion to the Furies suggestive of their activity among the dead (Iliad, XIX, 258-60). The lowest, the lower heaven, is a place of judgment and of punishment for those who have been born as criminals and have not heeded the laws of the gods, the Elysian Fields for a few special favourites chosen by divine caprice.

In later Greek thought touching the future life there are notable advances beyond the Homeric stage, but it is doubtful whether the average popular mind ever reached a much higher level. Among early philosophers Anaxagoras contributes to the notion of a purely spiritual soul; but a more directly religious contribution is made by the Eleusinian and Orphic Mysteries, to the influence of which in brightening and moralizing the hope of a future life we have just referred. In the Eleusinian Mysteries there seems to have been no definite doctrinal teaching—merely the promise or assurance for the initiated of the fullness of life hereafter. With the Orphic, on the other hand, the divine origin and pre-existence of the soul, for
which the body is but a temporary prison, and the doctrine of a retributive transmigration are more or less closely associated. It is hard to say how far the common belief of the people was influenced by these mysteries, but in poetical and philosophical literature their influence is unmistakable. This is seen especially in their effect among the poets, and in Plato especially in the philosophers. Pindar has a definite promise of a future life of bliss for the good or the initiated, and not merely for a few, but for all. Even for the wicked who descend to Hades there is hope; having purged their wickedness they obtain rebirth on earth, and if, during three successive existences, they prove themselves worthy of the boon, they will finally attain to happiness in the Isles of the Blest. Though Plato's teaching is vitiated by the doctrine of pre-existence, metempsychosis, and other serious errors, it represents the highest achievement of pagan philosophic speculation on the subject of the future life. The divine dignity, spirituality, and essential immortality of the soul being established, the issues of the future for every soul are made clearly dependent on its moral conduct in the present life in the body. There is a divine judgment after death, a heaven, a hell, and an intermediate state for penitent and purged, and rewards and punishments are graduated according to the merits and demerits of each. The incurably wicked are condemned to everlasting punishment in Tartarus; the less wicked or indifferent go also to Tartarus or to the Acherusian Lake, but only for a time; the just for goodness go to a happy home, the highest reward of all being for those who have purified themselves by philosophy.

From the foregoing sketch we are able to judge both of the merits and defects of ethnic systems of eschatology. Their merits are perhaps enhanced when they are presented, as above, in isolation from the other features of the religions to which they belonged. Yet their defects are obvious enough; and even of those that were most and most promising turned out, historically, to be failures. The precious elements of eschatology which contained in the Egyptian religion were associated with error and superstition, and were unable to save the religion from sinking to the state of utter degeneration in which it is found at the approach of the Christian Era. Similarly, the still richer and more profound eschatology of the Persian religion, which was dualism and other corrupting influences, and failed to realize the promise it contained, and has survived only as a ruin in modern Parseeism. Plato's speculative teaching failed to influence in any notable degree the popular religion of the Graeco-Roman world; it failed to convert even the philosophical few; and in the hands of those who did profess to adopt it, Platonism, uncorrected by Christianity, ran to seed in Pantheism and other forms of error.

II. OLD-TESTAMENT ESCHATOLOGY.—Without going into details either by way of exposition or of criticism, it will be sufficient to point out how Old-Testament eschatology concurred as to the what and how, notwithstanding its deficiencies in point of clearness and completeness, it was not an unworthy preparation for the fullness of Christian Revelation.

(1) Old-Testament eschatology, even in its earliest and imperfect form, shares in the distinctive character which belongs to O.-T. religion generally. In the first place, as a negative distinction, we note the entire absence of certain erroneous ideas and tendencies that have a large place in ethnic religions. There is no pantheism or dualism, no doctrine of pre-existence (Wisdom, viii, 17-20, does not necessarily imply this doctrine has been contended) or of metempsychosis; nor is there any trace, as might have been expected, of Egyptian ideas or practices. In the next place, on the positive side, the O. T. stands apart from ethnic religions in its doctrine of God, and of man in relation to God. Its doctrine of God is pure and un-compromising monothelism; the universe is ruled by the wisdom, justice, and omnipotence of the one, true God. And man is created by God in His own image and likeness, and destined to relations of friendship and fellowship with Him. Here we have revealed in clear and definite terms the basal doctrines which are at the root of eschatological truth; it is in the two chief defects, or limitations, which attach to the earlier eschatology and continue, by their persistence in popular belief, to hinder more or less the correct understanding and acceptance by the Jewish people as a whole of the highest eschatological utterances of their own inspired teachers.

(2) The first of these defects is the silence of the earlier and of some of the later books on the subject of moral retribution after death, or at least the extreme vagueness of such passages in these books as might be understood to refer to this subject. Death is not understood as the end of the world, and purgation of sin is not under the Hebrew thought is not very different from the Babylonian Aralé or the Hasmene Hades, except that Yahr is God even there. It is a dreary abode in which all that is prized in life, including friendly intercourse with God, comes to an end without any definite promise of renewal. The idea of death, clings to a man in Sheol, like the honour he may have won by a virtuous life on earth; but otherwise conditions in Sheol are not represented as retributive, except in the vengeant way. Not that a more definite retribution or the hope of a life of bliss is formally denied and excluded; it simply fails to find utterance in earlier O.-T. records. Religion is pre-eminently an affair of this life, and retribution works out here on earth. This idea, which to us seems so strange, must, to be fairly appreciated, be taken in conjunction with the national as opposed to the individual viewpoint (see under (3) of this section); and allowance must also be made for its pedagogic value for a people like the early Hebrews. Christ Himself explains why Moses permitted divorce ("by reason of the hardness of your heart")—Matt., xix, 8); revelation and legislation had to be tempered to the capacity of a singularly practical and unimaginative people, who were more effectually confirmed in the worship and service of God by a vivid sense of His retributive providence here on earth than they would have been by a higher and fuller doctrine of future immortality with its postponement of moral awards. Nor must we exaggerate the insufficiency of this early point of view. It gave a deep religious value and significance to every event of the present life, and raised morality above the narrow, utilitarian standpoint. Not worldly prosperity as such was the ideal of the pious Israelite, but prosperity bestowed by God as the gracious reward of fidelity in keeping His Commandments. Yet, when all has been said, the inadequacy of this belief for the satisfaction of individual aspirations must be admitted; and this inadequacy was bound to produce itself sooner or later in experience. The substitution of the national for the individual standpoint could not indefinitely hinder this result.

(3) The tendency to sink the individual in the nation and to treat the latter as the religious unit was one of the most marked characteristics of Hebrew faith. And this helped very much to support and prolong the other limitation just noticed, according to which retribution was looked for in this life. Deferred and disappointed personal hopes could be soothed by the thought of their present or future realization in the nation. It was only when the national calamities, culminating in the exile, had shattered for a time the
people's hope of a glorious theocratic kingdom that the eschatology of the individual became prominent; and with the restoration there was a tendency to revert to the national point of view. It is true of the O.T. as a whole that the eschatology of the people is the one of the wilds, by reason of the contrast of the individual, though it is true at the same time that, in and through the former, the latter advances to a clear and definite assurance of a personal resurrection from the dead, at least for the children of Israel who are to share, if found worthy, in the glories of the Messianic Age.

It is beyond the scope of this article to attempt to trace the growth or describe the several phases of this national eschatology, which centres in the hope of the establishment of a theocratic and Messianic kingdom on earth (see Messias). However spiritually this idea may be found expressed in O.T. prophecies, as we read them now in the light of their progressive fulfilment in the N.T. Dispensation, the Jewish people as a whole clung to a material and political interpretation of the kingdom, coupling their own domination as a people with the triumph of God and the worldwide establishment of His rule. There is much, indeed, to account for the obscurity of the prophecies though.

The Messias as a distinct person is not always mentioned in connexion with the inauguration of the kingdom, which leaves room for the expectation of a theophany of Jahve in the character of judge and ruler. But even when the person and place of the Messias are described, he is overshadowed, the fulness of what we have learned to distinguish as His first and second coming tends to give to the whole picture of the Messianic kingdom an eschatological character that belongs in reality only to its final stage. It is thus the resurrection of the dead in Isaïes, xxvii, 19, and Daniel, xii, 2, is introduced among the descriptions foretelling 'the day of the Lord', the judgment on Jews and Gentiles, the renovation of the earth and other phenomena that usher in that day, while applicable in a limited sense to contemporary events and to the inauguration of the Christian Era, are much more appropriately understood at the end of the world. It is not, therefore, surprising that the religious hopes of the Jewish nation should have become so predominantly eschatological, and that the popular imagination, foreshortening the perspective of Divine Revelation, should have learned to look for the event (the resurrection of the dead) on earth of God, which Christians are assured will be realized only in heaven at the close of the present dispensation.

(4) Passing from these general observations which seem necessary for the true understanding of O.T. eschatology, a brief reference may be made to the passages which exhibit the growth of a higher and fuller doctrine of immortality. The recognition of individual as opposed to mere corporate responsibility and retribution may be reckoned, at least remotely, as a gain to eschatology, even when retribution is confined chiefly to this life; and this principle is repeatedly recognized in the earliest books (see Gen., xxvi, 25; Ex., xxxii, 33; Num., xvi, 22; Deut., vii, 10; xxiv, 16; II K., xxiv, 17; IV K., iv, 6; Is., iii, 10 sq.; xxxiii, 15 sq.; Jer., xii, 1 sq.; xvii, 5–10; xxxii, 18 sq.; Ezek., xiv, 12–20; xviii, 4, 18 sq.; Psalms, passim, Prov., ii, 21 sq.; xi, 2; xi, 19, 31; etc.) It is recognized also in the very terms of the problem dealt with in the Book of Job.

But, coming to higher things, we find in the Psalms and in Job the clear expression of a hope or assurance for the just of a life of blessedness after death. Here is voiced, under Divine inspiration, the innate craving for a righteous soul (for detailed fullest of the wicked, the protest of a strong and vivid faith against the popular conception of Sheol. Omitting doubtful passages, it is enough to refer to Psalms xv (A.V. xvi), xvi (A.V. xvii), xlviii (A.V. xlix), and lxxi (A.V. lxxiii). Of these it is not impossible to explain the first two as prayers for deliverance from some imminent danger of death, but the assurance they express is too absolute and universal to admit this interpretation as the most natural. And this assurance becomes still more definite in the other two, the contrast of the just and the wicked, and it is asserted to introduce between the fates of the just and the impious. The same faith emerges in the Book of Job, first as a hope somewhat questionably expressed, and then as an assured conviction. Despairing of vindication in this life and rebelling against the thought that the righteous should die as an accursed, the sufferer seeks consolation in the hope of a renewal of God's friendship beyond the grave: "O that ye wouldst hide me in Sheol, that ye wouldst keep me secret, until ye wrath be past, that ye wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me. If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my warfare would I wait, till my release should come" (xvii, 13 sq.). In xxxi, 18–xvii, 9, the expression of this hope is more absolute; and in xix, 23–27, it takes the form of a definite certainty that he will see God, His Redeemer: "But I know that my Redeemer liveth and that after this my departure he shall awake: some unto everlasting life, and others unto everlasting shame and contempt," etc., it is clearly a personal resurrection that is taught—Isaïes a resurrection of righteous Israelites; in Daniel, of both the righteous and the wicked. The judgment, which in Daniel is connected with the resurrection, is also personal; and the same is true of the judgment of the living (Jews and Gentiles) which in various forms the prophecies connect with the "day of the Lord". Some of the Psalms (e.g. xlvi) seem to imply a judgment on individuals after death; and the certainty of a future judgment of "every work, whether it be good or evil!", is the final solution of the moral enigmas of earthly life offered by Ecclesiastes (xvii, 13–14; cf. iii, 17). Coming to the later (deuterocanonical) books of the O.T., we have clear evidence in II Mach. of Jewish faith not only in the resurrection of the body (vii, 9–14), but in the efficacy of prayers and sacrifices for the dead who have died in godliness (xii, 43 sqq.). And in the second and first centuries B.C., in the Jewish apocalyptic literature, new eschatological developments appear, chiefly in the direction of a more definite doctrine of retribution after death. The word Sheol is still most commonly understood of the general abode of the departed awaiting the resurrection, this abode having different divisions for the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked; in reference to the latter, Sheol is sometimes simply equivalent to hell. Gehenna is the name usually applied to the final place of punishment of the wicked after the last judgment, or even immediately after death; while paradise is often used to designate the intermediate abode of the souls of the just, and heaven their home on earth. See also apocalyptic literature as described by Charles, article "Eschatology" in "Encycl. Biblica", §§ 63, 70. Christ's use of these terms shows that the Jews of His day were sufficiently familiar with their N.-T. meanings.

III. Catholic Eschatology.—In this article there
is no critical discussion of N.-T. eschatology nor any attempt to trace the historical developments of Catholic teaching from Scriptural and traditional data; only a brief conspectus is given of the developed Catholic system. For critical and historical details and for the refutation of those who are punished for their errors the reader is referred to the special articles dealing with the various doctrines. The eschatological summary which speaks of the “four last things” (death, judgment, heaven, and hell) is popular rather than scientific. For systematic treatment it is best to distinguish between (A) individual and (B) universal and cosmic eschatology, including under (A): (1) death; (2) the particular judgment; (3) heaven, or eternal happiness; (4) purgatory, or the intermediate state; (5) hell, or eternal punishment; and under (B): (6) the approach of the end of the world; (7) the resurrection of the body; (8) the general judgment; and (9) the final consummation of all things. The superiority of Catholic eschatology consists in the fact that, without professing to answer every question that idle curiosity may suggest, it gives a clear, consistent, satisfying statement of all that need at present be known, or can profitably be understood, regarding the eternal issues of life and death for each man, personally, and the final consummation of the cosmos of which we are a part.

(A) Individual Eschatology.—(1) Death, which consists in the separation of soul and body, is presented under many aspects in Catholic teaching, but chiefly (a) as being actually and historically, in the present crisis of society, the consequence of the original sin and penalty of Adam’s sin (Gen., ii, 17; Rom., v, 12, etc.); (b) as being the end of man’s period of probation, the event which decides his eternal destiny (II Cor., v, 10; John, ix, 4; Luke, xii, 40; xvi, 19 sqq.; etc.), though it does not obviate immediate states of purification for the imperfect who die in God’s grace; and (c) as being universal, though as to its absolute universality (for those living at the end of the world) there is some room for doubt because of I Thess., iv, 14 sqq.; I Cor., xv, 51; II Tim., iv, 1, and the end of the Apocalypse (Mark, xiii, 32; Acts, i, 6 sqq.), and in the teaching of the Council of Florence (Denzinger, Enchiridion, no. 588) regarding the speedy entry of each soul into heaven, purgatory, or hell. (See Purgatory.)

(3) Heaven is the abode of the blessed, where (after the resurrection with glorified bodies) they enjoy, in the company of Christ and the angels, the immediate vision of God face to face, being supernaturally elevated by the light of glory so as to be capable of such a vision. There are infinite degrees of glory corresponding to degrees of merit, but all are unspeakably happy in the eternal possession of God. Only the perfectly pure and holy can enter heaven; but for those who have attained that state, either at death or after a course of purification in purgatory, entry into heaven is not deferred, as has sometimes been erroneously held, till after the General Judgment. (4) Purgatory is the intermediate state of unknown duration in which those who die imperfect, but not in unrepented mortal sin, undergo a course of penitential purification to qualify for admission into heaven. They share in the communion of saints (q. v.) and are benefited by our prayers and good works (see Dead, Prayers for the). The denial of purgatory by the Reformers introduced a dismal blank in their eschatology and, after the manner of extremes, has led to extreme reactions. (See Purgatory.)

(5) Hell, in Catholic teaching, designates the place or state of men (and angels) who, because of sin, are excluded for ever from the Beatific Vision. In this wide sense it applies to the state of those who die with only original sin on their souls (Council of Florence, Denzinger, no. 558), although this is not a state of misery or of subjective punishment of any kind, but merely implies the objective privation of supernatural bliss, which is compatible with a condition of perfect natural happiness. But in the narrower sense in which the name is ordinarily used, hell is the state of those who are punished eternally for unrepented personal mortal sin. Beyond affirming the existence of such a state, with varying degrees of punishment corresponding to degrees of guilt and its eternal or unending duration, Catholic doctrine does not go. It is a terrible and mysterious truth, but it is clearly and emphatically taught by Christ and the Apostles. Fundamentalists may deny the eternity of that which is separate from the authority of Christ, and professing, who are unwilling to admit it, may try to explain away Christ’s words; but it remains as the Divinely revealed solution of the problem of moral evil. (See HELL.) Rival solutions have been sought in some form of the theory of resurrection or, less commonly, in the theory of annihilation or conditional immortality. The restorationist view, which in its Origenist form was condemned at the Council of Constantineople in 543, and later at the Fifth General Council (see Apostataes), is the cardinal dogma of modern Universalists and most liberal Protestants and Anglicans. Based on an exaggerated optimism for which present experience offers no guarantee, this view assumes the all-conquering efficacy of the ministry of grace in a life of probation after death, and looks forward to the ultimate destruction of all sinners and the voluntary disappearance of moral evil from the universe. Annihilationists, on the other hand, failing to find either in reason or Revelation any grounds for such optimism, and considering immortality itself to be a grace and not the natural attribute of the soul, believe that the finally repentant will be annihilated or cease to exist—that God will thus ultimately be compelled to confess the failure of His purpose and power.

(B) Universal and Cosmic Eschatology.—(6) Notwithstanding Christ’s express refusal to specify the time of the end (Mark, xiii, 32; Acts, i, 6 sqq.), it was a common belief among early Christians that the end of the world was near. This seemed to have some support in certain sayings of Christ in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, which are set down in the Gospels side by side with prophecies relating to the end (Matt., xxiv, Luke, xi, xvii), and in certain passages of the Apocalypse, which might, not unnaturally, have been so understood (but see II Thess., ii, 2 sqq., where St. Paul corrects this impression). On the other hand, Christ had clearly stated that the Gospel was to be preached to all nations before the end (Matt., xxiv, 14), and St. Paul looked forward to the ultimate conversion of the Jewish people as a remote event to be preceded by the conversion of the Gentiles (Rom., xi, 25 sqq.). Various other signs are spoken of as preceding or ushering in the end, as a great apostasy (II Thess., ii, 3 sqq.), or falling away from faith or charity (Luke, xvii, 8; Matt., xxiv, 12), the reign of Antichrist (q. v.), and great social calamities and terrifying physical convulsions. Yet the end will come unexpectedly and take the living by surprise.

(7) The visible coming (parousia) of Christ in power and glory will be the sign of the rising of the dead (see Resurrection). It is Catholic teaching that all the dead who are to be judged will rise, the wicked as well as the just, and that they will rise with the bodies they had in this life. But nothing is defined as to what is required to constitute this identity of the risen with the present body. Though not formally defined, it is sufficiently certain that there is to be only one general resurrection, simultaneous for the good and the bad. (See Millennium.) Regarding the qualities of the risen bodies in the case of the just we have St. Paul’s description in I Cor., xv (cf. Matt., xiii, 43; Phil., iii, 21) as a basis for theological
speculation; but in the case of the damned we can only affirm that their bodies will be incorruptible.

(8) Regarding the general judgment there is nothing of importance to be added here to the graphic description of the event given by Christ Himself, who is to be Judge (Matt., xvi, etc.). (See Judgment, General.)

(9) There is mention also of the physical universe sharing in the general consummation (II Pet., iii, 13; Rom., viii, 19 sqq.; Apoc., xxii, 1 sqq.). The present heaven and earth will be destroyed, and a new heaven and earth take their place. But what, precisely, this purging will involve, or what purpose the vast and awful plan of God will serve is not revealed. It may possibly be part of the glorious Kingdom of Christ of which “there shall be no end”. Christ’s militant reign is to cease with the accomplishment of His office as Judge (I Cor., xv, 24 sqq.), but as King of the elect whom He has saved He will reign with them in glory for ever.

A good bibliography of older works is given in Alzler, A Critical History of the Doctrine of the Future Life with complete Bibliography by Ezra Abbott (New York, 1871). See also: Christian Doctrine of Immortality (5th ed., Edinburgh, 1903)—very complete; OVERBECK, The Doctrine of the Last Things (London, 1877); for Christian eschatology the reader is referred to a fuller bibliography to the special articles on the various religions mentioned; it is enough to refer here, for the lower races, to publications in Luzon, On the Origin of Civilizations in the Primitive Condition of Man (3rd ed., London, 1880); Tylor, Primitive Religion (3rd ed., London, 1891); REVILLE, Religions des peuples non-civilisés (Paris, 1853); for higher races, to HALSTED, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (Boston, 1885); J. KRAMER, Die babyloniisch-assyrischen Verstehungen der Ewigkeit (Leipzig, 1891); and stand nach dem Tode (Leipzig, 1887); BUDGE, Egyptian Ideas of the Future Life (London, 1903); PETRIE, Religion and Con science in the Ancient Egypt (London, 1884); STUART, The Religion of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia (Gifford Lectures, 1911); DILL, Religion in Babylonia and Assyria (London, 1882); JACOBS, Josephus, the Prophet of Ancient Israel (New York, 1888); ROIDE, Psuche, Seelenbund and Unterleibsbiographie der Griechen (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1905); besides general works on ancient religions like those of TIELE, DE LA SAUMOY, etc. For biblical eschatology see:ABBREVIATIONS IN BIBLE, DICTIONARY OF BIBLE, ARTICLES, v. s. CHARLES, Christian History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity (London, 1899); I. FREIMANN, Messianismus, v. s. (this author is to be read with caution; he is extremely arbitrary in dating and interpreting documents); ANDERBERG, Die christliche Eschatologie in den Heiligen Schriften der Kirche und der neuen Testaments (Freiburg in Br., 1890); MANGORET, Les Quatre Monde en V., Dict. de la Bible. For the history of Catholic eschatology see ANDERBERG, Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie innerhalb der eomini schen Zeit (Freiburg in Br., 1890); and for modern eschatological problems and controversies see bibliography of the several articles referred to in the last section of this article.

P. J. TONER.

Eskenhach, Wolfram von. See Wolfram.

Eschobar, Marina de, Venerable, mystic and foundress of a modified branch of the Brigittine Order b. at Valladolid, Spain, 8 Feb., 1534; d. there 9 June, 1633. Her father, Iago de Eschobar, was professor of civil and canon law and for a time governor of Osuna, a man noted for his learning and his saintly life, her mother was Margaret Montana, daughter of Charles V’s physician. She was an apt scholar and even in youth showed powers of reflection beyond her age. Until her forty-fifth year her attention was given mainly to her own perfection, then she devoted herself more to promoting the piety of others. At fifty her continual bodily afflictions became so severe that she was confined to her bed for the remainder of her life. Providence provided her with an admirable spiritual guide, in the Venerable Luis de Ponte (1554-1624). The special external work entrusted to her was to establish a branch of the Order of the Holy Saviour or of Brigittines but with the rules greatly modified to suit the times and the country. With the revelation of the work came the knowledge that she would not live to see its accomplishment. By divine command, as she believed, she wrote her revelations, and when too feeble to write herself she dictated them. When she was too weak to dictate them she had them left for publication after her death. In his preface he declares his belief in their genuineness because she advanced in virtue and was preserved free from temptations against purity, showed no pride, and had peace in prayer, feared deception, desired no extraordinary favours, loved suffering, was zealous for souls and, lastly, was obedient to her confessor. The writings were published in one large volume and are divided into six books containing his remarks and her own, interspersed between the visions themselves. Book I relates the visions she had when she was sixteen years old which God had led her; II contains revelations about the mysteries of redemption; III about God and the Blessed Trinity; IV about Guardian Angels and the B. V. Mary’s prerogatives; V gives means to help souls in purgatory and to save souls on earth; and VI reveals her perfection as shown under terrible sufferings. The style of the work is free and flowing and she speaks with simplicity and naive frankness. The visions, always picturesque, and pleasing or alarming according to their subject, are all instructive and at times distinctly curious; but the descriptions are mere outlines, leaving much to the imagination, and never going into details. Their variety is great. For some the following would have special interest: Daily communion and Satan’s objection to it; mystic espousals; how the bodies of saints can appear in visions; internal stigmata; some saints with whom modern magiciansartehave dealt harshly; how Christ’s Blood is given to the dying. Their brevity of detail may account in part for the oblivion into which they have fallen. Her life, so far as de Ponte had prepared it, was published at Madrid in 1664; the second part appeared there in 1673. It was translated into Latin by M. Hanel, S. J., and published again at Prague in 1672-1688, and in an enlarged edition at Naples 1690. All these editions are now very rare. A German translation, in four volumes, appeared in 1861. (See BRIGITTEINES.)

EDWARD P. GRAHAM.

Escobar y Mendoza, Antonio, b. at Valladolid in 1589; d. there 4 July, 1669. In his sixteenth year he entered the Society of Jesus. Talent and unriviling labour won him distinction for scholarship among the leaders of ecclesiastical science in his age. His writings are recognized as his classical and characteristically Jesuit writings are as far as their orthodoxy is concerned. For this reason Pascal’s efforts (fifth and sixth Provincial Letters) to fasten the charge of laxism on Escobar’s “Manual of Cases of Conscience”, together with his unerring insinuations of adroit hypocrisy on Escobar’s part, and too base and cowardly a conclusion. At the same time, it is only fair to add that Escobar’s writings are not entirely beyond the pale of criticism. Unprejudiced critics find him inexact in quotations, subtle in discussion, obscure and loose in reasoning. Besides the “Manual”, Escobar’s chief works are: “Summulae casuum confessionis” (Paris, 1610); “Examen et praxis confessarii” (Lyons, 1647); “Thesologia moralis” (Lyons, 1650; Venice, 1652); “Universe theologicae morales sententiae” (Lyons, 1663); “De triplici statu Ecclesiae” (Lyons, 1663); “De Justitia et de legibus” (Lyons, 1663).

Escobar was also a preacher of note. For fifty consecutive years he delivered a series of Lenten sermons with signal success.

HURTER, Nomenclator, II, 264 sqq.; BADER in Kirchenz., IV, 1892; BUCHBERGER, Kirchliche Handl., s. v.; CAT in La Grande Encyclop., s. v.

J. D. O’NEILL.

Escarial, The, a remarkable building in Spain situated on the south-eastern slope of the Sierra Guadarrama about twenty-seven miles north-west of Madrid. Its proper title is El real Monasterio de San Lorenzo del Escorial, Escorial being the name of a small town in the vicinity. The structure comprises a monastery, church, pantheon or royal mausoleum, a palace intended as summer and autumn residence of the court, college, library, art-galleries, etc., and is called by Spaniards the eighth wonder of the world. It was begun in 1563, at the order of Philip II, by the
architect Juan Bautista de Toledo, assisted by Lucas de Esquital and Pedro de Tolosa, and was intended to commemorate the Spanish victory over the French at the battle of St.-Quentin in 1557. Probably another reason was that Philip II was obliged by the will of Charles V for the construction of a royal mausoleum.

Bautista’s plan was ambitious and eccentric; he was influenced by Renaissance ideals and used the Doric style in its severest forms. He died in 1557 and was succeeded by Juan de Herrera and Juan de Mijone. The plan of the building is somewhat in the shape of a gable, which was thought to be appropriate for the mausoleum of his patron saint, St. Laurence, upon whose feast day, 10 August, the battle of St.-Quentin was fought. The church was consecrated in 1586, and the pantheon was completed in 1654. Charles III built some additions and the building generally was restored under Ferdinand VII. The Escorial has twice been devastated by fire, and in 1807 it was looted by the French troops. It is built of a light-coloured stone resembling granite, for the most part highly polished. The general plan is a parallelogram with a perimeter of 3000 feet; its area is about 360,000 square feet. There are four domes, one of the finest external expression which is given to the southern side. The western or principal front is 744 feet long and 72 feet high, while the towers at each end rise about 200 feet. The main entrance is in the centre of this façade. Moncrogo’s figure of Saint Laurence stands above the door. The vestibule is about eight feet high and leads into an antechamber. To the right are the library, refectory, and convent; the college is on the left. The church is the finest of the several buildings contained within the walls of the Escorial. Its tall towers on either side, the immense dome, with its superimposed massive lantern and cross, and the portals of the vestibule, all belong to the Renaissance style. The church is of stone throughout, huge in plan, and severe in its Doric simplicity. Pompeo Leoni designed and cast the metal statues that ornament the splendid screen. A hall behind the ante-choir is known as the library. On the south side of the church is the Court of the Evangelista, a square of 166 feet with two-storied cloisters in the Grecian style. Adjoining it is the monastery of Saint Laurence. Both the monastery and the church were served by Hieronymite monks until 1533; in 1835 Augustinians took charge. The Augustinian monks also conduct the college, the building of which formed an important part of the structure. On 10 February, 1909, a fire destroyed this college. The small room which Philip II occupied during the latter part of his life and in which he died adjoins the choir of the church. Through an opening in the wall he could see the celebration of the Mass when ill. The corridor of the Hall of the Caryatides is supposed to represent the handle of the gridiron.

The Escorial is a treasure-house of art and learning. The civilized world was searched to stock the library with great books and fine manuscripts. Greeks, Arabs, and Palestine contributed, and the collection was at one time the finest in Europe, the Arabic documents being among the most remarkable of the manuscripts. From the Inquisition the library received about one hundred and forty works. It contains 7000 engraved plates and 300 volumes, including 1027 manuscripts among the last named are 1566 Arabic, 582 Greek, and 73 Hebrew manuscripts, besides 2036 in Latin and other languages (cf. Casiri, Bibliotheca arab.-hisb. Esg., Madrid, 1700–1770, 2 vols.). Among its manuscript treasures are a copy of the Gospels illuminated in Frankish style, and the Apocryphal Gospels of the Apocalypse, a very fine copy of 9 vols. The manuscript and the book were in 1628 given to the Royal Library by Philip IV, who was deeply interested in the Escorial. The manuscript is illuminated in the style of the 13th century, and was written in the 14th century for the King of France. It is a fine example of the Escorial style of illumination, and is one of the finest manuscripts in existence. It contains 4077 manuscripts, among which are compositions of the monks, del Valle, Torrijos, and Corduba, besides many of the musical works of Antonio Soler. The most important tapestries of the Escorial are in the palace; many of them were designed by Goya and Maella. The weaving was done chiefly in Madrid, but those designed by Teniers were made in Holland. Since 1837 the finest pictures of the large collection of paintings have been placed in the museum at Madrid. Among the famous artists whose works were or still are in the Escorial are: Carducci, Giordan, Goya, Holbein, Pan- toja, Hernández, Ribera, Teniers, Tintoretto, Titian, Velázquez, Zuccaro, Zurbarán.


THOMAS H. POOLE.

**ESDRAS**

I. A famous priest and scribe connected with Israel’s restoration after the Exile. The chief sources of information touching his life are the canonical books of Esdras and Nehemiah. A group of apocryphal writings is also much concerned with him, but they can hardly be relied upon, as they relate rather the legendary tales of a later age. Esdras was of priestly descent and belonged to the line of Sadoc (1 Esdr., vii, 1–5). He styles himself “son of Saraias” (vii, 1), an appellation which is not altogether understood in a broad sense, as purporting that Saraias, the chief priest, spoken of in IV K., xxxv, 18–21, was one of Esdras’ ancestors. Nevertheless he is known rather as “the scribe” than as “priest”: he was “a ready scribe [a scribe skilled] in the law of Moses”, and therefore qualified for the task to which he was destined among his people.

The chronological relation of Esdras’s work with that of Nehemiah is, among the questions connected with the history of the Jewish Restoration, one of the most mooted. Many Biblical scholars still cling to the view suggested by the traditional order of the sacred text (due allowance being made for the break in the narrative—1 Esdr., iv, 6–23), and place the mission of Esdras before that of Nehemiah. Others, among whom we may mention Professor Van Hooacker of Louvain, Dr. T. K. Cheyne in England, and Professor C. F. Kent in America, to do away with the numberless difficulties arising from the interpretation of the main sources of this history, maintain that Nehemiah’s mission preceded that of Esdras. The former view holds that Esdras came to Jerusalem about 438 B.C., some 50 years before Nehemiah first arrived; and the second view that Nehemiah preceded Esdras, and the mission of Esdras’s might have taken place as late as 397 B.C. However this may be, since we are here concerned only with Esdras, we will limit ourselves to summarizing the principal features of his life and work, without regard to the problems involved, which it suffices to have mentioned.

Many years had elapsed after permission had been given to the Jews to return to Palestine; amidst difficulties and obstacles the restored community had settled down again in their ancient home and built a new temple; but their condition, both from the political and the religious point of view, was most precarious: they chafed under the oppression of the Persian satraps and had grown indifferent and unobservant of the Law. From Babylon, where this state of affairs was well known, Esdras languard to go to Jerusalem and use his authority as a priest and interpreter of the Law to restore things to a better condition. He was in favour at the court of the Persian king; he not only obtained permission to visit Judea, but a royal edict clothing him with ample authority to carry out his purpose, and ample support from the royal treasury. This edict, moreover, ordered the satraps “beyond the river” to assist Esdras liberally and enabled that all Jewish temple officials should be exempt from toll, tribute, or custom. “And thou, Esdras, appoint judges and magistrates, that they may judge all the people, that is beyond the river” (I Esdr., vii, 25). Finally, the Law of God and the law of the king were
like to be enforced by severe penalties. The edict left all Jews who felt so inclined free to go back to their own country. Some 1800 men, including a certain number of priests, Levites, and Nethinathes, started with Esdras from Babylon, and after five months the combined Jewish life was laid down by him, and in a way in which, in the main, it never departed. There is probably a great deal of truth in the tradition which attributes to him the organization of the synagogues and the determination of the books hallowed as canonical among the Jews. Esdras's activity seems to have proceeded still further. He is credited by the Talmud with having compiled his own book (that is to say Esd.-Nehem.), and the genealogies of the book of Chronicles as far as himself" (Treat. "Baba bathra", 15th). Modern scholars, however, differ widely as to the extent of his literary work: some regard him as the last editor of the Hexateuch, whereas, on the other hand, his part in the composition of Esdras-Nehemias and Paralipomenon is doubted. At any rate, it is certain that he had nothing to do with the composition of the so-called Third and Fourth Books of Esdras. As is the case with many men who take an important part at an epoch of Historical events, in the course of time Esdras's personality and activity assumed, in the minds of the people, gigantic proportions; legend blended with history and supplied the scantiness of information concerning his life; he was looked upon as a second Moses to whom were attributed all institutions which could not possibly be ascribed to the former. According to Jewish traditions, he restored from memory—an achievement little short of miraculous—all the books of the O.T., which were believed to have perished during the Exile; he likewise replaced, in the copying of Holy Writ, the writing by the hand still in use. Until the Middle Ages, and even the Renaissance, the crop of legendary achievements attributed to him grew up; it was then that Esdras was hailed as the organizer of the famous Great Synagogue—the very existence of which seems to be a myth—and the inventor of the Hebrew vocal signs. 

II. Books of Esdras.—Not a little confusion arises from the titles of these books. Esdras A of the Septuagint is III Esdras of St. Jerome, whereas the Greek Esdras B corresponds to I and II Esdras of the Vulgate, which were originally united into one book. Protestant writers, after the Geneva Bible, call I and II Esdras of the Vulgate respectively Ezra and Nehemiah, and III and IV Esdras of the Vulgate respectively I and II Esdras. It would be desirable to have uniformity of titles. We shall follow here the terminology of St. Jerome.

1 Esdras (Gr. Esdras B, first part; A.V. Ezra).—A remarkable book, highly important in the Jewish canon, together with II Esdras, a single volume. But Christian writers of the fourth century adopted the custom—the origin of which is not easy to assign—of considering them as two distinct works. This custom prevailed to such an extent that it found its way even into the Hebrew Bible, where it has remained in use. Protestant writers, after the Geneva Bible, call I and II Esdras of the Vulgate respectively Ezra and Nehemiah, and III and IV Esdras of the Vulgate respectively I and II Esdras. It would be desirable to have uniformity of titles. We shall follow here the terminology of St. Jerome.
posed as fairly expressing its contents. Should these books be regarded as independent, or as parts of a larger work? There is little discussion as to the union of I and II Esd., which may well be considered as a single book. As to the opinion holding Esd.--Neh. and Par. to be only one work, although it seems gaining ground among Biblical students, yet it is still strongly opposed by many who deem its arguments unable to outweigh the evidence in the opposite direction. We should not expect to find in I Esd., any more than in II Esd., a complete account of the events connected with the Restoration, even a complete record of the lives of Esdras and Nehemias. The reason for this lies in the author's purpose of simply narrating the principal steps taken in the re-establisment of the theocracy in Jerusalem. Thus, in two parallel parts, our book deals (1) with the return of the Jews under the leadership of Zorobabel; (2) with the return of another band commanded by Esdras. In the former, with the decree of Cyrus (i, 1-4) and the enumeration of the most prominent members of the caravan (ii), we read a detailed account of the rebuilding of the Temple and its successful completion, in spite of bitter opposition (iii-vi). The events therein contained cover twenty-one years (536-515). The latter deals with facts belonging to a much later date (458 or 397). Opening with the decree of Artaxerxes (vii) and the census of the members of the party, it briefly relates the journey across the desert (viii), and gives all the facts connected with the enforcement of the law of marriages with foreign women (ix-x).

I Esd. is a compilation the various parts of which differ in nature, in origin, and even in language. At least three of the parts may be recognized: (1) the personal memoirs of Esdras (vii, 27-ix, 15); (2) lists very likely furnished by reliable documents (ii, 1-70; viii, 1-5); (3) Aramaic writings (iv, 7-16; vii, 12-26), supported with some probability to be a portion of a more comprehensive history of the restored community (Stade). These compilers put together into the present shape, adding, of course, now and then some remarks of their own or comments borrowed from sources otherwise unknown to us. This compilatory character does not, as some might believe, lessen in any way the high historical value of the work. True, the compiler was very likely not endowed with a keen sense of criticism, and he has indiscriminately transcribed side by side all his sources "as if all were alike trustworthy" (L. W. Batten); but we should not forget that he has preserved to us pages of the highest value; even those that might be deemed of inferior trustworthiness are the only documents available with which to reconstruct the history of those times; and the compiler, even from the standpoint of modern scientific research, could hardly do anything more praiseworthy than place within our reach, as he did, the sources of information at his disposal. The composition of the work has long been attributed without discussion to Esdras himself. This view, taught by the Talmud, and still admitted by scholars of good standing, is however, contradicted by several modern Biblical students, who, although their opinions are widely at variance on the question of the date, fairly agree, nevertheless, that the book is later than 330 B. C.

II Esd. See NEHEMIAH.

III Esdras (Gr. Esdras A; Prot. writers, I Esdras).—Although not belonging to the Canon of the Sacred Scriptures, this book is usually found, ne prorsus interret, in an appendix to the editions of the Vulgate. It is made up almost entirely from materials existing in the canonical books. The following scheme will show sufficiently the contents and point out the canonical parallels:

III Esd., i.—II Par., xxxv, xxxvi.—History of the Kingdom of Judah from the great Passover of Josias to the Captivity.
ion, the thirteenth year after the destruction of Jerusalem (the date given is wrong by about a century). In the first vision (iii, 1–v, 20), Esdras is lamenting over the affliction of his people. Why does not God fulfill his promises? Is not Israel the elect nation, and better end, despite her "evil heart" and her heathen labours? The Angel Uriel chides Esdras for inquiring into things beyond his understanding; the "prophet is told that the time that is past exceeds the time to come, and the signs of the end are given him.—In another vision (v, 21–vi, 34), he learns, with new signs of the end, why God "doth not" do as the prophet had desired. Then follow (vi, 35–ix, 25) a glowing picture of the Messianic age. "My son" shall come in his glory, attested by those who did not taste death, Moses, Henoch, Elias, and Esdras himself; they shall reign 400 years, then "my son" and all the living shall die; after seven days of "the old silence", the Resurrection and the Judgment.—Next (ix, 26–x, 14) Kadosh, the second chapter, furnishes the verse Reminissenz, or the Office of the Dead (25–25), the response Lux perpetua lucet in the Office of the Martyrs during Easter time (35), the introit Accepe jubitatem for Whitsunday (36–37), the words Modo coronatorum of the Office of the Apostles (45); in like manner the verse Christi die for Christmas eve, is borrowed from xvi, 53. However beautiful and popular the book, its origin is shrouded in mystery. The introductory and concluding chapters, containing evident traces of Christianity, are assigned to the third century (about A.D. 250). The main portion (i–xii) is understood to be the story of a Jew—whether Roman, or Alexandrian, or Palestinian, no one can tell; as to its date, authors are mostly widely at variance, and all dates have been suggested, from 30 b.c. to A.D. 218; scholars, however, seem to rally more and more around the year A.D. 97.

Bonsly, The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra (Cambridge, 1875); Lidenerfeld, Messias Judæorum (Leipzig, 1901); Karfre, Das IV Buch Ezra auf seine Quellen untersucht (Güttlingen, 1889); Scherr, Apostrophon des T. in Rendleschmidt für prof. Theol. und Kirche (Leipzig, 1886); Ennemie, Notes sur le Messianisme au temps de Jesus (Revue Biblique, 1895); 468–501; Iden, Le Messianisme chez les Juifs (Paris, 1909); Is, Le quatrième livre des Ecles (Paris, 1859); F. Renan, L'Apocalypse de Jean à la Reine des Deux Mondes (1875); 1 March.

Charles L. Souvey.

Esglis, Louis-Philippe Mariauchau d', eighth Bishop of Quebec, Canada; b. Quebec, 24 April, 1710; d. 4 June, 1788. After completing his studies at the Quebec Seminary, he was ordained priest in 1734 and appointed pastor of Saint-Pierre-d'Orléans. After thirty-five years of humble ministry, he was called to the episcopal see. He died "and was buried at Saint-Pie, the fifteenth year of his priesthood and was buried at Saint-Pierre.

Lionel Lindsay.

Eskil, Archbishop of Lund, Skåne, Sweden; b. about 1100; d. at Clairvaux, 6 (77) Sept., 1181; one of the most capable and prominent princes of the Church in Scandinavia. A man of profound piety, he was always zealous for the welfare of the church, and was a courageous and unselfish defender of the Church's independence of the secular authority. His election to the hierarchy in 1130 was a turning point in the church's struggle for independence. He worked hard to establish the church's independence of the secular authority, and was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority. He was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority, and was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority. He was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority, and was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority. He was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority, and was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority. He was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority, and was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority. He was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority, and was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority. He was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority, and was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority. He was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority, and was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority. He was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority, and was a successful defender of the church's independence of the secular authority.

Jean-François Hubert was named coadjutor that same year, but the approval of the British Government was withheld till 1786. Bishop d'Esglis tried unsuccessfully to obtain the death of clergy by obtaining priests from France. The British Government favoured the ecclesiastical reforms in Sweden and settlments in Upper Canada and the Maritime Provinces. Pending the arrival of a missionary for the Arians, a layman was authorized to baptize and witness marriage contracts. Bishop d'Esglis issued (1787) a pastoral letter to all the faithful of the lower provinces, exhorting them to religious and charitable works. He died in the sixty-fifth year of his priesthood and was buried at Saint-Pierre.

TITU, Les Evénements de Quebec (Quebec, 1899); Archives of the Archdiocese of Quebec; Le Canada Eclesiastique (Montreal, 1908).
Eskimo, a littoral race occupying the entire Arctic coast and outlying islands of America from below Cook Inlet in Alaska to the mouth of the St. Lawrence, a distance of more than five thousand miles, including the coasts of Labrador, Baffin Land, and Ellesmere Land, with the west and south-east coasts of Greenland, the northern shores of Hudson Bay, and the Aleutian Islands, while one body, the Yuit, has even crossed Bering Strait, and is now permanently established on the extreme point of Siberia. Traditional and historical evidence go to show that the Eskimo formerly extended considerably farther south along Hudson Bay and the St. Lawrence, and perhaps even into New England. With the exception of the Aleuts, who differ very considerably from the rest, the various small bands scattered through the extreme stretch of territory are practically homogeneous, both linguistically and ethnologically, indicating long ages of slow development under similar and highly specialized conditions. In physique they are of medium stature, but strong and hardy, with yellow-brown skin and features, suggest some connection with the Mongoloid of the Indian, although there is no reason to suppose them of other than American origin. The only apparent admixture with the Indian occurs on their extreme southern frontier in Alaska. Owing to their constant exposure in the chilling waters, they are not long-lived. In character they are generally peaceable, cheerful, and honest, but with the common savage disregard of morality. The Aleut of the Alaskan peninsula and the Aleutian Islands speak a distinct language in two dialects, while all the others, including the Yuit of Siberia, speak practically but one language, in several dialects. The name Eskimo is a misnomer which is derived from an Algonkian term signifying "eaters of raw flesh". They call themselves Inuit, in various dialectic forms, meaning simply "people".

Living in a land of perpetual snow and ice, the Eskimo depend entirely upon the sea for a living, while the seafaring habit has made them perhaps the most expert and daring boatmen in the world. In summer they hunt the caribou and musk-ox on land; in winter they hunt the seal and polar bear in the water or on the ice floes. In travelling by sledge and skin-sleds, they rely much upon an intelligent breed of dogs trained to harness. Their houses are grouped into little settlements never more than a day's journey from the ocean. Those for temporary summer use are generally simple tents of deer or seal-skin. Their winter homes are either subterranean excavations roofed over with sod and earth laid upon a framework of timber or whale ribs, or are dome-shaped structures built of blocks cut from the hardened snow, with passage-ways and smaller rooms of the same material, with sheets of clear ice for windows. The roof of the snow-house is sometimes lined on the inside with skins to prevent dripping from the melting snow. Besides the bed platforms extending around the sides of the rooms, with the spears, harpoons, and other hunting equipment, the most important items of furniture are the stone lamps, fed with whale oil, for heating, lighting, and cooking purposes. The characteristic woman's tool is the ulu or skin-dressing knife.

Their clothing is of skins with the hair outside, or of the intestinal membranes of the larger sea animals, there being little difference between the costumes of men and women. Tattooing is common among the women, labrets are used in some tribes, but trinkets are seldom worn and the face is not painted. Their food consists of meat and fish, commonly boiled in a stone kettle, with an abundance of blubber and oil, together with berries gathered in the short summer season. From lack of running water in crowded quarters, and greyy environment, they are as a rule extremely filthy in person and habit. They are very ingenious and expert in the dressing of skins, the shaping of their fishing and hunting implements, and the construction of their skin canoes; they also display ability in the carving of designs in walrus ivory. The peculiar Eskimo kiaak or skin boat, made of dressed seal hides stretched around a framework of whale ribs or wood, with an opening in the top only large enough to accommodate the sitting body of one man, is one of the most perfect contrivances in the world for water travel, being light, swift,
and practically unsinkable. It is propelled by means
of a double paddle. The saddle is commonly a framework
of drift-wood, but is sometimes made from the rib
bones of whales, or even of a cigar-shaped mass of
dried salmon wrapped in skins and frozen solid. The
souls of the chief, or of the family head, in each little
tribal community being usually distinct and independent
from the others, with little of tribal cohesion or chiefly
authority, the head man being rather an adviser than a
ruler. Established custom, however, has all the force
of law. The bond of affection between parent and
children is very strong, children being seldom corrected
or even reprimanded, and old people are regarded
Monogamy is the rule, but polygamy and polyandry
are sometimes found. Violations of law, including
murder, are punished by the injured individual or his
nearest relations.

Their religion, like that of most primitive peoples, is
a simple animism, interpreted by the angakoks or
medicine-men and enforced by numerous taboos. All
the powers of nature, animate and inanimate, on sea
and land, are invoked or propitiated as the occasion
arises. A special deity in the central region is an old
woman of the sea, who presides over storms and sea-
and land, the latter having been created from her own
fingers. Some tribes believe in two souls, one of
which remains near the dead body until it can enter
that of a little child, while the other goes to one of
several soul lands, either above or below the earth.

There are numerous hunting and eating taboos and
contrabutions. Singing, music, story-telling, hand-games, mask-dances, and athletic competitions
make up a large part of the home life. A peculiar
institution among the central and eastern tribes is that
of the so-called "ninth song" (Norse nith, contention),
one of the first public functions, in which two rivals exhaust upon
each other their capacity for ridicule until one or the
other is declared victor by the company.

The history of the Eskimo goes back beyond the Columbian period as far as their first contact with
the Scandinavians about the year 1000, almost simultaneously in Greenland and on the coast of Labrador or New England. They do not seem to have approached the neighbourhood of the Scandinavian settlements
in South Greenland until about the end of the thirteenth century. In 1379 they made their first attack
upon the Greenland colony, and a war began, of which all details are lost, but which ended in the effective
destruction of the colony towards the close of the next century, so that even the way to Greenland was
entirely forgotten, and on the second discovery of the island in 1385, by Davis, it was found occupied only
by Eskimos, who remained in sole possession until the second colonization from Denmark in 1721, under the
leadership of the missionary Hans Egede. Since then most of the Greenland Eskimo have been gradually
civilized and Christianized under Lutheran and Moravian auspices.

In 1752 a Moravian missionary party made a landing on the Eskimo coast of Labrador, but was at once
attacked by the natives, who killed six of them. In
1771, however, they attempted a mission settlement at Nain, this time with success, Nain now being the
chief station on the Labrador coast, with five other
subordinate stations, counting altogether some 1200
Christian Eskimos. Regular mission work in Alaska
was begun among the Aleut by the Russian Orthodox
church in 1794, resulting in a few years in the com-
plete Christianization of the Aleut, who had already,
however, been terribly reduced by the wanton cruelty
of the fur traders. Russian mission work is still car-
ned on successfully both on the islands and on the
west coast of Alaska. Protestant workers entered the
field about 1880, beginning with the Presbyterians,
followed successively by the Moravians, Episcopalians,
the Swedish Evangelical Union, Congregationalists,
Lutherans, and Friends, numbering now altogether
about fifteen stations along the Eskimo coast of Alas-
ka, besides others among the neighbouring Indians.

Of special note in connexion with this work is the suc-
cessful introduction of Siberian reindeer by Rev.
Sheldon Jackson, Presbyterian, under government
patronage, to supplement the diminishing food sup-
ply of the natives. In 1865 the noted mission-
ary explorer Father Emil Petitot, descending the
Mackenzie, visited the Eskimo at the mouth of the
Anderson River on the Arctic coast of the British North-
West, preached to them, and afterwards to those at the
mouths of Mackenzie and Peel Rivers, and crossed over
sea to Nome, 980 miles, into Alaska. Among the ethnologic results of
his work in this region are a grammar and vocabulary
of the Teughit Eskimo (Paris, 1876). In 1886 the
Jesus entered Alaska, establishing their first mission
among the Indians at Nulato on the Yukon, and pro-
ceeding later to the Eskimo, among whom they have now a number of flourishing stations, the principal
one being those of Holy Cross (Koserefsky), St. Mary's (Akularak), and one at Nome. They are assisted
by the Sisters of St. Anne and the Lamasina Brothers,
and count some 1300 converts among the Eskimo,
exclusive of Indians. The Eskimo grammar and dic-
itonary of Father Father Egede, 1752, contains the
standard. No permanent mission work has ever been attempted by any denomination along the Arctic and
Hudson Bay coast from Alaska to Labrador (see
ALASKA). The total number of Eskimo is estimated
at about 29,000, Greenland 11,000; Labrador 1400; Central Region 1100; Alaska, of Eskimo proper
13,000; Aleut 1000; Yuit of Siberia 12000.

BARNUM, The Inuit Language (Boston, 1901); BOA,
The Central Eskimo Ninth Report, Bureau of Ethnology,
(1888); Report, Director of Bureau of Catholic Indian Mission
(Washington, 1907); CRANZ, Hist. of Greenland, 2 vols., tr. from
Ger. (London, 1876); DALL, Tribes of the Extreme Northwest in
Cont. N. Am. Ethnology (Washington, 1887); EGEDE, Descrip-
tion of Greenland, tr. from Ger. (London, '11); JACKSON, Facts
of Missionary Work in Alaska (New York, 1903); Labrador Missions of the Bradr.
Uniat (Spandau, 1871); MOONEY, Missions in Honor, Handbook of Amer.
Indians (Washington, 1907); MORRIS, The Point Barrow Exped. in Ninth Rept., Bur. Am. Ethn. (Washington, 1902); NELSON, The Eskimo about Bering Strait in Eighteenth Rept., Bur. Am. Ethn. (Washington, 1896); Noetinger, Notice de la Langue des Frangais-Eskimos, etc. (Paris, 1876); RINE, Tales and Tradi-
tions of the Eskimo—Greenland (London, 1878); TROMMEL, A

JAMES MOONEY.

Esnambuc, Pierre Bélain, Sieur d', captain in the
French marine, b. 1565, at Allouville, near Yvetot
(Seine-Infrérieure); d. at St. Christopher in Dec.,
1636. He was the founder of the French colonies in the
Antilles, and their first governor. Sailing from Dieppe,
in 1625, on a brigantine of four guns with a crew of
destroy fifty-five men, he took possession of the island of St.
Christopher. Returning to France in the following
year he brought about the formation by Richelieu of
the Company of the American Islands (Oct., 1626).
At this time he was authorized to occupy St. Christo-
pher and Barbadoes. Once established at St. Christo-
pher he wished to make the influence of France felt
throughout the Antilles, and for ten years devoted his energies to the accomplishment of this great work.
Owing to his efforts, colonists were recruited through-
out Lower Normandy, chiefly in the vicinity of
Dieppe, Honfleur, and Havre-de-Grâce, and these es-

cablished flourishing settlements in Guadeloupe,
Dominica, Les Saintes, and Martinique, and estab-
lished several forts and fortifications. About the
second quarter of the year he embarked from Antilles
for Martinique, where he arrived on Jan. 21, 1627.
He died in the same year at St. Christopher,
leaving to his nephews the government of the
kingdom beyond the Seas, which he had more or
less. On hearing of his death Richelieu de-
clared that the king and his realm had lost one of their
best servants.

Du Tertre, Histoire Générale des isles de Saint-Christophe, de
Espejo, Antonio, a Spanish explorer, whose fame rests upon a notable expedition which he conducted into New Mexico and Arizona in 1582-3. According to his own statement, he was b. in Cordova, but the dates both of his b. and d. are unknown. Following the reports brought to Mexico from the north by Cabeza de Vaca and the Franciscan monk, Marcos de Niza, a powerful expedition had been fitted out under the governor, Coronado, in 1540, which after passing through the territories of the Pueblo tribes of the Rio Grande, had penetrated as far as the province of Quivira, probably the country of the Wichita Indians on the Middle Arkansas, returning in the summer of 1542. Two Franciscan volunteers, Father Juan de Padilla and a lay brother, Luis, remained behind, of whom the first was afterwards murdered by the tribe—the first missionary martyr of the United States—while of the fate of the other nothing was ever known.

Forty years later three other Franciscans undertook to establish missions among the Tigua, about the present city of El Paso, Texas, in New Mexico. Soon rumour of their death at the hands of the Indians came back to Mexico, and finding the authorities dilatory in the matter, Espejo, a wealthy mining proprietor, offered to equip and lead a search expedition at his own expense. The offer was accepted and, being regularly commissioned with only fourteen soldiers, a number of Christian Indians, and a cavalcade of horses and mules, he left San Bartolome, Chihuahua, for the north on 10 Nov., 1582. From the junction of the Concho with the Rio Grande he ascended the latter stream, through populous tribes, to the pueblo of Pura, where he learned definitely of the murder of the three missionaries. Fearing punishment, the Indians had deserted their pueblo, and fled to the mountains.

Having accomplished his first purpose, Espejo determined to visit the unknown country beyond. After visiting several of the neighbouring pueblos he crossed over to the Zuni, near the present Arizona line, where he found three Christian Indians of Coronado's earlier expedition. Here several of the party decided to return, and with only nine soldiers and a party of Indians he pushed on to the Hopi (Moqui) villages in northern Arizona, where he met a friendly reception and was given guides to a mountain country further on—apparently some fifty miles northward from the site of Prescott—where he procured some rich specimens of silver ore. Returning to the Rio Grande, he visited several other pueblos farther up the river and then went over to the Pecos, noting other mines by the way. In consequence of the threatening attitude of the Tanos tribe he finally decided to return to Mexico, arriving at his starting-point in September, 1583, having accomplished, without bloodshed and with 1,858 men, as great results as had been obtained by Coronado with a whole army and at the cost of an exterminating warfare upon the Indians.

He soon afterwards submitted a report, with a map of the region explored, but his later proposition to organize a colonizing expedition was defeated by the jealousy of the viceroys.

Espejo, Relacion del viaje, etc. in Pacheco, Coleccion de Documentos Eclesiasticos (Madrid, 1864—1881), XI; also a variant version, Renan and Guey, in Harlvy, Voyages (London, 1600), III; SHEA, The Catholic Church in Colonial Days (New York, 1886); H. H. BANCROFT, History of Arizona and New Mexico (San Francisco, 1889). XVII of complete works.

James Mooney.

Espen, Zeger Bernhard Van, also called Espeńus, a Belgian canonist, b. at Louvain, 9 July, 1648; d. at Amersfoort, Netherlands, 2 Oct., 1728. He completed his higher studies at Louvain, became priest in 1673, and doctor of civil and canon law in 1675. He soon began to teach canon law at the University of Louvain where he was obliged to lecture only for six weeks during the summer vacation. The professor might explain one or other important chapter of the decreets, at his choice. He never accepted any other chair at the university, and he resigned even this position in order to devote himself entirely to study. He was consulted by all classes on account of his profound learning in canon law, and his famous work "Unigenitus"... although it raised numerous just criticisms, still remains remarkable. The author is accused, not without reason, of having borrowed considerably from the works of his predecessors, notably from Thomasin, yet it must be recognized that Van Espen possessed the art of setting forth a truth in a limpid and intelligible way the discipline of the ancient Church; he also cast light upon questions which up to his time had been very obscure. His clear and concise style gives to his work a value which the labours of his predecessors do not possess. He collected the most recent legislative decisions of the Church and his judicious judgment, except where party spirit blinded him, had also the incontestable merit of showing with precision the special law of Belgium. Benedict XIV recognized his authority in this matter. On the other hand he was a strict defender of the usus and never misconstrued the right of religious authority and exaggerated beyond measure the right of the civil power. It may be added, however, that he exalted and combated in turn all power, even the civil power. He exalted the power of the bishops in order to lessen that of the religious orders, and the rights of the bishop in the district in order to combat the powers of the pope. He gained for himself unpleasant notoriety in the Jansenist conflicts, by denying the importance of the famous distinction between right and fact with regard to the doctrine of Jansen; he declared that it was of little consequence to admit that Jansen had taught the propositions condemned by the Bull "Unigenitus" (1713) provided the doctrine itself was rejected.

The Jansenist quarrels led to Van Espen's ruin. On being consulted by the Jansenists of Holland with regard to the ordination of the Jansenist bishop of Utrecht, Cornelius Steenoven, he pronounced in favour of this ordination, which had been performed without the authorization of the Holy See. An unsuccessful attempt has been made to justify Van Espen's conduct in this matter, on the ground that he merely declared that episcopal ordination performed by a single bishop was valid. This was not the whole question, nor was it indeed the principal question, viz. to determine whether an episcopal ordination, performed without the pope's consent, was admissible. His action in this matter and his Jansenist doctrine brought about his suspension a divinis by the Bishop of Mechlin. The latter summoned him to make a declaration of orthodox faith. At the order of the civil power, the University of Louvain condemned and deprived (1728) Van Espen of his universitv functions. In the meantime the he fled and sought refuge first at Maastricht, and afterwards at Amersfoort, where he found protection in the Jansenist community, and where he died. The Augustinian Desirant, professor at the University of Louvain, is accused of having fabricated false documents in the controversy with Van Espen. This struggle is known as "The Forgery of Louvain." Desirant was condemned by the academical authorities and banished forever from his native country. The best edition of the works of Van Espen, all of which are on the Index, is that published in four volumes at Louvain, 1753. A fifth volume, "Supplementum ad varias collect-
pinel also enjoyed some reputation. He translated Horace's "Art of Poetry," and published his own "Diversas Rimas" in Madrid in 1591. He was the inventor of the measure known at first as the "espinela" and later as the "decima," because it has ten syllables. He was also noted for his musical taste. He added the fifth string to the national guitar. The "Marces de Obregón" was translated into English by Algernon Langton (London, 1816), into German by Tiek (Breslau, 1827), with a preface and notes, and into French by Vidal d'Audiguier (1816).

TIECK, Kritische Schriften (1848); Biblioteca de Autores Españoles (1848-86).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Espinosa, ALONSO DE, Spanish priest and historian of the sixteenth century. Little is known of his early life. He is first heard of towards the end of the sixteenth century in Guatemala where he had become a Dominican. It was while he was in Central America that he first heard of the miracles of Our Lady of Candelaria. This was an incident in the same story that had been among the Guanches of Tenerife since long before their conversion to Christianity, and had been venerated not only by the Guanches, but later by their conquerors, the Spaniards. Inspired by the image of this image, Espinosa soon found a member of the fraternity which had possession of it, and made it agree to make researches and write a history of the image and its miracles. The result was his "Guanches of Tenerife" published at Seville in 1594. Although the author's main purpose was to record the history of Our Lady of Candelaria, the work is important as being on the whole the best account of the Guanches, a lost race which has left scarcely any remains, even of their language; and also, though less significant, because it gives a good account of the conquest and settlement of the Canary Islands by the Spaniards. He divides his work into four books, in the first of which he describes the Island of Tenerife, gives its early history, and an account of its inhabitants, their customs, food and dress, marriages, training for war, and mode of interment. The second book gives a detailed history of the image, from its mysterious appearance, on the east coast of the island, to Espinosa's own visit. The third book is devoted to the invasion, conquest, and settlement of the island by the Spaniards. The fourth and last book contains an enumeration of various cures and other miracles performed by the image. A reprint of Espinosa's book appeared at Santa Cruz in 1597, as one of the "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles." A translation by Sir Clements Markham was published by the Hakluyt Society in London in 1897.

VENTURA FUENTES.

Espirito-Santo, Diocese of. See Spirito Santo.

Espousals, a contract of future marriage between a man and a woman, who are thereby affianced. The ecclesiastical law governing this contract was amended by the pontifical decree "Ne Tenerem" on 20 June 1600. Espousals and marriages, which was published 2 Aug., 1907, and took effect 19 April (Easter), 1908. For the old legislation see BETRUTHAL; the present article will be confined to the new. Regarding espousals the decree enactas follows: "Only those espousals are held to be valid and to beget canonical effects which are made in writing, signed by both parties, and either by the parish priest or the ordinary of the place, or at least by two witnesses. In case one or both of the parties be unable to write, this fact is to be noted in the document, and another witness is to add his signature to the contract as above, together with that of the priest or the ordinary of the place, or the two witnesses. Until Easter of 1908, there was no written document prescribed for espousals, except for Spain. Like other contracts, the promise of marriage was supposed to bind the parties making it according to prevailing law
THE ESPOUSALS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN (LO SPOSALIZIO)

RAPHAEL, SIREA GALLERY, MILAN
ESPousals

or customary. That caused many difficulties which necessitated this law. Private, clandestine espousals are henceforth of no value in the eyes of the Church. In the United States engagements were, as a rule, not considered sufficient to entice the impediment of public honesty. By which, unless the engagement were properly filled out, the Church would render null and void the marriage of either affianced party with a blood-relation in the first degree of the other affianced party, and make sinful marriage with any other person not so related, unless the engagement had been rightly broken. These are the canonical effects which are not begotten unless the espousals are made in writing, whether filling out a blank formula or by writing the document entirely.

As to the obligation of contracting espousals in writing, it is to be noted that the law does not concern itself with the promise of marriage as a matter of conscience; only with establishing the fact that espousals have no legal value and will not be considered in case of contention by ecclesiastical courts, unless they are in writing. Hence, in foro interno the Church leaves the matter to the confessor. The law suggests no particular formula for the contract of espousals. It must, however, express the promise of future marriage. There must be no condition attached contrary to the nature or laws of Christian marriage. No time is assigned by the law within which the promise must be fulfilled; still the time should be reasonable and accord with the common teaching of competent authorities. The document must be made by parties—man and woman—promising to marry each other on or within some definite date. If either or both are unable to write their names, that must be noted in the document. They must, of course, affix their signatures somehow, which must be attested by a qualified witness. In addition, either the parish priest or ordinary must sign it; both need not sign it; the signature of one only is required. By ordinary is meant the bishop of the diocese where the parties happen to be, or his vicar-general, or any one exercising episcopal jurisdiction, as for instance, the administrator when the see is vacant. By parish priest, as used in the present decree, is to be understood not only the priest who legitimately presides over a parish that is canonically erected, but also, in localities where parishes are not canonically erected, the priest to whom the care of souls has been legitimately entrusted in the specified district, and who is equivalent to a parish priest; and also, in missions where the territory has not yet been perfectly divided, every priest generally deputed for the care of souls in any station by the superior of the mission. The ordinary or parish priest cannot depute any other priest to sign in their stead (Reply of S. Congregation of Council, 30 March, 1908). If the signature of the ordinary or of the parish priest cannot be obtained, then at least two witnesses must sign. Their signatures are not needed if either of the foregoing have signed. The witnesses should of course be competent, though they differ in age and sex. The local ecclesiastical authorities are to decide where the document is to be deposited. The new law does not provide for the annulment of espousals. The reasons that formerly sufficed to annul them still remain. If espousals were made by prescribed by the new law, their force continued until they shall have been dissolved by proof of either or both parties claiming their dissolution.


JOSEPH SELINGER.

ESPousals of the Blessed Virgin Mary (De- 
Ponsatio Beatae Mariæ Virginis), a feast of the Latin Church. It is certain that a real marriage was contracted by Joseph and Mary. Still Mary is called "espoused" to Joseph ("his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph", Matt., i, 18) because the nuptials was never consummated. The term spouse is applied to married people until their marriage is consummated (Colovénier, Cal. Marian., 23 Jan.). Peter d'Ailly, chancellor of the University of Paris (d. 1420), and his famous disciple, Jean Chastellain, and Gerson, were the first energetic propagators of the devotion in honour of St. Joseph. Gerson worked many years to effect the institution of a special votive feast (Thursday of ember week in Advent), the object of which should be the virginal espousal of Mary and Joseph. Gerson's friend, Henry Chastel, canon of the cathedral chapter of Chartres, had bequeathed a certain sum for the celebration in the cathedral of this votive feast, for which Gerson had composed a proper Office. It seems that Gerson carried out the will of his friend, but tradition does not tell us on what day the feast was celebrated.

The first definite knowledge of a feast in honour of the espousals of Mary dates from 29 Aug., 1517, when with nine other Masses in honour of Mary, it was granted by Leo X to the Nuns of the Annunciation, founded by Saint Jeanne de Valois. This feast was celebrated on 22 October, as a double of the octave of the Nativity of Our Lady, by the Servites. Its Mass, however, honoured the Blessed Virgin exclusively; it hardly mentioned St. Joseph and therefore did not correspond to the idea of Gerson. Also purely as a feast of Mary it appears in the Missal of the Franciscans, to whom it was granted 21 Aug., 1907, for 7 March (by the Servites). At the same time the Servites obtained the feast for 8 March. The Office of the Nativity of Mary was recited, changing the word Nativitas to Desponsatio. After the religious orders, among the dioceses which adopted the feast of the Espousals of Mary, Arras takes the lead. It has been kept there since 23 Jan. (1556). The first Office was composed by Pierre Doré, O.P. (d. 1599), confessor of Duke Claude of Lorraine. This Office followed the outlines given by Gerson and commemorated both Joseph and Mary. Pierre Doré in 1546 successfully petitioned Paul III to extend the feast of the Desponsatio B.M.V. to the Universal Church. But even without the recommendation of the Apostolic See, the feast was adopted by many Churches. In Moravia it was in the sixteenth century kept on 18 July. In subsequent times Rome did not favour any feast in honour of espousals, but after the First Vatican Council it was refused (1655) to the King of Spain, it was granted to the German Emperor for Austria, 27 Jan., 1678 (23 Jan.); in 1680 it was conceded to Spain, but transferred (13 July, 1822) to 26 Nov., because in Spain the feast of St. Ildefonsus or St. Raymond is kept 23 Jan. In 1680 it was extended to the German Empire, 1689 to the Holy Land (double, second class), 1702 to the Cistercians (20 Feb.), 1720 to Tuscany, and 1725 to the Pontifical States. In our days it is kept in nearly the entire Latin Church on 23 Jan., in the Spanish-speaking countries on 26 Nov., but it has never been extended to the Universal Church. Since Pius V abolished the Office of Pierre Doré and introduced the modern Office, it is again a feast of Mary. The commemoration of St. Joseph in Mass, Vespers, Lauds (decree 5 May, 1730) can only be made by a special privilege.

Serr, Die Verehrung der hl. Joseph (Freiburg, 1898); Holweck, Fasti Marian Thi (Freiburg, 1892).

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

ESSENCE

Essence and Existence (Lat. essentia, existentia).— Since they are transcendentals, it is not possible to put forward a strict definition of either of the subjects of the present article. Essence, however, is properly described as that whereby a thing is what it is, an equivalent of the ἐσθενος of Aristotle (Metaph., VII, 7). The essence is thus the radical ground from which the various properties of a thing emanate.
and to which they are necessarily referred. Thus the notion of the essence is seen to be the abstract counterpart of the concrete entity: the latter signifying that which is or may be (ens actu, ens potentiale), while the former points to the reason or ground why it is precisely that which it is in the first instance. As an answer to the question What? (Quid?)—as, e.g., What is man?—essence is equivalent to quiddity; and thus, as St. Thomas remarks (I, Q. iii, a. 3), the essence of a thing is that which is expressed by its definition. Essence and nature express the same reality envisaged from the two points of view of being or of being.

As the essence is that whereby any given thing is that which it is, the ground of its characteristics and the principle of its being, so its nature is that whereby it acts as it does, the essence considered as the foundation and principle of its operation. Hence again St. Thomas: "Nature is seen to signify the essence of a thing according as it has relation to its proper operation" (De ente et essentia, cap. i). Furthermore, essence is also in a manner synonymous with form, since it is chiefly by their formal principle that beings are segregated into one or other of the species. Thus, while spiritual things and their rationality, taken as a whole, are composed of matter and form, specifically what they are by reason of their essences or "forms" alone, the compounded beings of the corporeal world receive their specification and determination of nature, or essence, principally from their substantial forms. A further form of essence is to be carefully noted that essence in this connexion is used rather with a logical or metaphysical connotation than with a real or physical one. This distinction is of considerable importance. The real or physical essence of compound entities consists in, or results from, the composition of the component parts. When we consider man as a being composed of matter and form, body and soul, the physical essence will be the body and soul. Apart from any act of abstraction, body and soul exist in the physical order as the constituents of man. On the other hand, we may consider man as the result of a composition of genus proximum and differentia ultima, i.e., of his animality and his rationality. Here the essence, humanity, is metaphysical or logical. Thus, while the real essence, to speak still only of composite beings, consists in the composition of all those physical component parts which are required to constitute the entity, what it is, either actually or potentially existent, without which it can be neither actual nor potential, the logical essence is no more than the composition of ideas or notions, abstracted mentally and referred together in what is known as "second intention." This consideration provides a basis for the distinction of essences according to the degree of physical and metaphysical complexity or simplicity which they severally display. The Supreme Being has—or rather is—a unique and utterly simple essence, free from all composition, whether physical or metaphysical. Moreover, in God—otherwise, as we shall see, than in creatures—there is no distinction of any kind between His essence and His existence. Spiritual created beings, however, as free from the composition of matter and form, have physically simple essences, yet they are composite in that their essences result of a union of genus and differentia, and are not identical with their existence. In the angel the essence is the species consequent on this union. Corporal creatures not only share in metaphysical complexity of essence, but have, on account of their composition, a physical soul.

The characteristic attributes of the essence are immutability, indivisibility, necessity, and infinity.—Since the essence of anything is that whereby the thing is what it is, it follows directly from the principle of contradiction that essences must be immutable. This, of course, is not true in the sense that physical essences cannot be brought into being or cease to exist, nor that they cannot be decomposed into their constituent parts, nor yet that they are not subject to accidental modification. The essence of God alone, as stated above, is so entirely free from any sort of composition and parts that it is not essentially capable of any accidental change. All other essences, however, is immutable in this, that it cannot be changed or broken up into its constituent parts and yet remain the same essence. The attribute is transcendental and is applied to essence precisely as it is essence. Thus, while the essence of any given man may be broken up into body and soul, animality and rationality, man as man and humanity as humanity is changeless. One individual ceases to exist; the essence itself, whether verified or not in concrete actuality, persists. The definition, "man is a rational animal," is an eternally immutable truth, verifiable whenever and wherever the subject man is given, either as a concrete and existent entity, or as a mere potentiality. Similarly, essences are said to be indivisible; that is to say, an essence ceases to be what it is when it is broken up into its constituents. Neither body nor soul alone is man. Neither animality nor rationality is the essence of man; and therefore, precisely as essence, it is indivisible. In like manner necessity is predicated of essences. They are necessary in that, though they may be merely possible and contingent, each must of necessity always be itself. In the order of actual being, the real essence is what it is from the moment it is; but it is the thing as what it is; in the order of the merely possible, it must necessarily be identical with itself. Finally, essences are said to be eternal and infinite in the negative sense that, as essences, there is no reason for their non-existence, nor for their limitation to a given number of individuals. As has been said, the distinction between essence considered as physical and as metaphysical will be apparent. It is the metaphysical essence that is eternal, immutable, indivisible, necessary, etc.; the physical essence that is temporal, contingent, etc. In other words, the metaphysical essence is a formal universal, while the physical essence is that real particularization of the universal that provides the basis for the abstraction.

So far the present article has been occupied in exhibiting the Scholastic view with regard to essence, and in obtaining a certain precision of thought rather than in raising any problems in connexion with the subject. Notice must be taken, however, of a philosophical tradition which has found adherents mainly among British philosophers and which is at variance with the Scholastic. This tradition would assert that essence is flatly denied and what we conceive of under that name is relegated to the region of purely mental phenomena; or, what practically amounts to the same thing, that fact is judged to be doubtful and consequently irrelevant; or again, while the fact itself may be fully admitted, essence is declared to be unknowable, except in so far as we may be said to know that it is a fact. Of those who take up one or other of these positions with regard to the essence of things, the most prominent may be Hobbes and Locke, Mill, Hume, Reid, and Bain, the Positivists and the Agnostics generally, together with a considerable number of scientists of the present day, would not improperly be described as either doubtful or dogmatically negative as to the reality, meaning, and cognizability of essence. The proponents and defenders of such a position are no means always opponents of speculation, but state their case, based for the most part on purely subjective views of the nature of reality, that the essence of beings are nonentities, or at least unknowable, and, as a consequence, that the whole science of metaphysics is no more than a jargon of meaningless
terms and exploded theories, they, on the other hand, express opinions and make implicit admissions that tell strongly against their own thesis. Indeed, it would generally seem that these philosophers, to some extent at least, misunderstand the position which they attack, that they combat a sort of intuitive knowledge of essences, erroneously supposed by them to be claimed by Scholastics, and do not at all grasp the theory of the natures of things as derived from a pains-taking consideration of their characteristic properties. Thus even Bain admits that there may in all probability be some one fundamental property to which all others are reducible, and he even uses the words “real essence” to designate that property. Mill tells us that “to penetrate to the more hidden agreement on which these more obvious and superficial agreements (the distinguishing leading to the greatest number of interesting properties) depend, is one of the most difficult of scientific problems. And as it is among the most difficult, so it seldom fails to be among the most important.” Father Rickaby in his “General Metaphysics” gives the citations from both Mill and Bain, as well as an important admission from Comte, that the natural tendency of man is to inquire for primary types, a synonomy, in the context for essences. The philosophical tradition, or school, to which allusion is made—although we have anticipated its assertions by the admissions into which its professors have allowed themselves to be drawn by the exigencies of reason and human language—may be divided into two main types, with their representatives in Locke and Mill. Locke got rid of the old doctrine by making the “supposed essences” no more than the bare significations of their names. He does not, indeed, deny that there are real essences; on the contrary, he fully admits this. But he asserts that we can have no knowledge of essential natures unless we know the actual or logical essences which we form mentally for ourselves. Mill, though, as we have seen, he occasionally abandons his standpoint for one more in keeping with the Scholastic view, professedly goes further than Locke in utterly rejecting real essences, a rejection quite in keeping with his general theory of knowledge, which eliminates substance, causality, and necessary truth.

The considerations previously advanced will serve to indicate a line of argument used against scepticism in this matter. The Scholastics do not and never have divided any direct or perfect knowledge with the essences of all things. They recognize that, in very many cases, no more than an approximate knowledge can be obtained, and this only through accidental characteristics and consequently by a very indirect method. Still, though the existence of the mere essences, of which the essences are in question, is contingent and mutable, human knowledge, especially in the field of mathematics, reaches out to the absolute and necessary. For example, the properties of a circle or triangle are deducible from its essence. That the one differs specifically from the other, and such from other figures, that their diverse and necessary attributes, their characteristic properties, are dependent upon their several natures and can be inferred by a mathematical process from these—so much we know. The deductive character of certain geometrical proofs, proceeding from essential definitions, must not be urged as an indication that the human mind is capable of grasping and of dealing with essences.

Similarly, and even from the admissions of the opponents of the Scholastic tradition given above, it may reasonably be maintained that we have a direct knowledge of essences, and that the actual and logical knowledge of the physical natures existent in the world about us. The essences thus known do not necessarily point to the fact of existence; they may or may not exist; but they certify to us what the things in question are. The knowledge and reality of essences emerges also from the doctrine of univer-

sals, which, although formally subjective in character, are true expressions of the objective realities from which they are abstracted. As Father Rickaby remarks: “In the rough form of expression could hardly be rejected, that science seeks to arrive at the most nature of things and has something to do with success in the enterprise”; and again, “In short, the very admission that there is such a thing as physical science, and that science is cognitio rerum per causas—a knowledge of things, according to the rationale of them—is tantamount to saying that some manner of essences is possible; that the world does present its objects ranged according to at least a certain number of different kinds, and that we can do something to mark off one kind from another.” (General Metaphysics, c. III.)

Existence is that whereby the essence is an actuality in the line of being. By its actualization with the essence is removed from the merely possible, is placed outside its causes, and exists in the world of actual things. St. Thomas describes it as the first or primary act of the essence as contrasted with its secondary act or operation (I Sent., dist. xxxiii, q. 1, a. 1; and again, as “necesse est in se esse”—Summa I, Q. iii, a. 4). Whereas the essence or quiddity gives an answer to the question as to what the thing is, the existence is the affirmative to the question as to whether it is. Thus, while created essences are divided into both possible and actual, existence is always actual and opposed to potential (as distinct from the former); with this regard to the existence of things, the question has been raised as to whether, in the ideal order, the possible is antecedent to the actual. The consideration here does not touch on the real or physical order, in which it is conceded by Scholastics that the potentiality of created essences precedes their actuality. The universe is pure and simple (as against such theorists as von Hartmann, maintaining an absolute primitive potentiality of all existence), that necessarily precedes all potentiality, is that of God, in Whom essence and existence are identical. We are concerned with the question: Is the concept of a possible entity prior to that of an existing one? Rosmini answers this question in the affirmative. The School generally takes the opposite view, maintaining the thesis that the primitive idea is of existent essence—that is, essence as actualized and purely possible is that idea of essence as the concept, though confused and indeterminate. Such an idea is of narrow intension, but extensively it embraces all being. The thesis is supported by various considerations, such as that the essence is related to its existence as potential to actual, that the act generally is prior to potentiality, and that this latter is known, and only known, through its corresponding actuality. Or, we know the possible being as that which may be, or may exist; and this necessary relation to actual existence, without which the possible is not presented to the mind, indicates the priority, in the line of thought, of the actually existent over the merely possible. Existence is thus seen to be in some sense distinguished from the essence which it actuates.

The question agitated in the School arises at this point: What is the nature of the distinction that obtains between the physical essence and the existence of creatures? It is to be borne in mind that the controversy turns not upon a distinction between the merely possible essence and the same essence as actualized, and thus physically existent; but on the far different and extremely nice point as to the nature of the distinction to be drawn between the actualized and existent essence and its existence or actuality, by which it is existent in the physical order. That there is no such distinction in God is conceded by all. With regard to creatures, several opinions have been advanced. Many Thomists hold that a real distinction obtains here and that the essence and exist-
ence of creatures differ as different entities. Others, among them Dominicus Soto, Lepidi, etc., seem to prefer a distinction other than real. The Scotists, affirming their "formal distinction," which is neither precisely logical nor real, but practically equivalent to virtual distinction, they refused to join the point against a real distinction. Suarez, with many of his school, teaches that the distinction to be made is a logical one. The principal arguments in favour of the two chief views may be summarized as follows:—

Thomists: (a) If essence and existence were but one thing, they should be as one in other, the one not conceiving the other. But we are as a fact able to conceive of essence by itself. (b) If there be no real distinction between the two, then the essence is identical with the existence. But in God alone are these identical.

Suarez: (a) A real physical essence is actual in the line of being and not merely possible. But this actuality must belong to it, as a physical essence; for it is, ex hypothesi, neither nothing nor merely possible, and the actuality of an essence is its existence. Cardinal Franzen cast the argument in this form: "Est omnino evidens in re posita extra suas causas, in statu actualitatis, nec ratione aliquem absque formatione existentiam" (De Verbo Incarnato). (b) It is inconceivable how the existence of a real or physical essence should differ from the existence of its essence.

These positions are maintained, not only by argument, but by reference to the authority and teaching of the Church, to whose genuine doctrines there is considerable difference of opinion and interpretation. It does not, however, appear to be a matter of great moment, as Soto remarks, whether one holds or rejects the doctrine of a real distinction between essence and existence, so long as the difference between God and men is safe-guarded, in that existence is admitted to be of the essence of God and not of the essence of creatures. And this would seem to be sufficiently provided for even in the supposition that created essences are not distinct from their existences as one thing is from another, but as a thing from its mode.

Blanc, Dict. de Phil. (Paris, 1906); Echtha, Tractatus de ente et essent (Thomas); FEIDLER, J. V. f. Phil., II. VII; Fink, Ontologia (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1889); KLIEGER, Die Philosophie der Vorzeit (Innsbruck, 1875); LABOUSSE, Précis de Logique et Ontologie (Louvain, 1895); LEON, Elementa Philosophiae Christianae (Louvain, 1875); LIBERATORI, Institutiones Philosophiae (Prati, 1855); LIEFDE, De distinctione essentiae et substantiae (Innsbruck, 1899); LOCKE, Essay Concerning Human Understanding (in London, 1714); LORENZELLI, Philosophie Theoretischen Institutionen (Paris, 1808); MARGUER, Théor. et Phil. de la Théorie (1883); MERCIER, Ontologie (Paris, 1902); MILL, System of Logic (1843); Reid, ed. Hamilton, Works (1828); ROYCE, General Metaphysics (London, 1896); R SIEDELER, Der menschliche Wille in den Geschöpfen: oder, Disputations Metaphysika.

FRANCIS AVELING.

Essenes, one of three leading Jewish sects mentioned by Josephus as flourishing in the second century B.C., the two others being the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Concerning their origin, history, and tenets there has been much inconclusive controversy. The only ancient authorities we have are a few paragraphs in Philo Judæus, a somewhat lengthy description in Josephus, and a scanty notice in Flinders. The former synoptic is derived mainly from the first two. They are styled Esseni by Philo, who derives it from keres, "holy," and Esseni and Esseni by Josephus. Their number according to both authors was about 4000 and their chief place of residence along the west side, but away from the shores, of the Dead Sea. Their also dwelt in other remote parts and small towns of Palestine; yet some were found in cities. The sect arose about 150 B.C. (the first-named Essene is Judas, 110 B.C.) and disappeared towards the end of the first century A.D. They worshipped one God, Creator and Ruler of all things, omnipotent and omniscient. Moses was held in very high esteem and to blaspheme his name meant death. The sun was held in such reverence as to awaken a suspicion of idolatry. An all-dismissing fate was admitted, yet free will, apparently, was not denied. The Temple was involved in the meeting-places, not because of fear of pollution, though they sent gifts thither; it seems that no blood-sacrifice was offered by them, as they claimed that a reverent mind was the best offering to God. The Sabbath was observed with most rigorous exactitude, not even the calls of nature being allowed to interrupt them. When they sat according to seniority, the Scripture was read and explained, generally in an allegorical manner, by some wise member. They washed frequently, as extreme importance was attached to ceremonial purity, and they followed scrupulously the prescriptions against Levitical defilements; even for a junior to touch a senior was pollution to the latter. What their esoteric doctrines were is not known. Death was welcomed, as they held that bodies are corruptible and the matter composing them is not lastling, but souls are immortal and live for ever, and proceeding from the most subtle ether have been drawn into prisons by some natural longing. But when they are set free from the bonds of the flesh then they rejoice as being freed from a long servitude and mount upwards. And agreeing with the opinions of the Greeks, they declare that the good dwell beyond the sea and in a place which is more rain-storms or intense heat, but is always calm and refreshed by a cool breeze breathing from the ocean. To the bad souls they allot a gloomy, tempestuous cave full of never-ending torments (Jos., Bell. Jud., I. ii. 8). Some conclude from the words just quoted that the Essenes disbelieved in the resurrection of the body.

Among the virtues the Essenes cultivated especially obedience, truthfulness, continence, justice, and temperance; they paid great attention to the sick, respect to the aged, and showed marked kindness and hospitality to strangers. All men were regarded as equal, and slavery was abhorred as contrary to the laws of nature. Those guilty of great crimes were punished by long exclusion or perpetual excommunication which, since they were not allowed to eat anything prepared by outsiders, entailed always great hardship and often death. The law was not useless and beyond man's capacity, but ethics was studied with zeal. They searched for medicinal remedies in nature, as they devoted special care to the sick irrespective of creed, and investigated the properties of minerals. They laid claim to magical powers and ability to predict. For the latter some cases are given by Josephus, among them that of the Essene, Mana-heim, who foretold Herod the Great's kingship when he was but a boy without any royal prospects. All things were held in common, their very houses not being their own. They laboured principally at agricultural pursuits or made farm implements and household articles, but never weapons of war, which they were not allowed to carry, except a staff for defence when travelling. Harvests and wages went to the stewards, who gave as each needed. Clothes and shoes were retained until worn out. No trading was allowed except barter. Anointing with oil was considered a defilement. Servants were forbidden as tempting men to injustice. Their rulers or presidents were elected, likewise their priests—if they can be so called—and their stewards. In towns an officer was appointed to look after travelling brethren. The only cow owned by them whose blood was not used. The unanimous decision was irrevocable. The members were divided into four classes. The daily routine is given as follows: They were up before daybreak and spoke of no profane subject before the sun, and to it they addressed a prayer as if soliciting it to rise. Each
was sent then to his appointed employment at which he worked until the fifth hour, i.e. eleven o'clock, when all assembled and having bathed in water specially excoriated, and clothed themselves in white, they entered the common dining-room quietly and silently. Before them a sort of food. A priest said grace and then, but not before, they might eat. At the end of the repast prayer was again said, the white garments laid aside, and resuming their ordinary attire they worked until evening, when they supped in the same manner. At the noonday meal, which was regarded apparently as a sacred feast, being prepared by their priests, no stranger was admitted, but at supper it was otherwise. As they spoke only in turn and observed great moderation in food and drink the silence at the meals appeared to outsiders, so we are told, something very solemn and mysterious. Many of the Essenes reached a great age and they acquired such fortitude of mind and body that the worst torments inflicted on them by the Romans failed to shake their constancy and they met death with a smile.

Most of the Essenes rejected marriage, not on account of any wrong in it but because they held divorce and the division of property necessary for the maintenance of those who were engaged in religious duties. They perpetuated their sect by adopting children and admitting adults who were "weary of battling with the rough sea of life", as Pliny says. At their coming they received an apron to wear during their ablutions, a white tunic, and a little purse made like a pomegranate, with which to dig a hole and cover their excrement from the rays of the sun. For one year their temperance was tested by observing outside the community its ascetic rules. Then came a fresh trial of two years, during which they shared in the lustral rites, but not in the meals, of the initiated. If found satisfactory they were chosen full members and bound themselves by sacred oaths to observe His commandments, and to conceal nothing from their fellows, and to reveal nothing to strangers, also to keep secret at all costs their books and the names of their angels. This was the only time when Essenes took oaths, their word being regarded by all as so sacred that Herod excused them from the oath of allegiance. Some of them observed the same rules yet married, and others for the ordinary purposes of life. There was a full three years' probation and if the woman appeared healthy and likely to bear children.

The Essenes have received an amount of attention during the last three centuries out of all proportion to their numbers, their influence upon contemporary life, or their importance as factors in religious development. This sprang from two causes, one external and the other internal. The latter was the curious mixture of Jewish and foreign elements in their tenets and customs. This peculiarity aroused the curiosity and exercised the ingenuity of the learned to account for the commotions. That they lived still, though speaking very likely Greek (Jews by race, says Josephus), was admitted. Their belief in one God, reverence for Moses, strict observance of the Sabbath, fastful adherence to circumcision (Hippolytus), etc. all the religious acts, were the result of a higher order of life, but the influence of the Pythagorean by Josephus himself, etc. seem to show outside influence. The source of this influence, like everything Essenic, begets controversy, but so far no one has succeeded in determining it satisfactorily. Buddhist, Parseean, Pythagoreanism (old, new, and Orphic), Hellene was Christianity is Christ.

The influence of the Greek tongue can amply account for foreign elements. The claim that these elements, if divested of their Greek external, could be proved to have their roots in Biblical ground is not lightly to be set aside. The external cause of attention was the bias of English deists and continental rationalists who strove to metamorphose the Gospels from what they regarded a literal into a progressive form and quite naturally Christians developed; and Freemasons pretended to find in Essenes pure Christianity. In reference to such chimeras it is enough to say that between Essенism in certain aspects and Christianity there are some points of resemblance; it could not very well be otherwise because Essenes was Judaic in its foundation and Christianity was partly its development but progressive. On the other hand, the differences are fundamental. That John the Baptist and Christ were Essenes are mere assumptions based on similarities which spring naturally and independently from asceticism and voluntary poverty. So likewise the pretended dependence between Essenism and monasticism can be resolved into necessary traits of any ascetic, communistic life (see "Wuku" in "Studien u. Mittheilungen der Ben. Cat. Orders", 1890, I, 223-30; Berliére in "Revue Budé", 1891, VIII, 12-190). The doctrine of Jesus and his disciples is a logical development of Esseneism" (Jewish Encyc.). The strict silence about any Messias is due partly perhaps to the secrecy of the Essenes and mainly no doubt to His rejection by their chronicler, Josephus. In fine, our present knowledge of the Essenes is slight and not all of it trustworthy, as its coloured and unhistorical. It has much weight. Ancient Authorities: Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber, xli, also extracts from his Apologia Jud, in Esseniut, Prop. Ewing, VIII, vi; Josephus, Bell. Jud., II, viii, London, 1841; Idem, Ant. Jud., XIII, v. 9; V. 4-5; XVIII, 5, etc., in tr. Complete Works (Paris, 1875), ed. Dendere: Pliny, Hist. Nat., VII, xvi-xvii; Hippolytus, Philosophumens (Cottoper, 1859), IX, Epiphanius, Harres, xix.

time he was frequently the bearer of pecuniary aid to his uncle, Nicolas Pieck, O.S.P., who was giving missions in Belgium; but the latter would not accept any help. In 1572, while Est was still at Louvain, a great catastrophe befell his native town, which was captured by the Calvinists. His father, brothers, and uncle were made prisoners and were in imminent danger of their lives. The father and brother escaped, but Nicolas Pieck, who was then Superior of the Franciscan convent at Gorecum and eighteen other ecclesiastics, were taken to Brielle, on the sea-coast, and put to death for the Catholic Faith with revolting brutality. Est wrote what is considered the best history of the Martyrs of Gorecum, who were canonized by Pius IX in 1867. From this history we learn many details about Est and his relatives.

When Est first arrived at Louvain he found the place in a ferment owing to the recently broached opinions of Busius (q. v.), one of the professors of Holy Scripture, and who held a leading position in the university all the time that Est was there. Violent controversy raged round the person of Busius during all that time. It is evident from the commentaries of Est that Busius was much influenced on questions of grace and free will by the teaching of his old professor, Busius; and on these points he has to be read with some caution. After having been made doctor, he continued teaching philosophy at Louvain two years longer. In 1582 he was made professor of theology at Douai, a position which he retained for three more years. He was also for many years rector of the diocesan seminary and during the last eighteen years of his life chancellor of the University of Douai. He was noted for his piety, modesty, and compassion for the poor, and greatly admired for his vast learning, solid judgment, and eloquence. He was afterwards styled *doctor funditusissimus* by the learned Pope Benedict XIV. Soon after he left Louvain a fresh controversy broke out there, into which he appears to have been drawn. About 1586 Lessius began to refute the errors of Busius in his ordinary course of lectures. The friends of Busius, who admired him for his edifying life, great learning, and manly submission, felt annoyed that his shortcomings should have been thus pointedly accentuated by their opponents. They attacked certain propositions of Lessius, resembling those of Molina and Suarez, and laid them condemned by the universal University of Louvain. The latter university of Douai added its condemnation (said to have been obtained under a misapprehension), and its terms were in still more violent language. It has been said, though on no very clear evidence, that the form of condemnation was drawn up by Est. There can be little doubt but that he was in favour of the condemnation. The whole controversy finally led up to the Congregatio de Auxiliis (q. v.). On mature examination the teaching of Lessius on grace etc. was found to be innocuous.

Most of Est's works, which were written in Latin, were not published until after his death. His greatest work is his "In omnibus Divi Pauli et Catholicae Epistolas Commentariis" (Douai, 1611-15; Mainz, 1858-60). There are several later editions, that of Mainz (1841-45, 7 vols.) being one of the best. To this work was prefixed the author's protestation of orthodoxy to the Church in which he declares that he desires to submit all things to the judgment of the Catholic Church and its supreme pastor and judge on earth, the Roman pontiff, and if anything has been spoken in error that it be considered as unadulterated. In his commentaries he everywhere endeavours to arrive at the literal meaning of the authorities, with great judgment, acumen, and erudition. He refutes objections, as occasion arises, with calmness and freedom from passion. No serious student of the Epistles can afford to neglect this work. Horne, a Protestant writer (Intro.d., London, 1834, II, 293), says that it is "a most valuable work, which Romanists and Protestants alike concur to recommend as an excellent critical help to the exposition of the Apostolic Epistles. The prefixed of Est are particularly valuable." His other works are: "Commentarii in IV libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi" (Douai, 1615); "Annotationes in libros praecipuorum et difficilliorum historiarum" (Douai, 1617); "Historia Martyrum Gorcomiensium" (Douai, 1603); also in the "Acta SS." for July, II, 754-847. He also translated the life of Blessed Edmund Campion, S.J., from French into Latin, and left copious notes for a new edition of the works of St. Augustine. *Historia Martyrum Gorcomiensium* (Douai, 1603). HUTHER, Nomenclator, vol. i, Estius and Lessius. RAPIN, Histoire du Jansénisme (Paris, 1840), I.

C. AMHERNE.

**Establishment (or Established Church).** The union of Church and State setting up a definite and distinctive relation between the two is frequently expressed in English by the use of the word "establishment", applied to such union in both Catholic and Protestant States, in connection with the doctrines of principle which characterize them. "The Establishment", or "the Established Church" is often used as a distinctive name for the ecclesiastical system established by law in Scotland, in Ireland (until 1869), and especially in England. The pre-Reformation Catholic Church of England believed that its establishment was the spontaneous act of the people; the distinctive feature of the post-Reformation Church is that it was imposed upon the people by legal enactment, and based upon the principle of royal supremacy. Papal jurisdiction was not simply swept away but was transferred entire to the Crown. And except for the brief return to Catholic unity under Mary (1553-1558) and during the Commonwealth (1649-1660), the arrangements then made have continued to limit the liberty of action of the Anglican body alike in matters doctrinal and disciplinary. Convocation cannot meet, discuss, or enact new canons without royal permission (25 Hen. VIII, c. 19); the effective nomination of archbishops and bishops, etc., rests with the Crown (25 Hen. VIII, c. 19); supreme spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction is annexed to the Crown (25 Hen. VIII, 19, cf. 1 Eliz., c. 1). Moreover the decrees of councils, synods, and litur- gies or doctrines has been permitted without the sanction of an act of Parliament. The term "by law established", as applied to the Church of England, is first met with in the canons of the Convocation of 1604 (c. iii), which declares that the Church of England by law established under the King's Majesty is a true and Apostolic Church. It is of frequent occurrence in subsequent statutes. The term "established" was applied to the prescribing and settling by law of the liturgical formularies of the English Church in the Act of Uniformity, 1558 (1 Eliz., c. 2, § 27). (See Anglicanism; Convocation of the English Clergy.)
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BERNARD WARD.

**Eaangi** JEAN-BAPTISTE-CHARLES-HENRI-HECTOR, COMTE D„ MARQUES DE SAILLAN, a French General, b. at the chateau of Raymont Mouton, Nov. 27, 1729; d. at Paris, 28 April, 1794. He first served in the army as a colonel of infantry. In 1757, having obtained the rank of brigadier-general, he went to the East Indies, with Lally-Tollendal. Made a prisoner at the siege of Madras (1759), he was set free.
on parole, entered the service of the French East India Company, and (with two vessels) destroyed the British factories in Sumatra and the Persian Gulf. He was on his way to France, in 1769, when he fell into the hands of the English and was sent to Plymouth. Released a second time, he was appointed lieutenant-general of the navy in 1763, and vice-admiral in 1777. One year later, he left Toulon in command of a fleet of twelve battleships and fourteen frigates with the intention of assisting the struggling American colonies against Great Britain. Unfavourable winds delayed him and so Admiral Howe's fleet escaped his pursuit and d'Estaing took possession of Newport (28 August). A great naval battle was about to take place, when a violent storm arose and dispersed the two fleets. After a short sojourn in Boston harbour, he sailed to the West Indies where he took St. Vincent and Grenada (4 July, 1779) and badly damaged Admiral Byron's fleet. His attempts to retake Savannah, in concert with the Americans, were unsuccessful; a severe wound obliged him to give up the enterprise. On his return to France, in 1780, he fell into disfavour at the court. Three years later, however, he was placed at the head of the Franco-Spanish fleet assembled before Cadiz, but peace was signed and no operations took place. He was then made a grandee of Spain. When the French Revolution broke out, he favoured the new idea. A member of the Assembly of Notables, he was named commandant of the National Guard at Versailles in 1789, and admiral in 1792. He constantly endeavoured to protect the king, and at the trial of Marie Antoinette in 1793 spoke in her favour. He was charged with being a reactionary and was sent to the scaffold, 28 April, 1794. In his moments of leisure, he wrote a poem, "Le Rêve" (1755), a tragedy, "Les Thermopyles" (1789), and a book on the colonies. 

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Esther (Heb. אסתר, star; happiness; Sept. "Esthēs"). Queen of Persia, and wife of Assuerus, who is identified with Xerxes (485-465 B.C.). She was a Jewess of the tribe of Benjamin, daughter of Abihail, and bore before her accession to the throne the name of Edissa (אִדִּיסָה, Haydēsāh, myrtle). Her family had been deported from Jerusalem to Babylon in the time of Jehochina (599 B.C.). On the day of her death her parents she was adopted by her father's brother, Mardochoai, who then dwelt in Susian, the capital of Persia. King Assuerus being angered at the refusal of his wife Vashti to respond to his invitation to attend a banquet begged her to use her influence with the king and thus avert the threatening danger. At first she feared to enter the presence of the king unsummoned, for to do so was a capital offence. But, on the earnest entreaty of her uncle, she consented to approach after three days, which with her maid she would pass in fasting and prayer, and during which she requested her uncle to have all the Jews in the city fast and pray.

On the third day Esther appeared before the king, who received her graciously and promised to grant her request whatever it might be. She then asked him and Aman to dine with her. At the banquet they accepted her invitation to dine with her again on the following day. Aman, carried away by the joy that this honour gave him, issued orders for the erection of a gallows on which he purposed to hang the hated Mardochoai. But that night the king, being sleepless, ordered the chronicles of the nation to be read to him. Learning that Mardochoai had never been rewarded for his service in revealing the plot of the eunuchs, he asked Aman, the next day, to suggest a suitable reward for one "whom the king desired to honour." Thinking it was himself that the king had in mind, Aman suggested the use of the king's apparel and insignia. These the king ordered to be bestowed on Mardochoai. At the second banquet, when the king returned to Esther his offer to grant her whatever she might ask, she informed him of the plot of Aman which involved the destruction of the whole Jewish
people to which she belonged, and pleaded that they should be spared. The king ordered that Aman should be hanged on the gibbet prepared for Mardochoai, and, confiscating his property, bestowed it upon the intended victim. He charged Mardochoai to address to all the governors of Persia letters to the Jews to defend themselves and to kill all those who, by virtue of the previous decree, should attack them. During two days the Jews took a bloody revenge on their enemies in Susan and other cities. Mardochoai then instituted the feast of Purim (lots) which he exhorted the Jews to celebrate in memory of the day which Aman had determined for their destruction, but which had been turned by Esther into a day of triumph. The foregoing story of Esther is taken from the Book of Esther as found in the Vulgate. Jewish traditions place the tomb of Esther at Hamadan (Echatana). The Fathers of the Church considered Esther as a type of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In her poems have found a favourite subject. (R. Schwartz, Esther im deutschen u. neulateinischen Drama des Reformationszeitalters, Oldenburg, 1894.)

Book of Esther.—In the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, the Book of Esther has been used by later writers under the title of "Esther," sometimes also as "the Esther." But the Jewish rabbis called it also the "volumen Esther," or simply "the volume" (meqillah) to distinguish it from the other four volumes (megilloth), written on separate rolls, which were read in the synagogues on certain feast days. As the body of the text furnished a number of facts about Purim and Esther, the Book of Esther was largely composed of epistles (cf. Esth., ix, 20, 29), which was called the "Epistle of Purim" in the Hebrew canon. The book was found in the Hagiographa and placed after Ecclesiastes. In the Latin Vulgate it has always been classed with Tobit and Judith, under which title it is put in the Vulgate, that is, the parts of the text which has come down to us varies considerably from those of the Septuagint and the Vulgate. The Septuagint, besides showing how many important divergencies, contains several additions in the body of the book or at the end. The additions are the portion of the Vulgate text after ch. x, 3. Although no trace of these fragments is found in the Hebrew Bible, they are most probably translations from an original Hebrew or Chaldaic text. Origen tells us that they existed in Theodotion's version, and that they were used by Josephus in his "Antiquities" (xv. i.). St. Jerome, finding them in the Septuagint and the Old Latin version, placed them at the end of his almost literal translation of the existing Hebrew text, and indicated the place where they occupy in the Septuagint. The chapters being thus rearranged, the book may be divided into two parts: the first relating the events which preceded and led up to the decree authorizing the extermination of the Jews (i-iii, 15; xi, 2; xiii, 7), the second showing how the Jews escaped from their enemies and avenged themselves (iv-v, 8; xi-xv).

The Book of Esther, thus taken in part from the Hebrew Canon in and part from the Septuagint, found a place in the Christian Canon of the O.T. The chapters taken from the Septuagint were considered deuterocanonical, and, after St. Jerome, were separated from the ten chapters taken from the Hebrew which were called protocanonical (see Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures). Among the Fathers many of the Greek and Latin Fathers clearly considered the entire work as inspired, although no one among them found it to its purpose to write a commentary on it. Its omission in some of the early catalogues of the Scriptures was accidental or unimportant. The first to reject the book was Luther, who declared that he could not find that it existed that it did not exist (Table Talk, 59). His first followers wished only to reject the deuterocanonical parts, whereupon these, as well as other deuterocanonical parts of the Scriptures, were declared by the Council of Trent (Dec. IV, de Can. Scripture) to be canonical and inspired. With the rise of rationalism the opinion of Luther found many supporters. When modern rationalists argue that the Book of Esther is irreverent in character, unlike the other books of the O.T., and therefore to be rejected, they have in mind only the first or proto- canonical part, not the entire book. The Jewish rabbis who declared that it contained nothing unworthy of a place in the Sacred Scriptures. And any way, as Driver points out (Introd. to the Lit. of the O.T.), there is no reason why every part of the Biblical record should be rejected if it is simply religious. But, although the first part is not explicitly religious, it contains nothing unworthy of a place in the Sacred Scriptures. And any way, as Driver points out (Introd. to the Lit. of the O.T.), there is no reason why every part of the Biblical record should be rejected if it is simply religious. But, although the first part is not explicitly religious, it contains nothing unworthy of a place in the Sacred Scriptures.

As to the authorship of the Book of Esther there is nothing but conjecture. The Talmud (Baba Bathra 19°) assigns it to the great Synagogue; St. Clement of Alexandria ascribes it to Mardochoai; St. Augustine suggests Esdras as the author. Many, noting the writer's familiarity with Persian customs and institutions and with the character of Assuerus, hold that he was a contemporary of Mardochoai, whose memoirs he used. But such memoirs and other contemporary documents showing this familiar knowledge could have been written only by a later author, and although the absence in the text of allusion to Jerusalem seems to lead to the conclusion that the book was written and published in Persia at the end of the reign of Xerxes I (485-465 b. c.) or during the reign of his son Artaxerxes I (465-425 b. c.), the text seems to show of reason in favour of a later date. They: (1) an implied statement that Susan had ceased to be the capital of Persia, and a vague description of the extent of the kingdom (i, 1); (2) an explanation of Persian usages that implies unfamiliarity with them (cf. Esth., ix, 13, 19, xiv, 17, 19; (3) the unimpassioned attitude of the Jews towards the Gentiles, by whom they felt they had been wronged, and with whom they wished to have little to do (iii, 8 sqq.); (4) a dictum showing many late words and a deterioration in syntax; (5) references to the Macedonians and to the plot of Aman as an attempt to transfer the "kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians" (xvi, 10, 14). On the strength of these passages various modern critics have assigned late dates for the authorship of the book, as, 155 b. c., 167 b. c., 208 b. c., the beginning of the third century b. c., or the early years of the reign of the Great Antiochus, who began 332 b.c. The majority accept the last opinion. Some of the modern critics have fixed upon dates for the composition of the book that it has any historical value whatever, and declare it to be a work of the imagination, written for the purpose of popularizing the feast of Purim. In support of their contention they point out in the text what appear to be historical improbabilities, and attempt to show that the narrative has all the characteristics of a romance, the various incidents being artfully arranged so as to form a series of contrasts and to develop into a climax. But what seem to be historical improbabilities are in many cases trivial. Even advanced critics do not agree as to those which seem quite serious. While some, for instance, consider it wholly improbable that Assuerus and Aman should have been ignorant of the great waste of the Great Antiochus in frequent communication with Mardochoai, a well-known Jew, others maintain that it was quite possible and probable that a young woman, known to a Jewess, should be taken into the harem of a Persian king, and that with the assistance of a relative she could have influenced the people with high official had endeavoured to effect. The seeming improbability of other passages, if not entirely explained, can be sufficiently explained to destroy the conclusion, on this ground, that the book is not historical. As to artful contrasts and climax which appeal is made as evidences that the book is the work
of a mere romancer, it may be said with Driver (op. cit.) that fact is stranger than fiction, and that a conclusion based upon such appearances is precarious. There is undoubtedly an exercise of art in the composition of the work, but no more than any historian may undertake: rearranging and arranging the incidents of history. A more generally accepted opinion among contemporary critics is that the work is substantially historical. Recognizing the author’s close acquaintance with Persian customs and institutions, they hold that the main elements of the work were supplied to him by tradition, but that, to satisfy his taste for dramatic effect, he introduced details which were not strictly historical. But the opinion held by most Catholics and by some Protestants is, that the work is historical in substance and in detail. They base their conclusions especially on the following: (1) the vivacity and simplicity of the narrative; (2) the precise and circumstantial details, as, particularly, the naming of unimportant personages, the noting of dates and events; (3) the references to the annals of the Persians; (4) the absence of anachronisms; (5) the agreement of proper names with the time in which the story is placed; (6) the confirmation of details by history and archaeology; (7) the celebration of the feast of Purim in commemoration of the deliverance of the Jews by Esther and Mardochai at the time of the Machabees (II Mach., xv, 37), at the time of Josephus (Antiq. of the Jews, XI, vi, §3), and suc- cession, limit and tradition, as well as by the Schoolmen. The Jews were, it is true, of the opinion that the story of Esther was engrafted on a Jewish feast already existing and probably connected with a Persian festival, is only a surmise. Nor has any one else suc- ceeded better in offering an explanation than that it had its origin as stated in the Book of Esther.


A. L. McMAHON.

Etiennot de la Serre, CLAUDE, Benedictine of the Congregation of Saint-Maur, b. at Varennes, France, 1639; d. at Rome, 1899. He joined the Benedictines at Vendôme and was professed there in 1658. After teaching humanities for a short time to the junior monks at Pontlevoy, he was, at the instance of Dom Luc d’Achéry, sent to the Abbey of St-George-des-Prés, Paris, where his aptitude for study and research was quickly discovered by Dom Mabillon, whose intimate friend and fellow-worker he became. Together they journeyed on foot through Flanders, visiting all its chief monastic libraries. In 1670 he was made sub-prior of St-Martin’s, Pontoise, a history of which abbey, in three volumes, was his first published work. Between 1673 and 1682 he compiled his chief work, entitled “Antiquités Bénédictines”, in which the monastic traditions of France are recorded under the headings of the different dioceses. In 1684 he was ap- pointed procurator for his congregation in the Curia Romana, which post required his residence in Rome for the remainder of his life. On his way thither from Paris he visited numerous monasteries and collected a great quantity of material, which he sent back to Dom Mabillon and most of which found its way into the “Annales O.S.B.” or the “Gallia Christiana.” During the fifteen years he lived in Italy he laboured faithfully on behalf of his congregation, and he was also greatly trusted by the French bishops, for whom he acted in many matters of ecclesiastical business. He enjoyed the entire confidence of several popes and other high officials of the Church, and he is described as combining all the qualities of a man of letters with great business ability. Besides the history of Pontlevoy and the “Antiquités”, he already mentioned, he collected sixteen volumes of fragments historicorum, but though he did not publish much under his own name, he worked incessantly in the chief libraries of Italy, all of which were open to him, and the results of his researches he forwarded to Dom Mabillon and others at St-George-des-Prés, to whom they were of the greatest service. He was buried in the church of the Minims of SS. Trinité de’ Monti.

Tassin, Hist. lit. de la cong. de St-Maur (Brussels, 1770). G. Cyprian Alston.

Eastergom, Diocese of. See Gran.

Eternal Gospel. See Joachim of Flora.

Eternity (aternum, originally aveternum, adavoy, son-long) is defined by Boecius (De Consol. Phil., VI, vi) as “possession, without successor and perfect, of interminable life” (interminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possitio). The definition, which was adopted by the Schoolmen, and least and especially for the determination of the faith properly so called, that of God, implies four things: that eternity is (1) a life, (2) without beginning or end, (3) or succession, and (4) of the most perfect kind. God not only is or exists, but lives. The notion of life, like all notions, is a product of the human mind; is, when applied to God, but analogously. He not only does not live precisely as anything else with which we are acquainted lives; He does not even exist as anything else exists. Our notions of life and existence are derived from creatures, in which life implies change, and it is therefore necessary that we should coinside with God in involving composition. In God there can be no composition or change or imperfection of any kind, but all is pure act or being. The agnostic, however, is not thereby justified in saying that we can know nothing and should predicate nothing of God. It is true that, however we conceive Him or in whatever terms we speak of Him, our ideas and terminology are utterly barren and unworthy of Him. Yet, even while arguing in this way, the agnostic thinks and speaks of Him as really as we do; nor can he or we do otherwise, compelled as we are to trace things back to their first cause. Yielding to this necessity, we can talk and speak of Him in the highest and most spiritual terms known to us; not merely as existing, for instance, but as living; correcting at once, as far as we can, the form of our thought and predication, by adding that the Divine life is perfect, free from the least trace of defect. That is how and why we represent the Di- vine existence as a life. It is a life, moreover, not only without beginning or end but also without succession —tota simul, that is without past or future; a never-changing instant or “now”. It is not so difficult to form some faint notion of a duration which never be- gins, but it is not easy to form an image of a duration which never ends. We hope that our own life shall be endless; and materialists have accustomed us to the notion of a series stretching backward without limit in time, to the notion of a material universe that never came into being but was always there. The Divine existence is that, and much more; it has a past, a success into right line—a line of separate dots; then a continuous line within two limits, beginning and end. The line can be, is not, divided into parts, shorter lines or dots, and the whole is finite both ways. It is like and yet unlike a finite spirit; like, since it has no actual parts or divisions and is limited; yet unlike since it
Eternity may be divided, whereas a spirit cannot be divided. Spirit exists whole and entire wherever it exists at all; and though it may fill the space occupied by a human body, let us say, it is whole and entire in every possible part of it; not quite unlike the continuous line. If we further suppose the end or limits of the line to be moved, of the earth’s axis, for instance, as extending indefinitely into space, the line is not only continuous or unbroken but infinite, without end or beginning, yet still divisible; like, but so unlike, the immensity of God. For God is a spirit, and as the human soul fills the space occupied by the body to which it is united, yet is whole and entire in every possible part of that space, so God fills all space whatsoever, extending without limit in all directions, and yet is whole and entire everywhere, in the smallest conceivable point, in the very loose or improper sense in which we may think or speak of God as being “whole.” Even the spatial relations of the soul to the body are far removed as compared to those which God’s existence bears to that of creatures and the spaces in which they exist or may exist. For however free from extension created spirits may be, they are not incapable of real internal change, real motion within themselves; whereas God, filling all space, is incapable of the least change or motion, but is so truly the same throughout that He is best conceived as an infinitely extended point, the same here, there, everywhere.

If, now, we apply to the time-line what we have been affording of that of space, the infinite, unchangeable point which was immensity before the real succession of separate acts or changes (which is known as “time”); nor even the continuous duration of a being which is changeless in its substance, however it may vary in its actions (which is what St. Thomas understands by “eternity”); but an endless line of existence and action which not only is not actually interrupted, but is incapable of interruption or of the least change or movement whatsoever. And as, if one instant should pass away and another succeed, the present becoming past and the future present, there is necessarily a change or movement of instances; so, if we are not to be irreverent in our concept of God, but to represent Him as best we can, we must try to conceive Him as excluding all, even the least, change or succession; and his duration, consequently, as being without even a possible past or future, but a never beginning, never-ending, absolutely unchangeable “now.” That is how eternity is presented in Catholic philosophy and theology. The notion is of special interest in helping us to realize, however faintly, the relations of God to created things, especially with regard to His foreknowledge. In Him there is no before or after, and therefore no foreknowledge, objectively; the distinction which we are wont to draw between His knowledge of intelligence or science or previsions and His knowledge of vision is merely our way of representing things, natural enough to us, but not by any means objective or real in Him. There is no real objective distinction between His intention, nor between either of these and the Divine substance, in which there is no possibility of difference or change. That infinitely perfect substantial intelligence, immense as it is eternal, and withinal existing entire and immutable as an indivisible point in space and as an indivisible instant in time, is coextensive, in the sense of being intimately present, with the space-extension and the time-succession of all creatures; not beside them, nor parallel with them, nor before or after them; but present in and with them, sustaining them, co-operating with them, and therefore seeing—not foreseeing; and this every point in the space-extension, or at any instant of the time-extension, in which they may exist or operate. God may be considered as an immovable point in the centre of a world which, whether as a more or less closely connected group of granulated individuals, or as an absolutely continuous ether mass, turns round Him as a sphere may be supposed to turn in all directions round its centre (St. Thomas, Cont. Gent., I, c. lxi). The imagery, however, must be corrected by noting that in the time-line God’s duration is an ever-moving, though here and there continuous, circle. The space and time relations are constantly changing between Him and the moving things around Him, not through any change in Him, but only by reason of the constant change in them. In them there is before and after, but not in Him. Who is equally present to them all, no matter how or when they may have come into being, or how they may succeed one another in time or in space. Some of them are free acts; and almost from the time the human mind began to speculate on these questions, and whereas there are any even of rudimentary speculations of the question has arisen and does arise as to how an act can be free not to happen if, as we suppose, God’s absolutely infallible foresight saw from all eternity that it was to be. To this Catholic philosophy supplies the only answer which can be given; that it is not true to say that God either saw or foresaw an act which He will see, but only that He sees it. And as my seeing you act does not interfere with your freedom of action, but I see you acting freely or necessarily, as the case may be, so God sees all finite things, quiescent or active, of necessity or freely, according as what may be objectively real, without the least interfering thereby with the mode or quality of their existence or of their action. Here again, however, care must be taken not to conceive the Divine knowledge as being determined by what the finite may be or do; somewhat as we see things because the knowledge is borne in upon us from what we see. It is not from the finite that God gets His knowledge, but from His own Divine essence, in which all things are represented or mirrored as they are, existing or merely possible, necessary or free. On this aspect of the question see God. When, if asked or tempted to ask, what God did or where He was before time and place began, with the creation of the world, the answer must be a denial of the legitimacy of the supposition that He was “before.” It is only in relation to the finite and mutable that there can be a before and after. And when we say, that, as faith teaches, the world was created in time and was not from eternity, our meaning should not be that the existence of the Creator stretched back infinitely before He brought the world into being; but rather that while His existence remains an unchangeable present, without possibility of before or after, of change or succession outside the Divine existence, to each instant of which it corresponds as the centre does to any point in the circumference, had a beginning, and might have extended indefinitely further backward, without, however, escaping the omnipresence of the eternal “now.” (See Billot, De Deo Uno et Trino, p. 222).

So far for the strict or proper notion of eternity, as applying solely to the Divine existence. There is a wide or improper sense in which we are wont to represent as eternal what is merely endless succession in time, without any instant of the time-line being a point of the space-extension, or at any instant of the time-extension, in which they may exist or operate. God may be considered as an immovable point in the centre of a world which, whether as a more or less closely connected group of granulated individuals,
ETHELBERT
represented as standing with one foot on sea and one on land, and swearing by Him that liveth forever that time shall be no more. Whatever the meaning of the oath may be, it has found an echo in our religious terminology, and we are wont to think and say that with death, and especially with the Last Judgment, time shall be no more.

The meaning is not that there will be no more succession of any kind; but that there will be no substantial change or corruption in what survives death, the soul; or in the body that shall have been raised from the dead; or in the heavens and earth as they shall be renewed after Christ's second coming. Therefore, no matter what an individual life may be, the doctrine that in the future life of souls, whether in heaven or in hell, succession will be accidental, the act in which their essential happiness or misery will consist being continuous and unbroken vision and love, or blinded wrong vision and hatred, of God. This kind of duration is in our ordinary language spoken of as life or death eternal, by a kind of participation, in a wide or improper sense, in the character of the Divine eternity (Billot, op. cit., 119).

Questions of the greatest importance have been raised as to the possibility of an eternal world, in the sense of a world of matter, such as we know, having never had a beginning and therefore not needing a first cause; also as to the possibility of eternal creation, in the sense of a being, with or without succession, having had no beginning of existence and yet having been created by God (see Creation). For other questions as to eternity see Heave. Held, "Eternal life" is a term applied times applied to the state and life of grace, even before death; this being the initial stage or seed, as it were, of the never-ending life of bliss in heaven, which, by a species of metonymy, is regarded as present in it, of the state of grace. This, if we are true to ourselves and to God, is sure to pass into the second stage, the true life eternal.

The basis of all later treatment of the question of eternity is that of St. Thomas, I, Q. N. For a fuller exposition, see Suarez, De Deo, I, iv.; Ibid., Metaphysics, disp. I. ii. sq.; Lessius, De perfectionibus divinum, I. For the teaching of such non-Christian philosophers as (Baly, Arisotle, and the Neo-Platonists), see also of the Fathers, see Petavius, De Deo, III, iii. iv. In the same chapters he discusses the meaning of the term dorm. For the testimony of the Fathers as to the possibility of creation from eternity, see Petavius, op. cit., vi. But the doctrine may be found in the ordinary handbooks of philosophy, on ontology and natural theology; also in the various treatises De Deo Uno.

WALTER MCDONALD.

ETHELBERT, SAINT, date of birth unknown; d. 794; King of the East Angles, was, according to the "Speculum Historiale" of Richard of Cirencester (d. about 1401), the son of King Ethelred and Leofrâne, a lady of Mercia. Brought up in piety, he was elected king on Ethelred's death, ruled wisely, and was a man of singular humility. Urged to marry, he declared his preference for a life of celibacy, but at length consented to woo Alithra (Aldrêce), daughter of Offa, King of the Mercians. Leofrâne foreboded evil and told Ethelbert to decline the princess; but in spite of an earth quake, an eclipse of the sun, and a warning vision, he proceeded from Bury St. Edmunds to Villa Australis, where Offa resided. On his arrival Alithra expressed her admiration for Ethelbert, declaring that Offa ought to accept him as suzerain. Cynethryth, the queen-mother, urged by hatred of Ethelbert, so poisoned Offa's mind against him, that he accepted the offer of a certain Grimbert to murder their guest. Ethelbert, having come for an interview with Offa, was bound and beheaded by Grimbert. The body was buried ignominiously, but, revealing itself by a heavenly light, it was translated to the cathedral of Hereford, where many miracles attested Ethelbert's sanctity. The head was enshrined at Westminster Abbey.

The "Chronicon" of John Brompton (fl. 1437) adds a few particulars: the body with the head was first buried on the banks of the Lugg. On the third night the saint commanded one Brittrid, a nobleman, to convey his relics to Stratus-way. During the journey the head fell out of the cart and healed a man who had been blind for eleven years. Finally the body was translated to Farnley, the present Hereford. According to Brompton, Althair, Ethelred's son, became a saint of that land. Offa repented of his sin (Matthew of Paris relates Offa as ignorant of the plot till after Ethelbert's murder), gave much land to the martyr, "which the church of Hereford holds to the present day", founded St. Albans and other monasteries, and made his historic pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Ethelbert. St. Ethelbert figures largely in the Missal, Breviary, and Hymnal of the Use of Hereford. His feast is on 20 May. Thirteen English churches, besides Hereford cathedral, are dedicated in honour of Ethelbert; and one of the gateways of Norwich cathedral bears his name.


PATRICK RYAN.

ETHELBERT, SAINT, King of Kent, b. 552; d. 24 February, 616; son of Eormenric, through whom he was descended from Hengest. He succeeded his father, in 560, as King of Kent and made a successful attempt to win from Cæanwulf of Wessex the overlordship of Britain. His political importance was doubtless advanced by his marriage with Bertha, daughter of Charibert, King of the Franks (see Benicia). A noble disposition to fair dealing is argued by his giving her the old Roman church of St. Martin in his capital of Cantwarburgh (Canterbury) and offering her every opportunity for the exercise of her religion, although he himself had been reared, and remained, a worshipper of Odin. The same natural virtue, combined with a quaint spiritual caution and, on the other hand, a large instinct of hospitality, appears in his message to St. Augustine when, in 597, the Apostle of England landed on the Kentish coast (see Augustine of Canterbury).

In the interval between Ethelbert's defeat by Cæanwulf and the arrival of the English missionaries, the death of the Wessex king had left Ethelbert, at least virtually, supreme in southern Britain, and his baptism, which took place on Whitensunday next following the landing of Augustine (2 June, 597) had such an effect in deciding the minds of his wavering countrymen that as many as 10,000 are said to have followed his example within a few months. Thenceforward Ethelbert became the watchful father of the infant Anglo-Saxon Church. He founded the church which in after-ages was to be the primate cathedral of all England, besides other churches at Rochester and Canterbury. But, although he permitted, and even helped, Augustine to convert a heathen temple into the church of St. Pancras (Canterbury), he never compelled his heathen subjects to accept baptism. Moreover, as the lawgiver who issued their first written laws to the English people (the nine "Books of Ethelbert", A. D. 604) he holds in English history a place thoroughly consistent with his character as the temporal founder of that see which did more than any other for the upbuilding of free and orderly political institutions in Christendom. When St. Mellitus had converted Siebert, King of the East Saxons, whose capital was London, and it was proposed to make that see the metropolitan, Ethelbert, supported by Augustine, successfully resisted the attempt, and thus fixed for more than nine centuries the individual character of the English Church. He left three children, of whom the only son, Eadbald, lived and died a pagan.
Ethelbert, ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, England, date of birth uncertain; d. 8 Nov., 781 or 782. The name also appears as AELBERT, ALDERBERT, AELBERHT, ALDERBERT, ALBERHT, EADBERHT, and EALBERT.

He was the teacher and intimate friend of Alcuin, whose poem on the saints and prelates of the Church of York, "De Santi et Pontificibus Ecclesiae Eboracensis," is the principal source of information concerning Ethelbert's life. He was a kinsman of his predecessor Archbishop Egbert (brother to Eadberht, King of Northumbria) and a pupil in the school which Egbert founded at York. When he reached man's estate, Egbert ordained him priest and made him master of the school. Among his pupils was Alcuin, who has left us an affectionate description of him, from which we learn how varied his erudition was—grammar, rhetoric, law, poetry, astronomy, natural history, and Sacred Scripture being all mentioned as subjects in which he instructed his pupils. He is described as a small, thin-statured, gentle to the docile, while of those who were scholars after his own heart it is said "hos sibi conjuxit, docius, nutritiv, amat ivi!" His ready sympathy won the affection of his students, while his strenuous energy urged them on to further progress. Even after Egbert became archbishop, he continued himself the duty of lecturing on the New Testament, while he entrusted the work of explaining the Old Testament to Ethelbert. As a keen scholar he loved books ardent and spared no pains in forming a library at York, which was probably the largest collection of books to be found outside Rome. Among the books enumerating many of these, mentions several Latin and Greek classical authors, as well as the Fathers and other Christian writers. Ethelbert, in his search for books, travelled far, and we know that he visited Rome among other places. Everywhere his learning and power of sympathy won for him friends, so that his influence for good was widespread and he ranks as one of the foremost among the promoters of education in the eighth century.

In 766 Archbishop Egbert died, and Ethelbert was unanimously chosen to succeed him. He was consecrated 707, and received the pallium from Adrian I in 773. As archbishop he continued his simple and laborious life, working with such success that he is regarded as one of the founders of the Church of York. He set himself to rebuild the minster which had been destroyed by fire in 741. It is impossible to obtain certain information as to the extent of his work, but Alcuin speaks as though he began, finished, and consecrated it:

Ast nova basilicie minre structura diebus
Presulis hujus erat jam capta, peracta, sacra.

He then retired to a cell where he spent some time in devotion. Shortly before his death, in the autumn of 781 or 782, he appeared once more in public that he might consecrate the cathedral which was now complete. Ten days later he died and was buried in his church at York. Alcuin, his father, and composed in his honour the splendid panegyric (lines 1394–1595) which is the gem of the poem on the Church of York. To him Ethelbert—or Elbert, as he calls him—was both pontiff and saint, "Jam cui Christus amor, potus, cibus, omnin Christus?"


Edwin Burton.
Ethelhard (ÆTHELHARD, ETHELHARD), fourteenth Archbishop of Canterbury, England, date of birth unknown; d. 12 May, 805. Much obscurity surrounds the details of his life previous to his election. He is described by Symeon of Durham as “Abbas Hludensis” but it is uncertain what monastery he is thus designated. It has been variously located at Louth in Lincolnshire (the most probable identification), Lydd, and Luddesdown in Kent, and at Malmesbury. William of Malmesbury is certainly mistaken in identifying him with Ethelhard, ninth Bishop of Winchester.

The rise of Offa, King of the Mercians (757–796), had divided England into three great states: Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex. The king sought to consolidate his kingdom by giving it an independent ecclesiastical organization; for although Northumbria had its own archbishopric at York, Mercia, after conquering Kent, was still ecclesiastically subject to the powerful see of Canterbury, then ruled over by Jaenbert (760–791). Offa’s scheme was to weaken Canterbury’s influence by dividing the southern province, and creating a Mercian archbishopric at Lichfield: this he successfully accomplished when on the occasion of the Legatine visit of George and Theophylact, sent by Pope Hadrian I (772–795) in 786–788, Higbert received the pallium as Archbishop of Lichfield, and Canterbury was left with only London, Winchester, Sherborne, Rochester, and Selsey as suffragan sees. On the death of Jaenbert (12 Aug., 791), Ethelward was raised to the see through the influence of Offa, which makes it likely that he was a Mercian abbot. Although he was elected in 791, his consecration only took place on 21 July, 793: the delay being probably due to the unwillingness of the Kentish clergy and people to receive a Mercian archbishop, and to his being consecrated by the Archbishop of Lichfield. Had Offa’s policy of separate ecclesiastical organization prevailed, it would have impeded the attainment of national unity, and its defeat by Ethelhard is an event of the greatest importance in the history of the making of the English nation. During Offa’s time little could be done to restore Canterbury’s rights and prestige. The year 796 was full of incident: the nobles of Kent rose in arms, and rallying round Eadbert Præna, a cleric and a member of their royal house, endeavoured to shake off the yoke of the Mercian Offa. To Ethelward’s difficulties increased Alethea had entreated him not to desert his Church; but after taking severe ecclesiastical measures against the recalcitrant cleric he was obliged to flee. Ethelward was consecrated by the Archbishop of Lichfield, and in the fore going year, about 13 Dec., Cenwulf succeeded in Mercia, but the struggle continued in Kent until the capture of Eadbert in 798.

The co-operation of Ethelhard and Cenwulf in deposing Eadbert, and in upholding the Mercian cause in Kent, increased the importance of Canterbury, and the archiepiscopal authority of Higbert waned. Cenwulf retained an estate taken from Canterbury by Offa, and wrote in 798 to Pope Leo asking him to examine into the question of the diminution of the rights of that see, and enclosing a letter from Ethelhard and his suffragans. Ethelward meanwhile had returned to Mercia, and Alfcild having increased his power was entertaining the idea of conquering the land and deserting the Church. The success of Abbot Wada’s mission to Rome, the tone of the letter of Leo III to Cenwulf, and the successful conference with Eanbald II of York, with reference to the restoration of the rights of his see, determined Ethelward to set out for Rome in 801. Although he stood in good stead; he sent a servant to meet him at St. Jossa-sur-mer, and furnished him with letters of recommendation to Charles the Great. Success attended his efforts in Rome. Pope Leo III (795–816) granted his request, and ended the dispute between Canterbury and Lichfield by depriving Lichfield of its recently acquired honours and powers. The pope’s decision was officially acknowledged by the Council of Clovesho on 12 Oct., 803, in presence of Cenwulf and his Witan, and Higbert was deprived of his pallium, in spite of Alcuin’s plea that so good a man should be spared that humiliation.

It is during Ethelward’s occupancy of the See of Canterbury that we first meet with official records of the profession of faith and obedience made by the English bishops-elect to their metropolitan. The first document of that type is the profession of obedience to the See of Canterbury made in 796 by Bishop Wulf of Linsay, who, as a suffragan of Lichfield, ought to have been consecrated by Higbert: it would appear to coincide with the collapse of Higbert’s archiepiscopal authority at the death of Offa.


Edward Myers.

Ethelwold, Saint, Bishop of Winchester was born there of good parentage in the early years of the tenth century; d. 1 Aug., 984. After a youth spent at the court of King Athelstan, Ethelwold placed himself under Elphege the Bald, Bishop of Winchester, who gave him the tonsure and consecrated him with Dunstan. At Glastonbury, where he was dean under Saint Dunstan, he was a mirror of perfection. In 955 he became Abbot of Abingdon; and 29 November, 963, was consecrated Bishop of Winchester by Dunstan, with whom and Oswald of Worcester he worked zealously in combating the general corruption occasioned by the Danish invasions. At Winchester, both in the old and in his new minster (see Swineth), he replaced the evil-living seculars with monks and refounded the ancient nunnery. His labours extended to Chertsey, Milton (Dorsetshire), Ely, Peterborough, and Thorney, expelling the unworthy, rebuilding and restoring: to the rebellious “terrible as a lion”, to the meek “gentler than a dove”. The epithet “father of monks” and “benevolent bishop” summarize Ethelwold’s character as reformer and friend of Christ’s poor. Though he suffered much ill-health, his life as scholar, teacher, and royal counsellor was ever austere. He was buried in Winchester cathedral, his body being translated later by Elphege, his successor. Abingdon monastery in the twelfth century had relics of Ethelwold. He is said to have written a treatise on the origin of law, translated the “Regularia Concordia”. His feast is kept on 1 August.

Not to be confounded with the foregoing are (2) St. Ethelwold, monk of Ripon, anchoret at Lindisfarne, d. about 720; feast kept 23 March; and (3) St. Ethelwold, Abbot of Melrose, Bishop of Lindisfarne, d. c. 740; feast kept 12 February.

Primary sources for Ethelwold of Winchester are Chronicon de Abingdon, in Rolls Series, passim, especially his Life, by Edmund Stubbs, in E. D. L., VII, 187–192; and the Life of Ethelwold, in The Life and Times of the Bishops of Winchester, in Acta SS., August, I, 83 sqq. Of. also Memorials of Dunstan, in Rolls Series, 6, 43 (Lond., 1849). Bollandists, Bibl. hagiog., 398; Chevaller, Répertoire, 1867; Stanton, 376; Hunt, in Dict. Nat. Biog., XVIII, 37. For Ethelwold’s beneficentus, see Archaeologia, XXIV, 1841; and Considerations of Dunstan, in Rolls Series, 6, 43 (Lond., 1849), 190; Bollandists, Bibl. hagiog., 398; Chevaller, Répertoire, 1867, 316; and Stanton, 376; Hunt, in Dict. Nat. Biog., XVIII, 37.

For Ethelwold’s Benedictional, see Archaeologia, XXIV, 1841; and Considerations of Dunstan, in Rolls Series, 6, 43 (Lond., 1849), 190; Bollandists, Bibl. hagiog., 398; Chevaller, Répertoire, 1867, 316; and Stanton, 376; Hunt, in Dict. Nat. Biog., XVIII, 37.

For (2) Acta SS., March, III, 448, with citations from Bede, Life of St. Cuthbert; Stanton, Mevlesi, Chevaller, Répertoire, 1867, 316.

For (3) Acta SS., Feb., II, 604; Stanton, 63; Chevaller.

Patrick Ryan.

Ethernianus, Hugh and Leo, brothers, Tuscan by birth, employed at the court of Constantineople under the Emperor Manuel I (Comnenus, 1143–1180). Their name is spelled in various ways: Ethernianus, Etherianus, Erothianus, etc. Leo is of little importance. We know from his brother (Adv. Graec. I, 290) that he was “occupied in translating the imperial
letters", evidently an interpreter for Latin correspondence. Hugh, who does not seem to have held any official post at court, but was a very learned theologian, had many opportunities of discussing the questions at issue between the Orthodox and Catholics (see note on Dr. Grose, p. 165, col. 1). As a result of these disputes he wrote a work in three books: "De heresibus quas Graeci in Latinos devolvunt, sive quod Spiritus Sanctus ex utroque Patre et Filio procedit" (P. L., CCII, generally quoted as "Adv. Graecos"). This work, the first exhaustive and scientific defence of the doctrine of the Trinity, was composed in both languages, Latin and Greek. The author sent copies to the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Aimerikos, and to Pope Alexander III (1159-1181), whose letter of acknowledgement is still extant (Ep. xlix, Baroinius, an. 1177, n. 37, 38). Hugh Etherius by this treatise obtains a very important place among Catholic controversialists against the Eastern Church. It appears that the emperor, who was well disposed towards Latins, had suggested that he should write it, having asked him whether they have "any authorities of saints who say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son" (ib. Praef. 1. CCII, col. 1). Hugh had used his knowledge of Greek and his opportunities of studying their Fathers so well that he was able to produce texts from nearly all the recognized authorities on both sides. He quotes especially Sts. Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil, Gregory NAZIANZEN. CHRYSOSTOM, JOHN Chrysostome, etc. From the Latins he produced witnesses from Sts. Augustine, Jerome, Gregory I, Ambrose. Hilary. He was also well acquainted with the writings of his adversaries and quotes Photius, Nicaea of Thessalonica, Theophylactus of Achiara, etc. The Latin version is very free and untrustworthy. There are also some incorrect expressions noted by the later editors, such as that God the Father is the cause of the Son (this is a concession to the Greeks that was, however, written, tolerated by the Council of Florence: Denzinger, Enchiridion, n. 567). Nevertheless, since it was written this work has been the foundation of nearly all Latin controversy with the Greeks. St. Thomas Aquinas used it for his "Opusc. I, contra errores Graecorum" and Cardinal Bessarion refers to it with great praise (Ep. ad Alex. P. L., CLXI, 328). Hugh Etherius also wrote a treatise "De regresso animarum ab inferno in infernum". There is another natural science of ethics; and (probably) a short work "De Graecorum malis consuetudinibus," "A Liber de immortali Deo," written by him, is lost.

Migne, P. L. CCII, HARTMANN, Photius (Ratisbon, 1867-1869), i, 646, ii, 175 seq., 514 sqq., etc. WERNER, Thomas von Aquin (Ratisbon, 1888), 731-738.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

ETHICS. I. DEFINITION.—Many writers regard ethics (Gr. ἔθικη) as an any scientific treatment of the moral order and divide it into theological, or Christian, ethics (moral theology) and philosophical ethics (moral philosophy). What is usually understood by ethics, however, is philosophical ethics, or moral philosophy, and in this sense the present article will treat the subject. Moral philosophy is a division of practical philosophy. Theoretical, or speculative, philosophy has to do with being, or with the order of things, dependent upon reason, and its object is to attain by the natural light of reason a knowledge of this order in its ultimate causes. Practical philosophy, on the other hand, concerns itself with what ought to, or with the order of acts which are human and which therefore depend upon reason. It is also divided into two parts: (a) the former orders the intellectual activities and teaches the proper method in the acquirement of truth, while the latter directs the activities of the will; the object of the former is the true; that of the latter, the good. Hence ethics may be defined as the science of the moral rectitude of human acts in accordance with the first principles of natural reason. Logic and ethics are normative and practical sciences, because they prescribe norms or rules for human activities and show how, according to these norms, a man ought to direct his actions. Moreover, ethics is pre-eminent, for it determines what it orders the activities of the will, and the latter it which sets all the other faculties of man in motion. Hence, to order the will is the same as to order the whole man. Moreover, ethics not only directs a man how to act if he wishes to be morally good, but sets before him the absolute obligation he is under of doing good and avoiding evil.

A distinction must be made between ethics and morals, or morality. Every people, even the most uncivilized and uncultured, has its own morality or sum of prescriptions which govern its moral conduct. Nature has so provided that each man establishes for himself a code of moral concepts and principles which are applicable to the details of practical life, without the necessity of awaiting the conclusions of science. Ethics is the scientific or philosophical treatment of morality. The subject-matter proper of ethics is the deliberate, free actions of man; the latter, such actions as are performed without deliberation, or through ignorance or coercion. Besides this, the scope of ethics includes whatever has reference to free human acts, whether as principle or cause of human actions (morality, justice, law, and so forth), or as effect or circumstance of action (merit, punishment, etc.). The particular aspect (formal object) under which ethics considers free acts is that of their moral goodness or the rectitude of order involved in them as human acts. A man may be a good artist or a good Christian, but not necessarily a good man, and conversely, a morally good man and a poor artist or technician. Ethics has merely to do with the order which relates to man as man, and which makes of him a morally good man.

Like ethics, moral theology also deals with the moral actions of man; but unlike ethics, it has its origin in supernaturally revealed truth. It presupposes man's elevation to the supernatural order, and, though it avails itself of the scientific conclusions of ethics, it draws its knowledge for the most part from Christian Revelation. Ethics is distinguished from the former and the latter natural sciences of ethics by the fact that it deals with the actions of man, as jurisprudence and pedagogy, in this, that the latter do not ascend to first principles, but borrow their fundamental notions from ethics, and are therefore subordinate to it. To investigate what constitutes good or bad, just or unjust, what is virtue, law, justice, science, duty, etc., what obligations are common to all men, does not lie within the scope of jurisprudence or pedagogy, but of ethics; and yet these notions and principles must be presupposed by the former, must serve them as a ground-work and guide; hence they are subordinate to ethics. The latter is true of political economy. The latter is indeed immediately concerned with man's social activity insomuch as it treats of the production, distribution, and consumption of material commodities, but this activity is not independent of ethics; industrial life must develop in accordance with the moral law and must be dominated by justice, equity, and love. Political economy was wholly wrong in trying to emancipate itself from the requirements of ethics. Sociology is at the present day considered by many as a science distinct from ethics. If, however, by sociology is meant a philosophical treatment of society, it is also divided into two parts: (a) the former for the inquiry into the origins of society in general, into the origin, nature, object, and purpose of natural societies (the family, the state) and their relations to one another forms an essential part of Ethics. If, on the other hand, sociology be regarded as the aggregate of the sciences which have reference to the social
life of man, it is not a single science but a complexus of sciences; and among these, so far as the natural order is concerned, ethics has the first claim.

II. Sources and Methods of Ethics.—The sources of ethics are partly man’s own experience and partly the principles and truths proposed by other philosophic disciplines (logic, metaphysics, history, science). Ethics takes its origin from the empirical fact that certain general principles and concepts of the moral order are common to all peoples at all times. This fact has indeed been frequently disputed, but recent ethnological research has placed it beyond the possible question. All nations, whether we draw from them good or evil, are nevertheless agreed in this: that the good is worth striving for, and that evil must be shunned, that the one deserves praise, the other, blame. Though in individual cases they may not be one in denouncing the same thing good or evil, they are nevertheless agreed as to the general principle, that good is to be done and evil avoided. Vice everywhere seeks to hide itself or to put on the mask of virtue; it is a universally recognized principle, that we should not do to others what we would not wish them to do to us. With the aid of the truths laid down in logic and metaphysics, ethics proceeds to give a thorough explanation of this undeniable fact, to trace it back to its ultimate causes, then to gather from fundamental moral principles certain conclusions which will direct men, in the various circumstances and necessities of life, how to shape his own conduct towards the attainment of the end for which he was created. Thus the proper method of ethics is at once speculative and empirical; it draws upon experience and metaphysics. Supernatural Christian Revelation is not a proper source of ethics. Only those conclusions properly belonging to ethics need be reached with the help of experience and philosophical principles. The Christian philosopher, however, may not ignore supernatural revelation, but must at least recognize it as a negative norm, inasmuch as he is not to advance any assertion in evident contradiction to the revealed truth of Christianity. God is the fountain-head of all truth—whether natural, as made known by Creation, or supernatural as revealed through Christ and the Prophets. As our intellect is an image of the Divine Intellect, so is all certain scientific knowledge the reflex and interpretation of the Creator’s thoughts, which are inscribed in His creatures in His eternal wisdom. God cannot reveal supernaturally and command us to believe on His authority anything that contradicts the thoughts expressed by Him in His creatures, and which, with the aid of the faculty of reason which He has given us, we can discern in His works. To assert the contrary would be to deny God’s omniscience and veracity, or to suppose that God was not the source of all truth. A conflict, therefore, between faith and science is impossible, and hence the Christian philosopher has to refrain from advancing any assertion which would be evidently antagonistic to certain revealed truths. Should his researches lead to conclusions out of harmony with faith, he is to take it for granted that some error has crept into his deductions, just as the mathematician whose calculations openly contradict the facts of experience must be satisfied that his demonstration is at fault.

After what has been said, the following methods of ethics must be rejected as unsound. (1) Pure Rationalism.—This system makes reason the sole source of truth, and therefore at the very outset excludes everything revealed by Christian Revelation, branding it with the anathema, and hampering free scientific investigation. The supreme law of science is not freedom, but truth. It is not derogatory to the true dignity and freedom of science to abstain from asserting what, according to Christian Revelation, is manifestly erroneous. (2) Pure Empiricism, which would erect the entire structure of ethics exclusively on the foundation of experience, must also be rejected. Experience can tell us merely of present or past phenomena; but as to what, of necessity, and universally, must, or ought to, happen in the future, experience cannot give us any notion. All that is necessary and universal principles. Closely allied to Empiricism is Historicism, which considers history as the exclusive source of ethics. What has been said of Empiricism may also be applied to Historicism. History is concerned with what has happened in the past and is intended to explain the moral aberrations of mankind. (3) Positivism is a variety of Empiricism; it seeks to emancipate ethics from metaphysics and base it on facts alone. No science can be constructed on the mere foundation of facts, and independently of metaphysics. Every science must set out from evident principles, which form the basis of all certain cognition. Ethics is partially impossible without metaphysics, since it is according to the metaphysical view we take of the world that ethics shapes itself. Whoever considers man as nothing else than a more highly developed brute will hold different ethical views from one who believes that man, as the image and likeness of God, possesses a spiritual, immortal soul and destined to eternal life; whoever refuses to recognize the freedom of the will destroys the very foundation of ethics. Whether man was created by God or possesses a spiritual, immortal soul will, or is essentially different from brute creation, all these are questions pertaining to metaphysics. Anthropology, moreover, is necessarily presupposed by ethics. No rules can be prescribed for man’s actions, unless his nature is clearly understood. (4) Another untenable system is Transcendentalism, which in the nineteenth century, counted many adherents (among others, de Bonald, Bautain), and which advanced the doctrine that complete certainty in religious and moral questions was not to be attained by the aid of reason alone, but only by the light of revelation as made known to us through tradition. They failed to see that for all reasonable belief certain knowledge of the existence of God and of the fact of revelation is necessarily presupposed, and this knowledge cannot be gathered from revelation. Fideism, or, as Paulsen designated it, the Irrationalism of many Protestants, which denies the ability of reason to function in matters relating to God and religion. With Kant, it teaches that reason does not rise above the phenomenon of the visible world; faith alone can lead us into the realm of the supersensible and instruct us in matters moral and religious. This faith, however, is not the acceptance of truth on the strength of external authority, but rather consists in certain appreciative judgments, i.e. assumptions or convictions which are the result of each one’s own inner experiences, and which have, therefore, for him a precise worth, and correspond to his own peculiar temperament. Since these persuasions are not supposed to come within the range of reason, exception to them cannot be taken on scientific grounds. According to this opinion, religion and morals are relegated to pure subjectivism and lose all their objectivity and universality of value.
of ethics; for, though they proposed various moral truths and principles, they did so in a dogmatic and didactic, and not in a philosophically systematic manner. Ethics properly so called is first met with among the Greeks, i.e., in the teaching of Socrates (470–399 B.C.), and then continued by Plato (427–347 B.C.), whose disciple Aristotle (384–322 B.C.), declares that the *sumnum bonum* consists in the perfect imitation of God, the Absolute Good, an imitation which cannot be fully realized in this life. Virtue enables man to order his conduct, as he properly should, according to the dictates of reason, and acting thus he becomes like unto God. But Plato differed from Socrates in that he did not consider virtue to consist in wisdom alone, but in justice, temperance, and fortitude as well, these constituting the proper harmony of man's activities. In a sense, the State is man writ large, and its function is to train its citizens in virtue. For his ideal State he provided the community of women, and also the public education of children. Though Socrates and Plato had been to the fore in this mighty work and had contributed much valuable material to the upbuilding of ethics; nevertheless, Plato's illustrious disciple, Aristotle (384–322 B.C.), must be considered the master of systematic ethics. Yet leaving characteristic keenness he solved, in his ethical and political writings, most of the problems with which ethics concerned itself. Unlike Plato, who began with ideas as the basis of his observations, Aristotle chose rather to take the facts of experience as his starting-point; thus he arrived at conclusions that accorded very accurately, though not always, with their highest and ultimate causes. He set out from the fact that all men tend to happiness as the ultimate object of all their endeavours, as the highest good, which is sought for its own sake, and to which all other goods merely serve as means. This happiness cannot consist in external goods, but only in the activity proper to human nature—not indeed in such a lower activity of the vegetative and sensitive life as man possesses in common with plants and brutes, but in the highest and most perfect activity of his reason, which is a training in turn from virtue. This activity, however, has to be exercised in a perfect and enduring life. The highest pleasure is naturally bound up with this activity, yet, to constitute perfect happiness, external goods must also supply their share. True happiness, though prepared for him by the gods as the object and the reward of virtue, can be attained only through a man's own individual exertion. With keen penetration, Aristotle then proceeds to investigate in turn each of the intellectual and moral virtues, and his treatment of them must, even at the present time, be regarded as in great part correct. The nature of the State and of the family were, in the main, rightly explained by him. The only pity is that his vision did not penetrate beyond this earthly life, and that he never saw clearly the relations of man to God.

A more hedonistic (ἀριστος, "pleasure") turn in ethics begins with Democritus (about 460–370 B.C.), who considers a perpetually joyous and cheerful disposition as the highest good and happiness of man. The means thereto is virtue, which makes us independent of external goods—so far as that is possible—and which wisely discriminate between the pleasures that are to be sought after and those that are to be shunned. Hedonism was first taught by Aristippus of Cyrene (435–354 B.C.), according to whom the greatest possible pleasure, especially sensual pleasure, is the end and supreme good of human endeavour. Epicurus (341–270 B.C.) differs from Aristippus in holding that the largest sum total possible of spiritual and sensual enjoyments, with the greatest possible freedom from displeasure and pain, is man's highest good. Virtue is the proper directive norm in the attainment of this end.

The Cynics (440–300 B.C.) and Diogenes of Sinope (414–324 B.C.), taught the direct contrary of Hedonism, namely, that virtue alone suffices for happiness, that pleasure is an evil, and that the truly wise man is above human laws. This teaching soon degenerated into haughty arrogance and open contempt for law and for the remainder of men (Cynics, 336–296 B.C.). The Stoics, that is, Socrates, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and others, strove to refine and perfect the views of Antisthenes. Virtue, in their opinion, consists in man's living according to the dictates of his rational nature, and, as each one's individual nature is but a part of the entire natural order, virtue is, therefore, the harmonious agreement with the Divine Reason, which shapes the whole course of nature. Whether they conceived this relation of God to the world in a pantheistic or a theistic sense, is not altogether clear. Virtue is to be sought for its own sake, and it suffices for man's happiness. All other things are indifferent and are, according to them, require, to be striven after or shunned. The passions and affections are bad, and the wise man is independent of them. Among the Roman Stoics were Seneca (4 B.C.–A.D. 65), Epictetus (born about A.D. 60), and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 121–180), upon whom the last-mentioned Stoic's influence had already begun to make themselves felt. Cicero (106–43 B.C.) elaborated no new philosophical system of his own, but chose those particular views from the various systems of Greek philosophy which appeared best suited to him. He maintained that human influences had already begun to make themselves felt. Cicero gives an exhaustive exposition of the cardinal virtues and the obligations connected with them, and especially the obligations of the gods, without which human society could not exist.

Parallel with the above-mentioned Greek and Roman ethical systems runs a sceptical tendency, which rejects every natural moral law, bases the whole moral order on custom or human arbitrariness, and frees the wise man from subjection to the ordinary precepts of the moral order. This tendency was furthered by the Sophists, against whom Socrates and Plato arrayed themselves, and later on by Carneades, Theodore of Cyrene, and others.

A new epoch in ethics begins with the dawn of Christianity. Ancient man never had a clear and definite concept of the relation between God and the world, of the unity of the human race, of the destiny of man, of the nature and meaning of the moral law. Christianity first shed full light on these and similar questions. As St. Paul teaches (Rom., ii. 24 sq.), God has written His moral law in the hearts of all men, even of those outside the influence of Christian Revelation; this law manifests itself in the conscience of every man and is the norm according to which the whole human race will be judged on the day of reckoning. In consequence of their perversive inclinations, those that have it to a great extent corrupted and distorted the pagan; Christianity, however, restored it to its pristine integrity. Thus, too, ethics received its richest and most fruitful stimulus. Proper ethical methods were now unfolded, and philosophy was in a position to follow up and
develop these methods by means supplied from its own store-house. This course was soon adopted in the early ages of the Church by the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, as Justi Martyr, Ireneus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, but especially the three Doctors of the Church, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, who, in the exposition and defense of Christian truth, made use of the principles laid down by the pagan philosophers. True, the Fathers had no occasion to treat moral questions from a purely philosophical standpoint, and independently of Christian Revelation; but in the explanation of Catholic doctrine their discussions naturally led to philosophical investigations. This is particularly true of St. Augustine, who proceeded to thoroughly develop along philosophical lines and to establish firmly most of the truths of Christian morality. The eternal law (lex aeterna), the original type and source of all temporal laws, the natural law, conscience, the ultimate end of man, the cardinal virtues, sin, marriage, etc., were treated by him in the clearest and most penetrating manner. Hardly a single portion of ethics does he present to us but is enriched with his keen philosophical commentary. Later ecclesiastical writers followed in his footsteps.

A sharper line of separation between philosophy and theology, and in particular between ethics and moral theology, is first met with in the works of the great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages, especially of Aquinas (1225–1274), Bonaventure (1221–1274), and Duns Scotus (1274–1308). Philosophy and, by means of it, theology reaped abundant fruit from the works of Aristotle, which had until then been a sealed treasure to Western civilization, and were first elucidated by the learned and profound commentaries of Bl. Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas, and pressed into the service of Christian philosophy. The same is particularly true as regards ethics. St. Thomas, in his commentaries on the political and ethical writings of the Stagirite, in his "Summa contra Gentiles" and his "Questions disputate", treated with his wonted clearness and penetration nearly the whole range of ethics in a purely philosophical manner, so that even to the present day his works are an inexhaustible source whence ethics draws its supply. On the foundations laid by him the Catholic philosophers and theologians of succeeding ages have been able to build. It is true that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, thanks especially to the influence of the so-called Nominalists, a period of stagnation and decline in philosophy set in, but the sixteenth century is marked by a revival. Ethical questions, also, though largely treated in connexion with theology, are again made the subject of careful investigation. We mention as examples the great theologians Victoria, Dominicus Soto, L. Molina, Suarez, Lessius, and De Lugo. Since the sixteenth century special chairs of ethics (morale philosophy) have been erected in many Catholic universities. The larger purely philosophical works on ethics, however, do not appear until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as an example of which we may instance the production of Ign. Schwarz, "Institutiones juris universalis naturae et gentium," Doctors of General Theology.

Far different from Catholic ethical methods were those adopted for the most part by Protestants. With the rejection of the Church's teaching authority, each individual became on principle his own supreme teacher and arbiter in matters appertaining to faith and morals. But the subjective doctrine from his#endif
ward von Hartmann, though the latter regards culture and progress merely as means to the ultimate end, which, according to him, consists in delivering the Abstract from the torment of existence.

The system of Cumberland, who maintained the concept of mankind and the conditions of moral conduct, was renewed on a positivist basis in the nineteenth century by Auguste Comte and has counted many adherents, e.g., in England, John Stuart Mill, Henry Sidgwick, Alexander Bain; in Germany, G. T. Fechner, F. E. Beneke, F. Paulsen, and others. Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) sought to effect a compromise between social Utilitarianism (Altruism) and private Utilitarianism (Egoism) in accordance with the theory of evolution. In his opinion, that conduct is good which serves to augment life and pleasure without any admixture of displeasure. In consequence, however, of man's lack of adaptation to the conditions of life, such absolute goodness of conduct is not as yet possible, and hence various compromises must be made between Altruism and Egoism. With the progress of evolution, however, this adaptability to existing conditions will become more and more evident, and consequently the benefits attending to the individual from his own conduct will be most useful to society at large. In particular, sympathy (in joy) will enable us to take pleasure in altruistic actions.

The great majority of non-Christian moral philosophers have followed the path of utilitarianism, starting with the assumption that man, by a series of transformations, was gradually evolving from the brute, and therefore differs from it in degree only, they seek the first traces and beginnings of moral ideas in the brute itself. Charles Darwin had demonstrated this process by showing that man's ethical tendencies have never been subject to the influence of the brute.

Present-day Evolutionists follow his view and attempt to show how animal morality has in man continually become more perfect. With the aid of analogies taken from ethology, they relate how man kind originally wandered over the face of the earth in semi-savage hordes, knew nothing of marriage or the family, and only by degrees reached a higher level of morality. These are the merest creations of fancy. If man is nothing more than a highly developed brute, how is it possible for him to possess a spiritual existence? This question can be answered by referring to the fact that there can no longer be any question of the freedom of the will, of the future retribution of good and evil, nor can man in consequence be hindered from ordering his life as he pleases and according to the way of life of the people only in so far as it redounds to his own profit.

As the Evolutionists, so too the Socialists favour the theory of evolution from their ethical viewpoint; yet the latter do not base their views on scientific principles, but on social and economical considerations. According to K. Marx, P. Engels, and other exponents of the so-called "materialist interpretation of history", all social, juridical, and religious concepts are the reflex of the economic conditions of society in the minds of men. Now these social relations are subject to constant change; hence the ideas of morality, religion, etc., are also continually changing. Every age, every people, and even each class in a given people forms its moral and religious ideas in accordance with its own peculiar economical situation. Hence, no universal code of morality exists binding on all men at all times; the morality of the present day is not of Divine origin, but the product of history, and will soon have to make room for another system of morals. This new system was to be in accordance with the materialist interpretation, though derived from other sources, is the system of Relativism, which recognizes no absolute and unchangeable truths in regard either to ethics or to anything else. Those who follow this opinion aver that nothing objectively true can be known by us. Men differ from one another and are subject to change, and with them, the manner and means of viewing the world about them also change. Moreover the judgments passed on matters religious and moral depend essentially upon the inclinations, interests, and character of the end judge, while the judgments of the theoretic moralist are constantly varying. Pragmatism differs from Relativism inasmuch as that only is to be considered true which is proven by experience to be useful; and, since the same thing is not always useful, unchangeable

view of the church of opinions and systems just described, it need not surprise us that, as regards ethical problems, skepticism is extending its sway to the utmost limits, in fact many exhibit a formal contempt for the traditional morality. According to Max Nordau, moral precepts are nothing but "conventional lies"; according to Max Stirner, that alone is good which serves my interests, whereas the common good, the love for all men, etc. are but empty phantoms. Men of genius and superiority in particular are coming more and more to be regarded as exempt from the moral law. Nietzsche is the originator of a school of thought founded on these doctrines and its exponents have made the system of individualism the foundation of their philosophy. According to him, goodness was originally identified with nobility and gentility of rank. Whatever the man of rank and power did, whatever inclinations he possessed, were good. The down-troddden proletariat, on the other hand, were bad, i.e. lowly and ignoble, their only duty being to render service and to obey the man of rank and power. Therefore, the term "bad" was only by a gradual process that the oppressed multitude through hatred and envy evoked the distinction between good and bad, in the moral sense, by denominating the characteristics and conduct of those in power and rank as bad, and their own behaviour as good. And thus arose the opposition between the morality of the master and that of the slave. Those in power still continued to look upon their own egoistic inclinations as noble and good, while the oppressed populace lauded the "instincts of the common herd", i.e. all those qualities necessary and useful to its existence—such as patience, meekness, obedience, and love of one's neighbour. Weakness became goodness, craving obsequiousness became humility, subjection to hated oppressors was obedience, cowardice meant patience. All morality is one long and audacious deception. Hence, the foundations of our existing social and ethical conceptions must be entirely re-arranged. Intellectual superiority is above and beyond good and evil as understood in the traditional sense. There is no higher moral order to which men of such calibre are amenable. The end of society is not the common good of its members; the intellectual aristocracy (the "over-man") is its own end; in its behalf the common herd, the "too many", must be reduced to slavery and dejected. As it rests with each individual to decide who belongs to this intellectual aristocracy, so each one is at liberty to emancipate himself from the existing moral order. In conclusion, one other tendency in ethical philosophy may be noted, which has manifested itself far and wide: namely, the effort to make morality independent of all religion. It is clear that many of the above-mentioned ethical systems essentially exclude all regard for God and religion, and this is true especially in the materialistic, agnostic, and, in the last analysis, of all pantheistic systems. Apart, also, from these systems, "independent morality", called also "lay morality", has gained many followers and defenders. Kant's ideas formed the basis of this tendency, for he himself founded a code of morality on the categorical imperative, expressly declared to be of sufficient power for itself, and therefore has no need of religion. Many modern moral philosophers—Herbert, Eduard von Hartmann, Zeller, Wundt, Paulsen, Ziegler, and a number of others—have followed Kant in this respect. For several decades practical attempts have been made
to emancipate morality from religion. In France religious instruction was banished from the schools in 1882 and moral instruction substituted. This tendency manifests a lively activity in what is known as the "ethical movement", whose home, properly speaking, was the United States. In 1870, P. P. P. Audisio, professor at Cornell University, founded the "Society for Ethical Culture", in New York City. Similar societies were formed in other cities. These were consolidated in 1887 into the "Union of the Societies for Ethical Culture". Besides Adler, the chief propagator of the movement by word of mouth and in writing, were W. M. Sulter and Stockl. The purpose of these societies is declared to be the improvement of the moral life of the members of the societies and of the community to which they belong, without any regard to theological or philosophical opinions. In most of the European countries ethical societies were founded on the model of the American organization. All these were combined in 1894 into the "International Ethical Association". Their purpose, i.e. the amelioration of man's moral condition, is indeed praiseworthy, but it is erroneous to think that any such movement can be brought about without taking religion into consideration. In fact many members of the ethical societies are openly antagonistic to all religions, and would therefore do away with denominational schools and supplant religious teaching by mere moral instruction. Even upon purely ethical considerations such attempts must be held to be unwise, if not inadvisable. In the case of adults moral instruction without religion, without any higher obligation or sanction, is a nonentity, a meaningless sham, how much more so is it in the case of the young? It is evident that, judged from the standpoint of Christianity, these efforts must meet with a still more decided condemnation. Christians are bound to observe not only the prescriptions of the natural law, but also all the precepts given by Christ concerning faith, hope, love, divine worship, and the imitation of Himself. The Christian, moreover, knows that without Divine grace and, hence, without prayer and the frequent reception of the sacraments, a morally good life for any considerable length of time is impossible. From their earliest years, therefore, the young must not only receive thorough instruction in all the Commandments, but must be exercised directly and truly in the practical use of the means of grace. Religion must be the soil and atmosphere in which education develops and flourishes.

While, among non-Catholics ever since the Reformation, and especially since Kant, there has been an increasing tendency to divorce ethics from religion, and to dissolve it into countless venturesome and frequently contradictory systems, Catholics for the most part have remained free from these errors, because, in the Church's infallible teaching authority, the guardian of Christian Revelation, they have always found secure orientation. It is true that towards the end of the eighteenth, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Illuminism and Rationalism penetrated here and there into Catholic circles and attempted to replace moral theology by purely philosophical ethics, and in turn to transform the latter. In the Catholic sense of the word, the ethical movement, however, was but a passing phase. With a reawakening of the Church's activity, fresh impetus was given to Catholic science, which was of benefit to ethics also and produced in its domain some excellent fruit.

Recourse was again had to the illustrious past of Catholicism, while, at the same time, modern ethical systems gave occasion to a thorough investigation and verification of principles of the moral order. Taparelli d'Azeglio led the way with his great work "Saggio teoretico di diritto naturale appoggiato sul fatto" (1840-43). Then followed, in Italy, Audisio, Rosmini, Liberatoro, Sanseverino, Roselli, Zighiara, Sig- moriello, Schifini, Ferretti, Talamo, and others. In Spain this revival of ethics was due to, among others, J. Balmes, Donoso Cortés, Zefirio González, Mendive, R. de Céspedes; in France and Belgium, to de Lehen (Institutes de droit naturel), de Margerie, Onearl, Ath. Villet, Charles Fépin, Plaget, Mouhart, Basilele; in England and America, to St. John, Jouin, Russo, Holland, J. J. Ming. In German-speaking countries the reawakening of Scholasticism in general begins with Kleutgen (Theologie der Vorzeit, 1853; Philosophie der Vorzeit, 1880), and of ethics in particular with Th. Meyer (Die Grundzüge der Religiosität und des Weltbegriffs, 1868; Institutiones juris naturalis seu philosophiae moralis universae, 1886-1900). After them came A. Stöckl, Ferd. Walter, Moy de Sona, C. Gitterlet, Fr. J. Stein, Brandis, Costa-Rosetti, A. M. Weiss, Renninger, Lehmen, Willens, V. Frins, Heinrich Pech, and others. We pass over numerous Catholic writers, who have made a specialty of sociology and political economy.

IV. OUTLINES OF ETHICS.—It is clear that the following statement cannot pretend to treat thoroughly all ethical questions; it is intended rather to afford the reader an insight into the most important problems of ethics, as well as into the methods adopted in their treatment. Ethics is usually divided into two parts: general, or theoretical ethics, and special, or applied ethics. General ethics expounds and verifies the general principles and concepts of the moral order; special ethics applies these general principles to the various situations of man, and determines his duties in particular.

Reason itself can rise from the knowledge of the visible creation to the certain knowledge of the existence of God, the origin and end of all things. On this fundamental truth is constructed all of morality. God created man, and He created all things else, for His own honour and glory. The ultimate end is the proper motive of the will's activity. If God were not the ultimate object and end of His own activity, He would depend upon His creatures, and would not be infinitely perfect. He is, therefore, the end of all things, they are created for His sake, not, indeed, that He can derive any benefit from them, which would be repugnant to an infinitely perfect being, but for His glory. They are to manifest His goodness and perfection. Irrational creatures cannot manifest themselves directly or naturally, for they are incapable of knowing Him. They are intended as means to the end for which rational man was created. The end of man, however, is to know God, to love Him and serve Him, and thereby attain to perfect and unending happiness. Every man has within him an irresistible, indestructible desire for perfect happiness; he seeks to be free from every evil and to possess every obtainable good. This impulse to happiness is founded on man's nature; it is implanted there by His Maker; and hence will be duly realized, if nothing is wanting on the part of man's own individual endeavour. But perfect happiness is unattainable in the present life, if for no other reason, at least for this, that inexorable death puts an early end to all earthly happiness. There is reserved for man a better life, if he freely chooses to glorify God here on earth. It will be the reward of victory to be conferred upon him thereafter. As present he remains subject to God and keeps His Commandments. Only from the viewpoint of eternity do this earthly life and the moral order acquire their proper significance and value. But how does man, considered in the natural order, or apart from every influence of supernatural revelation, come to know what God requires of him here below, or how he is to serve and glorify Him, in order to arrive at eternal happiness?—By means of the natural law.

From eternity there existed in the mind of God the idea of the world, which He freely determined to create, as well as the plan of government according to
which He wished to rule the world and direct it to its end. This ordination existing in the mind of God from all eternity, and depending on the nature and essential relations of rational beings, is the eternal law of God (Dei aeterna legis), the source from which all temporal laws derive. God does not move and change as their creator by a mere external directive impetus, as the archer does the arrow, but by means of internal impulses and inclinations, which He has bound up with their natures. Irrational creatures are urged, by means of physical forces or natural impulses and instincts, to exercise the activity peculiar to them and to keep the order designed for them. Man, on the other hand, is a being endowed with reason and free will; as such, he cannot be led by blind impulses and instincts in a manner conformable to his nature, but must needs depend upon practical principles and judgments, which point out to him how he is to order his conduct. These principles must somehow or other be manifested to him by nature. All created things have implanted in their natures certain guiding principles, necessary to their corresponding activities. Man must be no exception to this rule. He must be led by a rational light, manifested to him which shows him what to do or not to do. This natural light is the natural law. When we speak of man as possessing a natural, inborn light, it is not to be understood in the sense that man has innate ideas. Innate ideas do not exist. It is true, nevertheless, that the Creator has endowed man with the power to reason and the inclination to form concepts and develop principles. As soon as he comes to the use of reason, he forms, by a natural necessity, on the basis of experience, certain general concepts of a theoretical reason—e.g., those of being and not being, of cause and effect, of space and time—and so he arrives at universal principles, e.g., that "nothing can exist and not exist at the same time", that "every effect has its cause", etc. As it is in the theoretical, so also in the practical order. As soon as reason has been sufficiently developed, and the individual can somehow or other practically judge that he is something more than a mere animal, by an intrinsic necessity of his nature he forms the concept of good and evil, i.e., of something which is proper to the rational nature which distinguishes him from the brute, and which is therefore worth striving for, and something which is unbecoming and therefore to be avoided. Around about him he perceives that all things are well ordered, so that it is very easy for him to discern in them the handiwork of a superior and all-wise power. He himself has been appointed to be the guardian of nature, the protector of lord and master; he, too, must lead a well regulated life, as befits a rational being, not merely because he himself chooses to do so, but also in obedience to his Creator. Man did not give himself his nature with all its faculties and inclinations; he received it from a superior being, whose wisdom and power are everywhere manifest to him in Creation.

The general practical judgments and principles: "Do good and avoid evil", "Lead a life regulated according to reason", etc., from which all the Commandments of the Decalogue are derived, are based on the general principles of practical reason. Paul (Rom. ii, 14) says, it is written in the hearts of all men. This law is an emanation of the Divine law, made known to all men by nature herself; it is the expression of the will of nature's Author, a participation of the created rational being in the eternal law of God. Hence the obligation it imposes does not arise from man's own autonomy, as Kant held, nor from any other human authority, but from the Will of the Creator; and man cannot violate it without rebelling against God, his master, offending Him, and becoming amenable to His judgments. How deeply rooted in nature the conviction that the violation of the higher origin of the natural law was, is shown by the fact that for various violations of it (as murder, adultery, perjury, etc.) they did their utmost to propitiate the angered deity by means of prayers and sacrifices. Hence they looked upon the penalty as an act of divinity as the guardian and protector of the moral order, who would not allow the contempt of it to go unpunished. The same conviction is manifested by the value all nations have attached to the moral order, a value far surpassing that of all other earthly goods. The noblest among the nations maintained that it was better to undergo any hardship, even death itself, rather than prove recreant to one's duty. They understood, therefore, that, over and above earthly treasures, there were higher and more lasting goods whose attainment was dependent upon the observance of the moral order, and this not by reason of any ordinance of man, but necessarily by reason of the nature of the things. This being so, it is clearly impossible to divorce morality from religion without robbing it of its true obligation and sanction, of its sanctity and inviolability and of its importance as transcending every other earthly consideration.

The natural law consists of general practical principles (commands and prohibitions) and of practical judgments, necessarily flowing therefrom. It is the peculiar function of man to formulate these conclusions himself, though instruction and training are to assist him in doing so. Besides this, each individual has to take these principles as the guide of his conduct and apply them to his particular actions. This, to a certain extent, everybody does spontaneously, by virtue of an innate tendency. As in the case of all practical things, so in regard to what concerns the moral order, reason uses syllogistic processes. When a person, e.g., is on the point of telling a lie, or saying what is contrary to his convictions, there rose before his mental vision the general precept of the natural law: "Lying is wrong and forbidden." Hence he avoids himself, at least virtually, of the following syllogism: "Lying is forbidden; what you are about to say is a lie; therefore, what you are about to say is forbidden." The conclusion thus arrived at is his conscience, the proximate norm of our conduct. Conscience, therefore, is not an obscure feeling or a sort of moral instinct, but a practical judgment of our reason on the moral character of individual acts. If we follow the voice of conscience, our reward is peace and calm of soul; if we resist this voice, we experience disgust and remorse.

The natural law is the foundation of all human laws and precepts. It is only because we recognize the necessity of authority for human society, and because the natural law enjoins obedience to regularly constituted authority, that it is possible for a human super- man to impose laws and regulations in conscience. Indeed all human laws and precepts are fundamentally the conclusions, or more minute determinations, of the general principles of the natural law, and for this very reason every deliberate infringement of a law or precept binding in conscience, i.e., the violation of a Divine commandment, a rebellion against God, an offence against Him, which will not escape punishment in this life or in the next, unless duly repented of before death.

The problems hitherto mentioned belong to general, or theoretical, ethics, and their investigations in nearly all cases bear upon the origin and nature, as well as the scope of ethics to explain thoroughly and verify. The general philosophical doctrine of right is usually treated in general ethics. Under no circumstances may the example of Kant and others be imitated in
sovering the doctrine of right from ethics, or moral philosophy, and developing it as a separate and independent science. The juridical order is but a part of the moral order, even as justice is but one of the moral virtues. The first principles of right: “Give every man his due”, “Commit no injustice” and the necessary conclusions from these: “Thou shalt not steal”; “Thou shalt not commit adultery”, and the like, belong to the natural law, and cannot be divested from without violating one’s duty and one’s neighbour’s rights, and staning one’s conscience with guilt in the sight of God. The general ethics applies the principles of general, or theoretical, ethics to the various relations of man, and thus deduces his duties in particular. General ethics teaches that man must do good and avoid evil, and must inflict injury upon no one. Special ethics descends to particulars and demonstrates what is good or bad, right or wrong, and therefore to be done or avoided in the various relations of human life. First of all, it treats of man as an individual in his relations to God, to himself, and to his fellow-men. God is the Creator, Master, and ultimate end of man; from these relations arise man’s duties toward God. Presupposing his own individual efforts, he is, with God, endowed for eternal happiness from Him; he must love God above all things as the highest, infinite good, in such a manner that no creature shall be preferred to Him; he must acknowledge Him as His absolute lord and master, adore and reverence Him, and resign himself entirely to Him. The first, intrinsic business of man is to serve God. In case it is God’s good pleasure to reveal a supernatural religion and to determine in detail the manner and means of our worship of Him, man is bound by the natural law to accept this revelation in a spirit of faith, and to obey it accordingly. Hence the question is raised, in what manner shall morality be divested from religion? Religious duties, those, namely, which have direct reference to God, are man’s principal and most essential moral duties. Linked to these duties to God are man’s duties regarding himself. Man loves himself by an intrinsic necessity of his nature. From this fact Schopenhauer drew the conclusion that the commandment concerning self-love was superfluous. This would be true, if it were a matter of indifference how man loved himself. But such is not the case; he must love himself with a well-ordered, and therefore not solicitous for the welfare of His soul, and to do what is necessary to attain to eternal happiness. He is not his own master, but was created for the service of God; hence the deliberate arbitrary destruction of one’s own life (suicide), as well as the freely intended mutilation of self, is a criminal attack upon the proprietary right God has to man’s person. Furthermore, every man is supposed to take a reasonable care to preserve his health. He has certain duties also as regards temperance; for the body must not be his master, but an instrument in the service of the soul, and hence must be cared for in so far only as is conducive to this purpose. A further duty concerns the acquisition of external material goods, as far as they are necessary for man’s support and the fulfilment of his other obligations. This again involves the obligation to work; furthermore, God has endowed man with the capacity for the exercise of all functions; for it is possible that he might live in a state of indigence. The Creator might of himself have chosen to become a member of society; for idleness is the root of all evil. Besides these self-regarding duties, there are similar ones regarding our fellow-men: duties of love, justice, fidelity, truthfulness, gratitude, etc. The commandment of the love of our neighbour first received its practical application in the development of the Christian society. Though doubtless contained to a certain extent in the natural law, the pagans had so lost sight of the unity of the human race, and of the fact that all men are members of one vast family dependent upon God, that they looked upon every stranger as an enemy. Christianity restored to mankind the consciousness of its unity and solidarity, and supernaturally transfigured the natural precept to love our neighbour, by demonstrating that all men are children of the same Father in heaven, were redeemed by the blood of the same victim, and are destined to the same supernatural felicity. Better still, provided man with the grace necessary to the fulfillment of this precept and thus renewed the face of the earth. In man’s intercourse with his fellow-men the precepts of justice and of the other allied virtues go hand in hand with the precept of love. There exists in man the natural tendency to assert himself, and there is question of his goods or property. He expects his fellow-men to respect what belongs to him, and instinctively resists any unjust attempt to violate this proprietorship. He will brook an injury from no one in all that regards his health, his wife or child, his honour or good name; he resents faithlessness and ingratitude on the part of others, and the lie by which they would lead him into error. Yet he clearly understands that only then can he reasonably expect others to respect his rights when he in turn respects theirs. Hence the general maxim: “Do not do to others what you would not have them do to you.” And, not less naturally deduced are the general commandments known to all men: “Thou shalt not kill, nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor bear false witness against thy neighbour”, etc. In this part of ethics it is customary to investigate the principles of right as regards private ownership and property. Has every man the right to dispose of his property? Or, at least, may not society (the State) abolish private ownership and assume possession and control of all material goods either wholly or in part, in order thus to distribute among the members of the community the products of their joint industry? This question is discussed in the affirmative by the Socialists; and yet, it is the experience of all ages that the community of goods and of ownership is altogether impracticable in larger commonwealths, and would, if realized in any case, involve widespread slavery.

The second part of special, or applied, ethics, called by many sociology, considers man as a member of society, as far as this can be made the subject of philosophical investigation. Man is by nature a social being; out of his innate needs, inclinations, and tendencies the family and State necessarily arise. And first of all the preservation of the human species, the world would soon become an uninhabited solitude, a well-appointed abode without occupants. Hence God has given man the power and propensity to propagate his kind. The generative function was not primarily intended for man's individual well-being, but for the general good of his species, and in its exercise, therefore, he must be guided accordingly. This general good cannot be perfectly realized except in a lasting, indissoluble monogamy. The unity and indissolubility of the marriage bond are requirements of the natural law, at least in the sense that man may not on his own authority set them aside. Marriage is a Divine institution, for which God Himself has provided by means of definite laws, and in regard to which, therefore, man has not the power to make any change. The Creator might, of course, dispense for a time from the unity and indissolubility of the marriage tie; for, though the perfection of the married state demands these qualities, they are not of absolute necessity; the principal end of marriage may be attained to a certain degree without them. God could, therefore, for wise reasons grant a dispensation in the marriage tie for a certain length of time. Christ, however, restored marriage to the original perfection consonant with its nature. Moreover, He raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament and made it symbolic of His own union with the Church; and had He done nothing more in
this respect than restore the natural law to its pristine integrity, mankind would be bound to Him by an eternal debt of gratitude. For it was chiefly by means of the unity and indissolubility of the married life that the sanctity of the Christian family was established, for the better accomplishment of this chief blot and compared with which paganism has no equivalent to offer. This exposition of the nature of marriage from the theistic standpoint is diametrically opposed to the views of modern Darwinists. According to them, man did not originally recognize any such institution as the married state, but lived together in complete promiscuity. Marriage was the result of gradual development, woman was originally the centre about which the family crystallized, and from this latter circumstance there arises an explanation of the fact that many savage tribes reckon heredity and kinship between families according to the lineal descent of the female. We cannot dwell long upon these fantastic speculations, because they do not consider man as essentially different from the brute, but as gradually developed from a purely animal origin. Although marriage is of Divine institution, not every individual is obliged, as a human being, to enter the married state. God intends marriage for the propagation of the human race. To achieve this purpose it is by no means necessary for each and every member of the human family to enter upon marriage, and this particularly at the present time, when the question of over-population presents so many difficulties to social economists. In this connexion certain other considerations from a Christian point of view arise, which do not, however, belong to philosophical ethics. Since the principal end of marriage is the procreation and education of children, it is incumbent upon both parents to co-operate according to the requirements of sex in the attainment of this end. From this it may readily be gathered what duties mutually exist between husband and wife, and between parents and their children.

The second natural society, the State, is the logical and necessary outcome of the family. A completely isolated family could scarcely support itself, at all events it could never rise above the lowest grade of civilization. Hence we see that at all times and in all places, owing to natural needs and tendencies, larger groups of families are formed. A division of labour thus occurs. Each family devotes itself to co-operate according to the industry in which it may improve and develop its resources, and then exchanges its products for those of other families. And now the way is opened to civilization and progress. This grouping of families, in order to be permanent, has need of authority, which makes for security, order, and peace, and in general provides for what is necessary to the common good. Since God intends men to live together in harmony and order, He likewise desires such authority in the community as will have the right to procure what is needful for the common good. This authority, conscious of its task and apart from the hurrying world in which it is placed, comes immediately from God, and hence, within its proper sphere, it imposes upon the conscience of the subjects the duty of obedience. In the light of this interpretation, the exercise of public power is vested with its proper dignity and inviolability, and at the same time is circumscribed by necessary limitations. A group of families under a common authoritative head, and not subject to any similar aggregation, forms the primitive State, howeversmall this may be. By further development, or by coalition with other States, larger States gradually come into existence. What is not the purpose of planting the families, but to safeguard their rights, to protect them, and to supplement their efforts. It is not to forfeit their right or to abandon their proper functions that individuals and families combine to form the State, but to be secured in these rights, and to find support and encouragement in the discharge of the various duties assigned them. Hence the State may not deprive the family of its right to educate and instruct the children, but must simply lend its assistance by supplying, wherever needful, opportunities for the better accomplishment of this chief blot. As the order and prosperity of the body politic requires it, the State circumscribes individual effort and activity. In other words, the State is to posit the conditions under which, provided private endeavours be not lacking, each individual and each family may obtain true earthly happiness. By true earthly happiness is meant such as not only does not interfere with the free performance of the individual's moral duties, but even upholds and encourages him therein.

Having defined the end and aim of the State, we are now in a position to examine in detail its various functions and their extent. Private morality is not subject to State interference; but it is the proper function of the State to concern itself with the interests of public morality. It must not only prevent vice from parading in public and becoming a snare to many (e. g. through immoral literature, theatres, pubs, or other means being, to enforce the married state), but also ensure that the public ordinances and laws facilitate and advance morally good behaviour. The State must not affect indifference as regards religion; the obligation to honour God publicly is binding upon the State as such. It is true that the direct supervision of religious affairs is superannuated. It is referred to, trusted by Christ to His Church; nevertheless, it is the duty of the Christian State to protect and uphold the Church, the one true Church founded by Christ. Of course, owing to the unfortunate division of Christians into numerous religious systems, such an intimate relation between Church and State is at the present day but rarely maintained. The separation of Church and State, with complete liberty of conscience and worship, is often the only practical modus vivendi. In circumstances such as these the State must be satisfied to leave the affairs of religion to the various bodies, and to protect the latter in those rights which have reference to the general public order. The education and instruction of children belongs per se to the family, and should not be monopolized by the State. The latter has, however, the right and duty to suppress schools which disseminate immoral or subversive practices of faith. By state control it may not set limits to free individual endeavours. It may, however, assist the individual in his efforts to secure an education, and, in case these do not suffice, it may establish schools and institutions for his benefit. Finally, the State has to exercise important economical functions. It must protect private property and see to it that in man's industrial life the laws affecting justice be carried out in all their force and vigour. But its duties do not stop here. It should pass such laws as will enable its subjects to procure what is needed for their respectable sustenance even to attain a middle rank of comfort. But excessive wealth and extreme poverty involve many dangers to the individual and to society. Hence, the State should pass such laws as will favour the sturdy middle class of citizens and add to their numbers. Much can be done to bring about this desirable condition by the enactment of proper tax and inheritance laws, of laws which protect the labouring, manufacturing, and agricultural interests, and which supervise and control trusts, syndicates, etc.

Although the authority of the State comes immediately from God, the person who exercises it is not directly from God. The immediate origin of the State is left to the circumstances of men's progress and development or of their modes of social aggregation. According as the supreme power resides in one individual, or in a privileged class, or in the people collectively, governments are divided into three forms: the
monarchy; the aristocracy; the democracy. The monarchy is hereditary or elective, according as succession to supreme power follows the right of primogeniture of a family (dynasty) or is subject to suffrage. At the present day the only existing kind of monarchy is the hereditary, the elective monarchs, such as Poland and the old German Sovereignty, having long since disappeared. Those States in which the sovereign power resides in the body of the people, are called polyarchies, or more commonly, republics, and are divided into aristocracies and democracies. In republics the sovereignty is vested in the people. The latter elected from among their number to frame their laws and administer the affairs of government in their name. The almost universally prevailing form of government in Europe, fashioned upon the model created by England, is the constitutional monarchy, a mixture of the monarchical, aristocratic, and democratic forms. The law-making power is vested in the king and two chambers. The members of one chamber represent the aristocratic and conservative element, while the other chamber, elected from the body of citizens, represents the democratic element.

The monarch himself is responsible to no one, yet his government acts require the consent of the ministers, who in turn are responsible to the chamber.

With regard to its appointed functions the government of the State is divided into the legislative, judiciary, and executive powers. Of primary importance is the fact that the State must enact general and stable laws governing the activities of its subjects, as far as this is required for the good order and well-being of the whole body. For this purpose it must possess the right to legislate; it must, moreover, carry out these laws and punish, by means of the administrative, or rather, executive, power for what is needful to the general good of the community; finally, it has to infringe the laws and authoritatively settle legal disputes, and for this purpose it has need of the judiciary power (in civil and criminal courts). This right of the State to impose penalties is founded on the necessity of preserving good order and of providing for the security of the whole body politic. In a community there are always found those who can in no other way be effectually forced to observe the laws and respect the rights of others than by the infliction of punishment. Hence the State must have the right to enact penal statutes, calculated to deter its subjects from violating the laws, and the right, moreover, to actually inflict punishment after the violation has occurred. Among the legitimate modes of punishment is capital punishment. It is considered, and rightly so, a step forward in civilization, that nowadays a milder practice has been adopted in this regard, and that capital punishment is more rarely inflicted, and then only for such heinous crimes as murder and treason. Nevertheless, humanitarian sentiment has no doubt been carried to an exaggerated degree, so that many would on principles away with capital punishment altogether. And yet, this is the only sanction sufficiently effective to deter some men from committing the gravest crimes.

When it is asserted, with Aristotle, that the State is a sufficient for itself, this is to be considered true in the sense that the State needs no further development to complete its organization, but not in the sense that it is independent in every respect. The greater the advance of mankind in progress and civilization, the more necessary and frequent the communication between nations becomes. Hence the question arises as to what rights and duties mutually exist between nation and nation. That portion of ethics which treats this question from a philosophical standpoint is called the theory of international law, or of the law of nations. Of course, many writers of the present day deny the propriety of a philosophical treatment of international law. According to them the only international rights and duties are those which have been established by some positive measure either implicitly or explicitly agreed upon. This, indeed, is the position that must be taken by all who reject the natural law. On the other hand, this position precludes the possibility of any international law whatever, for lasting and binding compacts between various States are possible only when the primary principle of right is recognized—that it is just and obligatory to stand by lawful agreements. Now this is a principle of natural law; hence, those who seek to deny the existence of representations (E. C. Hartmann) must consequently reject any international law properly so called. In their opinion international agreements are mere conventions, which each one observes as long as he finds it necessary or advantageous. And so we are eventually led back to the principles of ancient paganism, which, in the intercourse between nations, too often identified right with might. But Christianity brought the nations into a closer union and broke down the barriers of narrow-mindedness. It proclaimed, moreover, the duties of love and justice as binding on all nations, thus restoring them to the primary principle of natural law. These principles: "Give each one his due", "Do injury to no man", "Do not to others what you would not have them do to you", etc., have an absolute and universal value, and hence must obtain also in the intercourse between nations. Purely natural duties and rights are common to all nations, and the acquired ones may vary considerably. Various, too, are the rules and duties of nations in peace and in war. Since, however, there are, under this head, many details of a doubtful and changeable character, the codification of international law is an earnest subject of discussion. Besides this an international court should be established to attend to the execution of the various measures promulgated by the law and to arbitrate in case of dispute. The foundations of such an international court of arbitration have been laid at The Hague; unfortunately, its competence has been limited to very much restricted, and besides, it exercises its functions only when the Powers at variance appeal to it of their own accord. In the codification of international law no one would be more competent to lend effective cooperation and to maintain the principles of justice and love which should exist between nations than in intercourse with one another, than the Pope. No one can offer sounder guarantees for the righteousness of the principles to be laid down, and no one can exert a greater moral influence towards carrying them into effect. This is even recognized by unreconciled Protestants. At the Vatican Council, not only the many Catholic bishops present, but the Protestant David Urquhart appealed to the pope to draw up a schedule of the more important principles of international law, which were to be binding on all Christian nations. Religious prejudice, however, places many difficulties in the way of realizing this plan.
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V. CATFHEM.

Ethiopia.—The name of this region has been derived, through the Greek form ethiôsia, from the two words ethiôs, "face", and ëthos, "race". It would thus mean the coloured man's land— the land of the scorchèd faces. But a different origin is claimed for the name by many modern writers: some of whom say that the Egyptians borrowed the word from the Egyptians, and that as early as the Twelfth Dynasty the Egyptians called Ethiopia by the name of Kosti. One form of this word, with the suffix. ethos, (the Coptic ethos, ethos, ethos), would thus be the real root-word. Others again maintain that it is derived from the Arabic word ethbis, the plural form of ethb, which means "spices", "perfumes" (Glaser, "Etymologiae," p. 305). It is also used in Arabic and Afrikan. Mention is made of it in 1896, or from an Arabic-Sabeian word, ethbis, which has the same meaning. (Haller in "Revue Sémithique," IV.)

Geography.—It is not easy to determine precisely to what part of the world the name of Ethiopia properly applies in the course of history. The word was at first used more loosely, and even the use of the word to denote a territory, have varied in various ages and at the hands of different writers. In the early pages of the Bible Ethiopia is used to designate the lands inhabited by the sons of Cush, and is therefore applied to all the scattered regions inhabited by that family. Such a use of the word is purely ethnographical. Elsewhere, however, in the Bible it is applied to a definite region of the globe without consideration of race, and is thus used geographically. It is in this sense that we find it mentioned in all Egyptian documents (Brugsch, Geography of the Egyptians, "et hippocrea" and "et hippocrea") and in documents of the Pharaohs. It denoted the region of Africa south of Egypt, and its boundaries were by no means constant. Generally speaking, it comprised the countries known in our own day as Nubia, Kordofan, Senaar, and Northern Abyssinia. It had one unvarying landmark, however: its northern boundary always began at Syene. We know from the writings of Pliny, Strabo, and Pomponius Mela that in the eyes of Greek geographers Ethiopia included not only all the territory south of Syene on the African Continent, but embraced all that part of Asia below the same parallel of latitude. Hence it came to pass that there were two regions with but one name: Eastern Ethiopia, including all the regions dwelling to the vast Red Sea as far as India; Western Ethiopia stretching southward from Egypt and westward as far as the southern boundary of Mauretania. Of all the vast tracts of country to which the name Ethiopia was given at one or other period of history, there are two to which the name has more peculiarly attached itself: the one is modern Nubia and the Egyptian Sudan (the ancient Ethiopia of the Pharaohs); the other modern Abyssinia (the Ethiopia of our own day), the last of all those regions to preserve the same name.

Nubian Ethiopia.—In Egyptian inscriptions the name Ethiopia is applied to the region of the Upper Nile lying between the First Cataract and the sources of the Albar and of the Blue Nile. Greek writers often call this region the Kingdom of Napatá, or of Meroë, after two cities that were successively the centres of its political life during the second period of its history. The name Island of Meroë, sometimes met with, is an allusion to the rivers which enclose it.

Ethiopia.—The races which occupied these regions differed considerably in their national characteristics. A small, dark-skinned population, the junction of the Atbara the population consisted for the most part of fishermen of Egyptian extraction. In the plains of the Upper Nile, side by side with some negro tribes, were a people allied to the Himyarites, and who had migrated thither from Southern Arabia, while others again showed that they owed their origin to the Egyptians and Berbers.

History.—Of the history of this country we know only what has been handed down to us through the monuments of Egypt and those erected by the inhabitants of the country itself in the vicinity of the Cataracts. It was the almost unanimous opinion of ancient historians that this was the cradle of the people occupying all the Nile Valley; and in proof thereof they pointed out the evident analogy of manners and religion between the Kingdom of Meroë and Egypt proper. But to-day we know without a doubt that the origin of Ethiopia, far from being the cradle of Egyptian civilization, owed to itself all the civilization she ever had. The chronological evidence of the monuments makes this quite clear. Whereas many of the ancient monuments are to be found on the delta, those of the neighbourhood of Meroë are common-sensically modern. Ethiopia's civilization was disordered as soon as the hieroglyphs had been interpreted. What its beginnings were, we do not know.

During the first five Egyptian Dynasties—i.e. for nearly thirteen centuries—its history is hidden behind the blackened face of the Siltluhkeit. It is only under the Sixth Dynasty that the history or the country comes within the ken of history. At that time King Mayrya, better known as Popi I, marched as far south as the Second Cataract, but did not establish a permanent foothold. Ethiopia's real occupation by Egypt did not begin till the Twelfth Dynasty, when the Pharaohs, being once more in peaceful possession of the Nile Valley, began an era of conquest, and the country of the Cataracts became their earliest prey. Amenemhat I and his son Petset I, having driven out the priests of Amun-Ra who ruled at Thebes, and having exiled them beyond Philé, continued their march as far as Wady-Halfa. The conquerors, encouraged by these victories, carried on the work of conquest, and established III pushed as far as the Fourth Cataract and even beyond Napatá, as far as the junction of the Atbara. At his death the frontiers of the Egyptian Empire extended as far as Semneh, and Ethiopia was a tributary province of Egypt. The darkness which envelops the history of the Thirteenth Dynasty does not permit of our tracing the results of this conquest, but it would seem that the victories of the Egyptian monarchs were far from decisive, and that Ethiopia always retained enough liberty to openly aspire to independence. Up to the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty this aspiration persisted, if, indeed, the country did not at times enjoy independence.

After the advent of the Eighteenth Dynasty, and the overthrow of the Shepherd Kings, Egypt undertook a series of wars against her isolated neighbours. The tribes along the Upper Nile, though harassed by her troops, resisted stubbornly. In spite of the campaigns of Amenhotep I, son of Amosis, who advanced as far as Napatá and Senaar—in spite of the violence of Thothmes I, his successor, who covered the country with devastation and ruin, it was not until the days of Thothmes II that Ethiopia was reduced to the loss of her liberty. The country was thereupon divided into nomes on the Egyptian system, and was placed under a viceroys with power extended from the First Cataract to the Mountains of Abyssinia. The office, entrusted at first to high function-
ries, soon became one of the most important in the State, and the custom arose at court of nominating to it the heir presumptive to the throne, with the title of Prince of Cush. The glorious reigns of Rameses II, of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and of Rameses III, of the Twentieth Dynasty, served to consolidate this contest for a time, but for a time only. Egypt, worn out, was weary of war, and even of victory, and the era of her campaigns ended with the Rameseid dynasty. Ethiopia, always alert to note the doings of her enemy, profited by this respite to recover her strength. She collected her forces, and soon, having won back her independence, an unexpected event left her mistress of her former conqueror.

The descendants of the royal priesthood of Amun-Ra, exiled from Thebes to Ethiopia by the Pharaohs of the Twenty-second Dynasty, had infused a new life into the land of their exile. They had reorganized its political institutions and centralized them at Napata, which city, in the hands of its new lords, became a sort of Ethiopian Thebes modelled on the Thebes of Egypt. With the co-operation of the native peoples Napata was soon reckoned among the great political powers. While Ethiopia was developing and flourishing, Egypt, so disintegrated as to be a mere collection of feudal States, was being more and more weakened by incessant revolutions. Certain Egyptian princes having at this period appealed to the King of Napata for help, he crossed over into the Thebaid, and established order there; then, to the surprise of those who had appealed to him, he continued his way northwards and went as far as Memphis, nor did he halt until he had subdued the country and proclaimed the suzerainty of Ethiopia over the whole Nile Valley. Piankhy, to whom belongs the honour of this achievement, caused an account of it to be engraved at Jebel-Barkal, near Napata. After his reign the throne passed to a native family, and during the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Dynasties Ethiopia had the glory of giving birth to the Pharaohs who ruled all the land from Abyssinia to the shores of the Mediterranean.

But at the very time when the Ethiopian armies were advancing from the South to subdue the North, the victorious Assyrian armies of the King of Nineveh were already encamped on the borders of Phoenicia. Menaced by Sargon II in the days of Shabaka, Egypt was invaded for the first time by Sennacherib's army during the reign of Shabataka. Taharqa, his succes-

sor, was defeated by Esarhaddon, and forced to retreat as far as Napata, pursued by the Ninevite hosts. The victory, however, was dearly bought by the Assyrians, and the Ethiopians, even in retreat, proved so dangerous that the pursuit was abandoned. Taharqa, encouraged by the fear he inspired in his enemies, tried to win back the Nile Valley. He assumed the offensive a few years after this, and soon entered Memphis almost without striking a blow. But the princes of the Delta, of whom Necho was the most powerful, far from extending him a welcome, joined forces with the King of Nineveh. Asurbanipal, who had now succeeded his father, Esarhaddon, straightway attacked Taharqa, and the King of Ethiopia fell back once more towards the Cataracts. His son-in-law, Tanuat-Amen, once more victorious, went up as far as Memphis, where he defeated the Delta princes, allies of the Assyrians, but a fresh expedition under Asurbanipal completely broke his power. Thereafter Tanuat-
Institutions.—The only civilization we know of in Ethiopia is that which was borrowed from Egypt. We find no record of really native institutions on any of the monuments that have come down to us, and the earliest records extant do not take us beyond the fourth century, when the priestly dynasty of Thebaid,—Napata Amun-Ra, King of the Gods, ruled supreme with Maut and Khonsu. The temple there was built on the model of the Karnak sanctuaries; the ceremonies performed were those of the Theban cult. The priest-kings, above all, as formerly in their native land, were the heads of a purely ecclesiastical polity. It was only later in history that the monarchy became elective in Ethiopia. The election took place at Napata, in the great temple, under the supervision of the priests of Amun-Ra, and in the presence of a number of special delegates chosen by the magistrates, the literati, the soldiers, and the officers of the palace. The members of the reigning family, the royal brethren, were brought into the sanctuary and presented one after another to the statue of the god, who indicated his choice by a signal previously agreed upon. The choice of the priests could undertake nothing without the royal consent, and was subject to them for life. Arq-Amem set out to have broken and secured complete independence for the throne.

Language.—The tongues in the land of Cush were as varied as the peoples who dwelt there, but Egyptian is the language of the Ethiopian inscriptions. On a number of dates dating from the epoch of Ethiopian history we find a mixed idiom. It is written in hieroglyphs, of which the alphabetical values, however, have been modified. Hitherto undecipherable, this language has recently been held to be related to Egyptian, with a large admixture of foreign (doubtless Nubian) words. The development of the study of demotic, as well as a more intimate knowledge of the speech of later times, will, perhaps, eventually bring a fuller knowledge of this idiom.

Abyssinian History.—Geography.—This region corresponds to the group of territories nowadays known as Abyssinia, descending from the Italian colony of Eritrea to the shores of the Great Lakes. Yet the ancient empire of this name did not by any means permanently occupy the whole of this area, the boundaries of which rather indicate its greatest extent at any period of its history. Among all the countries that are commonly known under the name of Ethiopia this alone took the name for itself, and calls itself by that name to this day. It rejects the name Abyssinian which is constantly given it by Arab writers. Western writers have often employed both terms, Abyssinian and Ethiope, indifferently, but in our own day a distinction seems to be growing up in their use. It seems that with the name of Ethiopia we should connect that portion of the country's history the documents of which are supplied by Greek literature alone; with that of Abyssinian, what belongs to the modern period since the definitive appearance of Amharic among the written languages. The modern Tigre, formerly the Kingdom of Axum, would seem to have been the kernel of this State. It was founded by refugees who came to the African continent when the Arsacidae were extending their sway in the Arabian peninsula, and the power of the Ptolemies was declining in Egypt. These refugees belonged to the Salban tribes engaged in the gold and spice trade between Arabia and the Roman Empire; their dealings with civilized races had developed them, and, thanks to their more advanced stage of mental culture, they acquired a preponderating influence in the country among whom they then dwelt. Still, the descendants of these immigrants form a minority of the Ethiopian people, which is mainly composed of Cushite tribes, together with members of an aboriginal race called by the Ethiopians themselves Shangana.

History.—From native sources we know nothing accurately of the political beginnings of the State. Its annals open with the rule of monsters in that land, and for many centuries Arue, the serpent, is the only ruler mentioned. Many writers see in this a but a perverted manifestation of idolatry or barbarism, and the explanation seems probable. According to certain traditions written in Gheez, Ethiopia embraced the Jewish religion at the time of Solomon, and received a prince of that monarch's family to rule over it. The Queen of Saba (Sheba), spoken of in the First Book of Kings, was an Ethiopian queen, according to the legend of Krahaboab and the Khing, and it was thought that Ethiopia received this double honour. But this tradition is of comparatively recent origin, and finds no confirmation in the most ancient native documents, nor in any foreign writings. History still waits for some foundation on which to base this appropriation of the sacred text, as well as for proofs to justify the variants with which Ethiopian chroniclers have embellished it.

The first thing that we know with certainty as to the history of Ethiopia is its conversion to Christianity. This work was accomplished in the early part of the fourth century by St. Frumentius, known in that country as Abba Salama. Rufinus of Aquileia has preserved the story for us in his history. According to him, a Christian of Tyre, named Merope, had gone on a journey to India with a large number of children, Eudesi and Frumentius, his nephews. On their return journey the ship was captured by pirates off the Ethiopian coast, and every one on board was put to death except the two children. These were sent as captives to the king, and were afterwards appointed tutors to his son, whom they converted to Christianity. Later, they returned to their own country. But Frumentius had still another ambition: to be consecrated bishop by the Patriarch of Alexandria. This wish having been fulfilled, he returned to Axum, organized Christian worship, and, under the title of Abba Salama, became the first metropolitan of the Ethiopian Church. Missionary monks (coming later from neighbouring countries in the sixth century) completed the work of his apostolate by establishing the monastic life. National traditions speak of these missionaries as the Nine Saints: they are the abbis Ale, Tienna, Aragawi, Girma, Panta, Haxo, Liganos, Amlak, and Afti. From this time forth Ethiopia takes its place among the Christian States of the East. One of its kings, Culeb, contemporary with the Nine Saints, and canonized as St. Eleazar, is famous in Oriental literature for an expedition he led against the Jewish kingdom of Yemen. The authority of the Ethiopian kings then extended over Tigre, Shoa, and Amhara, and the seat of government was the Kingdom of Axum.

But from this time forward the history of this country is enveloped in darkness, and remains almost unknown to us until the thirteenth century. We have nothing to guide us but the long and confused conflicting lists of kings with the indication of a dynastic revolution, which perhaps explains the brevity of the chronicles. Perhaps, in the midst of these troubles, the historical documents of preceding ages were purposely destroyed; and this seems likely since the foreign dynasty of the Zagwees, which at that time usurped the throne of the pretended descendants of the son of Solomon, would feel constrained to destroy the prestige of the supplanting dynasty in order to establish itself. According to the abridged chronicle published by Bruce, the Palasias, a tribe professedly Arabian, were the founders of this dynasty, and the fact is that we have no other evidence in support of this assertion. The chronicles we have are silent about the matter; they merely tell us that at the close of the thirteenth century, in the reign of Yekuno Amlak, after a period of exile, the length of which we do not know, the Solo-
monian dynasty regained power through the aid of the monk Takla Haymanot. After the restoration of the ancient national dynasty, the country, once more at peace within itself, had to concentrate its whole energy upon resisting the southward progress of Mohammedanism. For nearly three centuries Ethiopia had to wage wars without respite for liberty and faith, and it alone, of all the African kingdoms, was able to maintain both. The most famous of these wars was against the Emperor of Harar, Ahmed Ibn Ibrahim, surnamed the Left-handed. It took place during the reign of King Lebna Dengel (1508-40) and Galawdegn (1540-56), and the exhausted country was only saved by the timely help of Portuguese armies. Delivered from its foes, it might have become a great power in the East, but it lacked a capable leader, and its people, deriving but little moral support from a corrupt religion, fell rapidly away until, after a long series of civil wars, Ethiopia became a land of anarchy.

Under Menas (1559-63), Sarse Dengel (1563-97), and Ya'qob Za Dengel (1597-1607), civil war was incessant. There was a brief respite under Susneas (1607-32), but war broke out afresh under Fasiladas (1622-67), and the clergy, moreover, increased the trouble by their theological disputes as to the two natures of Christ. These disputes, often, indeed, but a cloak for ambitious intrigues, were always occasions of revolution. Under the successors of Fasiladas the general disorder passed beyond all bounds. Of the seven kings who followed him two died a natural death. Then there was a short period of peace under Bakafa (1721-30), and Yass II (1730-55), Yos (1755) and Yohannes (1755-69) were again victims of an ever-spreading revolution. The end of the eighteenth century left Ethiopia a feudal kingdom. The general government belonged to its king, or provincial chieftains. The unity of the nation had disappeared, and its kings reigned, but did not govern. The Ras became veritable Mayors of the Palace, and the monarchs were content to be roi fantômes. Side by side with these kings who have left in history only their names, the real masters of events, as the popular whim happened to favour them, were Ras Mikael, Ras Abeto of the Godjam, Ras Gabriel of the Samen, Ras Ali of Begameder, Ras Gabra Masqal of Tigre, Ras Walda-Sellasse of the Shoa, Ras Ali of Ambars, Ras Oubah of Tigré, and the like. Among these chief was incessant; ever dissatisfied, jealous of each other's power, each one sought to be supreme, and it was only after a century of strife that peace was at length established. A son of the governor of Kowara, named Kasa, succeeded in bringing it about, to his own profit; and he made it permanent by causing himself to be proclaimed king under the name of Theodore (1855).

With him the ancient Ethiopia took its place as one of the nations to be reckoned with in the international affairs of the West, and Abyssinia may be said to date its origin from his reign.

Religion.—Previous to the conversion of the country to Christianity, the worship of the serpent was perhaps the religion of a portion of Ethiopia, i.e. of the aboriginal Cushite tribes. From inscriptions at Asum and Adulis it would seem that the Semite, on the other hand, had a religion similar to that of Chaldeans and Syria. Among the gods mentioned we find Astar, Beher, and Medir—perhaps representing the triad of sky, sea, and land. As to the Jewish religion, and its introduction in the time of Solomon, we have only the assertion found in some recent documents, which we have already received as representatives of a national religion which has disappeared. After the evangelization by St. Frumenius, and in spite of the resulting general conversion of the people, Pananism always retained some adherents in Ethiopia, and has its representatives there even to this day. Moreover, at the time of the Muslim wars Islam succeeded in securing a foothold here and there. Nevertheless Christianity has always been the real national religion, always practised and defended by the rulers of the nation.

Although converted to Christianity by missionaries of the Catholic Church, Ethiopia to-day professes Monophyism. Being subject to the influence of Egypt, it has adopted in the course of time the theory of the Egyptian Church concerning the human nature of Christ. Our lack of information about the country prior to the thirteenth century hinders us from following the history of its separation from Rome, or even fixing the date of that event. Like the Egyptian, the Ethiopian Church anathematizes Eutyches as a heretic, yet remains Monophysite and rejects the Catholic teaching as to the two natures. United in the statement of their belief, the Ethiopian theologians have divided into two great schools in its explanation. On the one hand, the Walda-Qeb ("Sons of Union"), as they are nowadays called) hold that the most radical unification (tawehedho) exists between the two natures, such as the absorption of the human by the Divine nature that the former may be said to be merely a fantasm. This unification is the work of the union of the von Himself according to the general teaching of the Walda-Qeb. Some among them, however, known as the Qebat ("Union), teach that it is the work of the Father. Others again, the Segel-selel, or Walda-sega ("Sons of Grace), hold that the unification takes place in such a way that the nature of Christ becomes a special nature (babrey), and this is attributed to the Father, as in the teaching of the Qebat. But, as the mere fact of the union does not effect a radical unification (for this school rejects absorption), the unification is made perfect, according to them, by what they call the adoptive birth of Christ—the ultimate result of the union of the Father. In effect, they recognize in the Incarnation three kinds of birth: the first, the Word begotten of the Father; the second, the Son of Mary: the third, the Son of Mary, begotten the Son of God the
Father by adoption, or by His elevation to the Divine dignity—the work of the Father anointing His Son with the Holy Spirit, whence the name Sons of Grace. However, while rejecting absorption, this latter school refuses to admit the distinction of the two natures. Both schools, moreover, assert that the unification takes place without any blending, without change, without confusion. It is contradiction itself set up as a dogma.

The difficulties following from this teaching in regard to the reality of Redemption, the Monophysite Church of Ethiopia calls mysteries; her theologians confess themselves unable to explain them, and simply dismiss them with the word Ḫaqada; it is, so they say, “by the will of God.” In sympathy with the Church of Constantinople, as soon as it was separated from Rome, the Ethiopian Church in course of time adopted the Byzantine teaching as to the procession of the Holy Ghost; but this question never was as popular as the mystery of the Incarnation, and in reference to it the contradictions to be found in the texts of native theologians are even more numerous than those touching on the question of the two natures. Adrift from the Catholic Church on the dogma of the humanity of Christ and the procession of the Holy Spirit, the Ethiopian Church professes all the other articles of faith professed by the Roman Church. We find there the seven sacraments; the cultus of the Blessed Virgin and of the saints; prayers for the dead are held in high honour, and fasts without number occur during the liturgical year.

The Bible, translated into Gheez, with a collection of decisions of the Councils, called the Synodo, make up the groundwork of all moral and dogmatic teaching. The work of translating the Bible began in Ethiopia about the end of the fifth century, according to some authorities (Guidi; G. Rossini), or, in the opinion of others (Méncheau), in the fourth century at the very beginning of the evangelization. Notwithstanding the native claims, their Old Testament is not a translation from the Hebrew, neither is its Arabic origin any more capable of demonstration; Old and New Testaments alike are derived from the Greek. The work was done by many translators, no doubt, and the unity of the version seems to have been brought about only by deliberate effort. At the time of the Solomonian restoration in the thirteenth century, the whole Bible was revised under the care of the Metropolitan Abba Salama (who is often confounded with St. Frumentius), and the text followed for the Old Testament was the Arabic of Rabbi Sandjas Gaon of Pjryam. There was perhaps a second revision in the seventeenth century at the time of the Portuguese missions to the country; it has recently been noticed (Littmann, Geschichte der äthiopischen Literatur). But, just as the great number of translators employed caused the Bible text to be unequal, so also the revision of it was not uniform and official, and consequently the number of variant readings became multiplied. Its canon, too, is practically unsettled and fluctuating. A host of apocryphal or falsely ascribed writings are placed on the same level on the one hand, and on the other the most esteemed of which we may mention the Book of Henoch, the Ḫufale, or Little Genesis, the Book of the Mysteries of Heaven and Earth, the Combat of Adam and Eve, the Ascension of Isaiah. The “Ḥaymanot Ahaw” (Faith of the Fathers), the “Melkat Ḫalita” (Book of the Mysteries), the “Melkat Ḫaymanot” (Book of the Compilation), “Qēlos” (Cyrillus), “Ẓēnāḥéymanot” (Tradition of the Faith) are among the principal works dealing with matters moral and dogmatic. But, besides the fact that many of the quotations from the Fathers in these works have been modified, many of the canons of the “Ẓāḥmā” are, to say the least, not historical.

Liturgy.—In the general effect of its liturgical rules the Ethiopian Church is allied to the Coptic Rite. Numerous modifications, and especially additions, have, in the course of time, been introduced into its ritual, but the basic text remains that of Egypt, which, in many places, it differs only in the language. Its calendar and the distribution of festivals are regulated as in the Coptic Church, though the Ethiopians do not follow the era of the martyrs. The year has 365 days, with a leap year every four years, as in the Julian calendar. Its ordinary year begins on 29 August of the Julian calendar, which corresponds to 11 September of the Gregorian calendar. After a leap year the new year begins on the 30th of August (our 12 September). The year has twelve months of 30 days each, and an added thirteenth month of six days or of five days—according to the year or not. The era followed is seven years behind ours during the last four months of our year, and eight years during the remaining months. The calendar for each year is arranged in an ecclesiastical synod held in the springtime. It is at this gathering that the dates of the principal movable feasts are settled, as well as the periods for the fasts to be observed during the course of the year. The greater feasts of the Ethiopian Church are Christmas, the Baptism of Christ, Palm Sunday, Holy Week, Ascension Day, Pentecost, the Transfiguration. A great number of feasts are scattered throughout the year, either on fixed or movable dates, and their number, together with the two days every week (Saturday and Sunday) on which work is forbidden, reduces by almost one-third the working-days of the year. Festivals are observed every Wednesday and Friday, and five times annually during certain periods preceding the great festivals; the fast of Advent, is kept during forty days; of Ninivé, three days; of Lent, fifty-five days; of the Apostles, fifteen days; the fast of the Assumption, fifteen days. Most of the saints honoured in Ethiopia are to be found in the Roman Martyrology. Among the native saints (about forty in all), only a few are recognized by the Catholic Church—St. Frumentius, St. Elesban, the Nine Saints, and St. Takuł Háymanot. But, deprived of religious instruction, the Ethiopian people mingle with their Christianity many practices which are often opposed to the teaching of the Gospel; some of these seem to have a Jewish origin, such, for instance, as the keeping of the Sabbath, the distinction of animals as clean and unclean, circumcision, and the custom of marrying a widow to the nearest relative of her deceased husband.

Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.—The Ethiopian hierarchy is subject to the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, who has some degree of dependence on the Coptic Church is regulated by one of the Arabic canons found in the Coptic edition of the Council of Nicea. A delegate from this patriarch, chosen from among the Egyptian bishops, and called the Abouna, governs the Church. All-powerful in
masters spiritual, his influence is nevertheless very limited in other directions, owing to the fact that he is a stranger. The administrative authority is vested in the Etchagei, who also has jurisdiction over the regular clergy. This functionary is always chosen from among the monks and is a native. Legislation concerning the clergy is always regulated by a special code, of which the fundamental principles are contained in the Petha negashit. Only the regular clergy observe celibacy, and the facility with which confessions are made numbers the priests very large.

Language and Literature.—Although the races inhabiting Ethiopia have very different origins, only the Semitic family of tongues is represented among them. This is one of the results of the conquest made in olden days by the immigrants from the African Continent. Two dialects were spoken by these tribes, the Ghee, which is akin to Amhar, and a speech more akin to Me'lin, the tongue which later developed into Amharic. In the course of time Ghee ceased to be a spoken language, but it gave rise to two vernacular dialects, Tigre and Tigrai, which have supplanted it.

No longer in popular use, Ghee has always remained the language of the Church and of literature. Amharic, on the other hand, became a literary language in the fifteenth century, and its origin, Ghee literature has remained so in its productions, mostly of which are apocrypha, hagiographical compositions, or theological works. History and poetry have only a secondary place in it, and these are the only subjects in which we find any original effort; and as for the Amharic language itself, its evolution is traced from the Greek, Coptic, or Arabic. Most of its manuscripts have come down to us without date or author's name, and it is not an easy task to follow the history of letters in this country. As far as we know at present, the five hundred seems to have been the great literary century of Ethiopia. To the reign of Zara Yaqob (1454-68) belong the principal compositions of which we know the history. The wars against Adal and against Ahmed Ibn Ibrahim, in the sixteenth century, arrested this literary movement. The decline began after the civil wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the coming of Amharic as a language led to its decline. The earliest writing in Amharic date from the fourteenth century, and the period of the Portuguese missions it was beginning to supplant Ghee. The Jesuits made use of it to reach the people more surely, and henceforward Ghee tended to become almost exclusively a liturgical language. At the present day it is nothing else, Amharic having altogether taken its place in other departments, and it may be that at no distant date Amharic will supplant Ghee even as the language of the Church.

Job Ludolf, a German, in the eighteenth century, was the first to organize the study of Ethiopian subjects. To him we owe the first grammar and the first dictionary of the Ghee language. After a period of neglect these studies were taken up once more in the second half of the nineteenth century by Professor Dillmann, of Berlin, who, after many years of study, compiled a work, which begins the series of works on the grammar and lexicography, which are indebted to him for his publication of many texts. Thanks to the extension of philological, historical, and patristic studies, the study of this language has spread in our own time to a greater and greater degree. Of works of the first class, which have been published on the literature by Professors Bassett, Buzold, Guidi, Littmann, and Pretorius, as also by Charles, Evesque Pereira, Perruchon, and Touraise. The Amharic, too, has inspired a number of studies, whether of its grammar, of its lexicography, or of its texts; the works of Massaja, Isenberg, d'Abbadié, Pretorius, Guidi, Mondon-Kidalith, and Afevork have served to definitely place it within the domain of Oriental studies.

ETIOPIA. Histoire antique des peuples de l'Orient classique (Paris, 1895-96); BUDGE, A History of Egypt (London, 1902); AMEHERT DE LACONNET, A Sketch of Egyptian History (London, 1837); BASSET, Études sur l'Afrique et l'Orient (Rome, 1893); ROSSINI, Nota per la storia literaria abissina in Rend. della R. A. dei Lineri (Rome, 1899); LITTMAN, Geschichte des Abissinischen (Leipzig, 1907); BESCARI, Notizie e saggi di opere edizioni volgarizzanti in storia di Etiopia (Rome, 1905-); BRUG, A Journey to the Nubian Mountains (London, 1790); GLASER, Die Abissinier in Andern und Sieben (Munich, 1895); ROBERT, Littérature ETHIOPIE (Frankfort, 1861); LITTELL, History of Ethiopia (London, 1895); LUDOLFF, Geschichte Abyssiniens (Frankfort, 1861); ADVANCED ETHIOPIAN COMMENTARY (Frankfort, 1861).

M. CHAINE.

Ethiopian Versions of the Bible. See Versions of the Bible.

Etschmiadzin, a famous Armenian monastery, since 1441 the ecclesiastical capital of the schismatic Armenians, and seat of their patriarch or catholicoi (q. v.), whom the greater part of the Non-Unit Armenian Church acknowledge as their head. It is situated in Russian territory, in the extreme south of the Caucasus, on the River Arpa (Arpa), five miles south of Tiflis. As early as the fifth or sixth century, if not earlier, a monastery existed there attached to the royal residence of Vancharapat, itself the immemorial national centre of Armenia. According to national tradition, more or less reliable, the primatial see of Armenia and the see of Gregory the Thracian was founded here in the fourth century. On the site of his famous vision of “the descent of the only Begotten One” (Descendit Unigenitus in Arm. Etschmiadzin), the anniversary of which is still kept as a national feast, he built a chapel, and in time a splendid church and monastery arose, which centred the national and religious life of Armenia until the middle of the fifth century, when, owing first to the invasions of Caucasian hordes and thence to Persian ambition and persecution, there began the long series of wanderings which recall the story of the monks of Durham with St. Cuthbert's body. During these centuries both clergy and people valued most highly the right arm of St. Gregory; his possession was practically considered the legitimate patriarch. After many removals, first to Down (Duin, Tvin) and then to another place, the monastery was finally settled in or near the city of Sis, in Cilicia (Lesser Armenia), where it remained from 1293 to 1441; at the former date the relic was said to have been miraculously brought to Sis from Egypt, whether it had been taken by the Mamelukes. When the small Christian principality of Lesser Armenia, long upheld by the Crusades (1097-1375), was at last destroyed, the national and religious life of its people naturally turned again towards the earlier venerable centre, in Northern or Greater Armenia. After the death, at Sis (1410), of Patriarch Joseph II, irregularities occurred in the election of the new patriarch, Gregory Muspepekian, which northern bishops were willing to overlook if he would transfer his see to Greater Armenia. On his refusal a new election was held at Etschmiadzin where, it is said, about seven hundred bishops and archpriests (vertapods) assembled and elected Erazor, with whom begins the series of patriarchs of Etschmiadzin. By some stratagem the monastery is said to have secured from Sis the possession of the famous relic of St. Gregory. A patriarchal succession, however, was, and is still, maintained at Sis, where what purport to be the selfsame relics are shown and venerated.

There are, moreover, Armenian (schismatic) patriarchs at Aghamar, Jerusalem (1311) and Constantinople (1461), the latter for the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire, also an independent Archbishop of Lemberg. Several patriarchs of Etschmiadzin, Stephen V (1541), Michael of Sebastia (1564), David IV
Eucharist, a titular see of Phrygia Salutaris in Asia Minor. Eucarpii (Eucharis), mentioned by Strabo (XII, 579) and several other geographers, was situated on a road from Doryleum to Eumenia, between the Doryleum-Aemonia and Doryleum-Synnada roads, probably at the modern village of Emin Hisor, in the vilayet of Brussa. The imposing ruins, seen by Hamilton in 1837, have almost disappeared. Nothing is known about the history of the city, except that it is suggested by the coins from the time of Augustus till the reign of Volusianus. The bishopric, being a suffragan of Synnada, figures in the "Notitiae episcopatuum" until the twelfth or thirteenth century. Six bishops are known: Eugenius, present at the Council of Ephesus in 431, Ambroseus, consecrated by Dionysius in 536, Constantine or Constantius in 587 (not mentioned by Lequien), and Constantine in 879.


S. Pătridză.

Eucharist (Gr. εὐχαριστία, thanksgiving), the name given to the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar under its twofold aspect of sacrament and Sacrifice of the Mass, and in which, whether as sacrament or sacrifice, Jesus Christ is truly present under the appearances of bread and wine. Other titles are used, such as the "Lord's Supper" ( Corpus Domini), "Table of the Lord" (Menia Domini), the "Lord's Body" (Corpus Domini), and the "Holy of Holies" (Sollitatem), to which may be added the following expressions, now obsolete and somewhat altered from their primitive meaning: Aspe (Love-Feast), Enlogia (Blessing), "Table of Bread", "Synaxis", but the ancient title "Eucharistia", appearing in writers as early as Ignatius, Justin, and Irenaeus, has taken precedence in the technical terminology of the Church and her theologians. The expression "Blessed Sacrament of the Altar", introduced by Augustine, is at the present day almost entirely restricted to catechetical
The Church honours the Eucharist as one of her most exalted mysteries, since for sublimity and incomprehensibility it yields in nothing to the allied mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation. These three mysteries constitute a wonderful triad, which causes the intellectual character of Christianity, as a religion of mysteries far transcending the capabilities of reason, to shine forth in all its brilliance and splendour, and elevates Catholicism, the most faithful guardian and keeper of our Christian heritage, far above all pagan and non-Christian religions.

The organic connection of this mysterious triad is clearly discerned, if we consider Divine grace under the aspect of a personal communication of God. Thus in the bosom of the Blessed Trinity, God the Father, by virtue of the eternal generation, communicates His Divine Nature to the Son; “the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father” (John, i, 18), while the Son, by virtue of the hypostatic union, communicates in turn the Divine Nature received from His Father to His human nature formed in the womb of the Virgin Mary (John, i, 14), in order that thus as God-man, hidden under the Eucharistic Species, He might deliver to His Church, by means of the Eucharist, a mystery of immeasurably, and daily places it before her children as the spiritual food of their souls. Thus the Trinity, Incarnation, and Eucharist are really united together like a precious chain, which in a wonderful manner links heaven with earth, uniting them most intimitely and keeping them thus united. By the very fact that the Eucharistic mystery does transcend reason, no rationalistic explanation of it, based on a merely natural hypothesis and seeking to comprehend or of the sublime truths of the Christian religion as the spontaneous conclusion of logical processes, may be attempted by a Catholic theologian.

The modern science of comparative religion is striving wherever it can, to discover in pagan religions the natural prototypes of the theoretical and practical elements of Christianity, and thus by means of the former to give a natural explanation of the latter. Even were an analogy discernible between the Eucharistic repast and the ambrosia and nectar of the ancient Greek gods, or the haoma of the Indians, or the soma of the ancient Hindus, we should nevertheless be very cautious not to stretch a mere analogy to a parallelism strictly so called, since the Christian Eucharist has nothing at all in common with these pagan foods, whose origin is to be found in the crassest idol- and nature-worship. What we do particularly discover is a new proof of the reasonableness of the Catholic religion, from the circumstance that Jesus Christ in a wonderfully condescending manner responds to the natural craving of the human heart after a food which nourishes unto immortality, a craving expressed in many pagan religions, by dispensing to mankind His own Flesh and Blood. All that is beautiful, all that is true in the religions of nature, Christianity has appropriated to itself, and like a conch mirror has collected the dispersed and not infrequently distorted rays of truth into their common focus, and again sent them forth resplendently in perfect beams of light.

It is the Church alone, “the pillar and ground of truth”, imbued with and directed by the Holy Spirit, that guarantees to her children through her infallible teaching the full and unadulterated revelation of God. Consequently, it is the first duty of Catholics to adhere to what the Church proposes as the “proximate norm of faith” (regula fidei proxima), which, in reference to the Eucharist, is set forth in a particularly clear and detailed manner in Sessions XIII, XXI, and XXII of the Council of Trent. The quintessence of these doctrinal decisions consists in this, that in the Eucharist the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is truly, and substantially present for the nourishment of our souls, by reason of the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and that in this change of substances the unbloody Sacrifice of the New Testament is also contained. Since the humblest Christian is acquainted with the doctrine of transubstantiation from his childhood, there remain here for a more detailed consideration two principal truths: (I) The Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and (II) The Eucharist as a Sacrament.

1. The Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. — In this section we shall consider, first, the fact of the Real Presence, which is, indeed, the central dogma; then the several dogmas grouped about it, namely, the Totality of Presence, Transubstantiation, Permanence of Presence and the Adorableness of the Eucharist; and, finally, the speculations of reason, which, so far as speculative investigation regarding this august mystery under its various aspects is permissible, and so far as it is desirable to illumine it by the light of philosophy.

1. The Real Presence as a Fact. — According to the teaching of theology a revealed fact can be proofed, as a tendency to the faith, viz. Scripture and Tradition, with which is also bound up the infallible magisterium of the Church.

(a) Proof from Scripture. — This may be adduced both from the words of promise (John, vi, 26 sqq.) and, especially, from the words of Institution, as recorded in the Synoptics and St. Paul (I Cor., xi, 23 sqq.). By the miracles of the loaves and fishes and the walking upon the waters, on the previous day, Christ not only prepared His hearers for the sublime discourse containing the promise of the Eucharist, but also proved to them that He possessed, as Almighty God-man, a power superior to and independent of the laws of nature, and could, therefore, provide such a supernatural food, none other, in fact, than His own Flesh and Blood. This discourse was delivered at Capernaum (John, vi, 26–72), and is divided into two distinct parts, corresponding to the revelation of the truth: the first elucidates the nature of the Eucharist, the second the relation of the Eucharist to the Mysteries: the former, in the light of the Old Testament, the latter, in the light of the New Testament. Two kinds of food and three periods, there are as many dispensers—Moses dispensing the manna, the Father nourishing man’s faith in the Son of God made flesh, finally Christ giving His own Flesh and Blood. Although the manna, a type of the Eucharist, was instituted as a food, it could not, being a transitory food, ward off death. The second food, that offered by the Heavenly Father, is the bread of heaven, which He dispenses hic et nunc to the Jews for their spiritual nourishment, inasmuch as by reason of the Incarnation He holds up His Son to them as the object of their faith. If, however, the third kind of food, which Christ Him-
self promises to give only at a future time, is a new refection, differing from the last-named food of faith, it can be none other than His true Flesh and Blood, to be really eaten and drunk in Holy Communion. This is why Christ was so ready to use the realistic expressions (John, vi, 54, 55, 58): re-reading the phrase, "to eat" (John, vi, 51, 53: τρωγε). Cardinal Bellarmine (De Euchar., I, 3), moreover, calls attention to the fact, and rightly so, that if in Christ's mind the manna was a figure of the Eucharist, the latter must have been something more than that merely blessed bread, as otherwise the prototype would not substantially excel the type. The same holds true of the other figures of the Eucharist, as the bread and wine offered by Melchisedech, the loaves of proposition (panes propositionis), the paschal lamb. The impossibility of a figurative interpretation is brought home more forcibly by an analysis of the following text: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed" (John, vi, 54-56). It is true that even among the Nomites, and in Scripture itself, the phrase, "to eat some one's flesh", has a figurative meaning, namely, "to persecute, to bitterly hate some one". If, then, the words of Jesus are to be taken figuratively, it would appear that Christ had promised his enemies eternal life and raise them up in the last day, to a most solemn manner, in the texts quoted above (John, vi, 54 sq.). In consequence, many of His Disciples were scandalized and said: "This saying is hard, and who can hear it?" (John, vi, 61); but instead of retracting what He had said, Christ rather reproached them for their want of faith, by alluding to His sublimer origin and His future ascension into heaven. And without further ado He allowed these Disciples to go their way (John, vi, 62 sq.). Finally He turned to His twelve Apostles with the question: "Will you also go away?" Then Peter stepped forth and with humble faith replied: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known, that thou art the Christ, the Son of God" (John, vi, 68 sq.).

The entire scene of the discourse and murmurings against it proves that the Zwinglian and Anglican interpretation of the passage "It is the spirit that quickeneth", etc., in the sense of a glossing over or retraction, is wholly inadmissible. For in spite of these words the Disciples severed their connexion with Jesus, while the Twelve accepted with simple faith a mystery which as yet they did not understand. Nor did Christ say: "My flesh is spirit", i.e., to be understood figuratively, but: "My words are spirit and life". There are two views regarding the sense in which this text is to be interpreted. Many of the Fathers declare that the true Flesh of Jesus (τὸ σῶμα) is not to be understood as separated from His Divinity (σωματικά), and hence not in a cannibalistic sense, but as belonging entirely to the supernature of the economy. The second and more scientific explanation asserts that in the Scriptural opposition of "flesh and blood" to "spirit", the former always signifies carnal-mindedness, the latter mental perception illumined by faith, and that the expression of Jesus in this passage to give prominence to the fact that the sublimity of the Eucharist can be grasped in the light of supernatural faith alone, whereas it cannot be understood by the carnal-minded, who are weighed down under the burden of sin. Under such circumstances it is not to be wondered at that the Fathers and several ecumenical councils (Ephesus, 431; Nicea, 787) adopted the literal sense of the words, though it was not dogmatically defined (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXI, c. i). If it be true that a few Catholic theologians (as Cajetan, Ruardus Tapper, Johann Hessel, and the elder Jansenius) preferred the figurative interpretation, it was merely for controversial reasons, because in their perplexity they imagined that otherwise the claims of the Hussite and Protestant Utraquists for the partaking of the Chalice by the laity could not be answered by argument from Scripture. (Cf. Patrizi, "De Christo pane vitae", Rome, 1551, Schmitt, "Die Verheissung der Eucharistie bei den Vatizen", 2 vols., Wurzburg, 1900-03.)

The Church's Magna Charta, however, are the words of Institution, "This is my body—this is my blood", whose literal meaning she has uninterruptedly adhered to from the earliest times. The Real Presence is evinced, positively and negatively, by showing, not only that the literal sense of these words, and negatively, by refuting the figurative interpretations. As regards the first, the very existence of four distinct narratives of the Last Supper, divided usually into the Petrine (Matt., xxvi, 26 sq.; Mark, xiv, 22 sq.) and the Pauline (Luke, xxii, 19 sq.; Cor., xii, 24 sq.) favours the literal interpretation. In spite of their striking unaniinity as regards essentials, the Petrine account is simpler and clearer, whereas the Pauline is richer in additional details and more involved in its citation of the words that refer to the Chalice. It is but natural and justifiable to expect that, when four different narrators in different countries and at different times relate the words of Institution to different circles of readers, the occurrence of an unusual figure of speech, as, for instance, that bread is the sign of Christ's Body, would, somewhere or other, betray itself, either in the difference of word-setting, or in the unequivocal expression of the meaning really intended, or at least in the addition of some such remark as: "He spoke, however, of the sign of His Body." But nowhere do we discover the slightest ground for a figurative interpretation. If, then, the natural, literal interpretation were false, the Scriptural record alone would have to be considered as the cause of a pernicious error in faith and of the grievous crime of rendering Divine homage to bread (artolatria)—a supposition little in harmony with the character of the four Sacred Writers and with the inspiration of the Sacred Text. Moreover, we must not omit the very important circumstance, that one of the four narrators has interpreted his own account literally. This is St. Paul (I Cor., xi, 27 sq.), who, in the most vigorous language, brands the unworthy recipient as "guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord". There can be no question of a grievous offence against Christ Himself, unless we suppose that the true Body and the true Blood of Christ are really present in the Eucharist. Further, if we attend only to the words themselves, their natural sense is so forceful and clear that even the most extreme of the Catholic Fathers would, somewhere or other, say: "I am caught, I cannot escape, the text is too forcible" (De Wette, I, 577). The necessity of the natural sense is not based upon the absurd assumption that Christ could not in general have resorted to the use of figures, but upon the evident requirements of
the case, which demand that He did not, in a matter of such paramount importance, have recourse to meaningless and deceptive metaphors. For figures enhance the clearness of speech only when the figurative meaning is obvious, either from the nature of the case (e. g from a reference to a statute of Lincoln, by saying: "This is Lincoln reefed," or from uttering nonsense by one means or another (e. g. in the case of this synecdoche: "This glass is wine"). Now, neither from the nature of the case nor in common parlance is bread an apt or possible symbol of the human body. Were one to say of a piece of bread: "This is Napoleon"; he would not be using a figure, but uttering nonsense. There is but one means of rendering a symbol improperly so called clear and intelligible, namely, by conventionally setting beforehand what it is to signify, as, for instance, if one were to say: "Let us imagine these two pieces of bread before us to be Socrates and Pluto." Christ, however, instead of informing His Apostles that He intended to use such a figure, told them rather the contrary in the discourse containing the promise: "the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world" (John, vi, 52). Such language, of course, could be used only by a God-man; so that belief in the Person necessarily necessarily renders belief in the true Divinity of Christ. The foregoing rules would of themselves establish the natural meaning with certainty, even if the words of Institution, "This is my body"—this is my blood", stood alone. But in the original text corpus (body) and sanguis (blood) are found in the presence of the people, who without knowledge of the words of their Master and with deep faith accepted whatever He proposed to them. This childlike disposition to be reckoned with by Christ, particularly on the eve of His Passion and Death, when He made His last will and testament and spoke as a dying father to His deeply afflicted children. In such a moment of awful solemnity, the only appropriate mode of speech would be one which, stripped of unintelligible figures, made use of words corresponding exactly to the meaning to be conveyed. It must be remembered, also, that Christ as omniscient God-man, must have foreseen the error into which He would have led His Apostles and His Church by adopting an unheard-of metaphor; for the Church down to the present day appeals to the words of Christ in her teaching and practice. If then she practices idolatry by the adoration of mere bread and wine, this crime must be laid to the charge of the God-man Himself. Besides this, Christ intended to institute the Eucharist as a most holy sacrament, to be solemnly celebrated in the Church even to the end of time. But the content and the constituent parts of a sacrament had to be stated with such clearness of terminology and to exclude all error in liturgy and worship. As may be gathered from the words of consecration of the Chalice, Christ established the New Testament in His Blood, just as the Old Testament had been established in the typical blood of animals (cf. Ex., xxiv, 8; Heb., ix, 11 sqq.). With the true instinct of justice, jurists prescribe that in all debatable points the words of a will must be taken in their natural, literal sense; for they are led by the correct conviction, that every testator of sound mind, in drawing up his last will and testament, is deeply concerned to have it done in language at once clear and unmistakable. From this common purpose, Christ, according to the literal purport of His testament, has left us as a precious legacy, not mere bread and wine, but His Body and Blood. Are we justified, then, in contradicting Him to His face and exclaiming: No, this is not your Body, but mere bread, the sign of your Body!

The refutation of the so-called Sacramentarians, a name given by Luther to those who opposed the Real Presence, evinces as clearly the impossibility of a figurative meaning. Once the manifest literal sense is abandoned, occasion is given to interminable controversies about the meaning of an enigma which Christ supposedly offered His followers for solution. There were no limits to the dispute in the sixteenth century, for at that time Christopher Rasperger wrote a whole book on some 200 different interpretations: "Duoent verborum, 'Hoc est corpus meum' interpretationes" (Frankfort, 1577). If we confine ourselves to an examination of the most current and widely known disturbances of the literal sense, which were the butt of Luther's bitter ridicule even as early as 1527. The first group of interpreters, with Zwingli, discovers a figure in the corpus and rends the sentence: "This signifies (that is, is significant) my body." A proof of this interpretation, examples are quoted from Scripture, as: "The seven kine are seven years" (Gen., xli, 26) or: "Sara and Agar are the two covenants" (Gal., iv, 24). Waiving the question whether the verb "to be" (esse) or the verb "to signify" is the true interpretation of the words of Institution, there remains a fourth and last of decisive significance, namely: when a complete substance is predicated of another complete substance, there can exist no logical relation of identity between them, but only the relation of similarity, inasmuch as the first is an image, symbol, of the other. Now this last-named criterion is inapplicable to the Scriptural examples brought forward by the Zwinglians, and especially so in regard to their interpretation of the words of Institution; for the words are not: "This bread is my Body", but indefinitely: "This is my Body!" In the story of the Zwinglian conception of the Lord's Supper, certain "sacramental expressions" (locuciones sacramentales) of the Sacred Text, regarded as parallelisms of the words of Institution, have attracted considerable attention. The first is to be found in 1 Cor., x, 4: "And the rock was [signified] Christ." And the rock was [signified] Christ. In this evident that, if the subject rock is taken in its material sense, the metaphor, according to the fourth criterion just mentioned, is as apparent as in the analogous phrase: "Christ is the vine". If, however, the word rock in this passage is stripped of all that is material, it may be understood in a spiritual sense, because the Apostle himself is speaking of that "spiritual rock"
The traces of the Institution; It is well known how Zwingli by a clever manipulation of the latter phrase succeeded in one day in winning over to his interpretation the entire church of Zurich. And yet it is clear that no parallelism can be discerned between the aforesaid expressions and the words of Institution; no real parallelism, because there is question of entirely different matters. Not even a verbal parallelism can be pointed out, since in both texts of the Old Testament the subject is a ceremony (circumcision in the first case, and the rite of the paschal lamb in the second), while the predicate involves a mere abstraction (covenant, Passover of the Lord). A more weighty consideration is this, that on closer investigation the copula est will be found to retain the former meaning of "signum corporis", rather than "signum actus". For just as the circumcision not only signified the nature or object of the Divine covenant, but really was such, so the rite of the paschal lamb was really the Passover (Phase) or Pasch, instead of its mere representation. It is true that in certain Anglican circles it would be considered the custom to speak of the words of Institution, not as the poverty of the Aramaic tongue, which was spoken by Christ in the company of His Apostles; for it was maintained that no word could be found in this language corresponding to the concept "to signify". Yet, even precluding from the fact that in the Aramaic tongue the copula est is usually omitted and an omission rather makes for its strict meaning of "to be", Cardinal Wiseman (Note Syriaec, Rome, 1828, pp. 3-73) succeeded in producing no less than forty Syriac expressions conveying the meaning of "to signify" and thus effectually exploded the myth of the Semitic tongue's limited vocabulary.

A second group of Sacramentarians, with Oecolamphadius, shifted the diligently sought-for metaphor to the concept contained in the predicate corpus, giving to the latter the sense of "signum corporis", so that the words of Institution were to be rendered: "This is a body of Christ", imagine, in a sense tallying with the Zwinglian interpretation, this new meaning is entirely untenable. In all the languages of the world the expression "my body" designates a person's natural body, not the mere sign or symbol of that body. True it is that the Scriptural words "Body of Christ" not unfrequently have the meaning of "Church", which is called the mystical Body of Christ, a figure easily and always discernible as such from the text or context (cf. Col., I, 24). This mystical sense, however, is impossible in the words of Institution, for the simple reason that Christ did not give the copula est, but His Body, and that "body and blood", by reason of their real and logical association, cannot be separated from one another, and hence are all the less susceptible of a figurative use. The case would be different if the reading were: "This is the bread of Christ, the wine of my Blood". In order to prove at least this much, that the contents of the Chalice are merely wine and, consequently, a mere sign of the Blood, Protestants have recourse to the text of St. Matthew, who relates that Christ, after the completion of the Last Supper, declared: "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, unless it be the fruit of the Kingdom of God" (Matt., xxvi, 29). It is to be noted that St. Luke (xxii, 18 sqq.), who is chronologically more exact, places these words of Christ before his account of the Institution, and that the true Blood of Christ may with right still be called (consecrated) wine, on the one hand, because the Blood was partaken of after the manner in which wine is drunk, and, on the other, because the Blood continues to exist under the outward appearances of the wine. In its multifarious wanderings from the old beaten path, being consistently forced with the denial of Christ's divinity to abandon the words of Institution, and in the interpretation of the words of Institution also, modern criticism seeks to account for the text along other lines. With utter arbitrariness, doubting whether the words of Institution originated from the mouth of Christ, it traces them to St. Paul as their author, whose in ardent soul something original supposed to be inserted in the traditions of the Church, the value attached to "Body" and on the "repetition of the Eucharistic banquet". From this troubled fountain-head the words of Institution first found their way into the Gospel of St. Luke and then, by way of addition, were woven into the texts of St. Matthew and St. Mark. It stands to reason that the latter assertion is nothing more than a wholly unwarrantable conjecture, which may be passed over as gratuitously as it was advanced. It is, moreover, essentially untrue that the value attached to the Sacrifice and the repetition of the Lord's Supper are mere reflections of the words of Institution. Attached a sacrifice to His Death (cf. Mark, x, 45) and celebrated His Eucharistic Supper in connexion with the Jewish Passover, which it itself had to be repeated yearly. As regards the interpretation of the words of Institution, there are at present three modern explanations connected with the symbolism of the Eucharist—ecological, and the eschatological. According to the symbolic interpretation, corpus is supposed to designate the Church as the mystical Body and sanguis the New Testament. We have already rejected this last meaning as impossible. For is St. Paul brand the partaking of the Church and of the New Testament as a heinous offence committed against the Body and Blood of Christ? The case is not much better in regard to the parabolical interpretation, which would discern in the pouring out of the wine a mere parable of the shedding of the Blood on the Cross. This again is a purely arbitrary explanation, an invention, unsupported by any objective foundation. Then, too, it would follow from analogy, that the breaking of the bread was a parable of the slaying of Christ's Body, a meaning utterly inadmissible, seeing that we are out of our depth and labouring to take on a definite form, the incomplete eschatological explanation would make the Eucharist a mere anticipation of the future heavenly banquet. Supposing the truth of the Real Presence, this consideration might be opened to discussion, inasmuch as the partaking of the Bread of Angels is really the foretaste of eternal beatitude and the anticipated transformation of earth into heaven. But as implying a mere symbolic anticipation of heaven and a meaningless manipulation of un consecrated bread and wine, the eschatological interpretation is diametrically opposed to the text and finds not the slightest support in the life and character of Christ.

Concerning the entire matter, see Helf, Die Einsetzung des Abendmahls als Ritus für die Gottesdienstpraxis der Kirche (Würzburg, 1899); Körner, Die heilige Communie als Gegenstand der Kirchenrechtsgeschichte (Leipzig, 1909); also LOHÉ, Abendmahl in der neuzeitlichen Liturgien (Münster, 1900); H. Bernier, Die Einsetzung der hl. Eucharistie, in ihr ursprünglicher Form (Münster, 1901); and R. M. Polli, "Concerning the Eucharist in the Early Church", in The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, 1910), vol. 1, p. 155.

(b) Proof from Tradition.—As for the cogency of the argument from tradition, this historical fact is of decided significance, namely, that the dogma of the Real Presence remained, properly speaking, unchallenged throughout the time of the heretic Berengarius of Tours (d. 1088), and so could claim even at that time the uninterrupted possession of ten centuries. In the course of the dogma's history there arose in general
three great Eucharistic controversies, the first of
which, begun by Paschalis Radbertus, in the ninth
century, scarcely extended beyond the limits of his
audience and concerned itself solely with the philoso-
phical question, whether the Eucharistic Body of
Christ is spiritual in its natural Body He had
received, and now and then in heaven. Such a numerical
identity could well have been denied by Ratramnus,
Rabanus Maurus, Ratherus, Lanfranc, and others,
since even nowadays a true, though accidental, distinc-
tion between the sacramental and the natural condi-
tion of Christ’s Body must be rigorously maintained.
The first occasion for an official decision in the
Church was offered when Berengarius of Tours, in
fluenced by the writings of Scotos Eriugena (d. about 884),
the first opponent of the Real Presence,
rejected both the latter truth and that of Transubstan-
tiation. He repaired, however, the public scandal he
had given by a sincere repudiation made in the presence
of Pope Gregory VII at a synod held in Rome in 1079,
and died reconciled to the Church. The third and the
sharpest controversy was that opened by the Riforma-
tion in the sixteenth century, in regard to which it
must be remarked that Luther was the only one among
the Reformers who still maintained the Catholic
doctrine, and, though subjecting it to manifold
misrepresentations, defended it most tenaciously. He
was diametrically opposed by Zwingli of Zurich, who,
as was seen above, reduced the Eucharist to an empty,
meaningless symbol. Having gained over to his views
some of the Reformers of the day, as Calvin, Bucer, and
Ecolampadius, he later on secured influential
allies in the Arminians, Menonites, Socinians, and
Anabaptists, and even to-day the rationalistic con-
ception of the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper does not
differ substantially from that of the Zwinglians.
In this statement, at Geneva, Calvin and Bucer sought to
bring about a compromise between the extremes of
the Lutheran literal and the Zwinglian figurative
interpretations, by suggesting instead of the substantial
presence in one case or the merely symbolical in the
other, a “dynamis” presence, which consists essentially in
this, that at the moment of recep-
tion, the efficacy of Christ’s Body and Blood is
communicated from heaven to the souls of the presen-
ted and spiritually nourishes them. Thanks to
Melanchthon’s pernicious and dishonest double-deal-
ing, this attractive intermediary position of Calvin
made such an impression even in Lutheran circles that
it was not until the Formula of Concord in 1577 that
the “crypto-Calvinistic venom” was successfully re-
jected from the body of Lutheran doctrine. The
Council of Trent met these widely divergent errors of
the Reformation with the dogmatic definition, that
the God-man is “truly, really, and substantially”
present under the appearances of bread and wine,
purposely intending thereby to oppose the expression
sacramentorum differentiae (Sess. XIII, can. 1). And this teaching of the Council of Trent has
never been and is now the unavailing position of the
whole of Catholic Christendom.

As regards the doctrine of the Fathers, it is not pos-
sible in the present article to multiply patristic texts,
which are usually characterized by wonderful beauty
and clarity. Suffice it to say that, beside the
Didache (i, x, xiv), the most ancient Fathers, as
Ignatius (Ad Smyrn., vii; Ad Ephes., xx; Ad Philad.,
iv), Justin (Apol., I, lxvi), Irenæus (Adv. Hær., IV,
xvii, 5; IV, xvii, 4; V, ii, 2), Tertullian (De resurrection.
carn., viii; De pudice, ix; De orat., xix; De bapt., xvii),
and Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. xvi, 17), have
not without the slightest shadow of a misunderstanding
what is the faith of the Church, while later patristic
theology bears witness to the dogma in terms that ap-
proach exaggeration, as Gregory of Nyssa (Orat.
catech., xxxvii), Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. myst., iv,
2 sqq.), and especially the Doctor of the Eucharist,
Chrysostom (Hom. lxxiii (lxxxiii), in Matt., I, sqq.;
Hom. xlii, in Joan., 2 sqq.; Hom. xxiv, in I Cor., 1
sq.; Hom. ix, de pentic., 1), to whom may be added
the Latin Fathers, Hilary (De Trinit., VIII, iv, 13)
and Ambrose (De myst., viii, 49; ix, 51 sq.). Concern-
ing the Syrian Fathers, Th. Lincot (”Dagom.
Dictionnaire de la Science de l’Eucharistie,” 4th ed., Halle, 1906, p. 409), St. August-
usine never gives the “reception of the true Body and
Blood of Christ” a thought; and this view Ad. Har-
nack (Dagomérgeschichte, 3rd ed., Freiburg, 1897, III,
148) emphasises when he declares that St. August-
usine “undoubtedly was one in this respect with the
so-called pre-Reformation and with Zwingli.” Against
this rather hasty conclusion Catholics first of all ad-
vance the undoubted fact that Augustine demanded
that Divine worship should be rendered to the Eucha-
ristic Flesh (In Ps. xxxiii, enarr., 1, 10), and declared
that the Last Supper was a true Body and Blood of
Christ, and that he believed “in His own hands” (In Ps. xcvi, v. 9). They
insist, and rightly so, that it is not fair to separate
this great Doctor’s teaching concerning the Eucharist
from his doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice, since he clearly
and unmistakably asserts that the true Body and Blood
of Christ are indeed offered in the Holy Sacrament.
The various views just mentioned requires that an attempt
be made at a reasonable and unbiased explanation, whose
verification is to be sought for and found in the
acknowledged fact that a gradual process of development
took place in the mind of St. Augustine. No one will deny that cogently and convincingly he
asserts Augustine as forcibly realistic as those of Tertullian and
Cyprian or of his intimate literary friends, Ambrose,
Optatus of Milevi, Hilary, and Chrysostom. On
the other hand, it is beyond question that, owing to the
determing influence of Origen and the Platonist
philosophy, which, as is well known, attached slight
value to visible matter and the sensible pheno-
mena of the world, Augustine did not refer what was
properly real (res) in the Blessed Sacrament to the
Flesh of Christ (caro), but transferred it to the quicken-
ing principle (spiritus), i. e. to the effect produced by
a worthy Communion. A logical consequence of this
was that he allowed to caro, as the vehicle and
antitype of res, not indeed a mere symbolical worth,
but at best a transitory, intermediary, and subordinate
worth (signum), and placed the Flesh and Blood of
Christ, present under the appearances (fictura) of
bread and wine, in too decided an opposition to His
natural, historical Body. Since Augustine was a strenuous defender of personal co-operation and effort
in the work of salvation and an enemy to mere me-
chanical activity and supernatural routine, he omitted
insisting upon a lively faith in the real personality of
Jesus in the Eucharist, and called attention to the
spiritual efficacy of the Flesh of Christ instead. His
mental vision was fixed, not so much upon the saving
caro, as upon the spiritus, which alone possessed
worth. Nevertheless a turning-point occurred in this
conflict with Pelagianism and the diligent perusal of
the Chrysostom freed him from the bondage of Platonism,
and he thenceforth attached to caro a separate, indi-
vidual value independent of that of spiritus, going so
far, in fact, as to maintain too strongly that the Com-
union of children was absolutely necessary to salva-
tion. If, moreover, the reader finds in some of the
other Fathers difficulties, obscurities, and a certain
inaccuracy of expression, this may be explained on
three general grounds: (1) because of the peace
and security there is in their possession of the Church’s
truth, whence resulted a certain want of accuracy in
their terminology; (2) because of the strictness with which the Discipline of the Secret, expressly concerned with the Holy Eucharist, was maintained in the East until the end of the fifth, in the West down to the middle of the sixth century; (3) because of the preference of the Fathers for the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, which was especially in vogue in the Alexandrian School (Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyril), but which found a salutary counterpoise in the emphasis laid on the literal interpretation by the School of Antioch (Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodore of Mopsuestia, who, by his allegorical sense of the Presence in the Eucharist, which the Alexandrians did not exclude the literal, but rather supposed it as a working basis, the realistic phraseology of Clement (Ped., i, vi), of Origen (Contra Celsum, VIII, xiii, 32; Hom. ix, in Levit., x), and of Cyril (in Matt., xxvi, xxvii; Contra Nestor., IV, 5) concerning the Real Presence is readily accounted for.

(For the solution of patristic difficulties, see Pfeiffer, "Dogmatik," 3rd ed., Paderborn, 1908, II, 209 sqq.)

The argument from tradition is supplemented and completed by the argument from prescription, which traces the constant belief in the dogma of the Real Presence through the Middle Ages back to the Council of Antioch, AD 156; and proves the anti-Eucharistic heresies to have been capricious novelties and violent ruptures of the true faith as handed down from the beginning. Passing over the interval that has elapsed since the Reformation, as this period receives its entire character from the Council of Trent, we have for the time of the Reformation the important testimony of Luther (Wider etliche Rottengeister, 1532) for the fact that the whole of Christendom then believed in the Real Presence. And this firm, universal belief can be traced back uninterruptedly to Berengarius of Tours (d. 1088), in fact—omitting the sole exception of the Nestorians—to Paschalis Radbertus (831). On these grounds, therefore, we may confidently maintain that the Church has been in legitimate possession of this dogma for fully eleven centuries. When Photus started the Greek Schism in 867, he took over to his Church the inalienable heritage of the Catholic Eucharist, a treasure which the Greeks, in the negotiations for reunion at Lyons in 1274 and at Florence in 1439, could show to be still intact, and which they vigorously defended in the schismatical Synod of Jerusalem (1672) against the sordid machinations of the Calvinistic Mandelsloh. Patriarch of Constantinople (1629). From this it follows conclusively that the Catholic dogma must be much older than the Eastern Schism under Photius. In fact, even the Nestorians and Monophysites, who broke away from Rome in the fifth century, have, as is evident from their literature and liturgical books, preserved their faith in the Eucharist as unswervingly as the Greeks, and this in spite of the dogmatic difficulties which, on account of their denial of the hypostatic union, stood in the way of a clear and correct notion of the Real Presence. Therefore the Catholic dogma is at least as old as Nestorianism (311 A.D.) But is it not of even greater antiquity? To decide this question one has only to examine the oldest Liturgies of the Mass, whose essential elements date back to the time of the Apostles (see articles on the various liturgies), to visit the Roman Catocombs (see Catacombs, Roman), where Christ is shown as present in the Eucharistic food under the symbol of a fish (see Eucharist, Early Symbols of the), to decipher the famous Inscription of Ariburus (see Abercius, Inscription of), of the second century, which, though composed under the influence of the Discipline of the Secret, plainly attests the faith of that age. And thus the argument from prescription has a basis back to the dim and distant past and thence to the time of the Apostles, who in turn could have received their faith in the Real Presence from no one but Christ Himself.

On the argument from tradition, cf. Ernst, Die Lehre des Pachiasius Radbertus von der Eucharistie (Freiburg, 1896).

(2) The Totality of the Real Presence.—In order to forestall at the very outset the unworthy notion, that in the Eucharist we receive merely the Body and not the Soul and Divinity of Christ, the Council of Trent defined the Real Presence to be such as to include with Christ's Body and Blood His Soul and Divinity as well. A strictly logical conclusion from the words of promise: "he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me", this totality of Presence was also the constant property of the dogma which characterized the partaking of separated parts of the Saviour as a sacrophagy (flesh-eating) altogether derogatory to God. Although the separation of the Body, Blood, Soul, and Logos, is, absolutely speaking, within the allpowerful power of God, yet their actual inseparability is firmly established in the dogma of the indissolubility of the hypostatic union of Christ's Divinity and Humanity. In case the Apostles had celebrated the Lord's Supper during the fieri dim sum mortis (the time during which Christ's Body was in the tomb), when a real separation took place between the constitutive elements of Christ, there would have been really present in the Sacred Host only the bloodless, immaculate Body of Christ as it lay in the tomb, and in the chalice only the Blood separated from His Body and absorbed by the earth as it was shed, both the Body and the Blood, however, remaining hypostatically united to His Divinity. If the Mystical Body, which sojourned in Limbo, would have remained entirely excluded from the Eucharistic presence. This unreal, though not impossible, hypothesis, is well calculated to throw light upon the essential difference designated by the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII., c. 6), between the meanings of the words Institution and Consecration, or ex viti verbo, that only is made present which is expressed by the words of Institution, namely the Body and the Blood of Christ. But by reason of a natural concomitance (per concomitatem), there are sometimes simultaneously present all that which is physically inseparable from the parts just named, and which must, from a natural connexion with them, always be their accompaniment. Now, the glorified Christ, who "dieth now no more" (Rom., vi, 9), has an animate Body through whose veins circulates His life's Blood under the vivifying influence of the soul. Consequently, together with His Body and Blood and Soul, His whole Humanity also, and, by virtue of the hypostatic union, His Divinity, i. e. Christ whole and entire, must be present. Hence Christ is present in the sacrament with His Flesh and Blood, Body and Soul, Humanity and Divinity.

This general and fundamental principle, which entirely abstracts from the duality of the species, must, nevertheless, be extended to each of the species of bread and wine. For we do not receive in the Sacred Host one part of Christ and in the Chalice the other, as though our reception of the totality depended upon our partaking of both forms; on the contrary, under
the appearance of bread alone, as well as under the appearance of wine alone, we receive Christ whole and entire (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, can. iii). This, the only reasonable conception, finds its Scriptural verification in the fact, that St. Paul (1 Cor., xi. 27, 29) attaches the phrase of “the body and the blood” to the “Lord” as the unworthy “eating or drinking”, understood in a disjunctive sense, as he does to “eating and drinking”, understood in a copulative sense. The traditional foundation for this is to be found in the testimony of the Fathers and of the Church’s liturgy, according to which the glorified Saviour can be present on earth only in His two natural essences, not divided into parts or distorted to the form of a monstrosity. It follows, therefore, that supreme adoration is separately due to the Sacred Host and to the consecrated contents of the Chalice. On this last truth are based especially the permissibility and intrinsic propriety of Communion only under one kind for the laity and for priests not celebrating Mass (see Communion under both kinds). But in particularizing upon the dogma, we are naturally led to the further truth, that, at least at the actual division of either Species into parts, Christ is present in each part in Host and Chalice, and not only in His two natural essences, but also in His two natural states. They may only judge it improbable that Christ conserved separately each particle of the bread He had broken, we know with certainty, on the other hand, that He blessed the entire contents of the Chalice and then gave it to His disciples to be partaken of distributively (cf. Matt., xxviii. 26; Mark, xvi. 23). It is only on the basis of the Tridinium dogma that we can understand how Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. myst. v. n. 21) and later councils of Alexandria and of Autun (516), and of Avignon (d. 1439), and of Blois (d. about 1200), whereupon several ecumenical councils also adopted this significant expression, as the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215), and the Council of Lyons (1274), in the profession of faith of the Greek Emperor Michael Palaeologus. The Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, can. iv, can. ii) not only accepted as an inheritance of faith the truth contained in the idea, but authoritatively confirmed the “aptitude of the term” to express most strikingly the legitimately developed doctrinal concept. In a closer logical analysis of Transubstantiation, we find the first and fundamental notion to be that of conversion, which may be defined as “the transition of one thing into another in some aspect of being”. As is immediately evident, conversion (conversio) is something more than mere change (mutatio). Whereas in mere changes one of the two extremes may be expressed negatively, as “to turn from the light into the darkness”, in the Sacrament of Christ, it concerns two positive extremes, which are related to each other as thing to thing, and must have, besides, such an intimate connexion with each other, that the last extreme (terminus ad quem) begins to be only as the first (terminus a quo) ceases to be, as, e. g., in the conversion of water into wine. A thing which is usually required, known as the commune tertium, which, even after conversion has taken place, either physically or at least logically unites one extreme to the other; for in every true conversion the following condition must be fulfilled: “What was formerly A is now B”. A very important question is raised as to whether the definition should further postulate the previous non-existence of the last extreme, for it seems strange that an existing terminus a quo, A, should be converted into an already existing terminus ad quem, B. If the act of conversion is to become a mere process of substitution, as in a sight-of-hand performances, the terminus ad quem must unquestionably in some manner newly exist, just as the terminus a quo must in some manner really cease to exist. Yet as the disappearance of the latter is not attributable to the substance, but only to the substance acquired, it is altogether new and previously non-existing mode of being. Thus in the resurrection of the dead, the dust of the human bodies will be truly converted into the bodies of the risen by their previously existing souls, just as at death they had been truly converted into corpses by the departure of the souls. This much as regards the general notion of conversion. Transubstantiation, however, is not a conversion simply so called, but a substantial conversion (conversio substantialis), inasmuch as one thing is substantially or essentially converted into another. Thus from the concept of Transubstantiation is excluded every sort of mere accidental conversion, whether it is purely natural (e. g. the metamorphosis of insects) or supernatural (e. g. the Transfiguration of Christ on Mount Tabor). Finally, Transubstantiation differs from every other substantial conversion in this, that only the substance is converted into another—the accidents remaining the same—just as would be the case if the bread were miraculously converted into iron, the substance of the iron remaining hidden under the external appearance of the wood.

The application of the foregoing to the Eucharist is an easy matter. First of all the notion of conversion is verified in the Eucharist, not only in general, but in
all its essential details. For we have the two extremes of conversion, namely, bread and wine as the terminus a quo, and the Body and Blood of Christ as the terminus ad quem. Furthermore, the intimate connexion between the cessation of one extreme and the apparition of the other seems to be preserved by the Church that both events are the results, not of two independent processes, as, e.g. annihilation and creation, but of one single act, since, according to the purpose of the Almighty, the substance of the bread and wine departs in order to make room for the Body and Blood of Christ. Lastly, we have the commune tertium in the unchanged appearance of bread and wine, under which appearances the pre-existent Christ assumes a new, sacramental mode of being, and without which His Body and Blood could not be parted of by men. That the consequence of Transubstantiation, as a conversion of the total substance, is the transition of the entire substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, is the express doctrine of the Church (Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, can. ii). Thus were condemned as contrary to faith the antiquated view of Durandus, that only the substantial form (forma substantialis) of the bread and wine is transformed, while the primary matter (materia prima) remained, and, especially, Luther's doctrine of Consubstantiality, i.e. the coexistence of the substance of the bread with the true Body of Christ. Thus, too, the theory of Impanation advocated by Oslander and certain Reformed writers, and the doctrine of the static union is supposed to take place between the substance of the bread and the God-man (impantatio Deus panis factus), is authoritatively rejected. So the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation sets up a mighty bulwark around the dogma of the Real Presence and constitutes in itself a distinct doctrine of Its own, which is not involved in that of the Real Presence, though the doctrine of the Real Presence is necessarily contained in that of Transubstantiation. It was for this very reason that Pius VI, in his dogmatic Bull "Auctorem fidelis" (1784) against the Jansenistic pseudo-Synod of Pistoia (1780), protested most vigorously against suppressing this "scholastic question", as the synod had advised pastors to do.

(b) In the mind of the Church, Transubstantiation has been so intimately bound up with the Real Presence, that both dogmas have been handed down together. The Real Presence to this generation is not entirely ignore a dogmatico-historical development. The total conversion of the substance of bread is expressed clearly in the words of Institution: "This is my body". These words form, not a theoretical, but a practical proposition, whose essence consists in this, that the objective identity between subject and predicate is effected and verified only after the words have all been uttered, not unlike the pronouncement of a king to a subject: "You are a major", or, "You are a captain", which would immediately cause the promotion of the officer to a higher command. When, therefore, the Pope is All Power and All Might, and says: "This is my body", the bread became, through the utterance of these words, the Body of Christ; consequently, on the completion of the sentence the substance of bread was no longer present, but the Body of Christ under the outward appearance of bread. Hence the bread must have become the Body of Christ, i.e. the former must have been converted into the latter. The words of Institution were at the same time the words of Transubstantiation. Indeed, the actual manner in which the absence of the bread and the presence of the Body of Christ is effected is not read into the words of Institution, but strictly and exegetically deduced from them. The Calvinists, therefore, are perfectly right when they reject the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiality as a fiction, with no foundation in Scripture. For had Christ intended to assert the coexistence of His Body with the substance of the bread, He would not have expressed a simple identity between locos and corpus by means of the copula est, but would have resorted to some such expression as: "This bread contains my body", or, "In this bread is my body." The doctrine of Transubstantiation, as the theory that the bread becomes the Body of Christ, He would have had to state this expressly, for neither from the nature of the case nor according to common parlance can a piece of bread be made to signify the receptacle of a human body. On the other hand, the synedechism is plain in the case of the Chalice: "This is my blood" i.e., the contents of the Chalice are my blood, and hence no longer wine.

Regarding tradition, the earliest witnesses, as Tertullian and Cyprian, could hardly have given any particular consideration to the genetic relation of the natural elements of bread and wine to the Body and Blood of Christ, or to the manner in which the former were converted into the latter; for even Augustine was deprived of a clear conception of Transubstantiation, so long as he was held in the bonds of Platonism. On the other hand, complete clearness on the subject had been attained by writers as early as Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyprian of Carthage, and Cyril of Alexandria in the East, and by Ambrose and the later Latin writers in the West. Eventually the West became the classic home of scientific perfection in the difficult doctrine of Transubstantiation. The claims of the learned work of the Anglican Dr. Pusey (The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers, Oxford, 1855), who denied the cogency of the patristic argument for Transubstantiation, have been met and thoroughly answered by Cardinal Franzelin (De Euchar., Rome, 1887,thes. xiv). The argument from tradition is strikingly confirmed by the ancient liturgies, whose touching and beautiful prayers express the idea of conversion in the clearest manner. Many examples may be found in Renadou, "Liturgie orient." (2nd ed., Frankfort, 1847); Assenman, "Codex liturg." (13 vols., Rome, 1749-66); Denzinger, "Ritus Orientalium" (2 vols., Wurzburg, 1864). Concerning the Adduction Theory of the Scotists and the Production Theory of the Thomists, see Pohle, "Dogmatik" (3rd ed., Paderborn, 1908), III, 237 sqq.

(4) The Permanence and Aadoxableness of the Blessed Eucharist.—Since Luther arbitrarily restricted the operation of transubstantiation to the moment of reception (e.g., Wengert), the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, can. iv) by a special canon emphasized the fact, that immediately after the Consecration Christ is truly present and, consequently, does not make His Presence dependent upon the act of eating or drinking. On the contrary, He continues His Eucharistic Presence even in the consecrated Hosts and Sacred particles that remain on the altar or in the ciborium after the distribution of Holy Communion. In the deposit of faith the Real Presence and the Permanence of Presence are so closely allied, that in the mind of the Church both conformed to and defined the whole. The object of this doctrine is to answer the question, whether just as Christ promised His Flesh and Blood as meat and drink, i.e. as something permanent (cf. John, vi. 50 sqq.), so, when He said: "Take ye and eat. This is my body", the Apostles received from the hand of the Lord His Sacred Body, which was already objectively present and did not first become so in the act of partaking. This non-dependence of the Real Presence upon the actual reception is manifested very clearly in the case of the Chalice, when Christ said: "Drink ye all of this. For [e-nim] this is my Blood." Here the act of drinking is evidently neither the cause conditio sine qua non for the presence of Christ's Blood.

Much as he disliked it, even Calvin had to acknowledge the evident force of the argument from tradition (Instit. IV, xvii, §39). Not only have the Fathers, and among them Chrysostom with special vigour, de-
fended in theory the permanence of the Real Presence, but the constant practice of the Church has also established its truth. In the early days of the Church the faithful frequently carried the Blessed Eucharist with them to their homes (cf. Tertullian, "Ad uxor."); II, 12; Cyprian, "De lapsis", II, 19; De excessu fratris, I, 43, 40), while the deacons were accustomed to take the Blessed Sacrament to those who did not attend Divine service (cf. Justin, Apol., I, n. 67), as well as to the martyrs, the incarcerated, and the infirm (cf. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., VI, xiv). The deacons were also obliged to transfer the particles that remained to specially prepared repositories called Postphorion (cf. Apostolic Constitutions, VIII, xiii). Furthermore, it was customary as early as the fourth century to celebrate the Mass of the Presanctified (cf. Synod of Laodicea, can. xliii), in which were received the Sacred Hosts that had been consecrated one or more days previously. In the Latin Church the celebration of the Mass of the Presanctified is nowadays restricted to Good Friday, whereas, ever since the Trullan Synod (692), the Greeks celebrate it during the whole of Lent, except on Saturdays, Sundays, and the feast of the Annunciation (25 March). The Act of Consecration, however, is celebrated before the Mass, and the time at which the Mass is celebrated is found in the fact, that some time elapses between the consecration and the reception of the sacrament, i. e. between the Consecration and the Communion, whereas in the case of the other sacraments both the consecration and the reception take place at the same instant. The term which is longer, the time required for the baptismal action or ablation with water, and is, therefore, a transitory sacrament; on the contrary, the Eucharist, and the Eucharist alone, constitutes a permanent sacrament (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, can. ii). The permanence of Presence, however, is limited to an interval of time of which the beginning is determined by the instant of Consecration and the end by the corruption of the Eucharistic Species. The host has become moulder or the contents of the Chalice sour, Christ has discontined His Presence therein. Nor in the process of corruption those elementary substances return which correspond to the peculiar nature of the changed accidents, the law of the indestructibility of matter, notwithstanding the miracle of the Eucharistic conversion, remains in force without any interruption.

The unchangeableness of the Eucharist is the practical consequence of its permanence. According to a well-known principle of Christology, the same worship of Latia (cultus latina) as is due to the Divine Word is due also to the Divine Word, the God-man Christ, and in fact, by reason of the hypostatic union, to the humanity of Christ and its individual component parts, as, e. g., His Sacred Heart. Now, identically the same Lord Christ is truly present in the Eucharist as is present in heaven; consequently He is to be adored in the Blessed Sacrament, and just as long as He remains present under the appearances of bread and wine, namely, from the moment of Consecration, is the moment in which the species are decomposed (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, can. vi).

In the absence of scriptural proof, the Church finds a warrant for, and a propriety in, rendering Divine worship to the Blessed Sacrament in the most solemn and constant tradition, though of course a distinction must be made between the dogmatic principle and the varying discipline regarding the outward form of worship. While even the East recognized the unchangeable principle from the earliest ages, and, in fact, as late as the Euchologium of Jerusalem in 672, the West has furthermore shown an untiring activity in establishing and investing with more and more solemnity, homage and devotion to the Blessed Eucharist. In the early Church, the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament was restricted chiefly to Mass and Communion, just as it is to-day among the Orientals and the Greeks. Even in his time Cyril of Jerusalem insisted just as strongly as did Ambrose and Augustine on an attitude of adoration and homage during Holy Communion (cf. Ambrose, De Sp. Sancto, III, ii, 79; Augustine, In Ps. cviii, n. 9). In the West the way was opened to a more and more exalted veneration of the Blessed Sacrament by the use of the corporal and chalice and by the assigning of them to Communicants even outside of the liturgical service. After the Berengarian controversy, the Blessed Sacrament was in the eleventh and twelfth centuries elevated for the express purpose of repairing by its adoration the blasphemies of heretics and strengthening the inward rule of faith. In the thirteenth century were introduced, for the greater glorification of the Most Holy, the "theophoric processions" (circumvestiatio), and also the feast of Corpus Christi, instituted under Urban IV at the solicitation of St. Julian of Lèges. In honour of the feast, sublime hymns, such as the "Panne Lingua" of St. Thomas Aquinas, were composed. In the fourteenth century the practice of the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament arose. The custom of the annual Corpus Christi procession was warmly defended and recommended by the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, cap. v). A new impetus was given to the veneration of the Eucharist through the visits to the Blessed Sacrament (Visitatio SS. Sacramenti), introduced by St. Alphonsus Liguori; in later times the numerous orders and congregations devoted to Perpetual Adoration, the institution in many dioceses of the devotion of "Perpetual Prayer", the founding of International Eucharistic Congresses, e. g. that of London in September, 1908, have all contributed to keep alive faith in Him Who has said: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt., xxi, 20).

On this whole matter see Bellarmine De Euchar., disp. n. 20, sect. 3; Bonaparte, Die Eucharistie der Mittel-punkt des Glaubens, der Moral der Kirchen und des Lebens der Welt, 1883; Wolter, Die Eucharistie der Mittel-punkt des Glaubens, der Moral der Kirchen und des Lebens der Welt, 1882; Hoffmann, Die Verehrung und Anbetung des Sakraments des Altars geschichtlich dargestellt (Kempten, 1897).

(5) Speculative Discussion of the Real Presence.—The principal aim of speculative theology with regard to the Eucharist, should be to discuss philosophically, and seek a logical solution of, three apparent contradictions, namely: (a) the continued existence of the Eucharistic Species, or the outward appearances of bread and wine, without their natural object (accidentia sine subjecto); (b) the spatially uncircumscribed, spiritual mode of existence of Christ's Eucharistic Body (existens corporis ad modum spiri- tus); (c) the simultaneous existence of Christ in heaven and in many places on earth (multilocular).

(a) The study of the first problem, viz. whether or not the accidents of bread and wine continue their existence without their proper substance, must be based upon the clearly established truth of Transubstantiation, in consequence of which the entire substance of the bread and the entire substance of the wine are converted respectively into the Body and Blood of Christ in such a way that "only the appearances of bread and wine remain" (Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, can. ii: manentibus dumtaxat speciebus panis et vini). Accordingly, the continuance of the appearances without the substance of both bread and wine as their connatural substratum is just the reverse of Transubstantiation. If it be further asked, whether these appearances have any subject at all in which they inhere, we must answer with St. Thomas Aquinas (III, Q. lxvii, a. 1), that the idea is to be rejected as unbecoming, though the Body of Christ, in addition to its own accidents, should also assume those of bread and wine. The most that may be said is, that from the Eucharistic Body proceeds a miraculous sustaining power, which supports the appearances bereft of their natural substances and preserves them from collapse.

The position of the Church in this regard may
be readily determined from the Council of Constance (1414–1418). In its eighth session, approved in 1418 by Martin V, this synod condemned the following articles of Wyclif: (1) "Substantia panis materialis et simillimia substantia vini materialis remanens in Sacramentis altaris," i.e. the material substance of the bread is not altered and likewise the material substance of wine remain in the Sacrament of the Altar; (2) "Accidentia panis non manent sine subjecto," i.e. the accidents of the bread do not remain without a subject. The first of these articles contains an open denial of Transubstantiation altogether, i.e. the true substance of the bread and wine is not changed. This, however, might be considered as merely a different wording of the first, were it not that the history of the council shows that Wyclif had directly opposed the Scholastic doctrine of "accidents without a subject" as absurd and even heretical (cf. De Angelus, De sacramento, Rome, 1830, II, 573 sqq.). Hence it was the intention of the council to condemn the second article, not merely as a conclusion of the first, but as a distinct and independent proposition; wherefore we may gather the Church's teaching on the subject from the contradictory proposition: "Accidentia panis manent sine subjecto," i.e. the accidents of bread do remain with the subject. Such, at least, is the statement of contemporary theologians regarding the matter; and the Roman Catechism, referring to the above-mentioned canon of the Council of Trent, tersely explains: "The accidents of bread and wine inhere in no substance but continue existing by themselves. But being the case, some theologians in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who inclined to Cartesism, as e.g., Maigman, Drouin, and Vitasse, but little theological penetration when they asserted that the Eucharistic appearances were optical illusions, phantasms, and not true accidents, ascending to Divine omnipotence an immediate influence upon the five senses, whereby a mere subjective impression of what seemed to be the accidents of bread and wine was created. Since Descartes (d. 1650) places the essence of corporeal substance in its actual extension and recognises only material accidents united to it, Eucharistic appearances are as clear and as unobstructed as are corporeal accidents. This, and not merely optical, continuance of the Eucharistic accidents was repeatedly insisted upon by the Fathers, and with such excessive vigour that the notion of Transubstantiation seemed to be in danger. Especially against the Monophysites, who based on the Eucharistic conversion an a pari argument in behalf of the supposed conversion of the Humanity of Christ into His Divinity, did the Patristic Fathers, by concluding from the continuance of the unconverted Eucharistic accidents to the unconverted Human Nature of Christ. Both philosophical and theological arguments were also advanced against the Cartesians, as, for instance, the infallible testimony of the senses, the necessity of the commune tertium to complete the idea of Transubstantiation [see above, (3)], the idea of the Sacrament of the Altar as the visible sign of Christ's invisible Body, the physical significance of Communion as a real partaking of food and drink, the striking expression "breaking of bread" (fractio panis), which supposes the divisible reality of that food, etc. For all these reasons, the Eucharist was considered the physical reality of the accidents as an incontrovertible truth, which cannot without temerity be called in question.

As regards the philosophical possibility of the accidents existing without their substance, the older school drew a fine distinction between modal and absolute accidents. By the modal accidents were understood such as could not, being mere modes, be separated from their substance without involving a metaphysical contradiction, e.g. the form and motion of a stone. Those, however, whose objective reality was adequately distinct from the reality of their substance, in such a way that no intrinsic repugnance was involved in their separability, as, e.g., the quantity of a body. Aristotle himself taught (Metaph., VI, 3rd ed. of Becker, p. 1029, a. 34), that quantity was a proper substance, but only a phenomenon of substance. Modern philosophy, on the other hand, has endeavored since the time of John Locke, to reject altogether from the realm of ideas the concept of substance as something imaginary, and to rest satisfied with qualities alone as the excitants of sensation, a view of the material world which the so-called psychology of association and actuality is trying to carry out in its various details. The Catholic Church does not feel called upon to follow up the ephemeral vagaries of these new philosophical systems, but bases her doctrine on the everlasting philosophy of sound reason, distinguishing between the thing in itself and its characteristic qualities (colour, form, size, etc.).

The "thing in itself" may ever remain imperceptible to the senses and therefore be designated in the language of Kant as a noumenon, or in the language of Spener, the "Unknown". We cannot determine by that of seeking beneath the appearances the thing which appears, beneath the colour that which is coloured, beneath the form that which has form, i.e. the substratum or subject which sustains the phenomena. The older philosophy designated the appearances by the name of accidents, the subject of the appearances by that of substance. It matters little what the terms are, provided the things signified by them are rightly understood. What is particularly important regarding material substances and their accidental qualities, is the necessity of proceeding cautiously in this discussion, since in the domain of natural philosophy the greatest uncertainty reigns even at the present day concerning the nature of matter, one system pulling down what another has reared, as is proved in the latest theories of atomism and energy, of ions and electrons.

The theology tried with St. Thomas Aquinas (III, Q. lxxvii) to prove the possibility of absolute accidents on the principles of the Aristotelian-Scholastic hylomorphism, i.e. the system which teaches that the essential constitution of bodies consists in the substantial union of materia prima and forma substantialis. Some theologians of to-day would seek to come to an understanding with modern science, which bases all natural processes upon the very fruitful theory of energy, by trying with Leibniz to explain the Eucharistic accidenta sine subjecto according to the dynamism of natural philosophy. Assuming, according to this view, that the corporeal substance of the body is a manifestation of energy, the effect of energy and its effects, it may be seen that under the influence of the First Cause the energy (substance) necessary for the essence of bread is withdrawn by virtue of conversion, while the effects of energy (accidents) in a miraculous manner continue. For the rest it may be said, that it is far from the Church's intention to restrict the Catholic's investigation regarding the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament to any particular view of natural philosophy or even to require him to establish its truth on the principles of medieval physics; all that the Church demands is, that those theories which do not contradict the material substance of the accidents, thereby not only contradict the teaching of the Church, but also are repugnant to experience and sound reason, as Pantheism, Hylozoism, Monism, Absolute Idealism, Cartesianism, etc.
Presence, which means that Christ in His entirety is present in the whole of the Host and in each smallest part thereof, as the spiritual soul is present in the human body [see above, (2)]. The difficulty reaches its climax when we consider that there is no question here of the Divine Body, but of His Body upon earth, with its head, trunk, and members, having assumed a mode of existence spiritual and independent of space, a mode of existence, indeed, concerning which neither experience nor any system of philosophy can have the least inclining. That the idea of conversion of corporeal matter into a spirit can in no way be entertained, is clear from the material substance of the Eucharistic Body itself. Even the above-mentioned separability of quantity from substance gives us no clue to the solution, since according to the best-founded opinions not only the substance of Christ's Body, but by His own wise arrangement, its corporeal quantity, i.e. its full size, with its complete organization of integral members and limbs, is present within the diminutive limits of the Host and in each portion thereof. Later theologians (as Rossignol, Legrand) resorted to the unexplainable explanation, according to which Christ is present in diminished form and stature, a sort of nature-body; what Osvald Fernandez, Casasajona assumed with no better sense of fitness the mutual compensation of the members of Christ's Body to within the narrow compass of the point of a pin. The vagaries of the Cartesians, however, went beyond all bounds. Descartes had already, in a.d. 1637, expressed the opinion, that the identity of Christ's Eucharistic with His Heavenly Body was preserved by the identity of His Soul, which animated all the Eucharistic Bodies. On this basis, the geometrical Varignon suggested a true multiplication of the Eucharistic mode of the space, as well as, be it most faith, though greatly reduced, miniature copies of the prototype, the Heavenly Body of Christ. Nor does the modern theory of n-dimensions throw any light upon the subject; for the Body of Christ is not capable or impalpable to us because it occupies the fourth dimension, but because it transcends and is wholly independent of space. Such a mode of existence, it is clear, does not come within the scope of physics and mechanics, but belongs to a higher, supernatural order, even as does the Resurrection from the sealed tomb, the passion in and out through the doors, the Transfiguration of the future glorified risen Body. What explanation may, then, be given of the fact?

The simplest treatment of the subject was that offered by the Schoolmen, especially St. Thomas (III, Q. xxxvi, a. 4). They reduced the mode of being to the mode of becoming, i.e. they traced back the mode of existence peculiar to the Eucharistic Body to the Transubstantiation; for a thing has to so "be" as it was in "becoming". Since ex vi verborum the immediate result is the presence of the Body of Christ, its actuality present merely per communitionem, must follow the mode of existence peculiar to its substance, and, like the latter, must exist without division and extension, i.e. entirely in the whole Host and entirely in each part thereof. In other words, the Body of Christ is present in the sacrament, not after the manner of "a part" (ratio), but by "substance" (per modum substantiae). Later Scholasticism (Bellarmine, Suarez, Billuart, and others) tried to improve upon this explanation along other lines by distinguishing between internal and external quantity. By internal quantity (quantitas interna seu in acto secundo), is the same entity, but in so far as it follows its natural tendency to occupy space and actually extends itself in the three dimensions. While aptitudinal extension or internal quantity is so bound up with the essences of bodies that its separability from them involves a metaphysical contradiction, external quantity is, on the other hand, only a natural consequence and effect, which never is or can be withheld by the First Cause, that the corporeal substance, retaining its internal quantity, does not extend itself into space. At all events, however plausibly reason may seem to explain the matter, it is neverthe less face to face with a great mystery.

The third and last problem has to do with the multilocation of Christ in heaven and upon thousands of altars throughout the world. Since in the natural order of events each body is restricted to one position in space (unilocatio), so that before the law proof of an albii immediately frees a person from the suspicion of crime, multilocation without further question belongs to the supernatural order. First of all, no intrinsic repugnance can be shown in the concept of multilocation. For if the objection be raised, that no being can exist separated from itself or show forth local distances between its various selves, the sophism is readily answered, for no matter how an individual object, but only its external relation to and presence in space. Philosophy distinguishes two modes of presence in creatures: (1) the circumscriptive and (2) the definitive. The first, the only mode of presence proper to bodies, is that by virtue of which an object is considered as a determinate figure, e.g. a circle, sphere, face, in such wise that its various parts (atoms, molecules, electrons) also occupy their corresponding positions in that space. The second mode of presence, that properly belonging to a spiritual being, requires the substance of a thing to exist in its entirety in the space, e.g. as a whole and at a given part of that space. The latter is the soul’s mode of presence in the human body. The distinction made between these two modes of presence is important, inasmuch as in the Eucharist both kinds are found in combination. For, in the first place, there is a continuous definitive multilocation, called also replication, which consists in this, that the Body of Christ is totally present in each part of the continuous and as yet unbroken Host and also totally present throughout the whole Host, just as the human soul is present in the human body. And precisely this latter analogy is the one which gives us an insight into the possibility of the Eucharistic miracle. For if, as has been seen above, Divine omnipotence can in a supernatural manner impart to a body such a spiritual, unextended, spatially unencircumscribed mode of presence, which is natural to the soul as regards the human body, one may well surmise the possibility of Christ's Eucharistic Body being present in its entirety in the whole Host, and whole and entire in each part thereof.

There is, moreover, the discontinuous multilocation, whereby Christ is present not only in one Host, but in numerable separate Hosts, whether in the chalice or upon all the altars throughout the world. The intrinsic possibility of discontinuous multilocation seems to be based upon the non-repugnance of continuous multilocation. For the chief difficulty of the latter appears to be that the same Christ is present in two different parts, A and B, of the continuous Host, it being material whether we consider the distant parts A and B joined by the continuous line AB or not. The marvel does not substantially increase, if by reason of the breaking of the Host, the two parts A and B are now completely separated from each other. Nor is it matter how great the distance between the parts may be. Whether or not the fragments of a Host are distant one inch or a thousand miles from one another is altogether immaterial in this consideration; we need not wonder, then, if Catholics adore their Eucharistic Lord at one and the same time in New
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York, London, and Paris. Finally, mention must be made of mixed multilocation, since Christ with His natural dimensions reigns in heaven, whence He does not depart, and at the same time dwells with His Sacramental Presence in innumerable places throughout the world. As a third case we may be in possession of the two foregoing, were we per impossibile permitted to imagine that Christ were present under the appearances of bread and wine as in heaven, and that He had relinquished His natural mode of existence. This, however, would be but one more marvel of God's omnipotence. Hence no contradiction is noticeable in the fact, that Christ retains His natural dimensional relations in heaven and at the same time takes up His abode upon the altars of earth.

There is, furthermore, a fourth kind of multilocation, which, however, has not been realized in the Eucharist, but would be, if Christ's Body were present in its natural mode of existence both in heaven and on earth. Such a miracle might be assumed to have occurred in the conversion of St. Paul before the gates of Damascus, when Christ in person said to him: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" So, too, the bread and wine, or sacraments, provided in the pagans as the equivalent of the Eucharist, if not in the pagans themselves, at least in the case of St. Alphonsus Liguori, cannot be arbitrarily cast aside as untrustworthy. The Thomists and some later theologians, it is true, reject this kind of multilocation as intrinsically impossible and declare bicollion to be nothing more than a "phantasm." But Cardinal De Lugo is of opinion, and justly so, that to deny its possibility might reflect unfavourably upon the Eucharistic multilocation itself. If there were question of the vagaries of many Nominalists, as, e.g., that a bicollion person could be living in Paris and at the same time dying in London, hatting in Paris and at the same time loving in London, the impossibility would be as plain as day, since an individual, remaining such as he is, cannot be the subject of contrary propositions, since they exclude one another. The case assumes a different aspect, when wholly external contrary propositions, relating to position in space, are used in reference to the bicollion individual. In such a bicollion, which leaves the principle of contradiction intact, it would be hard to discover an intrinsic impossibility.

For further matter see Witzel, Explanatio miraculis, quae divina potentia in Eucharistia Sacrament opera evit (Bonn, 1860); Raynaud, Examen, en cours de rite (Lyons, 1868). Velarde, De sacramento Eucharistico et nubre sacrifici (Louvain, 1893); Reinhold, Die Lehre von der eterlichen Gegenwart Christi (Freiburg, 1934).

II. The Blessed Eucharist as a Sacrament.—Since Christ is present under the appearances of bread and wine in a sacramental way, the Blessed Eucharist is unquestionably a sacrament of the Church. Indeed, in the Eucharist the definition of a Christian sacrament "an outward sign of inward grace instituted by Christ" is verified. The investigation into the precise nature of the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, whose existence Protestants do not deny, is beset with a number of difficulties. Its essence certainly does not consist in the Consecration or the Consecrated substance, but in the latter the reception of the sacrament, and not the sacrament itself. The question may eventually be reduced to this, whether or not the sacramentality is to be sought for in the Eucharistic species or in the Body and Blood of Christ hidden beneath them. The majority of theologians rightly respond to the query by saying, that neither the species themselves nor the Body and Blood of Christ by themselves, but the union of both factors constitute the moral whole of the Sacrament of the Altar. The species undoubtedly belong to the essence of the sacrament, since it is by them and for them that it is consecrated. However, the apprehension of Christ, that the Eucharist possesses the outward sign of the sacrament. Equally certain is it, that the Body and the Blood of Christ belong to the concept of the essence, because it is not the mere unsubstantial appearances which are given for the food of our souls, but through the appearance of the Body and Blood of Christ, the twofold number of the Eucharistic elements of bread and wine does not interfere with the unity of the sacrament; for the idea of refection embraces both eating and drinking, nor do our meals in consequence double their number. In the doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass (see Mass), there is a question of even a higher relation, in that the separated species of bread and wine also represent the mystical separation of Christ's Body and Blood or the unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharistic Lamb. The Sacrament of the Altar may be regarded under the same aspects as the other sacraments, by every one of them which by the Eucharist is a permanent sacrament [see above I, (4)]. Every sacrament may be considered either in itself or with reference to the persons whom it concerns. Passing over the Institution, which was discussed above in connexion with the words of Institution, the only essential matter of which is the outward sign (matter and form) and inward grace (effects of Communion), to which may be added the necessity of Communion for salvation. In regard to the persons concerned, we distinguish between the minister of the Eucharist and its recipient or subject.

(a) The first element is wheaten bread (panis triticus), without which the "consecration of the sacrament does not take place" (Missale Romanum: De defunctis, § 3). Being true bread, the Host must be baked, since mere flour is not bread. Since, moreover, the bread required is that for which no leaven has been used, every kind of flour is allowed for validity, such, e.g., as is ground from rye, oats, barley, Indian corn or maize, though these are all botanically classified as grain. The necessity of wheaten bread is deduced immediately from the words of Institution: "The Lord took bread" (tuv ἄρων), in connexion with which it may be remarked, that in Scripture bread (ἄρων) means with, without any qualifying addition, always signifies wheaten bread. No doubt, too, Christ adhered unconditionally to the Jewish custom of using only wheaten bread in the Passover Supper, and by the words, "Do this for a commemoration of me," commanded its use for all succeeding times. In addition to this, uninterrupted tradition, whether it be the test of verity or the practice of the Church, shows wheaten bread to have played an essential part, that even Protestants would be loath to regard rye bread or barley bread as a proper element for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

The Church maintains an easier position in the controversy use of fermented or unfermented bread. By leavened bread (fermentum, άρων) is meant such wheaten bread as requires leaven or yeast in its preparation and baking, while unleavened bread (azyma, άζυμον) is formed from a mixture of wheaten flour and water, which has been kneaded to dough and then baked. After the Greek
Patriarch Michael Cerularius of Constantinople had sought in 1053 to palliate the renewed rupture with Rome by means of the controversy concerning unleavened bread, the two Churches, in the Decree of Union at Florence, in 1439, came to the unanimous dogmatic decision, that the distinction between leavened and unleavened bread did not interfere with the consecration of the sacrament, though for just reasons based upon the Church's discipline and practice, the Latins were obliged to retain unleavened bread, while the Greeks still held on to the use of leavened (cf. Denzinger, Enchirid., Freiburg, 1908, no. 692). Since the Synoptists, on the one hand, and the Catholic and Oriental Fathers, on the other, entertained doubts as to the validity of the Latin custom, a brief defence of the use of unleavened bread will not be out of place here. Pope Leo IX had as early as 1054 issued a protest against Michael Cerularius (cf. Migne, P. L., CXVIII, 775), in which he referred to the Scriptural fact, that according to the three Synoptics the Last Supper was celebrated "on the first day of the aymmes" and so the custom of the Western Church, received its solemn sanction from the example of Christ Himself. The Jews, moreover, were accustomed even the day before the fourteenth of Nisan to get rid of all the leaven which had been used in their dwellings, that so they might from that time on partake exclusively of the so-called mazzoth as bread. As regards tradition, it is not for us to settle the dispute of learned authorities, as to whether or not in the first six or eight centuries the Latins also celebrated the unleavened bread (St. Isidore), or have observed the present custom ever since the time of the Apostles (Mabillon, Probst). Against the Greeks it suffices to call attention to the historical fact that in the Orient the Maronites and Armenians have used unleavened bread from time immemorial, and, according to Origen (H. Thom., I, xlxv, 3), the people of the East "sometimes", therefore not as a rule, made use of leavened bread in their Liturgy. Besides, there is considerable force in the theological argument that the fermenting process with yeast and other leaven, does not affect the substance of the bread, but merely its quality. The reasons of consanguinity advanced by the Greeks in behalf of leavened bread, which would have us consider it as a beautiful symbol of the hypostatic union, as well as an attractive representation of the savour of this heavenly Food, will not be now willingly accepted, provided only that due consideration be given to the fact that the bread, as set forth by the Latins with st. Thomas Aquinas (III, Q. lxix, a. 4) namely, the example of Christ, the aptitude of unleavened bread to be regarded as a symbol of the purity of His Sacred Body, free from all corruption of sin, and finally the instruction of St. Paul (1 Cor., v, 8) to keep the Pasch "not with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth".

(b) The second Eucharistic element required is wine of the grape (vitum de vite). Hence are excluded as invalid, not only the juices extracted and prepared from other fruits (as cider and perry), but also the so-called artificial wines, even if their chemical constitution is identical with the genuine juice of the grape. The necessity of wine of the grape is not so much the result of the authoritative decision of the Council of Florence, as the Church's tradition, the expression of which is found in the Synod of Paderborn (1891), I, 278 sqq.; Schrenkler, Die Elemente der Eucharistie in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (Mainz, 1903).

In this connection, see Giese, Streifzüge durch den Gebrauch der Aymmen (Münster, 1853); HARNACK, THE ABENDMÄHLE UND IHRE ANFÄNGE, (Paderborn, 1897), I, 278 sqq.; Schwenkler, Die Elemente der Eucharistie in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (Mainz, 1903).

(2) The Sacramental Form or the Words of Consecration.—In proceeding to verify the form, which is always made up of words, we may start from the indubitable fact, that Christ did not consecrate by the mere fiat of His omnipotence, which found no expression in articulate utterance, but by pronouncing the words of Institution: "This is my body . . . this is my blood", and that by the addition: "Do this for a commemoration of me", He commanded the Apostles to follow His example. Were the words of Institution a mere declarative utterance of the conversion of the elements which have taken place in the "benediction" unanounced and articulately unexpressed, the Apostles and their successors would, according to Christ's example and mandate, have been obliged to consecrate in this mute manner also, a consequence which is altogether at variance with the deposit of faith. It is true, that Pope Innocent III (De Sacro altaris myst., IV, vi) before his elevation to the pontificate held the opinion, which later theologians branded as "temerarious", that Christ consecrated without words by means of the mere "benediction". Not many theologians, however, followed him in this regard, among the few being Ambrose of *caurinus, Chrysostom, and Hoppe, by far the greater number preferring to stand by the unanimous testimony of the Fathers. Meanwhile, Innocent III also insisted most urgently that at least in the case of the celebrating priest, the words of the sacramental form. It was, moreover, not until its comparatively recent adherence in the seventeenth century to the famous "Confessio fidei orthodoxa" of Peter Moglas (cf. Kimmel, "Monum. fidei eccl. orient.", Jena, 1580, I, p. 180), that the Schismatical Greek Church adopted the practice of excluding the priest from the act of consecration, according to which the priest does not at all consecrate by virtue of the words of Institution, but only by means of the Epiklesis occurring shortly after them and expressing in the Oriental Liturgies a petition to the Holy Spirit, "that the bread and wine may be converted into the Body and Blood of Christ."
Were the Greeks justified in maintaining this position, the immediate result would be, that the Latins who have no such thing as the Epiklesis in their present Liturgy, would possess neither the true Sacrifice of the Mass nor the Holy Eucharist. Fortunately, however, the obvious can be shown that for certain periods of their own writing, since it can be proved, that they themselves formally placed the form of Transubstantiation in the words of Institution. Not only did such renowned Fathers as Justin (Apol., I, iv, 2), Irenæus (Adv. haer., V, ii, 3), Gregory of Nyssa (Or. cathex., xxxvii, Ch. 10, Hom. i, 6), and John Damascene (De fide orthodoxa, IV, xiii) hold the view, but the ancient Greek Liturgies bear testimony to it, so that Cardinal Bessarion in 1439 at Florence called the attention of his fellow-countrymen to the fact, that as soon as the words of Institution have been pronounced, supreme homage and adoration are due to the Holy Eucharist, even though the famous Epiklesis follows some time after.

The objection that the mere historical recitation of the words of Institution taken from the narrative of the Last Supper possesses no intrinsic consecratory force, would be well founded, did the priest of the Latin Church merely intone by means of the ancient Liturgy of the Church, and not some historical event rather than pronounce them with the practical purpose of effecting the conversion, or if he pronounced them in his own name and person instead of the Person of Christ, whose minister and instrumental cause he is. Neither of the two superseded the ancient rite. The Greek words of Institution may in the best of faith go on erroneously maintaining that they consecrate exclusively in their Epiklesis, they do, nevertheless, as in the case of the Latins, actually consecrate by means of the words of Institution as contained in their Liturgies, if Christ has instituted these words as the words of Consecration and the form of the sacrament. We may in fact go a step farther and assert, that the words of Institution constitute the only and wholly adequate form of the Eucharist as such. Consequently, the words of the Epiklesis possess no inherent consecratory value. The content that the words of the Epiklesis have a joint essential value and constitute the partial form of the sacrament, was indeed supported by individual Latin theologians, as Toullec, Renaudot, and Lebrun. Though this opinion cannot be shared by the Greeks, it is not erroneous in faith, since it allows to the words of Institution their essential, though partial, consecratory value, it appears nevertheless to be intrinsically repugnant. For, since the act of Consecration cannot remain, as it were, in a state of suspense, but is completed in an instant of time, there arises the dilemma: Either the words of Institution alone and, therefore, not the Epiklesis, are productive of the conversion, or the words of the Epiklesis alone have such power and not the words of Institution. Of more considerable importance is the circumstance that the whole question came up for discussion in the council held at Florence in 1439. Pope Eugene IV urged the Greeks to come to a unanimous agreement with the Roman faith and subscribe to the words of Institution as alone constituting the sacramental form, and to drop the contention that the words of the Epiklesis also possessed a partial consecratory force. But when the Greeks, not without foundation, pleaded that a dogmatic decision would reflect with shame upon their whole ecclesiastical past, the ecumenical synod was satisfied with the oral declaration of Cardinal Bessarion recorded in the minutes of the council for 5 July, 1439 (XXVI, 411), namely, that the Church has always and in every place referred to the universal teaching of the Fathers, especially of "blessed John Chrysostom, familiarly known to us," according to whom the "Divine words of Our Redeemer contain the full and entire force of Transubstantiation".

The venerable antiquity of the Oriental Epiklesis, its peculiar position in the Canon of the Mass, and its interior spiritual union, oblige the theologian to determine its dogmatic value and to account for its use. Take, for instance, the Epiklesis of the Ethiopian Liturgy: "O Lord, send forth the Holy Spirit and His Power upon this Bread and Chalice and convert them into the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ." Since this prayer always follows after the words of Institution have been pronounced, the theological question arises, as to how it may be made to harmonize with the words of Christ, which alone possess the consecratory power. Two explanations have been suggested, which, however, can be merged in one. The first view considers the Epiklesis to be a mere declaration of the fact, that the conversion has already taken place, and that in the conversion just as essential a part is to be attributed to the Holy Spirit as to Consecrator as in the inlaid mystery of the Incarnation. Since, however, because of the brevity of the actual instant of conversion, the part taken by the Holy Spirit could not be expressed, the Epiklesis takes us back in imagination to the previous moment and regards the Consecration as just about to occur. A similar purely psychological retrospective transfer is met with in other portions of the Liturgy, as in the Mass for the Dead, wherein the Church prays for the departed as if they were still upon their bed of agony and could still be rescued from the gates of hell. Thus considered, the Epiklesis refer us back to the Consecration as the centre about which all the significance contained in its words revolves. A second explanation is based, not upon the enacted Consecration, but upon the approaching Communion, inasmuch as the latter, being the effective means of uniting us more closely in the organized body of the Church, brings forth in our hearts the mystical Christ, as is read in the Roman Canon of the Mass: "Ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat", i.e. that it may be made for us the body and blood. It was in this purely mystical manner that the Greeks themselves explained the meaning of the Epiklesis at the Council of Florence (Mansi, Collect. Concil., XXXI, 106). Yet since much more is contained in the plain words than this true and deep mysticism, it is desirable to combine both explanations into one, and so we may regard the Epiklesis, both in point of liturgy and of time, as the significant connecting link, placed midway between the Consecration and the Communion in order to emphasize the part taken by the Holy Spirit in the Consecration of bread and wine, and, on the other hand, with the help of the same Holy Spirit to obtain the realization of the true Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ by their fruitful effects on both priest and people.

On the subject-matter of the foregoing section, see Oras, De invocatione S. Spiritus in Liturgia Graecæ et orientaliæ (Milan, 1821); Hoppel, Die Epiklesis in der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgie (Schaffhausen, 1864); Franz, Die eucharistische Wordlung und die Epiklesis (Würzburg, 1880); Schenker, Mysterien des Chrestismus (Freiburg, 1889); Kardinal Guzzoni, Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie (1890), pp. 745 sqq.; (1897); pp. 253 sqq.; Semeru, La Messa nella sua storia e nei suoi simboli (Rome, 1904), 158 sqq.

(3) The Effects of the Holy Eucharist.—The doctrine of the Church regarding the effects of the Holy Communion centres around two ideas: (a) the union with Christ by love and (b) the spiritual repast of the soul. Both ideas are often verified in one and the same effect of Holy Communion.

(a) The first and principal effect of the Holy Eucharist is union with Christ by love (Deer. pro Arca), which does not consist in the sacramental reception of the Host, but in the spiritual and mystical union with Jesus by the theological virtue of love. Christ Himself designated the idea of Communion as a union by love: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my
blood, abideth in me, and I in him” (John, vi. 57). St. Cyril of Alexandria (Hom. in Joan., IV, xvii) beautifully represents this mystical union as the fusion of our being into that of the God-man, as “when melted wax is fused with other wax.” Since the Sacrament of Love is received with affection, it tends especially to fan the flame of actual love to an intense ardour, the Holy Eucharist is specifically distinguished from the other sacraments, and hence it is precisely in this latter effect that Suarez recognizes the so-called “grace of the sacrament,” which otherwise is so hard to discuss, and shows that the essence of this union by love consists neither in a natural union with Jesus analogous to that between soul and body, nor in a hypostatic union of the soul with the Person of the Word, nor finally in a pantheistical defacement of the communicant, but simply in a moral but wonderful union with Christ by the bond of the most ardent charity. Hence the chief effect of a worthy Communion is to a certain extent a foretaste of heaven, in fact the anticipation and pledge of our future union with God by love in the Beatific Vision. He alone can properly estimate the precious boon which Catholics possess in the Holy Eucharist, who know the true ideas of Holy Communion to their utmost depth. The immediate result of this union with Christ by love is the bond of charity existing between the faithful themselves, as St. Paul says: “For we, being many, are one body, all parts taking partake of one bread” (I Cor., x. 17). And of Saints is not merely an ideal union by faith and grace, but an eminently real union, mysteriously constituted, maintained, and guaranteed by partaking in common of one and the same Christ. The fruit of this union with Christ by love is an increase of sanctifying grace in the soul of the worthy communicant. Here let it be remarked at the outset, that the Holy Eucharist does not per se constitute a person in the state of grace as do the sacraments of the dead (baptism and penance), but presupposes such a state. It is, therefore, one of the sacraments of the living. It is as impossible for the soul in the state of mortal sin to receive this Heavenly Bread with profit, as it is for a corpse to assimilate food and drink. Hence the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, can. v), in opposition to Luther and Calvin, purposely defined, that the chief fruit of the Eucharist is the forgiveness of sins” (Sess. XIII, can. iv). For though Christ said of the Chalice: “This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins” (Matt., xxvi, 28), He had in view an effect of the sacrifice, not of the sacrament; for He did not say that His Blood would be drunk unto remission of sins, but shed for that purpose. It is for this very reason that St. Paul (I Cor., xi, 28) demands that rigorous “self-examination”, in order to avoid the heinous offence of being guilty of the Body and the Blood of the Lord by “eating and drinking unworthily”, and that the Fathers insist upon the subjection of the will as on a pure and innocent conscience. In spite of the principles just laid down, the question might be asked, if the Blessed Sacrament could not at times per accidens free the communicant from mortal sin, if he approached the Table, “a Lord unconscious of the sinful state of his soul. Presupposing what is self-evident, that there is question neither of a conscious sacrilegious Communion nor a lack of imperfect contrition (attritio), which would altogether hinder the justifying effect of the sacrament, theologians incline to the opinion, that in such exceptional cases the Eucharist can remove the sin of the state of grace, but all without excepting deny the possibility of the reviviscence of a sacrilegious or unfruitful Communion after the restoration of the soul’s proper moral condition has been effected, the Eucharist being different in this respect from the sacraments which impart a character upon the soul (baptism, confirmation, and Holy orders). Together with the increase of sanctifying grace there is associated another effect, namely, a certain spiritual relish or delight of soul (delectatio spiritualis). Just as food and drink delight and refresh the heart of man, so does “Heavenly Bread containing within itself all sweetness” produce in the soul of the communicant ineffable bliss, which, however, is not to be confounded with an emotional joy of the soul or with sensitive sweetness. Although both may occur as the result of a special grace, its true nature is manifested in certain cheerful and willing fervour in all that regards Christ and His Church, and in the consideration of the duties of one’s state of life, a disposition of soul which is perfectly compatible with interior desolation and spiritual dryness. A good Communion is recognized less in the transitory sweetness of the emotions than in its lasting practical effects on the conduct of our daily lives.

(c) Though Holy Communion does not per se remit mortal sin, it has nevertheless the third effect of “blotting out venial sin and preserving the soul from mortal sin” (Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, cap. i). The Holy Eucharist is not merely a food, but a medicine as well. The destruction of venial sin is powerfully produced by the holy bread. Our Lord and Saviour, and all the Apostles and Saints, is clearly understood on the basis of the two central ideas mentioned above. Just as material food banishes minor bodily weaknesses and preserves man’s physical strength from being impaired, so does this food of our souls remove our lesser spiritual ailments and preserve us from the danger of spiritual death. As a result, based upon love, the Holy Eucharist cleanses with its purifying flame the smallest stains which adhere to the soul, and at the same time serves as an effective prophylactic against grievous sin. It only remains for us to ascertain the manner in which this conservative influence against relapse into mortal sin is exerted. According to the teaching of the Roman Catechism, it is effected by the allaying of concupiscence, which is the chief source of deadly sin, particularly of impurity. Therefore it is that spiritual writers recommend frequent Communion as the most effective remedy against impurity, since its powerful influence extends even after other means have proved unavailing (cf. St. Thomas, III, Q. lxix, a. 6). Whether or not the Holy Eucharist is directly conducive to the remission of the temporal punishment due to sin, is disputed by St. Thomas and all the Fathers. The Sacrament of the Altar was not instituted as a means of satisfaction; it does, however, produce an indirect effect in this regard, which is proportioned to the communicant’s love and devotion. The case is different as regards the effect of grace in behalf of the dead. The pious custom of the faithful of “offering their Communion” for relations, friends, and the souls departed, is to be considered as possessing unquestionable value, in the first place, because an earnest prayer of petition in the presence of the Spouse of our souls will readily find a hearing, and then, because the fruits of Communion, as a means of satisfaction for sin may be applied to a third person, and especially per modum suffragii to the souls in purgatory.

(d) As a last effect we may mention that the Eucharist is the “pledge of our glorious resurrection and of eternal happiness” (Council of Trent, cap. ii), according to the promise of Christ: “He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up on the last day.” Hence the chief reason why the ancient Fathers, as Ignatius (Ephes., 20), Irenaeus (Adv. haer., IV, xviii, 4), and Tertullian (De resurr. carn., vii), as well as later patristic writers, insisted so strongly upon our future resurrection, was the circumstance that it is the door by which we enter upon unending happiness. There can be nothing incongruous or improper in the fact that the body also shares in this effect of Communion, since by its physical contact with the Eucharistic species,
and hence (indirectly) with the living Flesh of Christ, it acquires a moral right to its future resurrection, even as the Blessed Mother of God, inasmuch as she was the former abode of the Word made flesh, acquired a moral claim to her own bodily assumption into heaven. The further discussion as to whether some "physical quality" (Contension) or a "sort of germ of immortality" (Heinburcher) is imputed in the body of the communicant, has no sufficient foundation in the teaching of the Fathers and may, therefore, be dismissed without any injury to dogma.


We distinguish two kinds of necessity, (1) the necessity of means (necessitas medii) and (2) the necessity of precept (necessitas precepti). In the first sense a thing or action is necessary because without it a given end cannot be attained; the eye, e.g., is necessary for vision, because man possesses only a second sort of vision, which is imposed by the free will of a superior, e.g., the necessity of fasting. As regards Communion a further distinction must be made between infants and adults. It is easy to prove that in the case of infants Holy Communion is not necessary to salvation, either as a means or a precept. Since they have not as yet acquired the power of reason, they are free from the obligation of positive laws; consequently, the only question is whether Communion is, like Baptism, necessary for them as a means of salvation. Now the Council of Trent under pain of anathema solemnly rejects such a necessity (Sess. XXI, c. 15) and derives the custom of the primitive Church of giving Holy Communion to children was not based upon the erroneous belief of its necessity to salvation, but upon the circumstances of the times (Sess. XXI, cap. iv).

Since according to St. Paul's teaching (Rom., vii, 4) there is "no condemnation" for those who have been baptized, every child that dies in its baptismal innocence, even without Communion, must go straight to heaven. This latter position was that usually taken by the Fathers, with the exception of St. Augustine, who from the universal custom of the Communion of children drew the conclusion of its necessity for salvation (see COMMUNION OF CHILDREN). On the other hand, Communion is prescribed for adults, not only by the law of the Church, but also by a Divine command (John, vi, 50 sqq.), though for its absolute necessity as a means to salvation there is no more evidence to my knowledge of this necessity than the evidence that was established only on the supposition that Communion per se constituted a person in the state of grace or that this state could not be preserved without Communion. Neither supposition is correct. Not the first, for the simple reason that the Blessed Eucharist, being a sign of Christ's body and blood, presupposes the state of sanctifying grace; nor the second, because in case of necessity, such as might arise, e.g., in a long sea-voyage, the Eucharistic graces may be supplied by actual graces. It is only when viewed in this light that we can understand how the primitive Church, without going over to the Divine command, withheld the Eucharist from certain sinners even on their deathbeds. There is, however, a moral necessity on the part of adults to receive Holy Communion, as a means, for instance, of overcoming violent temptation, or as a viaticum for persons in danger of death. The dogma of Communion Exigentes in vehementer confessione (Freiburg, 1903) claims that the Eucharist, if not absolutely necessary, is at least a relatively and morally necessary means to salvation, in the sense that no adult can long sustain his spiritual, supernatural life who neglects or omits to approach Holy Communion. This view is supported, not only by the solemn and earnest words of Christ, when He promised the Eucharist, and by the very nature of the sacrament as the spiritual food and medicine of our souls, but also by the fact of the helplessness and perversity of human nature and by the daily experience of confessors and directors of souls.

Since Christ has left us no definite precept as to the frequency with which He desired us to receive Him in Holy Communion, it belongs to the Church to determine the Divine command more accurately and prescribe what the limits of time shall be for the reception of the sacrament. In the process of centuries the Church's discipline in this respect has undergone considerable change. Whereas the early Christians were accustomed to receive at every celebration of the Liturgy, which was probably not celebrated daily in all places, or were in the habit of communicating privately in their own homes every day of the week, a falling-off in the frequency of Communion is noticeable since the fourth century. Even in his time Pope Fabian (236–250) made it obligatory to approach the Holy Table three times a year, viz. at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, and this custom was still prevalent in the sixth century (cf. ep. 45 to Bishop Paul of Tarsus). Although St. Augustine left daily Communion to the free choice of the individual, his admission, in force even at the present day, was: Sicut in almo, at quotidie hoc obtendere (De dono persev., c. xiv), i.e., "So live, that you may receive every day." From the tenth to the thirteenth century the practice of Holy Communion more frequently during the year was rather rare among the laity and obtained only in cloistered communities. St. Bonaventure reluctantly allowed the lay brothers of his monastery to approach the Holy Table weekly, whereas the rule of the Canons of the Lateran Councils required it. St. Philip Neri, the founder of the Third Order of St. Francis, and St. Alphonso Liguori were zealous champions of frequent Communion; whereas the Jansenists, under the leadership of Antoine Arnauld (De la frequence communicatio, Paris, 1643), strenuously opposed them and demanded as a condition for every communication that the "most perfect penitential dispositions and the purest love of God." This rigorism was condemned by Pope Alexander VIII (7 Dec., 1690); the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, cap. viii; Sess. XXII, cap. vi) and Innocent XI (12 Feb., 1679) had already emphasized the permissibility of even daily Communion. To root out the last vestiges of Jansenistic rigorism, Pius X issued a decree (24 Dec., 1905) wherein he allows and recommends daily Communion to the entire laity and requires but two conditions for its permissibility, namely, the state of grace and a right and pious intention. Concerning the non-requirement of the twice-daily species as a means necessary to salvation see COMMUNION (SUNDAY) UNDER BOTH KINDS.

See Hoffmann, Geschichte der Laiencommunion bis zum 19. Jahrhundert (Speyer, 1893); Hoffmann, Laiencommunion in ihrem Wirkungen und ihrer Heilwirkungsfähigkeit (Ratisbon, 1898); BARTSCH, De frequenti quotidiane Communio (Freiburg, 1907).

(5) The Minister of the Eucharist—The Eucharist, being a permanent sacrament, and the consecration (consecratio) and reception (suscipio) thereof being separated from each other by an interval of time, the minister may be and is in fact twofold: (a) the minister of consecration and (b) the minister of administration.
(a) In the early Christian Era the Populists, Collyridians, and Montanists attempted priestly powers even to women (cf. Epiphanius, De haer., xlix, 79); and in the Middle Ages the Albignenses and Waldenses ascribed the power to consecrate to every layman of upright disposition. So, in the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) confirmed the ancient Catholic teaching, that "no one but the priest [sacerdos], regularly ordained according to the keys of the Church, has the power of consecrating this sacrament". Rejecting the hierarchical distinction between the priesthood and the laity, Luther freely declared, in accord with his ideal of a "universal priesthood" (cf. I Peter, ii, 7), that every layman was qualified, as the appointed representative of the faithful, to consecrate the Sacrament of the Eucharist. The Council of Trent opposed this teaching of Luther, and not only confirmed anew the existence of a "special priesthood" (Sess. XXIII, can. i), but authoritatively declared that "Christ ordained the Apostles true priests and commanded them as well as other priests to offer His Body and Blood in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass" (Sess. XXII, can. ii).

By this decision it was also declared that the power of consecrating and that of offering the Holy Sacrifice are isolated from each other. Both ideas are mutually reciprocally defined; the category of "priest" (sacerdos, legeis) belongs, according to the teaching of the Church, only bishops and priests; deacons, subdeacons, and those in minor orders are excluded from this dignity.

Scripturally considered, the necessity of a special priestly power with the power of publicly consecrating is derived from the fact that Christ did not address the words, "Do this", to the whole mass of the laity, but exclusively to the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood; hence the latter alone can validly consecrate. It is evident that this tradition has underlie the mandate of Christ in this sense and in no other. We learn from the writings of Justin, Origen, Cyprian, Augustine, and others, as well as from the most ancient Liturgies, that it was always the bishops and priests, and they alone, who appeared as the properly constituted celebrants of the Eucharistic Mysteries, and that the deacons merely acted as assistants in these functions, while the faithful participated passively therein. When in the fourth century the abuse crept in of priests receiving Holy Communion at the hands of deacons, the First Council of Nicaea (325) issued a strict prohibition to this effect. To offer the Holy Sacrifice shall not receive the Body of the Lord from the hands of those who have no such power of offering", because such a practice is contrary to "rule and custom". The sect of the Luciferians was founded by an apostate deacon named Hilary, and possessed neither bishops nor priests; wherefore St. Jerome concluded (DiaI. adv. Lucifer., n. 21), that for want of celebrants they no longer retained the Eucharist. It is clear that the Church has always denied the laity the power to consecrate. When the Arians accused St. Athanasius (d. 373) of sacerdotal, because suspecting him of bidding the Consecrated Chalice had been destroyed during the Mass which was celebrated by a certain Ischares, they had to withdraw their charges as wholly untenable when it was proved that Ischares had been invalidly ordained by a pseudo named Callathos and, therefore, could neither validly consecrate nor offer the Holy Sacrifice.

(b) The dogmatic interest which attaches to the minister of administration or distribution is not so great, for the reason that the Eucharist being a permanent sacrament, any communicant having the proper dispositions could receive it validly, whether he did then the work of a priest, or layman, or woman. Hence the question is concerned, not with the validity, but with the licit of administration. In this matter the Church alone has the right to decide, and her regulations regarding the Communion rite may vary according to the circumstances of the times.

In general it is of Divine right, that the laity should as a rule receive only from the consecrated hand of the priest (cf. Trent, Sess. XIII, cap. viii.). The practice of the laity giving themselves Holy Communion was formerly, and is to-day, allowed only in case of necessity. In ancient Christian times it was customary for the faithful to take the Blessed Sacrament to their homes and Communicate privately, a practice (Tertullian, Ad uxor., II, v), to which, even as late as the fourth century, St. Basil makes reference (Ep. xiiii, ad Caesariam). Up to the ninth century, it was usual for the priest to place the Sacred Host in the right hand of the communicant, who kissed it and then transferred it to his own mouth; women, from the fourth century onward, were required in this ceremony to have a cloth wrapped about their right hand. The Precious Blood was in early times received directly from the Chalice, but in Rome the practice, after the eighth century, was to receive it through a small tube (fistula); at present this is observed only in the pope's Mass. The latter method of drinking the Chalice spread to other localities, in particular to the Cistercian monasteries, where the practice was partially continued into the eighteenth century.

Whereas the priest is both by Divine and ecclesiastical right the ordinary dispenser (minister ordinarius) of the sacrament, the deacon is by virtue of his order the extraordinary minister (minister extraordinarius), yet he may not administer the sacrament except ex delegatone, i. e., with the permission of the bishop or priest. As has already been mentioned above, the deacons were accustomed in the Early Church to take the Blessed Sacrament to those who were absent from Divine service, as well as to present the Chalice to the laity during the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries (of Cyprian, De isip., n. 17, 25), and this practice was observed until Councils had intervened. It is observed that in St. Thomas's time (III, Q. lxxxiii, a. 3), the deacons were allowed to administer only the Chalice to the laity, and in case of necessity the Sacred Host also, at the bidding of the bishop or priest. After the Communion of the laity under the species of wine had been abolished, the deacon's powers were more and more restricted. According to a decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (25 Feb., 1777), still in force, the deacon is to administer Holy Communion only in case of necessity and with the approval of his bishop or prohibition of the pope. A "human being" in his "KirchengeschichtI. Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen" (Paderborn, 1897, I, pp. 293 sqq.; see also Theol. praktische Quartalschrift", Linz, 1906, LIX, 95 sqq.)

(6) The Recipient of the Eucharist.—The two conditions of objective capacity (capacitas, aptitudo) and subjective worthiness (dignitas) must be carefully distinguished. Only the former is of dogmatic interest, while the latter is treated in moral theology (see COMMUNION AND COMMUNICATION OF THE BLOOD). The first requisite of aptitude or capacity is that the recipient be a "human being", since it was for mankind only that Christ instituted this Eucharistic food of souls and commanded its reception. This condition excludes not only irrational animals, but angels also; for neither possess human souls, which alone can be nourished by this food until eternal life. The expression "Bread of Angels" (Ps. lxxxvii, 25) is a mere metaphor, which indicates that in the Beatific Vision where He is not concealed under the sacramental veils, the angels spiritually feast upon the God-man, this same prospect being held out to those who shall gloriously rise on the Last Day. The second requisite, the immediate deduction from the first, is that the recipient be still in the "state of pilgrimage" to the next life (status victoria), since it is only in the present life that man can validly Communicate. Exaggerating the Eucharist's necessity as a means to salvation, Rosmini advanced the untenable opinion that at the moment of death
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This heavenly food is supplied in the next world to children who had just departed this life, and that Christ could have given Himself in Holy Communion to the holy souls in Limbo, in order to ‘render them apt for the vision of God’. This evidently impossible view was condemned by Leo XIII (14 Dec., 1887). In the fourth century the Synod of Hippo (393) forbade the practice of giving Holy Communion to the dead as a gross abuse, and assigned as a reason, that “corpses were no longer capable of eating”. Later synods, as those of Augustine (438) and of Trier (615) took very energetic measures to put a stop to a custom so difficult to eradicate. The third requisite, finally, is baptism, without which no other sacrament can be validly received; for in its very concept baptism is the “sacrament of grace” and contains within itself the whole of Christian grace, which can only be admitted to communion with Christ.

The venerable and ancient practice of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, at least in its shape of the Roman and Sub-Apostolic rites, was renewed under the Edicts of Gratianus (1282), of Sixtus V (1586), of Clement IX (1669), of Pius IX (1870); and in our own day, by the Pope of 1879, the session of which also marked the beginning of the liturgical reform. The Church of the apostolic fathers, who repeated, as constituting the True Church, the Armenians and the Nestorians, are the only ones who do not have the Sacrament of the Eucharist in their divine worship.

I. THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST.—On two occasions Christ fed with loaves and fishes, miraculously multiplied, a crowd of five thousand people. He sent the multitude away, and having taken the five loaves and the two fishes followed Him into the desert. On the first of these occasions, recorded by all four Evangelists, five loaves and two fishes supplied the needs of five thousand people, while on the second occasion, mentioned only by St. Matthew (xxv. 32 sq.), seven loaves and a few fishes were sufficient for four thousand people. In accordance with the practice of depicting only those features which were necessary to convey the meaning of a symbol, the Christian artists of the catacombs represented the miraculous multiplication as a banquet, in which the guests are seen partaking of a repast of loaves and fishes, the remarkable number of them. According to St. Augustine (Tract. exxiii, in Joan.), the number seven represented the totality of the Christian world. The most vigorous representations of the Eucharist in the catacombs are the fresco known as the “Fratro Panis”, a monument of the Capella Greca, in the cemetery of St. Prisca. Wilpert attributes this, with other paintings of that chapel, to the early part of the second century, and his opinion is generally accepted.

The scene represents seven persons at table, reclining on a semi-circular dian, and is depicted on the wall above the arch of this little underground chapel, consequently in close proximity to the place where once stood the altar. One of the banqueters is a woman. The place of honour, to the right (in corn dexter), is occupied by the “president of the Brethren” (described about 150–155 by Justin Martyr in his account of the Christian worship), i.e. the bishop, who is seen in his place for the occasion (Apol., I, xvi). The “president” (πρεσβύτερος), a venerable, bearded personage is depicted performing the function described in the Acts of the Apostles (ii, 42, 46; xx, 7) as “breaking bread”; hence the name “Fratro Panis” (μαύρον ἐπάτημα), properly given to the place of its discoverer. It is to be noted that these words are frequently used in the earliest non-inspired Christian literature as a synonym for the Eucharist (for the texts see Wilpert, Fractio Panis, Freiburg, 1851).

The moment represented, therefore, is that immediately before the Communion, when the celebrant, then

J. Pohle.

Eucharist, EARLY SYMBOLS OF THE.—Among the symbols employed by the Christians of the first ages in decorating their tombs, those which relate to the Eucharist hold a place of the first importance. The monuments of greatest consequence on which these symbols are depicted exist, principally, in the subterranean tombs of early Christian Rome, and are known as the Roman catacombs (see Catacombs, Roman; Cemetery, Early Roman Christian Churches). Their discovery and reopening in the latter half of the nineteenth century have thrown great light on more or less obscure allusions in early Christian literature. In this way Catholic theology now possesses supplementary information of appreciable value bearing on the belief in, and the manner of celebrating, the Eucharist in the sub-Apostolic age. According to Wilpert, an expert scholar in this field of Christian archaeology, the symbolic representations of the Eucharist which refer to the Eucharist form three groups, inspired by three of Christ’s miracles, namely the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes, the banquet of the seven Disciples by the Sea of Galilee after the Resurrection, and the miracle of Cana. It is to the first two of these miracles, probably the most famous fish symbol, which briefly summed up the chief articles of the Christian belief (see Fish, Symbolism of the). The earliest and always the favourite symbol of the Eucharist in the catacombs was that inspired by the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes; the banquet of the seven Disciples appears only in one (second-century) catacomb scene; the miracle of Cana in two, one of which is of the early third, the other of the fourth century.

I. THE MIRACLE OF THE MULTIPLICATION.—On two occasions Christ fed with loaves and fishes, miraculously multiplied. The first of these occasions, recorded by all four Evangelists, five loaves and two fishes supplied the needs of five thousand people; while on the second occasion, mentioned only by St. Matthew (xxv. 32 sq.), seven loaves and a few fishes were sufficient for four thousand people. The Church of the apostolic fathers, who repeated, as constituting the True Church, the Armenians and the Nestorians, are the only ones who do not have the Sacrament of the Eucharist in their divine worship.

The venerable and ancient practice of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, at least in its shape of the Roman and Sub-Apostolic rites, was renewed under the Edicts of Gratianus (1282), of Sixtus V (1586), of Clement IX (1669), of Pius IX (1870); and in our own day, by the Pope of 1879, the session of which also marked the beginning of the liturgical reform. The Church of the apostolic fathers, who repeated, as constituting the True Church, the Armenians and the Nestorians, are the only ones who do not have the Sacrament of the Eucharist in their divine worship.

I. THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST.—On two occasions Christ fed with loaves and fishes, miraculously multiplied, a crowd of five thousand people. He sent the multitude away, and having taken the five loaves and the two fishes followed Him into the desert. On the first of these occasions, recorded by all four Evangelists, five loaves and two fishes supplied the needs of five thousand people, while on the second occasion, mentioned only by St. Matthew (xxv. 32 sq.), seven loaves and a few fishes were sufficient for four thousand people. In accordance with the practice of depicting only those features which were necessary to convey the meaning of a symbol, the Christian artists of the catacombs represented the miraculous multiplication as a banquet, in which the guests are seen partaking of a repast of loaves and fishes, the remarkable number of them. According to St. Augustine (Tract. exxiii, in Joan.), the number seven represented the totality of the Christian world. The most vigorous representations of the Eucharist in the catacombs are the fresco known as the “Fratro Panis”, a monument of the Capella Greca, in the cemetery of St. Prisca. Wilpert attributes this, with other paintings of that chapel, to the early part of the second century, and his opinion is generally accepted.

The scene represents seven persons at table, reclining on a semi-circular dian, and is depicted on the wall above the arch of this little underground chapel, consequently in close proximity to the place where once stood the altar. One of the banqueters is a woman. The place of honour, to the right (in corn dexter), is occupied by the “president of the Brethren” (described about 150–155 by Justin Martyr in his account of the Christian worship), i.e. the bishop, who is seen in his place for the occasion (Apol., I, xvi). The “president” (πρεσβύτερος), a venerable, bearded personage is depicted performing the function described in the Acts of the Apostles (ii, 42, 46; xx, 7) as “breaking bread”; hence the name “Fratro Panis” (μαύρον ἐπάτημα), properly given to the place of its discoverer. It is to be noted that these words are frequently used in the earliest non-inspired Christian literature as a synonym for the Eucharist (for the texts see Wilpert, Fractio Panis, Freiburg, 1851).

The moment represented, therefore, is that immediately before the Communion, when the celebrant, then
as now, divided the Sacred Host. And, as though to exclude all doubt as to the character of his subject, the artist added a detail found in no other representation of the Eucharist; in front of the celebrant he placed a two-handed cup, evidently the chalice (calix ministerialis) of the second century. Such is the earliest representation, in Christian art, of the offering of the Mass. A recent writer regards the scene as representing the celebration of the Eucharist in connexion with the funeral agape on the anniversary of some person interred in the chapel. The guests partaking of the banquet, in this view, represent the relations of the deceased assisting at an anniversary Mass (sacrificium pro dormitione) for the repose of his soul (Wieland, Mensa und Confesso, p. 139). In addition to these unique details showing a real celebration of the Mass in the early second century, the author of this fresco depicted, side by side with the reality, a symbol of the Eucharist. In the centre of the table are two plates, one containing five loaves, the other two fishes, while on the right and left of the divan seven baskets of bread are distributed symmetrically.

After the "Fractio Panis" the most remarkable frescoes in which the miraculous multiplication is employed as a symbol of the Eucharist are two in the crypt of Lucina, the most ancient part of the catacomb of St. Callistus. Each consists of a fish and a basket of bread on a green field. At first view it would seem as though the fishes were represented each carrying a basket of bread, in the act of swimming. A closer examination of the frescoes made by Wilpert, however, has shown that the baskets are placed very close to, but not on, the fishes, and that the surpassing blue surface is really green. The subject, therefore, is the miraculous multiplication, the green surface representing a field. As a symbol these pictures are particularly striking from the introduction of two glasses, containing a red substance, into the baskets. Evidently the artist in this detail had in mind the Eucharistic matter of wine. Consequently, the frescoes as a whole conveyed to an onlooker in the second century a meaning somewhat as follows: the miraculously multiplied bread, together with wine, formed the matter of the Eucharist, which, in turn, by a still greater miracle, became the substance of the Body and Blood of the Divine Iethys, Jesus Christ. The various Eucharistic banquet scenes of the catacombs appropriately symbolized the reception of Holy Communion. In one early instance the artist portrayed, besides a representation of this character, a new symbol having special reference to the Consecration. This consists of a scene showing two persons beside a tripod, on which are placed a loaf and fish. One of the figures is clad in the tunic and pallium reserved in early Christian art to persons of sacred character, while the other, at the opposite side of the tripod, stands in the attitude of an orans. The sacred personage holds his hands extended over the loaf and the fish, somewhat after the manner of a priest holding his hands over the chalice before the Consecration. Wilpert's interpretation of the scene is that the figure with extended hands represents Christ performing the miracle of the multiplication, which act, in the intention of the artist, is symbolic of the Consecration. The orans, on the other hand, is a symbol of the one who, through the reception of Holy Communion, has obtained eternal happiness: "He that eateth this bread shall live forever" (St. John, vi, 59). The representation described forms one of a series comprising three subjects, all relating to the Eucharist. The second of the series is the usual banquet of seven persons, symbolizing Communion, while the third depicts Abraham and Isaac in the orans attitude. In the symbolism of the time Isaac was regarded as a figure of Christ, whence the inference that this representation of Abraham's sacrifice was figurative of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

II.—The Banquet of the Seven Disciples.—The repast of the seven Disciples by the Sea of Galilee is recorded by the Evangelist St. John (xxxi, 9 sq.). St. Peter and his fellow-fishermen, seven altogether, after taking the miraculous draught of fishes, drew their boats on shore, where they found "hot coals

![Fractio Panis](image)

Capella Greca, Catacomb of St. Priscilla

lying, and a fish laid thereon, and bread". The risen Saviour then invited them to eat, "and none of them... durst ask him: Who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord!". The incident thus recorded was just as appropriate a symbol of the Eucharist as the miracle of the multiplication, and as such it is once depicted in a painting of the second century. In this, as in all Eucharistic frescoes, the symbol of Communion appears in close proximity with a baptismal symbol. The banquet scene itself at first view seems in no wise different from the category of Eucharistic representations already described: seven persons are partaking of food, which consists of loaves and fishes. Two details, however, differentiate this particular picture (Sacrament Chapel A 2, cemetery of Callistus), from the symbolic banquets based on the miraculous multiplication. The first of these details is the absence of the basket of fragments always present in frescoes inspired by the latter subject, and the second consists in the fact that the seven banqueters are depicted nude, the manner in which fishermen were invariably represented in classic art. The author of this fresco, we may safely conclude, drew his inspiration from the repast by the Sea of Galilee, which he depicted as a symbol of the Eucharist. St. Augustine alludes to this symbol when he speaks of the "roasted fish" on the hot coals as representing Christ crucified (Pascas aspinus Christus est passus, Tract. cxxii, in Joan.).

During the first and second centuries, with the one exception noted, the only symbol of the Eucharist adopted in Christian art was that inspired by the miraculous multiplication. The mode of representing the symbol, also, during this period severely varied: seven guests partake of the symbolic loaves and
fishes, while baskets of bread are distributed at the sides. In one instance, however, the guests are omitted, and only a tripod with loaves and fishes and the baskets of bread are depicted. This fresco, which occupies a lunette of the Sacrament Chapel containing the relics of the bishop St. Dionysius, Wilpert regards as a sort of compendium of the two symbols of the Consecration and the Communion described above. In the third century a new mode of representing the favourite Eucharistic symbol was adopted in a number of frescoes. This consisted in a scene showing Christ performing the miracle of multiplication by touching with a rod one of several baskets of bread placed before Him. In the loaves, also, incisions, sometimes made in the form of a cross, are seen. Paintings of this class were symbols of the Consecration. One of them (chamber III in the catacomb of St. Domitilla) is of more than ordinary interest. Unfortunately it has suffered serious injury at the hands of collectors. By the aid of a design made for Bosio, Wilpert has been able to reproduce the picture. It consists of three scenes. In the centre Christ is performing the miracle of multiplication. To the right of this He is again represented, His hand raised in the oratorio gesture, while within the folds of His pallium five loaves marked with a cross are visible. Balancing this figure on the left is the Samaritan woman drawing water from the well of Jacob. According to the general principles underlying Christian art, scenes relating to events intended between the three groups. Ordinarily the Samaritan woman was a symbol of the refregium (refriment) petitioned for in the Memento for the Dead at Mass. In the present instance Wilpert regards it as more probable that she is intended as a symbol of the soul in the enjoyment of eternal happiness: the Eucharist, like the fountain of water (John, iv, 14) "springing up into life everlasting", being a pledge of immortality. In the catacomb of St. Callistus there is a fourth painting of the miracle of the multiplication which conforms more closely to historical narrative than the representations of an earlier date: Christ is here depicted with both hands held over the loaves and fishes presented to Him by two Apostles. It may be added that more than thirty frescoes of the miraculous multiplication still exist in the Roman catacombs. For an exact and reliable reference to them see St. Paul, "Le Piture delle catacombe Romane", Rome, 1903.

III.—THE WEDDING AT CANA.—The custom introduced in the third century of representing the multiplication of the loaves to the exclusion of the fishes is thought to have been indirectly instrumental in bringing about a new and beautiful symbol of the Eucharist in early Christian painting. Previous to this time only two frescoes contained any allusions to the Eucharistic wine: the chalice of the "Fractio Panis" and the red substance in the baskets of the Eucharist, in the crypt of Lucina. The epitaph of the multiformity of the chalice, alluding to the offering of the fishes (leaving only bread, one of the two species required for the Eucharist) probably suggested the idea of a special symbol for the Eucharistic wine. No more appropriate symbol for this purpose was to be desired than the miracle of Cana (John, ii, 1-11), which was next adopted. As Christ at the marriage feast changed water into wine, so on another occasion He changed wine into His blood. Quite apropos in this relation is a statement of St. Cyril of Jerusalem to the effect that, since the Lord "in Cana of Galilee changed water into wine, which is akin to blood", why should He not have accepted the chalice as incredible that He should have changed wine into blood? (cary. XXII. 2) Two frescoes representing the miracle of Cana exist in the Roman catacomb of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus. The more ancient of these, which dates from the middle of the third century, represents four men and three women partaking of a repast. Before the couch on which they are reclining is a table, while on the left a servant is carrying a dish to the person occupying the post of honour at the right extremity. The servant's hands are covered by a cloth. On the right Christ is seen touching with a rod one of six water pots that stand in front of Him. Taken as a whole, there can scarcely be any doubt that here we have a Eucharistic scene, with the symbol of wine substituted for the symbol of bread. The number of guests is the invariable number in Eucharistic representations. The servant with veiled hands is the bearer of some sacred object (elsewhere St. Peter receiving the Law from Christ has his hands similarly veiled). Finally, as in all other Eucharistic frescoes, the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion are brought into close relationship; on the right of the scene described is the fountain of Moses and on the left a representation of the administration of baptism. In the centre of the vault or a veiled orans is an allusion to the effects of Communion (a pledge of eternal life).

The second fresco of this subject belongs to the middle of the fourth century. Here Christ is twice represented, once touching the loaves, and again, in the act of changing water into wine. A banquet scene, which has suffered serious injury, occupies the lunette; five of the seven participants can still be recognized as men. The discovery in 1864 at Alexandria of an ancient Christian subterranean cemetery similar in catacombs of Rome to those at Catacomb of St. Marcellus light a fresco in which two Eucharistic symbols of the first Christian age are reproduced in a new and striking manner. The picture occupies the frieze of the apse in a small cemetery basilica and is, consequently, above the place formerly occupied by the altar. The scene is separated by trees, are represented. The central subject is the miraculous multiplication: Christ, identified by the nimbus, is seated on a throne and is in the act of blessing loaves and fishes presented by St. Peter and St. Andrew (identified by inscriptions). At his feet twelve baskets of bread are distributed symmetrically. To the right and left of this picture were two banquet scenes. The former is almost wholly destroyed, but a Greek inscription gives a clue to the subject. This reads: _Those partaking of the eulogia of Christ._ Eulogia is the term used by St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 18) in reference to the Eucharist: "the chalice of eulogia [beneficence] which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" The application of this term, therefore, to the food set before the banqueters, points to the inference that here was depicted a Eucharistic scene in which the guests partook of the symbolic loaves and fishes. The scene on the right, we learn from inscriptions ("Jesus", "Mary", "Servants"), represented the miracle of Cana. The author of this fresco, who was well acquainted with the symbolism of the first centuries, evidently reproduced (1) the favourite symbol of the Eucharist, the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes, and (2) the later symbol of the Eucharistic wine, inspired by the miracle at the wedding feast.

WILPERT, _Fractio Panis_ (Freiburt, 1895). _Idem_. _Le piture delle catacombe Romane_ (Milan, 1895, folio, replaces for completeness and trustworthy all previous similar works, e.g., D. Ross, _Garrecci_, etc.). _Willand, Mons_ and _Cons.,_ St. Alb., 1906; _Rait, in Real-Encykloep._, _etc._ (Freiburt, 1882). 333-51; _Marucchi, Elments d'archai._ (Paris, 1905), i, 291-307; _Cot and Browlow, Roman Nantories_ (London, 1878), passim; _Lowrie, Monuments of the Early Ch._ (New York, 1901), non-Catholic.

MAURICE M. HASSNET.

Eucharistic Congresses are gatherings of ecclesiastics and laymen for the purpose of commemorating and glorifying the Holy Eucharist and of seeking the best means to spread its knowledge and love throughout
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chosen as the location for the fourteenth congress, and the fifteenth, 20–24 July, 1904, went to Angoulême, where the operations of French law forbade the usual procession of the Blessed Sacrament.

Pope Pius X having expressed a wish that the Eucharistic Congress should be held in Rome, the delegates met there, 1–6 June, 1905. Here, while the solemnity of the occasion by celebrating Mass, at the opening of the sessions, by giving a special audience to the delegates, and by being present at the procession that closed the proceedings. It was the dawn of the movement that led to his decree, “Tridentina Synodus”, 20 December, 1905, forbidding the procession of the Blessed Sacrament might be held. Each year the congress had become more and more definitely international, and at the invitation of Archbishop Bourne of Westminster it was decided to hold the nineteenth congress in London, the first under the archbishop, and among, English-speaking members of the Church.

In addition to these general congresses there had also grown up, in all countries where Catholics were numerous, local gatherings of the Eucharistic movement which were potent factors in the spread of the devotion. These were held in the form of meeting of those interested in a local area, and attended by the clergy of the several parishes, and often other religious. In the United States the first of these in the United States was at St. Louis, in September, 1901; the second in New York, in 1908; and the third at Pittsburg, in 1907. The presidents of the Permanent Commissions of the International Eucharistic Congresses, under whose direction all this progress was made were: Bishop Gaston de Ségur, of Lille; Archbishop de La Bouillerie, titular of Perga and coadjutor of Bordeaux; Archibishop Duquesnay of Cambrai; Cardinal Mercier, Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva; Bishop Doutreloux of Liège, and Bishop Thomas Heylen of Namur, Belgium. After each congress this committee prepared and published a volume giving a report of all the papers read and the discussions on them in the various sections of the meeting, the sermons preached, the addresses made at the public meetings, and the details of all that transpired.

As the most representative and important of all the congresses, the whole Catholic world was at once interested in the nineteenth, which was held in London, 9–13 September, 1908, and regarded as the greatest religious triumph of its generation. In an affectionate letter voicing anew his interest in these congresses, the pope once more designated Cardinal Vannutelli as his legate to attend the sessions. More than three hundred and fifty years had elapsed since a legate from the pope had been seen in England. With the words of “The Second Spring” one of them aptly said, awakened by the tears and blood of persecution, and strengthened by the prayers of the faithful in the dreary years of the penal laws, bore fruit and flower.

A distinguished escort met Cardinal Vannutelli when he landed at Dover, and an enormous crowd assembled to witness the arrival of a papal legate in London for the first time in more than three centuries. On the next day, 9 September, the congress was solemnly opened in the cathedral at Westminster, by the legate, supported by Cardinals (Bishops of Baltimore, Logue of Ireland, Sancha y Heriva of Toledo, Ferrari
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Eucharistic Test. See ORDEAL.

Eucharist, Saint, first Bishop of Trier (Treves) in the second half of the third century. According to an ancient legend, he was one of the seventy-two disciples of Christ, and he succeeded Peter as bishop, together with the deacon Valerius and the subdeacon Maternus, to preach the Gospel. They came to the Rhine and to Elegia (Ehl) in Alsace, where Maternus died. His two companions hastened back to St. Peter and begged him to restore the dead to life. St. Peter granted his pastoral staff to Eucharist, and, upon being touched with the staff, Maternus, who had been in his grave for forty days, returned to life. The Gentiles were then converted in large numbers. After founding many churches the three companions went to Trier where the work of evangelization progressed so rapidly that Eucharist chose that city for his episcopal residence. Among other miracles related in the legend he raised a dead person to life. An angel announced to him his approaching death and pointed out Valerius as his successor. Eucharist died 8 Dec., having been bishop for twenty-five years and was interred in the church of St. John outside the city. Valerius was bishop for fifteen years and was succeeded by Maternus, who had in the meantime founded the dioceses of Cologne and Trier, being bishop altogether for forty years. The staff of St. Peter, with which he had been raised to life, was kept in the cathedral till the end of the 16th century when the upper half was presented to Trier, and was afterwards taken to Prague by Emperor Charles IV.

In the Middle Ages it was believed that the pope used no crozier, because St. Peter had sent his episcopal staff to St. Eucharist. Innocent III confirmed this opinion (De Sacris Mis. I, 62). The same instance, however, is related of several other alleged disciples of St. Peter, and more recent criticism interprets the staff as the distinctive mark of an envoy, especially of a missionary. Missionaries in subsequent centuries, e.g. St. Boniface, were occasionally called ambassadors of St. Peter, the pope who sent them being the successor of Peter. Moreover, in medieval times the foundation of a diocese was often referred to as early a date as possible, in order thereby to increase its reputation, perhaps also its rights. Thus Paris gloried in Dionysius Areopagita as its first bishop, similarly ancient origins were claimed by other Frankish dioceses. In time, especially through the ravages of the Normans, the more reliable earlier accounts were lost. When at a later period the lives of primitive holy founders, e.g. the saints of ancient Trier, came to be written anew, the gaps in tradition were filled out with various combinations and fanciful legends. In this way there originated in the monastery of St. Matthias near Trier the famous chronicle of Trier (Gesta Treverorum, ed. Waits in Mon. Germ. Hist.; script., VII, 111-174) in which there is a curious mixture of truth and error. It contains the account of the life of St. Eucharist given above. An amplification thereof, containing the lives of the three saints in question, is said to have been written by the monk Gobich or Golscher, who lived in that monastery in the year 1130. From the “Gesta”, the narrative passed unchallenged into numerous medieval works. More recent criticism has detected many contradictions and inaccuracies in these ancient records, and it is almost universally believed at present that, with a few exceptions, the first Christian missionaries came to Gaul, to which Trier then belonged, not earlier than the 26th century. Calmet and others, the Hollandists, with Marx, Lütolf, and other historians refer these holy bishops of Trier to a period following 250, though not all of them consider this as fully established. The feast of St. Eucharist is celebrated on 8 Dec.
EUCHERIUS

The lives of the three saints may be found in the Acta SS., Jan., ii, 917–22 (feast of St. Valerian); and in the Mon. Ger. vet., in the Scriptor. (Verona, 1866, VIII, 111–174), by P. Theissen. See also REYERBACH, Geschichte der Kirchen Deutschlands, i, 74–82; HAUKE, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, 2d ed., i, 4 sqq.; MARX, Geschichte des Erstamts Trier, Berlin, 1858, ii, 13–90; BRÜSSEL, Geschichte der Trierer Kirchen (Trier, 1888), i, 10 sqq.

GABRIEL MEIER.

Eucherius, Saint, Bishop of Lyons, theologian, i. in the latter half of the fourth century; d. about 410.

On the death of his wife he withdrew to the monastery of Lérins, where his sons, Veranius and Sulonius, lived, and soon afterward to the neighboring island of Lerona (now Saint-Marguerite), where he devoted himself to study and meditation. Desiring, however, to join the apostles in the deserts of the East, he consulted John Cassian, who, in reply, sent him some of his "Collations", describing the daily lives of the hermits of the Thebaid. It was at this time that Eucherius wrote his beautiful letter "De laude Eremit," to St. Hilary of Arles (c. 425). Though imitating the virtues of the Egyptian solitaries, he kept in touch with men renowned for learning and piety, e.g. Cassian, St. Hilary of Arles, St. Honoratus, later Bishop of Marseilles, and Valerian, to whom he wrote his "Epistola panemetica de contemplu mundi". The same period was one of great mission work, and Eucherius was soon chosen Bishop of Lyons. This was probably in 414; it is certain, at least, that he attended the First Council of Orange (411) as Metropolitan of Lyons, and that he retained this dignity (until his death. In addition to the above-mentioned letters, Eucherius wrote "Formularium spirituales intelligientia ad Veranum", and "Institutiones ad Sulonium", besides many homilies. His works have been published both separately and among the works of the Fathers. There is no critical edition but the text is most accessible in Migne, "Patrologia Latina", vol. I, 856–894. A short biography, p. 893–1214, is to be found in a long series of works attributed to Eucherius, some of doubtful authenticity, others certainly apocryphal.

All these works are published in Paris, M. A. M. (1862), VIII, 277–85, 459–58, 499–81; CONTINOLOU, "S. Eucher, Lrini, et l’église de Lyon au Ve siècle" (Lyons, 1881); MIZZIER, "De vita et scriptis S. Euchrii Lugudunensis episcopi" (Lyons, 1877); Remy, "Lumier de Lyon" (Lyons, 1868); C.VI, 422–46; BÄRENKREUZER, "Patrologia Latina", vol. I, 893–1214, is to be found in a long series of works attributed to Eucherius, some of doubtful authenticity, others certainly apocryphal.

Euchites. See MESSALIANS.

Euchologia (εὐχολόγιον), the name of one of the chief service-books of the Byzantine Church. It corresponds more or less to our Missal and Ritual. The Euchologia contains first, directions for the deacon at the Hesperonon, Vespers, Orthros, Lauds, and Liturgy. The priest’s prayers and the deacon’s litanies for those two hours follow. Then come the Liturgies; first, rubries for the holy Liturgy in general, and a long note about the arrangement of the offices of the Proskomide. The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is the frame into which the others are fitted. The Euchologia contains only the parts of priest and deacon at full length, first for the Chrysostom-Liturgy, then for those parts of St. Basil’s Liturgy that differ from it, then for the Presanctified-Liturgy, beginning with the Hesperon that always precedes it. After the Liturgies follow a collection of sacraments and sacramentals with various rules, canons, and blessings. First the rite of chanting the church the mother after child-birth (εὐχαίρει η γυναῖκα λατρεύει), adapted for various conditions, then certain canons of the Apostles and Fathers about baptism: the deacons to be said over catechumens, the rite of baptism, followed by the washing (άφωνας) of the child, the seven days later, certain exorcisms of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, and the rite of consecrating chrism (μηχέας) of Maundy Thursday. Then follow the ordination service for deacon, priest, and bishop (there is a second rite of ordaining bishops "according to the exposition of the most holy Lord Metropolitan, Metropolitan of Nysa"), the blessing of a hegumenos (abbot) and of other superiors of monasteries, a prayer for those who begin to serve in the Church, and the rites for minor orders (reader, singer, and subdeacon).

The ceremonies for receiving novices, clothing monks in the manys (the "little habit") and in the "great and angelic habit" come next, the appointing of a priest to be confessor (πενηθησιακός) and the manner of hearing confessions, prayers to be said over persons who take a solemn oath, for those who incur canonical punishments, and for those who are absolved from them. Then comes a collection of prayers for various necessities. A long hymn to Our Lady for "forgiveness of sins", written by a monk, Euthymius, follows, and we come to the rites of espousal, marriage (called the "crowning", γυναίκα, from the most striking feature of the ceremony), the prayers for taking off the crowns eight days later, the rite of second marriages (called, as by us, "bigamy", γυναίκα, in which the persons are not crowned), and the very long antiphon of the sick (τῷ ἀσύνθετῳ), performed normally by seven priests. Next, blessings for new churches and antimons (the corporals which they use for the Liturgy; it is really a kind of portable altar), the ceremony of washing the altar on Maundy Thursday, erection of a Staurogion (exempt monastery), the short blessing of waters (γάζα), and the great one (used on the Epiphany) followed by an antemural, which contains a blessing for bishops and afterwards. After one or two more ceremonies, such as a curious rite of kneeling (καθάρσις, otherwise a rare gesture in the Eastern Churches) on the evening of Whitsunday, exorcisms, prayers for the sick and dying, come the burial services for laymen, monks, priests. Then follows a vestment, and miscellaneous prayers and hymns (marked χαίρε δάφης), canons of penance, against earthquakes, for time of pestilence, and war, and two addressed to Our Lady. More prayers for various occasions end the book. In the "Apostoles" (the Epistles) and Gospels for the chief feasts (these are taken from the two books that contain the whole collection of liturgical lessons), and lastly the arrangement of the court of the eucenaemical patriarch in choir, with rubrical directions for their various duties during the Liturgy. The chapter is found, of course, only in the Orthodox book.

It will be seen, then, that the Euchologia is the handbook for bishops, priests, and deacons. It contains only the short responses of the choir, who have to use their own choral books (Triodion, Pentekonton, Octoechos, Parakletike, Menologion). The Euchologia, in common with all Byzantine service-books, suffers from an amazing want of order. One discerns a certain fundamental system in the order of its chief parts: but the shorter services, blessings, prayers, hymns, etc. are thrown together higgledy-piggledy.

The first printed edition was published at Venice in 1526. The Orthodox official edition in Greek is printed (as are all their books) at the Phoenix press (Φιλοτέμος) at Venice (7th ed., edited by Spiridon Zerbas, 1895). There is also an Athenian edition and one of Constantinople. The churches that use other liturgical languages have pressures generally at the capital of the country, St. Petersburg, Bukarest, Jerusalem) for their translations. Provost Alexis Malzow of the Russian Embassy Church at Berlin has edited the Euchologia in Old Slavonic and German notes (Vienna, 1861, reprinted at Berlin, 1892). Unitas use the Propaganda edition and have a compendium (μικρόν εὐχολόγιον) containing only the Liturgies, Apostles and Gospels, baptism, marriage, unction, and confession (Rome, 1872). J. Goar, O.P., edited the Euchologia with very complete notes, explanations, and illustrations (Euchologia...
Eudists, or Society of Jesus and Mary, an ecclesiastical society instituted at Caen, France, 25 March, 1643, by the Venerable Jean Eudes. The principal works of the society are the education of priests in seminaries and the giving of missions. The end which Father Eudes assigned to his society made him decide not to introduce religious vows. He was persuaded that, better than religious, priests finding in the very dignity with which they were invested the reason and means of rising to eminent perfection, were in a position to inspire young clerics with a high idea of the priesthood and of the sanctity which it required. He also felt that bishops would not so willingly give their seminaries over to priests who were not entirely subject to them. Father Eudes shared the opinions of Cardinal de Bérulle and Father Olier, who did not think it proper to admit religious vows in the orders which they founded. Even St. Vincent de Paul did so only after great hesitation and on the condition, ratified by the sovereign pontiff, that the Mission should not form a religious order, properly so called, but an ecclesiastical society.

The Society of Jesus and Mary is not, therefore, a religious order, but an ecclesiastical body under the immediate jurisdiction of the bishops, to aid in the formation of the clergy. It is composed of postulants who are admitted after a probation of three years and three months. There are also lay brothers employed in temporal affairs, but who do not wear the ecclesiastical habit. To develop the spirit of Jesus Christ in the members of the society, Father Eudes caused to be celebrated every year in his seminaries the feast of the Holy Priesthood of Jesus Christ and of all Holy Priests and Levites. After the feast of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary it is one of the principal in the community. The solemnity begins on 13 November and is celebrated with an octave. It thus serves as a preparation for the renewal of the clerical promises on 21 November, the feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin. As early as 1649 Father Eudes had prepared an Office proper to the feast. Some years later the feast and office were adopted by the Sulpician Fathers. Although not a religious order, the Society of Jesus and Mary is subject to discipline which does not differ from that of orders with simple vows. The administration is modelled on that of the Oratory to which Father Eudes had belonged for twenty years. The supreme authority resides in a general assembly which names the superior general and which is called, at intervals, to control his administration. It alone can make permanent laws. In the intervals between the general assemblies, the superior general, named for life, exercises full authority in matters spiritual and temporal. He has the right to name and depose general superiors, to fix the number of members, to make the annual visit, to admit, and, in case of necessity, to dismiss, subjects, to accept or to give up foundations, and, in general, to perform, or at least to authorize, all important acts. He is aided by assistants, named by the general assembly, who have a deciding vote in temporal affairs, and a consulting vote only in other questions.

During the lifetime of Father Eudes, the society founded seminaries at Caen (1643), Coutances (1650), Lisieux (1653), Rouen (1658), Evreux (1667), and Reims (1670). These were all "grand" seminaries; Father Eudes never thought them to be first. He admitted, however, besides clerical students, priests with newly granted benefices who came for further study, those who wished to make retreats, and even lay students who followed the courses of the Faculty of Theology. After his death directors were
appointed for the Seminaries of Valognes, Avranches, Dol, Senlis, Blois, Domfront, and Sceiz. At Rennes, Rouen, and some other cities seminaries were conducted for students of a poorer class who were called to exercise the ministry in country places. These were sometimes called "little" seminaries. The Jesuits were admitted early and made both their pro- fane and ecclesiastical studies. During the French Revolution, three Jesuits, Fathers Hébert, Potier, and Lefranc, perished at Paris in the massacres of September, 1792.

The cause of their beatification with that of some other victims of September has been introduced in Rome. Father Hébert was the confessor of King Louis XVI, and shortly before his death he made the king promise to consecrate his kingdom to the Sacred Heart if he escaped from his enemies. After the Revolution the society had great difficulty in establishing itself again, and it was only in the second half of the nineteenth century that it began to prosper. Too late to take over again the direction of seminaries formerly theirs, the Jesuits entered upon missionary work and secondary education in colleges. The "Law of Associations" (1906) brought about the ruin of the establishments which they had in France. Before the revolution, they had a college in Belgium and in Spain, they direct seminaries at Carthage, at Antioch, at Pamploa, at Pamád (South American), and at San Domingo, West Indies. In Canada they have the Vicariate Apostolic of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, a seminary at Halifax, N. S., a college at Church Point, N. S., and at Caraquet, N. B., and a number of other establishments less important. They number about fifteen establishments and about one hundred and twenty priests in Canada. In France, where the majority still remains, the Jesuits continue to preach missions and to take part in various other works.


CHARLES LEBRUN.

Eudocia (Eudoksia)._Eulia Eudocia, sometimes wrongly called Eudoxia, was the wife of Theodosius II; died c. 460. Her original name was Athanas, and she was the daughter of Leontius, one of the last pagans to teach rhetoric at Athens. Malalas and the other Byzantine chroniclers make the most of the romantic story of her marriage. Leontius when dying left nearly all his property to his two sons. To Athanas he bequeathed only 100 pieces of gold with the explanation that she who would not need more, since she was already richer than that of all women came to Constantinople to dispute this will, and was there seen by Pulcheria, the elder sister of Theodosius II, who ruled for him till he should be of age. The emperor had already expressed his wish to marry (he was just twenty years old); both he and Pulcheria were greatly delighted with Athanas. Malalas (op. cit., p. 353) enlarges on her beauty. She was instructed in the Christian Faith and baptized by the Patriarch Atticus. On 7 June, 421, she married Theodosius. At her baptism she had taken the name Eudocia. Pulcheria took charge of her education in the department that was expanded, where Alexander the Great had cut the famous knot, and stood perhaps at the modern Yürme, in the vilayet of Angora. Others, however, identify Eudoxia with Akkilaion, whose site is unknown, and place Germe at Yürme.

Eudoxias, a titular see of Galatia Secunda in Asia Minor, suffragan of Pessinus. Eudoxias is mentioned only by Heroeles (Synecdemus, 698, 2) and Parthey (Notit. episc. I, VIII, IX). Two bishops are known, Aquilas in 451 and Momas in 536 (Lequien, Or. christ., I, 495). Another is spoken of in the life of St. Theodore of Syce, about the end of the sixth century. The original name of the town is unknown, Eudoxias being the name given to it in honour either of the mother or of the daughter of Theodosius II. It was perhaps a less important town than that of Eudoxia in Thessaly, where, however, the dialogue of Alexander the Great was composed. It is mentioned in the fourth century in connection with the church which bore its name. The name is found in a missal of the eleventh century in which it appears to have been added at a late date to a manuscript from a former church.

Eugænus, SAINT (Eugenius; Fr. Oyand, Oyan), fourth Abbot of Condat (Jura), b. about 418, at Izernore, Ain, France-Comté; d. 1 Jan., 490, at Condat.

He was instructed in reading and writing by his Dulcet, and received the tonsure and the tonsure and the

blessing of St. Peter ad Vincula was built to receive this chain (Brev. Rom., 1 Aug., Lec. 4-6).

In 441 Eudocia fell into disgrace through an unjust suspicion of infidelity with Paulinus, the "Master of the Offices". Paulinus was murdered and Eudocia banished. In 442 she went back to Jerusalem and there died. She was buried under the Armenian Monastery.

Eudocia, forgotten by the world, spent her last years in good works and quiet meditation at the holy places of Jerusalem. She was buried in the church of St. Stephen, built by her outside the northern gate. Byzantine history offers few so strange or picturesque stories as that of the little pagan Athenian who, after having been mistress of the civilized world, ended her days as an ardent mystic, almost a nun, by the tomb of Christ. Eudocia wrote much poetry. As empress she composed a poem in honour of her husband's victory over the Persians; later at Jerusalem she wrote an essay, a paraphrase of a great part of the Bible (warmly praised by Photius, Bibliotheca, 183), a life of Christ in homeric hexameters, and three books telling the story of Sts. Cyprian and Justina (a legend about a converted magician that seems to be one version of the Faust story; see Th. Zahn, "Cyriakus von Antiochien und die deutsche Faustage", 1887). The extant fragments of these poems were edited by A. Ludwig, "Eudocia Augustae . . carminum graecorum reliqua" (Leipzig, 1897). See also fragments in P. G., LXXV, 582 sqq.

Another Byzantine empress of the same name (d. 404), like the above often wrongly called Eudoxia, daughter of the Frank general Bauto, and wife of Emperor Arcadius, was the cause of the first and second exile of St. John Chrysostom. After the fall of the eunuch Eutropius this beautiful but proud and aversive woman dominated Arcadius. She was the mother of Pulcheria and Theodosius II. The homily against her attributed to St. John Chrysostom (P. G., LIX, 483) is not genuine. C. Tillemont, "Hist. des Empereurs" (Paris, 1771), V, 735.

Malalas, Chronographia (ed. Rendtorf; Bonn, 1831); repr. in P. G., XXIV, 9-790, pp. 353-358; Socrates, H. E., VII, xxi, 47; Evagrius, H. E., I, xxv; Wiseman, Eudoxius: Gemälde des oströmischen Kaisers Theodosius II. (Worms, 1871); Greco-Syropoulos, Athens, Geschichte einer byzantinischen Kaiserin (Leipzig, 1892); Drumm, Athanas in Figures Byzantinae (Paris, 1896, pp. 25-49), i. ii.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.
father, who had become a priest, and at the age of seven was given to Sts. Romanus and Lupicinus to be educated at Condut, in the French Jura. Thenceforth he never left the monastery. He imitated the example of the above-named saints with such zeal that it is said that he could recite St. Romanus’ Life in only two hours once, and after more. Eugendus acquired much learning, read the Greek and Latin authors, and was well versed in the Scriptures. He led a life of great austerity, but out of humility did not want to be ordained priest. Abbot Minimus made him his condutor, and after the former’s death (about 496) Eugendus became his successor. He always remained the humble religious that he had been before, a model for his monks by his penitence and piety, which God deigned to acknowledge by miracles. After the monastery, which St. Romanus had built of wood, was destroyed by fire, Eugendus erected another of stone, and improved the community life; thus far the brethren had lived in separate cells after the fashion of the Eastern ascetics. He built a beautiful church in honour of the holy Apostles Peter, Paul, and Andrew, and enriched it with precious relics. The order, which had been founded on the rules of the Oriental monasteries, took on more of the active character of the Western brethren; the rule of Tarnate is thought to have served as a model. Constat began to flourish as a place of refuge for all those who suffered from the misfortunes and afflictions of those eventful times, a school of virtue and knowledge amid the surrounding darkness, an oasis in the desert. When Eugendus felt his end approaching he had his breast anointed by a priest, took leave of his brethren, and died quietly after five days.

A few years after his death, his successor, St. Vitalis, consecrated a church over his tomb, to which numerous pilgrims travelled. A town was founded, which was called, after the saint, Saint-Oyand de Joux, and which retained that name as late as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, while its former name of Constat passed into oblivion. But when St. Claudius had, in 687, resigned his Diocese of Besançon and had died, in 690, as twelfth abbot, the number of pilgrims who visited his grave was so great that, since the thirteenth century, the name Saint-Claude came more and more into use and has to-day superseded the other. The feast of St. Eugenius was at first transferred to 18 June in the Dioceses of Besançon and Saint Claude and is now celebrated on 1 Jan.

_Acta SSA.,_ January, 1, 49–54; _Mon. Germ. Hist. SS. Res. Meron._, 113, 154, et al. Eudian, who wrote this text of his biography, is said to have been an unauthentic: _Annotia Bollandiana._ XVII, 367; _Mabillon._, _Acta SS._, _ord. s. Bened.,_ 1, 570–76.

GABRIEL MEER.

**EUGENE I-IV, POPES.**—EUGENE I, Saint, was elected 10 Aug., 654, and d. at Rome, 2 June, 657. Because he would not submit to Byzantine dictation in the matter of Monothelitism, St. Martin I was forcibly carried off from Rome (18 June, 653) and kept in exile till his death (September, 656). What happened in Rome after his departure is not well known. For a time the Church was governed in the manner usual in those days during a vacancy of the Holy See, or during the absence of its occupant, viz., by the archbishop, the archdeacon, and the priory of the canons in a particular position and the notaries. Three years and two months a successor was given to Martin in the person of Eugene (10 Aug., 654). He was a Roman of the first ecclesiastical region of the city, and was the son of Rufinianus. He had been a cleric from his earliest years, and is set down by his biographer as distinguished for his gentleness, not only in his personality, but also in his works, and his love of charity and generosity. With regard to the circumstances of his election, it can only be said that if he was forcibly placed on the Chair of Peter by the power of the emperor, in the hope that he would follow the imperial will, these calculations miscarried; and that, if he was elected against the will of the reigning pope in the first instance, Pope Martin subsequently acquiesced in his election (Ep. Martini vi in _P. L._, _LXXVII_.)

One of the first acts of the new pope was to send legates to Constantinople with letters for the Emperor Constant II, informing him of his election, and presenting a profession of faith. The emperor allowed himself to be deceived, or gained over, and brought back a synodical letter from Peter, the new Patriarch of Constantinople (656–666), while the emperor’s envoy, who accompanied them, brought offerings for St. Peter, and a request from the emperor that Eugene should enter into communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople. Peter’s letter proved to be written in the most obscure style, and avoided making any specific declaration as to the number of “wills or operations” in Christ. When its contents were communicated to the clergy and people in the church of St. Mary Major, they not only rejected the letter with indignation, but would not allow the pope to leave the basilica until he had promised that he would not on any account accept it (656). So furious were the Byzantine officials at this contemptuous rejection of the wishes of their emperor and patriarch that they threatened Eugene with a rejection of the gifts of the state of politics allowed it, they would roast Eugene, and all the talkers at Rome along with him, as they had roasted Pope Martin I (Disp. inter _S. Maxim. et Theod._ in _P. L._, CXXIX, 564). Eugene was saved from the fate of his predecessor by the advance of the Moslems who now defeated Constantine IV at the naval battle of Phoenix (655). It was almost certainly this pope who received the youthful St. Wilfrid on the occasion of his first visit to Rome (c. 654). He went thither because he was anxious to know “the ecclesiastical and monastic rites which were in use there” (Gibbon). At Rome he gained the appointment of archdeacon Boniface, a counsellor of the apostolic pope, who presented him to his master. Eugene “placed his blessed hand on the head of the youthful servant of God, prayed for him, and blessed him” (Bede, _Hist. Eccles._, V, 19; _Edius, In vit. Wil.,_ c. _v._). Nothing more is known of Eugene, except that he consecrated twenty-one bishops for different parts of the world, and that he was buried in St. Peter’s. In the Roman Martyrology he is reckoned among the saints of that day.


EUGENE II, elected 6 June, 824; d. 27 Aug., 827. On the death of Paschal I (Feb.–May, 824) there took place a divided election. The late pope had wished to endeavour to curb the rapidly increasing power of the Roman nobility, who, to strengthen their position against him, had turned for support to the Frankish power. When he died these nobles made strenuous efforts to replace him by a candidate of their own; and despite the fact that the clergy put forward a candidate likely to continue the policy of Paschal the nobles were successful in their attempt. They secured the consecration of Eugene, archpriest of St. Sabina on the Aventine, although by a decree of the Roman Council of 709, under Stephen IV, they had no right to select his successor. The fact is stated, in earlier editions of the _Liber Pontificalis_, to have been the son of Boemund; but in the recent and better editions his father’s name is not given. Whilst archpriest of the Roman Church he is credited with having fulfilled most conscientiously the duties of his calling, and was well known to his gentleness, and the ancient church of St. Sabina with mosaics and with metal work bearing his name, which were intact in the sixteenth century. Eugene is described by his biographer as simple and humble, learned and eloquent, handsome and generous, a lover of peace, and wholly occupied with the thought of doing what was pleasing to God.
The election of Eugene II was a triumph for the Franks, and they resolved to improve the occasion. Emperor Louis the Pious accordingly sent his son Lothair to Rome to strengthen the Frankish influence There was a check, however, on the preceding night when the Roman nobles, who had banded together in the Palatinate (Francia), were recalled, and their property was restored to them. A concordat or constitution was then agreed upon between the pope and the emperor (824). This "Constitutio Romana," in nine articles, was drawn up seemingly with a view of advancing the imperial pretensions in the city of Rome, but at the same time of checking the power of the nobles. It decreed that those who were under the special protection of the pope or emperor were to be inviolable, and that proper obedience be rendered to the pope and his officials; that church property be not plundered after the death of a pope; that only those to whom the right had been given by the decree of Stephen IV, in 769, should take part in papal elections; that two commissioners (missi) were to be appointed, the one by the pope and the other by the emperor, who should report to them how justice was administered, so that any faults in its administration might be corrected by the emperor, or, in the event of his not doing so, by the pope; that the people should be judged according to the law (Roman, Salic, or Lombard) they had elected to live under; that its property be restored to the Church; that robbery with violence be put down; that the emperor was in charge of the chief clergy, who should appear before him to be admonished to do their duty; and, finally, that all must obey the Roman pontiff. By command of the pope and Lothair the people had to swear that, saving the fidelity they had promised the pope, they would obey the Emperors Louis and Lothair; would not be made contrary to the canons; and would not suffer the pope-elect to be consecrated save in the presence of the emperor's envoys.

Seemingly before Lothair left Rome, there arrived ambassadors from Emperor Louis, and from the Greeks concerning the image-question. At first the Greek emperor, Michael II, showed himself tolerant towards the image-worshippers, and their great champion, Theodore the Studite, wrote to him to exhort him "to unite us [the Church of Constantinople] to the head of the Churches of God, viz. Rome, and through the three Patriarchs, and in accordance with ancient custom to refer any doubtful points to the decision of Old Rome (II, lxxvi; cf. II, cxxix)." But Michael soon forgot his tolerance, bitterly persecuted the image-worshippers, and endeavored to secure the co-operation of Louis the Pious. He also sent envoys to the pope to consult him on certain points connected with the worship of images (Einhard, Annales, 824). Before taking any steps to meet the wishes of Michael, Louis sent to ask the pope's permission for a number of his bishops to assemble, and make a selection of passages from the Fathers to elucidate the question the Greeks had put before them. The leave was granted, but the bishops who met at Paris (825) were incompetent for their work. Their collection of extracts from the Fathers was a mass of confused and ill-digested lore, and both the Greeks and the Latins, when they wished the books to be translated, were based on a complete misunderstanding of the decrees of the Second Council of Nicaea (cf. P. L., XC VIII, p. 1293 sqq.). Their labors do not appear to have accomplished much; nothing at any rate is known of their consequences.

In 826 Eugene held an important synod of sixty-two bishops, in which thirty-eight disciplinary decrees were issued. One or two of its decrees are noteworthy as showing that Eugene had at heart the advance of learning. Not only were ignorant bishops and priests to be suspended till they had acquired sufficient learning to perform their sacred duties, but it was decreed that, as in some localities there were neither masters nor zeal for learning, masters were to be attached to the episcopal palaces, cathedral churches and other places, to give instruction in sacred and profane literature (can. xxxiv). To help the work of the conversion of the North, Eugene wrote commending St. Ansgar, the Apostle of the Scandinavians, and his companions "to all the sons of the Catholic Church" (Jaffé, 2564). Coins of this pope are extant bearing his name and that of Emperor Louis. It is supposed, for no document records the fact, that, in accordance with the custom of the time, he was buried in St. Peter's.


**HORACE K. MANN.**

**EUGENE III**, BLESSED (BERNARDO PIGNATELLI), born in the neighbourhood of Pisa, elected 16 Feb., 1145; d. at Tivoli, 8 July, 1153. On the very day that Pope Lucius II succumbed, either to illness or wounds, the Sacred College, foreseeing that the Roman populace would make a determined effort to forestall the new pontiff to abdicate his temporal power and swear allegiance to the *Senatus Populus Romanus*, hastily buried the deceased pope in the Lateran and withdrew to the remote cloister of St. Cesarius on the Appian Way. Here, presumably, they chose a candidate outside their body, and unanimously chose the Cistercian monk, Bernard of Pisa, abbot of the monastery of Tre Fontane, on the site of St. Paul's martyrdom. He was enthroned as Eugene III without delay in St. John Lateran, and since residence in the rebellious city was impossible, the pope and his cardinals fled to the country. Their rendezvous was the monastery of Farfa, where Eugene received the episcopal consecration. The city of Viterbo, the hospitable refuge of so many of the afflicted medieval popes, opened its gates to welcome him; and thither he proceeded to await developments. Though powerless in face of the Roman mob, he was assured by embassies from all the European powers that he possessed the sympathy and affectionate homage of the entire Christian world.

Concerning the parentage, birth-place, and even the original name of Eugene, each of his biographers has advanced a different opinion. All that can be affirmed as certain is that he was born in the territory of Pisa. Whether he was of the noble family of Pignatelli, and whether he received the name of Bernardo in baptism or only upon entering religious life, must remain uncertain. He was educated in Pisa, and after his ordination was made a canon of the cathedral. Later he held the office of *vice-dominus* or steward of the temporalities of the diocese. In 1130 he came under the magnetic influence of St. Bernard of Clairvaux; five years later when the saint returned home from the Synod of Pisa, the *vice-dominus* accompanied him as a novice. In course of time he was employed by his order on several important affairs; and lastly was sent with a colony of monks to reanimate the ancient Abbey of Farfa; but Innocent II placed them instead at the Tre Fontane.

St. Bernard received the intelligence of the elevation of his disciple with astonishment and pleasure, and gave expression to his feelings in a pastoral letter addressed to the new pope, in which he occurs the famous passage so often quoted by reformers and apostles of reform: "Who will grant me to see, before I die, the Church of God as in the days of old when the Apostles let down their nets for a draught, not of silver and gold, but of soul?" The saint, moreover, proceeded to compose in his few moments of leisure that admirable hand-book for popes called "De Consideratione," Eugene sojourned at Viterbo, Arnold of Briscia
neglect to enforce them were threatened with suspension. Eugene was inexorable in punishing the unworthy. He deposed the metropolitans of York and Mainz, and, for a cause which St. Bernard thought not sufficiently grave, he withdrew the pallium from the Archbishop of Regensburg. But if Philip could at times be severe, this was not his natural disposition.

"Never," wrote Ven. Peter of Cluny to St. Bernard, "have I found a truer friend, a sincerer brother, a purer father. His ear is ever ready to hear, his tongue is always ready to advise. Nor does he comport himself as one's superior, but rather as an equal or an inferior. I have never made him a request which he has not either granted, or so refused that I could not reasonably complain." On the occasion of a visit which he paid to Clairsun, his former companions discovered to their joy that "he who externally shone in the pontifical robes remained in his heart an observant monk".

The prolonged sojourn of the pope in France was of great advantage to the French Church in many ways and enhanced the prestige of the papacy. Eugene now encouraged the intellect and the spirit, consisting of the principal families and their adherents, in the interests of order and the papacy, and the democrates were induced to listen to words of moderation. A treaty was entered into with Eugene by which the Senate was preserved but subject to the pontiff's authority and sweeping allegiance to the supreme pontiff. The senators were to be chosen annually by popular election and in a committee of their body the executive power was lodged. The pope and the senate should have separate courts, and an appeal could be made from the decisions of either to the other. By virtue of this treaty Eugene made a solemn entry into Rome a few days before Christmas, and was greeted by the fickle populace with boundless enthusiasm. But the dual system of government proved unworkable. The Romans demanded the destruction of Tivoli. This town had been faithful to Eugene during the rebellion of the Romans and merited his protection. He therefore refused to permit it to be destroyed. The Romans, growing more and more turbulent, he retired to Castle S. Angelo, thence to Viterbo, and finally crossed the Alps, early in 1146.

In 1147, before the pope of vastly greater importance than the maintenance of order in Rome. The Christian principalities in Palestine and Syria were threatened with extinction. The fall of Edessa (1144) had aroused consternation throughout the West, and already from Viterbo Eugene had addressed a stirring appeal to the chivalry of Europe to hasten to the defence of the Holy Places. St. Bernard was commissioned to preach the Second Crusade, and he acquitted himself of the task with such success that within a couple of years two magnificent armies, commanded by the King of the Romans and the King of France, set out on their way to Palestine. That the Second Crusade was a wretched failure cannot be ascribed to the saint or the pope; but it is one of those phenomena so frequently met with in the history of the papacy, that a pope who was unable to subdue a hand of fickle subordinates could hurl all his energy against the Saracens. Eugene spent three busy and fruitful years in France, intent on the propagation of the Faith, the correction of errors and abuses, and the maintenance of discipline. He sent Cardinal Brevispeak (afterwards Adrian IV) as legate to Scandinavia; he entered into relations with the Oriental patriarchs that led to reunion; he proceeded with vigour against the nascent Manichean heresies. In several synods (Paris, 1147. Trier, 1148), notably in the great Synod of Reims (1148), canon laws were enacted regarding the dress and conduct of the clergy. To ensure the strict execution of these canons, the bishops who should
with Mass and Office rite duplci on the anniversary of his death.

For the earlier lives by Bosio, John of Salimbuni, Bern- ino Grumio and Angerii; see Momper, Rec. Ital. III, 339 sqq. Cl. Lib. Pont., ed. Duchesne, II, 386; Hefele, Conc. dogmatico, V, 494; his letters are in P. L., CL XIV, and CLXVI, 1847; see also Nuncius, 1574, del bando Eugenio III (Monte, 1874); Annal. Bullard, (1891), x, 455; and histories of the city of Rome by Von Lomont and Gregorovius.

JAMES F. LOUGHLIN.

EUGENE IV (Gabriello Condulmiro, or Condulmario, b. at Venice, 1383; elected 4 March, 1431; d. at Basle, 23 Feb., 1447). He sprang from a wealthy Venetian family and was a nephew, on the mother's side, of Gregory XII. His personal presence was princely and imposing. He was tall, thin, with a remarkably winning countenance. Coming at an early age into the possession of great wealth, he distributed 20,000 ducats to the poor and, turning his back upon the world, entered the Augustinian monastery of St. George in his native city. At the age of twenty-four he was appointed by his uncle Bishop of Siena; but since the people of that city objected to the rule of a foreigner, he resigned the bishopric and, in 1408, was created Cardinal-Priest of St. Clement. He rendered signal service to Pope Martin V by his labours as legate in Pecum (March of Ancona) and later by building a sedition of the Bolognese. In recognition of his abilities, the concava, assembled at Rome in the church of the Minerva after the death of Martin V, elected Cardinal Condulmiro to the papacy on the first scrutiny. He assumed the name of Eugene IV, possibly anticipating a stormy pontificate similar to that of Eugene III. Stormy, in fact, his reign was destined to be; and it cannot be denied that many of his troubles were owing to his own want of tact, which alienated all parties from him. By the terms of the capitulation which he signed before election and afterwards confirmed by a Bull, Eugene secured to the cardinals one-half of all the revenues of the Church, and promised to consult with them on all questions of importance relating to the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Church and the Papal States. He was crowned at St. Peter's, 11 March, 1431.

Eugene continued throughout his simple routine of monastic life and gave great edification by his regularity and unfeigned piety. But his hatred of nepotism, the solitary defect of his great predecessor, led him into a fierce and sanguinary conflict with the house of Colonna, which would have resulted disastrously for the pope, had not Florence, Venice, and Naples come to his aid. A peace was patched up by virtue of which the Colonnese surrendered their castles and paid an indemnity of 75,000 ducats. Scarcely was this danger averted when Eugene became involved in a far more serious struggle, destined to trouble his entire pontificate. Martin V had convoked the Council of Basle (q. v.) which opened with scant attendance 23 July, 1431. Distrusting the spirit which was reigning at the council, Eugene, by a Bull dated 18 Dec., 1431, dissolved it, to meet eighteen months later in Bologna. There is no doubt that the spirit of the papal prerogative would sooner or later have become imperious; but it seems wise to have resorted to it before the council had taken any overt steps in the wrong direction. It alienated public opinion, and gave colour to the charge that the Curia was opposed to any measures of reform. The pontiff of Basle refused to be cowed, published an encyclical to all the faithful in which they proclaimed their determination to continue their labours. In this course they had the assurance of support from all the secular powers, and on 15 Feb., 1432, they reasserted the Gallican doctrine of the superiority of the council to the pope (see Constance, Council of). All efforts to induce Eugene to recall his Bull of dissolution having failed, the council, on 29 April, formally summoned the pope and his cardinals to appear at Basle within three months, or to be punished for contumacy. The aemolium which now seemed inevitable was for the time averted by the exertions of Sigismond, who had come to Rome to receive the imperial crown, 31 May, 1433. The pope recalled the Bull and acknowledged the council as oecumenical, 15 Dec., 1433. In the following May, 1434, a revolution, fomented by the pope's enemies, broke out in Rome. Eugene, in the garb of a monk, and pelted with stones, escaped down the Tiber to Ostia, whence the friendly Florentines conducted him to their city and received him with an ovation. He took up his residence in the Dominican convent of Santa Maria Novella, and sent Vitelleschi, the militant Bishop of Recanati, to restore order in the States of the Church.

The prolonged sojourn of the Roman Court in Florence, then the centre of the literary activity of the age, gave a strong impetus to the Humanistic movement. During his stay in the Tuscan capital, Eugene consecrated the beautiful cathedral, just then finished by Brunelleschi. Meanwhile, the rupture between the Holy See and the revolutionists at Basle, now completely controlled by the radical party under the leadership of Cardinal d'Allemagne, of Arles, became complete. This time our sympathies are entirely on the side of the pontiff, for the proceedings of the little coterie which assumed the name and authority of a general council were utterly subservient of the Divine constitution of the Church. By abolishing all sources of papal revenue and restricting in every way the papal prerogative, they sought to reduce the head of the Church to a mere shadow. Eugene answered with a dignified appeal to the European powers. The struggle came to a crisis in the matter of the negotiations for union with the Greeks. The majority at Basle were in favour of holding a council in France or Savoy. But geography was against them. Italy was much more convenient for the Greeks; and they declared for the pope. This exercise of the papal prerogative would sooner or later have become imperious; but it seems wise to have resorted to it before the council had taken any overt steps in the wrong direction. It alienated public opinion, and gave colour to the charge that the Curia was opposed to any measures of reform. The pontiff of Basle refused to be cowed, published an encyclical to all the faithful in which they proclaimed their determination to continue their labours. In this course they had the assurance of support from all the secular powers, and on 15 Feb., 1432, they reasserted the Gallican doctrine of the superiority of the council to the pope (see Constance, Council of). All efforts to induce Eugene to recall his Bull of dissolution having failed, the council, on 29 April, formally summoned the pope and his cardinals to appear at Basle within three months, or to be punished for contumacy. The aemolium which now seemed inevitable was for the time averted by the exertions of Sigismond, who had come to Rome to receive the imperial crown, 31 May, 1433. The pope recalled the Bull and acknowledged the council as oecumenical, 15 Dec., 1433. In the following May, 1434, a revolution, fomented by the pope's enemies, broke out in Rome. Eugene, in the garb of a monk, and pelted with stones, escaped down the Tiber to Ostia, whence the friendly Florentines conducted him to their city and received him with an ovation. He took up his residence in the Dominican convent of Santa Maria Novella, and sent Vitelleschi, the militant Bishop of Recanati, to restore order in the States of the Church.

The prolonged sojourn of the Roman Court in Florence, then the centre of the literary activity of the age,
The deliberations with the Greeks lasted for over a year, and were concluded at Florence, 5 July, 1439, by the Decree of Union. Though the union was not permanent, it vastly enhanced the prestige of the papacy. The union with the Greeks was followed by that of the Armenians, 11 Nov., 1445; the Jacobites, 1443, and the Nestorians, 1445. Eugenius exerted himself to the utmost in rousing the nations of Europe to resist the advance of the Turks. A powerful army was formed in Hungary, and a fleet was despatched to the Hellespont. The first successes of the Christians were followed by the crushing defeat at Varna, 10 Nov., 1444. In the meantime, the dwindling conventile at Basle proceeded on the path of schism. On 21 Jan., 1438, Eugenius was pronounced suspended, and this step was followed by his deposition on 25 June, 1439, on the charge of heretical conduct towards a general council. To crown their infamy, the sectaries, now reduced to one cardinal and eleven bishops, elected an anti-pope, Duke Amadeus of Savoy, as Felix V. But Christendom, having repeatedly experienced the horrors of a schism, repudiated the revolutionary step, and, before his death, Eugenius had the happiness of seeing the entire Christian world, at least in theory, obedient to the Holy See. The decrees of Florence have since been the solid basis of the spiritual authority of the papacy.

Eugenia secured his position in Italy by a treaty, 6 July, 1443, with Alfonso of Aragon, whom he confirmed as monarch of Naples, and after an extensive campaign he made a triumphal entry into Rome, on 28 Sept., 1443. He devoted his remaining years to the amelioration of the sad condition of Rome, and to the consolidation of his spiritual authority among the nations of Europe. He was unsuccessful in his attempts to induce the French court to cancel the papal Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (7 July, 1438), but, by prudent compromises and the skill of Aeneas Silvius, he gained a marked success in Germany. On the eve of his death he signed (5, 7 Feb., 1447) with the German nation the so-called Frankfort, or Prince's Concordat, which, after long hesitancy and against the advice of many cardinals, he recognized, not without diplomatic reserve, the persistent German contentions for a new council in a German city, the mandatory decree of Constance (Frequens) on the frequency of such councils, also the authority (and of that of other general councils), but after the manner of his predecessors, from whom he declared that he did not intend to differ. On the same day he issued another document, the so-called 'Bulla Salvatoria', in which he asserted that notwithstanding these concessions, made in his last illness when unable to examine them with more care, he did not intend to do aught contrary to the teachings of the Fathers, or the rights and authority of the Apostolic See (Hergenrother-Kirsch, II, 941–2).

EUGENIUS II (THE YOUNGER), Archbishop of Toledo from 647 to 13 Nov., 657, the date of his death. He was the son of a Goth named Evanitus, became a cleric in the cathedral of Toledo, and at the death of Eugenius I was elected his successor. The office was so little to his taste that he fled to Saragossa to lead a monastic life, but was forced to return to Toledo by King Chindaswinth and decree that the bishops of Toledo should reside one month every year in that city.

EUGENIUS III, Archbishop of Toledo, from 647 to 13 Nov., 657, the date of his death. He was the son of a Goth named Evanitus, became a cleric in the cathedral of Toledo, and at the death of Eugenius I was elected his successor. The office was so little to his taste that he fled to Saragossa to lead a monastic life, but was forced to return to Toledo by King Chindaswinth and decree that the bishops of Toledo should reside one month every year in that city.

EUGENIUS II (THE YOUNGER), Archbishop of Toledo from 647 to 13 Nov., 657, the date of his death. He was the son of a Goth named Evanitus, became a cleric in the cathedral of Toledo, and at the death of Eugenius I was elected his successor. The office was so little to his taste that he fled to Saragossa to lead a monastic life, but was forced to return to Toledo by King Chindaswinth and decree that the bishops of Toledo should reside one month every year in that city.

See Pius II; Gregory of Heimburg.


EUGENIUS I, Archbishop of Toledo, successor in 636 of Justus in that see; d. 617. Like his predecessor he had been a disciple of Helladius in the monastery of Agli. He is famous as an astronomer and mathematician. As a bishop he was virtuous and intelligent. At this period, under the Gothic kings, the councils of Toledo were national diets convoked by the monarch, attended by lay lords; they regulated, to some extent, not only spiritual but temporal affairs. Of these councils Eugenius presided at the fifth, convoked in 636 by King Vilaus to confirm his elevation to the throne; he assisted at the sixth, convoked by the same king to take precautions against the disorders of royal elections. This council, contrary to the principles later put in practice by St. Ildefonsus, banished all Jews who did not embrace the Catholic Faith. Eugenius attended the seventh council of Toledo, which was summoned by King Chindaswinth and decreed that the bishops of Toledo should reside one month every year in that city.

EUGENIUS II (THE YOUNGER), Archbishop of Toledo from 647 to 13 Nov., 657, the date of his death. He was the son of a Goth named Evanitus, became a cleric in the cathedral of Toledo, and at the death of Eugenius I was elected his successor. The office was so little to his taste that he fled to Saragossa to lead a monastic life, but was forced to return to Toledo by King Chindaswinth, and take up the government of that see. Though of small stature and feeble health he was a zealous prelate. He undertook the reform of the disciplinary chart of the Divine Office, and the spiritual administration of the See. As a writer of prose and poetry. His style is natural and clear, and his exposition easy and agreeable. His poems, though lacking polish and elegance, are full of fire, spirit, and poetic movement. Poetically, he breathes throughout, and the orthodoxy of his faith is notable. His thought is solid, fertile, and gives evidence of a well-trained mind. His feast is kept on 13 November.

Eugenius left two books in prose and verse, published (Paris, 1619) by Father Simond, S.J., containing his poems on religious and secular subjects, his recension of the poem of Dracocontus on "The Six Days of Creation" (Hexaemeron), to which he added a "Seventh Day", and a letter to King Chindaswinth explaining the plan of the entire work; he also edited the metrical "Satisfactio" of Dracocontus, an account of the writer's misfortunes. Of this work Bardenhewer says (Pauly, tr. St. Louis, 1900) that it is a substan-tial revision at the hands of Eugenius II, Bishop of Toledo, in keeping with the wish of the Visigoth King Chindaswinth (642–49); not only were the poetical form and the theology of the poem affected by this treatment, but probably also its political sentiments. It is this revised edition that was usually printed as Dracocontus Elegia (Migne, P.L., LXXXVIII, 383–88), until the edition of Arevalo (Rome, 1791, 362–402, and 901–32) made known the original text. He also wrote a treatise on the Trinity probably against the Arian Visigoths. Ferrera mentions a letter of Eugenius to the king and one to Protasius, the Metropolitan of Tarra-ragona, promising if possible to write a mass of St. Hippolytus and some festal sermons, but disclaiming the ability to equal his former productions.

EUGIPPIUS

Word he was imitated by the members of his flock, many of whom were exiled with him, after he had admitted Vandals into the Catholic Church, contrary to royal edict, and had worsted in argument Arian theologians, whom the king pitted against the Catholics. Both sides called the name "Catholic", the Arians calling their opponents "Homoomians". The conference was held some time between 418 and February, 441, and ended by the withdrawal of the chief Arian bishop on the plea that he could not speak Latin. The Arians being enraged, Hunicer persecuted the Catholics, exiling forty-six bishops to Corsica, and then burning two to the African deserts. Among the latter was Eugenius, who under the custody of a ruffian named Antonius dwelt in the desert of Tripoli. On setting out he wrote a letter of consolation and exhortation to the faithful of Carthage which is still extant in the works of Gregory of Tours (P. L., LVII, 769-71). Gunthamund, who succeeded Hunicer allowed Eugenius to return to Carthage and permitted them to reopen the church. After eight years of peace Thrasamund succeeded to the throne, revived the persecution, arrested Eugenius, and condemned him to death. He was commuted the sentence into exile at Vienne, near Alps (Languedoc), where the Arian Alaric, then king. Eugenius built here a monastery over the tomb of St. Amaranthus, the martyr, and led a penitential life till his death. He is said to have miraculously cured a man who was blind.

In the Expositio Fidei Catholicae, "demanded of him by Hunicer, possibly the one submitted by the Catholic bishops at the conference. It proves the constitutability of the Word and Divinity of the Holy Ghost. He wrote also an "Apologeticus pro Fide"; "Altercatio cum Arianis", fragments of which are cited also prior to his letters, addressed to Hunicer or his successors. His letter to the faithful of Carthage has been mentioned above.

Victor de Vite, Historia persecutionis Vandalicorum (Paris, 1688, 13 July; Geneva, 1691; Paris, 1702); Rebeschinger, Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise Catholique (Paris, 1857), VIII, 384-400; Bardenhewer, Patrologia, St. Shahan (Freiburg, 1900), 615.

MARK J. McNEAL

Eugippius. See Severinus, Saint.

Eulalia of Barcelona, Saint, a Spanish martyr in the persecution of Diocletian (12 Feb., 304), patron of the city of Barcelona, also of St. Eulalia. The Acts of her life and martyrdom were copied early in the twelfth century, and with elegant conciseness, by the learned ecclesiastic Renallus Grammaticus (Bol. acad. hist., Madrid, 1902, XIII, 253-55). Their historical source is a Latin hymn of the middle of the seventh century by Quiricus, Bishop of Barcelona, friend and correspondent of St. Ildonzes of Toledo and of St. Tajo, Bishop of Saragossa. This hymn, identical with that of Prudentius (Peristephanon, III) for the feast of St. Eulalia of Merida (10 Dec., 304), was preserved in the Visigothic Church and has reached through the Mozarabic Liturgy.

There is no reason to doubt the existence of two distinct saints of this name, despite the over-hasty and hypercritical doubts of some. The aforesaid Quiricus of Barcelona and Oronius of Merida were present at the fourth council of Toledo (656). The latter had already founded (651) a convent of nuns close by the basilica of the celebrated martyr of his episcopal city, had written a rule for its guidance, and given it for abbess the noble lady Eugenia. Quiricus now did as much for the basilica and sepulchre of the martyr of Barcelona, close to whom he wished to be buried, as we read in the last lines of the hymn. The inscriptions on many Visigothic altars show that they contained relics of St. Eulalia; except in the context, however, they do not distinguish between the martyr of Barcelona and the one of Merida. On an altar in the village of Morera, Province of Badajoz, we find enun-

mered consecutively Sts. Fructuosus and Augurius (Tarragona), St. Eulalia (Barcelona), St. Baudilius (Nimes), and St. Paulus (Narbonne). The Visigothic archaeology of Eastern Spain has been hitherto poor in hagiological remains; nevertheless, a trans-Pyrenean inscription found at St. Eulalia near Dijon mentions a basilica dedicated to the martyrs Sts. Benedictus, Eulalia, and Euundius (of Barcelona). Until 23 Nov., 874, the body of the Barcelona martyr reposed outside the walls of the city in the church of Santa Maria del Mar. On that date both the body and the tomb were transferred to his cathedral by Bishop Frodoinus. In memory of this act he set up an inscription now preserved in the Museo Provincial de Barcelona (no. 864); see also volume XX of Flores, "España Sagrada", for a reproduction of the same. Not long before this the martyr, St. Eulogius, having occasion to defend the martyrs of Cordova for their spontaneous confession of the Christian Faith before the Massilian magistrates, quoted the example of St. Eulalia of Barcelona, and referred to the ancient Acts of her martyrdom. Her distinct personality is also confirmed by the existence of an ancient church and monastery in Cordova that bear the name of the Barcelona martyr; this important evidence is borne out by the papers examined by the learned Dom Freron (below).


F. FITA.

Eulalia, Anti-pope. See Boniface I.

Eulogia (Greek εὐλογία, "a blessing")—The term has been applied in ecclesiastical usage to the object blessed. It was occasionally used in early times to signify the Holy Eucharist, and in this sense is especially frequent in the writings of St. Cyril of Alexandria. The origin of this use is doubtless to be found in the words of St. Paul (1 Cor., x, 16): τὸ παρθένον τῆς εὐλογίας ἡ εὐλογίαμεν. But the more general use is for such objects as bread, wine, etc., which it was customary to distribute after the celebration of the Eucharistic Mysteries. Bread so blessed, we learn from St. Augustine (De peccat. merit. ii, 26), was customary distributed in his time to catechumens, and he even gives it the name of sacramentum, as having received the formal blessing of the Church. "Quini accepit catechumenus, quamvis non sit bonum Christi, sanctum tamen est, et sanctius quam cibi quibus alimur, quoniam sacramentum est." (What the catechumens receive, even if it is not the Body of Christ, is holy—holier, indeed, than our ordinary food, since it is a sacrament.) For the extension of this custom in later ages, see Antidoron; Bread, Liturgical Use of.

The word eulogia has a special use in connexion with monastic life. In the Benedictine Rule monks are forbidden to receive "littera, eulogia, vel quaelibet eucharistica" without the abbot's leave; and the word may be used in the sense of blessed bread only, but it seems to have a wider signification, and to designate any kind of present. There was a custom in monasteries of distributing in the refectories, after Mass, the eucharistic bread blessed at the Mass, as the eucharistic sacrament. For the extension of this custom in later ages, see Antidoron; Bread, Liturgical Use of.

Arthur S. Barnes.

Eulogius of Alexandria, Saint, patriarch of that see from 380 to 607. He was a successful combatant of the heretical errors then current in Egypt, notably the various phases of Monophysitism. He was a
warm friend of St. Gregory the Great, corresponded with him, and received from that pope many flattering expressions of esteem and admiration. Among other merits the pope makes special mention of his defence of the primacy of the Roman See (Baronius, Ann. Eccl. 1622, p. 59). Eulogius visited the East, some communities of which ancient sect still existed in his diocese, and vindicated the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, against both Nestorius and Eutyches. Baronius (ad ann. 600, no. 5) says that Gregory wished Eulogius to survive him, recognizing in him the voice of truth. It has been rightly said that he restored for a brief period to the church of Alexandria that life and youthful vigour characteristic of those churches only which remain closely united to Rome. Besides the above works and a commentary against the various sects of the Monophysites (Caelestis, Theodosians, Cainites, Aedapuli) he left eleven discourses in defence of Leo I and the council of Chalcedon, also a work against the Agnoetie, submitted by him before publication to Gregory I, who after some observations authorized it unchanged. With exception of one sermon and a few fragments of its works, St. Ephrem has preserved of the writings of Eulogius the following:

Nicaea, The Holy Eastern Church, Faithfulness of Alexandria (London, 1850), II, 46-52; Barrows, History, Theology, v. Sulpicius Severianus (Freiburg and St. Louis, 1908), 534. The extant fragments of the writings of Eulogius are in F. G. LXXIX (140) 58-64.

M. J. McNeal.

Eulogius of Cordova, Saint, Spanish martyr and writer who flourished during the reigns of the Cordovan Caliphs, Abd-ar-Rahman II and Mohammed I (822-856). It is not certain on what date or in what year of the ninth century he was born; it must have been previous to 819, because in 845 he was a priest highly esteemed among the Christians of Catalonia and Navarre, and priesthood was then conferred only on men thirty years of age. The family of the saint was of the nobility and held land in Cordova from Roman times. The Musulman rulers of Spain, at the beginning of the eighth century, tolerated the creed of the Christians and left them, with some restrictions, their civil rule, ecclesiastical hierarchy, monasteries, and property, but made them feel the burden of subjection in the shape of pecuniary exactions and military service. In the large cities like Toledo and Cordova, the civil rule of the Christians did not extend from that of the Visigothic epoch, and the government was exercised by the comarces (counties), president of the council of senators, among whom we meet a similarly named ancestor of Eulogius. The saint, like his five brothers, received an excellent education in accord with his good birth and under the guardianship of his mother Isabel. The youngest of the brothers, Joseph, held a high office in the palace of Abd-ar-Rahman II; two other brothers, Alvarus and Ideorde, were merchants and traded on a large scale as far as Central Europe. Of his sisters, Niola and Anulona, the first remained with her mother; the second was educated from infancy in a monastery where she later became a nun.

After completing his studies in the monastery of St. Zoilus, Eulogius continued to live with his family the better to care for his mother; also, perhaps, to study with famous masters, one of whom was Abbot Spardin, an illustrious writer of that time. In the meantime he found a friend in the celebrated Alvarus Paulus, a student-fellow, and they cultivated together all branches of science, sacred and profane, within their reach. Their correspondence in prose and verse filled volumes; later they agreed to destroy it, the manuscripts perishing and the Alvarus in a short time. The Alvarus married, but Eulogius preferred the ecclesiastical career, and was finally ordained a priest by Bishop Recared of Cordova. Alvarus has left us a portrait of his friend: “Devoted,” he says, “from his infancy to the Scriptures, and growing daily in the practice of virtue, he quickly reached perfection, surpassed in knowledge all his contemporaries, and became the teacher even of his masters. Mature in intelligence, though in body a child, he excelled them all in science even more than they surpassed him in years. Fair in manner (caritas et cultura) and amiable in person, he was gained by his eloquence, and yet more by his works. What books escaped his avidity for reading? What works of Catholic writers, of heretics and Gentiles, chiefly philosophers? Poets, historians, rare writings, all kinds of books, especially sacred hymns, in the composition of which he was a master, were read and digested by him; his humility was none the less remarkable and he readily yielded to the judgment of others less learned than himself.” This humility shone particularly on two occasions. In his youth he had decided to make a foot pilgrimage to Rome; notwithstanding his great fervour and his devotion to the sepulchre of the Prince of the Apostles (a notable proof of the union of the Mozarab Church with the Holy See), he gave up his project, yielding to the advice of prudent friends. Again, during the Saracen persecution in 830, after reading a passage of the Apostles (John 13:18), he decided that he might better defend the cause of the martyrs; however, at the request of his bishop, Saul of Cordova, he put aside his scruples. His extant writings are proof that Alvarus did not exaggerate. They give an account of what is most important from 845 to 856, otherwise almost unknown. From them we learn both without and within the Musulman dominions, especially of the lives of the martyrs who suffered during the Saracen persecution, quorum pars ipsa magna fuit. He was elected Archbishop of Toledo shortly before he was beheaded (11 March, 850). He leaves a perfect account of the orthodox doctrine which he defended, the intellectual culture which he propagated, the imprisonment and sufferings which he endured; in a word, his writings show that he followed to the letter the exhortation of St. Paul: Immitate me et ego Christi. He is buried in the cathedral of Oviedo.

Fuentes, Hist. Ec. de España (1852), II, 124-26; Florez, España Sagrada, X, 359-471; Gams, Kirchenlex. (1892), II, 229-38; Magin, P. E. C. CNV, 701-996; Moreau, Historia de los autores de la lengua de Castilla desde la Edad Media hasta la Edad Contemporánea (Madrid, 1911); Bautista, Eulogius de Cordova (Brussels, 1874). For his life, see Brusa, Historia de las Ordenes de la Alta Lliga, de los Maestros (Leyden, 1858), II, 390-95; Bourbet, Schola Cordobensis Christiana (Paris, 1888), 35-58.

F. Fita.

Eumenia, a titular see of Phrygia Pacatina in Asia Minor, and suffragan to Hierapolis. It was founded by Attalus II Philadelphus (159-138 b.C.) at the sources of the Cludrus and near the Glauceus, on the site of the modern Iškeleli, the centre of a palace in the vilayet of Brusa (1000 inhabitants). The new city was named by her founder after his brother Eumenes. Numerous inscriptions and many coins remain to show that Eumenia was an important and prosperous city under Roman rule. On the site of its Achaeion origin. The source of Christianity is, however, the most interesting fact in its history. As early as the second century its population was in great part Christian, and it seems to have suffered much during the persecution of Diocletian. Its bishopric and martyr, St. Thraseas (Euseb., H. E., XXIV, 28), did not belong to this period. Another bishop, Metrodorus, known by an inscription, lived probably soon after Emperor Constantine. Four other bishops are known by their subscriptions to proceedings of councils—Theodore in 361, Leo in 787, Paul and Ephraim in 879 (Lequien, Oriens christ., I, 897). The information mentioned in the "Notitia ecclesiastica" as late as the twelfth or thirteenth centuries.


S. Pétridi S.
Eunomianism, a phase of extreme Arianism prevalent among a section of Eastern churchmen from about 350 until 381; as a sect it is not heard of after the middle of the fifth century. The teaching of Arians was condemned by the Council of Nicæa, and the doctrine itself, as the touchstone of orthodoxy. The subsequent history of the Arians here is the history of the endeavours of arnining sympathizers to get rid of the obnoxious word. The diplomacy of court intrigeurs forms the dark background against which stand Eusebius and Semi-Arians. Imperial influence had been all-powerful too to allow Arians to be treated as outlaws in church affairs to the imperial change of attitude towards Christianity. That influence was exercised through the court prelates tinged with the fundamental rationalism underlying Arianism. They skillfully avoided the real issue, represented the whole affair as merely a question of the propriety of using particular terms, and for a time deluded those who were unfamiliar with the metaphysics of the question. St. Athanasius was represented as a political fire-brand whose watchword was **homoousian**. The Emperor Constantius (335–381), to his great personal annoyance, was ignorant of the doctrine of the Orthodox, and would not allow Athanasius to be exiled to Alexandria (31 Oct., 346). The lull which seemed to follow the return of Athanasius was due to the political circumstances arising out of the disastrous Persian War and the civil war against Maxentius; and it was not until the victory of Valentinian (13 Aug., 350) that the emperor’s hands were freed.

In the meantime a new and more defiant Arian school was arising, impatient of diplomacy, and less plant to imperial dictation. It frankly returned to the fullest expression of the errors of Arius, and intended to defend it by the rationalizing basis of Aristotelian dialectics. The history of the new school coincides with the life-history of Aetius and Eunomius. Aetius, its founder, successively a goldsmith, physician, and grammarian, turned his attention to theology under Arian influences at Antioch and Alexandria. Aristotle’s categories henceforth formed the limits of his knowledge, and the abuse of the syllogism his principal weapon. Ordained deacon at Antioch in 350, he was deposed by Leonius and sought refuge at Alexandria, where he found a disciple in Eunomius. Radical and uncompromising in their heretical teaching, they asserted that in substance and in all else the Son is unlike the Father: **divinos**, “unlike”, became their watchword as against the **homoousios** (homoousios) of the Orthodox, the **homoios** (homoios) of the Semi-Arians, and the later **huios** (huios) of the Arians. Hence the Arian extremists became known as Aetians, and later as Eunomians and Anomoeans. Their doctrines were received favourably by Eudoxius of Antioch and the Synod of Antioch in 358; but the formulation of their tenets produced a reaction, and in the same year they were condemned by the Semi-Arians and by the Synod of Seleucia (Sept., 359), where Aetius and Cæræus rejected the **homoios** and the triumph of the Homoeans led to their second exile of Aetius to Moesia and later at Ambialada in Pridias. After 360 the Anomoean Arians ceased to be formidable. Julian the Apostate (361–363) allowed Aetius to return; he was rehabilitated in an Arian synod, and died c. 370. Meanwhile Eunomius, supported by his friend Eudoxius, transferred from Antioch to Constantinople (366), became Bishop of the Orthodox See of Cyzicus in Asia Minor. His flock appealed to Constantius, who obliged Eudoxius to take action against him. Deposed in his absence and banished, Eunomius founded a sect of his own, ordained and consecrated some of his followers. Julian recalled both Aetius and Eunomius, who acquired considerable importance in Constantinople. The Synod of Antioch, 362, explicitly set forth the Anomoean doctrine that “the Son is in all things unlike [κατά τὰ πάντα ἀνδρόμαι] the Father, as well in will as in substance”. The death of Eudoxius in 370 marks the beginning of the end of Eunomianism. The sectarians were excluded from the benefit of Gratian’s edict of toleration (end of 378), were directly condemned by the Council of Constantinople (381), and were the objects of special repressive measures in addition to those directed against Arians and heretics in general. Moreover, disruptive forces were at work within the sect. Eunomius died about 395, and for all practical purposes the sect may be said to have died with him.

The dogmatic system of Eunomius is characterized at once by its presumptuous dialectics and its shallowness. His errors concerning Christ are founded upon his erroneous theology, which involves the assertion that a God of simplicity cannot be a God of mystery at all, for even man is as competent as God to comprehend simplicity. Eunomius proclaims the absolute intelligibility of the Divine Essence: “God knows no more of His own substance, than we do; but whatever we know about the Divine Substance, that is more known to me.” It must be said that whatever he knows about the Divine Substance, it is more accurately known to God; on the other hand, whatever He knows, the same also you will find without any difference in us” (Socrates, Hist. Eccl., IV, vii).

**Eunomia**, he maintains, perfectly expresses the Divine Essence: as the Unbegotten, God is a simple being: an act of generation would involve a contradiction of His essence, by introducing duality into the Godhead. The Father is **heterousios**; the Son is **heterousios**; hence, he held, there must be diversity of substance, and thus an Anomoean doctrine. Such constructions against the Orthodox was as follows: we allow **heterousia** to be a Divine attribute. Now the simplicity of God excludes all multiplicity of attributes. Consequently **heterousia** is the only attribute which befits the Divine nature, the only one therefore essential to God. In other words, God is essentially incapable of being begotten. Hence it is folly to speak of a God begotten, of a Son of God. The one God, **heterousios** and **heterousia**, unbegotten and without beginning, could not communicate His own substance, nor beget even a consubstantial Son; consequently there could be no question of identity of substance (homoiousios) or of likeness of substance (homoousios) between the Father and the Son. There could be no essential resemblance (κατὰ ὁμοιασίαν), but at most a moral resemblance. For the Son is a being drawn forth from nothing by the will of the Father, yet superior to all Creation inasmuch as He alone was created by the One God to be the Creator of the world. He does not share in the incomunicable Divine Essence (hōsia), but he does partake in the communicable Divine creative power (hēmera), and it is that partaking which constitutes the Son’s Divinity and distinction, and it is that which the term **Son of God** may be used is clear.

The works of Eunomius are of less importance in themselves than in the light which they throw on the best efforts of St. Basil and St. Gregory of Nyssa. His Commentary on the Romans and his letters have perished. His “Apologieticum” (P. G., XXX, 835), written before 365, seeks to refute the Nicene teaching concerning the coeternal and consubstantial Divinity of the Son. It is extremely obscure, and has been frequently misunderstood. For example, Tilmont, VI, 501–516, needs careful checking. It was against this work of Eunomius that St. Basil wrote his “Adversus Eunomium” (Ἀντίγραφον) in five books. (It is clear, however, that books IV and V are from another pen.) Eunomius retorted with his *Apologetic*.
EUPHROSYNE, P. (Defence of the Defence), written after the death of St. Basil (1 Jan., 379), wherein he does his best to defend more fully and by new arguments his teaching concerning the nature of God. This work was elaborately refuted by St. Gregory of Nyssa by "Advocatus Dei, Euphrosyne," one of which some twelve books have come down to us preserving the fragmentary remains of the "Apologetics, which are gathered in Retberg's "Marelliana" (Gottingen, 1794, pp. 124-147). A very full analysis of it is found in Dicamp, "Gotteslehre des hl. Gregor von Nyssa" (1896), I, 129 sqq. The third extant work is "Euphrosyne," or "Confession of Faith," presented by order to the Emperor Theodosius in 383. (See Arianism.)

EUPHRAZIA. See BRENKINSEP, PETER.

Euphemites. See Mesalians.

Euphrosyne of Constantinople (409-496) succeeded as Patriarch Flavitas (or Fravitas, 489-490), who succeeded Acacius (471-489). The great Arian schism (484-519), therefore, lasted during his reign. The Emperor Zeno (474-491) had published a decree called the "Henotikon" (482) that forbade in the current discussions any other criterions but that of Nicaea-Constantinople (ignoring the decrees of Chalcedon), carefully avoiding speaking of Christ's two natures, and used ambiguous formulæ that were meant to conciliate the Monophysites. The "Henotikon" really satisfied no one. Consistent Monophysites disliked it as much as Catholics. But Acacius at the capital, Peter Mongus of Alexandria, and Peter Fullo (Graphus) of Antioch, signed it. Pope Felix III (or H., 485-492) in a Roman synod of sixty-seven bishops (484) condemned the emperor's decree, deposed and excommunicated Acacius, Peter Mongus, and Peter Fullo. Acacius retired by striking the pope's name from his diplomas and persecuted Catholics at Constantinople. When he died, Flavitas, his successor, applied for recognition at Rome, but in vain, since he would not give up communion with Peter Mongus. Euphrosyne recognized the Council of Chalcedon, restored the pope's name to his diplomas, and brought Peter Mongus, who died in the year of Euphrosyne's accession (490). He was therefore a well-meaning person who wanted to restore the union with the Holy See. Unfortunately he still refused to cease the names of his two predecessors (Acacius and Flavitas) from the diplomas, where they occurred among the faithful departed. The pope insisted that heretics and followers of heresy should not be prayed for publicly in the Liturgy; so during the reign of Euphrosyne the union he desired was not brought about. But Euphrosyne was always a Catholic at heart. Before the accession of Emperor Anastasius I (491-518) he had made him sign a Catholic profession of faith (Evagrius, H. E., III, xxii). After the death of Pope Felix, Euphrosyne wrote to his successor, Gelasia I (492-496), again asking for intercommunion on any terms but the condemnation of Acacius. This time, too, the pope refused to modify his condition (Gelasia Epist. et Decret. P. L., LIX, 13). The patriarch had already summoned a synod at Constantinople in which he confirmed the decrees of Chalcedon (Mansi, VII, 1190). Eventually he fell foul of the emperor. A war against the Bulgars and Slavs was then going on, and Euphrosyne was accused of treason by revealing the emperor's plans to his enemies. A soldier tried, unsuccessfully, to murder the patriarch, apparently by order of Anastasius. The emperor further wanted to have back his written profession of faith, which Euphrosyne refused to give up. So he was deposed (496) in spite of the resistance of the people, and Anastasius II (496-511) was appointed successor. Macedonius seems to have been unwilling to take his place and refused to wear patriarchal vestments in his presence. Euphrosyne was exiled to Asia Minor and died in 515 at Anra. He was recognized to the end as lawful patriarch by Catholics in the East (Elias of Jerusalem, Flavian of Antioch, etc.).

Euphrasia, or EUPHRAXIA, SAINT, VIRGIN, b. in 380; d. after 410. She was the daughter of Antigonus, a senator of Constantinople, and a relation of Emperor Theodosius. Her father died shortly after her birth, and her mother, also Euphrosyne, devoted her life thenceforth exclusively to the service of God. To carry out this ideal she abandoned the capital, and, with her seven-year-old daughter, repaired to Egypt, where she dwelt on one of her estates, near a convent, and adopted the nuns' austere mode of life. This example aroused in her daughter the desire to enter the convent, and her mother gave her into the care of the superior, that she might be trained in the ascetic life. After her mother's death she declined an offer of marriage made by the Emperor Theodosius, on behalf of a senator's son, transferred to the emperor her entire fortune, to be used for charitable purposes, and took up, with a holy ardor, the rigorous practices of Christian perfection. She was about thirty when she entered. Her feast is celebrated in the Greek Church on 25 July, and in the Latin Church on 13 May. She is mentioned by St. John Damascene, in his third "Ontio de imaginibus".


Euphrates. See PERATE.

Euphrosyne, SAINT, d. about 470. Her story belongs to that group of legends which relate how Christian virgins, in order the more successfully to lead the life of celibacy and asceticism to which they had dedicated themselves, put on male attire and passed for men. According to the narrative of the "Vita Patrum" Euphrosyne was the only daughter of Paphnous, a rich man of Alexandria, who desired to marry her to a wealthy youth. But having conserved her life to God and apparently seeing no other means of keeping this vow, she clothed herself as a man and under the name of Smaragdus gained admittance into a monastery of men near Alexandria, where she lived for thirty-eight years after. She soon attracted the attention of the abbot by the rapid strides which she made toward a perfect ascetic life, and when Paphnous appealed to him for comfort in his sorrow, the abbot committed the latter to the care of the alleged young man Smaragdus. The father received from his own daughter, whom he failed to recognize, helpful advice and comfort. Not until she was dying did she reveal herself to him as his lost daughter Euphrosyne. After her death Paphnous also entered the monastery where she is celebrated in the Greek Church on 25 September, in the Roman Church on 16 January (by the Carmelites on 11 February).

Eurea, a titular see of Epirus Vetus in Greece, suffragan of Nicopolis. Eurea is mentioned by Hierocles (Syenecedemus, 651, 6). Justinian transferred its inhabitants to an islet in a neighbouring lake and built there a strong town (Procop., De aed., IV, 1).

We know five bishops of Eurea: the first, St. Demetrius, who lived before the time of Theodosius I, the last is mentioned in a letter of Pope St. Gregory the Great about 603 (Lequien, Or. christ., II, 143).

The site of the city is unknown; Lequien identifies it with Paramythia, which is called At Donat (St. Donatus) by the Turks, in the vilayet of Janina. Others have placed it at Limbioni, near Missolonghion. In the east, however, it is most likely to be Phocion, others say, Nicopolis. Panagiotides in Νικοπόλις Ἑλληνική ἔρημος (Constantinople, 1882), II, 308; Philippou in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyk., s. v.

S. Pétridès.

Europe.—Name.—The conception of Europe as a distinct division of the earth, separate from Asia and Africa, had its origin in ancient times. The sailors of the Egean Sea applied the Semitic designation Breb (sunset, west) and Aga (sunrise, east) to the countries lying respectively west and east of the sea; in this way it became customary to call Greece and the territory back of it Europe, while Asia Minor and the parts beyond were named Asia. At a later date the mass of land lying to the south of the Mediterranean was set off as a distinct division of the earth with the name of Asia Minor.

Position, Boundaries, and Area.—Europe is a large peninsula forming the western part of the northern continent of the Eastern Hemisphere. On the north and west it is separated from North America by the Arctic and North Atlantic Oceans; on the south by the Mediterranean Sea from Africa and the Egean Sea. In the east there is no clear natural division from the continental mass of Asia. Such a dividing line may be drawn along the crest of the Ural and Caucasus Mountains, the Emba River, Caspian Sea, and the lowlands of the Manich River, or through the depression that, starting from the Gulf of Obi, extends through the valleys of the Obi, Irtish, Tobol, and Emba Rivers. The political boundary extends beyond the Ural Mountains towards the east, and beyond the Ural River to the south and west, runs along the range called Obischei Syrt and the Usen River, and encircles within the eastern boundary of Europe the whole of the Caucasus. The most northern point of Europe is North Cape (71° 12' N. lat.) on the Island of Magerö belonging to Norway; the most western point is Cape de Roche (9° 31' west of Greenwich) in Portugal; the most southern is Cape Tarifa (36° 50' 33" S. lat.) in Spain; the continent extends as far to the east as 65° longitude east of Greenwich. Its greatest length from north to south is 2398 miles, from west to east 3455 miles. The statement as to the extent of its area varies, according to the position assigned to its eastern boundary, from 3,672,960 sq. miles to 4,092,960 sq. miles. This measurement includes the polar islands Iceland, Nova Zembla, and Spitzbergen, but not the Canary, Madeira, and Azores Islands.

Geological Formation.—Three leading tectonic divisions are to be distinguished in the geological formations of Europe. In the Tertiary period... Western Europe, as far south as the Alps, the Pyrenees, and, reaching beyond the Pyrenees, into the Spanish Peninsula, to the east as far as the Baltic and the Vistula River, is formed of debris and sedimentary deposits. This has been produced by the breaking up and overflowing with water of the mountain chains that now exist as secondary ranges, as the Scotch Highlands, the central plateau of France, and the mountain chain of Central Germany. Towards the east is low-lying land that has remained the same from early times. Sweden and Finland form together a great level called the Plain of the Baltic, south-east from which spreads the great Russian plain, which is limited by the Urals and Carpathian Mountains, the Crimea, and the Caucasus Mountains. The whole of Southern Europe and a part of Middle Europe is a region of late folded mountain ranges. These begin with the Alps, which have remarkable heights, in the ranges of Prealps, in Crete, in the southern and central parts of the Balkan Peninsula. The north-western Apennines pass into the Alpine System. In the eastern Alpines the Alps proper are divided into three chains; of these the middle one passes into the Hungarian plain; the Carpathian and Balkan ranges unite in a great bend with the northern chain, and the southern one is continued by the Dinaric Alpes and the western chains of the Balkan Peninsula as far as Crete and the south-western part of Asia Minor. Numerous islands belong to the Continent of Europe. The separation of the islands from the mainland arose in two ways. In the north and west, the encroachment of the sea produced bays and peninsulas and formed islands. In the south, the war against the sea from the Mediterranean, those of the Adriatic and Egean Seas, the Sea of Marmora, and the southern part of the Black and Caspian Seas, were formed by folding; and in this way also were formed the Iberian, Italian, and Balkan Peninsulas and the archipelagos lying between Greece and Asia Minor. The islands of Europe belong to three different basins, namely, to the Caspian Sea, the Atlantic Ocean, including the Mediterranean and Black Seas, and the Arctic Ocean. The courses of the rivers of Europe are much shorter than the courses of those of Asia, Africa, or America. The largest of the European rivers, the Volga (1778 miles), the Danube (1771 miles), Dnieper (1329 miles), Don (1120 miles), Petehora (1023 miles), and the Dniester (835 miles), flow into seas that are almost entirely cut off from the ocean, consequently from the world's traffic. They offer, however, little obstruction to navigation, and numerous canals are cut through the main watershed that extends from Gibraltar to the northern Urals. The largest number of lakes is found in the region, formerly covered with glaciers, lying north of 50° N. lat.—Finland, Scandinavia, Scotland, and Ireland, and the Alps. Besides this lake region, lakes have also been formed in the Alps by folding, in the Balkans by the breaking in of the surface, and in the Apennine Peninsula by volcanic outbursts.

Climate, Flora, Fauna.—The climatic conditions of Europe are very favourable. Almost the entire continent, excepting the northern point, belongs to the temperate zone. At the same time it is much warmer than other countries in the same latitude, as, for instance, than eastern North America, because along its western coast flows the Gulf Stream, which leaves the coast of Florida with a temperature of 68° Fahr. and raises the normal temperature on the Portuguese and Spanish coast about 7° 2° Fahr., of the British coast about 9°—14° 4° Fahr., and of the Norwegian coast about 14°-18° Fahr. Since there is no chain of mountains traversing Europe from north to south, as is the case in North America, the influence of the Gulf Stream extends far into the interior of the mainland. On the borders of the Arctic Ocean a rigorous climate prevails, summer is short, and during the greater part of the year the temperature is below freezing. This northern region has polar vegetation; the rolling plains called tundras are found on the peninsulas of Kain and Kola and at the mouth of the Pechora. The sub-arctic zone is found south of this in the Scandinavain Peninsula down to 60° N. lat., where the climate of the coast, influenced by the sea, is milder in winter and colder in summer. The part of Europe properly included in the temperate zone is divided
into the following regions: the countries lying on the Atlantic, Great Britain, Brittany, the Channel, and northwestern Spain; this section has moderate temperature and large rainfall; west and middle Europe, with an inland climate, less heavy rainfall (about 1'7 inches), and the rainfall of the mountainous regions is less than 23'6 inches. Finally comes the section of the Euxine comprising the great Hungarian plain, the plain of the Balkan provinces, and Southern Russia; in this division the spring is moist and warm and midsummer hot and dry. The depression of the Caspian belongs to the dry zone of Asia.

The forests of Europe flourish in the temperate zone. In Norway they are composed chiefly of pine; the only deciduous tree found in the highest latitudes is the birch (betula odorata); the mixed forests of pines and deciduous trees are found south of 61° N. lat.; this region is characterized by grass-lands, heaths, and moors. The cultivated land, which in Central and Western Europe is about sixty to seventy per cent, is divided into farm land, cultivated forest land, grass and pasture land. From north to south the succession of grains is as follows: barley, rye and oats, wheat, corn, and finally in France and Hungary, and maize. Potatoes are cultivated on less fruitful soil. In this region native fruits are the apple, pear, and cherry; finer kinds of fruit trees, as the peach, apricot, plum, and of nut trees, the walnut and almond, have been introduced from the south. In this region the grape is cultivated; its northern limit is in the south of the Loire, as far as Paris and the Rhine near Bonn, thence towards the Unstrut and Saale Rivers, and reaches its most northerly point on the Oder below 52° N. lat.; the limit of its cultivation here turns to the south-east until it reaches the Sea of Azov. The region of the Mediterranean, that is the Iberian Peninsula, Provence, Italy, to the foot of the Alps, and the Balkan Peninsula south of 42° N. lat., has a sub-tropical climate. Here flourish trees and bushes which are always green; among those that are cultivated for their products are the citron, orange, fig, and almond; myrtle, and pomegranates. The fauna of Europe is in accord with the climate and vegetation. In Northern Europe are found the polar bear, polar fox, and reindeer; in the region of forests live the bear, wolf, and lynx, which have, however, almost disappeared; the region of the Mediterranean contains numerous reptiles.

**Population, Political Divisions, and Religions.**

-The greater part of the population of Europe belongs to the European or Mediterranean race. The main race-groups are the Teutonic, Romanic, and Slavonic. To the Teutonic division belong: the Germans, Dutch, Flemish, English, and Scandinavian; it contains in all 127,800,000 souls or 32'1 per cent of the whole population; included in the Romanic group are: the French, Walloons, Italians, Friulians, natives of the Rharian Alps, Maltese, Spaniards, Portuguese, and Cubans. In all 108,311,682 souls, or 27'1 per cent are included in the Slavonic are: the Russians, Ruthenians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Wends, Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Bulgarians, Letts, and Lithuanians, in all 124,600,000, or 31'3 per cent. A smaller number, about 9,500,000 souls or 2'4 per cent is composed of other Asian races: Turks, Greeks, Albanians, Gypsies, Armenians, etc. There are also about 27,000,000, or some 7 per cent, of non-Aryan races: Basques, Magyars, Finns, the tribes of the Ural region, Turks, Kal- mucks, and Jews. The total population of Europe amounts to about 429,000,000.

The organization of the present States of Europe may be traced back to the Middle Ages. Most of the States are limited by natural boundaries within which each has developed its own individual character. The States vary greatly in size and population; most of them are constitutional monarchies, the only republiques being France and Switzerland. Among the latter, Great Britain and Ireland has a total area of 71,622 square miles and 43,722,000 inhabitants; as a natural consequence of the geographical position of the islands, the nation is largely interested in colonial enterprises. The Scandinavian Peninsula is halved by an uninhabited mountain range, thus permitting the existence of two countries, Norway and Sweden. Denmark, on the Atlantic, has an area of 123,938 square miles and 2,300,000 inhabitants; Sweden, on the Baltic, has an area of 172,973 square miles and 5,261,000 inhabitants. The peninsula and islands lying south of Norway and Sweden form the third Scandinavian state, Denmark, that controls the entrance to the Baltic. Denmark has an area of 14,672 square miles and 2,450,000 inhabitants. France, the western part of the continental mass, has an area of 206,950 square miles and a population of 39,060,000; it has the advantage, excepting the Swiss, of having for its boundaries either seas or mountain ranges. Between Western and Central Europe lie the so-called "buffer" States: Belgium with an area of 11,197 square miles and 7,075,000 inhabitants; the Netherlands, area 12,741 square miles, inhabitants 5,510,000; Switzerland, area 15,830 square miles, inhabitants 6,466,000. The German Empire, area 128,880 square miles, inhabitants 60,605,000, covers the greater part of Central Europe. Germany borders upon nearly all the great powers of Europe and has, therefore, developed a large army. The State having the least organic union geographically and ethnically, and consequently in constant danger of external disorganization, is the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Its area is 261,004 square miles, population 49,092,000 souls. Russia, area 2,081,079 square miles, inhabitants 119,115,000, occupies the lowland of Europe and, in its largest extent, stretches beyond Europe into the Asiatic plain. Southern Europe embraces numerous states with sharply defined boundaries. The Iberian Peninsula is divided between Portugal and Spain; Portugal, a country lying on the ocean and having a great maritime past, has an area of 43,393 square miles, inhabitants 5,016,000; Spain, area 199,282,341 square miles, inhabitants 28,124,000. Italy belongs completely to the lands of the Mediterranean; its area is 110,811 square miles, population 33,604,000. The physical contour of the Balkan Peninsula is so broken up by mountain ranges that it fails to show any one organically large State. Its divisions at the present time are: Bulgaria, 37,066 square miles, population 3,744,400; Montenegro, 3475 square miles, population 228,000; Rumania, 50,579 square miles, population 6,392,000; Servia, 18,533 square miles, population 2,677,000; European Turkey, 65,251 square miles, population 6,130,000; Greece, 25,662 square miles, population 2,440,000.

By far the greater proportion of the population of Europe belong to the Christian faith. One-fourth of the population are Protestants, somewhat over one-fourth belong to the Oriental Christian Churches, nearly 45 per cent are Catholics, 44 per cent are not professing any religion. In the Romanic States 99 per cent of the population are Catholic; in the Teutonic States 74 per cent are Protestant and less than one per cent non-Christian. In the States of Eastern Europe, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and the Balkan provinces, 57 per cent belong to the Oriental Churches, 9'2 per cent are Protestants, and 6 per cent are Catholic. The only heathen peoples are the Kal- mucks living between the Ural and Caucasus mountains, the Finns of the Volga, and the Samoyedes. About 3,550,000 persons or 2 'per cent of the whole population of Europe are Mohammedans in belief; these are limited to several tribes of the Uralo-Altaic
family in Russia, and to the former territories of the Ottoman Empire; among the Mohammedans are a large portion of the Albanians, some of the Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and a part of the Bulgarians. The Jews of Europe number 9,000,000 or 2·2 per cent; they are largely found only in Russia, in the Austrian, Hungarian, Rumanian Monarchy, Rumania, and Turkey. (The above figures are based on Hettner, op. cit. infra.)

Christianity.—European civilization is founded on that of the East; from Western Asia and Egypt Europe received its food-plants, domestic animals, method of writing, numerals, the beginnings of art and science; and the modern forms of state organization and religion. The various States of Greece, the European neighbour of Asia, transmitted these by trade and the foundation of colonies to the countries lying on the shores of the eastern Mediterranean and to Southern Italy. Rome from its central position imparted them to Western and Northern Europe and united the civilized parts of the continent into a great empire. At the time of its greatest extent imperial Rome included, on European soil, the present countries of Italy, Spain, France, England, Germany west of the Rhine and south of the Danube, the countries bordering on the Black Sea, and the whole Balkan Peninsula, besides all the islands of the Mediterranean. Christianity, too, came from the East by way of Greece and Rome. The connexion existing between the various Roman provinces and the wide prevalence of the Latin and Greek tongues were most favourable to the spread of the Christian faith. When the Byzantine emperors by the Caesars fell to pieces, the Christian Faith not only entered into its inheritance, but also subdued all those barbarian peoples that had up to then defied the imperial power. The Gospel was brought to Rome by colonies of converts who kept up close relations with Palestine, of the Church of Paris. St. Paul brought Christianity to Greece on his second journey (49-52 A.D.) when he founded, with the aid of Silas, Timothy, and Luke, Christian communities in Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth. St. Paul's mission to Greece and Italy, perhaps also to Spain, prepared the way for the close connexion between the Roman and Greek Christians and strengthened them for the work of spreading the Gospel. In fact the first persecution under Nero in 64 was not able to crush the new movement, and the same fate befell the many others.

Towards the end of the first century, under Clement, the head of the Church at that time, there was a close bond between Rome and Corinth. It is also to be assumed that in the meantime all the commercial cities on the coasts of the Mediterranean had Christians in their midst, and that before long the regions adjoining these cities accepted the Gospel. According to tradition the Church in Gaul was founded by Trophimus, who was sent there by St. Paul; to Crescentius, a disciple of the Apostles, is ascribed the preaching of the Gospel in Vienne and Mââ©; and to Dionysius the Areopagite, the founding of the Church of Paris. To Eucharius and Maternus, two disciples of St. Paul, are attributed the founding of the Churches of Trier and Cologne. It is certain that flourishing dioceses arose in Lyons and Vienne during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180). At the beginning of the third century, according to the testimony of Tertullian (Adv. Judæos), various tribes of Gaul had accepted Christianity. At about the same date Irenæus (Adv. haerescæ) speaks of Churches in Germany, and the new faith had at that time spread into all the provinces of the Spanish Peninsula. According to the Venerable Bede (Histor. gentis Anglorum) 86; the first missionaries came from the English during the reign of Pope Eleutherius (177-90). By the opening of the third century the British Church had spread beyond the Roman possessions in Britain and may even have embraced Ireland. In the meantime the barbarians living along the northern bound-aries of the Roman Empire had begun their migrations and predatory incursions. Along this border lived the tribes of the Teutonic family, divided by the Oder into the East Germans and West Germans. The East Germans included the Ostrogoths and Visigoths, the Burgundians, Vandals, Heruli, Rugii, and Scyri. The West Germans were either Franks, Alamans, or Germans on the sea-coast, including the later Frisians and Anglo-Saxons; the Istvaneons or the Germans of the Rhine, including the Franks between the Weser and Rhine; the Herulians, among whom were the later Thuringians and the upper German tribes of the Alamans and Bavarians (141-154). As early as the years 161-80 the Marcomanni, a West German tribe, advanced as far as Aquileia; they were defeated, but introduced northern elements into the population. After this failure the current of the migration divided into two streams: one to the south-east, the migration of the East Germans; one to the south-west, the migration of the West Germans. Of the East Germans, the Goths reached the lower Danube and the Black Sea and divided, according to these respective positions, into the Ostrogoths and Visigoths. In 375, on account of the pouring in of Asiatic tribes through the Danube and Black Sea, and the whole Balkan Peninsula, besides all the islands of the Mediterranean. Christianity, too, came from the East by way of Greece and Rome. The connexion existing between the various Roman provinces and the wide prevalence of the Latin and Greek tongues were most favourable to the spread of the Christian faith. When the Byzantine emperors by the Caesars fell to pieces, the Christian Faith not only entered into its inheritance, but also subdued all those barbarian peoples that had up to then defied the imperial power. The Gospel was brought to Rome by colonies of converts who kept up close relations with Palestine, of the Church of Paris. St. Paul brought Christianity to Greece on his second journey (49-52 A.D.) when he founded, with the aid of Silas, Timothy, and Luke, Christian communities in Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth. St. Paul's mission to Greece and Italy, perhaps also to Spain, prepared the way for the close connexion between the Roman and Greek Christians and strengthened them for the work of spreading the Gospel. In fact the first persecution under Nero in 64 was not able to crush the new movement, and the same fate befell the many others.

Towards the end of the first century, under Clement, the head of the Church at that time, there was a close bond between Rome and Corinth. It is also to be assumed that in the meantime all the commercial cities on the coasts of the Mediterranean had Christians in their midst, and that before long the regions adjoining these cities accepted the Gospel. According to tradition the Church in Gaul was founded by Trophimus, who was sent there by St. Paul; to Crescentius, a disciple of the Apostles, is ascribed the preaching of the Gospel in Vienne and Mââ©; and to Dionysius the Areopagite, the founding of the Church of Paris. To Eucharius and Maternus, two disciples of St. Paul, are attributed the founding of the Churches of Trier and Cologne. It is certain that flourishing dioceses arose in Lyons and Vienne during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161-180). At the beginning of the third century, according to the testimony of Tertullian (Adv. Judæos), various tribes of Gaul had accepted Christianity. At about the same date Irenæus (Adv. haerescæ) speaks of Churches in Germany, and the new faith had at that time spread into all the provinces of the Spanish Peninsula. According to the Venerable Bede (Histor. gentis Anglorum) 86; the first missionaries came from the English during the reign of Pope Eleutherius (177-90). By the opening of the third century the British Church had spread beyond the Roman possessions in Britain and may even have embraced Ireland. In the meantime the barbarians living along the northern bound-
the state religion of Rome since the time of Constantine the Great, with a more stable power, the united West Germans.

The West Germans, although their migrations were not very extended, had changed their habitations as far as the Rhine, and in the fifth century took entire possession of it, spreading towards the north as far as Coblenz. The Franks were divided into the Ripurian and Gaulish Franks; the former settled on both sides of the middle and lower Rhine, the latter advanced from the Schelde to the Somme. Towards the end of the fifth century, the Saxons advanced from the Elbe to the Rhine; in the fifth century, with the aid of the Angles, they conquered Britain; the former inhabitants of Britain took refuge in Wales and France and gave their name to Brittany. The Frisians settled on the coast and islands of Schleswig-Holstein; the Thuringians spread from the lower Elbe to the southern bank of the Main. The Bajuurari went farthest south. At the time of the birth of Christ they lived in modern Bohemia; about 500 their territory extended from the Lech to the Elbe and from the Danube to the junction of the Tisza and the river Ilz. The tribes just named enlarged the scene of European history; all that was now needed was the political and spiritual union of these peoples to make them the leading people of Europe. The political union was brought about by the Franks, the spiritual union by Germania. In the end these two forces combined in a form of theocracy which, by a rapid series of victories, conquered not only southern Europe, but also Middle and Eastern Europe as well.

Just as the fifth century passed into the sixth (481-511), Clovis, King of the Saxon Franks, forcibly subdued the most important of the tribes and led them to embrace Christianity after his own conversion. Clovis first united what was left of the Roman Empire on the Seine and Loire with his own domain and made Paris his capital. After this he subdued the Alamanni on the Rhine, Mosel, Lower Main, and Neckar; as the champion of the doctrines of Roman Christianity, he conquered the King of the Arian Visigoths near Poitiers (507) and seized the Visigothic territory between the Loire and the Garonne. By overthrowing the petty Saxon chief and the royal family of the Ripurian Franks, he made himself the ruler of the Frankish tribes. The work was completed by his four sons, who seized the territories of the Thuringians and Burgundians, forced the Ostrogoths to give up Provence and Rhetia, and obtained by treaties sovereignty over the Bajuurari.

The first of the foundations of the Franco-Christian Empire which opened to Christianity a new missionary field to be won over to the Faith only by properly trained apostles. The training was given in the monastic institutions which, in imitation of the East, had now spread over all of Western Europe. One of the chief factors in the conversion of the heathen was the Order of St. Benedict of Nursia, encouraged by Gregory the Great. The precursors of the Benedictines were St. Patrick (432) and St. Columba (about 590), who converted Ireland and Scotland, while the Anglo-Saxons received Christianity from the Hibernians in the seventh century. Augustine (590), who had been specially sent by Rome. At the death of St. Patrick there were in Ireland several bishops, numerous priests and many monasteries; his own see was Armagh. Columba founded the celebrated monastery on the Island of Iona, between Ireland and Scotland, which was the centre of the Scotch missions and dioceses. The Abbot Augustine and his companions erected the metropolitan See of Canterbury (Durovernum), York (Eboracum), and the see of London; in the course of the seventh century the successors of Augustine, Mellitus and Theodore of Tarsus, completed his work.

A glorious band of self-sacrificing apostles of the Faith, from Columbanus and Gallus to Boniface, carried Christianity from the British Isles to the Continent. They founded their work on what scanty remains of Christianity still existed in the former Roman provinces. In the fifth century Severinus and Valentinian, both Gaulish Franks, laboured in the south of France. At the end of the fifth century, the first Franks crossed the Vosges mountains, where he had founded the monasteries of Annegray and Luxeuil, and came to Lake Constance; here from Bregenz as a centre he preached Christianity, while his companion St. Gall became the founder of the celebrated monastery of St. Gall. In the early part of the seventh century the monks Agilus and Eustaceus of the monastery of Luxeuil preached the Gospel in Bavaria; they were followed by Rupert of Worms and Emmeram of Aquitaine. St. Corbinian laboured as the first Bishop of Freising, and Kilian in Wormsburg. Ecclesiastical life on the Rhine was largely developed by Bishop Nectarius of Cologne, Dragobodo of Speyer, Amandus, Lambert, and Hugo of Maestricht. The Gospel was brought to the Frisians by Wilfrid of York and Willibrord of Northumbria; the latter erected a see at Utrecht. Willibrord's companion, Suidbert, went into the countship of Mark and Frisia, Lower Lüneburg, and founded a monastery. The brothers Ewald laboured with little success among the Saxons. An organization including all these countries was not established until the appearance of the greatest of the apostles of the Germans, St. Boniface. He entered on his career in the time of the Carlingian Mayors of the Palace, who were destined to realize the union of Church and State in Western Europe.

Repeated divisions of the kingdom, disputes as to succession, civil wars, and the power of the nobles almost brought the great Frankish kingdom to dissolution. It was saved from utter ruin by Pepin of Heristal, Mayor of the Palace (Major domus), who gradually took control of the government. In 687 Pepin won for himself the position of Mayor of the Palace of Neustria and Burgundy, in addition to that for Austrasia which he already held; in this way he ruled the kingdom. He undertook the conquest of the tribes which had broken loose from the Frankish rule and encouraged the missions to the West Frisians. His son Charles Martel, who was not less active, held a position of such power that he was able, in the great battle of Poitiers, 732, to protect Christian German civilization against the attack of Islam to conquer the world. Pepin the Short, the son of Charles, brought about the union of Church and State which had so great an influence on the history of the world. Having obtained the title of king in 752, his first task was to defend Pope Stephen II, who had appealed to him for aid, from the attacks of the Lombards; this was followed by the so-called "Donation of Pepin", a grant of territory to the pope which was the foundation of the later States of the Church. Their mutual engagements fixed not only their own policy but also that of their successors. Like Pepin his famous son Charlemagne lent his support to the Holy See, and all his conquests were undertaken for the good of the Church and Christianity. By successful campaigns against Aquitaine, the Lombards, Avars, Saxons, and Danes, and by treaties with the Slavic peoples, Charlemagne increased his domain, which extended from the Elbe and the Arno to the Elder River in Schleswig-Holstein, and from the Atlantic to the Elbe and the Raab. His kingdom became a world-empire and he himself one of the great rulers of history, worthy of reviving the Western Roman Empire. He was crowned, Christmas Day, 800,
by the pope, and the new empire rested essentially on the basis of an alliance with the Church. Its ideal was the Kingdom of God on earth, in which the emperor by divine appointment is God’s viceroy in order to lead and rule all races as divided into nations, classes, and distinctions of rank according to Divine will. Pepin the Short had been filled with this lofty concept; consequently extraordinary success attended the missionary labours of the Church under both rulers. As early as 716, under the rule of Charles Martel, the Anglo-Saxon monk Winfrid, better known as Boniface, landed on the Continent; he was to be the reformer and organizer of German ecclesiastical life. He always laboured in union with Rome, and was himself a missionary in Frisia with Willibrord, then, in 722, in Hesse and Thuringia, and in 736 in Bavaria. Having been made an archbishop and having received authority from Rome, he founded a number of monasteries, e.g. that of Fulda, and the Bishops of Eichstätt, Würzburg, Burgrave, and Erfurt. By means of synods held every five years he brought about the closer union between the old and new dioceses, and placed the newly founded sees in Thuringia, as well as those of Speyer, Worms, Cologne, Utrecht, Tongern, Augsburg, Chur, Constance, and Strasbourg, under Mainz as metropolitan see, of which he became archbishop in 746. In the reign of Charlemagne the large territories of the Saxons and Avars were added to the lands thus organized, and the regions also received Christian bishops. The result was the founding of the Dioceses of Bremen (787), Paderborn (806), Werden, and Minden in the county of the Engern, Osnabrück and Münster (785) in Westphalia, Halberstadt and Hildesheim (817) in Eastphalia; the metropolitan of all the Saxon sees was Bremen (831). The conversion of the Avars had been attempted by the Bavarian Duke Tassilo II; when the East Mark was founded the Avars came under the influence of the sees and monasteries established in this country; after their subjugation they were placed partly under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Salzburg and partly under that of the Patriarch of Aquileia.

From these points, Christianity, as formerly in the Roman Empire, extended beyond the boundaries of Charlemagne’s dominions, and new tribes and peoples were evangelized, while, at the same time, German civilization was peacefully established within the Frankish Empire. The monastery of Corvey on the Weser, and the Sees of Bremen and Hamburg (831) were the mission centres for the northern provinces. The monk Anschar of Corvey, first Archbishop of Hamburg, laboured with great zeal as Apostolic legate in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway; his successors were equally active as missionaries and bishops. However it was not until the reign of Canute the Great (1014-35) that the victory of Christianity in Denmark was assured; in 1164 Lund was made the metropolitan See of Scandinavia; in 1163 Upsala became the metropolitan See of Sweden, and about the middle of the twelfth century Trondhjem was made the same for Norway. Iceland was won for Christianity about the year 1000 and was divided into the two sees of Skálholt and Holm. The inhabitants of the Orkneys, Hebrides, Faroe, and Shetland Islands were converted about the same time as Iceland; they were at first placed under the metropolitan See of Hamburg-Bremen, which had been united in 849, and later under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan See of Norway.

During the period of the Teutonic migrations the Slavs had come into contact with Christianity and were converted partly by Christian rulers, as in Thrace, Macedonia, Greece, and Dalmatia, partly through the influence of neighbouring Christian countries, as in Carinthia. In 806 the Bishop of Passau undertook the conversion of Moravia; that of Pannonia was attempted by Archbishop Adalram of Salzburg (821-36). In both these countries a great missionary work was done by Cyril and Methodius; the latter, Methodius, became Archbishop of Moravia and of Thessaly. The work of converting Bohemia began in the year 945; the country was at first subject to Ratisbon; in 973 a diocese was founded in Bohemia itself at Prague, which was suffragan to Mainz. Poland was brought to Christianity by its ruler Duke Mieszylaw (963), and in 968 he erected the Bishopric of Posen. In the year 1000 Gnesen was made a metropolitan see, its suffragan sees were Breslau (1000), and Cracow (1000). Finally, in the reigns of Heinrich I and Otto I the northern Slavs, living in regions subsequently German, namely the Wends, including those living in Pomerania, as well as the Obodrites and Sorbs on the Oder, Vistula, and Elbe, in Lusatia, and Saxonys were forcibly Christianized. The new sees of Havelberg, Brandenburg, Meissen, Zeitz, Merseburg, and Oldenburg (Stargard) served as points from which the work of conversion could be carried on; Magdeburg was the centre of the entire Slavonic mission.

It was during the same period that the Greek Church spread through the eastern part of Europe. In 955 the first Christian princess of Russia, Olga, was baptized at Constantinople; during the reign of her grandson Vladimir, baptized 989, Christianity became the religion of the country. In 864 the Bulgars, at the demand of their patriarch, accepted Christianity as a people, and from 870 were under the ecclesiastical control of Constantinople. A bishop sent from Constantinople introduced Christianity among the Magyars, or Hungarians; the work was carried by German missionaries in particular by the great policy of the Saxon emperors. The first Christian ruler of Hungary was Stephen (997-1038).

Many sacrifices, however, were still necessary in order to keep what had been gained for Christianity and to protect these gains against the threatened dangers of Mohammedanism and heathenism. These sacrifices were freely made by medieval Christian Europe. Under the careful training of their appointed guardians, the Catholic orders, the various nations and their rulers were filled with Christian thoughts and feelings. Although the concession of their lands to the representatives of the secular and spiritual power inevitably led to friction, especially in the age of the Hohenstaufen emperors, nevertheless all were conscious of their common duty to protect faith and civilization against foes both in Europe and outside of it. In the convincing proof of this was the courageous struggle of Europe against the attempted inroads of Islam, and especially the expeditions of conquest to the Holy Land repeatedly undertaken by the various nations of Europe acting together. Spain, which since 711 had been almost entirely under the control of the Moors, was able in 1212 to drive them as far back as Granada; in 1492 Granada also fell. From 875 Sicily had been in the hands of the Saracens, but it was freed by the courageous Normans (1061-91). The so-called Crusades (1096-1291) continued with interruption for nearly two hundred years; among those who were engaged in them were monks, as Peter of Amands and St. Bernard; bishops, as Otto of Freising; rulers of the greatest nations of Western Europe, as the German emperors, Frederick Barbarossa and Frederick II; the French kings, St. Louis, and Philip II, and the English Richard the Lion-Hearted. Orders of knights, as the Order of St. John, were formed to take part in these expeditions. The original aim of the Crusades, the freeing of Palestine from the control of non-Christians, it is true, was not attained. But the power of Mohammeedanism was weakened for a long time to come; the civilization of Western Europe, moreover,
RELIGIOUS STATISTICS FOR THE COUNTRIES OF EUROPE

The figures below are based on census reports, dates of which are given in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Catholics (including Unitarian Eastern Churches)</th>
<th>Evangelicals: including Anglicans, Calvinists, Unitarians, etc.</th>
<th>Oriental Christians: Orthodox Greeks, Gregorian Armenians, etc.</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Mohammedans</th>
<th>Others: Rationalists, Without a Confession, Non-Christian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia, Finland, and Poland, (1897)</td>
<td>11,326,794</td>
<td>6,283,679</td>
<td>78,713,017</td>
<td>5,082,342</td>
<td>3,560,361</td>
<td>320,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modern Poland, with Bosnia and Herzegovina (1900)</td>
<td>33,504,263</td>
<td>4,227,691</td>
<td>4,05,573</td>
<td>2,15,530</td>
<td>549,693</td>
<td>17,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (1900)</td>
<td>26,279,933</td>
<td>33,201,194</td>
<td>3,90,883</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>23,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France (1900)</td>
<td>35,100,000</td>
<td>4,273,967</td>
<td>3,90,000</td>
<td>3,90,000</td>
<td>3,90,000</td>
<td>3,90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (1900)</td>
<td>about 15,006,000</td>
<td>2,273,967</td>
<td>(1857-1604)</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>13,770</td>
<td>13,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (1900)</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>2,273,967</td>
<td>1,790,337</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>13,770</td>
<td>13,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway (1900)</td>
<td>3,310,000</td>
<td>33,201,194</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (1900)</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>1,490,000</td>
<td>1,490,000</td>
<td>1,490,000</td>
<td>1,490,000</td>
<td>1,490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Empire (1900)</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>2,436,012</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>57,416</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (1900)</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>2,273,967</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>57,416</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania (1900)</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>2,490,000</td>
<td>3,90,000</td>
<td>3,90,000</td>
<td>3,90,000</td>
<td>3,90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria (1900)</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>4,234,000</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>4,176</td>
<td>57,416</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal (1900)</td>
<td>5,423,500</td>
<td>1,45,000</td>
<td>1,45,000</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>115,179</td>
<td>115,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece and Crete (1900)</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servia (1895)</td>
<td>1,790,161</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
<td>3,085,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland (1890)</td>
<td>2,900,161</td>
<td>1,914,197</td>
<td>2,281,018</td>
<td>1,281,018</td>
<td>1,281,018</td>
<td>1,281,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands (1899)</td>
<td>6,018,000</td>
<td>1,281,018</td>
<td>1,281,018</td>
<td>1,281,018</td>
<td>1,281,018</td>
<td>1,281,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (1900)</td>
<td>12,934</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>13,840</td>
<td>13,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro (1897)</td>
<td>6,355,759</td>
<td>4,872,067</td>
<td>98,372,501</td>
<td>8,550,368</td>
<td>7,941,686</td>
<td>612,992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christianity did not win the victory until 1348. After this only the Turks, in the south-eastern corner of the Continent, were a cause of alarm to Christian Europe for centuries. The decline of the power of the Eastern Empire drew the Turks over the Bosporus; in 1366 they had control of Adrianople; in the course of the fourteenth century the Serbs, Bulgars, Macedonians, and the inhabitants of Thessaly became their subjects. In 1353 the Turks took Constantinople, in 1461 Trebizond, in 1490 even Otranto in Apulia; after 1566 they owned half of Hungary. It was not until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that their possessions were reduced to their present boundaries, thus limiting Mohammedanism to a small part of the population of Europe.

At the beginning of modern times a great change took place in the boundaries of the European States. The cause was that ecclesiastical movement known as the Reformation, which placed in opposition to the unity of Catholicism in Western Europe the numerous religious associations that together form Protestantism. The apostasy of the various countries and cities, which began soon after Luther first appeared, was brought about by the most varied causes, described elsewhere, and was facilitated by the violent procedure of the petty princes who had absolute sovereign power over their subjects. The first of the ruling princes to make the change was Albert of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights (1525); he was followed by the Elector John of Saxony, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse (1527), and at almost the same date by nearly all the German imperial cities. The movement soon gained the northern countries, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and the Baltic provinces; these all gave their adherence (1530) to the so-called Augsburg Confession, while the upper German imperial cities, Strasbourg, Constance, Limburg, Memmingen, held to the Tetrapolitan Confession of the so-called Reformed Church founded by Zwingli and especially strong in Switzerland. The Reformed Church also found adherents in the Palatinate, and at the beginning of the seventeenth century in Hesse-Cassel and Brandenburg. The Anglican Church was established in 1549 in Great Britain; in 1559 the French Reformed Church adopted the "Confessio Gallicana"; in 1560 the Scotish Reformed the "Confessio Scotica"; from 1592 the Reformation in Scotland adopted a Presbyterian form of government. Since 1562 the Reformation in the Netherlands has held to the "Confessio Belgica", and the Reformed Church in Hungary since 1567, to the "Confessio Hungarie". Soon the Counter-Reformation, called into life by the Council of Trent (1545-63) to prevent the loss of the whole of middle Europe, appeared; its success was assured by the aid of the Society of Jesus. In this way various princes and bishops who were desirous of doing their duty were enabled to hold their countries to the Catholic Church, as the Duke of Cleves, the Electors of Mainz and Trier, the Bishops of Augsburg, Wurzburg, Bamberg, Münster, Constance, Basle, the Abbey of Fulda, but especially the Dukes of Bavaria and the Hapsburg dynasty within their Austrian provinces. Soon the hostility between the two ecclesiastical parties grew so bitter that a trifling incident sufficed to bring on a terrible religious conflict, the Thirty Years War (1618-48). Two religious confessional leagues confronted each other in Germany:
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the Catholic League, which was formed in 1609 among the Catholic States of the German Empire and had for its leader the vigorous Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, and the Union in which, from 1609, most of the Protestant princes and cities combined under the leadership of Frederick IV of the Palatinate. Foreign powers were Sweden, France, and the Roman States, and the war, which lasted till 1648, and which was ended by the Peace of Westphalia, laid the foundation of the present conditions of the religious community. The expenses of the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Greek Churches are met from a fund controlled by the State and obtained from the secularization of Church property in the reign of Joseph II. In Hungary the Roman Catholic Church was originally the state religion and now is the state religion by a decree of 1867, but also exercizes to other Christian confessions and to the Jewish faith. Croatia-Slavonia recognizes only the Roman Catholic and Uniat Greek Churches, the Orthodox Greek Church and Protestant Churches, and the Jewish faith. In Bosnia and Herzegovina the ruling confessions are the Roman Catholic Church and the Uniat Church, and Mohammedanism. The State Church of the Balkan provinces is the Orthodox Greek. The State Church of Russia is the Orthodox Greek Russian Church; the other Christian and non-Christian confessions are tolerated, the Jews have only limited rights.

The situation in the English-speaking countries is, however, more free. In England and Wales the Anglican is the State Church, its head being the king; the fundamental principles are defined by Parliament. There is a similar arrangement for the Presbyterian State Church in Scotland. In these three countries the Church is not subject to the state, but the state grants the Church privileges and protection. In Ireland, however, the Church is still subject to the state, but the Government has a limited influence on it. In France the separation of Church and State was declared in 1905, and the Church is now independent of the state. In Germany the state is more or less subject to the Church, but the state grants the Church privileges and protection. In Italy the Church is independent of the state, but the state grants the Church privileges and protection. In Belgium, Switzerland, and Austria the Church is independent of the state, but the state grants the Church privileges and protection. In Spain and Portugal the state religion is the Roman Catholic. In Belgium the Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and Anglican forms of worship are recognized by the state and are recognized by the state and are recognized by the state.

The synodal form of organization and similar Presbyterian associations which are based on assemblies of elected representatives and the ordinances passed by these. This form of organization is in existence in Austria-Hungary, Prussia, Bavaria, Hesse, Mecklenburg, and other German States, where the consistory is not in force. The synodal organization also exists among the non-Anglican Churches in Great Britain, in France, among the Italian Waldenses, in the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, and Austria, and in connection with the episcopal form of church government in Sweden and Finland. The Anglican Church, called in England and Wales the Established Church of England, and in Ireland the Church of Ireland, is episcopal in government; in Ireland the episcopal synodal system is in force. The church in England and Wales is divided into three provinces, Canterbury and York. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the Primate of All England; under Canterbury are 42 suffragan dioceses; York consists of an archdiocese and 9 suffragan bishops. Ireland has 3 archdioceses: Armaigh, which has the primacy of all Ireland, and Dublin with 10 suffragans; Scotland has 7 dioceses. The organization of the Oriental Greek Church varies in different countries. In Russia the head of the Church is the Tsar, who appoints the members of the Holy Synod, the highest ecclesiastical body. In Turkey the Ecumenical Patriarch is the head; under him are 10 or 12 metropolitans. In Rumania a national synod is the highest ecclesiastical authority; in Servia a metropolitan with the bishops; in Bulgaria the government is vested in an exarch, aided by archbishops, bishops, and the Council of Bishops. The Holy Synod of Greece consists of five prelates or bishops named by the king. In the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy there are 3 provinces of the Oriental Greek Church: the Austrian, or Province of Czernowitz, with the suffragan Dioceses of Zara and Cattaro, the Archdiocese of Karlowitz (Patriarch-Archbishop), with 6 suffragans, and the Archdiocese of Hermannstadt, with 3 suffragans. Bosnia and Herzegovina have each a metropolitan.

For the ecclesiastical organization of European countries, see the respective articles on the various political divisions, also Eastern Churches. The
Europus, a titular see in Provincia Euphratensis, suffragan of Hierapolis. The former name of this city was Thapsacus (Thapsakh), an Aramean word which means "ford"; it was an important trade-centre at the northern limit of Solomon's kingdom (11 I., iv. 24). The younger Cyril and Alexander the Greatford the Euphrates at this point. The Macedonians called it Amphipolis. It took finally a third name, Europus, under which it is mentioned by the geographers Ptolomy, Pliny, Hierocles, Georgius Cyprius, etc. and figures in the "Notitia episcopatum" of the Antiochenos patriarchate (See Echos d'Orient, 1907, 145). We know but one of his bishops, above 200 (?), 949, and a Jacobite one, between 793 and 817 (Rev. de l'Orient Chrétien, 1899, 451). Justinian built a fortress at Europus (Procop., De edif., II, 9). When the city was destroyed is unknown. Its ruins stand at Djahas, a corrupt form of Europos, on the right bank of the Euphrates, about twenty-five kilometres south of Birejik, in the vilayet of Aleppo.

HOTTMANN, Auszüge aus Acten Per. Martyrer, 161; SACHSCHADE, Relais in Syria und Mesopotamien, 189.

S. VAIVÉHÉ.

Eusebianites. See EUSEBIUS of Nicomedia.

Eusebius, Saint. Bishop of Vercelli, b. in Sardinia c. 283; d. at Vercelli, Piedmont, 1 August, 371. He was made lector in Rome, where he lived some time, probably as a member of a religious community (Spreitzenhofer, Die Entweltigung des alten Monachitums in Italien, Vienna, 1894, 14 sq.). Later he came to Vercelli, the present Vercelli, and in 340 was unanimously elected bishop of that city by the clergy and the people. He received episcopal consecration at the hands of Pope Julius I on 15 December of the same year. According to the testimony of St. Ambrose (Ep. liii, Ad Vercellenses) he was the first bishop of the West who united monastic with clerical life and with the clergy of his city a community modelled upon that of the Eastern cenobites (St. Ambrose, Ep. xxxxi and Serm. lxxxix). For this reason the Canons Regular of St. Augustine honour him along with St. Augustine as their founder (Propram Canon. Reg., 16 December).

In 354 Pope Liberius sent Eusebius and Bishop Lucifer of Cagliari to the Emperor Constantius, who was then at Arles in Gaul, for the purpose of inducing the emperor to convene a council which should put an end to the dissensions between the Arians and the orthodox. The synod was held at Milan in 355. At first Eusebius refused to attend it because he foresaw that the Arian bishops, who were supported by the emperor, would not accept the decrees of the Nicaean Council and would insist on the condemnation of St. Athanasius. Being pressed by the emperor and the bishops to appear at the synod, he came to Milan, but was refused asylum by the emperor. The document condemning St. Athanasius had been drawn up and was awaiting the signature of the bishops. Eusebius vehemently protested against the unjust condemnation of St. Athanasius and, despite the threats of the emperor, refused to attach his signature to the document. As a result he was sent into exile, first to Seytropolis in Syria, where the Arian Bishop Patro-philus, whom Eusebius calls his jailer (Baronius, Annal., ad ann. 356, n. 97), treated him very cruelly, then to Cappadocia, and lastly to the Thebaid. On the accession of the Emperor Julian, the exiled bishops were allowed to return to their sees, in 362. Eusebius, however, and his brother Lucifer, refused to accept the synod which, in 362, was held there under their joint presidency. Besides declaring the Divinity of the Holy Ghost and the orthodox doctrine concerning the Incarnation, the synod agreed to deal mildly with the repentant apostate bishops, but to impose severe penalties upon the leaders of the several Arianizing factions. At its close Eusebius went to Antioch to reconcile the Eustathians and the Melenians. The Eustathians were adherents of the bishop, St. Eustathius, who was deposed and exiled by the Arians in 331. Since Meletius's election in 391 was brought about chiefly by the Arians, the Eustathians would not recognize him, although he claimed that his orthodox faith from the ambo after his episcopal consecration. The Alexandrian synod had desired that Eusebius should reconcile the Eustathians with Bishop Meletius, by purging his election of whatever might have been irregular in it, but Eusebius, upon appearing at Antioch, refused to go to any synod, in which Lucifer had condemned Paulinus, the leader of the Eustathians, as Bishop of Antioch, and thus unwittingly frustrated the design. Unable to reconcile the factions at Antioch, he visited other Churches of the Orient in the interest of the orthodox faith and finally passed through Illyricum into Italy. Here arrived at Vercelli in 365, he assisted the zealous St. Hilary of Poitiers in the suppression of Arianism in the Western Church, and was one of the chief opponents of the Arian Bishop Auxentius of Milan. The Church honors him as a martyr andcelebrates his feast as a semi-double on 16 December. In the "Journal of Theological Studies" (1000), I, 302-99, E. A. Burn attributes to Eusebius the "Quicumque". (See ATHANASIAN CRED.")

Three short letters of Eusebius are printed in Migne, P. L., XII, 947-54, and of which the first, De vir. ill., c. xvi, and Ep. ii, n. 2 (Migne, loc. cit.) is a translation of a commentary on the Psalms, written originally in Greek by Eusebius of Cesarea; but this work has been lost. There is preserved in the cathedral of Vercelli the "Codex Vercellensis"; the earliest manuscript of the Old Latin Gospels (codex a), which is generally believed to have been written by Eusebius. It was published by Iríco (Milan, 1748) and Bianchini (Rome, 1749), and is reprinted in Migne, P. L., XII, 9-98; a new edition was brought out by Belsheim (Christiania, 1894). Kräger (Lucifer, Bischof von Calias), Leipzig, 1886, 113-30, ascribes to Eusebius a baptismal oration published by Cesari (Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbolis, Christiania, 1869, 112-40). The confession of faith of St. Augustine "De s. trinitate confessio" (P. L., XII, 959-968, sometimes ascribed to Eusebius, is spurious.


Michael Ott.

Eusebius, Saint. Bishop of Samosate (now Samosat), in Syria; date of birth unknown; d. in 379 or 380. History makes no mention of him before the year 361.
when, as Bishop of Samosata, he took part in the
congregation of St. Meletius, the newly elected Patriarch
of Antioch. Just then the Eastern Church was rent
by Arianism and its affiliated heresies. Most of the
episcopal sees were occupied by Arian bishops, and
Meletius himself was elected Patriarch of Antioch only
because the Arians believed him to be a supporter
of their heresy. Tillemont and a few other historians
even maintain that Eusebius was at that time leaning
towards Arianism. Whatever may have been the
faith of Eusebius previously, it is certain that at a
synod held in Antioch in 363 the Nicene formula, with
expression of the term of heresies, was accepted
and the document was signed by Eusebius and
twenty-four other bishops.

When the Arians discovered that Meletius upheld
the doctrine of the Nicene Council, they declared his
election invalid and attempted to obtain from Eusebius,
to whom they had been entrusted, the synodal acts
proving the lawfulness of the election. The
Emperor Constantius, who supported the Arians,
ordered Eusebius to surrender the document, but
without success. Thereupon Constantius threatened
Eusebius with the loss of his right hand, but the bishop
eluded both his棒 and to the bearer of the
imperial message, saying: "Strike them both off.
I will not surrender the document by which the injusti
tice of the Arians can be proved." The emperor
was struck by the constancy of Eusebius and left the
document in his possession.

The danger was averted by the concerted efforts of St.
Eusebius and St. Gregory Nazianzen that, in 370, St.
Basil was elected Archbishop of Cessarea in Cappadocia.
From this time forward the tender friendship
between St. Eusebius and the last-named Father, which
had been attended by some still greater spill blood
between Basil and to the Bishop of Samosata. Eusebius
displayed his greatest activity during the persecution
of the Catholics by the Arian Emperor Valens. Disguised
as a military officer, he visited the persecuted Churches
of Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, exhaling the
sufferings of the Christians, solemnizing the
sacred acts and solemnizing the,

Eusebius, a presbyter at Rome; date of
birth unknown; d. 357 (?). He was a Roman patri-

Michael Ott.

Eusebius, Saint, Pope, successor of Marcellus, 309
or 310. His reign was short. The Liberian
Catalogue gives its duration as only four months, from
18 April to 17 August, 309 or 310. We learn some details
of his career from an epitaph for his tomb which Pope
Damnus ordered. This epitaph has come down to us
through ancient transcripts. A few fragments of the
original, together with a sixth-century marble copy
made to replace the original, after its destruction,
were found by De Rossi in the Papal Chapel, in the
Catacomb of Callistus. It appears from this
epitaph that the grave internal dissensions caused in the
Roman Church by the persecution of apostates (Arians)
during the persecution of Diocletian, and which had
'already arisen under Marcellus, continued under Eusebius. The latter maintained the attitude of the Roman Church, adopted after the Decian persecution (250–51), that apostates should not be forever barred from ecclesiastical communion, but on the other hand should be readmitted only after doing proper penance (Eusebius miseros ducit sua criminis flere). This view was opposed by a faction of Christians in Rome under the leadership of one Heraclius. Whether the latter and his partisans advocated a more rigorous (Novationist) or a more lenient (Eusebian) interpretation of the law has not been ascertained. The latter, however, is by far more probable, in the hypothesis that Heraclius was the chief of a party made up of apostates and their followers, who demanded immediate restoration to the body of the Church. Damascus characterizes in very strong terms the conflict which ensued (sedition, caedes, bellum, discordia, lites). It is likely that Heraclius and his supporters sought to compel by force their admission to divine worship, which was resisted by the faithful gathered in Rome about Eusebius. In consequence, both Eusebius and Heraclius were exiled by the Emperor Maximianus. In 261, Eusebius, in particular, was deported to Sicily, where he died soon after. The Western Synod of 235 excommunicated the emperor who had exiled him. 

Eusebius, CHRONICLE OF, consists of two parts: the first was probably called by Eusebius the "Chronograph" or "Chronographies"; the second he terms the "Canons" or "Canons of Eusebius," and also the "Eusebian Canons." It is brought down to the year 225, and as Eusebius alludes to it at an earlier date in the "Ecclesiastical History," and "Preparation of Evangelica," there must have been two editions. The original is lost, but both parts are preserved in an Armenian version of which two rival translations by Zohrab and Aueher, respectively, were published in 1818. Both these editions are superseded by Schoene's. The "Canons," moreover, are preserved in St. Jerome's translation. Two Syriac editions also have been published, one from a MS in the British Museum, which was translated by Rodiger for Schoene's edition, another edited by Siegfried and Gelzer (Eusebius Canonum Epitome ex Dionysii Telmaharesiano Chronicis petita, Leipzig, 1844). Considerable extracts from the original were also preserved by later writers, especially by Synecules. These have been possible to identify since the discovery of the Armenian. They will be found in Schoene. 

The "Chronography" is an epitome of universal history. It is divided into five parts: (1) the history of the Chaldeans, and the Assyrians, followed by lists of kings; (2) Jewish history; (3) Egyptian history; (4) Grecian history; (5) Roman history. It is, like the "Preparation of Evangelica," full of quotations from lost authors. As an illustration of its value in one particular province we may turn to the third chapter of Smith's "Chaldean Account of Genesis," entitled "Chaldean Legends transmitted through Berosus and other Authors." The longest and most important extracts here given, containing, e.g. the Babylonian story of the Creation and the Flood, owe their preservation to Eusebius. The "Canons" are a series of annotations, with short historical notices. The years of Abraham, beginning from the supposed date of his birth, form the backbone. Alongside of these are placed the regnal years of the monarchs of different kingdoms as they rose and fell. A single extract will, however, serve better than any description to give the reader an idea of the character and contents of the "Canons." We have shown above the value of the "Chronicle" to an Assyriologist; our second example will illustrate its importance for classical scholars. On almost the first page of Jebb's edition of the newly discovered poems of Bacchylides, the notices in the "Chronicle" concerning the poet are discussed. There are two such notices. We give the first with its context, as it is found in the facsimile of the Bodleian MS. of St. Jerome's version:—

LXXVI From the above we learn that Bacchylides became renowned in the 16th year of Xerxes, King of Persia, the 36th of an Alexander, King of Macedon, and the 154th year of Abraham. In this MS, the years of Abraham are given at the commencement of every decade. Thus, in the last line, the first year (MDL) marks the opening of a new decade; while the second year (XVIII) shows the continuation of the era of Xerxes.

Which of the two versions of the "Chronicle" is the more trustworthy as regards dates and figures is a question that was conclusively answered in favour of the Latin version by Lightfoot in his excursion, "The Early Roman Succession." The striking differences between the episcopal lists (notably the Roman) as they are found in the Armenian version, on the one hand, and in the Latin version and "The Church History," on the other hand, give rise to a number of ingenious theories concerning changes made by Eusebius in a later edition of his "Chronicle." Lightfoot annullé these theories by demonstrating the corrupt state of the Armenian version in all that relates to figures and the years to which different events are assigned. It is important to remember this in reading books or articles in which reference is made to the "Chronicle," if they were written before 1890. 

Best Editions.—(1) "Eusebii Chronicorum Libri duo," ed. Schoene, 2 vols., Berlin, 1868–75; (2) the Bodleian manuscript of Jerome's version of the "Chronicle of Eusebius," reproduced in collotype with an introduction by John Knight Fotheringham, M.A., Oxford, 1905; (3) the Syrian epistles referred to above. 
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Eusebius of Cesarea (EUSEBIUS PAMPHELII), Bishop of Cesarea in Palestine, the "Father of Church History", b. about 260; d. before 341.

Life.—It will save lengthy digression if we at once speak of a document of a truly slavish kind, which we often have to refer to on account of its biographical importance, viz., the letter written by Eusebius to his diocese in order to explain his subscription to the Creed pronounced by the Council of Nicaea. After some preliminary remarks, the writer proceeds with an account concerning the faith which was put forward by us, and then the second, which they have published after putting in additions to our expressions. Now the writing presented to us, which when read in the presence of our most religious emperor was declared to have a right and approved character was as follows: [The Faith put forward by us]. As we have received from the bishops before us both in our first catechetical instruction and when we were baptized, and as we have learned from the Divine Scriptures, and as we have believed and taught in the presbytery and in the office of bishops, we likewise believing offer to you our faith and it is thus.” Then follows a formal creed [Theodoret, Hist., I, 11; Socrates, Hist., I, 8; St. Athanasius, de Dec. Syn. Nic. (appendix) and elsewhere. Translated by Newman with notes in the Oxford Library of the Fathers (Select Treatises of St. Athanasius, p. 59) and St. Athanasius, vol. I. The translation given here is Dr. Hort's. The words in brackets are probably genuine though not given by Socrates and St. Athanasius].

Dr. Hort in 1876 (“Two Dissertations”, etc., pp. 56 sqq.) pointed out that this creed was presumably that of the Church of Cesarea of which Eusebius was bishop. This view is widely accepted (cf. Lightfoot, art. “Euseb.” in “Dict. of Christ. Biog.”). All references to Lightfoot, unless otherwise stated, are to this article.—Sunday, “Journal of Theolog. Studies”, S. 15; Gwatkin, “Studies of Arianism” (3rd 1899, 2nd edition; McNeill, “Prolog. to C. H. of Euseb.”, in “Select Library of Nic. and post-Nic. Fathers”; Duchesne, “Hist. de l’Eglise”, vol. II, p. 149). According to this view it is natural to regard the introduction, “As we have received” etc., as autobiographical, and to infer that Eusebius had exercised the office of the priesthood in the city of Cesarea before he became his bishop, and had received his earliest religious instruction and the sacrament of Baptism there also. But other interpretations of this document are given, one of which destroys, while the other diminishes, its biographical value: (a) According to some

garius who erroneously maintained that in the Holy Eucharist the bread and the wine are merely a figure or a symbol of the Body and Blood of Christ. That he was a partisan of Berengarius, at least for a time, cannot be denied. In a letter written shortly after the death of Berengarius (1050), in which Berengarius was condemned, he protested against the injustice done to his teacher and the archdeacon of his church. When King Henry I of France (1030-60) summoned the bishops of his realm to a synod held in Paris in 1051, both Eusebius and Berengarius absented themselves, through fear of condemnation. Two contemporary writers—writers, Eusebius, Albert of Liege (P. L., CXLVI, 1438), and Durandus, Abbot of Troarn (P. L., CXLIX, 1422)—class Eusebius Bruno among the followers of Berengarius; the latter always claimed him as a partisan. It is not certain that he really appropriated in its entirety the teaching of his master, though Dodwell and Durandus affirm it. On the other hand, at the Council of Tours (1054), presided over by the papal legate Hildebrand, Eusebius Bruno induced his friend Berengarius to declare, in writing and on oath, that after the consecration the bread and the wine are the Body and Blood of Christ. Martin of Angers (1092) at which Count of Anjou, Geoffrey the Bearded, asked for an account of the teaching of Berengarius, Eusebius’ defence of his master was somewhat weak. When, shortly afterwards, Berengarius complained to him of the opposition of a certain Geoffrey Martini to his teaching, Eusebius declared that in which he lived. Galland (Vet. Patr. Biblioth., VIII, 23) says, “De Eusebio qui vulgo dictur episcopus Alexandriacum inerat omnino” (Concerning Eusebius, commonly called Bishop of Alexandria, there is nothing sure).

His writings have been attributed to Eusebius of Emesa, Eusebius of Cesarea, and others. According to an old biography said to have been written by his notary, the monk John, and discovered by Cardinal Mai, he lived in the fifth century and led a monastic life near Alexandria. The fame of his virtues attracted the attention of Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, who visited him with his clergy, and in 444, when dying, had him elected his successor and consecrated him bishop, though much against his will. Eusebius displayed great zeal in the exercise of his office and did much good by his preaching. Among those whom he converted was a certain Alexander, a man of senatorial rank. After having ruled his see for seven or, according to another account, for twenty years, he made Alexander his successor and retired to the desert, whence Cyril had summoned him, and there died in the office of sanctity.

Mai seems to have established the existence of a Eusebius of Alexandria who lived in the fifth century, it has been objected that neither the name of Eusebius, nor that of his successor Alexander, appears in the list of the occupant of that ancient see. Dioscurus is mentioned as the immediate successor of Cyril. Nor does the style of the homilies seem on the whole in keeping with the age of Cyril. It may be noted, however, that the biographer of Eusebius expressly states that the Cyril in question is the great opponent of Nestorius. Various solutions of the difficulty have been proposed. Thilo (Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius v. Alexandrien u. des Eusebius von Eusebia, Halle, 1839) thinks that the first of the homilies is to be assigned either to a certain monk—one of four brothers—of the fifth century, or to a presbyter and court chaplain of Justinian 1, who took an active part in the theological strife of the sixth century. Mai suggests that after the death of Cyril there were two bishops at Alexandria. Dioscorus died in the Constantinian party. The homilies cover a variety of subjects, and the author is one of the earliest patristic witnesses to the doctrine regarding the descent of Christ into Hell. A list of homilies with the complete text is given by Mai (Sylllogism Romanum, IX). They may also be found in Migne, P. L., CXXXVI, part I (Paris, 1860); Syriac in Kirchenzetns., s. v.

H. M. Brock.

Francis J. Schaefner.

Eusebius of Alexandria, ecclesiastical writer and author of a number of homilies well known in the sixth and seventh centuries and of much ascetical and dogmatic value. There has been much dispute regarding the date of his life and the age in which he lived. Galland (Vet. Patr. Biblioth., XIII, 78, 80; Deutsch in Realencycl. f. prot. Theol., s. v.; Chevalier, Rép. des sources hist., Bio-bibl., s. v.)
the creed proffered by Eusebius was drawn up as a formula to be subscribed by all the bishops. It was they who were to say that it embodied what they had been taught as catechumens and had taught as priests and bishops. This seems to have been the view generally held by the fathers of the Church, as Kattenbusch has shown in 1894 (Das apostolische Symbol, vol. I, p. 231). One objection to this view may be noted. It makes all the bishops equivalently say that before they received the episcopate they had for some time exercised the duties of the priesthood. (b) Others maintain that this creed was not the official creed of Cæsarea, but one drawn up by Eusebius in his own justification as embodying what he had always believed and taught. According to this interpretation the preliminary statement still remains autobiographical; but it merely informs us that the writer exercised the office of priest before he became a bishop. This interpretation has been adopted by Kattenbusch in his second volume (p. 239) published in 1900. One of the reasons which he gives for his change of view is that when he was preparing his first volume he used Socrates, who does not give the superscription which we have printed in brackets. It is a writer of the school of Kattenbusch not to accept what seems the natural interpretation of Eusebius’s words, viz., that the creed he read before the council was actually the one he had always used. If this is admitted, “then”, to quote Dr. Sanday, “I cannot but think the probability of Kattenbusch’s view that the Eastern creeds were daughters of the early Roman creed, and this latter did not reach the East till about A.D. 272” breaks down altogether. Bishop Lightfoot, puts the birth of Eusebius about 260 A.D., so that he would be something like twelve years old when Aurelian invaded and burned Antioch. In other words he was in all probability already baptized, and had already been catechized in the Cæsarean creed at a time when, in the Kattenbusch-Harnack hypothesis, the parent of that creed had not yet reached Antioch—much less Cæsarea or Jerusalem (Journ. Th. Studies, i, 15).

The passage just quoted shows that the date of Eusebius’s birth is more than a merely curious question. According to Lightfoot, it cannot have been “much later than A.D. 260” (p. 309); according to Harnack, “it can hardly be earlier than 240-250.” (Harnack, i, p. 106). The data from which they argue are the persons and events which Eusebius describes as belonging to “our own times.” Thus, at the end of his account of the epistles of Dionysius of Alexandria, he says he is now going to relate the events of “our own times” (see 6:9). He then recounts how, at Rome, Pope Dionysius (230-236) succeeded Xystus, and about the same time Paul of Samosata became Bishop of Antioch. Elsewhere (H. E., V, 28) he speaks of the same Paul as reviving in “our own time” (see ékóthei) the heresy of Artemon. He also speaks of the Alexandrian Dionysius (d. 246) in the same way (H. E., III, 28). He calls Manes, whom he places (H. E., VII, 31) during the episcopate of Felix (270-274), “the maniac of yesterday and our own times” (Theophania, IV, 30). An historian might of course refer to events recent, but before his own birth, as belonging to “our own times,” e.g. a man of thirty might speak thus of the Franco-German war in 1870. But the reference to Manes as “the maniac of yesterday” certainly suggests a writer who is alluding to what happened within his own personal recollection.

Concerning Eusebius’s parentage we know absolutely nothing. But the fact that he escaped with a short term of imprisonment during the terrible Diocletian persecution, when his master Pamphilus and others of his companions suffered martyrdom, suggests that he belonged to a family of some influence and importance. His relations, later on, with the Emperor Constantine point to the same conclusion. At some time during the last twenty years of the third century he visited Antioch, where he made the acquaintance of the priest Dorotheus, and heard him expound the Scriptures (H. E., VII, 32). By a slip of the pen or the manuscript Kattenbusch (p. 300) makes Dorotheus a priest of the Church of Philippopolis. In 296 he saw for the first time the future Emperor Constantine, as he passed through Palestine in the company of Diocletian (Vit. Const., 1, 19).

At a date which cannot be fixed Eusebius made the acquaintance of Pamphilus, the founder of the magnificent library which remained for several centuries the great glory of the Church of Cæsarea. Pamphilus came from Phœnicia, but at the time we are considering resided at Cæsarea, where he presided over a college or school for students. A man of noble birth, and wealthy, he sold his patrimony and gave the proceeds to the poor. He was a great friend to indigent students, supplying them to the best of his ability with the necessaries of life, and bestowing on them copies of the Holy Scriptures. Too humble to write anything himself, he spent his time in preparing accurate copies of the Scriptures and other books. It was he who first began the collection of the apocryphal books. Elloquent testimonies to the care bestowed by Pamphilus and Eusebius on the sacred text are found in Biblical MSS. which have reproduced their colophons. We give three specimens. (1) The following is prefixed to Ezechiel in the codex Marchalianus of Eusebius. A facsimile of the original will be found in Mai’s “Bibl. nov. Pat.”, IV, p. 218, and in Migne. It is printed in ordinary type in Swete’s O. T. in Greek (vol. III, p. viii). It must be remembered that Origen’s own copy of the Hexapla was in the library of Pamphilus. It had probably been deposited there by Origen himself.

“The following was transcribed from a copy of the Father Apollinaris the Cœnoiarch, to which these words are subjoined: ‘It was transcribed from the editions of the Hexapla and was corrected from the Tetrapla of Origen himself which also had been corrected and furnished with scholia in his own handwriting, whence I, Eusebius, added the scholia, Pamphilus and Eusebius corrected.’”

(2) At the end of the Book of Eneas, in the commentary in the codex Sinaiticus, there is the following note:

“it was compared with a very ancient copy that had been corrected by the hand of the blessed martyr Pamphilus to which is appended in his own hand this subscription: ‘It was transcribed and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen. Antoninus compared, I, Pamphilus, corrected.’” (Swete, vol. I, p. 212. H. E., VII, 26).

(3) The same codex and also the Vatican and Alexandrine quote a colophon like the above, with the difference that Antoninus has become a confessor, and Pamphilus is in prison—‘Antoninus the confessor compared, Pamphilus corrected’. The volume to which this colophon was subjoined began with I Kings and ended with Esther. Pamphilus was certainly not idle in prison. To most of the books in the Syro-Hexapla is subjoined a note to the effect that they were translated from the Hexapla in the library of Cæsarea and compared with a copy subscribed. “I, Eusebius, corrected these, as far as I could” (Harnack, “Altechrist. Lit.”, pp. 544, 545).

May not the confessor Antoninus be the same person as the priest of that name who, later on, with two companions interrupted the governor when he was on the point of sacrificing, and was beheaded? (Mart. Pol., 52.) One member of Pamphilus’s household, Appius, had done the same a few years before, and another, Ædesius, after being tortured and sent to the mines, on obtaining his release provoked martyrdom at Alexandria by going before the governor and rebuking him. Towards the end of 307 Pamphilus was arrested, horribly tortured, and consigned to prison.
Besides continuing his work of editing the Septuagint, he wrote, in collaboration with Eusebius, a Defence of Origen which was sent to the confessors in the mines—a wonderful gift from a man whose sides had been carried with iron combs, to men with their right eyes buried and the sinews of their left leges broken. Early in 300 Pamphilus and several of his disciples were beheaded. Out of devotion to his memory Eusebius called himself Eusebius Pamphilii, meaning, probably, that he wished to be regarded as the bondsman of him whose name "it is not meet that I should mention, without styling him my lord." (Mart. Paul. et Cureton, p. 37.) Mr. Gifford, in the introduction to his translation of the Prepar. Evang., thus suggested another explanation on the authority of an ancient scholiion emanating from Caesarea which calls Eusebius the "son of Pamphilus." He argues further that Pamphilus, in order to make Eusebius his heir, took the necessary step of adopting him.

During the persecution Eusebius visited Tyre and Egypt and witnessed numbers of martyrdoms (H. E., VIII, vii and ix). He certainly did not shun danger, and was at one time a prisoner. When, where, or how he escaped death or any kind of mutilation, we do not know. An indignant bishop, who had been one of his fellow-prisoners and "lost an eye for the Truth," demanded at the Council of Tyre how he "came off scathless." To this taunt—it was hardly a question—made under circumstances of great provocation, Eusebius deigned no reply (Epiphan., Haer., lviii, 5, c. aliis, "Apol. c. Aris.," viii, 15, 1). But he wrote (p. 135) he was already a bishop, for he was present in that capacity at the dedication of a new basilica at Tyre, on which occasion he delivered a discourse given in full in the last book of the Church history.

Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, excommunicated Arius about the year 320. The Arians soon found that for all practical purposes Eusebius was on their side. He wrote to Alexander charging him with misrepresenting the teaching of the Arians and so giving them cause to attack and misrepresent whatever they please (see below). A portion of this letter has been preserved in the Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea, where it was cited to prove that Eusebius was a heretic. He also took part in a synod of Syrian bishops who decided that Arius should be restored to his former position, but on his side he was to obey his bishop and continually entertain peace and communion with him (Soz., H. E., I, 15). According to Duchesne (Hist. de l'Eglise, II, 132), Arius, like Origen before him, found an asylum at Caesarea. At the opening of the Council of Nicaea Eusebius occupied the first seat on the right of the emperor, and delivered the inaugural address which was "echoed in a strain of thanksgiving to Almighty God on his, the emperor's, behalf" (Vit. Const., III, 11; Soz., H. E., I, 19). He evidently enjoyed great prestige and may not unreasonably have expected to be able to steer the council through the via media between the Scylla and Charybdis of the party. But it is clear that the councilmen had no common aim to build up a martyrs. But it is clear that the councilmen had no common aim, and that the Arians, who were the stronger, made use of the opportunity to make a full confession. Arianism spread like wildfire. It was in view of the actual state of the controversy, a colourless, or what is called "grey," creed of the day, that Eusebius at once undertook a comprehensive survey. After some delay Eusebius subscribed to the uncompromising creed drawn up by the council, making no secret, in the letter which he wrote to his own Church, of the non-natural sense in which he accepted it. Between 323 and 330 a heated controversy took place between Eusebius and Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch. Eustathius accused Eusebius of tampering with the faith of Nicaea; the latter retorted with the charge of Sabellianism. In 331 Eusebius was among the bishops who, at a synod held in Antioch, deposed Eustathius. He was offered and refused the vacant see. In 334 and 335 he took part in the campaign against St. Athanasius at the synods held in Caesarea and Tyre respectively. From Tyre the assembly of bishops was summoned to Jerusalem by Constantine, to assist at the dedication of the basilica he had erected on the site of Calvary. After the dedication they restored Athanasius and his followers to communion. From Jerusalem they were summoned to Constantinople (336), where Marcellus was condemned. The following year Constantine died. Eusebius survived him long enough to write his Life and two treatises against Marcellus. But by the summer of 341 he was already dead, since it was his successor, Aenarius, who assisted Bishop of Caesarea at a synod held at Antioch in the summer of that year.

WRITING.—We shall take Eusebius's writings in the order given in Harnack's "Altchrist. Lit.," pp. 554 sqq.

A. Historical.—(1) The life of Pampilus, often referred to by Eusebius. He was a rich man who had been a soldier and is called in his letter one of many enemies, yet the charge of cowardice was never seriously made—the best proof that it could not have been sustained. We may assume that, as soon as the persecution began to relax, Eusebius succeeded Pampilus in the charge of the college and literary work. From the information given in the Acts of the second Council of Nicaea, where it was cited to prove that Eusebius was a heretic, he also took part in a synod of Syrian bishops who decided that Arius should be restored to his former position, but on his side he was to obey his bishop and continually entertain peace and communion with him (Soz., H. E., I, 15). According to Duchesne (Hist. de l'Eglise, II, 132), Arius, like Origen before him, found an asylum at Caesarea. At the opening of the Council of Nicaea Eusebius occupied the first seat on the right of the emperor, and delivered the inaugural address which was "echoed in a strain of thanksgiving to Almighty God on his, the emperor's, behalf" (Vit. Const., III, 11; Soz., H. E., I, 19). He evidently enjoyed great prestige and may not unreasonably have expected to be able to steer the council through the via media between the Scylla and Charybdis of the party. But it is clear that the councilmen had no common aim to build up a martyrs. But it is clear that the councilmen had no common aim, and that the Arians, who were the stronger, made use of the opportunity to make a full confession. Arianism spread like wildfire. It was in view of the actual state of the controversy, a colourless, or what is called "grey," creed of the day, that Eusebius at once undertook a comprehensive survey. After some delay Eusebius subscribed to the uncompromising creed drawn up by the council, making no secret, in the letter which he wrote to his own Church, of the non-natural sense in which he accepted it. Between 323 and 330 a heated controversy took place between Eusebius and Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch. Eustathius accused Eusebius of tampering with the faith of Nicaea; the latter retorted with the charge of Sabellianism. In 331 Eusebius was among the bishops who, at a synod held in Antioch, deposed Eustathius. He was offered and refused the vacant see. In 334 and 335 he took part in the campaign against St. Athanasius at the synods held in Caesarea and Tyre respectively. From Tyre the assembly of bishops was summoned to Jerusalem by Constantine, to assist at the dedication of the basilica he had erected on the site of Calvary. After the dedication they restored Athanasius and his followers to communion. From Jerusalem they were summoned to Constantinople (336), where Marcellus was condemned. The following year Constantine died. Eusebius survived him long enough to write his Life and two treatises against Marcellus, but by the summer of 341 he was already dead, since it was his successor, Aenarius, who assisted Bishop of Caesarea at a synod held at Antioch in the summer of that year. Still, however, the abridgment found its way into the Church History. The shorter form lacks some introductory remarks, referred to in c. xii., which defined the scope of the book. It also breaks off when the writer is about to "record the palinode" of the persecutors. It is probable that part of the missing conclusion is extant in the form of an appendix to the eighth book of the Church History found in several MSS. This appendix contrasts the miserable fate of the persecutors with the good fortune of Constantine and his father. From these data Lightfoot concludes that what we now possess formed "part of a larger work in which the sufferings of the Martyrs were set off against the deaths of the persecutors." It must, however, be remembered that the missing parts would not add much to the book. So far as the martyrs are concerned, it is evident that the book would not take long in the telling. Still, the missing conclusion may explain why Eusebius curtailed his account of the Martyrs. The book, in both forms, was intended for popular reading. It was therefore desirable to keep down the price of copies. If the compiler of the shorter form (Texte u. Untersuch., XIV, 4, 1896) followed up this idea and pointed out that, whereas the longer form was constantly used by the compilers of Martyrologies, Menologies, and the like, the shorter form was never used. In a review of Violet (Theol. Litz, 1897, p. 300), Freuensch returns to his original
idea, and further suggests that the shorter form must have been joined to the Church History by some copyist who had access to Eusebius's MSS. Harnack (Chronicle, 11, 115) holds to the priority of the longer form, but he thinks that the shorter form was compiled about the same time for readers of the Church History.—(4) The Chronicle (see separate article, Eusebius, Chronicle of).—(5) The Church History. It would be difficult to overestimate the obligation which posterity is under to Eusebius for this monumental work. Living during the period of transition, when the old order was changing and all change was so forward at the critical moment with his immense stores of learning and preserved priceless treasures of Christian antiquity. This is the great merit of the Church History. It is not a literary work which can be read with any pleasure for the sake of its style. Eusebius’s “dictation,” as Photius said, “is never pleasant nor clear.” Neither is it the work of a great thinker. But it is a storehouse of information collected by an indefatigable student. Still, great as was Eusebius's learning, it had its limitations. He is provokingly ill-informed about the West. That he knew very little about Tertullian or St. Cyril of Alexandria, no instance of a sufficient knowledge of Latin; but in the case of a Greek writer, like Hippolytus, we can only suppose that his works somehow failed to make their way to the libraries of the East. Eusebius’s good faith and sincerity has been amply vindicated by Lightfoot. Gibbon, who indirectly confessed that he has related whatever might redound to the glory, and that he has suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace of religion, can be sufficiently met by referring to the passages (H.E. VIII, 11; Mark. Pal. c. 12) on which it is based, “but indirectly confess,” but openly avows, that he passes over certain scandals, and he enumerates them and denounces them. “Nor again,” to quote Lightfoot, “can the special charges against his honour as a narrator be sustained. There is no ground whatever for the charge that Eusebius forgot to interpolate the passage from Josephus relating to our Lord quoted in H.E. I, 11, though Heinichen is disposed to entertain the charge. Inasmuch as this passage is contained in all our MSS, and there is sufficient evidence that other interpolations (though not this) were introduced into the text of Josephus long before the time (see Orig., Cæli, I. 47, Delarue’s note) no suspicion can justly attach to Eusebius himself. Another interpolation in the Jewish historian, which he quotes elsewhere (11, 23), was certainly known to Origen (l.e.). Doubtless also the omission of the owl in the account of Herod Agrippa’s death (H.E. II, 10) was already in some texts of Josephus (Ant., X, 9, 2). The manner in which Eusebius deals with his numerous quotations elsewhere, where we can test his honesty, is a sufficient vindication against this unjust charge (L., p. 325).

The notices in the Church History bearing on the New Testament Canon are so extended that a word must be said about the rule followed by Eusebius in what he recorded and what he left unrecorded. Speaking generally, his principle seems to have been to quote testimonies for and against those books only whose claims to a place in the Canon had been disputed. In the case of undisputed books he gave any interesting information concerning their composition which he had come across in his reading. The subject was most carefully investigated by Lightfoot in an article in “The Contemporary” (January, 1876, reprinted in Essays on Supernatural Religion), entitled “The Gospels of St. John, Lightfoot concludes: “The silence of Eusebius respecting early witnesses to the Fourth Gospel is an evidence in its favour.” For the episcopal lists in the Church History, see article on the Chronicle. The tenth book of the Church History records the defeat of Licinius in 323, and must have been completed before the death and disgrace of Crispus in 326, for it refers to him as Constantine’s “most pious son.” The ninth book was compiled between the defeat of Maxentius in 312, and Constantine’s first victory over Maxentius in 312. (6) The Life of Constantine, in four books. This work has been most unjustly blamed, from the time of Sozomen down to the present day, because it is a panegyric rather than a history. If ever there was a man under an obligation to respect the maxim, De mortuis nil nisi laudum, this man was Eusebius, writing the Life of Constantine within twenty years after his death (11). This Life is especially valuable because of the account it gives of the Council of Nicaea and the earlier phases of the Arian controversy. It is well to remember that one of our chief sources of information for the history of that council is a book written to magnify Constantine.

B. Apologetic.—(7) Against Hierocles. Hierocles, who, as governor in Bithynia and in Egypt, was a cruel enemy of the Christians during the persecution, before the persecution had attacked them with the pen. There was nothing original about his work except the use he made of Philostatius’s Life of Apollonius of Tyana, to institute a comparison between Lord and Apollonius in favour of the latter. In his reply Eusebius confined himself to this one point.—(8) “Against Porphyry”, a work in twenty-five books of which not a fragment survives.—(9) The “Preparatio Evangelica”, in fifteen books.—(10) The “Demonstratio Evangelica”, in twenty, of which the last ten, with the exception of a fragment of the fifteenth, are lost. The object of these two treatises, which should be regarded as two parts of one comprehensive work, was to justify the Christian in rejecting the religious system of the Greeks in favour of that of the Hebrews, and then to justify him in not observing the Jewish manner of life. The “Preparatio” is devoted to the first of these objects. The following summary of its contents is taken from Mr. Gifford’s introduction to his translation of the “Preparatio”: "The first three books discuss the religious system of Pagan Theology, Mythical, Allegorical, and Political. The next three, IV–VI, give an account of the chief oracles, of the worship of daemons, and of the various opinions of Greek Philosophers on the doctrines of Fate and Free Will. Books VII–IX give reasons for preferring the religion of the Hebrews to that of the Greeks, chiefly on the testimony of various authors to the excellency of their Scriptures and the truth of their history. In Books X–XII Eusebius argues that the Hebrews had borrowed from the older theology and philosophy of the Greeks, dwelling especially on the supposed dependence of Plato upon Moses. In the last three books the comparison of Moses with Plato is continued, and the mutual contradictions of other Greek Philosophers, especially the Peripatetics and Stoics, are exposed and criticized.”

The “Preparatio” is a gigantic feat of erudition, and, according to Harnack (Chronicle, 11, 120), was, like many of Eusebius’s other works, actually composed during the stress of the persecution. It ranks, with the Chronicle, second only to the Church History in importance, because of its copious extracts from ancient authors whose works have perished. The first book of the Demonstratio chiefly deals with the temporary character of the Mosaic Law. In the second the prophecies concerning the vocation of the Gentiles and the rejection of the Jews are discussed. In the remaining eight the testimonies of the prophets concerning Christ are treated of. We now pass to a consideration of one of the things that is known save that they were read by Photius, viz. (11). The “Preparatio Eusebiana,” (12) the “Demonstratio Ecclesiastica,” and (13) Two Books of Objection and Defence, of which, from Photius’s account, there seem to have been two separate editions. (14)
The "Theophania" or "Divine Manifestation". Except for a few fragments of the original, this work is only extant in a Syriac version discovered by Tattam, edited by Lee in 1842, and translated by the same in 1843. It treats of the cosmic function of the Word, the nature of the Incarnation, revelation, etc. In form and style, the first five books are particularly remarkable as a kind of anticipation of modern books on Christian evidences. A curious literary problem arises out of the relations between the "Theophania" and the work "De Laudibus Constantini". There are entire passages which are almost verbatim the same in both works. Lightfoot decides in favour of the priority of the first-named work. Gressel, who has edited the "Theophania" for the Berlin edition of the Greek Fathers, takes the opposite view. He compares the parallel passages and argues that they are improved in the "De Laudibus Constantini". (15) "On the Numerous Progeny of the Ancients". This work is referred to by Eusebius twice, in the "Prep. Ev.", VII, 8, and in the "Dem. Ev.", VII, 8; and also (Lightfoot and Harnack think) by st. Basil ("De Spr. Sacret.", xxxi), where he says, "I draw attention to his [Eusebius'] words in discussing the difficulties simply connected with anachronism. I read from st. Basil's words, Lightfoot thinks that in this treatise Eusebius dealt with the difficulties presented by the Patriarchs possessing more than one wife. But he overlooked the reference in the "Dem. Ev.", from which it would appear that the difficulty discussed was perhaps, a marred tradition contrasted by the desire of the Patriarchs for a numerous offspring and the honour in which circumcision was held by Christians."

C. Exegetical. (16) Eusebius narrates, in his Life of his times, (IV, 36, 37), how he prepared fifty (or sixty) copies of the Bible for use in the Churches of Constantinople. Some scholars have supposed that the Codex Siniaticus was one of these copies. Lightfoot rejects this view chiefly on the ground that "the Text of the codex in many respects differs widely from the readings found in Eusebius". (17) Sections and Canons. Eusebius drew up ten canons, the first containing a list of passages common to all four Evangelists; the second, those common to the first three and so on. He also divided the Gospels into sections numbered continuously with a number, against the one section referred to the particular canon where he could find the parallel sections or passages. (18) The labours of Pampylus and Eusebius in editing the Septuagint have already been spoken of. They "believed (as did St. Jerome nearly a century afterwards) that Origen had succeeded in restoring the old Greek version to its primitive purity." The result was a "miscellaneous mixture of the Alexandrian version with the versions of Aquila and Theodotion." (Swete, "Intro. to O.T. in Greek", pp. 77, 78). For the labours of the two friends on the text of the N. T., the reader may be referred to "Tertullian's Study zum N. T.", c. ii. Whether as in the case of the Old Testament, they worked on any definite critical principles is not known. (19) (a) Interpretation of the ethnological terms in the Hebrew Scriptures; (b) Chronology of Ancient Jerusalem; (c) the Inheritance of the Ten Tribes; (d) A plan of Jerusalem and the Temple; (e) On the Names of Places in the Holy Scriptures. These four works were written at the request of Eusebius's friend Paulinus. Only the fourth is extant. It is known as the "Topics," or the "Onomasticon." (20) On the manuscripts of the Book of the Prophets. This work gives a short biography of each Prophet and an account of his prophecies. (21) Commentary on the Psalms. There are many gaps in the MSS. of this work, and they end in the 115th Psalm. The missing portions are in part supplied by extracts from the Catena. An allusion to the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre fixes the date at about 330. Lightfoot speaks very highly of this commentary. (22) Commentary on Isaiah, written after the persecution. (23 to 28) Commentaries on other books of Holy Scripture, of some of which what may be extracts are preserved. (29) Commentary on St. Luke, which what seem to be extracts are preserved. (30) Commentary on I Cor., the existence of which seems to be implied by St. Jerome (Ep. xlix). (31) Commentary on Hebrews. A passage that seems to belong to such a commentary was discovered and published by Mai. (32) On the Discrepancies of the Gospels, in two parts. It is strongly probable that the first part of this work, of which this part of the Eusebius, of this work was discovered and published by Mai in 1825. Extracts from the original are preserved. Of the two parts, the first, dedicated to a certain Stephen, discusses questions respecting the genealogies of Christ; the second, dedicated to one Marinus, questions concerning the Resurrection. The Discrepancies were largely borrowed from by St. Jerome and St. Ambrose, and have thus indirectly exercised a considerable influence on Biblical studies. (33) General Elementary Introduction, consisting of ten books, of which VI–IX are extant under the title of "Prophetical Excerpts". There are also a few fragments of the remaining books. "This work seems to have been a general introduction to theology, and its contents were very miscellaneous as the extent remains show" (L., pp. 330). D. Dogmatic. (34) The Apology for Origen. This work has already been mentioned in connection with Pampylus. It consisted of six books, the last of which was added by Eusebius. Only the first book is extant, in a translation by Rufinus. (35) Against Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, and (36) On the Theology of the Church of Constantine. In two articles in the "Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft" (vol. IV, pp. 330 sqq. and vol. VI, pp. 250 sqq.), written in English, Prof. Conybeare has maintained that our Eusebius could not have been the author of the two treatises against Marcellus. His arguments are rejected by Prof. Köstermann, in his introduction to these two works published in 1905 for the Berlin edition of the Greek Fathers. The "Contra Marcellum" was written after 336 to justify the action of the synod held at Constantinople when Marcellus was deposed; the "Theology" a year or two later. "On the Paschal Festival" (a mystical interpretation) was addressed to Constantine (Vit. Const., IV, 35, 36). A long fragment of it was discovered by Mai. (38) A treatise against the Manichæans is perhaps implied by Epiphanius (Haer., lxvi, 2). E. Orationes. (39) At a Sermon on the Church in Tyre (see above). (40) At the Triennalia of Constantine. This seems to have been the opening address delivered at the Council of Nicaea. It is not extant. (41) On the Sepulchre of the Saviour, A.D. 325 (Vit. Const., IV, 35) not extant. (42) At the Triennalia of Constantine. This work is generally known as the "De Laudibus Constantini". The second part (11–18) seems to have been a separate oration joined on to the Triennalia. (43) In Praise of the Martyrs. This oration is preserved in the same MS. as the "Theophania" and "Martyrs of Palestine". The Oration was published and translated in the "Journal of Sacred Literature" by Mr. H. B. Cowper (New Series, V, pp. 403 sqq., and ibid. VI, pp. 129 sqq.). (44) On the Failure of Rain, not extant.

F. Letters. — The history of the preservation of the three letters, (45) to Alexander of Alexandria, (46) to the Bishops of Euphrasia, or Euphrasion, (47) to the Empress Constantia, is sufficiently curious. Constantia asked Eusebius to send her a certain likeness of Christ of which she had heard; his refusal was couched in terms which centuries afterwards were appealed to by the Iconoclasts. A portion of this letter was read at the Second Council of Nicaea, and against it were set
portions from the letters to Alexander and Euphrasian to prove that Eusebius "was delivered up to a repugnable sense, and of one mind and opinion with those who followed the Arian superstition" (Labbe, "Conc. VIII, 1168-1177; Manly, "Conc. XIII, 313-317). Eusebius还挺在 the passage quoted in the introduction, other parts of the letter to Constantine are extant.—(IN) To the Church of Cesararea after the Council of Nicea. This letter has already been described.

F. J. Baccius.

**Eusebius of Doryleum**, Bishop of Doryleum in Asia Minor, was the prime mover on behalf of Catholic orthodoxy against the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches. During the earlier part of his life he followed the profession of an advocate at Constantinople, and was already known as a layman of considerable learning when he protested publicly (125) against the erroneous doctrine of a discourse delivered by Anastasius, the syneculus, or chaplain, of Nestorius. Shortly afterwards he again bore public witness against the Nestorian heresy as to the nature of Christ, this time during a discourse by Nestorius himself, which he interrupted with the question that "for I have a second generation"—i.e., of a woman, according to the flesh. Much disorder followed, but Nestorius replied with arguments against the "second generation". After the Council of Ephesus (431), at which the teaching of Nestorius had been condemned, a document composed by general consent to Eusebius was made public, in which the doctrine of Nestorius was shown to be identical with that of Paul of Samosata. Eusebius had at some period contracted a friendship with Eutyches, founded, we may fairly conjecture, on their common opposition to Nestorian error. But when Eutyches, acknowledging the Council, and maintaining the opinion which, though directly opposed to those of Nestorius, were equally contrary to the faith of the Church, Eusebius, now Bishop of Doryleum, was no less zealous against his former friend than he had been against their common opponent. After repeated attempts at persuasion, Eusebius brought a formal charge of false teaching against Eutyches, before Flavian, who was then (418) presiding over a synod at Constantinople. Flavian was reluctant to proceed against Eutyches, and urged Eusebius to remonstrate with him privately once more. Eusebius, however, refused, saying that he had already done all he could of his errors, and that further efforts would be useless. Eutyches was then summoned to attend, but did not do so until the summons had been three times issued; he excused his refusal to obey by asserting that he had resolved never to leave his monastery and pleading distrust of Eusebius, whom he now looked upon as his enemy. At last, however, he came, attended by a large escort of soldiers and monks. He was interrogated by Eusebius, who in the meantime had been strongly pressing his case, and who now, as he said, felt some alarm. Eutyches should succeed in evading condemnation and retaliate upon his accuser by obtaining a decree of banishment against him. Eutyches, however, was condemned and deposed; he immediately wrote a letter to the pope, complaining of Eusebius's proceedings, which he attributed to the instigation of the emperor.

In the following year (419) at Constantinople, an examination was held, by imperial authority, of the acts of the synod which had condemned Eutyches, which acts he alleged to have been falsified. Eutyches was represented by three delegates; Eusebius, who was not to withdraw but was permitted to do so, urged that the doctrinal question should not be considered on that occasion, but should be remitted to a general council. On the assembly of the council then summoned at Ephesus (see EPHESUS, ROBBER COUNCIL OF), Eusebius was forcibly excluded by the influence of Dioscorus of Alexandria, who had obtained the support of the emperor. The reading of his part in the synod at Constantinople provoked an outburst of reproaches and threats: "Away with Eusebius! Burn him! As he has divided so let him be divided!" Flavian and Eusebius were deposed and banished, and Eusebius only survived the general disabilities and injuries he had received in the tumultuary council. Eusebius wrote to the Emperors Valentinian and Martin, asking for a fresh hearing; and both Flavian and Flavian sent written appeals to Rome. The text of these appeals was discovered in 1879 by Amelii—who was then curator of the Vatican Library—at Milan and afterwards became Abbot of Monte Cassino—and was published by him in 1882. Eusebius grounds his appeal on the fact of having been condemned unheard, and prays the pope to quash the sentence (pronuntiate evacuari et insanem fieri hanc iniquam condemnationem); he also mentions a written appeal given by him to the papal legates at Ephesus, in which he had begged the Holy See to take cognizance of the matter (in quibus vestrum sedis cognomen poposse). Eusebius fled to Rome, where he was kindly received by Leo I. In two letters written on the same day (28 April, 451) to Patriarch and Zosimus, he bespeaks their good offices for Eusebius; in the former letter he mentions a report that the Diocese of Doryleum was being thrown into disorder by an intruder (quaem curtur vastare qui illi injuste assurritur subrogatus). But Liberatus (Breviariu, c. xii) says that no one was put in the bishop's place, and the report was therefore probably of merely local origin.

Eusebius took part in the Council of Chalcedon, at which he appears as the accuser of Dioscorus. He was one of the commission which drew up the definition of faith finally adopted. The council annulled his condemnation, and made Nestorius the special mention of the fact in the letter to the pope in which it sought his confirmation of its acts. The despatch of the Emperor Marcian (451), issued to clear the memory of Flavian, declares the reputation of Eusebius to be uninjured by the sentence of the Robber Council (injusta sententia nihil obit Eusebio). He was one of the bishops who signed the 28th canon of Chalcedon giving patriarchal rights over Pontus and Asia to Constantinople. When the papal legates despatched the passing of the canon in their absence, and the signatories of the region affected were asked to declare whether they had signed it (the question being whether or not Eusebius had done so), because, when in Rome, he had read the canon to the pope, who had accepted it. Though he was doubtless mistaken as to the fact alleged (how the mistake arose cannot now be determined), his professed motive is significant. His name appears among the signatures to the acts of a council held in Rome in 484, but it seems improbable that he was alive at that date. Baronius considers that the signatures of numerous Eastern bishops appended to these acts are misplaced, and properly belong to some much earlier council; since none of the bishops is otherwise heard of later than these years after the Council of Chalcedon, at which they had all been present.

Flavian said of Eusebius at Constantinople that "fire seemed cold to his zeal for orthodoxy", and Leo wrote of him that he was a man who "had undergone great trials and toils for the Faith". These are all that is known of him, and may be fitted summarily.

St. Cyprian of Alexandria, Ad. Neron. 1, 20; Marcus Mercator, Part II; Evagrius, Hist. Eccl.; Theophanes, Chronographia; Eusebius de Christianis Byz. contra Nestor. S. Dion. Cass. epist. i. 34, 35; Theodoret. Hist. i. 34, 35; Euseb. Pler. 10; De viris illustribus (all in P. G. E.); Labbe and Cossart, Conc. I. v. Libratis, Gesta de nom. Acac. also Breviarium conciliorum III, diocesis Constantinopolitana (ed. Edinburgh, 1855); Amell, S. L. Magna lndia (Milan, 1852); see also Barrow, Theology, Shahan, St. Louis, 1372; Scott, History of Literature, with historical introduction (pub. Church Historical Society, No. 20, London, 1891) and some of the (two) Amell letters (Cambridge, 1903); Anglican; Smith and Wace, Dict. of Christ. Biog. (London, 1880), s.v.

A. B. Sharpe.
EUSEBIUS of Laodicea, an Alexandrian deacon who had some fame as a confessor and became Bishop of Laodicea in Syria, date of birth uncertain; d. about 260. His story is told by Eusebius of Cesarea (Hist. Eccl., VII, xi and xxxii). As deacon at Alexandria he had accused the bishop Eusebius (with a number of other deacons, and two Romans who were then in Egypt) before the tribunal of Eunomius, Prefect of Egypt, at the time of the Emperor Valerianus (253–260). Dionysius tells the story of their trial in a letter to a certain Bishop Germanus (Eus., Hist. Eccl., VII, xi). They were all sentenced to leave the city in hiding, "severely served the confessors in prison and buried the bodies of the dead and of the blessed martyrs, not without danger to his own life" (ibid.). In 260 they broke out a rebellion at Alexandria and at the same time a plague ravaged the city. Eusebius again risked his life continually by nursing the sick and the wounded (ibid., VII, xxxii). The Romans besieged a part of the town (Bruchium, Πυροστέα, Πυροστέων). Anatolius, Eusebius' friend, was among the besieged, Eusebius himself outside. Eusebius went to the Roman general and asked him to allow any who would to leave the city. His petition was granted and Anatolius, with whom he managed to communicate, explained the matter to the leaders of the rebellion and implored them to capitulate. They refused, but eventually allowed the women, children, and old men to profit by the Romans' mercy. A great crowd then came to surrender at the Roman camp. "Eusebius there nursed all who were exhausted by the long siege with every care and attention as a father and a physician" (ibid., xxxii). In 264 Dionysius (who seems to have come back from banishment) sent Eusebius as his legate to Syria to represent him at the discussions that were taking place concerning the affair of Paul of Samostia. Anatolius accompanied his friend. The Syrians were so impressed by these two Egyptians that they kept them both and made Eusebius Bishop of Laodicea as successor to Socrates. Not long afterwards he died and was succeeded by Amphilochius. The date of his death is uncertain. Harnack thinks it was before the great Synod of Antioch in 268 (Chron. der altchrist. Litt., I, 34). Another theory is that the siege at Alexandria was in 269, that the friends went to Syria at the end of that year, and that Eusebius' death was not till 270 (so W. Reading in the Variae notes to his edition of Eusebius Pamph., Cambridge, 1720, I, 367). Gams puts his death in 270 (Kirchenlexikon, s. v. Eusebius von Laodicea). Eusebius' name does not occur in the acts of the Synod of 268 (Euseb. Eccl., VII, xi and Barb. Bononiensis, Annales ed., ad an. 263, 8–11; Harnack, Chron. der altchristl. Litt., I, 34, 37, 41, etc.: Duchesne, Hist. ancienne de l'Église (Paris, 1900), I, 488–489.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

EUSEBIUS of Nicomedia, Bishop, place and date of birth unknown; d. 341. He was a pupil, at Antioch, of Lucian the Martyr, whose famous school he learned his Arian doctrines. He became Bishop of Berytus; but from ambitious motives he managed to get transferred, contrary to the canons of the early Church, to the see of Nicomedia, the residence of the Emperor Licinius, and with the support of Constantia, sister of Constantine, he was in high favour. Arius, when he was condemned at Alexandria, by Constantine, bishop of that see, took refuge at Cesarea, where he was well received by the famous apologist and historian Eusebius, and wrote to Eusebius of Nicomedia for support. The letter is preserved. In it the heretic explains his views clearly enough, and appeals to his correspondent as to a "fellow Lucianist". Eusebius put himself at the head of the party, and wrote many letters in support of Arius. One is preserved, addressed to Paulinus, Bishop of Tyre. We learn from it what Eusebius' doctrine was at this time: the son, he says, is "not generated from the substance of the Father", but He is "other in nature and power"; He was created, and this is not inconsistent with His Sonship, for the wicked are called sons of God (Is. i, 2; Deut., xxxii, 18) and are even exalted to the dignity of deities (Job, xxxviii, 28); He was begotten by God's free will. This is pure Arianism, borrowed from the letters of Arius himself, and possibly more definite than the doctrine of St. Lucian.

Alexander of Alexandria was obliged to address a circular to all bishops. He had hoped, he says, to carry the matter in silence, but Eusebius, who is now at Nicomedia, considering this a matter of life and death, had induced him to take up the question in his own church; the Emperor being present at a council from his residence in Syriac, had declined to return to the Church which he had governed in Alexandria.

The situation changed when Constantine had conquered Licinius in 323. The Christian emperor began by comprising Arius and Alexander in the list of "men of bad reputation". Why could not they agree to differ about subtleties of this kind, as the philosophers did? A letter in this sense to the patriarch was ineffectual; so Constantine preferred the side of authority, and wrote an angry rebuke to Arius. In the case of the Donatists, Constantine, having obtained the decision from a general council, at Arles, of all the bishops of his then dominions, he now summoned a larger council, from the world of which his victorious arms had made him master. It met at Nicæa in 325. The bishops were nearly all Easterns; but a Western bishop, Hosius of Cordova, who was in the emperor's confidence, was a leading part, and the pope was represented. Constantine ostentatiously declared that his duty at the council went no further than the guardianship of the bishops, but Eusebius of Cesarea makes it clear that he spoke on the theological question. The bishops of the Easterns were told that the emperor himself had voted against the Arian confessions of faith, but that it had only about seventeen supporters from among some three hundred members of the council, and it was hooted by the majority. The formula which was eventually adopted was resisted by the Arians, but eventually all the bishops signed, with the exception of the two Egyptians who had been before excommunicated by Alexander.

Eusebius of Nicomedia had bad luck. Though he had signed the creed, he had not agreed to the condemnation of Arius, who had been, so he said, misrepresented; and after the council he encouraged in their heresy some Arians whom Constantine had invited to Constantinople with a view to their conversion. Three months after the council, the Emperor sent him like Arius into exile, together with Theognis, whom he induced Constantine to appoint to the bishopric of Nicea. He was accused of having been a supporter of Licinius, and of having even approved of his persecutions, as well as of having sent spies to watch himself. But the banishment of the intriguer lasted only two years. It is said that it was Constantia, the widow of Licinius, who induced Constantine to exile him, and it is probable that she was also the cause of the return of her old friend Eusebius. By 329 he was in high favour with the emperor, with whom he may have had some kind of relationship, since Ammianus Marcellinus makes him a relative of Julian.

From this time onwards we find Eusebius of Nicomedia at the head of a small and compact party called,
by St. Athanasius, the Eusebians, at ἅγιον τον Ἑσυαίον, whose object it was to undo the work of Nicaea, and to procure the complete victory of Ariusianism. They did not publicly recall the signatures that had been forced from them. They explained that Arius had repented of his former words, or been misquoted. They dropped the Nicene formula, as ambiguous. They were the leaders of a much larger party of conservative prelates, who wished to stand well with the emperor, who reverence[d] the martyr Lucian and the great Origen, and were seriously alarmed at any danger of Sabellianism. The emperor, therefore, opened with a successful attack on Eusebius of Antioch, the principal prelate of the East properly so called. He had been having an animated controversy with Eusebius of Caesarea, in which he had accused that learned personage of polytheism, while Eusebius retorted with a charge of Sabellianism. Eustathius was deposed and exiled, for alleged disrespectful expressions about the emperor's mother, St. Helena, who was greatly devoted to the memory of St. Lucian. It is said that he was also charged with immorality and heresy, but it is certain that the whole case was got up by the Eusebians, to check the grace of a religious court of Alexandria, which had taken a leading part at Nicaea. Small in stature, and young in years, he was at the head of a singularly united body of nearly a hundred bishops, and his energy and vivacity, his courage and determination marked him out as the only man from the Eusebians. Alexandria Ariana had now signed an ambiguous formula of submission, and Eusebius of Nicomedia wrote to Athanasius, asking him to reinstate them, adding a verbal message of threats. The Meletian schism in Egypt, had only been partially healed by the mild measures decreed at Nicaea, and the schismatic names were giving trouble. Constantine was induced by Eusebius to write to Athanasius curtly telling him he should be deposed, if he refused to receive into the Church any who demanded to be received. Athanasius explained why he could not do this, and the emperor seems to have been satisfied. Eusebius then joined hands with the Meletians, and induced them to trump up charges against Athanasius. They first pretended that he had invented a tribute of linen garments which he exacted. This was disproved, but Athanasius himself was sent for to the court. The Meletians, who intended to save the emperor from his own policy, kept on accusing him for many years, that he had ordered a priest named Macarius to overturn an altar and break up a chalice belonging to a priest named Ischyros, in the Mareotis, though in fact Ischyros had never been a priest, and at the time he alleged could not have been pending to say Mass, for he was ill in bed. It was also said that Athanasius had assisted a certain Philumenus to conspire against the emperor, and had given him a bag of gold. Again the accusers were refuted and put to flight. The saint returned to his Church with a letter from Constantine, in which the emperor apologized to the Antiochians after his wont, urging them to peace and unity. But the question of the broken chalice was not dropped, and the Meletians further got hold of a bishop named Arsenius, whom they kept in hiding while they declared that Athanasius had put him to death; the charge was brought up against him, and he was exiled. Some said, was Arsenius's, cut off by the patriarch for the purpose of magic. Athanasius induced Ischyros to sign a document denying the former charge, and managed to discover the whereabouts of Arsenius. Constantine in consequence wrote a letter to the patriarch disavowing the innocent.

Eusebius had stood apart from all these false accusations, and he was not disheartened by so many failures. He got the Meletians to demand a synod, and represented to Constantine that it would be right for peace to be obtained before the assembling of many bishops. At Jerusalem, to celebrate the dedication of the new Church of the Holy Sepulchre. This was in 335. A synod met at Tyre, whose history need not be detailed here. Athanasius brought some fifty bishops with him, but they had not been summoned, and were not allowed to sit with the rest. A deputation was sent from the Mareotis, to be informed of what had happened at Ischyros and the chalice, and the chief enemies of Athanasius were chosen for the purpose. The synod was tumultuous, and even the Count Dionysius, who had came with soldiers to support the Eusebians, thought the proceedings unfair. It remains a mystery how so many prelates were deceived into condemning Athanasius. He refused to await their judgment. Extricating himself with difficulty from the assembly, he led away his Egyptians and betook himself directly to Constantinople, where he accused the emperor abruptly, and demanded justice. At his suggestion, the Council of Tyre was ordered to come before the emperor. Meanwhile Eusebius had brought the bishops on to Jerusalem, where the deliberations were made joyous by the reception back into the Church of the followers of Arius. The Egyptian bishops had drawn up a protest, attributing all that had happened at Tyre to the emperor. The synod of Caesarea, the Meletians and Arians, the enemies of the Church. Athanasius asserts that the final act at Jerusalem had been Eusebius's aim all along; all the accusations against himself had tended only to get him out of the road, in order that the rehabilitation of the Arians might be effected.

Eusebius prevented any of the bishops at Jerusalem from going to Constantinople, save those he could trust, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theognis of Nicaea, Patrophius of Scythopolis, and the two young Pannonian bishops Ursacius and Valens, who were to continue Eusebius's policy laid down at Nicaea, and the schismatic names were giving trouble. The young Emperor, however, declared later that his father had made a mistake by trusting Eusebius, and the Meletians, the Arians, and the Eusebians were not trusted. And Athanasius tells us that five Egyptian bishops reported to him that they rested their case on a new charge, that he had threatened to delay the crown ships from Alexandria, and the bishop Hilarus, who supplied Constantinople. The emperor was enraged. No opportunity of defence was given, and Athanasius was banished to Gaul. But, in public, Constantine said that he had put in force the decree of the Council of Tyre. Constantine the Younger, however, declared later that his father had made a mistake by trusting Eusebius, and the Meletians, the Arians, and the Eusebians were not trusted. And Athanasius tells us that five Egyptian bishops reported to him that they rested their case on a new charge, that he had threatened to delay the crown ships from Alexandria, and the bishop Hilarus, who supplied Constantinople. The emperor was enraged. No opportunity of defence was given, and Athanasius was banished to Gaul. But, in public, Constantine said that he had put in force the decree of the Council of Tyre. Constantine the Younger, however, declared later that his father had made a mistake by trusting Eusebius, and the Meletians, the Arians, and the Eusebians were not trusted. And Athanasius tells us that five Egyptian bishops reported to him that they rested their case on a new charge, that he had threatened to delay the crown ships from Alexandria, and the bishop Hilarus, who supplied Constantinople. The emperor was enraged. No opportunity of defence was given, and Athanasius was banished to Gaul. But, in public, Constantine said that he had put in force the decree of the Council of Tyre. Constantine the Younger, however, declared later that his father had made a mistake by trusting Eusebius, and the Meletians, the Arians, and the Eusebians were not trusted. And Athanasius tells us that five Egyptian bishops reported to him that they rested their case on a new charge, that he had threatened to delay the crown ships from Alexandria, and the bishop Hilarus, who supplied Constantinople. The emperor was enraged. No opportunity of defence was given, and Athanasius was banished to Gaul. But, in public, Constantine said that he had put in force the decree of the Council of Tyre. Constantine the Younger, however, declared later that his father had made a mistake by trusting Eusebius, and the Meletians, the Arians, and the Eusebians were not trusted. And Athanasius tells us that five Egyptian bishops reported to him that they rested their case on a new charge, that he had threatened to delay the crown ships from Alexandria, and the bishop Hilarus, who supplied Constantinople. The emperor was enraged. No opportunity of defence was given, and Athanasius was banished to Gaul. But, in public, Constantine said that he had put in force the decree of the Council of Tyre. Constantine the Younger, however, declared later that his father had made a mistake by trusting Eusebius, and the Meletians, the Arians, and the Eusebians were not trusted. And Athanasius tells us that five Egyptian bishops reported to him that they rested their case on a new charge, that he had threatened to delay the crown ships from Alexandria, and the bishop Hilarus, who supplied Constantinople. The emperor was enraged. No opportunity of defence was given, and Athanasius was banished to Gaul. But, in public, Constantine said that he had put in force the decree of the Council of Tyre.
After the Gwatkin, He complain Alexandria. Diet. Stantius, the somewhere between Ariani and the Nicene faith. The Arians of who had fallen away to the arts. Eusebius, so that the rest of his foolish and obstinate life was spent in persecuting Athanasius, and in carrying out Eusebius’s policy. Never himself an Arian, Constantius held orthodoxy to lie somewhere between Arianism and the Nicene faith. Thus he was able to obtain from him a favour, which he denied to the few uncompromising Catholics who rejected his generalities.

The see of Alexandria had remained vacant during the absence of Athanasius. Eusebius now claimed to put the Synod of Tyre in force, and a rival bishop was set up in the person of Plistus, one of the Ariani priests whom Alexander had long ago excommunicated. Until now the East alone had been concerned. The Eusebians were the first to try to get Rome and the West on their side. They sent to the pope an embassy of two priests and a deacon, who carried with them the minutes of the Council of Tyre and the supposed proofs of the guilt of Athanasius, of which the accused himself had been unable to get a sight. Instead of at once granting his communion to Plistus, Pope Julius sent the documents to Athanasius, in order that he might present them as a defence. The latter summoned council at his suffragans. More than eighty attended, and sent to Julius a complete defence of their patriarch. The arrival of Athanasius’s envoys bearing this letter struck terror into the minds of the ambassadors of the Eusebians. The priests fled, and the deacon could think of nothing better than to beg Julius to call a council, and be judge himself. The pope consented, on the ground that in the case of one of the chief Churches such as Alexandria, it was right and customary that the matter should be referred to him. He therefore wrote summoning both accusers and accused to a council, at which he was willing that they should determine the place and time.

Thus it was not Athanasius who appealed to the pope, but the Eusebians, and that simply as a means of withdrawing from an awkward predicament. Plistus was not a success, and Constantius introduced by way of contrast another Gregory, a Capadocian, in his place. After addressing a protest to the whole Church against the methods of Eusebius, managed to escape with his life, and at once made his way to Rome to obey the pope’s summons. His accusers took good care not to appear. Julius wrote again, fixing the end of the year (339) as the term for their arrival. They detained the legates until the fixed time had elapsed, and sent them back in January, 340, with a letter full of studied and ironical politeness, of which Sozomen has preserved us the tenor. He says: “Having as- sembled at Antioch, they wrote an answer to Julius, elaborately worded and rhetorically composed, full of irony, and containing terrible threats. They admitted in this letter that Rome was always honoured as the school of the Apostles, and the metropolis of the Faith from the beginning, although its teachers had settled in the East. They had been made null, and they ought not to take a secondary place because they had less great and populous Churches, since they were superior in virtue and intention. They reproached Julius with having communicated with Athanasius, and complained that this was an insult to their synod, and that the condemnation of him was made null; and they urged that this was unjust and contrary to ecclesiastical law. After thus reproaching Julius and complaining of ill usage, they promised, if he would accept the deposition of those whom they had deposed, and the appointment of those whom they had ordained, to grant him peace and communion, but if he withstood their decrees, they would refuse to do so. For they declared that the earlier Eastern bishops had made no objection when Novatian was driven out of the Roman Church. But they wrote nothing to Julius concerning their acts, which were contrary to the decisions of the Council of Nicea, saying that they had been by necessary reason, because it was superfluous to make any defence against a vague and general suspicion that they had done wrong.” The traditional belief that Rome had been schooled by the Apostles, and that had always been the metropolis of the Faith, is interesting in the mouths of those who were denying her right to interfere in the East, in a matter of jurisdiction; for it is to be remembered that neither then, nor at any time, was Athanasius accused of heresy. This claim of independence is the first sign of the breach which began with the foundation of Constantinople as New Rome, and which ended in the complete separation of that city and all its dependencies from Catholic communion. For Eusebius had not contended himself with Nicomedia, now that it was no longer the capital, but had managed to get St. Paul of Constantinople exiled once more, and had seized upon that see, which was evidently, in his view, to be set above Alexandria and Antioch, and to be in very deed a second Rome.

The Roman council met in the autumn of 340. The Eusebians were not represented, but many Easterners, their victims, who had taken refuge at Rome, were from Thrace, Coele-Syria, Phœnicia and Palestine, besides Athanasius and Marcellus. They came to complain of the violence at Alexandria. Others explained that many Egyptian bishops had wished to come, but had been prevented and even beaten or imprisoned. At the wish of the council the pope sent to Eusebius and the Eusebians. It is one of the finest letters written by any pope, and so it all the deeds of Eusebius, with a clearness which is as unsparing as it is dignified. It is probable that the letter did not trouble Eusebius much, safe as he was in the emperor’s favour. It is true that by the death of Constantine II., Constantius, the protector of orthodoxy, had inherited his dominions, and was now far more powerful than Constantius. But Eusebius had never posed as an Arian, and in 341 he had a fresh triumph in the great Dedication Synod of Antioch, where a large number of orthodox and conservative bishops ignored the Council of Nicea, and showed themselves quite at one with the Eusebian party, though denying that they were followers of Arius, who was not even a bishop.

Eusebius died, full of years and honours, probably soon after the council; at all events he was dead before that of Sardica. He had arrived at the summit of his hopes. He may really have believed Arian doctrine, but clearly his chief aim had ever been his own aggrandisement, and the humiliation of those who had humbled him at Nicea. He had succeeded. His enemies were in exile. His creatures sat in the sees of Alexandria and Antioch. He was bishop of the imperial city, and the young emperor obeyed his counsels. If Epiphanius is right in calling him an old man even before Nicea, he must now have reached a great age. His work lived after him. He had trained a host of prelates who continued his intrigues, and who followed the Court from place to place throughout the reign of Constantius. More than this, it may be said that the world suffers to this day from the evil wrought by this worldly bishop.

John Chapman.
EUSTACE

Eustace, Saint, date of birth unknown, d. 29 March, 625. He was second abbot of the Irish monastery of Luxeuil in France, and his feast is commemorated in the Celtic martyrologies on the 29th of March. He was one of the first companions of St. Columbanus, a monastic missionary of certain passages in his writing, who devoted much to spread the Gospel over Central and Southern Europe. When Columbanus, the founder of Luxeuil, was banished from the Kingdom of Burgundy, he was one of the first companions to choose Eustace as his successor. Subsequently Columbanus settled at Bobbio in Italy. Three years after his appointment (613), when Clothaire II became ruler of the triple Kingdom of France, the abbot of Luxeuil was commissioned, by royal authority, to proceed to Bobbio for the purpose of recalling Columbanus. The latter, however, setting forth his reasons in a letter to the king, declined to return, but asked that Clothaire would take under his protection the monastery and brethren of Luxeuil. During the twelve years that followed, under the administration of the abbot Eustace, the monastery continued to acquire renown as a centre of learning and sanctity. Through the patronage of its benefices and lands were increased, the king devoting a yearly sum, from his own revenues, towards its support. Eustace and his monks devoted themselves to preaching in remote districts, not yet evangelized, chiefly in the north-eastern extremities of Gaul, and their missionary work extended even to Bavaria. Between the monasteries of Luxeuil in France and that of Bobbio in Italy (both founded by St. Columbanus) connexion and intercourse seem to have long been kept up.


John B. Cullen.

Eustace, John Chetwode, antiquary, b. in Ireland, c. 1702; d. at Naples, Italy, 1 Aug., 1815. His family was English; his mother being one of the Chetwodes of Cheshire. He was educated at Sedgley Park School, and after 1741 at the Benedictine house, St. Gregory's, Douay. He did not become a Benedictine though he always retained an attachment to the order, but went to Ireland where he taught rhetoric at Maynooth college, where he was ordained priest. He never had much sympathy for Ireland and, having gone back to France, he returned to England and entered the service of Dr. Collins in his school at Southall Park. From there he went to be chaplain to Sir William Jerningham at Costessey. In 1802 he travelled through Italy with three pupils, John Cust (afterwards Lord Brownlow), Robert Rushbrooke, and Philip Roche. During the travels he wrote a journal which subsequently became celebrated in his "Classical Tour." In 1805 he resided in Jesus College, Cambridge, as tutor to George Petre. This was a most unusual position for a Catholic priest, and Eustace's intercourse with leading members of the university led to his being charged with indifferentism. Dr. Milner, then vicar Apostolic, charged him with laying aside "the distinctive worship of his priesthood, in compliment, as he professed, to the liberality of the Protestant clergy, with whom he associated" and with permitting Catholics under the care of his house to attend "public worship"; and wrote the bishop, "was so notorious and offensive to real Catholics, that I was called upon by my brethren to use every means in my power to put a stop to it." On the other hand, an intimate friend says, "he never for a moment lost sight of his sacred character or its duties" (Gentleman's Magazine, see below). Petre left Eustace and accompanied him on another tour to Greece, Sicily, and Malta. In 1813 the publication of his "Classical Tour" obtained him sudden celebrity, and he became a prominent figure in literary society, Burke being one of his chief friends. A short tour in France, in 1814, led to his "Letter from Paris," and in 1815 he travelled again to Italy to collect fresh materials, but he was seized with malaria at Naples and died there. Before death he bitterly lamented the erroneous tendency of his works and the mistakes in his previous works, as "A Political Catechism adapted to the present Moment" (1810); "An Answer to the Charge delivered by the Bishop of Lincoln to the Clergy of that Diocese at the Triennial Visitations in 1812"; "A Tour through Italy" (London, 1813, 2d ed., 1814); "A Classical Tour" (London, 1809), a collection of his previous works, revised and enlarged (1815). A seventh edition of it appeared in London in 1841. It was also reprinted at Paris in 1837 in a series "Collections of Ancient and Modern English Authors," and "The Proofs of Christianity." The manuscript of his course of rhetoric, never published, is at Downside. Catholicon (1817), V, 205; Gentleman's Magazine, LXXXV, ii; Kirk, Biog. Mem. of Eighteenth Century Cath. London, 1805; Butler, Mem. of English Cath. (London, 1819); Heber, Life of Bishop Milner (Dublin, 1862); Gillow, Bibli. Dict. Eng. Cath., ii; Cooper in Dict. Nat. Biog. XVII.

Edwin Burton.

Eustace, Maurice, eldest son of Sir John Eustace, Castlemartin, County Kildare, Ireland, martyred for the Faith, Nov. 1581. Owing to the fact that he was to be educated at the Jesuit College at Bruges in Flanders, where, after the completion of his secular studies, he desired to enter the Society of Jesus. His father, however, wrote the superiors of the college to send him home. Maurice returned to Ireland, much against his own inclination, but in the hope of being able, later on, to carry out his desire. After a brief stay, during which he tried to dissuade his father from opposing his vocation, he went back to Flanders. His old masters at the college of Bruges on learning his father's determination advised him to return to Ireland, and devote himself in the world to the service of religion. Shortly after his arrival in Ireland, he got an appointment as captain of horse, in which position he did much to edify, and even win back to the Faith, those who served under him. He never abandoned the idea of becoming a priest, and secretly took Holy Orders. His servant, who was aware of the fact, told his father, who had his son immediately arrested and imprisoned in Dublin. A younger brother, desiring to inherit the family estates, also reported Maurice to be a priest, a Jesuit, and a friend of the queen's enemies. As a consequence, he was put on trial for high treason. During his imprisonment, against Adam Loftus, Archbishop of Dublin, offered him his daughter in marriage, and a large dowry, if he would accept the reformed religion. Yielding neither to bribery nor persecution, Eustace was sentenced to public execution, and hanged.

John B. Cullen.

Eustachius, Bartolomeo, a distinguished anatomist of the Renaissance period—"one of the greatest anatomists that ever lived," according to Isherwood's authoritative "Biographical Dictionary of the Most Prominent Physicians of All Time"—b. at San Severino, in the March of Ancona, Italy, in the early part of the sixteenth century; d. at Rome, August, 1574. Of the details of his life very little is known. He received his medical education at the University of Perugia, and travelled in France and Italy, very well. After receiving his degree in medicine he devoted himself to the study of anatomy so successfully that with Vesalius and Columbus he constitutes the trio who remade the science of anatomy for modern times. He early attracted attention for his skill and knowledge, and became physician to Cardinal Borromeo, son and successor of Charles Borromeo. He was also physician to Cardinal Giulio della Rovere whom he accompanied to Rome. After the death of Columbus he was chosen professor of anatomy at the Sapienza which had been reorganized as
EUSTACHIUS

the Roman University by Pope Alexander VI and magnificently developed by Popes Leo X and Paul III. The reason for his selection as professor was that he was considered the greatest anatomist in Italy after Columbus's death, and the policy of the popes of his time was to secure for the papal medical school the best available teachers. This position gave him time and opportunity for original work of a high order and Eustachius took advantage of it. He published a number of works on anatomy in which he added very markedly to the knowledge of the details of the structure of most of the organs of the body accepted up to that time. His first work was an anatomical commentary on Galen's "Lexicon." Subsequently he wrote a treatise on the kidneys, another on the teeth, a third on blood vessels, a paper on the Azygos vein, and other special anatomical structures. Morgagni and Haller declared that there was not a part of the body on whose structure he had not shed light. In the midst of his work he became, in 1570, physician to Cardinal Peretti, afterwards Pope Sixtus V. At the beginning of his career as an anatomist, Eustachius criticized Vesalius rather severely for having departed too far from Galen. After having continued his own original investigations for some time, however, he began to appreciate Vesalius's merits and did ample justice to his work.

Eustachius's greatest contributions to anatomical science passed through many vicissitudes which kept his real merit from being recognized until long after his death. His anatomical investigations were recorded in a series of plates with text attached. Eustachius himself was not afforded the opportunity to arrange for the publication of his work, as he died rather suddenly. Some of his papers and plates went to his heirs, and others were deposited in the Vatican Library. They were unearsted by Lancisi, a distinguished papal physician at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and were published at the expense of Pope Clement XI. This work, "Bartholomei Eustachi Tabulæ Anatomicæ," (Rome, 1714), demonstrates how much Eustachius had accomplished in anatomy. His special contributions to the science were the descriptions of the sturrup bone in the ear and the canal connecting the ear and the mouth, since called by his name. His monograph on the teeth of the child is very complete and has been surpassed only in recent years. In mythology he worked out the insertions and attachment of the sterno-hioide-muscle of the coccigeus, the splenius of the neck, the levator of the eyelid, and some others. In neurology his descriptions of the cranial nerves is especially full. In abdominal anatomy he added much. His description of the facial circulation was the most complete up to his time and it was he who recognized the valve on the left side of the opening of the inferior vena cava which serves to direct the blood from this vessel through the foramen ovale into the left auricle. This constitutes the most important distinctive structural difference between the circulatory apparatus of the adult and the child and is called the Eustachian valve.


EUSTACHIUS AND COMPANIONS, SAINTS, martyrs under the Emperor Hadrian, in the year 118. Feast, in the West, 20 September; in the East, 2 November. Emblems, a crucifix, a stag, an oven.

The legend relates that Eustachius (before baptism, Flaccus), a Roman general under Trajan, while still a heathen, saw a stag coming towards him, with a crucifix between the horns. He turned the head of the stag in that direction and heard a voice telling him that he was to suffer much for Christ's sake. He received baptism, together with his wife Tatiana (or Trajana, after baptism, Theopista) and his sons, Agapius and Theopistus. The place of the vision is said to have been Guadagnolo, between Tibur and Prænesta (Tivoli and Palestrina), in the vicinity of Rome. Through adverse fortune the family was scattered, but later reunited. For refusing to sacrifice to the idols after a victory, they suffered death in a heated brazen bull. Baronius (Ann. Ecc., ad an. 103, 4) would identify him with Placidus Flavius as a general under Titus.

The Acts are certainly fabulous, and recall the similar story in the Clementine Recognitions. They are a production of the seventh century, and were used by St. John Damascene, but the veneration of the saint is found in both the Latin Church and in the Slav Church; he is honoured as one of the Holy Helpers, is invoked in difficult situations, and is patron of the city of Madrid and of hunters. The church of Sant' Eustachio in Rome, title of a cardinal-deacon, existed in 827, according to the "Liber Pontificalis," but perhaps as early as the time of Gregory the Great (d. 604). It claims to possess the relics of the saint, some of which are said to be at St.-Denis and at St.-Eustache in Paris. An island in the Lesser Antilles and a city in Canada bear his name.

EUSTACHIUS, SAINT, Bishop of Antioch, b. at Side in Pamphylia, c. 270; d. in exile at Trajanopolis in Thrace, most probably in 360, according to some already in 336 or 337. He was at first Bishop of Berea in Syria, whence he was transferred, c. 323. At the Council of Nicea (325), he was one of the most prominent opponents of Arianism and from 325-330 he was engaged in an almost continuous literary warfare against the Arians. By his fearless denunciation of Arianism and his refusal to engage in synods he incurred the hatred of the Arians, who, headed by Eusebius of Cesarea and his namesake of Nicomedia, held a synod at Antioch (331) at which Eustathius was accused, by subdued witnesses, of Sabellianism, incontinence, cruelty, and other crimes. He was deposed by the synod and banished to Trajanopolis in Thrace by order of the Emperor Constantine, who gave credence to the scandalous tales spread about Eustathius. The people of Antioch, who loved and revered their holy and learned patriarch, became indignant at the injustice done to him and were ready to take the law into their own hands. But Eustathius kept them in check, exhorted them to remain true to the orthodox faith and humbly left for his place of exile, accompanied by a large body of his clergy. The adherents of Eustathius at Antioch formed a separate community by the name of Eustathians and refused to acknowledge the bishops set over them by the Arians. When, after the death of Eustathius, St. Melitius became Bishop of Antioch in 360 by the united vote of the Arians and the orthodox, the Eustathians would not recognize him, even after his election was approved by the Synod of Alexandria in 362. Their intransigent attitude gave rise to two factions among the orthodox, the so-called Melitian Schism (q. v.), which lasted till the second decade of the fifth century (Cavallera, Le schisime d' Antioche, Paris, 1905).

Most of the numerous dogmatic and exegetical treatises of Eustathius have been lost. His principal extant work is "De Engrastrymythio," in which he maintains against Origen that the apparition of Samuel (1 Kings, xxviii) was not a reality but a mere phantasm called up in the brain of Saul by the witch of Endor. In the same work he severely criticizes Origen for his allegorical interpretation of the Bible. A new edition of it, together with the respective homilies of Origen, was made by A. Jahn in Gebhardt and Harnack's "Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur" (Leipzig, 1886), II, fasc. iv. Cavallera recently discovered a Christological homily:

...
EUSTATHIUS

Eustathius, Greek savant and defender of monasticism, Archbishop of Thessalonica, b. at Constantinople in the early part of the twelfth century; d. at Thessalonica c. 1194. He received his ecclesiastical training in the monastic school of St. Ephrem at Constantinople, became a monk there in the monastery of St. Florus, and afterwards deacon of the "Great Church" (St. Sophia), and teacher of rhetoric and secretary to the petitions addressed to the emperor. He enjoyed the confidence of the Commnen emperors, particularly of Manuel of Palaeologus. The emperor reposed his utmost confidence in him, who intrusted to him the education of one of his sons. About 1174 he was made Archbishop of Myra in Asia Minor; but before his installation, was transferred to the archiepiscopal See of Thessalonica by special direction of the emperor. In this position he proved himself a real shepherd and father of his people. He tried to reform the worldly and hypocritical lives of the monks and anchorites of his time; he shielded his people against the excessive exactions of the imperial tax-collectors; he remained with his flock at the time of the invasion of Thessalonica by the Normans of Sicily in 1185, and tried to encourage his subjects and alleviate their sufferings. Owing to his opposition to the monastic order and its frankness of speech towards those in high places, he incurred the displeasure of the emperor and was removed from Thessalonica for a brief period; at what time, however, is not known.

Eustathius was a prolific and elegant writer, and the best Greek author of his age. His works may be classified in two categories: commentaries on ancient authors written during his activity in Constantinople; and his writings, tracts, orations, or letters, which were occasioned by special circumstances during his episcopate in Thessalonica. Of the former class may be mentioned: "The Commentaries on the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer" (Rome, 1542–50; Basle, 1559–69; Leipzig, 1852–55); "A Paraphrase of the Geographical Epic of Dionysius Periegetes", ed. Bernhardy (Leipzig, 1825); "A Commentary on the works of Pindar", of which, however, only the preface is known, ed. Tafel (Frankfurt, 1832). These works of Eustathius on the ancient classics are much prized by modern philologists. Among the works of the second class the following are to be reckoned: "A History of the conquest of Thessalonica by the Normans" (ed. Tafel in "Kommenen und Normannen", 2d ed., 1870); several addresses to the Emperor Manuel Comnenus I, and the funeral oration at the death of the same; letters written to the emperor or other distinguished personages of his time; several tracts having reference to his own monastery; as, "On the Monastic Life" (German tr. by Tafel, 1847); a letter written to a styliote of Thessalonica; a tract on hypocrisy; and others. Several purely religious works such as: four LENTEN sermons; a sermon for the beginning of the year; and panegyrics for the festivals of various saints. Most of his theological works, first edited by Tafel (1832), are in Migne, P. C., CXXXV. CXXXVI.

In these Eustathius shows himself an earnest and zealous ecclesiastical, fully penetrated with the genuine spirit of Christianity.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Eustathius of Sebaste, born about 300; died about 377. He was one of the chief founders of monasticism in Asia Minor, and for a long time was an intimate friend of St. Basil. He was censured because of the exaggerated asceticism of his followers, hesitated all his life between various forms of Arianism, and finally became a leader of the Pneumatomachians condemned by the First Council of Constantinople (381). Eustathius was apparently the son of Eulalius, Bishop of Sebaste, the metropolis of Armenia (the Roman province). He studied under Arius (Basil, Ep. cxxxii, 3; cxciv, 3; ccxii, 3), and was known from the beginning as a sympathizer with the heretic. He was ordained priest and then founded a community of monks. Partly because of the idea common at that time (Fortescue, The Greek Fathers, London, 1895, pp. 57, 94) that no one could be both a priest and a monk, and partly also because of the jealousy of the emperor, Constantius (337–361), who feared lest he be suspended from his priesthood by a synod at Neocaesarea. Later, in 340, a synod at Gangra condemned his followers (τοὺς ἐν Εὐσταθίῳ) for exaggerated and extravagant asceticism. These monks forbade marriage for any one, refused to communicate with married priests, and taught that no married person can be saved; they fasted on Sundays and would not do so on the appointed fast-days; they claimed special grace for their own conventicles and dissuaded people from attending the regular services of the Church. It was evidently a movement like that of the Encratites and Montanists. Against these abuses the council drew up twenty canons, but without directly censuring Eustathius (Hefele, "Conciliengesch.", 1st ed., II, 777 sq.; Braun, "Die Abhaltung der Synode von Gangra" in "Hist. Jahrb.", 1895, pp. 590 sq.). Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., III, xiv, 36) says that Eustathius submitted to the council's decision. However, a synod at Antioch (341?) condemned him again for "perjury" (Sozomen, IV, xxiv, 9), perhaps because he had broken his promise made on oath. About the year 356 he became Bishop of Sebaste. St. Basil was at that time (355–369) studying the history of monks before founding his own community at Annesus, and he was much attracted by Eustathius's reputation as a zealous leader of monasticism. For years, till about 372 or so, Basil believed in and defended his friend. But Eustathius was anything but a Catholic. Once, apparently in 366, he persuaded the pope (Liberius, 352–366) of his orthodoxy by presenting a confession of the Nicene faith (Socrates, IV, xii); otherwise he wavered between every kind of Arianism and semi-Arianism and signed all manner of heretical and contradictory formulae. In 368 a synod at Miletene deposed him, it seems rather for the old question of his rigorism than for Arianism. Meletius (later the famous Bishop of Antioch) succeeded him at Sebaste. But the Semi-Arians still acknowledged Eustathius. He wandered about, was present at many synods (at Seleucia in 359, later at Smyrna, in Pisidia, Pamphylia, etc.); Socrates, IV, xxii, 8), and at last (372 or so?) was deposed and excommunicated. If one can speak of any principle in so inconsistent a person, it would seem that Eustathius was generally on the side of one of the forms of Semi-Arianism, opposed to Catholics on the one hand and to extreme Arians on the other. St. Basil found him out and broke with him definitively at last (about 372 or 373).
By this time Eustochius had taken up the cause of the people who denied the consubstantial nature of the Holy Ghost (Socrates, Hist. Eccl., II, xlv; 6; Basil, Ep. cxxi, 3). We hear of him last about 377; he was then a very old man (Basil, Ep. cxxv, 4; cxxi, 3). Besides his activity as a founder of monasteries in Armenia, Pontus, and Paphlagonia (Sozomen, III, xiv, 36), Eustochius had merit as an organizer of works of charity, builder of almshouses, hospitals, refuges, etc. (Epiphanius, Haer., lxxx, 1; Sozomen, III, xiv, 36).

We find in Dict. Eccl., II, IV; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., III, besides references in the letters of St. Basil in F. G., XXXII, 219–1110, a few fragments in those of St. Gregory. Loofs, Eusta-
chio und die Chronik Menologion (Halle, 1898); Braun, Die Abfaßung der Synode von Ganzia in Hat. Jahrbuch der Gerresienschaff, XVI (1895), p. 368 sq.; Grenn, Eustochium in Arianism (Cambridge, 1900); Viros in Dict. of Christ. Biog., s. v.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.
Euthanasia. He also wrote a short "Life of St. Paul" and a series of "Argumenta" or short summaries which are placed by way of introduction to the different books of the New Testament. Of Euthaliius' activities as a bishop little or nothing is known. Even the place of his episcopal see, Aelia, is a matter of doubt. It can hardly be identified with the bishopric of that name in Sardinia. More likely it was situated somewhere in Egypt, and it has been conjectured that it is the same as Paika, a city of the Thebaid in the neighbourhood of Syene.

For a long time in oblivion, the works of Euthaliius were published in Rome, in 1698, by Lorenzo Alessandro Zaccagni, Prefect of the Vatican Library. They are embodied in the first volume of his "Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum Ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae." They can also be found in Gallandi (Biblioth. Pat., X, 197) and in Migne (P. G., LXXXV, 623).

Vigouroux in Dict. de la Bible, s. v.; Milligan in Dict. of Christian Biography, s. v.; Schraven, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament (London, 1894), 53, 624, etc.

James F. D'Arcy.

Euthanasia (from Greek ἐθάνατος, death), easy or painless death. This is as far as it may be artificially brought about by the employment of anaesthetics. When these last are of a character to deprive the sufferer of the use of reason, their effect at this supreme hour of human life is not viewed with approbation by the received teaching of the Catholic Church. The reason for this attitude is that this practice deprives a man of the capacity to act meritoriously at a time when the competency is most necessary and its product invested with finality. It is equally obvious that this space is immeasurably precious to the sinner who has still to reconcile himself with his offended God.

An additional motive assigned for this doctrine is that the administration of drugs of the nature specified is in the premises if not formally at all events equivalent a shortening of the life of the patient. Hence as long as the stricken person has as yet made no adequate preparation for death, it is always gravely unlawful to induce a condition of insensibility. The most that may be granted to those charged with responsibility in the case is to take up a passively permissive demeanour whenever it is certain that the departing soul has abundantly made ready for the great change. This is equally true of those who have continued possession of his faculties, a relapse into sin.

In no contingency, however, can any positive indorsement be given to means whose scope is to have one die in a state of unconsciousness. What has been said applies with equal force and for the same reasons to the case of those who have to suffer capital punishment by process of law.

Gigenot, Theologia Moral Institutione, (Louvain, 1898); Lemesch, Theologicae Moralis, (Freiburg, 1897); Ballerini, Opus Theologicum Morale (Pisto, 1898).

Joseph F. Delany.

Euthymius, Saint (styled The Great), abbot in Palestine; b. at Melitene in Lesser Armenia, A.D. 377; d. A.D. 473. He was educated by Bishop Otreius of Melitene, who afterwards ordained him priest and placed him in charge of all the monasteries in the Diocese of Melitene. At the age of twenty-nine he secretly set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and remained for some time with a settlement of monks at a laura called Pharan, about six miles east of Jerusalem. In 411 he withdrew, with St. Theoctistus, a fellow-saint, into the wilderness, and lived for a while in a rock cell on the land of the Samaritans. At this time the disciples gathered around them, they turned the cavern into a church and built a monastery which was placed in charge of St. Theoctistus.

A miraculous cure which Euthymius worked has been related. It is said that he was sent by God to a place called Eutropeus, the son of the Saracen chief Aspetebus, spread the fame of the holy hermit far beyond the confines of Palestine. Aspetebus, was afterwards ordained priest and became bishop over his tribe, in which capacity he attended the Council of Ephesus in 431.

When the report of this miracle had made the name of Euthymius famous throughout Palestine, and large crowds came to visit him in his solitude, he retreated with his disciple Domitian to the wilderness of Ruba, near the Dead Sea. Here he lived for some time on a remote mountain called Marda whence he afterwards withdrew to the desert of Ziphon (the ancient Engaddi). When large crowds followed him to this desolate retreat, he returned to the neighbourhood of the monastery of Theoctistus, where he took up his abode in a cavern. Every Sunday he came to the monastery to take part in the Divine services. At length, because numerous disciples desired him as their spiritual guide, he founded, in 420, on the right side of the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, a laura similar to that of Pharan. The church connected with this laura was dedicated in 425 by Juvenal, the first Patriarch of Jerusalem. When the Council of Chalcedon (451) condemned Euthymius and Eutyches, it was greatly due to the authority of Euthymius that the sounder recluses accepted its decrees. The Empress Eudoxia was converted to Catholic unity through his efforts. The Church celebrates his feast on 20 January, the day of his death.


Michael Ott.

Eutropius of Valencia, a Spanish bishop; d. about 610. He was originally a monk in the Monasterium Serritantum, generally believed to have been situated in the province of Valencia, Spain. It was founded some time in the sixth century by the monk Donatus who had been driven from Roman Africa during one of the Vandal persecutions. The rule he introduced must have been based on that in use among the African monks, which has caused the members of this community to be connected with the Augustinians, without, however, sufficient warrant. The Monasterium Serritantum is known on through the reports of Isidore and Ildenphonius to its founder and one of his disciples, Eutropius, who succeeded as abbot.

Eutropius is known as the author of three letters, one to Licinius, Bishop of Carthage, and two to Peter, Bishop of Iubirica. In the first, which has been lost, he inquires the reason for having banished children with holy chriam. This letter is known through St. Isidore. The same saint mentions a letter to Bishop Peter, the text of which has been preserved, which he says every monk should read. The title is "De destructione monachorum et ruinâ monasteriorum." In response to a suggestion of some candidates for his monastery, he points out that the number of monks is a small matter compared with their earnestness. He may be criticized for his severity in enforcing the rule and in reprimanding the guilty, but he can easily justify himself, as his whole care consists in applying the rules the founders of the monastery laid down. And thus the reproaches made against him fall back on their authors. In any case he will not swerve from his course; he is indifferent to the criticisms of men. He cannot allow the faults of his monks to go uncheked. The Scriptures and the canons of councils agree that every part of the monastery is the abode of God, and the duties of him who is charged with the guidance of others, and negligence on this head would only lead to serious irregularities. The second letter to Bishop Peter touches on the seven deadly sins. Like Cassian, Eutropius enumerates eight: gluttony, lust, covetousness,
anger, sadness, faint-heartedness, vanity, and pride.

He analyzes them, traces the links that unite them, and emphasizes their results. A Christian should resist these enemies with all his strength, persuaded that of himself he cannot be victorious, but that he needs the help of God. As Eutropius develops his theme in the treatise "De blasphemia et anathema" of Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage (c. 210–258), and as the bishops of Antioch, "Laetentur eas!", written after the agreement between the two patriarchs, in 434. These documents were acclaimed by all. Flavian summed up to the effect that Christian was of "two natures", 

Eutyches}, an heresiarch of the fifth century, who has given his name to an opinion to which his teaching and influence contributed little or nothing. The essence of the view is the assertion that there was one nature after the Incarnation, and it is spoken of indifferently as the Eutychian or the Monophysite heresy, though Eutyches was not its originator, and though he was repudiated and condemned by many of the Monophysites, who all looked upon St. Cyril of Alexandria as their great Doctor. Eutyches in 434 was seventy years of age, and had been for thirty years archimandrite of a monastery outside the walls of Constantinople, where he ruled over three hundred monks. He was not a learned man, but was much respected and had influence through the infamous minister of Theodosius II, the eunuch Chrysaphius, to whom he had stood godfather. He was a vehement opponent of Nestorianism, and of the Antiochian party led by Theodoret of Cyprus (Cyrrhus) and of John of Antioch. These bishops had, for a time, championed the orthodoxy of Eutyches, and had been excommunicated the Council of Ephesus in 431; he was again in the same council in 449. Mutual explanations had been exchanged between the great theologians Theodoret and Cyril, but their partisans had not been convinced. On the death of Cyril, in 444, his successor Dioscorus was not slow to renew hostilities, and the Cyrillicans and anti-Nestorians everywhere took the offensive. It was but as a part of this great movement that Eutyches, at Constantinople, began to denounce a supposed revival of Nestorianism. He wrote to Pope Leo on the subject, and received a sympathetic reply. The Patriarch of Antioch, Domnus, was on his guard, and he addressed a synodal letter to the Emperor Theodosius II, accusing Eutyches of renewing the heresy of Apollinarius (this had been the charge of the Antiochian party against St. Cyril) and of wishing to anathematize the great Antiochian teachers of a past generation, Diodorus and Theodore — which Eutyches was not altogether in the wrong (Facundus, viii, 6, and xiii, 5). This was probably in 448, as St. Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, had heard of no such accusation when he held a synod on Nov. 8th, with regard to a point of discipline connected with the province of Sardis. Eutyches had been accusing various personages of covert Nestorianism, and at the end of the session of this synod one of those inculpated, Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum, brought the question forward, and preferred a counter charge of heresy against the archimandrite.

Eutyches had been, many years before, while yet a layman, one of the first to detect, and denounce, the errors in the sermons of Nestorius, and he was naturally indignant at being called a Nestorian. Flavian expressed great surprise at this sudden and unexpected charge, and suggested a private conference with Eutyches. Eusebius refused, for he had frequent interviews without result. At the second session the orthodox view was defined, at Eusebius's request, by the reading of the second letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius, and its approbation by the council, and the excommunication of Cyril to John of Antioch, "Laetentur eas!", written after the agreement between the two patriarchs, in 434. These documents were acclaimed by all. Flavian summed up to the effect that Christ was of "two natures", 

"in two natures", and all the bishops echoed, in their own words, the sentiments of the president. In the third session the messengers, who had been sent to summon Eutyches to attend, returned, bringing his absolute refusal. He had determined, he declared, that he would never set his foot outside his monastery, which he regarded as his tomb. He was ready to subscribe to the councils of Nicea and Ephesus; though in doing so he ought not to be understood to subscribe to, or to condemn, any errors into which they might have fallen; he searched the Scriptures alone, as being the expression of the Holy Spirit, and he acknowledged one nature of God, incarnate and made man after the Incarnation. He complained that he had been accused of saying that God the Word had brought His flesh down from heaven. This was untrue. He acknowledged our Lord Jesus Christ as of "two natures" (τὰ δύο φύσεως) hypostatized, united, as perfect God, and perfect Man born of the Virgin Mary, not having flesh consubstantial with ours. These statements of Eutyches were substantiated by three witnesses. The council therefore addressed a letter to him, summoning him to appear, for his excuse was insufficient in fact of the participation of Eusebius of Dorylaeum, whose ardour was by no means quenched, than pointed out that Eutyches had been sending round a writing to the different monasteries to stir them up, and that danger to the council might result. Two priests were therefore sent round to the different monasteries in the city; two to those across the Golden Horn, and two across the Bosphorus to Chalecedon, to make enquiries.

Meanwhile the envoys sent to Eutyches had returned. After some difficulties and the plea of illness, Eutyches had consented to receive them. He still refused to come to the council; but he sent a letter to the Bishops and the Pope, addressed to the Emperor, in which he explained that he was not at all 'in error', that he was not a Nestorian, and that he had not been "in two natures", and that he performed his services as before. The council then returned, and the Pope, with the monks, and the envoys, went back to the Emperor, who had ordered the synod to be held. Eutyches remained in Antioch, and the council pronounced him "in error", and recommended him to be excommunicated.

The day after the council, an express arrived from the Emperor with a second letter, repeating his reasons. Eutyches returned the letter, saying that he would not be bound by the synod, and that he refused to have anything to do with Nestorianism. The Emperor wrote to his cousin and protégé, St. Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, saying that Eutyches was a nestsorian; that he had been reproached with the errors of the Rotary, and had been charged with the heresy of Apollinarius; that he had been warned for many years not to hold these opinions; that he was not worthy of the title of Nestorian; that he was not to be regarded as a Christian; that he was an heretic; and that he would be excommunicated if he did not repent. The Emperor then added that Eutyches had been long a friend of his, and that he had always acquitted himself well in his office of Bishop of Antioch; that he had been a good Christian; that he had been a good man; that he had been a good servant of God; that he had been a good friend of his; and that he had been a good friend of his.

The Emperor then added that Eutyches had been long a friend of his, and that he had always acquitted himself well in his office of Bishop of Antioch; that he had been a good Christian; that he had been a good man; that he had been a good servant of God; that he had been a good friend of his; and that he had been a good friend of his.
EUTYCHES

On the Saturday, Eusebius elicited testimony to further heretical remarks of Eutyches, which the envoys had heard him make. In particular he had denied two natures in Christ after the Incarnation, and had said he was ready to be condemned; the monastery should be burnt. On Monday Eutyches was sought vainly in the Church and the Archbishop's palace, but was eventually announced as arriving with a great multitude of soldiers, and monks, and attendants of the Prefect of the Pretorian guard, and this escort only permitted him to enter under the synod's promise that his person should be restored to them. When Eutyches arrived a Silentiary, Magnus, bringing a letter from the Emperor, who desired that the Patrician Florentius should be admitted to the Council; the Silentiary was therefore sent to invite his presence. Eusebius showed more than ever his anxiety that Eutyches should be convicted on the grounds of his former sayings, lest he should now unsay them, and be simply acquitted; for in that case his accuser might be made liable to the penalties due to calumnious accusation: "I am a poor man," he said, "without means. He threatens me with exile; he is rich; he has already depicted the Oasias as my destination." Flavian, and the Patriarch Magnus replied, that any submission made by Eutyches now should not release him from answering the charges as to his past words. Flavian then said: "You have heard, priest Eutyches, what your accuser says. Say now whether you admit the union of two natures, τὸ δύο φύσεων Παραμετρίαν, Eutyches answered: "Yes, and moreover." Eusebius interrupted: "Do you acknowledge two natures, Lord Archimandrite, after the Incarnation, and do you say that Christ is consubstantial with us according to the flesh; yes or no?" This expressed clearly the whole question between Catholic truth and the heresy of Monophysitism. Eutyches, after a few words, replied: "I have never up till now said that Christ was consubstantial with us; but I have acknowledged the holy Virgin to be consubstantial with us." Basil of Seleucia urged that her Son must therefore also be consubstantial with us, since Christ was incarnate from her. Eutyches answered: "Since you say so, I agree with all;" and he further explained that the body of Christ is the body of God, not of a man; though it is a human body. Provided he was not understood to deny that Christ is the Son of God, he would say "consubstantial with us," as the Archbishops would wish it and permit it. Flavian denied that the expression was novel.

Florentius showed that the Emperor had judged rightly that he was a good theologian, for he now pushed the Archimandrite on the essential point, the two natures. Eutyches answered explicitly: "I confess that Lord was one of two natures, before the union; but after the union, I acknowledge one nature." It is very odd that no comment was made on this utterance. The synod ordered Eutyches to anathematize all that was contrary to the letters of Cyril, which had been read. He refused. He was ready enough to accept the homilies of Dioscurus and Athanasius; but he would not anathematize all who did not use these expressions; otherwise he would be anathematizing the holy Fathers. Nor would he admit that Cyril or Athanasius had taught two natures after the Incarnation (and this was indeed correct, so far as mere words go). But Basil of Seleucia rightly urged: "If you do not say two natures after the union, you say there is mixture or confusion" (though, at the Robber Council, the unfortunate bishop was fain to deny his words). Florentius then declared, that he is not orthodox who does not confess for Eutyches also τὸ δύο φύσεων. The synod agreed, and considered the forced submission which Eutyches offered to be insincere. Flavian then pronounced the sentence of degradation, excommunication, and deposition. This was signed by about 30 bishops, including Julian of Cos, the pope's chargé d'affaires at the Court of Theodosius. The acts of the synod were published for this reason, because they were read in full at the Robber Council of Ephesus, in the following year 449, and again, in 451, at the Council of Chalcedon as a part of the Acts of the Robber Council. Flavian took care that the acts should also be signed by many archimandrites of the city, Eutyches, on his side, wrote for support to the chief bishops of the world, and placarded Constantinople with complaints. He sent an appeal to the pope (St. Leo, Ep. xxii) explaining that he had refused to affirm two natures and to anathematize all who did not do so; else he would have condemned the holy Fathers, popes Julius and Felix; Saints Athanasius and Gregory (he is referring to the extracts from the Fathers which were read in the first session of the Council of Ephesus; later in 555 it was declared that these papal documents were Apollinarian forgeries, and such is still the opinion of critics. See Harnack, Bardenhewer. Eutyches complained that this might be made known to your holiness, and that you might judge as you should think fit, declaring that in every way I should follow that which you approve." It was untrue that Eutyches at the council had appealed to the pope. He could only prove that in a low place he had said he did not give the heresy to rise.

When St. Leo had received the Acts of the Council, he concluded that Eutyches was a foolish old man who had erred through ignorance, and might be restored if he repented. Dioscorus of Alexandria, imitating some of his predecessors in assuming a primacy over Constanti- nople with complaints. The archimandrite had not been touched by the consideration Flavian had shown. His obstinacy continued. He obtained, through Chrysaphius, a new synod met in April 449 (without the presence of Flavian, but including the Patrician Florentius and several of the bishops who had taken part in the condemnation), in order to examine his complaint that the Acts had been falsified. After a careful revision of them, some slight alterations were made to please Eutyches; but the result was of no practical importance. Dioscorus and Eutyches had obtained the convocation by the Emperor of an oecumenical council to meet at Ephesus on 1st August, 449. The proceedings of the party of Dioscorus before and at that council will be found under Dioscorus, and Robber Council of Ephesus; it is only necessary to say here that in the first session Eutyches was exculpated, and absolved, while violence was done to Flavian and Eusebius, who were imprisoned. The former soon died of his sufferings. Both had appealed to Rome. The Pope annulled the council, but not the synod, which met in April 449. On the Emperor's sudden death the outlook changed. A new council met at Chalcedon in October, 451, at the wish of the Emperor Marcian and his consort St. Pulcheria, the course of which was directed by imperial commissioners, in accordance with the directions of St. Leo, whose letters presided. Dioscorus and Eutyches were put to death. Eutyches was also exiled. A letter of St. Leo (Ep. 134), written 15th April, 454, complains that Eutyches is still spreading his poison in banishment, and begs Marcian to transfer him to some more distant and lonely spot. The old man does not seem
to have long survived. His monastery, at Constantinople, was put under the supervision of Julian of Cos as visitor, that prelate being still the papal representative at Constantinople.

The leading authorities for the life of Eutyches are The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon and The Letters of St. Leo. See also under Eutychianism.

John Chapman.

Eutychianism and Monophysitism are usually identified as a single heresy. But as some Monophysites condemned Eutyches, the name Eutychian is given by some writers to the more extreme of the Monophysites, or even to those in Armenia, though it seems best to use the words indifferently, as no party of the sect looked to Eutyches as a founder or a leader, and Eutychian is but a nickname for all those who, like Eutyches, rejected the orthodox expression “two natures” of Christ. The tenet “one nature” was common to all Monophysites and Eutychians, and they affected to call Catholics Diphytaries or Dyophysetes. The error took its rise in a reaction against Nestorianism, which taught that in Christ there is a human hypostasis or person as well as a Divine. This was interpreted to imply a want of reality in the union of the two natures, and it even to result in two Christs, two Sons, though this was far from the intention of Nestorius himself in giving his incorrect explanation of the union. He was ready to admit one "Д|ο|τ|ο|ρ|ο|ν", but not one hypostasis, a "prosopie" union, though not a "hypostatic" union, which is the Catholic expression. He so far exaggerated the heresy of the Eutychians that he denied that the Blessed Virgin could be called Mother of God, Theotokia. His views were for a time interpreted in a benign sense by Theodoret, and also by John, Bishop of Antioch, but they all eventually condemned him in his condemnation of John, and his heretical spirit by refusing all submission and explanation.

His great antagonist, St. Cyril of Alexandria, was at first vehemently attacked by Theodoret, John, and their party, as denying the completeness of the Sacred Humanity after the manner of the heretic Apollinaris. St. Cyril, however, produced just the same difficulties that the word υπόστασις had aroused in the preceding century. For υπόστασις, as St. Jerome rightly declared, was the equivalent of όλη in the mouths of all philosophers, yet it was eventually used etymologically, from a letter to lea, as applied to the Person of the Trinity, different from the Latin persona, that is, a subsistent essence. Similarly ϕάσις was an especially Alexandrian word for όλη and υπόστασις, and was naturally used of a subsistent όλη, not of abstract όλη, both by Cyril often (as in the formula in question), and by the more moderate Monophysites. The Cyrilian formula, in its genesis and in its rationale, has been explained by Newman in an essay on astounding learning and perfect clearness (Tracts Theol. and Eccl., iv, 1874).

He points out that the word υπόστασις could be used (by St. Athanasius, for example), without change of meaning, both of the one Godhead, and of the three Persons. In the former case it did not mean the Divine Essence in the abstract, but considered as subsistent, without defining whether that subsistence is threedfold or single, just as we say "one God" in the concrete, without denying a triple Personality. Just the same is true of υπόστασις. We are not, at the point of view it is clear that Christ is not so fully "consubstantial with us" as He is "consubstantial with the Father". Yet again,
in these two phrases the word *consubstantial* appears in different senses; for the Father and the Son have one substance numero, whereas the Incarnate Son is of one substance with us *specie (not numero, of course). It is therefore not to be wondered at, if the expression *consubstantial* with *us* was avoided as late as the fourth century. In like manner the word *physis* has its full meaning when applied to the Divine Nature of Christ, but a restricted meaning (as has been just explained) when applied to His Human Nature.

In St. Cyril's use of the formula its signification is plain. It means (1) the body of St. Cyril's opinion, the Divine Word became man, remained one and the same in essence, attributes and personality; in all respects the same as before, and therefore *μὰ φύσιν*. It means (b), that the manhood, on the contrary, which He assumed, was not in all respects the same nature as that *massa, usus, physis, etc.* out of which it was taken; (1) from the very circumstance that it was only an addition or supplement to what He already was, not a being complete in itself; (2) because in the act of assuming it, He changed it in its qualities. This added nature, then, was best expressed, not by a second substantive, as if collateral in its position, but by an adjective, as *σαυρακωμένη*. The three words answered to St. John's ὁ λόγος ἀπὸ τοῦ τέρτου, ἐκ τοῦ συνεσχημούντος. Thus St. Cyril intended to safeguard the teaching of the Council of Antioch (against Paul of Samosata, 264-72) that the Word was unchanged by the Incarnation, *καθαρὸς καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν οἰκόμην* (p. 317). He intended by his one nature of God, "with the council of Antioch, a protest against that alterableness and imperfection, which the anti-Catholic schools affixed to their notion of the Word. The council says one and the same in *φύσιν*; I have in like manner written a treatise entitled 'quod unus sit Christus'; and, in one of his Paschal Epistles, he quotes with the text 'Jesus Christ, yesterday, to-day, the same, and for ever.' His great theme in these words is not the coalescing of the two natures into one, but the error of making two sons, one before and one upon the Incarnation, one divine, one human, or again of degrading the divine essence by making it subject to the humanity" (p. 321). It has been necessary thus to explain at length St. Cyril's meaning in order to be able to enumerate the more briefly and clearly, the various phases of the Eutychian doctrine. 1. The Eutychian party before Chalcedon did not put forward any doctrine of their own; they only denounced as Nestorians any who taught *τὸν φύσαν* two natures, which they made equal to two hypostases, and two Sons. They usually admitted that Christ was *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* "of two natures", but this meant that the Humanity before (that is, logically before) it was assumed was a complete *φύσις*; it was no longer a *φύσις* (subsistent) after its union to the Divine nature. It was natural that those of them who were consistent should reject the teaching of St. Leo, that there were two natures: "Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utratque naturae", "Assumpti formam servi sine sorte pecati, humanum agens, divina non agens", and if they chose to understand "nature" to mean a subsistent nature, they were even bound to reject such language as Nestorian. Their fault in itself was not necessarily that they were Monophysites at heart, but that they would not stop to listen to the six hundred bishops of Chalcedon, to the father of the Church, and to the entire Western church, who were ready to hear explanations and to realize that words may have more than one meaning (following the admirable example set by St. Cyril himself), were able to remain in the unity of the Church. The rest were rebels, and whether orthodox in belief or not, well deserved to find themselves in the same ranks as the real heretics.

2. Eutyches himself was not a Cyrilian. He was not a Eutychian in the ordinary sense of that word. His mind was not clear enough to be definitely Monophysite, but his spirit was ever in thinking him ignorant. He was with the Cyrilians in denouncing as Nestorians all who spoke of two natures. But he had never adopted the "consubstantial with us" of the "creed of the union", nor St. Cyril's admissions, in accepting that creed, as to the two natures. He was willing to accept St. Cyril's letters and the decisions of Ephesus and Nicea in a general way; but they contained no error. His disciple, the monk Constantine, at the revision, in April, 449, of the condemnation of Eutyches, explained that he did not accept the Fathers as a canon of faith. In fact Eutyches simply upheld the ultra-Protestant view that nothing can be imposed as of faith which is not verbally to be found in Scripture. This, together with an exaggerated notion of Nestorianism, appears to describe his whole theological position.

3. Dioscorus and the party which followed him seem to have been pure Cyrilians, who by an excessive dislike of Nestorianism, fell into excess in maintaining the completeness of the Humanity, and exaggerating the effects upon it of the union. We have not documents enough to tell us how far their error went. A fragment of Dioscorus is preserved in the "Antirrhetica" of Nicephorus (Spiecl. Solesm., IV, 380) which states: If the Blood of Christ is not by nature the Blood of God's and not a man's, how does it differ from the blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer? For this is earthly and corruptible, and the blood of man according to nature is earthly and corruptible. But God forbid that we should say the Blood of Christ is consubstantial with one of these things, or that it according to nature (ἐν τῶν κατὰ φύσιν ἁμαρτίας)." If this is really, as it purports to be, from a letter written by Dioscorus from his exile at Gangra, we shall have to class him with the extreme Monophysites "in contempt", if the formula "the consubstantial with us" and makes the Blood of Christ incorruptible of its own nature. But the passage may conceivably be a Julianist forgery.

4. Timothy Ælurus, the first Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, was on the contrary nearly orthodox in his views, as has been clearly shown by the extracts published by Lebon from his works, extant in Syria in a MS. in the British Museum (Addit. 12156). He denies that *φύσις*, nature, can be taken in an abstract sense. Hence he makes extracts from St. Leo, and mocks the pope as a pure Nestorian. He does not even accept *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, and declares there can be no question of two natures, either before or after the Incarnation. "There is no nature which is not a hypostasis, nor hypostasis which is not a person." So far we have, not heresy, but only a term defined contrary to the Chalcedonian and Western usage. A second point is the word *εἰκονισμός* means that which is "by nature". Christ, he says, is by nature God, not man; He became man only by *εἰκονισμός* (economy or Incarnation); consequently His Humanity is not His *φύσις*. Taken thus, the formula *μὰ φύσιν* was intended by Ælurus in an orthodox sense. Thirdly, the actions of Christ are attributed to His Divine Person, to the one Christ. Here Ælurus seems to be unorthodox. For the essence of Monothelism is the refusal to ascribe the actions (ὑπερευθέν) between the two natures, but to insist that they are all the actions of the one Person—whether in the Son or in the Holy Spirit. How far Ælurus was in reality in reality, we cannot be judged until his works are before us in full. He is, at all events in the main, a schismatic, full of hatred and contempt for the Catholic Church outside Egypt, for the 600 bishops of Chalcedon, for the 1600 of the É veneral, for Rome and the whole West. But
he consistently anathematized Eutyches for his denial that Christ is consubstantial with us. 

5. In the next generation Severus, Bishop of Antioch (511–39), was the great Monophysite leader. In his earlier days he rejected the Henoticon of Zeno, but when a patriarch he accepted it. His contemporaries assign the duty of the Humanity of Christ to himself in the nature of the union of the two, and it seems to be comprehensive. He did not, however, concede the Incorruptible, but maintained the corruptibility of the Body of Christ. He seems to have admitted the expression ἐν δύο φύσεισ. Chalcedon and Pope Leo he treated as Nestorian, as Αἰλουρος did, or two wills, he sought to found his truth on two natures. He did not allow the Humanity to be a distinct monad; but this is no more than a view of many modern Catholic theologians that it has no esse of its own. (So St. Thomas, III, Q. xvii, a. 2; see Janssens, De Deo homoine, pars prior, p. 607, Freiburg, 1901.) It need not be understood that by thus making a composite hypothesis Severus renounced the Cyrilian doctrine of the unchanged nature of the Word after the confusion union. Where he is most certainly heretical is in his conception of one nature not Divine (so Cyril and Αἰλουρος) but theandric, and thus a composition, though not a mixture—φύσις. He naturally attributed all the activities of Christ, and they are called “theandric” (θεαναρικα). Instead of being separated into Divine activities and human activities as by the Catholic doctrine. The undivided Word, he said, must have an undivided activity. Thus even if Severus could be defended from the charge of strict Monophysitism, in that he affirmed the full reality of the Human nature of Christ, though he refused to it the name of nature, yet at least he appears as a dogmatic Monotheliste. This is the more clear, in that on the crucial question of one of the most important he pronounced for his theandric position. The other utterances of Severus which make Christ’s sufferings voluntarily permitted, rather than naturally necessitated by the treatment inflicted on his Body, might perhaps be defended by the consideration that from the union and consequent Beatitude, the Soul of Christ, would congruously enjoy a beatiﬁcation of the Soul and a spiritualizing of the Body, as was actually the case after the Resurrection; from this point of view it is true that the possibility of the Humanity is voluntary (that is, decreed by the Divine will) and not due to it in the state which is consequent upon it. Thus in the natural union the Humanity is of its own nature possible apart from the union (St. Thomas, III, Q. xiv, a. 1, ad. 2). It is important to recollect that the same distinction has to be made in considering whether the Body of Christ is to be called corruptible or incorruptible, and consequently whether Catholic doctrine on this point is in favour of Severus or of his adversary Julian. The words of St. Thomas may be borne in mind: “Corruptio et mors non competit Christo ratione suppositi, secundum quod admitterit unitas, sed ratione naturae, secundum quam inventur differentia mortis et vitae.” (St. Thomas, III, Q. xiv, a. 2.) As the Catholic theologians discussed the question ratione suppositi (since they took nature to mean hypostasis, and to imply a suppositum) they were bound to consider the Body of Christ incorruptible. We must therefore consider the Julianists more consistent than the Severians.

6. Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, was the leader of those who held the incorruptibility, as Severus was of those who held the corruptibility. The question arose in Alexandria, and created great excitement, when the two bishops had taken refuge in that city, soon after the accession of the orthodox Emperor Justin, in 519. The latter called the Severians Corrupticole, and the latter retorted by entitling the Julianists Αὐθαναστέων and Phantasists, as renewing the Docetic heresies of the second century. In 537, the two parties elected rival patriarchs of Alexandria, Theodosius and Gaianas, after whom the Corrupticole were known as Theodosians, and the Incorrupticole as Gaianites. Julian considered, with some show of reason, that the doctrine of Severus necessitated the admission of two natures, and he was unjustly accused of Docetism and Manicheanism, for he taught the Incorruptible was not formalis quæ human, but as united to the Word. His followers, however, split upon this question. One party admitted a potential corruptibility. Another party taught an absolute incorruptibility εὐτυχίαν ὡς πάντα τὸνόσον, as flowing from the union of the two natures. This third sect declared that by the union the Humanity obtained the prerogative of being incorruptible; they were called Actistetes, and replied by denominating their opponents “Cistolaters”, or worshippers of a creature. Heresies, after the analogy of low forms of physical life, tend to propagate by division. So Monophysitism showed its nature, once it was separated from the Catholic doctrine, in 556, adopted the incorruptibilist view, and made it a law for all bishops. The troubles that arose in consequence, both in East and West, were calmed by his death in November of that year.

The famous Philoxenus or Xenocrates (d. soon after 518), Bishop of Mahbour, Mambuce, or Hierapolis in Syria Euphratensis, is best known to-day by his Syriac version of the N. T., which was revised by Thomas of Harkel, and is known as the Harklean or Philoxenian text. It is unfair of Hefele (Councils, tr. III, 459–60) to treat him as almost a Docetist. From what can be learned of his doctrines they were very like those of Severus and of Αἰλουρος. He was a Monophysite in words and a Monothelite in reality, for he taught that Christ had one will, an error which was almost impossible for any Monophysite to avoid. To those who use the word pius θεαναρικόν, on the other hand, who refused it, there is no possibility of explaining away this assertion of the suffering of the Divine Nature by the communicatio idiomatum, for it is not merely the Divine Nature (in the sense of hypostasis) of the Son which is said to have been crucified, but the words are attached to a three-fold invocation of the Trinity. Peter may therefore be considered as a full-blooded Monophysite, who carried the heresy to its extreme, so that it involved error as to the Trinity (Sabellianism) as well as with regard to the Incarnation. He did not admit the addition of the words “Christus Rex” which his orthodox rival Cyril added to his formula. Some Syrian monks of Constantinople, led by John Maxentius, before the reconciliation with the West in 519, upheld the formula “one of the Trinity was crucified” as a test to exclude the heresy of Peter Fulo on the one hand and Nestorianism on the other. The orthodox adherents of the Council of Chalcedon, Pope Hormisdas thought very badly of the monks, and would do nothing in approval of their formula. But it was approved by John II, in 534, and imposed under anathema by the Second Council of Constantinople in 553, which closed the so-called “Theopaschite” controversies. 

9. We have further to catalogue a number of subdivisions of Monophysitism which pululated in the sixth century. The Agnoetics were Corrupticole, who denied completeness of knowledge to the Human.
EUTYCHIANISM

Nature of Christ; they were sometimes called Theonistians, from Themistius Calonymus, an Alexandrian deacon, their chief writer. They were excommunicated by the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Thessalonica (d. 527) and Theodosius. Their views resemble the "Theonistians" of our day. The Triarchites, or Tritheites, or Condobaudites, were founded by a Constantinopolitan philosopher, John Asenagus, or Asenagh, at the beginning of the sixth century, but their principal teacher was John Philoponus, an Alexandrian philosopher, who died probably in the year 538. These heretics taught that there were three natures in the Holy Trinity, the three persons being individuals of a species. A zealot of the sect was a monk Athanasius, grandson of the Empress Theodora, wife of Justinian. He followed the view of Theodosius, that the bodies to be given in the resurrection are new creations.

Stephen Gobaraus was another writer of this sect. Their followers were called Athanasians or Philoponiaci. Athanasius was opposed by Conon, Bishop of Tarsus (c. 600), who, eventually anathematized his teacher Philoponus. The Cononites are said to have urged that, though the matter of the body is corruptible and was excommunicated by the Jacobite Patriarch of Alexandria, Damian (577), who found the unity of God in a brahman distinct from the three persons, which he called abheses. His disciples were taunted with believing in four Gods, and were nicknamed Tetrachites or Triarchites. Eutyches, the first of the Monophysites, taunted them with the doctrine of the three natures. They found the three natures of the Holy Trinity to resemble the three axes of a species. Eutyches was accused of heresy by the Emperor Theodosius II (577), excommunicated, and died not long after.

Leo the Great was supposed to be of the sect of the Monophysites, while he was bishop of Antioch (578-91), opposed them, and, with both he and Damian attacked the Alexandrian philosopher Stephen the Usurper, founder of the Nyobites, who taught that there was no distinction whatever between the Divine Nature and the Human after the Incarnation, and characterized the distinctions made by those who admitted only one nature as half-hearted.

Many of his followers joined the Catholics, when they found themselves excommunicated by the Monophysites.

History.—Of the origin of Eutychianism among the Christians, a few words were said above. The controversy between Cyril and the Patriarch of Alexandria, Dioscorus, and the Emperor Theodosius, was revived with violence in the attacks made in 444-8, after Cyril's death, by his party on Ireneus of Tyre, Ibas of Edessa, and others (see Dioscorus). The trial of Eutyches, by St. Flavian at Constantinople, brought matters to a head (see Eutyches II), and convened an ecumenical council at Ephesus, in 449, over which Dioscorus, the real founder of Monophysitism as a sect, presided (see Ephesus, Robber Council). St. Leo had already condemned the teaching of one nature in his letter to Flavian called the tomæ, a masterpiece of exact terminology, unsurpassed for clearness of thought, which condemns Nestorius on the one hand, and Eutyches on the other (see Leo I, Pope). After the council had acquitted Eutyches, St. Leo insisted on the signing of this letter by the Eastern bishops, especially those who had taken part in the disgraceful scenes at Ephesus. A hundred bishops assembled at Chalcedon, under the presidency of the papal legates (see Chalcedon, Council). The pope's view was assured of success beforehand by the support of the new Emperor Marcian. Dioscorus of Alexandria was deposed. The tomæ was condemned by all, save by thirteen of the seventeen Egyptian bishops present, for these declared their lives would not be safe, if they returned to Egypt after signing, unless a new patriarch had been appointed. The reality difficulty lay in drawing up a definition of faith. There was no new Patriarch of Alexandria; the bishops were to be banished and, it was decided that Dioscorus, though they had now accepted the tomæ, the bishop of Jerusalem, had been one of the leaders of the Robber Council. The rest had submitted to St. Leo. It is consequently not surprising that the committee, appointed to draw up a definition of faith, produced a colourless document (no longer extant), using the words ἐκ δύο φύσεως, which Dioscorus and Eutyches might have signed without difficulty. It was excitedly applauded in the fifth session of the council, but the papal legates, supported by the bishops of the East, would not agree to it, and declared they would break up the council and return to Italy, if it were pressed.

The few bishops who stood by the legates were of the Antiochian party and suspected of Nestorianism by many. The emperor's personal intervention was invoked. It was decided to refuse to assert "two natures" (not merely "of" two) was to agree with Dioscorus and not with the pope, and they yielded with a very bad grace. They had accepted the pope's letter with enthusiasm, and they had deposed Dioscorus, not indeed for heresy (as Anatolius of Constantinople had the courage, or the impudence, to point out), but for violation of the canons. To side with him meant punishment. The result was the drawing up by a new committee of the famous Chalcedonian definition of faith. It condemns Monophysitism in the following words: "Following the holy Father we acknowledge one and the same Lord Jesus Christ; and in accordance with this we all teach that He is perfect in Godhead, perfect also in Manhood, truly God and truly Man, of a rational soul and body, consubstantial with His Father as regards His Godhead, and consubstantial with us as regards His Manhood, and in like manner in all things. For, having been begotten of His Father before the worlds as to His Godhead, and in the last days for us and for our salvation [born] of Mary the Virgin Theotokos as to His Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, made known as in two natures [the Greek text now has "of two natures"], but the history of the definition shows that the Latin "in" is correct] without confusion or change, indissolubly inseparably [ἐκ δύο φύσεως ἰδιωτικής, ἀρρενωποί ἀνεμορφωμένος, ἐν δύο φύσεως ἱερομυθώματι, ἐν δύο φύσεως ἱερομυθώματι]; the distinction of the two natures being in no wise removed by the union, but the properties of each nature being rather preserved and concurring in one Person and one Hypostasis, not as divided or separated into two Persons, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; even as the Prophets taught aforesaid about Him, and as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself taught us, and as the symbol of the Fathers is recorded among us." So Monophysitism was exorcised; but the unwillingness of the larger number of the six hundred Fathers to make such a declaration is important. The historical account of the Council is this, that a doctrine which the Creed did not declare, which the Fathers did not unanimously witness, and which some eminent Saints had almost in set terms opposed, which the whole East refused as a symbol, not once, but twice, patriarch by patriarch, metropolitan by metropolitan, first by the mouth of above one hundred, then by the mouth of above six hundred of its bishops, and repeatedly, and upon the ground of its being contrary to the Creed, was forced upon the Council, not indeed as a Creed, yet, on the other hand, not for subscription merely, but for its acceptance as a definition of faith under the sanction of an anathema, forced on the Council by the resolution of the Pope of the day, acting through his Legates and supported by the civil powers (Newman, "Development", v. § 3, 1st ed., p. 307). Theodosius issued edicts against the Eutychians, in March and July, 433, forbidding them to have priests, or assemblies, to make wills or inherit property, or to do military service. Priests who were obstinate in these were to be banished by the civil powers beyond the empire. Troubles began immediately the council was over. A monk named Theodosius, who had been punished at Alexandria for blaspheming Dioscurus, now on the contrary opposed the decision of the council, and going to Palestine persuaded the
many thousands of monks there that the council had taught plain Nestorianism. They made a raid upon Jerusalem and drove out Juvenal, the bishop, who would not renounce the Chalcedonian definition, although he had been before one of the heads of the Robber Council. Houses were set on fire, and some of the churches were destroyed. Theodosius made one known bishop, and throughout Palestine the bishops were expelled and new ones set up. The Bishop of Scythopolis lost his life; violence and riots were the order of the day.

Eudocia, widow of the Emperor Theodosius II, had retired to Palestine, and gave some support to the monks. Marcian and Pulcheria, with their usual mild measures to restore peace, and sent repeated letters in which the real character of the decrees of Chalcedon was carefully explained. St. Euthymius and his community were almost the only monks who upheld the council, but this influence, together with a long letter from St. Leo to the excited monks, had no doubt great weight in obtaining peace. In 453, large numbers acknowledged their error, when Theodosius was driven out and took refuge on Mount Sinai, after a tyranny of twenty months. Others held out on the ground that it was uncertain whether the pope had ratified the council. It was true that he had annulled its disciplinary canons. The emperor therefore wrote to St. Leo asking for an explicit confirmation, which the pope sent at once, at the same time thanking Marcian for his acquiescence in the condemnation of the twenty-eighth canon, as to the precedence of the See of Constantinople, and for repressing the religious riots in Palestine.

In Egypt the results of the council were far more serious, for nearly the whole patriarchate eventually sided with Dioscurus, and has remained in heresy to the present day. Out of seventeen bishops who represented, at Chalcedon, the hundred Egyptian bishops, only four had the courage to sign the decree. These four returned to Alexandria, and peaceably ordained the archdeacon, Proterius, a man of good character and venerable by his age, in the place of Dioscurus. But the deposed patriarch was popular, and the thirteen bishops, who had been allowed to defer signing the tome of St. Leo, misrepresented the teaching of the council as contrary to that of Cyril. A riot was the result. The soldiers who attempted to quell it were driven into the ancient temple of Serapis, which was now a church, and it was burnt over their heads. The pagans retaliated by the usual largess of corn, of public shows, and of privileges. Two thousand soldiers reinforced the garrison, and committed scandalous violence. The people were obliged to submit, but the patriarch was safe only under military protection. Schism began through the retirement from his communion of the priest Timo-thy, called Elurus, "the cat", and Peter, called Mongus, "the horse", a deacon, and these were joined by four or five bishops. When the death of Dioscurus (September, 454) in exile at Gangra was known, two bishops consecrated Timothy Elurus as his successor. In 456, the emperor almost the whole of Egypt acted against the Monophysites. On the arrival of the news of the death of Marcian (February, 457), Pro-terius was murdered in a riot, and Catholic bishops were everywhere replaced by Monophysites. The new emperor, Leo, put down force by force, but Elurus was protected by his minister Aspar. Leo wished for a council, but gave way before the objections made by the pope his namesake, and the difficulties of assembling so many bishops. He therefore sent queries throughout the Eastern Empire to be answered by the bishops, as to the version due to the pope and to the ordinaries of the See of Elurus. As only Catholic bishops were consulted, the replies were unanimous. One or two of the provincial councils, in expressing their indignation against Timothy, add the proviso "if the reports are accurate", and the bishops of Pamphylia point out that the decree of Chalcedon is not a creed for the people, but a test for bishops. The letters, still preserved (in Latin only) under the name of Eucylus, or Codex Eucylus, bear the signatures of about 260 bishops, but Nicephorus Callistus says, that there were altogether more than a thousand, while Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria, in the days of St. Theodosius the Great, puts the number at 1000. He says that only one bishop, the aged Amphilocheus of Sidon, dissented from the rest, but he soon changed his mind (quoted by Photius, Bibl., CXXX, p. 283). This tremendous volume of testimonies to the Council of Chalcedon is little remembered to-day, but in controversy with the Monophysites it was in those times of equal importance with the council itself, as its solemn ratification.

In the following year Elurus was exiled, but was recalled in 475 during the short reign of the Monophysite usurper Basiliscus. The Emperor Zeno exiled Elurus from communion on account of his great age. That emperor tried to reconcile the Monophysites by means of his Henotic decree, a decree which dropped the Council of Chalcedon. It could, however, please neither side, and the middle party which adhered to it and formed the official Church of the East was excommunicated by the Pope. Emulated by Marcian of Alexandria, the Monophysites were united to the schismatic Church of Zeno by Peter Mongus who became patriarch. But the stricter Monophysites succeeded from him and formed a sect known as Acæphal (q. v.). At Antioch Peter Fullo also supported the Henotic doctrine. A schism between East and West lasted through the reigns of Zeno and his more definitely Monophysite successor Anastasius, in spite of the efforts of the pope, especially the great St. Gelasius (q. v.). In 518, the orthodox Justin came to Rome, and in that year he signed a famous decree which had been preserved at Rome, and condemned not only the leaders of the Eutychian heresy, but also Zeno’s time-serving bishops of Constantinople. Similarly, Acæus (q. v.) and his successors. Few of the Eastern bishops seem to have been otherwise than orthodox and anxious for the reunion, and they were not obliged to omit from their diptychs of their churches the names of their predecessors, who had unwillingly been cut off from actual communion with Rome, in the reigns of Zeno and Anastasius. The famous Monophysite writer Severus was only deposed from the See of Antioch, Justinian, during his long reign, took the Catholic side, but his empress, Theodora, was a Monophysite, and in his old age the emperor leaned in the same direction. We still possess the acts of a conference, between six Severian and seven orthodox bishops, held by his order in 533. They are controversial, but of his reign was the following treatise about the “three chapters”, extracts from the writings of Theodre of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas, which Justinian wished to get condemned in order to conciliate the Severians and other moderate Monophysites. He succeeded in driving Pope Viglius (q. v.) into the acceptance of the Successors of Constantine (q. v.), which he had summoned for the purpose of giving effect to his view. The West disapproved of this condemnation as derogatory to the Council of Chalcedon, and Africa and Illyricum refused to receive the council.
beggar’s garb, ordaining bishops and priests everywhere in Mesopotamia, Syria, Asia Minor, in order to repair the spiritual ruin caused by the Monophysites by Justinian’s renewal of the original laws against their bishops and priests. John of Ephesus puts the number of clergy he ordained in a period at 200,000, otherwise 30,000. His journeys were incredibly swift. He was believed to have miracles of healing, and at least he performed the miracle of infusing a new life into the dry bones of his sect, though he was unable to unite them against the “Syndotes” (as they called the orthodox), and he died worn out by the quarrels among the Monophysite patriarchs and theologians. He has been variously named to give his name to the Monophysites of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia, with Asia Minor, Palestine, and Cyprus, who have remained since his time generally united under a Patriarch of Antioch (see JOSEPH). A number of these united in 1646 with the Catholic Church, and they are governed by the Syrian Archbishop of Aleppo. The rest of the Monophysites are also frequently called Jacobites.

For the Coptic Monophysites see EUTHYCHUS, and for the Armenians see ARMENIA. The Armenian Monophysite Patriarch resides at Constantinople. The Abyssinian Monophysites, in Persia, were drawn to the same heresy toitle the close connexion with Alexandria. At least since the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt, in 641, the Abuna of the Abyssinians has always been consecrated by the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria, so that the Coptic Church has always been, and is still, maintaining Monophysitism.

The chief materials for the general history of the Eutychians will be found in the Collections of the Councils by MANUHAROOS, lectiones, letters of persons, and other documents. To these must be added the historians EUTHYCHIANUS, THEOPHANES, etc., and the Monophysite historians JOHN OF EPHESUS, and ZACHARIAH (writing both in Leyden’s Optica Syriaca, 11–111, Leyden, 1879), a German translation of the latter by GEORG KONIG (Leipzig, 1889), and an English one by HAMMERSLEY and BROOKS (London, 1889). The works of FAKUR, the Brauer von Liberatus, and information imparted by FAKUR were valuable. Of modern authorities, the larger and smaller histories are innumerable, e.g. BARONIS, FLEET, GIBSON, HEEFELDE, and for the early period TILLEMONT, VI; also biographical articles in such works as: LATE in Biogr. Litt. FABERE:KUR, die Kirchengesetzien, HENRO, KRONEN, KREUZER, and DET. CH. BOOS., KONSFSE, etc.; DET. ORIENT., DET. CH. ORIENT, WALCH, KOTZKESGEGNISSE, Leipz., 1780–12; VI–VIII; for detailed biographies see the articles referred to above.

For the Coptic see PETAVIO, DE INERM. VI; DOREN, Enzyklopädie der Kirchengeschichte von der Person Christi (Berlin, 1853), 2nd ed.; TRU: DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST (Edinburgh, 1813); and we should note that Dorens himself has not treated the Coptic view. Of the latter, the most famous is the Eutychianus-Coptic. Its history is: DIET. TH. CATH., the history of dogmas such as Eutychianus-Coptic, and up to 411, B. BAKER: KREUZER, Monophysite Streitigkeiten in Zusammenhang mit der Kirchenpolitischer (1819); LORING, LSAMINA von der Kirchengeschichte, 1st series. 1–3, 1937; see also the three works of John of Ephesus. The latter, however, are from the Syrian, Arabic, and Coptic of late years. In addition to the histories mentioned above, EUTYCHUS, History of the Monophysites of the Coptic Church of Alexandria, Arabic and English in Patrology, 1, 2 (Paris, 1905); S. BEN EL MOFFAFA, History of Patriarch Eutychius, in Opera Script. Chrest. Orient., Ser. arabicae, 3rd series. IX; CHORANO, Chronique de Michel le Syrien (Paris, 1901), II.


JOHN CHAPMAN.

Eutychianus, Saint, Pope.—He succeeded Pope Felix I as Pope, almost a year after the latter’s death, and entered the Church from the imperial household, 275, until 7 December, 283. We know no details of his pontificate. The rite for blessing the produce of the fields, ascribed to him by the “Liber Pontificalis”, undoubtedly belongs to a later period. The statement also that he promulgated rules for the burial of martyrs and buried many of them with his own hands, has but slight claim to acceptance, since after the death of Aurelian (275) the Church enjoyed a long respite from persecution. It is highly probable that Eutychianus did not die a martyr. The fourth-century Roman Calendar mentions him (8 December), in the “Deposito Episcoporum”, but not in its list of martyrs. His remains were placed in the papal chapel in the Catacomb of Callistus. When this famous crypt was discovered some fragments of the epitaph of Eutychianus were found, i.e. his name (in Greek letters): EUTHYCHIANUS EPIS (KOPHOS). His feast is celebrated on 8 December.


J. P. KIRSH.

Eutychius I, Patriarch of Constantinople, b. about 512, in Phrygia; d. Easter Day, 5 April, 582. He became a monk and then archimandrite at Amasea, and was chosen to succeed the Patriarch Eutychianus in Constantinople, where he seems to have made a great impression on Justinian I (527–565), so much so that when Mennas the Patriarch (536–552) died, the emperor procured Eutychius’s election as successor, on the very same day (in August). The great quarrel of “the Three Chapters” was then going on. Justinian thought he could conciliate the Monophysites, in Egypt, and Syria, by publishing anathemas against three theologians,—long dead—who were suspect of the opposite heresy, Nestorianism. The three points (called ἐπαθετά, ἐπιτυχία, νεανική): were: (1) the condemnation of the person and works of Theodore of Mopsuestia (428); (2) the condemnation of the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus (c. 457) against the Council of Ephesus; (3) a letter of one Ibas, to a Persian named Masri, which attacked that Council. It should be noted that these documents certainly were Nestorian, and that their condemnation involved no real concession to Monophysitism. The question at issue was rather, whether it were worth while, on the chance of conciliating these Monophysites, to condemn people who had died so long ago. It is also true that, in the West, people suspected in these Three Chapters were anathematized; however, he did not attack on Chalcedon. Justinian’s “Δικαίωσις τῶν Κεκλημένων” appeared in 544. It was accepted in the East and rejected in the West. Pope Vigilus (540–555) was the unhappy victim of the quarrel. In 548 he accepted the Edict by a council, which also carefully guarded Chalcedon. He had himself just come to Constantinople in order to advise a Council that should confirm the three anathemas. But he found that, by its inclusion, he had grievously offended his own Western bishops. Dositius of Milan, and Facundus of Hermance led the opposition against him, and in 550 a Synod of Carthage excommunicated the Pope. Vigilus did not die for the condemnation that has left him the reputation of being the weakest Pope that reigned. He was still at Constantinople when Eutychianus became Patriarch. Eutychius sent him the usual announcement of his own appointment and the usual (and quite orthodox) profession of
of faith. At the same time, he urged him to summon the Council at once. Meanwhile Justinian had published a second, and still stronger, condemnation of the Three Chapters (23 Dec., 551). Vigilius gave, and then withdrew, his consent to the Council. Justinian insisted on the exclusion of the African bishops who were all opposed to his condemnation. In spite of the Pope's refusal, the council met on 5 May, 553, at Constantinople. A hundred and sixty-five bishops attended. This is what was afterwards recognized as the Fifth General Council (Constantinople II). On 11 May the Pope sent them a modified Decree, to which they adhered. It is called "The Breviarium of the Council of Constantinople," and it forbade the condemnation of the other Chapters. As he would not attend the council Eutychius presided. The council wrote respectfully to the Pope, but, in spite of the Constitutium, completely confirmed Justinian's edicts in its eighth session. It also acknowledged the formula Unus de Trinitate passus est as orthodox, and incidentally condemned Origen. (Can. 11, 12, 13, 14. For this Council see Liberati Breviarium, infra; Mansi, IX, 163; Hefele, Concilienesch., 2nd ed., II, 598 seq.) Vigilius gave in on 8 December, after months of ill-treatment, and was allowed to go back to Rome, and died on the way, in Sicily, in 554. [There is an account of all this story in Fortescue's Orth. Eastern Church, 82-83.]

Eutychius had, so far, stood by the Emperor throughout. He composed the decree of the Council against the Patricians (Mansi, IX, 367-575); he consecrated the new church of Sancta Sophia. His next adventure was a quarrel with Justinian about the Aphthartodocetes. These were a sect of Monophysites, in Egypt, who said that Christ's body on earth was incorruptible (δεινος), and subject to no pain. To prevent this flow in the defence of these people, Justinian means of conciliating the Monophysites, and, in 554, he published a decree defining their theory (Evagrius, Hist. Eccl., IV, 391). Eutychius resisted this decree, so on 22 January, 555, he was arrested in his church, and banished to a monastery at Chalcedon. Eight days later a synod was summoned to judge him. A ridiculous list of charges was brought against him; he used ointment, he ate deliciously, etc. (Eustathius, Vita S. Eutych., 4, 5). He was condemned, deposed, and sent to Prince's Island in Propontis. There he went to his old home at Amasea, where he stayed for twelve years. Joannes Scholasticius succeeded as Patriarch (John III, 566-577); and after his death, in 577, the Emperor Justin II (565-578) recalled Eutychius, who came back in October. At the end of his life Eutychius evolved a heretical opinion denying the resurrection of the body. St. Gregory the Great was then Apotheosis (legate) of the Roman See, at Constantinople. He argued about this question with the patriarch, quoting Luke, xxv, 39, with great effect, so that Eutychius, on his death-bed, made a full and orthodox profession of faith as to this point. St. Gregory tells the whole story in his "Exp. in Nov. Job" (Moralism lib. XIV, 56): Eutychius dying said: "I confess that we shall all rise again in this flesh" (See also Paul. Diacon.: Vita Greg. Mag. I, 9.) His extant works are his letter to Pope Vigilius (Migne, P. L., LXX, 53, P. G. LXXXVII, 2601), a fragment of a "St. Gregory's Letter to Constantine," (Mansi, X, 1054; Script. Vet. Nov. Coll. X, 623); and other fragments in P. G., LXXVII. His life was written by his disciple Eustathius, a priest of Constantinople. His feast is kept by the Byzantine Church on 6 April, and he is mentioned in our "Corpus Iuris" (Grat., I pars., D, 548).---EUTYCHIUS. Vita S. Eutychii in Acta SS., April, I, 550-573; EVAGRIUS, Hist. Eccl., IV, 37, 38; V, 16, 18; HEPFEL, Concin- cillation., II, 2, 582, etc. ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Eutychius, Melchite Patriarch of Alexandria, author of a history of the world, b. 876, at Fustat (Cairo); d. 11 May, 940. He was an Egyptian Arab, named Sa'id ibn Batriq; his father's name was BatrIQ (Patricius). He first studied medicine and history, and practised for a time as a physician. He then entered a monastery and eventually became Patriarch of Alexandria, taking the name Eutychius, being the Melchite Orthodox. He spent most of his reign in strife with the great majority of Egyptian Christians who were (Monophysite) Copts, and with his Coptic rival. His works (all written in Arabic and preserved only in part) are treatises on medicine, theology, and history. He wrote a compendium called "The Breviarium of the Council of Constantinople," treatises on fasting, Easter, and the Jewish Passover, various feasts, etc. also a "Discussion between a Christian and an Infidel," by which he means a Melchite and a Monophysite. But his most important work is "Nasn al-Gawahir" (Chaplet of Pearls), a chronicle of the history of the world from Adam to 938. The work is dedicated to his brother, Isa ibn Batriq, and is meant to supply a short account of universal history. In Latin it is quoted as "Eutychii Historia universalis", or as the "Annales" of Eutychius. The author states that he has compiled his history only from the Bible and from the civil authorities. He has, however, a great number of strange and improbable additions to Biblical and profane history not found in any other source. There are also in the "Chaplet of Pearls" many valuable details about the Monophysite controversy and the history of the Patriarchate of Alexandria. The book acquired a certain fame when, in the seventeenth century, John Selden published an excerpt of it (London, 1642, see below) in order to prove that originally at Alexandria there was no distinction between bishops and priests (a theory at one time adopted by St. Jerome; "In ep. ad Titum"), i.e., the ancient "Evagrius" al-Oawahir" (John Selden's excerpt contains an excerpt from the work of St. Ephrem, translated from Syriac; it was published in 1589 by a Maronite, Abraham Ecchellensis (Rome, 1661), who disputed the accuracy of his translation of the passages in question and proposed another. In the thirteenth century another Arabic historian, Al-Mākie (d. 1275), used Eutychius work for compiling his own history of the world to 1290 (Krumbacher, Byzantinische Litteratur, Munich, 1897, p. 365).

Evagrius, surnamed Ponticus, b. about 315, in Ibarra, a small town on the shores of the Black Sea; d. 399. He is numbered among the more important ascetical writers of the fourth century. Instructed by St. Gregory Nazianzen, he was ordained reader by St. Basel, the great and peace-loving St. Gregory Thaumaturges (380), whom he accompanied to the Second Council of Constantinople (381). According to Palladius, who differs in his account from Sozomen and Evagrius, Evagrius remained for a time as archdeacon in Constantinople, while Nectarios was patriarch (381-393). Leaving the city on account of its spiritual dangers, he went first to Jerusalem and then into the Nitrian Desert, where he began an eremitical life under the guidance of the younger Macarius (383). He steadfastly refused a bishopric offered by Theophilus of Alexandria, and became very celebrated as an ascetical life and writings, though St. Jerome (e.g. Ep. 133 ad Ctesiphonem, n. 3) charges him with Origenistic errors and calls him the precursor of Pelagius. The Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Ecumenical Councils condemn Evagrius together with Origen. Rufinus and Eusebius translated the works of Evagrius into Latin; several of them have been lost or have not thus far been recovered (P. L., XL). The best collections of his works are edited by Bigot (Paris, 1680); Galland, "Biblioth. vet. patr.," VII, 551-581; Migne, "P. G.," XI; cf. also Elter, "Gnomica" (Leipzig, 1862); Zeokler, "Evagrius Pontikus" (Munich, 1893). We may here name: "Monachus seu de vita activa"; "De oraculis sancti Hieronymi"; "Rerum itineraria rationes earumque juxta quinimum retrorsum"; "De orto vitiosarum cognitionibus."--Bardeenwer, Patrology, etc. (Stil. Louis, 1908), 271; A. J. Maas. 

Evangeliaria, liturgical books containing those portions of the Gospels which are read during Mass or in the public offices of the Church. The name does not date back earlier than the seventeenth century. The Greeks called such collections Εὐαγγελία, "Gospel", or Ἑυαγγελία τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, "Selections from the Gospel". The collection of readings from the Acts of the Apostles is known as Ἀποστόλος, "Apostle", or πράξεις Ἀποστόλων. In churches of the Latin Rite, the lessons from the Old Testament, the Epistles from the New Testament, and portions of the Gospels are usually grouped in the same book, under the name Comes, Liber comitii, Liber comicus (from comes, companion), or Lectionario. Separate Evangeliaria are seldom to be met with in Latin. Tables indicating passages to be read, as well as the Sundays and Holy Days on which they are to be read, are called the Capitulare, or the Collectio of Evangeliaria. The word is sometimes given to the Evangeliarum proper; they are also called "Synaxarium", and by the Latins are known as "Ceritalus". Although the word Evangeliarium is of recent origin, it has been universally adopted. The word Lectionario is employed, however, to denote either the collection from the Old and New Testaments, including the Gospels, or else the passages alone without the corresponding Gospels.

Origin and Use of Evangeliaria.—Following the custom of the Synagogue, the Scriptures of the Old Testament were read at the primitive Christian assemblies. According as the Canon of the New Testament was decided on, certain extracts from it were included in these readings. Justin tells us that in his day, when the Christians met together, they read the Memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets (Apol., I, lxvii). Tertullian, Cyprian, and other writers bear witness to the practice of this custom, and in fact the order of lector existed as early as the third century. The want of precise testimony we do not know how the particular passages were decided on. Most likely the presiding bishop chose them at the assembly itself; and it is obvious that on the occurrence of certain festivals the scripture relating to them would be read. Little by little a more or less definite list would naturally result from this method. St. John Chrysostom in a homily delivered at Antioch exhorts his hearers to read beforehand the Scripture passages to be read and commented on in the Office of the day (Homiliae de Lectori, 3, c. 1). In like manner others would form a table of readings. In the margin of the MS. text it was customary to note the Sunday or festival on which that particular passage would be read, and at the end of the manuscript, the list of such passages, the Synaxarium or Ceritalus, would be added. Transition from this process to the making of an Evangeliarium, or collection of all such passages, was easy. Gregory is of opinion that we possess fragments of Evangeliaria in Greek dating from the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, and that we have many from the ninth century onwards (according to Gregory Thaumaturges, c. 1072). But together with these, we find Lectionaries in the Latin Churches as early as the fifth century. The Comes of the Roman Church dates from before St. Gregory the Great (P. L., XXX, 487-532). From the tenth century onwards we find the Gospel lessons, together with the Epistles and prayers, united in a new liturgical book, called the Missal.

Evangeliarium and the Text of the New Testament.—Evangeliaria have very little importance for the critic of the Gospel text. At the time when the various Gospel passages began to be collected in book-form for use in liturgical reunions, the various families of the Gospel text and its transmission were already in existence; and those Evangeliaria simply reproduce the particular text favoured by the Church which compiled it. They have even exercised an unfortunate influence on the more recent MS. of the Gospels; certain additions of a liturgical nature (e. g. in illo tempore: discri Dominus) which were set at the beginning or end of a reading, have found their way into the text itself. But in the official text of the Vulgate, and in editions of the Greek text of to-day, owing to the labours of Tischendorf and of Westcott and Hort, these liturgical glosses are very rare. We notice one example in the Vulgate text: Matt. vii, 31 and 32. The Evangeliorum et Liturgiarum.—It is especially from a liturgical point of view that the study of Evangeliaria is interesting. The general method of Greek Evangeliaria is uniform. The first part contains the Gospels of the Sundays beginning with Easter; the
second part gives the Gospels for the festivals of the saints beginning with 1 September. In the Churches of the West the distribution of the Gospel pericopes was more divergent because of the various rites. And the ceremonial followed in the reading of the Gospel presents many differences of usage between one church and another, in which it would be too long to treat here.


The Evangeliaires may be mentioned the following: the portion of an Evangelarium from Siono (sixth century: in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris); the Evangelarium of Rossano (about 600) in Greek uncials; the Syrian codices of Rabula (580, at Florence) and Eschmidzin (miniatures of the sixth century); the Evangelical Family of Gregory I (at Cambridge) in Latin uncials; the Book of Kells (seventh to ninth century, at Dublin); the Book of Lindisfarne (eighth century, in the British Museum, London) of Irish workmanship; the Irish-Continental Evangelaria of St. Gall (about 800); the Carolingian Evangelarium of Codexcale (about 789, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris); the Ada Codex (eighth century, at Trier); the Evangelarium of Euchernach (tenth century, at Gota), and of the Abbess Uta (about 1002, at Munich). Valuable Evangeliaires were carefully treasured, and when used in the offices were placed on a strip of parchment or a strictly selected leaf of the binding was usually left plain, but the front cover was enriched with all the skill of the goldsmith. One of the most ancient bindings or covers we possess is that offered by Queen Theodelinda (600) to the cathedral of Monza. At times plaques of ivory, relined with gold and copper, were set into the binding, or, as in the earliest of them we are of Oriental or Italian origin, and bear painted figures of Christ or the Blessed Virgin, etc. A number of them, to be found in the countries along the Rhine and the Meuse and in Northern France (tenth and eleventh centuries), have the scene of the Crucifixion.

See general works on palaeography, archeology, iconography, the lesser arts, and monographs on the Evangeliaires especially: R. Remy, Geschichte der Evangeliaires im Mittelalter (Freiburg im Br., 1900).

Evangelical Alliance, The, an association of Protestants belonging to various denominations, founded in 1846, whose object, as declared in a resolution passed at the first meeting, is "to enable Christians to realize in themselves and to exhibit to others that a living and everlasting union binds all true believers into the fellowship of the Church." (Report of the Proceedings of the First General Conference). The points of belief, which the members accept as being the substance of the Gospel, are contained in a document adopted at the first conference and known as the Basis. They are nine in number:

1. The Divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures; 2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; 3. The unity of the Godhead and the Trinity of Persons therein; 4. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall; 5. The Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked; 6. The Divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. ... It being, however, distinctly declared that this brief summary is not to be received, in any formal or ecclesiastical sense, as a creed or confession, nor the adoption of it as involving an assumption of the right authoritative to define the limits of Christian brotherhood, but simply as an indication of the class of persons whom it is desirable to embrace within the Alliancé.
is also distinctly stated that no compromise of the views of any member, or sanction of those of others, on the points wherein they differ, is either required or expected; but that all are held free as to maintain and advocate their religious convictions, with due freedom and brotherly love at all times. It is not conceded that the Alliance should assume or aim at the character of a new ecclesiastical organization, claiming and exercising the functions of a Christian Church. Its simple and comprehensive object, it is strongly felt, may be successfully promoted without interfering with, or disturbing the order of, any branch of the Christian Church to which its members may respectively belong.

The Alliance thus lays claim to no doctrinal or legislative authority. In a pamphlet issued by the society itself this feature is thus explained: "Then it is an Alliance—not a union of Church organizations, much less an attempt to secure an outward uniformity—but the members of the Alliance are allies: they belong to different ecclesiastical bodies—yet all of the One Church. They are of different nations as well as of many denominations—yet all holding the Head, Christ Jesus. Unum corpus sumus in Christo. We are one body in Jesus Christ good for the common purpose of manifesting the real unity which underlies our great variety. We are free to hold our own views in regard to subsidiary matters, but all adhere to the cardinal principles of the Alliance as set forth in its Basis."

The Alliance arose at a time when the idea of unity was a popular one. During the years that had witnessed the beginning of the Oxford Movement in the Church of England, there progressed a movement in favour of union among men whose sympathies were diametrically opposed to those of the Tractarians, but who in their own way longed for a healing of the divisions and differences among Christians. In 1842 the Presbyterian Church of Scotland tried, though without success, to establish relations with other Protestant bodies. In England the progress of the Tractarian Movement led many distinguished Evangelical Non-conformists to desire a "great confederation of men of all Churches who were loyal in their attachment to Evangelical Protestantism in order to defend the faith of the Reformation" (Dale, History of Eng. Congregationalism, 637). At the annual assembly of the Congregational Union held in London, May 1842, John Angell James (1785–1859), minister of Craven Chapel, Birkbeck Street, London, proposed a plan which immediately developed into the Evangelical Alliance. He asked: "Is it not in the power of this Union to bring about by God's blessing, a Protestant Evangelical Union of the whole body of Christ's faithful followers who have at any rate adopted the voluntary principle?... Let us only carry out the principle of a great Protestant Union and we may yet have representatives from all bodies of Protestant Christians to be found within the circle of our own United Empire" (Congregational Magazine, 1842, 435-6). The first definite step towards this was taken by Mr. Patton, an American minister who proposed the sending of delegates from various bodies, with the result that a preliminary meeting was held at Liverpool in October, 1845, at which the basis of such a conference was arranged. On 19 Aug., 1846, at a meeting of eight hundred delegates, representing fifty denominations, held in the Freemasons' Hall, London, the Evangelical Alliance was founded. All who would accept the Basis were eligible as members, and the representatives of the various nations were recommended to form national organizations or branches, of which the British Organization, formed in 1846, was the first. The British Organization was independent and were at liberty to carry on their work in such a manner as should be most in accordance with the peculiar circumstances of each district. They have been formed in the United States, Germany, France, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Italy, Turkey, Australia, India, and several missionary countries. The French national branch abandoned the Basis in 1854 and substituted for it a wider form of a Unitarian character. The Alliance meets and acts as a whole only in the international and general conferences, which are held from time to time. The first of these was held in London, 1851, and has been succeeded by others as follows: Paris, 1855; Berlin, 1857; Geneva, 1861; Amsterdam, 1867; New York, 1873; Basle, 1879; Copenhagen, 1884; Florence, 1891; London, 1896 (Celebration of the Jubilee); London, 1907, on which occasion the Jubilee was observed.

These international conventions are regarded as of special value in the promotion of the aims of the Alliance. Another matter to which much importance is attached is the annual "Universal Week of Prayer", observed the first complete week in January of each year since 1846. At this time the Alliance invites all Christians to join in prayer, the programme being prepared by representatives of all denominations and printed in many different languages. The relief of persecuted Christians is another department of work in which the Alliance claims to have accomplished much. Finally, in 1865, the Alliance School was founded with headquarters at Berlin, under the direction of Pastor Kohler and Herr Warns, "to place before the students the history and doctrine of the Bible in accordance with its own teaching." The reports of the conferences claim considerable success, a claim which is best investigated. From its principles the Evangelical Alliance is necessarily opposed to the doctrine and authority of the Catholic Church; and Catholics, while sympathizing with the desire for union among Christians, realize that the unity by which we are made one in Christ is not to be won by such methods. The motto of the Alliance is Unum corpus sumus in Christo.

The Evangelical Alliance (London, 1847) and other reports of the International Conference of Congregationalists and Non-conformist religious bodies, as well as some pamphlets and tracts, are recommended.

Edwin Burton

Evangelical Church (in Prussia).—The sixteenth-century Reformers accused the Catholic Church of having adulterated the primitive purity of the Gospel by the addition of human ordinances and practices; consequently they designated themselves as "Evangelicals", or followers of the pure Gospel, in contradistinction to the un-evangelical followers of Roman traditions and institutions. Almost from the beginning the new Evangelical Church was split, first into two communions, the Lutheran and the Reformed, then into a multitude of sects which baffles the skill of statisticians. The cleavage arose through differences in the doctrine of Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist. Luther taught the actual bodily presence of Christ in and with the elements, while denying Transubstantiation. Zwingli and the Swiss Reformers admitted only His spiritual presence. The Lutheran and the Reformed Churches form the two great branches of Evangelical Protestantism to which all the other divisions of Protestants are subordinate. The evangelical section of the Anglican Church stands midway between the High Church and the Lutheran Low Church. As a proper name with strictly limited meaning the designation "Evangelical Church" applies to a branch of the Protestant Church in Germany, formed in 1817 at the instance of King Frederick William III of Prussia, by a union of the Lutherans and the Reformed Churches of one and the same state.

History.—At the beginning of the nineteenth century religious life in Germany was at a low ebb. The Rationalism and Illuminism of the eighteenth century, openly encouraged by King Frederick II (the Great), had told severely on the supernatural life of the coun-
try, especially among the Protestants. The “rights of man”, proclaimed and ruthlessly carried out by the French Revolutionists, had found a welcome beyond the Rhine and well nigh superseded the rights of God. Luther and Calvin, whilst casting off the authority of the Holy Bible, but that of the Bible, and their followers adhered to several “Confessions of Faith” as binding on their conscience. These formulae were now overthrown as inimical to the rights of free inquiry, as the work of men little versed in exegesis and history, as unscientific and un-Protestant. Religious life, thus deprived of its staff, was rapidly withering away. Indifference and indolent indifference obliterated the differences among Protestant communities and threatened for a time to sweep away Christianity itself.

The Prussian State, owing its origin, growth, and importance to Protestantism, was not sympathetic to its Catholic subjects. The Rhine Province, Westphalia, and the Polish provinces were ever ready to manifest their affection for the Catholic rulers of Austria and even of France. The House of Hohenzollern was Calvinist, the majority of the nation was Lutheran. Frederick William III, King of Prussia (1797-1840), undertook to strengthen his rule and his country by forming a united religion, armed with a powerful army, efficient schools, and a flourishing trade. As early as 1798 he had expressed the hope of uniting the Reformed and the Lutheran Churches by means of a common “Agenda”, or ritual. He matured the idea on his visit to England in 1811, and made the first attempt towards that object with a union and a visit to James’s Palace in London. It was proposed to celebrate in Germany the third centennial jubilee of the Reformation, and in anticipation of this festival he issued on 27 Sept., 1817, the memorable declaration that the royal wish was that the separate Lutheran and Reformed Confessions in his dominions should a union into one Evangelical Christian Church, and that he would set an example in his own congregation at Potsdam by joining in a united celebration of the Lord’s Supper at the approaching festival of the Reformation. It was the intention to fuse the Reformed Church into the Lutheran, or vice-versa, but to establish one Evangelical Church, quickened with the spirit of the Reformation. The epithet “Protestant” was avoided as too partisan; prominence was given to the vague term evangélist,” Lutherans and Calvinists, whilst maintaining their own specific dogma, and form a single church under a single government and to present a united front to the Catholic Church.

The execution of the royal plan was entrusted to the provincial consistory, synods, and clergy generally. The Synod of Berlin and nearly all the clergy and laity of Prussia responded cordially to the decree. External union, facilitated by the prevailing religious indifference, was adopted in Nassau and in the Rhineland Palatinate (1818), in Baden (1821), in Rhenish Hesse (1825), in Württemberg (1827). But Saxony, Hanover, and Bavaria proper were too exclusively Lutheran, while Switzerland was too exclusively Reformed to join the Evangelical Church, and the Austrian Protestants also divided their allegiance between the Helvetic and the Augsburg Confessions. Instead of the former two Protestant bodies in Germany, there were now three - the Reformed Church, the Lutheran, and the united Evangelical. The Reformed was the weakest in numbers; and in doctrine its sole distinctive tenet was the rejection of Luther’s teaching concerning the Eucharist. Neither was the Lutheran flourishing; true Lutheranism existed only in the piou aspirations of a few theologians, pastors, and laymen. A uniform confession and liturgy is but a loose mass, unworthy to be called a church. Frederick William, therefore, attempted to consolidate his Evangelical Church by giving it a common liturgy composed by himself with the assistance of the court chaplains and a pious layman. This “Agenda” was made obligatory by royal order for the royal chapel, the cathedral of Berlin, and for the army; its general adoption was only recommended. It met with determined opposition as a measure oppressive of evangelical freedom, antiquated, leaning to “Romanish” practices, unsettling men’s consciences. None the less, by 1826 it had been adopted by 5343 churches out of 7782. The Protestant bishops Eylert and Neunander in Berlin were in favour of it and of the measures taken to enforce it. In 1828-29 the “Agenda” was issued in a revised form and made binding on all Protestant churches, some concessions being granted to Silesia, Saxony, Pomerania, and other parts of the kingdom, in deference to provincial uses. The Lutherans, fearing the loss of their confessional status, offered increased resistance. But the king was inexorable. Dr. Scheibl, professor in Breslau, and others of the Lutheran clergy who had refused to accept the new liturgy, were suspended from their offices. For several years a fierce persecution raged against the “Old Lutherans”, especially in Silesia and the Grand Duchy of Pozen. Preacher Hahn headed the troops which were sent to subdue the recusant vilagers by seizure of their goods, imprisonment, and all manner of violence. Minister Curschmann justified these measures on the principle that it was the Government’s duty to protect these blind sectarians against the consequences of their own folly. Thousands of the recusants were driven to emigrate to America and Australia. Not a voice was raised in their defence; the whole Liberal party lauded the energy of the Government. By a royal decree of 28 Feb., 1834, all Lutheran worship was declared illegal.

Frederick William III ruled his Church as summus episcopus, as a pope without a fixed deposit of faith to guard, or a hierarchy Divinely ordained to co-operate with him. The result was arbitrary in the rule, disorganization in the ruled. The king’s first royal decrees aimed at the conciliation of religion with the prevailing rationalistic philosophy, but the misfortunes of the year 1836 and the death of his beloved consort turned his mind more and more to the religion of revelation and mysteries. Considering himself the protector and leader of the Church in Germany he endeavoured to raise it from degradation by forcing unity upon it with a strong hand; unity not in dogma, for he disliked theologians “who pretend to be more Christian than Christ,” but in liturgy, wherein his sincere piety found sufficient satisfaction. In 1831 he surprised Superintendent Eylert with an essay on the power of the keys and the binding and loosing power in the Church; it contained an attempt to reintroduce auricular confession and the old old discipline. All his efforts, however, only ended in greater division. At his death, in 1840, the Church of his creation was still a chaos of warring sects, irresponsible to the brooding of the royal mind and restive to the royal arm.

Frederick William IV immediately set free the imprisoned Lutheran clergy and allowed the formation of separate congregations. The Old Lutherans now founded a “separate Lutheran Church” at Breslau under the direction of the lawyer Huschke. By the general concession of 1845 they were recognized as Dissenters with legal status but without pecuniary support from the State. The new sect was, however, wanting in union and cohesion; Diederich opposed Huschke and the Oberkirchecommissariat (supreme ecclesiastical council); frictions among members were of frequent occurrence. But few of the latter had left the established Evangelical Church to join the Old Lutherans; the majority remained at their posts for various reasons: within the Union they had a better opportunity for working its destruction than without; they were unwilling to sacrifice their incomes from the State and consequent independence from the financial support of their pa-
Theical part abandoned the revivalers of the doctrine by forming a Lutheran union. Theologically teaching in schools and preaching, although starting from the same roots, diverged in 1846. On the one side there were the partisans of a maior medius, endeavouring to find the golden mean between the Lutheran Confession of Faith and the Rationalism of the period. On the other side stood the Neo-Lutherans, who resisted the Lutheran doctrine of justification but rejected his invisible Church and universal priesthood; they defended a Divinely ordained hierarchy, and their teaching on sacrifice, orders, and sacraments nearly approached the Roman. This current runs parallel with Positivism in England; Hengstenberg (1814-1886) was its main support.

The General Synod of Berlin (2 June-29 Aug., 1846) had given rise to great hopes for the consolidation of the Union. It was resolved that the National Evangelical Church should have no other basis than the "consensus"; that the parish councils (Generalversammlung) and consistorial boards be the supreme centres of doctrine. The King of Prussia, in his "Kirchenzeitung," branded the synod as a Robber Synod, a denial of Christ; its decrees were not to be executed, because they failed to give expression to the "general Protestant consciousness." The consistory was reserved to increase existing dissensions. The most vital questions divided the leading minds: What was the territorial ruler by right the minnuss episcopus within his territory? Was it advisable to impose an evangelical church discipline, and if so, which? What part was to be conceded to laymen in the ministry of the Word of the sacraments? The very start of the controversy turned some practical men from words to works: the "Inner Mission" was originated (1848) by Wicheren, the founder of the Hamburg Boxhagen Institute, who had been a Roman Catholic priest, and who now established an institution which covers almost the whole field of Christian charity.

The preacher Friedner (d. 1861) instituted the order of Protestant deaconsesses, an imitation of the Catholic Sisters of Charity in the main objects of their life. Court preacher Zimmermann of Darmstadt founded the Gustav-Adolfs-Verein (1841-2), a union whose purpose was to support the evangelical missions in outlying districts (the Diakonie). The secondary object being to bind together all Protestants regardless of denominational differences, and to oppose a solid bulwark to the encroachments of Catholicism. The secondary object caused a split in the Union.

The short-lived movement of the "Protestant Friends," or "Free Light," was started in opposition to pietistic orthodoxies, and was also unfettered in teaching. Article 3 of the programme which they issued from the Moravian settlement at Gnadenau, in 1841, runs: "We hold it to be our right and our duty to submit to the test of our reason whatever is said or written." Ulrich, the man who had the gift of popular preaching, and Pastor Wisslicenus, a downright Rationalist, were the soul of this movement. The Berlin magistrates presented to King Frederick William IV an address conceived in the spirit of the Protestant Friends. They recommended him to grant the Church a free constitution in keeping with the needs of the time, and freedom of teaching limited only by public morality and the safety of the State. The king in person received his theological municipality, who paraded in fourteen state coaches before the royal castle. His piety was offended by the pretensions of the town councillors; in language not over gracious he told them to mind their own business. This happened 22 August, 1845; it marks the end of the Protestant Friends but also the beginning of the "Free Communities" (Freie Gemeinden). As formerly the right wing of the Church of Prussia continued to form Neo-Lutheran communities, so now the left wing withdrew to form dissenting rationalistic congregations. Their meetings were prohibited, but Rupp, Ulrich, and Wisslicenus resisted until by royal decree of 30 March, 1847, the new dissenters were allowed to separate from the Established Church without the loss of their civil rights; yet not without many vexatious formalities and expenses. The Free Communities, wanting internal cohesion to resist the royal disfavour and the ceaseless assaults of the dominant pietist clique, came to a speedy end.

The wave of liberal aspirations which rolled over Europe in 1848 left its mark on the Churches in Prussia. Paragraph 15 of the new Constitution read: "The Evangelical, and the Roman Catholic Church, and every other religious Society, orders and manages its own affairs independently (selbsstbeständig)." The Catholics had the benefit of this law until the beginning of the Kulturkampf, but among the Protestants, the ruling orthodox pietists, led by Hengstenberg, were determined that no freedom should be given to any other party. They evaded the law by a new theory, viz. the king, being the princeps principium ecclesiae, i.e. the chief member of the Church, rules it in his inherent right without any law. He made in fact Par. 15 makes the territorial lord quite independent of all State interference with his management of his own Church. The king himself did not favour this extraordinary doctrine. "Do I look like a bishop?" he said, pointing to his uniform and spurs. His ideal
was “the small independent Christian community managing its own affairs in the spirit of the universal Church” as in the days of the Apostles. The ideal of his minister von Raumer and of Hengstenberg was to train Prussian Unterkapenverein, i.e. a mentality fit for people under strict authority: believe in Luther, obey the ministers and ask no questions. The alliance of politics, Lutheran orthodoxy and pietism, royal cabinet-orders and counter-orders, general unsettledness and discontent, and five authorized churches instead of one—such was the result of the Union of 1817 in the fourth decade of its existence. Many attempts at a reform were done and the general revolution was made on the basis of practical charity, federation, opposition to Catholicism; church conferences were held in Berlin, Wittenberg, Eisenach, and elsewhere; the Gustav-Adolf-Verein and the Inner Mission were founded; the English Evangelical Alliance was invited to Berlin (1857). The result was greater discord and disruption.

William I, who as Regent, King of Prussia, and German Emperor reigned from 1858 to 1888, was an honest, single-minded, and industrious ruler. He had little sympathy with the Constitution and none at all with Hengstenberg’s agitation for enforcing Lutheran orthodoxy. He maintained the Constitution as the law of the land. But of the orthodox party he said in an address to his newly constituted ministry: “...in both Churches [Catholic and Protestant] all endeavours to make religion a cloak for politics must be strenuously opposed. In the Evangelical Church—we cannot deny—it an orthodoxy has found a footing which is in contradiction with the fundamental idea of the Union, and which has hypocrites in its train. That orthodoxy has impeded the work of the Union, has almost wrecked it. Now it is my will that the Union be maintained intact.”

Until 1866, however little was done to carry out William’s programme. It was impossible and unavoidable to dismiss all the clerical office-bearers and professors appointed for their opinions during the last eighteen years. The new minister of worship, von Muehler, was dominated by Queen Augusta, a highly educated woman devoted to orthodoxy, who suggested candidates for higher positions and insisted on their appointment (Hase, Neue Kirchengesch., 305). By her stood Hengstenberg and Hoffman, a fanatic Swabian. Together they worked for the preservation of the old regime. The Liberal party meanwhile found a common centre and a driving force in the Evangelical Church. The Protestant Union was founded in 1863 at Frankfurt-on-the-Main with the object of defeating both Protestant and Catholic orthodoxy. It spread at first but slowly, as it found little support among the still faithful masses and met with open hostility among the ruling classes. In 1896 it numbered 27,000 members.

After the war with Austria (1866) the acquisition of new territories laid upon William I the task of again regulating the religious situation of his kingdom. The Hengstenberg party proposed a measure which would have dealt a death-blow to the Union, viz. to divide the Supreme Church Council into three senates: a Lutheran, a Reformed, and a United, each with circumscribed territorial jurisdiction. But the Supreme Council refused to take this step and persuaded the King to leave to the new provinces their existing church constitutions as long as they chose to maintain them. This was done. To a deputation from the Hanover Consistory William I expressed his conviction that “the Evangelical Union was best furthered by free and unprejudiced hearts working towards unity in charity. The slight difficulties which arose locally, e.g. in Hesse, were probably due as much to faulty political as religious sentiment. The political unity of Germany achieved through the Franco-German War (1870–71) naturally aroused a strong desire for religious unity in the new empire. Bismarck started the Kulturkampf to bring the Catholics into line with the Protestant majority, but had to acknowledge himself vanquished in 1886. For the unification of the Protestants in the empire only one way was open: to abolish legal pressure and to allow the various religious bodies to work out their own salvation in their own way. The emperor, however, was loath to disturb them. Prussian and Catholic bishops and the head of the whole organization stands the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council (Oberkirchenrat) in Berlin, consisting of twelve regular members, one ecclesiastical vice-president, and a lay president. Under this council are eight provincial consistories, Königberg, Berlin, Stuttgart, Breslau, Posen, Magdeburg, Münster, and Colbenz; and under them the superintendents numbering 415. In the Evangelical State Church the two types of Protestantism are united; no distinction is made between Lutheran and Reformed either in the theological faculties or in the seminaries. Luther’s Bible is the only Bible in common use; the churches and the schools have no denominational character. The emperor, or as King of Prussia, is summus episcopus, which, however, is a title rather than an office. In matters of faith the royal pronouncements neither claim, nor are they credited with, infallibility; and matters of administration are left to the councils and the diocesan estates.

The doctrinal status of the United Evangelical Church in Germany may be fitly described as Modernism in the sense of the Encyclical “Pascendi”. The simple country folk, who practise more than they think, still follow the religion of older generations, but the towns are either openly or secretly hostile to all supernatural religion. Owing to the principle sanctioned in 1648 “that all the subjects must follow the religion of their ruler” the population, from a religious point of view, is less mixed in Germany than in England or America. Numerically, the two confessions are in the same proportion as they were 300 years ago: two Catholics to one Catholic. Conversions from one religion to the other almost balance with a slight excess in favour of Protestantism. This is entirely due to mixed marriages and temporal allurements. The efforts of proselytism as the Gustav-Adolf-Verein, the Protestant and the Evangelical Unions, show but poor results. Statistics from the census of 1900 are as follows: Evangelical Church in Prussia: 8,558 parishes with 17,246 churches, etc., 10,071 clergy, and 21,517,577 adherents against 12,110,229 Catholics, which gives the proportion of 5 Catholics to 9 Protestants. For the whole German Empire the proportion is 7 Catholics to 12 Protestants, i.e. 20,321,411 to 35,231,104.


J. WILHELM.

**Evangelical Counsels.** See **Counsellors, Evangelical**.

**Evangelist.**—In the New Testament this word, in its substantive form, occurs only three times: Acts, xxxii, 8; Eph., iv, 11; II Tim., iv, 5. It seems to indicate not so much an order in the early ecclesiastical hierarchy as a function. The Apostles, indeed, were evangelists, inasmuch as they preached the Gospel (Acts, viii, 5; xii, 17; Philip likewise was both a deacon (Acts, vi, 5) and an evangelist (Acts, viii, 5–40; xxi, 8). In like manner was St. Timothy exorted by St. Paul to do the work of an evangelist (II Tim., iv, 5).
EVE

The first account of the creation (Gen. i, "P") sets forth the creation of mankind in general, and states simply that they were created male and female. The second narrative (Gen. ii, "J") is more explicit and detailed. God is represented as forming an individual man from the slime of the earth, and breathing into his nostrils the breath of life. In like manner the creation of the first woman and her relation to man is described with picturesque and significant imagery. In this account, in which the plants and animals appear on the scene only after the creation of man, the loneliness of the latter (Gen. ii, 18), and his failure to find a suitable companion among the animals (Gen. ii, 20), are set forth as the reason why God determines to create for man a companion like unto himself. He causes a deep sleep to fall upon him, and taking one of his ribs, forms it into a woman, who, when she is brought to him, is recognized at once as bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. A discussion of the arguments in favor of the historical, or the more or less allegorical character of this narrative would be beyond the scope of the present notice. Suffice it to say that the biblical account has always been looked upon by pious commentators as embodying, besides the fact of man's origin, a deep, practical and many-sided significance, bearing on the mutual relationship established between the sexes by the Creator. Thus, the primitive institution of monogamy is implied in the fact that one woman is created for one man. Eve, as well as Adam, is made the object of a special creative act, a circumstance which indicates her natural equality with him, while on the other hand her being taken from his side implies not only her second-order role in the conjugal state (I Cor. xi, 9), but also emphasizes the intimate union between husband and wife, and the dependence of the latter on the former.

"Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh."

The innocence of the newly created couple is clearly implied in the following verses. After the fall, God immediately proceeds to relate how they soon acquired, through actual transgression, the knowledge of good and evil, and with it the sense of shame which had been previously unknown to them. In the story of the Fall, the original cause of evil is the serpent,
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which in later Jewish tradition is identified with Satan (Wisdom, ii, 24). He tempts Eve presumably as the weaker of the two, and she in turn tempts Adam, who yields to her seduction. Immediately their eyes are opened, but in an unexpected manner. Shame and remorse take possession of them, and they seek to hide from the face of the Lord.

For her share in the transgression, Eve (and woman-kind after her) is sentenced to a life of sorrow and travail, and to be under the power of her husband. Doubtless this last did not imply that the woman’s essential condition of equality with man was altered, but the sentence expresses what, in the nature of things, was bound to follow in a world dominated by sin and its consequences. The natural dependence and subjection of the weaker party was destined inevitably to become something little short of slavery. But if woman was the occasion of man’s transgression and fall, it was also decreed in the Divine counsels, that she was to be instrumental in the scheme of restoration which God already promises while in the act of pronouncing sentence upon the serpent. The woman has suffered defeat, and infinitely painful are its consequences, but henceforth there will be enmity between her and the serpent, between her seed and his seed, until through the latter in the person of the future Redeemer, who will crush the serpent’s head, she will again be victorious.

Of the subsequent history of Eve the Bible gives little information. In Gen., iv, 1, we read that she bore a son whom she named Cain, because she got him (נָתַן—to acquire, possess) through God—this at least is the most plausible interpretation of this obscure passage. Later she gave birth to Abel, and the narrative does not record the birth of another child until after the slaying of Abel by his elder brother, when she bore him a son and called his name Seth; saying: “God hath given me [הָיָה]—put or appoint another seed, for Abel whom Cain slew.” Of daughters no specific mention is made in this account, but in Gen., v, 4 (“P”) we find the general statement that “the days of Adam, after he begot Seth, were eight hundred years: and he begot sons and daughters.”

Eve is mentioned in the Book of Tobias (viii, 8; Sept., viii, 6) where it is simply affirmed that she was given to Adam for a helper; in II Cor., xi, 3, where reference is made to her seduction by the serpent, and in I Tim., ii, 13, where the Apostle enjoins submission and obedience of women. In the apocryphal story of “Adam and Eve” first formed; then Eve. And Adam was not seduced, but the woman being seduced, was in the transgression.”

As in the case of the other Old Testament personages, many rabbinical legends have been connected with the name of Eve. They may be found in the “Jewish Encyclopedia,” s. v. (see also, Adam), and in Vouzouros, “Dictionnaire de la Bible,” I, art. “Adam.” They are, for the most part, puerile and fantastic, and devoid of historical value, unless in so far as they serve to illustrate the mentality of the later ages, their writers, and the unreliability of the “traditions” derived from such sources, though they are sometimes appealed to in critical discussions.


JAMES F. DRISCOLL

Eve of a Feast (or Vigil; Lat. Vigilia; Gr. παρακλήσις).—In the first ages, during the night before a holy feast, a ceremony of the faithful assembled in the place or church where the feast was to be celebrated and prepared themselves by prayers, readings from Holy Writ (now the Offices of Vespers and Matins), and sometimes also by hearing a sermon. On such occasions, as on fast days in general, Mass also was celebrated in the evening, before the Vespers of the following day. Towards morning the people dispersed to the streets and houses near the church, to wait for the solemn services of the forenoon. This vigil was a regular institution of Christian life and was defended and highly recommended by Augustine and St. Jerome (see Pfélieux, Aelterge Heilige des Breviergetes, pp. 223 sq.). The morning intermission gave rise to grave abuses; the people caroused and danced in the streets and halls around the church (Durandus, “Rat. Div. off.,” VI, 7). St. Jerome speaks of these improprieties (Epist. ad Riparium).

As the feasts multiplied, the number of vigils was greatly reduced. But the abuses could be stopped only by abolishing the vigils. And where they could not be abrogated at once and entirely they were to begin in the afternoon. A synod held at Rouen in 1231 prohibited all vigils except those before the patronal feast of a church (Hefele, “Concilien des ecclésiastiques,” V, 1007). In place of nocturnal observances, the bishops introduced for the laity a fast on the day before the feast, which fast Durandus (loc. cit.) calls “jejunium dispensations.” Honorus of Auxerre, in 1152 (Gemma Animae, III, 6), and others explain in this way the Libri, which existed, however, after the abolition of the nocturnal meetings. The fast on Christmas Eve is mentioned by Theophilus of Alexandria (d. 412), that before the Epiphany by St. John Chrysostom (d. 407), that before Pentecost by the Sacrament of St. Leo I. Pope Nicholas, in the Liber Pontificalis, answers to the Bulgarians, of the fast on the eves of Christmas and of the Assumption. The Synod of Erfurt (932) connects a fast with every vigil. The very fact that the people were not permitted to eat or drink before the services of the vigil (Vespers and Matins) were ended, after the vigil was celebrated, explains the exceptions of which the councils and writers speak.

The Synod of Seligenstadt (1022) mentions vigils on the eves of Christmas, Epiphany, the feasts of the Apostles, the Assumption of Mary, St. Laurence, and All Saints, besides the fast of two weeks before the Nativity of St. John. After the eleventh century the fast, Office, and Mass of the nocturnal vigil were transferred to the day before the feast; and even now the liturgy of Holy Saturday (vigil of Easter) shows, in all its parts, that originally it was not kept on the morning of Saturday, but during Easter Night. The day before the feast was henceforward called a similar celebration before the high feasts exists also in the Orthodox (Greek) Church, and is called πανοικία or Νυκτονια. In the Occident only the older feasts have vigils; even the feasts of the first class introduced after the thirteenth century (Corpus Christi, the Sacred Heart) have no vigils, except the Immaculate Conception, which Pope Leo XIII (30 Nov. 1879) singled out for this distinction. The number of vigils in the Roman Calendar besides Holy Saturday is seventeen, viz., the eves of Christmas, the Epiphany, the Ascension, Pentecost, the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption, the eight feasts of the Apostles, St. John the Baptist, St. Laurence, and All Saints. Some dioceses and religious orders have particular vigils, e. g. the Servites, on the Saturday next before the feast of the Seven Dolors of Our Lady; the Carmelites, on the eve of the feast of Mount Carmel. In the United States only four of these vigils are fast days: the vigils of Christmas, Pentecost, the Assumption, and All Saints. The vigils of Christmas, the Epiphany, and Pentecost are called vigiliae majores; they have a proper Office (semi-double), and the vigil of Christmas is kept as a double feast. The rest are vigiliae minores, or communes, and have the ferial office. On the occasion of the reform of the Brevalary, in 1568, a homily on the Gospel of the vigil was added, an innovation not accepted by the Cistercians. If a vigil falls on a Sunday, according to the present rubrics, it is kept on the preceding Saturday; during the Middle
Evesham Abbey, founded by St. Egwin, third Bishop of Worcester, about 701, in Worcestershire, England, and dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. The founder’s charter of endowment, dated 714, records that a herdsman of the bishop, named Evoes, was one day favoured with a vision of Our Lady. St. Egwin, being informed, visited the spot and there the Mother of God appeared to him also, commanding him to erect in that place a monastery in her honour for Benedictine monks. The bishop at once set about the task, being liberally assisted in the work by Ethelred and Kenred, successive kings of Mercia, and others. The derivation of the name Evesham is accounted for by the above legend. It is stated, though contemporary charters make the fact doubtful, that St. Egwin resigned his see in order to become first abbot of the new foundation, which he ruled until his death in 717. He was buried in the abbey church and his shrine, beautified by subsequent abbots, became in after years one of the richest and most popular in the West of England. Many miracles are recorded as having taken place there. In 941, after the havoc wrought by the Danes, the few remaining monks who had survived were ejected and secular canons installed in their place. Their possession of the abbey, however, did not last long, for in 969 St. Dunstan and St. Ethelwold, then engaged upon their great reform of the English monasteries, restored the Benedictines to their own. A second expulsion occurred in 977 and it was not until 1014 that the monks effected their final return. With the Norman conquest and the consolidation of the kingdom of England, Evesham grew and prospered, and enjoying royal favour became one of the most important abbeys of Black Monks in the country, so much so, indeed, that the jealousy of the bishops of Worcester was aroused.

As in the case of many other monasteries they claimed rights of visitation and diocesan authority over the monks. The dispute continued for a long time, but eventually the exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, originally obtained by St. Egwin, was confirmed by Rome in 1296. In this as in other matters, the internal history of the abbey is recorded in the “Evesham Chronicle”, differs only in detail from that of any other great Benedictine house of the same period. A succession of worthy abbots, seldom broken, guided its fortunes wisely and religiously through the eight centuries of its existence. The use of abbatial pontificalia was obtained in 1160 by Abbess Adam from the reigning pope. At the height of its prosperity the abbey was one of the largest and most stately in England. It had two dependent “cells”—Penwortham, in Lancashire, and Aleseter, in Warwickshire—besides another in Denmark; the abbots were also the patrons of seventeen neighbouring parishes; they held a seat in the House of Lords; and they exercised civil jurisdiction within the bounds of the monastic territory. The great abbey church, which, besides the magnificent shrine of St. Egwin, contained fifteen altars, was commenced in the eleventh century by Abbot Walter and gradually completed by several subsequent abbots. It was cruciform, with a central tower, and was nearly 300 feet in length. The previous campaign having fallen, after being struck by lightning, a magnificent bell tower, still standing, was built by Abbot Clement Lichfield about 1533.

Within the abbey precincts and under the very shadow of its minster, were two parish churches, erected by the monks for the use of the people of the town which had grown up around its walls. That of St. Lawrence dates from the thirteenth century and that of All Saints is of a century later. The last of the great abbots of Evesham, Clement Lichfield, who reigned from 1514 to 1539, added chantries to both of these churches. Unwilling to yield to the rapacity of Henry VIII, when the suppression of the monasteries was threatening, he resigned his abbacy, acting, it is said, at Cromwell’s suggestion. His unworthy successor was Philip Hawford, who surrendered the abbey for £3,240, and afterwards became first Protestant Dean of Worcester, in which cathedral his tomb may still be seen. The revenues of the abbey at the time of its suppression are given by Dugdale as £1,215. The demolition of the buildings commenced almost immediately, and the ruins became, as in the case of so many others, a stone quarry for the neighbourhood. Besides the two parish churches and the bell tower, only a gateway, a cloister arch, the almonry, and a few other isolated fragments remain intact to show what man-
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ner of building the once glorious abbey of Evesham was.

TANNEQ, Nettia Mongeius (London, 1794); DUGDALE, Monasticon Anglicanum (London, 1817-30); Chronicon Abbatis de Evesham in Rolla Series, MACKAY ed. (London, 1863); TINDAL, History and Antiquities of Evesham (Evesham, 1794); MURDOCH, history of Evesham (Evesham, 1745); G. CYPRIAN ALSTON. Nuns of Stanbrook, St. Egwin and his Abbey of Evesham (London, 1904).

EVIL

Evil, in a large sense, may be described as the sum of the opposition, which experience shows to exist in the universe, to the desires and needs of individuals; when one considers among human beings at least, the suffering in which life abounds. Thus evil, from the point of view of human welfare, is what ought not to exist. Nevertheless, there is no department of human life in which its presence is not felt; and the discrepancy between what is and what ought to be has always called for explanation in the account which mankind has sought to give of itself and its surroundings.

For this purpose it is necessary (1) to define the precise nature of the principle that imparts the character of evil to so great a variety of circumstances, and (2) to ascertain, as far as may be possible, the source for its power.

With regard to the nature of evil, it should be observed that evil is of three kinds—physical, moral, and metaphysical. Physical evil includes all that causes harm to man, whether by bodily injury, by thwarting his natural desires, or by preventing the full development of his powers, either in the order of nature directly, or through the various social conditions under which mankind naturally exists. Physical evils directly due to nature are sickness, accident, death, etc. Poverty, oppression, and some forms of disease are instances of evil arising from imperfect social organization. Evil suffering, suppression, disappointment, and remorse, and the limitation of intelligence which prevents human beings from attaining to the full comprehension of their environment, are congenital forms of evil which vary in character and degree according to natural disposition and social circumstances.

By moral evil are understood the deviation of human volition from the prescriptions of the moral order and the action which results from that deviation. Such action, when it proceeds solely from ignorance, is not to be classed as moral evil, which is properly restricted to the motions of thought from which the conscience disapproves. The extent of moral evil is not limited to the circumstances of life in the natural order, but includes also the sphere of religion, by which man’s welfare is affected in the supernatural order, and the precepts of which, as depending ultimately upon the will of God, are of the strictest possible obligation (see Sin).

The obligation to moral action in the natural order is, moreover, generally believed to depend on the motives supplied by religion; and it is at least doubtful whether it is possible for moral obligation to exist at all apart from a supernatural sanction.

Metaphysical evil is the limitation by one another of the various component parts of the natural world. Through this mutual limitation natural objects are for the most part prevented from attaining to their full or ideal perfection, whether by the constant pressure of physical conditions, or by sudden catastrophes. Thus, animal and vegetable organisms are variously influenced by climate and other natural causes; predatory animals depend for their existence on the destruction of life; nature is subject to storms and convulsions, and its order depends on a system of reproduction and renewal due to the interaction of its constituent parts. It is evident that metaphysical evil does not, like the other two kinds, necessarily connote suffering. If animal suffering is excluded, no pain of any kind is caused by the inevitable limita-
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tions of nature; and they can only be called evil by analogy, and in a sense quite different from that in which the term is applied to human experience. Clarke, moreover, has aptly remarked (Correspondence with Leibnitz, letter ii) that the apparent disorder of nature is really no disorder, since it is part of a definite scheme, and precisely fulfills the intention of the creator; it may therefore be counted as a relative perfection rather than an imperfection. It is, in fact, only by a transference to irrational objects of the subjective ideals and aspirations of human intelligence, that the “evil of nature” can be called evil in any sense and in any degree. The nature and degree of pain in the lower animals is very obscure, and in the necessary absence of data it is difficult to say whether it should rightly be classed with the merely formal evil which belongs to inanimate objects, or with the suffering of human beings. The latter is generally held in ancient times, and may perhaps be referred to the anthropomorphic tendency of primitive minds which appears in the doctrine of metempsychosis. Thus it has often been supposed that animal suffering, together with many of the imperfections of animate nature, was due to the fall of man, with whose welfare, as the prime chief part of the universe, it is bound up the fortunes of the rest (see Theop. Antioc., Ad Autolyc., II; cf. Gen. iii, and I Cor. ix). The opposite view is taken by St. Thomas (I, Q. xxvi, a. I, 2). Descartes supposed that animals were merely machines, without sensation or consciousness; he was therefore followed by Malebranche and Clarke generally. Leibniz grants sensation to animals, but considers that mere sense-perception, unaccompanied by reflexion, cannot cause either pain or pleasure; in any case he holds the pain and pleasure of animals to be far less acute than those of human beings, and capable in degree to those resulting from reflex action in man (see also Maher, Psychology, Supp. 3. A., London, 1903).

It is evident again that all evil is essentially negative and not positive; i.e. it consists not in the acquisition of anything, but in the loss or deprivation of something necessary for perfection. Pain, which is the test or criterion of physical evil, has indeed a positive, though purely subjective existence as a sensation or emotion; but its evil quality lies in its disturbing effect on the sufferer. In like manner, the perverse action of the will, upon which moral evil depends, is more than a mere negation of right action, implying as it does the positive element of choice; but the morally evil character of wrong action is constituted not by the element of choice, but by its rejection of what right reason requires. Thus Origen (In Joh., ii, 7) defines evil as ἀρέτας; the Pseudo-Dionysius (De. Div. Nom. iv) as the non-existent; Maimonides (Dux, plex, 3. iii, 10) as “privato boni aleiquest”; Albertus Magnus (adopting St. Augustine’s phrase) attributes evil to “alia causa deficiens” (Summa Theol., I, xi, 4); Schopenhauer, who held pain to be the positive and normal condition of life (pleasure being its partial and temporary absence), nevertheless made it depend upon the failure of human desire to obtain fulfillment — the wish is in itself pain —. Thus it will be seen that evil is not a real entity; it is relative. What is evil in some relations may be good in others; and there is no form of existence which is exclusively evil in all relations. Hence it has been thought that evil cannot truly be said to exist at all, and is really nothing but a “lesser good.” But this opinion seems to leave out of account the reality of human experience. Though the mere cause may give pain to the suffering, and pleasure to another, pain and pleasure, as sensations or ideas, cannot be mutually exclusive. No one, however, has attempted to deny this very obvious fact; and the opinion in question may perhaps be understood as merely a paradoxical way of stating the relativity of evil.
There is practically a general agreement of authorities as to the nature of evil, some allowance being made for varying modes of expression depending on a corresponding variety of philosophical presuppositions. But on the question of the origin of evil there has been a considerable diversity of opinion. The problem is strictly a metaphysical one; i.e., it cannot be solved by a mere experimental analysis of the actual conditions from which evil results. The question, which Schopenhauer has called "the pune-tum pruriens of metaphysics," is concerned not so much with the various detailed manifestations of evil in nature, as with the hidden and underlying cause which has made these manifestations possible or necessary; and it is at once evident that enquiry in a region so obscure must be attended with great difficulty, and that the conclusions reached must, for the most part, be of a provisional and tentative character. No systematic philosophy has ever succeeded in escaping from the obscurity in which the subject is involved; but it is not too much to say that the Christian solution offers, on the whole, fewer difficulties, and approaches more nearly to completeness than any other. The question may be stated to the following effect: Admitting that evil consists in a certain relation of man to his environment, or that it arises in the relation of the component parts of the totality of existence to one another, how comes it that though all are alike the results of a universal cosmic process, this universal agency is perpetually at work; or, by what means? Is evil due only to a deficiency, or is it a principle, which is itself, interacting into itself, developing its own efforts in the mutual hostility of its progeny? Further, admitting that metaphysical evil in itself may be merely nature's method, involving nothing more than a continual redistribution of the material elements of the universe, human suffering and wrongdoing will stand out as essentially opposed to the general scheme of natural development, and are scarcely to be reconciled in thought with any conception of unity or harmony in nature. To what, then, is the evil of human life, physical and moral, to be attributed as its cause? But when the universe is considered as the work of an all-benevolent and all-powerful Creator, a fresh element is added to the problem. If God is all-benevolent, why did He cause or permit suffering? If He is all-powerful, He can be under no necessity of creating or permitting it; and on the other hand, if He is under any such necessity, He cannot be all-powerful. Again, if God is both all-powerful and also omnipotent, how can He permit the existence of moral evil? We have to enquire, that is to say, how evil has come to exist, and what is its special relation to the Creator of the universe.

The solution of the problem has been attempted by three different methods.

I. It has been contended that existence is fundamentally evil; that evil is the active principle of the universe, and good no more than an illusion, the pursuit of which serves to induce the human race to perpetuate its own existence (see Pessimism). This is the fundamental tenet of Buddhism (q.v.), which regards happiness as unattainable, and holds that there is no way of escaping from misery by ceasing to exist otherwise than in the impersonal state of Nirvana. The origin of suffering, according to Buddha, is inherent in the nature of this world; its cause was partly the necessary imperfection of material and created existence, and partly the action of the human will (Timæus, xlii; cf. Phadoc, ix). With Aristotle, evil is a necessary aspect of the constant change of matter, and has in itself no real existence (Metaph., ix, 9). The Stoics conceived evil in a somewhat similar manner, as due to necessity; the immanent Divine power harmonizes the evil and good in a changing world. Moral evil proceeds from the folly of mankind, not from the Divine will, and is overruled by it to a good end. In the hymn of Cleanthes to Zeus (Stat. Exp., I, p. 30) may be perceived an approach to the doctrine of Leibniz, as to the nature of evil and goodness of the world. "Nothing is done without thee in earth or sea or sky, save what evil men commit by their own folly; so thou hast fitted together all evil and good in one, that there might be one
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reasonable and everlasting scheme of all things." In the mystical system of Eckhart (d. 1329), evil, sin included, has its place in the evolutionary scheme by which all proceeds from and returns to God, and contributes, both in the moral order and in the physical, to the accomplishment of the Divine purpose. Eckhart's mystic or pantheistic tendencies seem to have obscured for him many of the difficulties of the subject, as has been the case with those by whom the same tendencies have since been carried to an extreme conclusion.

Christian philosophy has, like the Hebrew, uniformly attributed moral and physical evil to the action of created free will. Man has himself brought about the evil from which he suffers by transgressing the law of God, on obedience to which his happiness depended. Evil is in created things under the aspect of mutability, and possibility of defect, not as existing per se: and the errors of mankind, mistaking the true conditions of its own well-being, have been the cause of moral and physical evil (Dion. Areop., De Div. Nom., iv, 31; St. Aug., De Civ. Dei, xii). The evil from which man suffers is, however, the condition of good, for the sake of which it is permitted. Thus, "God judged it better to bring good out of evil than to suffer no evil to exist." (St. Aug., Enchirid., xxvii). Evil contributes to the perfection of the universe, as shadows to the perfection of a picture, or harmony to that of music (De Civ. Dei, xii). Again, the excellence of God's works in nature is insisted on as evidence of the Divine wisdom and goodness, and no evil is directly caused. (Greg. Nyss., De opif. hom.) Thus Boethius asks (De Consol. Phil., I, iv) Who can be the author of good, if God is the author of evil? As darkness is nothing but the absence of light, and is not produced by creation, so evil is merely the defect of goodness. St. Augustine (Hexæm., Hom. ii) points out the educative purposes served by evil; and St. Augustine, holding evil to be permitted for the punishment of the wicked and the trial of the good, shows that it has, under this aspect, the nature of good, and is pleasing to God, not because of what it is, but because of where it is; i. e. as the penal and just consequence of sin (De Civ. Dei, xi, xii, De Vera Relig. xlv). Lactantius uses similar arguments to oppose the dilemma, as to the omnipotence and goodness of God, which he puts into the mouth of Epiciurus (De Ira, Dei, xii). St. Augustin (Monologium) connects evil with the partial manifestation of good by creation; its fullness being in God alone.

The features which stand out in the earlier Christian explanation of evil, as compared with non-Christian dualistic theories are thus (1) the definite attribution to God of absolute omnipotence and goodness, notwithstanding His permission of the existence of evil; (2) the assignment of a moral and retributive cause for suffering in the sin of mankind; and (3) the unhesitating assertion of the beneficence of God's purpose in permitting evil, together with the full admission that He could, had He so chosen, have prevented it (De Civ. Dei, xiv). How God's permission of the evil which He foreknew and could have prevented is to be reconciled with His goodness, is not fully considered; St. Augustine states the question in forcible terms, but is content by way of answer to follow St. Paul, in his doctrine of the unsearchableness of the Divine judgments (Contra Julianum, I, 48).

The same general lines have been followed by most of the modern attempts to account in terms of Theism for the existence of evil. Descartes and Malebranche held that the world is the best possible for the purpose for which it was created, i. e. for the manifestation of the attributes of God. If it had been more perfect in detail, it would have been less fitted as a whole for the attainment of this object. The relation of evil to the will of a perfectly benevolent Creator was elaborately treated by Leibniz, in answer to Bayle, who had insisted on the arguments derived from the existence of evil against that of a good and omnipotent God. Leibniz founded his views mainly on those of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, and deduced from them his theory of Optimism (q. v.). According to it, the universe is the best possible; but metaphysical evil, or imperfection, is necessarily involved in the whole of creation, and it may be supposed that the evil it contains is necessary for the existence of other regions unknown to us. Voltaire, in "Candide," undertook to throw ridicule upon the idea of the "best possible world"; and it must be admitted that the theory is open to grave objections. On the one hand, it is scarcely consistent with belief in the Divine omnipotence; and on the other, it fails to account for the permission (or indirect authorship) of evil by a good God, to which Bayle had specially taken exception. We cannot know that this world is the best possible; and if we could, why, since it may contain so much that is evil, should a perfectly good God have created it? It may be urged, moreover, that there can be no degree of finite goodness which is not susceptible of increase by omnipotence, without ceasing to fall short of infinite perfection.

Leibniz has been more or less closely followed by many who have since treated the subject from the Christian point of view. These have, for the most part, emphasized the evidence in creation of the wisdom and goodness of its Author, after the manner of the Book of Job, and have been content to leave undiscussed the reason for the fall of man, by Hamartia, in which evil is unavoidable. Such was the view of King (Essay on the Origin of Evil, London, 1732), who insisted strongly on the doctrine of the best possible world; of Cudworth, who held that evil, though inseparable from the nature of imperfect beings, is largely a matter of men's own fancy and opinions, rather than of the reality of things, and therefore not to be made the ground of accusation against Divine Providence. Derham (Physico-Theology, London, 1712) took occasion from an examination of the excellence of the Creator to commend an attitude of humility and trust towards the Creator of "this elegant, this well-contrived, well-formed world, in which we find everything necessary for the sustentation, use and pleasure both of man and every other creature here below; as well as some whips, some rods, to scourge us for our sins." Priestley held a doctrine of absolute Determinism, and consequently attributed evil solely to the Divine will; which, however, he justified by the good ends which evil is providentially made to subserve (Doctrine of Philosophical Necessity, Birmingham, 1782). Clarke, again, called special attention to the evidence of method and design, which bear witness to the benevolence of the Creator, in the midst of apparent moral and physical disorder. Rosmini, closely following Malebranche, pointed out that the question of the possibility of a better world than this has really no meaning; any world created by God must be the best possible in relation to its special purpose, apart from which neither goodness nor badness can be predicated of it. Mamiani also supposed evil to be inseparable from the finite, but that it tended to disappear as the finite approached its final union with the infinite.

III. The third way of conceiving the place of evil in the general scheme of existence is that of those systems of Monism, by which evil is viewed as merely a mode in which certain aspects or moments of the development of nature are apprehended by human consciousness. In this view there is no distinctive principle to
which evil can be assigned, and its origin is one with that of nature as a whole. These systems reject the specific idea of creation; and the idea of God is either rigorously excluded, or identified with an impersonal principle, immanent in the universe, or conceived as a material being, or the origin of nature is due to the fact viewed from the standpoint of Materialism or from that of Idealism, is the one ultimate reality. The problem of the origin of evil is thus merged in that of the origin of being. Moral evil, in particular, arises from error, and is to be gradually eliminated, or at least minimized, by improved knowledge and the conditions of human welfare (Meliorism). Of this kind, on the whole, were the doctrines of the Ionic Hylozoists, whose fundamental notion was the essential unity of matter and life; and on the other hand, also, of the Eleatics, who found the origin of all things in abstract being. The Atomists, Leucippus and Democritus, held what may be called a doctrine of materialistic Monism. This doctrine, however, found its first complete expression in the philosophy of Epicurus, which explicitly rejected the notion of any external influence upon nature, whether of “fate”, or of Divine predetermination, according to the Epicurean Literature of Rerum Natura, II, line 180) the existence of evil was fatal to the supposition of the creation of the world by God:

Nequaquam nobis divinitus esse creatum

Naturam mundi, quo tanta est prælita culpa

Gioveno, who made God the immanent cause of all things, acting by an internal necessity, and producing the relations considered evil by mankind. Hobbes regarded God as merely a corporeal first cause: and applying his theory of civil government to the universe, defended the existence of evil by simple assertion of the absolute power to which it is due—a theory which is little else than a statement of materialistic Determinism in terms of social relations. Spinoza united matter and spirit in the notion of a single substance, to which he attributed both thought and extension; error and imperfection were the necessary consequence of the order of the universe. The Hegelian Monism, which reproduces many of the ideas of Eckhart, and is adopted in its main features by many different systems of recent origin, gives to evil a place in the unfolding of the Idea, in which both the origin and the inner reality of the universe are to be found. Evil is a necessary discord born to the general good. Huxley was content to believe that the ultimate causes of things are at present unknown, and may be unknowable. Evil is to be known and combatted in the concrete and in detail; but the Agnostics, who are discordant in evil, seems to be a transcendental cause, and confines itself to experimental facts. Haeckel advances a dogmatic materialism, in which substance (i.e. matter and force) appears as the eternal and infinite basis of all things. Professor Metchnikoff, on similar principles, places the cause of evil in the “dis-harmony of the forms” to which prevail in nature, which may perhaps be ultimately removed, for the human race at least, together with the pesimistic temper arising from them, by the progress of science. Bourdeau has asserted in express terms the futility of seeking a transcendental, or supernatural origin for evil, and the necessity of confining the view to natural, accessible, and determinable causes (Revue Philosophique, I, 1900).

The recently constructed system, or method, called Pragmatism, has this much in common with Pessimism, but it regards evil as an actually unavoidable part of that human experience which is in principle identical with truth and reality. The world is what we make it; evil tends to diminish with the growth of experience, and may finally vanish; though, on the other hand, there may always remain an irreducible minimum of evil. The origin of evil is, like the origin of all things, inexplicable; it cannot be fitted into any theory of the design of the universe, simply because no such theory is possible. “We cannot by any possibility comprehend the character of a cosmic mind whose purposes are fully revealed by the strange and terrible details that we find in the universe; and the world’s particulars—the mere word design, by itself, has no consequences and explains nothing.” (James, Pragmatism, London, 1907. Cf. Schiller, Humanism, London, 1907.) Nietzsche holds evil to be purely relative, and in its moral aspect at least, a transitory and non-essential phenomenon. With him, mankind in its present state, is “the animal not yet properly adapted to his environment”. In this mode of thought the individual necessarily counts for comparatively little, as being merely a transient manifestation of the cosmic force; and the social aspects of humanity are those under which its pains and shortcomings are mostly considered, with a view to their amelioration. Hence, the various forms of Socialism; the idea conceived by Nietzsche of a totally new, though as yet undefined, form of social morality, and of the constitution and mutual relations of classes; and the so-called religions in the moral and scientific literature tending to the general good. The first example of such religions was that of Auguste Comte, who, upon the materialistic basis of Positivism, founded the “religion of humanity”, and professed to substitute an enthusiasm for humanity as the motive of right action, for the natural religion.

In the light of Catholic doctrine, any theory that may be held concerning evil must include certain points bearing on the question that have been authoritatively defined. These points are (1) the omnipotence, omniscience, and absolute goodness of the Creator; (2) the freedom of the will; and (3) that suffering is the penal consequence of wilful disobedience to the law of God. A complete account may be gathered from the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, by whom the principles of St. Augustine are systematised, and to some extent supplemented. Evil, according to St. Thomas, is a privation, or the absence of something which belongs properly to the nature of the creature. (I, Q. xiv, a. 10; Q. xlix, a. 3; contra Gentiles, III, x, 8). There is therefore no “sumnum malum”, or positive source of evil, corresponding to the “sumnum bonum”, which is God (I, Q. xxvii, a. 3; C.G., xliii, q. 13; De Malo, I, 14). Evil being not “from without” only “ens rationis” i.e. it exists not as an objective fact, but as a subjective conception; things are evil not in themselves, but by reason of their relation to other things, or persons. All realities (entitas) are in themselves good; they produce bad results only incidentally; and consequently the ultimate cause of evil is fundamentally good, as well as the objects in which evil is found (I, Q. xliii; cf. I, Q. v, 3; De Malo, I, 3). Thus the Manichaean dualism has no foundation in reason.

Evil is threefold, viz., malum naturae (metaphysical evil), culpa (moral), and ira (suppositive consequence of malum culpa) (I, Q. xvii, a. 5; Q. lxvi, a. 9; De Malo, I, 4). Its existence subserves the perfection of the whole; the universe would be less perfect if it contained no evil. Thus fire could not exist without the corruption of what it consumes; the lion must slay the ass in order to live; and if there were no wrongdoing, there would be no sphere for patience and justice (I, Q. xviii, a. 2). God is said (as in Is., xlvi) to be the author of evil in the sense that the corruption of material objects in nature is ordained by him, as a means for carrying out the design of the universe; and in this world, as an instrument, to bring about the perfection of the universe, the source of which is in Divine appointment; the universe would be less perfect if its laws could be broken with impunity. Thus evil, in one aspect, i.e. as counter-balancing the secession of sin, has the
The mystery of creation, before which all schools of thought are equally helpless. It is as impossible to know, in the fullest sense, why this world was made as to know how it was made; but St. Thomas has at least shown that the acts of the Creator admit of complete logical justification, notwithstanding the mystery in which, for human intelligence, they can never wholly cease to be involved. On Catholic premises, the amelioration of moral evil and its consequent suffering can only take place by means of individual reformation and not so much through increase of knowledge as through stimulation or re-direction of the will. But since all methods of social improvement that have any truth in them must necessarily represent a measure of conformity with Divine laws, they are welcomed and furthered by the Church, as tending, at least indirectly, to accomplish the purpose for which she exists.

For ancient views of evil, see: Histories of philosophy by Zeller und Ueberweg; Darmstätter and Miélot, The Zend-Avesta (London, 1887); Moinier-Williams, Buddhism, Brahmanism and Hinduism (London, 1889); Allegro, Univ. Church Hist. (Dublin, 1900); Godfreiton, Buddhism (London, 1905).

A. B. Sharpe.

Eudoxus, first Bishop of Antioch after St. Peter. Eusebius mentions him thus in his "History": "And Eudoxus having been established the first [bishop] of Antiochians, Ignatius flourished at this time (III, 22). The time referred to is that of Rome and Trajan, of whom Eusebius has just spoken. Harnack has shown (after discarding an earlier theory of his own) that Eusebius possessed a list of the bishops of Antioch which did not give their dates, and that he was obliged to synchronize them roughly with the popes. It seems certain that he took the three episcopal lists of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch from the "Chronography" which Julius Africanus published in 221. The "Chronicle of Eusebius" is lost; but in Jerome's translation of it we find in three successive years (1) the three entries that Peter having founded the Church of Antioch, is sent to Rome, where he perseveres as bishop for 25 years; (2) that Mark, the interpreter of Peter, preaches Christ in Egypt and Alexandria; and (3) that Eudoxus is ordained first Bishop of Antioch. This last year is given as Claudius III by the Codex Fethianus, but by the fifth-century Bodleian Codex (not used in Schnöe's edition) and the rest as Claudius IV (A. d. 44). The Armenian translation has Claudius II. We have no mention of Eudoxus earlier than that by Africanus; but the latter is confirmed by his contemporary, Origen, who calls Ignatius the second bishop after Peter (cf. Origen, Contra Cels. 1. 13). It is curious that the ordination of Eudoxus should not have been given in the "Chronography" in the same year as the founding of the Antiochian Church by Peter, and Hort supposed that the three entries must have belonged to a single year in
Eusebius. But the evidence is not in favour of this simplification. The year of the accession of Ignatius, that is the death of Evodus, was unknown to Eusebius, for he merely places it in the "Chronicle" together with the death of Peter and the accession of Linus at Rome (Nero 14-18), while in the "History" he mentions it at the beginning of Trajan's reign.

The fame of Ignatius has caused later writers, such as Athanasius and Chrysostom, to speak of him as though he were the immediate successor of the Apostles. Jerome (De viris ill., 16) and Socrates (H. E., VI, 71) call him the "third" Peter; but this is only because they illogically include Peter among his own successors. Theodoret and Pseudo-Ignatius represent Ignatius as consecrated by Peter. The difficulty which arose about Evodus was solved in the Apostolical Constitutions by stating that Evodus was ordained by Peter and Ignatius by Paul. The Byzantine chronographer, John Malalas (X, 252), relates that as Peter went to Rome, and passed through the great city of Antioch, it happened that Evodus, the bishop and patriarch, died, and Ignatius succeeded him; he attributes to Evodus the introduction of the name Christian, which seems to be justified in supposing that Malalas ascribes any of this information to Theophilus, the second-century Bishop of Antioch. We may be sure that Evodus was an historical personage, and really the predecessor of St. Ignatius. But the dates of his ordination are quite uncertain. No early witness makes him a martyr.

The Greeks commemorate together "Evodus" and Onesiphorus (II Tim., 1, 16) as of the seventy disciples and as martyrs on 29 April, and also on 7 Sept. Evodus was unknown to the earlier Western martyrologists that St. Bertram and those of Peter Ado introduced him into the so-called "Martyrologium Romanum parvum" (which he forsook not long before 860) and into his own work, on 6 May. His source was Pseudo-Ignatius, whom he quotes in the "Libellus de fest. Apost.", prefixed to the martyrology proper. From him the notice came to Usuard and the rest, and to the present Roman Martyrology.

Acta SS., 6 May: Salmon in Diss. Christ. Böing., s. v.; Har- nack, Gesch. der Alten Lit., I, 781, s. v. Chronol. part 1, cap. II 152; Quentin, Les Martyrologies historiques (1906), 77, attributes writings to Evodus, of which one was called Ser. The Eight: in it was stated that three years elapsed from the Baptism of Christ until His Passion, and seven years more until the stoning of Stephen. A Sermon is attributed to him in a Coptic papyrus published in Rome in Memoria della R. Acad. delle Scienze di Torino, Series II, XXI, 1892. See Harnack, I loc. cit.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Evolution.—This subject will here receive a twofold treatment, as follows: A. The Theory Broadly Considered, and the Catholic Attitude in its Regard; B. Its History and Scientific Foundations.

A. ATTITUDE OF CATHOLICS TOWARDS THE THEORY.

One of the most important questions for every educated Catholic is: What is to be thought of the theory of evolution? Is it to be rejected as ungrounded in science and Christianity; or is it to be accepted as an established theory altogether compatible with the principles of a Christian conception of the universe? We must distinguish between the different meanings of the words theory of evolution in order to give a clear and correct answer to this question.

We must distinguish (1) between the theory of evolution as a scientific hypothesis and as a philosophical speculation; (2) between the theory of evolution as based on theistic, then as purely scientific, then as anistic and lastly as atheistic foundation; (3) between the theory of evolution and Darwinism; (4) between the theory of evolution as applied to the vegetable and animal kingdoms and as applied to man.

(1) As a scientific hypothesis, the theory of evolution seeks to determine the historical succession of the various species of plants and of animals on our earth; and, with the aid of paleontology and other sciences, such as comparative morphology, embryology, and zoology, to show how in the course of the different geological epochs they gradually evolve from their primitive forms by purely natural causes. The theory of evolution, then, as a scientific hypothesis, does not consider the present species of plants and of animals as forms directly created by God, but as the final result of an evolution from other species existing in former geological periods. Hence it is called "the theory of evolution," or "the theory of descent," since it implies the descent of the present from extinct species. This theory is opposed to the theory of constancy, which assumes the immutability of organic species. The scientific theory of evolution, therefore, does not concern itself with the origin of life. It merely inquires into the genetic relations of systematic species, genera, and families, and endeavours to arrange them according to the natural order of descent (genetic trees).

How far is the theory of evolution based on observed facts? It is understood to be still only an hypothesis of the newest and most accurate type. The forces which brought it into existence, and which seem to be justified in supposing that Malalas ascribes any of this information to Theophilus, the second-century Bishop of Antioch. We may be sure that Evodus was an historical personage, and really the predecessor of St. Ignatius. But the dates of his ordination are quite uncertain. No early witness makes him a martyr.

The Greeks commemorate together "Evodus" and Onesiphorus (II Tim., 1, 16) as of the seventy disciples and as martyrs on 29 April, and also on 7 Sept. Evodus was unknown to the earlier Western martyrologists that St. Bertram and those of Peter Ado introduced him into the so-called "Martyrologium Romanum parvum" (which he forsook not long before 860) and into his own work, on 6 May. His source was Pseudo-Ignatius, whom he quotes in the "Libellus de fest. Apost.", prefixed to the martyrology proper. From him the notice came to Usuard and the rest, and to the present Roman Martyrology.

Acta SS., 6 May: Salmon in Diss. Christ. Böing., s. v.; Har- nack, Gesch. der Alten Lit., I, 781, s. v. Chronol. part 1, cap. II 152; Quentin, Les Martyrologies historiques (1906), 77, attributes writings to Evodus, of which one was called Ser. The Eight: in it was stated that three years elapsed from the Baptism of Christ until His Passion, and seven years more until the stoning of Stephen. A Sermon is attributed to him in a Coptic papyrus published in Rome in Memoria della R. Acad. delle Scienze di Torino, Series II, XXI, 1892. See Harnack, I loc. cit.

JOHN CHAPMAN.
fere directly with the natural order, where secondary causes suffice to produce the intended effect" (De operis sex dierum, II, c. x, n. 13). In the light of this principle of the Christian interpretation of nature, the history of the animal and vegetable kingdoms on our planet is the subject of a separate volume of a million pages, which the natural development of the cosmos is described, and upon whose title-page is written: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth."

(2) The theory of evolution just stated rests on a theistic foundation. In contradistinction to this is another theory resting on a materialistic and atheistic basis, the first principle of which is the denial of a personal Creator. This atheistic theory of evolution is ineffectual to account for the first beginning of the cosmos or for the law of its evolution, since it acknowledges neither creator nor lawgiver. Natural science, moreover, has proved that spontaneous generation—i.e., the independent genesis of a living being from non-living matter—contradicts the facts of observation. For this reason the atheistic theory of evolution postulates an intervention on the part of the Creator in the production of the first organisms. When and how the first seeds of life were implanted in matter, we do not know. The Christian theory of evolution also demands a creative act for the origin of the human soul, since the soul cannot have its origin in matter. The atheistic theory of evolution, on the contrary, rejects the assumption of a soul separate from matter, and thereby sinks into blank materialism.

(3) Darwinism and the theory of evolution are by no means equivalent conceptions. The theory of evolution was propounded before Charles Darwin's time, by Lamarck (1809) and Geoffroy de Saint-Hilaire. Darwin, in 1859, gave it a new form by endeavouring to explain the origin of species by means of natural selection. According to this theory the breeding of new species depends on the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. The Darwinian theory of selection is Darwinism—adhering to the narrower, and accurate, sense of the word. As a theory, it is scientifically inadequate, since it does not account for the origin of attributes fitted to the purpose, which must be referred back to the interior, original causes of evolution. Haeckel, with other materialists, has enlarged this selection theory of Darwin's into a philosophical world-idea, by attempting to account for the whole evolution of the cosmos by means of the chance survival of the fittest. This theory is Darwinism in the secondary, and wider, sense of the word. It is that a theistical form of the theory of evolution which was shown above—under (2)—to be untenable. The third significance of the term Darwinism arose from the application of the theory of selection to man, which is likewise impossible of acceptance. In the fourth place, Darwinism frequently stands, in popular usage, for the theory of evolution in general. This use of the word rests on an evident confusion of ideas, and must therefore be set aside.

(4) To what extent is the theory of evolution applicable to man?—That God should have made use of natural, evolutionary, original causes in the production of man's body, is ver se not improvable, and was propounded by St. Augustine (see Augustine of Hippo, Saint, under V. Augustinism in History). The actual proofs of the descent of man's body from animals is, however, inadequate, especially in respect to paleontology. And the human soul could not have been derived through natural evolution from that of the brute, since it is of a spiritual nature; for which reason we must refer its origin to a creative act on the part of God.

For a thorough exposition, Wasmann, Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution (Freiburg im Br., 1894). Of the later literature, Stricklet, On the Geneas of Species (London and New York, 1871).

E. Wasmann.

B. History and Scientific Foundations. The world of organisms comprises a great system of individual forms, generally classified according to structural resemblances into kingdoms, classes, orders, families, genera, species. The species is considered as the unit of the system. It is designated by a double name, the first of which indicates the order, e.g., Canis familiaris, the dog, and Canis lupus, the wolf. Comparing the species of the present day with their fossil representatives in the geological layers, we find that they differ from one another the more the farther we retrace the geological record. To explain this remarkable fact two theories have been proposed, the one maintaining the stability and special creation of species, the other the instability and evolution, or genetic relation, of species. As is plain from the preceding section of this article, the principal difference between the two theories consists in: that the theory of evolution derives the species of today by a progressive development from one or more primitive types, whilst the theory of constancy insists upon the special creation of each true species. It is generally admitted that the determination of specific forms depends largely on the subjective views and experience of one naturalist.

We shall here confine our attention to the history and scientific foundations of the biological theory of evolution, leaving all purely philosophical and theological discussions to others. The entire subject will here be divided into the following parts: I. History of the Scientific Theories of Evolution; II. Definition of Species; III. Variability and Experimental Facts Relating to the Evolution of Species; IV. The Paleontological Argument; V. The Morphological Argument; VI. The Ontogenetic Argument; VII. The Biogeographical Argument.

Before we begin, we wish to remind the reader of the important distinction brought out in the preceding essay, that the general theory referring to the mere fact of evolution must be well distinguished from all special theories which attempt to explain the assumed fact by ascribing it to certain causes, such as natural selection, the influence of environment, and the like. In other words, an evolutionaryist—that is, a defender of the general scientific theory of evolution—isc not eo ipso a Darwinian, or a Lamarckian, or an adherent of any special evolutionary system. No less important are the other definitions and distinctions emphasized above under A.

I. History of the Scientific Theories of Evolution. The historical development of the scientific theories of evolution may be divided into three periods. The main figure of the first period is Lamarck. The period ends with an almost complete victory of the theory of constancy (1830). The second period commences with Darwin's "Origin of Species" (1859). The idea of evolution, and in particular Darwin's theory of natural selection, enters into every department of the biological sciences and to a great extent transforms them. The third period is a time of critical reaction. Natural selection is generally considered as insufficient to explain the origin of new characters, while the ideas of Lamarck and G. Saint-Hilaire become prevalent. Besides, the theory of evolution is tested experimentally. Typical representatives of the period are Bateson, Hugo de Vries, Morgan. First Period. Linnaeus based his important "Systema naturae" on the principle of the constancy and special creation of every species—"Species tot numeros quotidiversa forma in principio sua creatas" ("Philosophia botanica", Stockholm, 1751, p. 99). For, "contemplating the works of God, it is plain to every one that organisms produce offspring perfectly similar to the parents" ("Systema", Leipzig, 1748, p. 21). Linnaeus had a vast influence upon the naturalists of his time. Thus his principle of the con-
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stancy of species was universally acknowledged, and this all the more because it seemed to be connected with the first chapter of the Bible. Georges Louis Leclerc Buffon (1707–88), the "suggestive" author of the "Histoire naturelle générale et particulière" first to dispense with scientific grounds. Till 1761 he had defended the theory of constancy, but he then became an extreme evolutionist, and finally held that through the direct influence of environment species could undergo manifold modifications of structure. Similar views were expressed by the German Goethe in Reinhold Trum

anis in his work "Biologie oder Philosophie der lebenden Natur" (1802), and by "the poet of evolution", J. W. Goethe (1749–1832). However, none of these men worked out the details of a definite theory. The same must be said of the grandfather of Charles Darwin, Erasmus Darwin (1731–1802), physician, poet, and naturalist, the first who seems to have anticipated Lamarck's main views. "All animals undergo transformations which are in part produced by their own exertions in response to pleasures and pains, and many of these acquired forms and propensities adhere to their posterity," (Zoonomia, Jean-Baptiste de Lamarck (b. 1744) was the scientific founder of the modern theory of evolution and its special form, known as Lamarckism. At the age of forty-nine Lamarck was elected professor of invertebrate zoology at the Jardin des Plantes (Paris). In 1809 his complete work, the "Philosophie zoolo
gique" (1809) and his "Histoire des animaux sans vertébrés" (1816–22). Lamarck disputes the immutability of species, and characters, and his principle of variability is an objective criterion for determining, with any degree of accuracy, which forms ought to be considered as true species. Consequently, according to him, the name species has only a relative value. It refers to a collection of similar individuals "que la génération perpétuelle dans le même état tant que les circonstances de leur situation ne changent pas assez pour faire varier leurs habitudes, leur caractère et leur forme" (Phil. zool., I, p. 75). But how are species transformed into new species? As to plants, Lamarck believes that all changes of structure and function are due to the direct influence of environment. Lamarck shows how the conditions of the environment first call forth new wants and new activities. New habits and instincts will be produced, and through use and disuse organs may be strengthened or weakened, newly adapted to the requirements of new functions, or made to disappear. The acquired changes are handed down to the offspring by the strong principle of inheritance. Thus the web in the feet of water birds was acquired through use, while the so-called rudimentary organs, e. g. the teeth of the baleen whale, the small eyes of the mole, were reduced to their imperfect condition through disuse. Lamarck did not include the closure of man in his system. He expressed his belief in abiogen
cesis, but he maintained at the same time that "rien n'existe que par la volonté du sublime Auteur de toutes choses" (Phil. zool., I, p. 56).

Lamarck's theory was not sufficiently supported by facts. Besides, it offered no satisfactory explanation of the origin and development of new organs, though he did not ascribe the effect to a mere wish of the ani
mal. Finally, he offered no proof whatever for his position that acquired characters are inherited. Lamarck had very little influence upon his own time. Lamarck's doctrine of the powerful influence of the environment was again lost with the death of Lamarck. Lamarck introduced the term "Lamarckianism" in the sense of evolutionism. As professor of zoology Saint-Hilaire (1772–1841) had long been the colleague of Lamarck. Saint-Hilaire held the mutability of species, but ascribed the main influence in its evolution to the "monde ambiant". Besides, in order to account for the discontinuity of species, he imagined that the environment could produce sudden changes in the specific charac
ters of the embryo (Philosophie anatômique, 1818). In 1850 G. Saint-Hilaire presented to the French Academy of Sciences an outline of unity of plan and composition in the animal kingdom. Cuvier opposed his celebrated theory of the four "embranchements", and showed that his adversary had mistaken resemblance for unity. Cuvier brought convincing facts in support of his attitude; Saint-Hilaire did not settle the issue. The theory of evolution was officially abandoned. Natu

ralists left speculation and returned for a few decades to an almost exclusive study of positive facts. A single writer of some celebrity, Bory de Saint-Vincent (1780–1846), took up Lamarck's doctrines, but not without modifying them by insisting upon the following.

Second Period.—Charles Robert Darwin's book, on the "Origin of Species by means of natural selection or the preservation of favourable races in the struggle for life", published 24 November, 1859, marks a new epoch in the history of the evolution idea. Though the main principles of Lamarck's theory, "struggle, variation, selection", had been enunciated by others, it was mainly Darwin who first combined them into a system which he tried to support by an extensive empirical foundation. Assisted by a num

ber of influential friends, he succeeded in obtaining an almost universal acknowledgment for the general the

ey of evolution, though his special theory of natural selection gradually lost much of the significance at

tached to it, especially by Darwin's extreme followers. Charles Robert Darwin was born at Shrewsbury, 12 February, 1809. From 1831–36 he accompanied as naturalist an English scientific expedition to South America. In 1842 he retired to his villa at Down in Kent, where he wrote his numerous works. He died on 19 April, 1882, and was buried in Westminster Abbey a few feet from the grave of Newton. Biogeographical observations on his voyage to South America led Darwin to abandon the theory of creation. "I had been deeply impressed", he says in his Autobiography, "by discovering in the Pampean formation great fossil animals covered with armour like that on the existing armadillos; secondly by the manner in which closely allied animals replace one another in proceeding southward over the continent; and thirdly by the South American character of most of the productions of the Galapagos archipelago and more especially by the manner in which they differ slightly on each island of the group. . . . It was evi
dent that such facts could only be explained on the idea of the gradual modification of species. . . ." In order to account for the transformation, Darwin began with a systematic study of numerous facts referring to domesticated animals and cultivated plants. This was in July, 1837. He soon perceived that selection was the keystone of man's success in making useful races, namely, by breeding only from useful vari

ations. But it remained a mystery to him how selec
tions could be applied to organisms living in nature. In October, 1838, Darwin read Malthus's "Essay on Population" and understood at once that in the struggle for existence described by Malthus "favourable variations would tend to be preserved while unsuitable ones would be destroyed, and that the result of this selection or survival would be the formation of new species". The struggle itself appeared to him as a necessary consequence of the high rate at which organ

ic beings tend to increase. The result of the selec

tion—that is the survival of the fittest variations—was supposed to be transmitted and accumulated through the principle of inheritance. In this manner Darwin defined and tried to establish the theory of natural selection. Long after he had come to Down house, he was the most important and influential writer on this subject. The formation of new species implies that organic beings tend to diverge in character as they become modified. But how could this be explained? Darwin answered: Because the modified offspring of all dominant and increasing forms tend to become adapted to many and highly diversified places in the economy of nature. In species, according to Darwin, species are continuously transformed "by the preservation of such variations as arise and are beneficial to the being under its conditions of life", that is, by the survival of the fittest, which is to be considered "not the exclusive", but the "most important means of modification".

As his studies and observations progressed, Darwin lost his almost exclusive belief in his own theory, as he held it in 1859, and gradually adopted, at least as secondary causes in the origin of species, the Lamarck factor of the inheritance of the effects of use and disuse and the Buffon factor of the direct action of the environment, especially in case of the geographical isolation of species. To the human species, Darwin was, as early as 1837 or 1838, of the opinion that it was likewise no special creation, but a product of evolutionary processes. The numerous facts which, according to Darwin, might be adapted to substantiate his views are contained in his work, "The Descent of Man" (1871). As a supplementary work to "The Origin of Species", Darwin published, in 1868, "The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication", which contains many valuable facts and theoretical discussions concerning variation and heredity. The principle of natural selection is certainly a very useful factor in removing variations not well adapted to their surroundings, but the action is merely negative. The main point (that is the origin and teleological development of useful variations) is left untouched by the theory, as Darwin himself has indicated. Moreover, no proof is brought forward that variations must accumulate in the same direction and that the result must be a higher form of organization. On the contrary, as we shall point out below, the experimental evidence of the post-Darwinian period has failed to substantiate Darwin's claim. It is, however, well to note that Darwin did not wish to ascribe the origin and survival of useful variations to chance. That word, he deduces, is a wholly incorrect expression which merely serves to acknowledge plainly our ignorance of the causes of certain variation. Later on, it is true, he seems to have abandoned the idea of design, "the old argument", he says in "his Autobiography" (1876) ... "fails now that the law of natural selection has been discovered." Similarly, his belief in the existence of God, which was strong in him when he wrote the "Origin", seems to have vanished from his mind in the course of years. In 1874 he confessed: "I for one must be content to remain Agnostic".

Of the numerous friends of Darwin who contributed so much to the development and spread of his theories, we mention in the first place Alfred Russel Wallace, whose essay on natural selection was read before the Linnaean Society, in London, 1 July, 1858, together with Darwin's first essay on the subject. The main work of Wallace, "Darwinism, an Exposition of the Theory of Natural Selection with Some of its Applications" (1889), "treats the problem of the origin of species on the same general lines as were adopted by Darwin; but from the standpoint reached only 30 years of discussion." In fact the book is a defence of pure Darwinism. Wallace, too, assumed the animal origin of man's bodily structure, but, contrary to Darwin, he ascribed the origin of man's "intellectual and moral faculties to the unseen Universe of spirit" (Darwinism). Thomas H. Huxley (1825-1895) was one of the most strenuous defenders of Darwin's views; his book on "Man's Place in Nature" (1863) is a defence of man's "Oneness with the brutes in structure and in substance". Besides Wallace and Huxley, there were the geologist Sir Charles Lyell, the zoologist Sir John Lubbock, and the botanists Asa Gray and J. D. Hooker, who supported Darwin's theory almost from the beginning. Quatrefages and Dana called it in part, but declared that there were no arguments in favour of the animal origin of man. Spencer's views are not very much different from those of Darwin's later years. Natural selection is more aptly called by him "the survival of the fittest" ("Principles of Biology", 1898, I, p. 530). Trying to harmonize the Lamarckian and Darwinian factors of evolution, he was among the first to defend the so-called neo-Lamarckian theory, which insists upon the direct influence of the environment and the inheritance of newly acquired characters. Before we enter upon the last phase in the development of the evolution idea, it is necessary to devote some space to the extreme defenders of Darwinism in Germany. Ernst Haeckel, of Jena, is in some sense the founder of the science of phylogeny, which seeks at least by way of hypothesis, to determine the genetic relation of past and present species. In 1868 Darwin wrote to Haeckel: "Your boldness sometimes trembles". This refers especially to the phylogeny, which is in fact an aprioristic structure often contradicted, and at almost no point supported by experiment and observation. The tetrahedral carbon atom is, according to Haeckel, the external fountain of each particular kind of life. Through abiogenesis of certain most primitive organisms are said to have been formed, such as "moners", which Haeckel described as unicellular beings without structure and without any nuclear differentiation. During ages of unknown duration these simple masses of protoplasm have been
evolved into higher plants and animals, man included. As one of his main arguments, Haeckel refers to the so-called “biogenetic law of development”. The supposed law maintains that ontogeny is a short and rapid repetition of phylogeny, that is, the stages in the individual development of an organism correspond more or less to the stages which the species passed through in their evolution. The causes of development are, according to Haeckel, the same as were proposed by Darwin and by Lamarck; but Haeckel denies the existence of God and rejects the idea of teleology.

Our leading scientists do not care to support the unfounded generalities of Haeckel's doctrines. They have even, most severely, but justly, censured Haeckel's scientific methods, mainly his frauds, his want of distinction between fact and hypothesis, his neglect to correct wrong statements, his disregard of facts not agreeing with his apriori conceptions and his unacquaintance with history, physics, and even modern biology. They have also pointed out that the biogenetic law of development is by no means a trustworthy guide in retracing the phylogenetic succession of species, that many other species, Haickel are without foundation. But above all we must reject Haeckel's popular writings because they contain numerous errors of every kind, and ridicule in a shameful manner the most sacred convictions and moral principles of Christianity. It is a sad fact, that even through the influence of "Die Welt im Geschichtsprozeß", Haeckel did great harm was done to religion and morality, especially in Germany and in the English-speaking countries.

The present leader of extreme Darwinism is August Weismann of Freiburg (Vorträge über Derzendener Alterthümer, 24 ed., 1904), the energetic opponent of Lamarck's idea that acquired characters—i.e., changes that according to Weismann, every individual and specific character which may be transmitted by heredity is preformed and prearranged in the architecture of certain ultra-microscopic particles composing the chromatin of the germ-cells. On account of qualitative differences the various groups of these ultimate particles or "biophores" have a different power of assimilation. Besides, they are present in different numbers. In consequence thereof, an intracellular struggle for existence will arise, and the germ-cells are undergoing fertilization. The outcome of the struggle will be that the weaker forms will succumb. Thus the principle of the survival of the fittest is transferred to the germ-cells. Weismann, moreover, admits an indirect influence of the environment upon the germ-cells. In order to account for the facts of regeneration and rejuvenation established by Driesch, Morgan, and others, Weismann appeals at times to unknown forces of vital affinities, without, however, dismissing his thoroughly materialistic and antiteleological suppositions. It will be superfluous to add that Weismann's theory is a mere hypothesis whose foundation can probably never be controlled by observation and experiment. But it must be acknowledged that Weismann was among the first to point out the intrinsic connexion between the evolution of species and the science of the cell. As extreme scientific opponents of Darwinism and evolution we may mention Albert Wiegand the zoologist and paleontologist Louis Agassiz, the well-known adversary of Asa Gray. These men produced many an excellent argument against the extreme defenders of pure Darwinism, but, probably by attending too much to the exceedingly weak foundation of the current theory of mutation by small changes, they rejected evolution almost entirely. The most recent representative of such extreme views is the zoologist Albert Fleischmann, who has become a complete scientific agnostic.

Third Period.—The third period in the history of the biological evolution theory has only in recent years assumed the form which marks it as a new epoch. Its path was prepared by the fact that two classes of naturalists had in course of time been drawing nearer to one another. On the one hand were those whose work was merely critical, by discriminating clearly between Darwinism and evolution, and on the other hand those who gave their undivided attention to the work of experimental investigation. Only in recent years have the two classes joined hands and, in men like de Vries, Bateson, Morgan, have gained very efficient assistance. At the present time the greatest importance is laid on the study of the origin of species, on the adaptation of organisms to environment, and on the inheritance of characters thus acquired, and above all on the idea of the segregation and the independence of biological characters, as was pointed out almost fifty years ago by Gregor Johann Mendel.

As far back as 1865, K. von Nägeli decided in favour of the general theory of evolution and against Darwinism. According to him progressive evolution required intrinsic laws of development, which, however, as he added, were to be sought for in molecular forces. But this was only an effort to say, could only explain the survival of the more useful, but not its origin. Like Spencer, Nägeli was a determined precursor of neo-Lamarckism. This theory, which is now defended by many evolutionists, attempts to reconcile Lamarck's principle of the use and non-use of organs of animals, with the influence of external circumstances. There are many evolutionists, such as Th. Eimer, Packard, Cunningham, Cope, who defend this view. However, the experimental evidence for the foundation of neo-Lamarckism—namely, the inheritance of acquired characters—is still wanting, or at least very debatable. Nägeli's most important work, "Mechanisch-physiologische Theorie der Abstammungslehre", appeared in 1884. The embryologist K. E. von Baer, who did not share the antiteleological views of Nägeli, opposed no less energetically Darwin's theory of natural selection, because, as he argued, that theory does not explain teleology and correlation, and is at the same time in contradiction to the persistence of species and varieties. He also vigorously controverted Haeckel's system, especially his biogenetic law of development. But he maintained the transformation of species was much more gradual and sudden changes. This leads us to the theory of saltatory evolution which is to-day most strongly defended by Bateson, de Vries and others. Some of the first scientific expositors of this view were R. von Kölliker and St. George Mivart. In his work "On the Genesis of Species" (1871) Mivart proposed a number of convincing arguments against the opinion of the power of natural selection as a prevailing factor. According to this hypothesis species are suddenly born and originate by some innate force, which works orderly and with design. Mivart concedes that external conditions play an important part in some way determining evolutionary processes. But the transformation of species will mainly, if not exclusively, be produced by some constitutional affection of the generative system of the parental forms, an hypothesis which Mivart would extend also to the first genesis of the body of man. Hugo de Vries (Die Mutationstheorie, 1901-03) is, with Bateson, Reimke, and Morgan, a typical representative of the exponent of the modern theory of saltatory evolution. He first endeavoured to show experimentally that new species cannot arise by selection. Then he attempted to demonstrate the origin of new lines of variation. The principal illustration to establish his theory of "mutation" was the large flower, evening primrose (\textit{Engelackeriana}). Th. H. Morgan ("Evolution and Adaptation", 1903) summarizes this view as follows: "If we suppose that new mutations and
The moderate catastrophes, species the 186.5, experiments. Theory that EVOLUTION his may are or a of scientific advance. The earliest forerunners of Mendel were the first scientific hybridists J. G. Köhreuter (1739–1806) and T. A. Knight (1758–1838). Köhreuter’s results are of special interest because, through the repeated crossing of a hybrid with the pollen or ovules of one of the parents, forms appeared which more and more reverted to the characteristics of the respective parent. K. F. von Gartner (1772–1850) was the most prolific writer on hybridism of his time, though he did not surpass Köhreuter as to the positive results of his experimental research. C. Naudin’s essay on the hybridity in plants (1802) represented a considerable advance. The author pointed out that the facts of the reversion of the hybrids to the specific forms of their parents, when repeatedly crossed with the latter, are naturally explained by the hypothesis of the segregation of the two specific essences in the pollen grains and ovules of the hybrids (Leck). This formed in after years no small part of Mendel’s discovery, which is indeed one of the most brilliant results of experimental investigation.

Gregor Mendel was born 22 July, 1822, at Heinen- dorf near Odrau (Austrian Silesia). After finishing his studies he entered, in 1843, the Augustinian monastery at Brunn. Having been for fourteen years professor of the natural sciences, he was elected abbot of the monastery in 1868, and died in January, 1884. Mendel’s celebrated memoir, “Versuche über Pflanzenhybriden”, appeared in 1865, but attracted little attention, and remained unknown and forgotten till 1900.

It was based on experiments that had been carried out during the course of eight years on more than 10,000 plants. The principal result of these experiments was the recognition that the peculiarities of organisms produced entities independent of one another, so that they can be joined and separated in a regular way. As we have said above, H. de Vries was the first to recognize the value of Mendel’s paper. Other investigators who have taken up the same line of work are Correns, Tschermak, Morgan, and, most of all, Bateson, the principal founder of “Mendelism”, or the science of genetics.
criterion of the elementary species is the experimentally proved constancy of the features (it is quite immaterial how small they may be) during a series of generations.

How are we to regard these opinions? Before answering this question we must strongly emphasize the fact that the biological idea of species has nothing whatever in common with the Scriptural conception or with that of Scholastic philosophy. The Mosaic story of Creation signifies nothing more than this, that ultimately all organisms owe their existence to the Creator of the world. The connecting link has nothing to do with the proposition of faith regarding creation. The enumeration of certain popular groups of organisms, such as fruit-trees, draft-animals, and the like, could have no other design than to manifest to the simplest as well as to the most cultivated mind the action of the Creator of all things; at least, there can be no question of a scientific conception of genera and species. The biological concept of species is likewise removed from the philosophical concept which designates either the metaphysical or the physical species. The former is identical with the *integrā essentia* (Urrbrah, in general essence)—the latter, founded on the essence (*fundatur in essentia*—T. Pesch), and is to be recognized by some attribute (*gradus alicujus perfectionis*) which remains constant and unchangeable in every individual of every generation and so appears to be necessarily connected with the ultimate essence of the organism (*cum rei naturalis constitutum*—Hsau). The concept, therefore, of species according to Holy Scripture, Philosophy, and Science, is by no means a synonymous one for the natural units of the organic world. And particularly, the first chapter of Genesis should not be brought into connection with Linnaeus’s “Systema naturae.”

As far as the biological concept of species is concerned there is not up to the present time any decisive criterion by which we may determine in practice whether a given group of organisms constitute a particular species or not. Genuine species are differentiated from one another by the fact of their possessing some important morphological difference which remains constant during a series of generations without the production of any intermediate form. If the difference is of less importance, but constant, we have to do with sub-species (elementary species). Jordan species, while intermediate forms and all deviations which are not strictly constant are set down as varieties. Are such distinctions and criteria acceptable? Expressions such as “considerable,” “essential,” “more or less considerable,” signify relative propositions. Hence it follows that the morphological determination of species depends to a great extent on the subjective estimate of the naturalist and on his intimate knowledge of the geographical distribution and habits of the organism concerned. In fact, the force of the term *species* differs greatly in the different classes of organisms. On this account the fact that species do not cross-breed, or at least that after a cross they do not produce fertile descendants, was added as an auxiliary criterion. This criterion, however, is an impracticable one in the case of paleontological species, and in the plant world in particular on many exceptions. In botany, therefore, the auxiliary criterion has been limited in the sense that within the species itself the fertility always maintains the same general level, while by the crossing of different species it diminishes very materially—propositions which do not admit of converse suggestions. The general law of hybridization is generally recognized from the fact that they oscillate around a certain mean, from which they deviate in inverse proportion to their frequency, a rule which primarily pertains only to quantitative differences. According to Darwinians, useful individual differences can be increased indefinitely by selection and may finally become independent of it. In this manner new species would result: Darwin himself sometimes considered single variations as of greater importance. The same view is strongly defended by modern evolutionists, who, if correct, at the same time, a direct influence of environment to which an organism adapts itself.
In order first of all to obtain a just estimate of the influence of selection, it must be pointed out that not everything that is attributed to selection has originated through selection. The origin of many pure breeds (e.g., of pigeons) is unknown, and cannot therefore be further investigated be ascribed to selection. Furthermore, many cultivated forms have arisen through crosses and segregation of characters, but not through merely strengthening individual characters. If we restrict our examination only to well attested facts, we find, first, that nothing new is brought about by selection; secondly that the maximum amount in quantitative modification is obtained in a few generations (mostly in three to five) and that this amount can only be maintained through constant selection. In case selection is stopped, a regression will follow proportional to the length of time required for the progress. In short, as far as facts teach us, new species do not arise by selection. But if qualitative changes were produced by some other cause, selection would probably be a potent principle in order to explain why some peculiarities survive and others disappear. The question is: Whether changes in the environment may furnish such a cause. There can be no doubt that the environment does influence organisms and mould them in many ways. As proof of this we need only draw attention to the different forms of Alpine and valley plants, to the formation of the leaves of plants according to the humidity, shadiness, or sunniness of the habitat, to the influence of light and temperature on the formation of pigment and colouring of the surface, to the strange and considerable differences produced, for instance, in knot-weeds by merely changing the environment, and so forth. But as far as actual experiments show, the changes of characteristics and niceties of adaptation go to and fro, as it were, without transgressing definite ranges of variation. Moreover, it is not at all clear how discontinuity of species could have arisen "by a continuous environment, whether acting directly, as Lamarck would have it, or as a selective agent, as Darwin would have it" (Bateson), unless one takes into account the accidental destruction and isolation of intermediate forms.

In spite of these conclusions it has been assumed that individual differences might lead to the formation of new species under the continuous influence of natural selection. Wasmann's well-known Dinarda-forms may serve as an example. The four forms of the rove-beetle, Dinarda, namely D. Markeli, D. dentata, D. Hagensi and D. pygmaea, bear a certain relation with regard to size to the four forms of ants, Formica rufa, sanguinea, exsecta, fusco-rufibarbisis, and to their nests, in which they live as tolerated guests. D. Markeli, which is 5 mm. long, dwells with F. rufa, which is comparatively large and builds spacious hill-nests. D. dentata, which is 4 mm. long, lives with F. sanguinea, which is comparatively large, but builds small earth-nests. D. Hagensi, which is 3-4 mm. long, lives with F. exsecta, which is smaller than F. sanguinea, but builds a fairly roomy hill-nest. D. pygmaea, which is 3 mm. long, lives with F. fusco-rufibarbisis, which is relatively small and builds small earth-nests. Moreover, the three first-named ants are two-coloured (red and black), and so are the corresponding Dinarda. The last-named ant, however, is of a more uniform dark colour, as is also the corresponding Dinarda. Now comparative zoogeography contains some indications according to which the similarity of colour and proportion of size must be attributed to actual adaptation. For (1) there are regions in Central Europe in which only F. sanguinea with D. dentata, and F. rufa with D. Markeli are found, whereas F. exsecta and F. fusco-rufibarbisis do not harbour any Dinarda-forms at all. Secondly, there are districts in which the four forms of Dinarda are living with their four hosts and yet hardly ever showing transitional forms. Thirdly, in other parts there are more or less continuous intermediate forms, D. dentata-Hagensi living with F. exsecta, and D. Hagensi-pygmaea living with F. fusco-rufibarbisis. The nearer a Dinarda approaches the form of D. pygmaea, the more frequently it is found with F. fusco-rufibarbisis. To all this must be added, that the adaptation in general appears to have kept pace with the historical freeing of Central Europe from ice, though numerous exceptions must be explained by local circumstances, especially by isolation. Considering these facts, we are inclined to believe that D. pygmaea especially presents an example of real adaptation in fieri, though this adaptation cannot be called a progressive one, since the more recent forms, Hagensi and pygmaea, are only smaller in size and of a more uniform colour. But at the same time it seems to us that the adaptation of the Dinarda cannot be considered as an example to illustrate specific evolution, because, as we have shown elsewhere, there are many instances in nature—we mention only the races and othersub-divisions of the human species—that likewise present different degrees of adaptation far more pronounced than that found in the Dinarda, but which are not, and cannot on that account be, quoted as examples of the formation of new specific characters.

(2) Single Variations are presumably of far greater importance for the solution of the evolution problem
than individual differences; for they are discontinuous and constant, and are therefore capable of explaining the gaps between existing species and those of palaeontology. We use the term single variation when, from among a large number of offspring, some one particular individual stands out that differs from the rest in one or more characteristics which it transmits unchanged to posterity. It is said to be peculiar to the single variations that they cannot be reduced to crosses. If this is possible, we speak of "analytical variations." Favourable conditions for the appearance of single variations are altered environment, a liberal supply of seed, and excellent nourishment. It is a remarkable fact that the fertility of single variations decreases considerably, and this the more so the greater the deviation from the parents. Besides, the newly produced forms are comparatively weak. This weakness and inclination to sterility are facts which must be carefully weighed when determining the probable importance of single variations for specific evolution. Besides, it is—to our knowledge—in no case excluded that the suddenly arising form may be traced back to former crossings. Probably the only case which is quite generally interpreted to demonstrate specific evolution experimentally is that of the primrose observed by de Vries. After many failures with more than 100 species, de Vries, in 1880, determined to cultivate the evening primrose (Oenothera Lamarkiana), whose extraordinary fertility had attracted his attention. He chose nine well-developed specimens and transplanted them into the Botanical Garden of Amsterdam. The cultivation was at first continued through eight generations. In all he examined 50,000 plants, among which he discovered 800 deviating specimens, which could be arranged in seven different groups, as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>O. gigas</th>
<th>albida</th>
<th>oblonga</th>
<th>rubrinervis</th>
<th>Lamarkiana</th>
<th>nanella</th>
<th>lata</th>
<th>scintillans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 1886-87</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 1888-89</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 1890-91</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 1893</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 1896</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. 1897</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. 1899</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 1899</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specimen of O. gigas (1895) was self-fertilized and yielded 450 O. gigas forms, among which there was only one dwarf form, O. gigas-nanella. The three following generations remained constant. O. albida was a very sickly form, though it succeeded, thanks to regular attention, in breeding constant offspring. Among the O. oblonga descendants there was one specimen, albida, and in a later generation one specimen of O. rubrinervis. O. rubrinervis proved to be as fertile as Lamarkiana, and yielded besides a new variation, leptocarpa. The offspring of O. nanella was constant, though among the 1800 descendants of nanella in 1896 three specimens showed oblonga characteristics. O. lata was purely female: but, fertilized with pollen of other variants, it yielded 15 to 20 per cent O. lata descendants. O. scintillans was not constant. According to de Vries' observations (Repr. 1888), these new forms also originated in nature, but they succumbed in the struggle for existence. The differences between the single forms relate to various parts and degrees of development, though in several they are very slight. The plants become either stronger or weaker, with broader or narrower leaves: the flowers become larger and darker yellow, or smaller and lighter, the fruit longer or shorter, the outer skin rougher or smoother, etc.

It may be conceded that the Oenothera has developed constant forms corresponding to the so-called "small or elementary species." The question, however, is, whether the forms are really new ones or whether they owe their origin to some unexpected original crosses. In fact, if we are to suppose a previous cross, perhaps O. Lamarkiana and O. rubrinervis, then the O. Lamarkiana of Hilversum had contained the different variations in a latent form; and through cultivation gradually reverted by throwing off the different variations. At any rate, there cannot be any question of a progressive development, for the reason that none of the new forms shows the slightest progress in organization or even development of any kind advancing in that direction.

(3) Crosses and Mendelian Segregations. Cross-breeding can in nature hardly be considered as a factor in the progressive development of species; in particular, forms of different degrees of organization do not cross, and if they did, all deviations would soon be equalized according to the laws of chance (Heredity). All the greater seems to be the importance of the Mendelian segregations. It may be known to the reader that the famous experiments of the Abbot Mendel were carried on with seven different pairs of characters which he crossed with one another, and then, by letting the cross-breds self-fertilize, he continued the cultivation of the plants through a series of generations. In the first generation it was found that the offspring exhibited without exception the character of one of the parents, that of the other parent not appearing at all. Mendel therefore called the former—the prevailing—character the "dominant" and the other the "recessive." In the following generation,
The hybrids of any two different characters produce seeds, one half of which again develop the hybrid forms, while the other half yield offspring which remains constant, and possess the dominant and recessive characters in equal proportion. A simple analysis of this rule shows that it consists of three parts: (a) By fertilization the characters of the parents are united, without, however, thereby losing their purity and independence; (b) In the offspring the characters of both parents may again be separated from each other; (c) The character of one of the parents may completely conceal that of the other. This last part of the rule is not, according to later investigators, necessarily connected with the other two parts. We may add that Mendel's rule also holds good for the offspring of hybrids, in which several constant characters are combined, and that in it there is found a splendid confirmation of the modern theory of the cell. Cross-breeding, therefore, does not by any means lead to the mixing of characteristics. These, on the contrary, remain pure, or, at most, form new combinations or split up into simpler components. Hence, the idea that gaps in nature originate through such segregation is well founded. But the question, whether the idea is to be applied to the formation of species, and how this is to be carried out, can scarcely be answered at present. This much, however, is evident: that there is no progress in organization any more than there is any progressive specific development, brought about by segregation.

Hence this important conclusion follows: That the central idea of modern evolution theories—namely, progressive specific development—has not up to the present received any confirmation from observation of the world of organisms as it now exists. It is quite true, however, that the plasticity of organisms has been proved by a number of experiments to be very considerable; so that, in a constant environment, and by single variations, changes may be brought about which a systematist would classify as specific or even generic, if it were not clear from other sources that they are not such. In the same way forms could be developed by segregation, the characteristics of which would suffice "to constitute specific differences in the eyes of most systematists, were the plants or animals brought home by collectors" (Bateson) Yet such criteria are meaningless for the demonstration of the formation of species. The question as to the transmission of acquired characters is not by any means decided. It follows from the doctrine of propagation that only such characters can be transmitted as are contained in the germ-cells or which have been either directly or indirectly transmitted to them. Hence it is clear that all peculiarities acquired by the cells of the body through the influence of environment, or by use or disuse, can only be inherited if they are handed over, as it were, to the germ-cells. But it is useless to discuss the question before we have sufficient experimental evidence that acquired characters are at all inherited.

IV. The Paleontological Argument.—(1) Historical Method. Before entering upon the discussion of the evidence furnished by palaeontology we must briefly refer to the method which ought to be employed in the interpretation of the palaeontological records. The great archives of the geological strata are very incomplete. Almost three-quarters of the earth's surface is covered with water, and another large portion, with perpetual ice, while of the rest which has remained free from the ravages of water and the elements; of this small portion, again, only certain regions are accessible to the investigator, and these have been but partially examined. Besides, in most cases only the hard portions of organisms are preserved, and even these are often so badly mutilated that their correct classification is sometimes difficult. Many of them, especially in the oldest rocks, must have perished under the crushing force of metamorphic processes. Further, the geographic distribution of plants and animals must have varied according to climatological and topographical changes. It may suffice to cite the glacial periods of which there are clear indications in various geological epochs. Finally, the geological strata themselves underwent many violent strains and displacements, being upheaved, tilted, folded again, and even entirely inverted. It is evident that every one of these phenomena tends to produce chaos in its own way and makes the work of classifying and restoring all the harder. It gives at the same time to the scientist the right to formulate hypotheses probable in themselves and adapted to bridge over the numerous gaps in the work of reconstruction in the organic world. But these working hypotheses ought never to assume the form of scientific dogmas. For after all, the documents which have really been deciphered are the only deciding factors. At all events, the chronological succession and the genetic relation of organisms cannot be determined by a priori reasoning, or by means of our present system of classification, or by applying the results of ontogenetic studies. One illustration may suffice. Some maintain that trilobites are descended from blind ancestors because certain blind forms exhibit a number of simple characteristics which are common to all specimens. And yet we know that, e.g., *Tritonichus* possesses eyes in the earlier stages of its development, and only becomes blind in the later stages. The non-existence of eyes is, therefore, due to degeneration, and does not point to a former eyeless state. As a matter of fact, specimens of trilobites possessing eyes are found side by side with eyeless specimens in the lower Carabrian strata. Other examples of false a priori conclusions are to be found in the extraordinary genealogies constructed by extreme evolutionists, and which dissolve like so many mists in the light of advancing investigations. In fact, up to the present the genealogy of phylology has not been proved in any single instance. In short, if we disregard observation and experiment on living organisms, it is the historical method alone which can decide the limits of evolution and the succession and genetic relations of the different forms: "In the substitution of the present by the ancestral by real ones lies the future of true phylegetic science" (Handlisch).

(2) The Oldest Fossils. Now let us turn to the documents themselves and see what they have to show us. The foundation of the Archives is formed of gneiss and crystallized slate, a rigid mass containing the remains of organic life, and one which offers to the palaeontologist the hopeless outlook that his science must remain in a very incomplete state, perhaps forever. Immediately above this foundation, nature has imbedded the multitudinous, highly-developed Cambrian fauna, with-
out leaving the slightest trace of their antecedents, origin, birth, or age. Some 800 species of this remo-
test period are known to us. They belong almost
without exception to marine faunas, and are distributed
over all the chief groups of the invertebrates. Nearly
one-third are arthropods. They are the
known trilobites which occupy a position about the
middle of the scale of animal development. Other
groups belong to coelenterates, brachiopods, gastropods,
and cephalopods. Sponges, too, and traces of
worms are found, as also very imperfect fragments of
sporopods and other insects. Moreover, there can be
no doubt that various types of fishes must have ex-
isted, since in the Silurian age numerous representa-
tives, such as selachians, ganoids, marsipobranchi,
and dipnoans, are found from the very beginning side by side.
Where are the ancestors of these highly specialized
beings? The one thing we may affirm is that we know
absolutely nothing whatever of a primitive fauna and
of the numberless series of organisms which must have
followed them up to the Cambrian era, for the simple
reason that we possess absolutely no evidence. More-
over, there is not the least trace of paleontological evi-
dence of the spontaneous appearance of one imper-
fect organism or of the ascending development out of
primitive protoplasmic masses up to the time of the Cambrian
era. The Cambrian types were all of them specialized
forms perfectly adapted to time and environments,
and not generalized types of zoological systems. The
onset of the plant world is absolutely shrouded in im-
possible darkness for the paleontologist. The enor-
mous layers of anthracite and graphite are, according
to the most recent investigations, of inorganic origin.
Clearly established evidence of plant life only dates
from post-Silurian times, and consists of contents of the
oldest turf moors—giant ferns and horsetails, plants akin to the club-mosses, like the Lepidodendron,
and Gymnosperms, like the slender Cordaites. One
is astounded at the rich forms of this long-lost flora, and
we search in vain for their ancestors.
It is certainly remarkable, and a fact which clearly
proves the transformation of species, that plants be-
longing to these remote times vary considerably from
their later representatives. But, as Kerner von Mari-
lau insists, the “fundamental structure of the type”
is never obliterated, and the degree of organization has
at least remained the same. In particular, the pres-
cence of layers of the horsetails, ferns, and horsetails,
but miserable remains of their mighty ancestors, and the
Cordaites, though different from the present con-
ifers, were as highly organized as they. To this must
be added the recently discovered fact that seed-
bearing plants, which constitute a considerable part of
the fern flora of the Carboniferous, are found among
the ferns of the Devonian era.
(3) Angiosperms and Vertebrates. But how did the
undoubtedly higher forms of a later period originate?
To begin with the angiosperms, we are confronted
with the fact that these organisms appear quite sud-
denly in the Cretaceous era and form a group remark-
able, in forms as highly organized as their present
representatives. It is a fact that principally the dic-
yotyledons (at least those in the more recent strata)
correspond more and more to the present-day forms,
clearly indicating the relationship they bear to one an-
other. But whence the earliest forms of the creta-
ceous came, is shrouded in mystery. Similarly, the
gradual transformation of one species into another
cannot be proved in any concrete case. Only this
much is certain, that if evolution took place, it in-
volved a change which did not imply attainment to a
high degree of organization. In other words, what was
in mind, moreover, that we know of no intermediate forms capable of justifying even as much as a hypoth-
thesis that angiosperms were evolved from lower plants.
If the origin of the angiosperms is for the present
an insoluble problem, the genesis of the verte-
brates is no less so. However, in order not to pass en-
tirely over the post-Cambrian history of the inverte-
brates, we must at least make mention of the sig-
nificant fact that this fauna seems to be constantly
changing, but without ascending to higher forms of
organization. They are the “ancestors of the shell-
bearing groups, owing to the changed size, form,
and ornamentation of their shells, and in this
offers a very acceptable basis for the establishment of a
series of kindred forms—e. g., with the gastropod
genus Paludina of the Siluvian tertiary strata. But
these and other instances would almost entirely fall
on the calcareous nature of the medium, and on the varying
kind and amount of movement, we can scarcely be
inclined to regard an increased ornamentation of the
shell as a mark of real progress in organization, but
at most as a temporary development of actual disposi-
tions due to varying conditions of life.
EVIDENCE OF ANIMAL ORIGIN
The first authenticated ancestors of the vertebrates are
the fish—remains of the lower Silurian era. Widely
removed from them we find in the carboniferous
strata the oldest remains of the amphibian quadrup-
eds and, associated with them, forms of reptiles
which suddenly appear. These groups both, however,
belong to the unsolved problems of paleontology.
Among the Mesozoic fishes we encounter old forms
together with teleosts which suddenly appear in
the Jurassic strata without producing any transitional
forms. It is generally supposed that the teleosteans
are derived from some reptile which was adapted to
the water and, thus, the teleosts, as a matter of fact,
it would seem, have no structural advantage over the cartilagi-
nous fishes in the lesser hardness of the scale and the
greater hardness of the skeleton. This is, however,
but a shifting, as it were, of development, as the dis-
appearances of the rigid body-covering is compensated
for by the ossification of the skeleton. At any rate,
the origin of the teleosteans is an unsolved problem, as is
that of the Silurian ganoids. The appearance of birds
and mammals is likewise very mysterious. The first
known bird is the famous "bird-reptile" Archaeo-
teryx of the Jurassic strata at Soluhofen. In spite
of some characteristics that remind one of reptiles—as
for instance the twenty homologous caudal vertebrae,
the talons, the separated metacarpal bones and the
toothed jaw—yet the true bird nature is evidenced by
the plumage, the pinions, and the bill. In fact Archae-
teryx is far removed from the reptiles, nor does it
constitute any connecting link with the later birds,
not even with the toothed Ichthyornis and Hesperornis
of the upper Cretaceous era. Certainly the two iso-
lated specimens from Soluhofen indicate that birds
must have existed a long time before; but where their
place of origin is, none can tell.
Paleontology is silent likewise about the early his-
tory of mammals. The mesozoic representation of this
class may have some connexion with marsupials,
monotremes, and insectivorous animals, but as to the
early history of the great majority of placental mam-
mal mammals we have no evidence. A vast number
of intermediate forms would certainly be required to
connect the mammals with the reptiles. No such
series of forms is known. Even the genealogy of the
horse, which is considered the most striking example
of an evolutionary series within a mammalian family,
is scarcely more than a very moderately supported
hypothesis. Let the reader consider the accompany-
ing table of differences in the paleontological represen-
tatives of the Equidae. Upon the facts embodied
in this table, which—chiefly refer to fossils found in
North American strata, the following comments are
made: The generic classification must be a mere as-
sumption, though it must be conceded that some sedi-
mentary deposits their series seems to be continuous.
Secondly, the sub-families show great differences be-
tween one another. Of the Merychippus, which con-
nects the Equina with the Palaeotheria, we know only
the teeth. Thirdly, if we take the European material into consideration as well, we are confronted with widely divergent opinions, so much so that the brilliant pedigree becomes greatly dimmed. In particular, the Eocene forms and the still more remote genus *Phohippus* are avowedly very dubious ancestors of the horse. Lastly, it is well within the range of possi-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sub-family</th>
<th>Genus</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diluvian and Pliocene</td>
<td>Equus</td>
<td><em>Equus</em></td>
<td>One toe between two similar rudiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Miocene</td>
<td>Palaeotherium (with a)</td>
<td><em>Equus</em></td>
<td>United Long-crowned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eocene</td>
<td>Stygotherium (greatly different skull)</td>
<td><em>Hyracotherium</em></td>
<td>Three toes with larger middle toe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Eocene</td>
<td><em>Hyracotherium</em></td>
<td><em>Hyracotherium</em></td>
<td>Three toes with rudimentary split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hyracotherium</em></td>
<td>Three toes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE OF DIFFERENCES IN PALEONTOLOGICAL EQUIDAE

In all, eighty figures are represented, of which number forty-nine are those of bisons.

From what has been said we may conclude that man, in the first stage of civilization known to us, appears as a true *Homo sapiens*; but how he arrived at that stage is a problem we are quite unable to answer, because all records are wanting. The bones, too,
human, and have given rise to renewed interest through the valuable discoveries made in Krapina. The Neandertal skull itself serves as a type which, owing to the low, receding forehead and the strongly developed supra-orbital ridges, appears to be very primitive, though no one knows the actual geological conditions of the place where it was originally deposited. We pass over the fact that twenty scientists have expressed twelve different opinions on this mysterious cranium, and confine ourselves to the latest opinion of Schwab, who says that the Neandertal cranium exhibits forms which are never found in either a normal or a pathologically altered Homo sapiens, whether Negro, European, or Australian, and yet at the same time the skull does exhibit human characteristics. In a word, the Neandertal skull does not belong to any variety of Homo sapiens. Kohlbrugge very aptly compares Schwab's hypothesis to an upturned pyramid balancing on a fine point, since a single Australian or Negro skull which may be found to agree with the Neandertal skull suffices to overthrow the hypothesis. Such a skull has not as yet been found, but there are other factors which suffice to disprove Schwab's hypothesis. The nearest relative to the other diluvial bone remains of Homo primigenius, amongst others to the petrified Gibraltar skull, to two molar teeth from the Taubach cave, to the two fragments of a skull from the mammoth caves of Spy, and the jawsbones from La Nauette, Schipka, Oches, and, finally, to considerable remains of bones, such as fragments of skulls, lower jawbones, pelvic bones, thigh and shin bones, from a cave near Krapina in Croatia. To these must be added the "Mouster skull" which was dug up in August, 1908, in Vezenetal (Dordogne). All these fragments possess fairly uniform characteristics. Especially those worthy of note are, above all, the cranium with its prominent supra-orbital ridges and receding forehead. These qualities, however, are not infrequently found in men of the present day. Australians exhibit here and there even the genuine supra-orbital ridges (Gorjanowie-Kramberger). It cannot be clearly decided whether we are dealing with purely individual characteristics or with peculiarities which would justify us in classifying the Krapina fragments as belonging to a special race. But this much is clear, that the formation of the skull and the degree of civilization of that race are quite sufficient to permit of our designating Homo primigenius not as a species of itself, but merely as a local sub-division of the Homo sapiens. The Galley Hill skull, from England, which is still older than the Krapina bones, points to the same conclusion and corresponds to the most ancient skulls of post-diluvial man. Hence, to sum up, we may affirm that we are acquainted with no records of Tertiary man, that the most ancient remains of the Quaternary belong to the Galley Hill man, whose skull worthily represents Homo sapiens. The same is to be said of the oldest traces of civilization as yet known to us.

Palaeontology, therefore, can assert nothing of whatever a development of the body of man from the animal. It may be added that Haeckel's curious "Progonotaxis", or genealogy of man, is a pure fiction. It consists of thirty stages, beginning with the "mon-
analogies of structure and function in vastly different groups. Finally, the chief problem, which refers to teleology of adaptive modifications, is not even touched by the doctrine of descent from common ancestors.

(2) Man and the Anthropoids.—Palæontology knows of no records that point to the relationship between the body of man and that of the anthropoid. Hence it follows that the argument of analogy and classification is of little worth. But, as ever and again attempts are made to discover analogies between every bone of man and his corresponding part of the ape (e.g. Wiedersheim), it will be useful to gather a few of the more important morphological discrepancies which exist between man's body and that of the anthropoids (orang-utang, chimpanzee, gorilla). It is, however, far from our intention to attribute to these differences any great argumentative force, especially against those who suppose that there was a common primate ancestry from which both man and ape finally descend; nor do we wish to deny that zoologically the human body belongs to the class of the mammals, nor that within this class there is any representative more similar to it than the anthropoids.

Of these differences the most important lies in the development of the brain of man and of the anthropoid, which is seen from the comparison of the weights. According to Wiedersheim we are forced to admit that the relative mass of the human brain is twice that of the chimpanzee, while, absolutely, it is from three to four times as great. The same is probably true of the orang-utang, while the brain of the gorilla, which, according to Wiedersheim, is the most humanlike of any of the anthropoid brains, is relatively only one-fifth that of man's. The human skull is from three to four times as large as that of the anthropoids. The difference becomes much more striking still when we compare the cerebral hemispheres and their convolutions. The weight of the brain of a male Teuton of from thirty to forty years of age is on the average 1424 grammes, that of a female 1273 grammes, and that of a full-grown orang only 79-7 grammes (Wundt). The proportion is therefore from 18:1 to 16:1. If we measure the superficial area of man's brain with all its convolutions and that of the orang we have, according to Wagner, from 1777 sq. cm. to 2196 sq. cm. for the human brain and 533-5 sq. cm. for that of the orang—that is a proportion of 4:4:1. It is further to be taken into consideration that, as Wiedersheim points out, the human brain is not to be looked upon as an enlarged anthropoid one, but as a "new acquisition with structures which the anthropoid does not as yet [!] possess." These new acquisitions are presumably qualitative and refer mainly to the centre within the great cerebral hemispheres. Intimately connected with the development of the brain is the moderate development of the dentition of man in comparison with the chisel-like molars of the monkey, which is armed with powerful teeth. Again, "the human face slides as it were down from the forehead and appears as an appendix to the front half of the skull. The gorilla's face, on the contrary, protrudes from the skull, which on return slides almost entirely backwards from the face. . . . It is only on account of its protruding, strongly developed lower parts that the small skull-cap of the animal can mask as a kind of human face" (Ranke).

A second group of differences is obtained by comparing the limbs of man and the anthropoid. Owing to his upright stature, man's appendicular skeleton is quite different in form and structure from that of the anthropoid. This is shown not merely by the length of the single parts, which, strangely enough, exhibit inverse proportions, but also in the interior structure of the bones, as was proved by Wallhoff (1905) in the case of the femur. If we suppose the length of the body to be 100 we have, according to Ranke, the following proportions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Gorilla</th>
<th>Chimpanzee</th>
<th>Orang</th>
<th>Negro</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arm and hand</td>
<td>84'9</td>
<td>87'7</td>
<td>80'7</td>
<td>48'16</td>
<td>45'43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>34'9</td>
<td>35'2</td>
<td>34'7</td>
<td>45'5</td>
<td>48'8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special measurements taken from the skeletons of an adult Frenchman and an orang, represented in the accompanying plate, gave the following particulars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Orang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humerus 25 cm. 36 &quot;</td>
<td>22 cm. 39'8 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius: Ulna 25 cm. 41 &quot;</td>
<td>47 cm. 31 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femur: Tibia 25 cm. 37 &quot;</td>
<td>25 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sponge-like structure in the femur of man and anthropoid exhibits considerable difference, so that it could be established by means of radiogrammes whether the femur was that of an upright walking individual or not; e.g., it was possible to prove the Neanderthal and Spy femur to be human. The foot of man is, moreover, very characteristic. It is not furnished with a thumb that can be bent across the whole member and hence it does not represent a typical prehensile organ, as is the case with the hind feet of the monkey. In general, each bone and organ of man could in some sense be styled ape-like, but in no case does this similarity go so far that the form peculiar to man would pass over into the form which is peculiar to the ape. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that, according to Ranké and Weisbach, all the efforts to discover a series of bodily formations which would lead from the most apelike savages to the best apelike races have till now resulted in utter failure, since the apelike forms of organs actually found in some individuals are not confined to a single race or nation, but are distributed throughout all of them. Tailed ape-men, in the proper sense of the word, have no existence. If sometimes tail-like appendages occur, they are genuine deformities, pathological remnants of the individual's embryonic life. Cretins and microcephali are likewise pathological cases. The theory that such were the ancestors of the human species is certainly excluded by the fact that they are unable to procure independently the necessary means of existence.

(3) **“Blood Relationship” between Man and the Anthropoid.** In 1900 Friedental thought that he was able to prove the kinship of man and the anthropoid biochemically by showing, first, that the transfusion of human blood-serum into the chimpanzee was not followed by any signs of blood-poisoning, as usually happens on the introduction of foreign blood, and, secondly, that human serum did not produce a reaction when introduced into a solution of the blood of the orang and gibbon, while on the other hand it dissolved the blood corpuscles of the lower apes. A little later Nutall and others proved that anti-sera exercised an opposite effect. An "anti-man-serum" was prepared by injecting subcutaneously sterile human serum into a rabbit till the animal became immune to poisoning from the foreign blood-serum. The "anti-man-serum" of rabbit-blood thus prepared gave a precipitate with the blood-serum of man or of an animal with chemically similar blood, for instance anthropoids, but not with the serum of chemically different blood. The force of the argument lies, therefore, in this, that the chemical reaction obtained seems to be on the whole proportional to the degree of their chemical affinity.

What follows from these facts? Only this, that the blood of man is chemically similar to that of the anthropoids; but it does not follow that this chemical similarity must be attributed to any kinship of race. The mistake arises from the confusion of the ideas "similarity of blood" and "blood-relationship" in the genealogical sense of the term; otherwise it would be at once perceived that the fact of chemical similarity of blood is of no more importance for the theory of vertical evolution than any other fact of comparative morphology or physiology.

(4) **Rudimentary Organs.** One of the special arguments commonly cited in favour of the evolution theory is based on the frequent occurrence of rudimentary structures in organisms. As examples we may mention the following: Pythons and boa possess vestiges of hind limbs and of a pelvis separated from the vertebral column. The slow-worm is without external limbs, and yet possesses the shoulder-girdle and the pelvis, as well as a slightly developed breast-bone. The ostrich has merely stunted wing-bones, while the nearly extinct kiwi (aperyx) of New Zealand has only extremely small stumps of wings, which are clothed with hair-like feathers. The gigantic birds of New Zealand which became extinct in past ages were entirely wingless. Well worthy of note, also, are the rudimentary organs of the whale (Cetacea), since of the hind limbs only a few minute bones remain, and these are considered to be the pelvic bones, while the Greenland whale (Balena mysticetus) also possesses thigh and leg bones. The bones of the fore-limbs are not movable independently of one another, being bound together by means of tendons. Other remarkable pathological structures are the teeth of the Arctic right whale, which never penetrate the gums and are reabsorbed before birth, the upper teeth of the ox, the milk teeth and the eyes of the mole. The deep sea fish, like the Barathronae, have instead of eyes "two golden metallic concave mirrors" (Chun).

Nor is man devoid of rudimentary organs. Wiedereiche mentions no fewer than one hundred but of these only a few are genuine. The vermiform appendix may serve as an example, though according to recent research it is not entirely functionless. Its length oscillates between 2 cm. and 23 cm., while its breadth and external form vary exceedingly. Probable reasons for its partially rudimentary character are, besides its extreme variability, especially two facts in particular: the length of the organ compared with that of the large intestine is 1:10 in the embryo, and as 1:20 in the adult; secondly, in 32 per cent of all cases among adults of over twenty years of age the appendix is found to be closed.

Do such rudimentary organs furnish us with an acceptable proof for the theory of evolution? It is to be admitted that in many instances the organs were
formerly in a more perfect condition, so as to perform their typical functions—e.g., the eyes of the mole as organs of sight; and the limbs of the kiwi as means of locomotion for running or even for flying. Hence those individuals which now possess rudimentary organs are descended from ancestors which were in possession of some organs in a less degenerate condition. But it cannot be ascertained from the structures whether those ancestors were of another kind than their offspring. The veriform appendix in man is fully explained by supposing it to have had in antediluvian man a more perfect function of secretion, or simply the organs that remained. Until the palaeontological records furnish us with more evidence we can only conclude from the occurrence of rudimentary structures that in former ages the whale possessed better developed limbs, that the moles had better eyes, the kiwi wings, etc. In short, rudimentary organs per se do not prove more than that structures may dwindle away by disuse.

Haeckel’s endeavour to invalidate the teleological argument has no foundation in fact. In many cases the function of rudimentary organs has been discovered—e.g., the rudimentary teeth of the whale are probably of use in the growth of the jaw; the vertebral bone of the slow-worm as a protection of the chest. But even in instances in which we have not succeeded in discovering the function of such structures, it must not be forgotten that degeneration may be eminently teleological in furnishing material for other organs whose functions become more important. Moreover, as long as rudimentary organs remain, they may become, under altered circumstances, the starting-point for an appropriately modified reorganization. It is indeed difficult to see how “dysteleology”, as Haeckel calls it, follows from the fact that an organ adapted to some function disappears, probably in order to strengthen other organs when those means of livelihood are changed; and, until the contrary is proved, we may assume that we have to deal with instances of teleological adaptation and correlation, as has already been demonstrated in many cases—e.g., in the development of amphibians.

VI. THE ONTOGENETIC ARGUMENT.—Comparisons between the embryos of higher forms and the adult stages of lower groups were made long before the evolution theory was generally accepted by biologists. But it was only after 1859 that the facts of embryology were interpreted by means of that theory. Fritz Müller (1864) was one of the first to advance the view that the ontogenetic development of an individual is a short and simplified repetition of the stages through which the species had passed. Haeckel modified the proposition by introducing the term “kenogenesis”, which should account for all points of disagreement between the two series of development. In its new form the theory of recapitulation received the name “the biogenetic law of development”. Later on Hertwig reformed the law a second time by changing the expression “repetition of forms of essential ancestors” into “repetition of forms necessary for organic development and leading from the simple to the complex”. Besides, considerable changes, generally in an advancing direction, are said to have been brought about by the action of external and internal factors, so that in reality “a later condition can never correspond to a preceding one”. Both Haeckel’s and Hertwig’s views were rejected by Morgan, who does not believe in the recapitulation of ancestral adult stages by the embryo, but tries to show that the resemblance between the embryos of higher forms might be due to “the presence in the embryos of the lower groups of certain structures that remain in the adult forms of this group”. According to Morgan, we are justified in comparing “the embryonic stages of the two groups” only—a theory which he calls “the repetition theory.” Perhaps the most striking fact to illustrate the ontogenetic argument is the resemblance between the gill-system of fishes and certain analogous structures in the embryos of the other vertebrates, man included. However, contrary to the statements of most scientists, we do not think that the resemblance is such as to justify us in concluding “with complete certainty that all vertebrates must in the course of their history have passed through stages in which they were gill-breathing animals” (Wiedersheim). The embryos of fishes are at a certain very early stage of development furnished with vertical pouches which grow out from the wall of the pharynx till they fuse with the skin. Then a number of vertical slits (gill-slits) are formed by the fact that the walls of the pouches separate. In the adult fishes the corresponding openings serve to let water pass from the mouth through the gill-slits, which are covered by the capillaries of the gill-filaments. In this way the animal is enabled to provide the blood with the necessary oxygen and to remove the carbon dioxide. Now it is quite true that in all vertebrates there is some resemblance as to the first formation of the pouches, the slits, and the distribution of blood-vessels. But it is only in fishes that real gill-structures are formed. In the other vertebrates the development does not proceed beyond the formation of the apparently indiffernt pouches which never perform any respiratory function nor show the least tendency to develop into such organs. On the contrary, the gill-slits and arches seem to have, from the very beginning, a totally different function, actually subserving, at least in part, the formation of other organs. Even the amphibians that are furnished with temporary gills form them in quite a peculiar manner, which cannot be compared with that of fishes. Besides, the distribution of blood-vessels and the gradual disappearance of seemingly useless structures, as the “gill-systems” of vertebrates seem to be, may likewise be observed in cases where no one would seriously suspect a relation to former specific characteristics of living forms. In short, there is (1) no evidence that the embryos of mammals and birds have true inipient gill-structures; (2) it is probable that the structures interpreted as such really subserve from the very beginning quite different functions, perhaps only of a temporary nature.

In general it may be said that the biogenetic law of development is as yet scarcely more than a pristino principii. Because (1) the agreement between ontogeny and phylogeny has not been proved in a single instance; on the contrary—e.g., the famous pedigree of the horse’s foot begins ontogenetically with a single digit; (2) the ontogenetic similarity which may be observed, for instance, in the larval stages of insects may be explained by the similarity of the environment; (3) the ontogenetic stages of organisms are throughout specifically dissimilar, as is proved by a careful concrete comparison. The same conclusion is indicated.
by Hertwig's and Morgan's modifications of the biogenetic law, which, in turn, are of a merely hypothetical nature. In addition to this a short reference to Weismann's "confirmation" of Haeckel's law may be useful. Weismann knew that in the larval development of butterflies the species cannot be traced by merely longitudinal ones. Hence he concluded that in certain similar butterflies, whose early larval stages were then unknown, a similar succession of markings ought to be found. Ten years later the "predicted" marking was discovered. It is plain that such facts are not confirmation of the biogenetic law, but find their simple explanation in the fact that similar organisms will show similar ontogenetic stages. This fact, too, seems to account sufficiently for the observations advanced by Morgan in support of his theory of repetition.

VII. THE BIOGEOGRAPHICAL ARGUMENT.—The biogeoographical argument is a very complex one, composed of a vast number of single facts whose correlation among one another, and whose bearing upon the problem of evolution, can hardly be determined before many years of detailed research have gone by. The theory is well established, for instance, by Wallace are certainly not supported by facts. On the contrary, they have serious defects. One of them is the well-known "Wallace line"; another, much more important, the unfounded assertion that the higher vertebrates must have originated from marsupial and monotremes because these animals are almost entirely extinct everywhere except Australia, where they survive, as the highest representatives of the Australian vertebrates, in greatly varying forms till today. Besides, in most cases that we have no sufficient knowledge of the geographical distribution of organisms and of its various causes. But in order to give the reader an idea of the argument we shall briefly refer him to a group of facts which is well adapted to support the view of evolution explained in the preceding pages. Volcanic islands and such as are separated from the continent by a sea or strait of great depth exhibit a fauna and flora which have certainly come from the neighbouring countries, but which at the same time possess features altogether peculiar to them. The flora of Socotra, in the Indian Ocean, for instance, comprises 550 systematic species; among these there are 300 endemic plant species or 450; on the Hawaiian Islands, 70 endemic species of birds among 116; on the Galapagos, 81 among 108. Many such facts are known. They certainly form an excellent demonstration in favour of the proposition defended throughout this article: that such forms as the endemic species, which may well be compared with the races of the human species, were not directly created, but arose by some process of modification which was greatly facilitated by their complete isolation.

The most important general conclusions to be noted are as follows:—
1. The origin of life is unknown to science.
2. The origin of the main organic types and their principal subdivisions are likewise unknown to science.
3. There is no evidence in favour of an ascending evolution of organic forms.
4. There is no trace of even a merely probable argument in favour of the animal origin of man. The earliest human fossils and the most ancient traces of culture refer to a true Homo sapiens as we know him today.
5. Most of the so-called systematic species and genera were certainly not created as such, but originated by a process of either gradual or saltatory evolution. Changes which extend beyond the range of variation observed in the human species have thus far not been distinctly demonstrated, either experimentally or historically.

6. There is very little known about the causes of evolution. The greatest difficulty is to explain the origin and constancy of "new" characters and the teleology of the process. Darwin's "natural selection" is a negative factor only. The moulding influence of the environment cannot be broken down, but it proves unable to ascertain how far that influence may extend. Lamarck's "inheritance of acquired characters" is not yet exactly proved, nor is it evident that really new forms can arise by "mutation". In our opinion the principal of Mendelian segregation", together with the Weismann's natural selection and the movement of environment, will probably be some of the chief constituents of future evolutionary theories.

Many works referring to the subject have been mentioned in the body of the article. We shall here enumerate mainly such works on which the student of biogeography, or palaeontology, will be most interested.
bishop, Quintianus, was present at the Council of Elvira early in the fourth century. There exists no complete list of his successors for the next two centuries, though some are known from ancient diplomas. In 584 the Visigothic king, Leovigild, incorporated Evreux into the Kingdom of the Suevi, to the sorrow of Evora, which hitherto belonged. From the sixth and seventh centuries there remain few Christian inscriptions pertaining to Evora. In one of them has been interpolated the name of a Bishop Julian (1 Dec., 566); he is, however, inadmissible. Thenceforth the episcopal list is known from the reign of Recared (586) to the Arab invasion (714), after which the succession is quite unknown for four centuries and a half, with the exception of the epiphany of a Bishop Daniel (January, 1100). Until the reconquest (1106) by Alfonso I of Portugal, Evora was suffragan to Merida. Under this king it became suffragan to Braga, despite the protests of the Archbishops of Compostella, administrators of Merida. In 1274, however, the latter succeeded in bringing Evora within their jurisdiction. Finally, it became suffragan to Lisbon from 1394 to 1514, when it was made an archbishopric. Its large and splendid cathedral has undergone many architectural changes. Among its illustrious prelates may be mentioned Enrique (1540-64), 1578-80; the founder of its university and King of Portugal (1578-80); Teutonic de Braganza (1570-1602); and the scholarly writers Alfonso de Portugal (1456-1522) and Father Manuel de Cenaculo Villasboas (1802-14). Portuguese writers have maintained that the first bishop of Evora was St. Mautius, a Roman, and a disciple of Jesus Christ, sent by the Apostles into Spain as a missionary of the Gospel; from his genuine acts it appears that he was a devout Christian, put to death by the Jews after the fourth century. Spanish Jews, it is known, are mentioned in the fourth-century Council of Elvira (can. 49).

FONSECA, Evora glosaria (Rome, 1729), 261-315; Espana Sagrada (Madrid, 1761), XIV, 102-141; Gama, Series episcoporum (1753), 93-100; Suppl. (1789), 91; HINBERN, Inscriptiones Hispaniae christiane (Berlin, 1871), n. 1, 9, 10, 11, 213, 324; EDELE, Hierarchia catholica medii aevi (Munich, 1901), I, 163, II, 246.

F. FITA.

EVEUX, Diocese of (Evreciensis), in the Department of Eure, France; suffragan of the Archdiocese of Rouen. A legend purporting to date from a certain Deodatus, who is said to have been converted and then later ordained by St. Taurinus, makes the latter first bishop of Evreux. According to this legend St. Taurinus was baptized at Rome by St. Clement and sent to Gaul as a companion to St. Denis. According to Mgr. Duchesne this legend arose about the ninth century, when Abbot Hilduin of Saint-Denis was intent on proving the identity of Dionysius the Areopagite with Dionysius (Denis), first Bishop of Paris. It is certain that in the time of Charles the Bald (ninth century) St. Taurinus was held in high esteem at Evreux; still earlier, Bishop Landulphus, who seems to have occupied the See of Evreux at the beginning of the seventh century, had built the basilica in his honour. It is also impossible to fix the date of the reign of St. Gaul, who died a hermit at St. Pair, in the Cotentin. The first historically known Bishop of Evreux is Maurusio, who was present at the Council of Orléans in 511. Other bishops of Evreux are: St. Landulphus, St. Eterius, and St. Aquilinus (seventh century); Gilbert (1017-1112), sent by William the Conqueror to Alexander II, who preached the funeral oration over the Conqueror; still earlier, Bishop Landulphus, who seems to have occupied the See of Evreux at the beginning of the seventh century, had built the basilica in his honour. It is also impossible to fix the date of the reign of St. Gaul, who died a hermit at St. Pair, in the Cotentin.

Cathedral of Notre-Dame, Evreux. There are pilgrimages to the shrine of Notre-Dame de la Couture at Bernay (since the tenth century); to that of Notre-Dame des Ares at Pont de l'Arche; and to a relic of St. Clotilda venerated at Andelys. Previous to the anti-Congregations law of 1901, there were Jesuits and Lazarists at Evreux. Communities of nuns devoted to teaching and the relief of the poor were: the Dominicans of St. Catherine of Siena, an institute founded in 1587 at Etrepagny, which has three houses in the English West Indies; and especially the Sisters of Providence of Evreux, an order founded in 1700 by Justine Duvivier and her brother Father Duvivier in a small hamlet called Caer. It was organized by Father James, an Eudist missionary, and re-established in 1804 by Mgr. Théodore Le Mesle; it now has several houses in the diocese. The charitable institutions in charge of religious orders were in 1900: 2 cècrèches, 10 day-nursery, 1 orphan asylum for boys, 12 for girls, 3 workrooms, 19 homes for the aged, 11 dispensaries, 2 houses of retreat, and 1 insane asylum. The Diocese of Evreux comprised in 1905 (close of the Concordat period) 334,751 inhabitants, 37 parishes, 554 curvularian churches (mission churches), and 25 vicariates paid by the State.

Ewald (or Ewald), Saints, Martyrs in Old Saxony about 693. They were two priests and natives of Northumbria, England. Both bore the same name, but were distinguished as the Black Ewald and the Fair Ewald, from the difference in the colour of their hair and complexion. According to the example of many at that time, they spent several years as students in the schools of Ireland. Ewald the Black was the more learned of the two, but both were equally renowned for holiness of life. They were apparently acquainted with St. Willibrord, the Apostle of Friesland, and were animated with his zeal for the conversion of the Germans. Indeed, by some they have been actually numbered among the eleven companions of that saint, but it is more probable they did not set out from England till after St. Willibrord's departure. They entered upon their mission about 690. The scene of their labours was the country of the Ewalds, the part of Westphalia, and covered by the dioceses of Münster, Osnabrück, and Paderborn. At first the Ewalds took up their abode in the house of the steward of a certain Saxian earl or ealdorman (satrapa). Bede remarks that "the old Saxons have no king, but the royal power is shared among their ealdormen, who are elected by the people; and the wisest is the one in whose wisdom the country is best served, who is held to be the king of the tribe, the protector of the church." The Ewalds therefore lived in the midst of the people, and were respected by the heathen for their knowledge of the Scriptures and for their holiness of life. They laboured with much success, and were followed by many disciples, among whom were several ealdormen who were converted to Christianity. These, after the death of the Ewalds, continued their labours in the same spirit and with the same success as their masters.

Meanwhile, the Ewalds omitted nothing of their religious exercises. They prayed often, recited the canonical hours, and celebrated Mass, for they carried with them all that was necessary for the Holy Sacrifice. The pagan Saxons, understanding from these things that they had Christian priests and missionaries in their midst, began to suspect that their aim was to convert their overlord, and thus destroy their temples and their religion. Inflamed with jealousy and anger, they resolved that the Ewalds should die. Ewald the Fair quickly despatched with the steward of the Black Ewald, but, since the Black Ewald was a man of peace and was respected by the heathen, he was preserved. He was then called to the chief town, and there was held a meeting to decide the fate of the Ewalds. After much deliberation, the heathen agreed to put them to death, and the two bodies were cast into the Rhine. This is understood to have happened on 3 October at a place called Andernach, where a chapel still stands.

When the ealdorman heard of what had been done he was exceedingly angry, and took vengeance by ordering the murderers to be put to death and their village to be destroyed by fire. Meanwhile the martyred bodies were miraculously carried against the stream up the Rhine, for the space of forty miles, to the place in which the companions of the Ewalds were residing. As they floated along, a heavenly light, like a column of fire, was seen to shine above them. Even the murderers are said to have witnessed the miraculous brightness. Moreover, one of the martyrs appeared in vision to the monk Tilm (a companion of the Ewalds), and told him where the bodies would be found: "that the spot where they are buried will be a place of pilgrimage for the faithful through all ages."

Pepin, Duke of Austrasia, having heard of the wonders that had occurred, caused the bodies to be translated to Cologne, where they were solemnly enshrined in the collegiate church of St. Gumibert. The heads of the martyrs were bestowed on Frederick, Bishop of Munster, by Archbishop Anno of Cologne, at the opening of the shrine in 1074. These relics were probably destroyed by the Anabaptists in 1534. When St. Norbert visited Cologne, in 1121, he obtained two vessels containing the relics of the Ewalds, and among them were bones of the saints. These were deposited either at Prémontré, or at Florennes, a Premonstratensian monastery in the province of Namur. The two Ewalds are honoured as patrons in Westphalia, and are mentioned in the Roman Martyrology on 3 October. Their feast is celebrated in the dioceses of Cologne and Munster.

Ewing, Thomas, jurist and statesman, b. in West Liberty, Virginia (now West Virginia), U.S. A., 28 December, 1789; d. at Lancaster, Ohio, 26 October, 1871. His father, George Ewing of New Jersey, who had served as an officer in the Continental Army after the Revolu- tionary War, was a founder of the ancient county of Monogum Valley, and then, in 1789, in what is now Ames Township, Athens County, Ohio. Here, amid the privations of pioneer life, Ewing was taught to read by his elder sister, Sarah, and by extraordinary efforts acquired a fair elementary education. At the age of eleven, he left home and worked in a salt establishment, pursuing his studies at night by the light of the furnace fires. He remained there until he had earned sufficient to enable him to enter the Ohio University at Athens, where, in 1815, he received the degree of A.B., the first degree conferred by any college in the western part of the United States.

In March, 1821, Ewing entered public life as a member from Ohio of the United States Senate, and became prominent therein, with Webster and Clay, in resistance of the acts of President Jackson and in support of the Black Republicans. He upheld the protective tariff system of Clay, and presented one of the first of the memorials for the abolition of slavery.

In March, 1837, on the expiration of his term, he resumed the practice of the law. Upon the election of President Harrison, he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury in March, 1841. He prepared the second bill for the re-charter of the Bank of the United States, and, on its veto by Tyler, resigned from the cabinet, in September, 1841. In March, 1849, he was appointed by President Taylor secretary of the recently created Department of the Interior. He originated and conducted the construction of a railroad to the Pacific. On the death of Taylor in 1850, Ewing resigned from the cabinet and was appointed senator from Ohio to fill an unexpired term. On the expiration of his term in March, 1851, he returned to the practice of the law. In 1860 Ewing was appointed by the Governor of Ohio a member of the famous Peace Conference, and he was prominent in the efforts to avert the secession of the Southern States. During the war he unreservedly supported the government, and his judgment on matters of state was frequently sought by Mr. Lincoln. Upon the capture of Mason and Slidell brought England and the United States to the verge of hostilities, Ewing sent Mr. Lincoln the famous telegram that was decisive of the whole trouble: "There can be no contraband of war between neutral points."

COLUMBA EDMONDS.
the envos and the averting of hostilities. Conservative in his opinions, Ewing opposed the radical measures of Reconstruction at the close of the war and supported the administration of President Johnson. In February, 1868, after the removal of Stanton, the President appointed him to the Senate nomination of Ewing as Secretary of War, but it was not confirmed.

Descended of Scottish Presbyterian stock, Ewing, after a lifelong attraction to the Catholic Church, entered it in his latter years. Reared outside the fold of any religious body, he married, 7 January, 1820, Maria Wills Boyle, daughter of Hugh Boyle, an Irish Catholic, who was deeply influenced by the faith and pious example of his wife during their long married life, and all his children were reared in the faith. In October, 1869, Ewing was stricken while arguing a case before the Supreme Court of the United States and he was baptized in the court room. In September, 1871, his lifelong friend, Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, received him into the Church.

Philemon Beecher, eldest son of Thomas, b. at Lancaster, 3 November, 1820; d. there 15 April, 1896. He graduated in 1858 from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and then entered upon the study of the law. Admitted to the Bar in 1851, he formed with his father the firm of T. Ewing & Son. In both State and Federal courts, through his grasp of the philosophy of the law and his judicial temperament, he won a place beside his illustrious father. He was also the main support of his father in his political life and labours, and was an active figure first in the Whig and then in the Republican party. In 1862 he was appointed Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. Being opposed to the Reconstruction measures of his party he took part in the Liberal Republican movement. He was nominated to the supreme bench of Ohio in 1873. During the fifties and sixties which he engrossed in banking business, and was prominent in the development of the Hocking Valley coal-fields. The later years of his life were spent in retirement.

He married at Lancaster 31 August, 1848, Mary Rebecca Gillespie, a sister of Eliza Maria Gillespie (Mother Mary of St. Angela of the Sisters of the Holy Cross of Notre Dame, Indiana). He was a man of wide culture and a writer of vigorous and limpid English. He was ever foremost where the interests of the Church were concerned, and was a delegate from the Diocese of Columbus to the Catholic Congresses of 1847 and 1853.

Hugh Boyle, third son of Thomas, b. at Lancaster, 31 October, 1826; d. there 30 June, 1905. He was educated at the United States Military Academy at West Point, and in 1849 went to California, returning to Lancaster, in 1852, to enter on the study of the law. On his admission to the Bar, he practiced in St. Louis, Missouri, from 1854 to 1856, and then, in partnership with his brother Thomas, at Leavenworth, Kansas, from 1856 to 1858. In April, 1861, he was appointed a captain in the 7th Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and while in his regiment at St. Louis, Missouri, from 1854 to 1856, and then, in partnership with his brother Thomas, at Leavenworth, Kansas, from 1856 to 1858.

In April, 1861, he was appointed a captain in the 7th Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and while in his regiment at St. Louis, Missouri, from 1854 to 1856, and then, in partnership with his brother Thomas, at Leavenworth, Kansas, from 1856 to 1858, he was commissioned colonel, commanding the 17th Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and rendered conspicuous service. In November, 1862, he was commissioned brigade-general. He took part in the operations against Vicksburg, and his command led in the assault of 22 May, 1863. In July following he was made a major-general, and his command was in the assault upon Missionary Ridge in the operations about Chattanooga. He led his division in the assault upon Missionary Ridge and its capture. In the latter part of the war he was placed in command of the district of Kentucky, and at its close was brevetted major-general. In 1869 President Johnson appointed him Governor of Missouri, but he resigned.

On 3 January, 1873, he was appointed by President Johnson to the Senate, to the Senate nomination of Ewing as Secretary of War, but it was not confirmed.
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Descended of Scottish Presbyterian stock, Ewing, after a lifelong attraction to the Catholic Church, entered it in his latter years. Reared outside the fold of any religious body, he married, 7 January, 1820, Maria Wills Boyle, daughter of Hugh Boyle, an Irish Catholic, who was deeply influenced by the faith and pious example of his wife during their long married life, and all his children were reared in the faith. In October, 1869, Ewing was stricken while arguing a case before the Supreme Court of the United States and he was baptized in the court room. In September, 1871, his lifelong friend, Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, received him into the Church.

Philemon Beecher, eldest son of Thomas, b. at Lancaster, 3 November, 1820; d. there 15 April, 1896. He graduated in 1858 from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and then entered upon the study of the law. Admitted to the Bar in 1851, he formed with his father the firm of T. Ewing & Son. In both State and Federal courts, through his grasp of the philosophy of the law and his judicial temperament, he won a place beside his illustrious father. He was also the main support of his father in his political life and labours, and was an active figure first in the Whig and then in the Republican party. In 1862 he was appointed Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. Being opposed to the Reconstruction measures of his party he took part in the Liberal Republican movement. He was nominated to the supreme bench of Ohio in 1873. During the fifties and sixties which he engrossed in banking business, and was prominent in the development of the Hocking Valley coal-fields. The later years of his life were spent in retirement.
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Hugh Boyle, third son of Thomas, b. at Lancaster, 31 October, 1826; d. there 30 June, 1905. He was educated at the United States Military Academy at West Point, and in 1849 went to California, returning to Lancaster, in 1852, to enter on the study of the law. On his admission to the Bar, he practiced in St. Louis, Missouri, from 1854 to 1856, and then, in partnership with his brother Thomas, at Leavenworth, Kansas, from 1856 to 1858. In April, 1861, he was appointed a captain in the 7th Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and while in his regiment at St. Louis, Missouri, from 1854 to 1856, and then, in partnership with his brother Thomas, at Leavenworth, Kansas, from 1856 to 1858.

In April, 1861, he was appointed a captain in the 7th Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and while in his regiment at St. Louis, Missouri, from 1854 to 1856, and then, in partnership with his brother Thomas, at Leavenworth, Kansas, from 1856 to 1858, he was commissioned colonel, commanding the 17th Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and rendered conspicuous service. In November, 1862, he was commissioned brigade-general. He took part in the operations against Vicksburg, and his command led in the assault of 22 May, 1863. In July following he was made a major-general, and his command was in the assault upon Missionary Ridge in the operations about Chattanooga. He led his division in the assault upon Missionary Ridge and its capture. In the latter part of the war he was placed in command of the district of Kentucky, and at its close was brevetted major-general. In 1869 President Johnson appointed him Governor of Missouri, but he resigned.
must enter into all effectual instruction, for it is not sufficient that a book be placed in the hands of a pupil or that he be compelled to attend lectures, but it is necessary to see that he grasps the ideas conveyed. Such tests are widely in vogue in Catholic institutions, as measures not subject to the Church. Examinations, however, have other purposes, especially as tests of qualifications for offices or positions, and as investigations to arrive at the truth. It is particularly under these aspects that the question of examinations now presents itself.

Examination for Appointment to Parochial Benefits.—The Council of Trent, realizing that parishes should be ruled over by men of virtue and learning, decreed (Sess. XXIV, c. xvii, De ref.) that the cure of souls should be entrusted only to those who, in a competitive examination or concursus, have demonstrated their fitness. The purpose of this examination is not only to exclude unworthy candidates, but to secure the selection of the best. Clement XI and Benedict XIV determined the form of this examination (see CONCORSUS. EXAMINERS. SYNODAL.

Examination for Promotion to Orders.—The Council of Trent (XXIII, c. vii, De ref.), repeating the legislation of previous councils, prescribes that a bishop promote no one to orders in the Church till priests and others prudent and learned, appointed by the bishop, pass upon the candidate's qualifications. This investigation is concerned with legitimate birth, habit, formation, freedom, or other details of the examination are left to the bishop. A prelate commissioned by another to ordain the latter's subject is free to submit the candidate to an examination or not, as he may deem proper, unless, for grave reasons, he suspects the unfitness of the candidate, notwithstanding a previous examination, or unless he be commissioned by the candidate's bishop to hold the examination. Members of religious orders are examined by their own superiors and likewise by the ordinary prelate, except the Jesuits and some others who by special privilege are exempt from examination by the ordinary prelate. (See EXAMINATION. EXAMINERS. SYNODAL.)

Examination of Bishops-Elect.—In addition to the examination in the Roman Pontifical, Gregory XIV prescribed another for bishops-elect, while Clement VIII instituted a congregation of cardinals for this purpose. This examination, however, developed into little else than a ceremony, since bishops are not selected till assurance is given of their prudence, piety, and learning. The late reorganization of the Roman Curia puts this matter under the Congregational Congregation. Cardinals who are to receive episcopal consecration are exempt from this examination.

Examination of Confessors.—The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, c. xv, De ref.) established the necessary requirements of episcopal approbation for all priests, both secular and regular, to hear confessions, advising an examination as a test of fitness, though bishops are free to appoint, without such test, those whose judgment are qualified for the work. Members of the regular clergy, without exception, may be obliged by the ordinary of the diocese to undergo this test, if they would hear the sacramental confessions of secular persons. Once approved, however, they are not subjected to another examination, unless some grave cause relating to confessions arise (see EXAMINERS. APOTOLIC.)

Examination of Preachers.—The ordinary of a diocese may submit to an examination members of religious bodies who desire to preach in the diocese in churches other than those of their own order. Once, however, he has given his approbation, he may not insist on a second examination, though for just cause he may withdraw the permission given to preach. The bishop's successor in office may demand a re-examination.

Examination of Those Wishing to Contract Marriage.—Before publishing the bans of marriage the pastor questions separately the contracting parties regarding their place of residence, to ascertain whether he has a right to unite them in matrimony. He inquires, likewise, whether they are acting with perfect freedom, from any undue pressure, fear, or other motive which might invalidate the contract. He learns of any opposition on the part of parents to the proposed union, as well as of the possible existence of any matrimonial impediment. He must ascertain, moreover, whether the parties are sufficiently grounded in the rudiments of the Catholic religion and capable, consequently, of instructing their offspring. If the parties belong to different parishes, by whom is this investigation to be conducted? Local regulations and customs are to be observed, since there is neither positive universal legislation nor uniform practice in this matter.

In ecclesiastical courts, civil, courts, witnesses are examined under oath, administered by the auditor or judge, who should first call the witness's attention to the nature and binding effect of an oath and to his duty of telling the truth. The oath must be to the effect that the witness will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. If thought advisable by the judge, the oath may also contain the promise of secrecy. A statement not sworn to does not constitute evidence. Witnesses are examined separately. In civil trials the interested parties have a right to be present when witnesses are deposed, and may not be excluded except in rare cases approved by the judge. In criminal or other cases, where public rather than private interest is at stake, the practice is to exclude the plaintiff and defendant, as well as other witnesses. Here, also, in extreme cases an exception may be made. If, however, the defendant is not allowed to confront the witnesses cited by the plaintiff and vice versa, he is permitted to see the witnesses take the oath and may suggest interrogatories to be proposed.

Witnesses are to be asked or cited, but not necessarily in a formal manner, to appear in court and testify. He who offers his witness is responsible.
which must be attested by the clerk. If the witness refuses to subscribe, the fact and the reason thereof must be noted. Finally, both the judge and the clerk sign the document.

FERRARO, Prospettis Bibliothecg, s. v.; LAURENTIUS, Institutiones, s. v. Examen. TAUNTON, The Law of the Church, s. v. Examination.

ANDREW B. MEEHAN.

Examination of Conscience.—By this term is understood a review of one's past thoughts, words, and actions for the purpose of ascertaining their conformity with, or disparity from, the moral law. Disclose and admission of faults or the acquisition of conscience is necessary, not so much for the dignity and happiness it confers on them as through regard for the holiness of the Supreme Author of the moral law. This precept of rational nature has been enforced by the voice of revelation. Thus God said to Abraham: “Walk before me and be perfect.” (Gen. xvi, 1). To this precept the Prophet Jeremiah referred when he sang in his Lamentations: “Let us search our ways, and seek, and return to the Lord” (Ill, 40).

In the fullness of time Christ came to perfect the knowledge of the moral law and draw the human heart into closer union with God. Frequent examination of conscience then became more imperative than before. In particular it was commanded by the Apostle St. Paul to be performed by the faithful each time they received Holy Communion: “Let a man examine himself; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself…” if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged” (I Cor. xi, 28-31). And the early Christians who received Holy Communion very frequently, examination of conscience become a familiar exercise of their spiritual life. Thus we read of the great hermit St. Anthony, that he examined his conscience every night, while St. Basil, St. Augustine, and St. Bernard, and founders of religious orders generally, made the examination of conscience a regular daily exercise of their followers. What was thus enjoined on religious by rule was inculcated upon the faithful at large by the masters of the spiritual life as a most effectual means to advance in virtue.

The devotional examination of conscience is quite distinct from that required as a proximate preparation for sacramental confession. If a Christian judges himself unworthy of receiving the Body of the Lord, he is to make himself worthy by obtaining pardon of his sins; and the means is provided for the purpose by Christ in the power He has given His ministers to remit sins. As confession is to be used in remitting or retaining sins, the confession of the sinner is necessary; and to confess his faults he must examine his conscience with proper diligence. By self-examination he intensifies his contrition and purpose of amendment. In preparing for confession, the penitent is strictly obliged to examine his imagination with such diligence as the most man ordinarily devotes to important business, but the impossibility is not demanded. The more protracted his wanderings have been, the weaker the prodigal may have become to travel back to his Father, and the more help he may need to accomplish the task. When he has made some earnest efforts in this matter, the priest is to lend his assistance to perfect the work; as Vasquez and de Lugo remark, a prudent confessor can accomplish more with most penitents by a few questions than they themselves can by a long examination. Suarez takes notice that the Fathers of the Church have had a wide range for such examinations. The ordinary method followed in the examination for confession is to consider in succession the Ten Commandments of God, the Commandments of the Church, the Seven Capital Sins, the duties of one's state of life, the nine ways of mortification, and those things which have led a uniform life it will often suffice to recall. Where they have been, the persons with whom they have dealt, the duties or pursuits in which they have been engaged; how they have behaved on ordinary occasions—as, for instance, when buried in their usual employment on working-days—and on unusual occasions, such as Sundays and holidays.

As to the daily examination of conscience, two species must be distinguished, the general and the particular. The former aims at the correction of all kinds of faults, the latter at the avoidance of some particular sin. Some particular sins are so grave that the general examination a good method is laid down by St. Ignatius of Loyola in his “Spiritual Exercises”.

It contains five points. In the first point we thank God for the benefits received; in the second we ask grace to know and correct our faults; in the third we pray that we may be so disposed that we will, in the fourth we ask God's pardon; in the fifth we purpose amendment.

Of the particular examination of conscience St. Ignatius is generally considered as the author, or at least as the first who reduced it to system and promulged its practice among the faithful. It concentrates one's attention on some one fault or virtue. On arising in the morning we resolve to avoid a certain fault during the day, or to perform some act of a particular virtue. Afternoon we consider how often we have committed that fault, or practiced that virtue; we mark the number in a booklet prepared for the purpose, and we renew our resolution for the rest of the day. At night we examine and mark again, and make resolutions for the following day. We thus get a more careful business of our affairs, and a special portion of our mercantile transactions to see where losses come in or where greater gain may be secured. St. Ignatius further suggests that we impose upon ourselves some penance for every one of the faults committed, and that we compare the numbers marked each time with those of the preceding day, the total sum at the end of the week with that of the preceding week, etc. (See Conscience; Duty; Sin.)


CHARLES COPPENS.

Examiners, APOSTOLIC, so called because appointed by the Apostolic See for service in Rome. In 1570 Pius V instituted the Apostolic examiners to conduct examinations of candidates for orders and of confessors. These examiners, who are chosen by the pope, are instructed to examine the candidates to ascertain whether they have been to examination examiners. In preparing for confession, the penitent is strictly called to examine his imagination with such diligence as the most man ordinarily devotes to important business, but the impossibility is not demanded. The more protracted his wanderings have been, the weaker the prodigal may have become to travel back to his Father, and the more help he may need to accomplish the task. When he has made some earnest efforts in this matter, the priest is to lend his assistance to perfect the work; as Vasquez and de Lugo remark, a prudent confessor can accomplish more with most penitents by a few questions than they themselves can by a long examination. Suarez takes notice that the Fathers of the Church have had a wide range for such examinations. The ordinary method followed in the examination for confession is to consider in succession the Ten Commandments of God, the Commandments of the Church, the Seven Capital Sins, the duties of one's state of life, the nine ways of mortification, and those things which have led a uniform life it will often suffice to recall. Where they have been, the persons with whom they have dealt, the duties or pursuits in which they have been engaged; how they have behaved on ordinary occasions—as, for instance, when buried in their usual employment on working-days—and on unusual occasions, such as Sundays and holidays.

As to the daily examination of conscience, two species must be distinguished, the general and the particular. The former aims at the correction of all kinds of faults, the latter at the avoidance of some particular sin. Some particular sins are so grave that the general examination a good method is laid down by St. Ignatius of Loyola in his “Spiritual Exercises”.

It contains five points. In the first point we thank God for the benefits received; in the second we ask grace to know and correct our faults; in the third we pray that we may be so disposed that we will, in the fourth we ask God's pardon; in the fifth we purpose amendment.

Of the particular examination of conscience St. Ignatius is generally considered as the author, or at least as the first who reduced it to system and promulged its practice among the faithful. It concentrates one's attention on some one fault or virtue. On arising in the morning we resolve to avoid a certain fault during the day, or to perform some act of a particular virtue. Afternoon we consider how often we have committed that fault, or practiced that virtue; we mark the number in a booklet prepared for the purpose, and we renew our resolution for the rest of the day. At night we examine and mark again, and make resolutions for the following day. We thus get a more careful business of our affairs, and a special portion of our mercantile transactions to see where losses come in or where greater gain may be secured. St. Ignatius further suggests that we impose upon ourselves some penance for every one of the faults committed, and that we compare the numbers marked each time with those of the preceding day, the total sum at the end of the week with that of the preceding week, etc. (See Conscience; Duty; Sin.)
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from this examination, except in case of tonsure, when he may allow candidates to be examined privately by one examiner. All, whether affiliated to the Diocese of Rome or not, must undergo this examination. Those who have been in Rome four months or more, and to return to the Eternal City under pain of suspension, be examined in the vicariate before receiving orders (not tonsure) elsewhere. An exception is made in regard to the canons of the basilica of St. Peter, who are examined and promoted to orders by their cardinal archpriest. They must, however, have testimonial letters from the cardinal vicar. Examiners are required to take the oath as above, to allow suspects to swear, and to accept gifts or any form of examination. Whether these examiners, thus appointed out of synod, hold office till death or only till the convening of the next synod is not determined. In many dioceses these same examiners conduct the examinations for the junior clergy, confessors, candidates for orders, and the like. (Cf. Council of Trent, Sess. 21; Conc. V, c. xxv, Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, nos. 21 sq.)

Andrew B. Meehan.

**Exarch** (Gr. ἕξαρχος), a title used in various senses both civilly and ecclesiastically. In the civil administration of the Roman Empire the exarch was the governor or viceroy of any large and important province. The best-known case is that of the Exarch of Italy, who, after the defeat of the Goths, ruled from Ravenna (552-751) in the name of the emperor at Constantinople. In ecclesiastical language an exarch is a bishop whose see has been extended beyond his own (metropolitical) province, over other metropolitans. Thus, as late as the time of the Council of Chalcedon (451), the patriarchs are still called exarchs (can. ix). When the name “patriarch” became the official one for the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch (ancestor of Constantinople and Jerusalem), the other title was left as the proper style of the metropolitans who ruled over the three remaining (political) dioceses of Diocletian’s division of the Eastern Prefecture, namely the Exarchs of Asia (at Ephesus), of Cappadocia and Pontus (at Caesarea), and of Thrace (at Nicomedia). The adoption of Constantinople put an end to these exarchates, which fell back to the state of ordinary metropolitan sees (Ferrusæus, Orth. Eastern Church, 21-25). But the title of exarch was still occasionally used for any metropolitans (so at Thessalonica in 1439, can. vi). Since the use of all these titles became gradually fixed with definite technical meanings, that of exarch has disappeared in the West, being replaced by the names “Apostolic vicar” and then “primate.” A few cases, such as that of the Archbishop of Lyons, whom the Emperor Frederick I named Exarch of Burgundy in 1157, are known, but the title of primate is a bishop who holds a place between that of patriarch and that of ordinary metropolitan. The principle is that, since no addition may be made to the sacred number of five patriarchs, any bishop who is independent of any one of these five should be called an exarch. Thus, since the Church of Cyprus was declared autocephalous (at Ephesus in 431), its primate receives the title of Exarch of Cyprus. The short-lived medieval Churches of Ipek (for Servia), Achrida (for Bulgaria), Tirnovo (for Rumania), were governed by exarchs, though these prelates occasionally usurped the title of patriarch (Ferrusæus, Orth. Eastern Church, 305 sq., 317 sq., 328 sq.). On the same principle the Archbishop of Mount Sinai is an exarch, though in this case, as in that of Cyprus, modern Orthodox usage generally prefers the (to them) unusual title, “archbishop” (Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος). When the Bulgarians were granted their national Church (1570), not quite daring to call its head a patriarch, they made him an exarch. The Bulgarian exarch, who resides at Constantinople, is the most famous of all persons who bear the title now. Because of his adherents throughout Macedonia are called exarchs (as opposed to the Greek patriarchs’ the title use of). It was an invented title styled “exarch” of Peter the Great, after abolishing the Patriarchate of Moscow (1702), for twenty years before he founded the Russian Holy Directing Synod, appointed a vicegerent with the title of exarch as president of a tem-
porary governing commission. Since Russia destroyed the old independent Georgian Church (1802) the Primate of Georgia (always a Russian) sits in the Holy Synod at St. Petersburg with the title of Exarch of Georgia (Fortescue, Orth. Eastern Church, 304-305).

Lastly, the third officer of the court of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who examines marriage cases (suo
defensor matrimonii), is called the exarch (ibid., 349).
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ADRIAN FORTECUE.

Excadrination. See Incardination.

Ex Cathedra, literally “from the chair,” a theological term which signifies authoritative teaching and is more particularly applied to the definitions given by the Roman pontiff. Originally the name of the seat occupied by a professor or a bishop, cathedra was used later on to denote the magisterium, or teaching authority. The phrase ex cathedra occurs in the writings of the medieval theologians, and more frequently in the time at which arose the Reformers, regarded to the papal prerogatives. But its present meaning was formally determined by the Vatican Council, Session IV, Const. de Ecclesiâ Christi, iv. “We teach and define that it is a dogma Divinely revealed that the Roman pontiff when he speaks ex cathedra, that is when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the Divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are of themselves and not from the consent of the Church irrefromable.” (See Infallibility; Pope.)

E. A. PACE.

Exclusion, Right of (Lat. Jus Exclusionis), the alleged competence of the more important Catholic countries, Austria, France, and Spain, to include in their respective cardinal protector, or cardinal procurator, those members of the Sacred College who were persona minus grata, so that, if there was a possibility of one of these becoming pope, the authorized cardinal might, before the decisive ballot, give his veto, in the name of his government, against such election. At one time this veto was given orally; later it was given in writing. The cardinal protector, or cardinal procurator, who cast the veto, was, as a rule, that member of the Sacred College who had been created a cardinal at the desire of his government. This declaration could only be the last moment, for the bishops, by traditional usage, a government might invoke this alleged right only once at the same concile, and consequently would not wish to employ it unnecessarily. A veto made after the election was not recognized. Opinions differ widely as to the antiquity of this right. It cannot be proved that it is in any way related to the rights in the papal election, exercised by German kings and emperors in the early Middle Ages. Indeed, it was not until the sixteenth century, that the more important European countries obtained larger influence over papal elections, owing to the contentions of France, Spain, and the German emperors for the control of Italy. These governments were originally satisfied with the so-called “ballot of exclusion,” i.e., they sought to unite more than one-third of the voters against an undesirable candidate and thus make his election impossible, through lack of the necessary two-thirds majority. About the beginning of the seventeenth century, however, in the conclaves that elected Leo XI and Paul V (1605), Spain raised the claim, that it could exclude a candidate by a general declaration addressed to the College of Cardinals. Soon after, in the conclaves of 1614 and 1655, which elected, respectively, Innocent X and Alexander VII, and in both of which Cardinal Sfregotti was excluded as a candidate, the term used for this action was Jus Exclusi-

EXCLUSION. I

In the following period repeated use was made of this so-called right. In 1721 the German emperor formally excluded Cardinal Rampolla; in 1730 the King of Spain excluded Cardinal Imperiali; in 1758 France exercised this right to exclude Cardinal Cavalchini. In the nineteenth century Austria maintained the right of exclusion, in 1830, against Cardinal Severoli, and Spain, in 1890, against Cardinal Giustiniani; in 1903 Austria again exercised this right, this time against Cardinal Rampolla. As a matter of fact, no government has a right to exercise any veto in a papal election. On the contrary the popes have expressly repudiated the exercise of such right. Pius IV in the Bull “In eligentia” (9 October, 1565) (Magnum Bullarium, II, 277 sqq.), ordered the cardinals to elect a pope “Prin-
cipium secularium intercessionibus, et certe, quae mundanis respectibus, minime attentis” (without any regard to the interference of secular rulers, or to other human considerations). That he meant thereby what is now known as the right of exclusion cannot, however, be proved; according to the foregoing account of its origin such claim did not then exist. Gregory XV, in the Bull “Æterni Patris Filius” (15 November, 1621, in “Magnum Bullarium”, III, 444 sqq.) declared authoritatively: “Cardinales omnino ab intercessionibus et omnibus pactis convencionibus, promotionibus, intendimentis, condicis, fraudibus, aliquibus obligationibus, minis, signis, contrasignis sufragiorum seu schedularum, aut aliis tam verbis quam scripto aut quodocumque dantibus aut petendis, tam respectu inclusionis quam exclusionis, tam universum quum plurimum aut omnium rebus, ebedem of which is, that the cardinals must abstain from all agreements, and from acts of any kind, which might be construed as binding them to include or exclude any one candidate, or several, or candidates of a certain class. It may be that the pope does not ever refer to exclusion by a state, but only to the so-called “ballot of exclusion”; it has already been stated, however, that the governments at this time laid claim to a formal right of exclusion. In the Bull “Apostolatus officium” (11 October, 1792, in “Magnum Bullarium”, XIV, 39 sqq.) Clement XIII ordered the cardinals in the words of Pius IV, already quoted, to elect, “principium secularium intercessionibus et certe, quae mundanis respectibus minime attentis et postpositis” (i.e. without regard to the interference of secular rulers or to other human considerations). By this decision governmental interference of an extent long been the accepted form of the interference of secular rulers (interesto principiis) in papal elections. It is, therefore, precisely this exclusion which the pope forbids. This command has all the more weight since we know that this pope was urged to recognize, within certain limits, the right of exclusion put forth by the Catholic states; in the minutes of the deliberations of the commission of cardinals appointed to draw up this Bull the right of exclusion is explicitly characterized as an abuse. By the Constitution “In hac subditi”, of 23 August, 1871 (Archiv für kath. Kirchenrecht,
1891, LXV, 303 sq.), Pius IX forbade any interference of the secular power in papal elections. It is plain, therefore, that the popes have rejected all right of exclusion by a Catholic state in a papal election. Nor can it be admitted that this right has arisen otherwise than from the consequences essential to the growth of a customary right are present; reasonableness and prescription are especially lacking. To debar precisely the most capable candidates is an onerous limitation of the liberty of the electors, and injurious to the Church. Moreover, the cases of exclusion by a Catholic state are few in comparison with the exclusion of a right acquired by customary possession. Recent legislation by Pope Pius X has absolutely repudiated and abolished forever this jus exclusivum. In the Constitution "Commissum Nobis" (20 Jan., 1904) he declared that the Apostolic See had never approved the civil veto, though previous legislation had not succeeded in preventing it: "Wherefore in virtue of holy obedience, under threat of the Divine judgment, and pain of excommunication latet sententia . . . . we prohibit the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, all and single, and likewise the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, who take part in the Conclave, to receive even under the form of a simple desire the office of proposing the veto in whatever manner, either by writing or by word of mouth. . . . And it is our will that this prohibited will be extended . . . . to all intercessions, etc., and whatever the lay persons endeavor to intrude themselves in the election of a pontiff. . . . "Let no man infringe this our inhibition . . . under pain of incurring the indignation of God Almighty and of his Apostles, Sts. Peter and Paul." The new form of oath to be taken by all cardinals contains these words: "we shall never in any way accept, under any pretext, from any civil power whatever, the office of proposing a veto of exclusion under the form of a mere desire . . . and we shall not lend favour to any intercession, or intercession, or any other method whatever, by which the lay powers of any grade or order may wish to interfere in the election of a pontiff."

JOHANNES BAPTISTE SAGMÜLLER.

Excommunication.—This subject will be treated under the following heads: I. General Notions and Historical Summary; II. Kinds of Excommunication; III. Who Can Excommunicate? IV. Who Can Be Excommunicated? V. Effects of Excommunication; VI. Excommunication from Excommunication; VII. Excommunications Late Sententia Now in Force.

I. GENERAL NOTIONS AND HISTORICAL SUMMARY.

Excommunication (Lat. ex, out of, and communio or communicatio, communion—exclusion from the communion), the principal and severest censure, is a medical spiritual penalty that deprives the guilty Christian of all participation in the Eucharistic society. Being a penalty, it supposes guilt; and being the most serious penalty that the Church can inflict, it naturally supposes a grave offence. It is also a medicinal rather than a vindictive penalty, being intended, not so much to punish the culprit, as to correct him and bring him back to the path of righteousness. It necessarily, therefore, contemplates the future, either to prevent the recurrence of certain culpable acts that have grievous external consequences, or, more especially, to induce the malefactors to satisfy certain moral obligations with the growth of a customary right are present; reasonableness and prescription are especially lacking. To debar precisely the most capable candidates is an onerous limitation of the liberty of the electors, and injurious to the Church. Moreover, the cases of exclusion by Catholic states are few in comparison with the exclusion of a right acquired by customary possession. Recent legislation by Pope Pius X has absolutely repudiated and abolished forever this jus exclusivum. In the Constitution "Commissum Nobis" (20 Jan., 1904) he declared that the Apostollic See had never approved the civil veto, though previous legislation had not succeeded in preventing it: "Wherefore in virtue of holy obedience, under threat of the Divine judgment, and pain of excommunication latet sententia . . . . we prohibit the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, all and single, and likewise the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, who take part in the Conclave, to receive even under the form of a simple desire the office of proposing the veto in whatever manner, either by writing or by word of mouth. . . . And it is our will that this prohibited will be extended . . . . to all intercessions, etc., and whatever the lay persons endeavor to intrude themselves in the election of a pontiff. . . . "Let no man infringe this our inhibition . . . under pain of incurring the indignation of God Almighty and of his Apostles, Sts. Peter and Paul." The new form of oath to be taken by all cardinals contains these words: "we shall never in any way accept, under any pretext, from any civil power whatever, the office of proposing a veto of exclusion under the form of a mere desire . . . and we shall not lend favour to any intercession, or intercession, or any other method whatever, by which the lay powers of any grade or order may wish to interfere in the election of a pontiff."
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JOHANNES BAPTISTE SAGMÜLLER.
Christian centuries it is not always easy to distinguish between excommunication and penitential exclusion; to differentiate them satisfactorily we must await the decline of the institution of public penance and the well-defined separation between those things pertaining to the forum internum, or tribunal of spiritual censure, and the forum externum, or public ecclesiastical tribunal; nevertheless, the admission of a sinner to the performance of public penance was consequent on a previous genuine excommunication. On the other hand, formal exclusion from reception of the Eucharist and the other sacraments was only mitigated excommunication or a species of interdict, which moves the bishop or some other ecclesiastical authority, begot eventually a contempt for excommunication. Consequently the Council of Trent was forced to recommend to all bishops and prelates more moderation in the use of censures (Sess. XXV, c. iii, De ref.). The passage is too significant to be here unduly condensed. The reason for the use of excommunication is the very sinews of ecclesiastical discipline, and very salutary for keeping the people to the observance of their duty, yet it is to be used with sobriety and great circumspection; seeing that experience teaches that if it be wielded rashly or for slight causes, it is more despised than feared, and works more evil than good. Wherefore, such excommunications which are wont to be issued for the purpose of provoking a revelation, or on account of things lost or stolen, shall be issued by no one whosoever but the bishop; and not then, except on account of some uncommon circumstance or occasion, nor is it ever possible for the Church to obtain from the civil power the execution of such penalties.

Excessive Number of Excommunications.—In the course of time, also, the number of canonical excommunications was excessively multiplied, which fact, accompanied with their frequent repetition, made it difficult to know whether many among them were always in force. The difficulty was greater as a large number of these excommunications were reserved, for which reason theologians with much ingenuity construed favourably said reservation and permitted the majority of the faithful to obtain absolution without presenting themselves in Rome, or indeed even writing thither. In recent times the number of excommunications in force has been greatly diminished, and a new method of absolving from them has been inaugurated; it will doubtless find a place in the future legislation of the canon law that is being prepared. Thus, without change of nature, excommunication in foro externo has become an exceptional penalty, reserved for very grievous offences detrimental to Christian society; in foro interno it has been diminished and mitigated, at least in regard to the conditions for absolution from it. However, as can readily be seen from a perusal of the excommunications actually in force, it still remains true that what the Church aims at is not so much the cringe as the satisfaction to be obtained from the culprit in consequence of his offence.

Refusal of Ecclesiastical Communion.—Finally, real excommunication must not be confounded with a measure formerly quite frequent, and sometimes even known as excommunication, but which was rather a refusal of spiritual communion. It was the refusal by a bishop to communicate in sacris with another bishop and his church, in consideration of an act deemed reprehensible and worthy of chastisement. It was undoubtedly with this withdrawal of communion that Pope Victor threatened (or actually punished) the bishops of Asia in the paschal controversy (Council Hist. Eccl., V, xxiv); it was certainly the measure to which St. Martin of Tours had recourse when he refused to communicate with the Spanish bishops who caused Emperor Maximinus to condemn to death the heretic Priscillian with some of his adherents (Sulpicius Severus, Dial., iii, 15). Moreover, a similar pri-
Excommunication was in early Christian times imposed by councils as a regular penalty for bishops found guilty of certain minor faults; the most frequent example is that of bishops who, without good reason, neglected to attend the provincial council (so the Council of Carthage, 401, can. 506, can. xxxv; Tarragona, 510, can. vi; II Macon, 555, can. xx; etc.). These bishops were evidently not excommunicated, properly speaking; they continued to govern their dioceses and publicly to hold ecclesiastical services; they were simply deprived, as the aforesaid texts show, of the consolation of communion with their episcopal brethren.

II. Kinds of Excommunication.—(1) Major and Minor.—Until recently excommunication was of two kinds, major and minor. (a) Minor excommunication is uniformly defined by canonists and by Gregory IX (cap. lx, De sent. exc. lib. V, tit. xxxix) as prohibition from receiving the sacraments, what theologians call the passive use of the sacraments. In order to receive the Eucharist and the other sacraments, those who had incurred this penalty had to be absolved therefrom; as it was not reserved, this could be done by any confessor. Indirectly, however, it entailed other consequences. The canonical law (cap. x, De cler. excomm. ministrante, lib. V, tit. xxvii) taught that the priest who celebrates Mass while under the ban of minor excommunication sins grievously; also that he sins similarly in administering the sacraments; and finally, that while he cannot vote with the others, he himself is imputable to a canonical offense. This is readily understood when we remember that the cleric thus excommunicated was presumed to be in the state of grievous sin, and that such a state is an obstacle to the lawful celebration of Mass and the administration of the sacraments. Minor excommunication was merely identical with the state of the penitent of older times, who, prior to his reconciliation, was admitted to public penance. Minor excommunication was incurred by unlawful intercourse with the excommunicated, and in the beginning no exception was made of any class of excommunication. Hence, however, to any inconstancy arising from this condition of things, especially after excommunications had become so numerous, Martin V, by the Constitution “Ad evitanda scandalia” (1415), restricted the aforesaid unlawful intercourse to that held with those who were formally excommunicated as persons who were therefore known as vitandi (Lat. vitare, to avoid), also with those who were notoriously guilty of striking a cleric. But as this twofold category was in modern times greatly reduced, but little attention was paid to minor excommunication, and eventually it ceased to exist after the publication of the Constitution “Apostolice Sedis” (4 Jan., 1884, ad 4).

(b) Major excommunication, which remains now the only kind in force, is therefore of the kind of which we treat below, and to which our definition fully applies. Anathema is a sort of aggravated excommunication, from which, however, it does not differ essentially, but simply in the matter of special solemnities and outward display.

(2) A jure and ab homine.—Excommunication is either a jure (by law) or ab homine (by judicial act of minors or juries). The first, the law itself, which declares that whosoever shall have been guilty of a definite crime will incur the penalty of excommunication. The second is inflicted by an ecclesiastical prelate, either when he issues a serious order under pain of excommunication or imposes this penalty by judicial sentence and after a criminal trial.

(3) Latæ and Ferendæ Sententiae.—Excommunication, especially a jure, is either latæ or ferendæ sententiae. The first is incurred as soon as the offence is committed; the second, on the contrary, even without intervention of any ecclesiastical judge; it is recognized in the terms used by the legislator, for instance: “the culprit will be excommunicated at once, by the fact itself [statim, ipso facto]”. The second is indeed foreseen by the law as a penalty, but is inflicted on the culprit only by a judicial sentence; in other words, the delinquent is rather threatened than visited with the penalty, and incurs it only when the judge has summoned him before his tribunal, declared him guilty, and punished him according to the terms of the law. It is recognized when the law contains these or similar words: “under pain of excommunication”; “the culprit will be excommunicated”.

(4) Public and Occult.—Excommunication ferendæ sententiae can be public only, as it must be the object of a declaratory sentence pronounced by a judge; but excommunication latæ sententiae may be either public or occult. It is public through the publicity of the law when it is imposed and published by ecclesiastical authority; it is public through notoriety of fact when the offence that has incurred it is known to the majority in the locality, as in the case of those who have publicly done violence to others, or of the purchasers of the contrary property. The contrary is occult when the offence entailng it is known to no one or almost no one. The first is valid in the forum externum and consequently in the forum internum; the second is valid in the forum internum only. The practical difference is very important. He who has incurred excommunication for himself as excommunicated and be absolved as soon as possible, submitting to whatever conditions will be imposed upon him, but this only in the tribunal of conscience; he is not obliged to denounce himself to a judge nor to abstain from external acts connected with the exercise of jurisdiction, and he may ask absolution without making himself known either in confession or to the Sacred Penitentiary. According to the teaching of Benedict XIV (De synodo, X, i, 5), “a sentence declaratory of the offence is always necessary in the forum externum, since in this tribunal no one is pronounced unless he is shunned and condemned as a crime that entails such a penalty”. Public excommunication, on the other hand, is removed only by a public absolution; when it is question of simple publicity of fact (see above), the absolution, while not judicial, is nevertheless public, inasmuch as it is given to a known person and appears as an act of the forum externum.

(5) Vitandi and Tolerati.—Public excommunication in foro externo has two degrees according as it has or has not been formally published, or, in other words, according as excommunicated persons are to be shunned (vitandi) or tolerated (tolerati). A formally published or nominally existing excommunication is called latæ sententiae; it is not removed when the sentence has been brought to the knowledge of the public by a notification from the judge, indicating by name the person thus punished. No special method is required for this publication; according to the Council of Constance (1414–18), it suffices that “the sentence has been published or made known by the judge in a special and express manner” Persons thus excommunicated are to be shunned (vitandi), i. e. the faithful must have no intercourse with them either in regard to sacred things or (to a certain extent) to profane matters, as we shall see farther on. All other excommunicated persons are to be tolerated (tolerati), i. e. the law no longer obliges the faithful to abstain from intercourse with them, even in religious matters. This distinction dates from the aforesaid Constitution “Ad evitanda scandalia”, published by Martin V at the Council of Constance in 1415; until
then one had to avoid communion with all the excommunicated, once they were known as such. "To avoid scandal and numerous dangers", says Martin V, "and to relieve timorous consciences, we hereby mercifully grant to all the faithful that henceforth no one need refrain from communicating with another in the reception or administration of the sacraments, or in other matters Divine or profane, under pretext of any ecclesiastical sentence or censure, whether promulgated in general form by law or by a judge, nor avoid anyone whosoever, nor observe an ecclesiastical interdict, except when this sentence or censure shall have been published or made known by the judge in special and express form, against some certain, specified person, college, university, church, community, or place." But while notoriously excommunicated persons are no longer vitandi, the pope makes an exception of those who have "incurred the penalty of excommunication by reason of sacrilegious violence against a cleric, and so notoriously that the fact can in no way be disseminated or excused". He declares, moreover, that he has not made this concession in favour of the excommunicated, whose condition remains unchanged, but solely for the benefit of the faithful. Hence, in virtue of ecclesiastical law, the latter are no longer deprived of themselves of intercourse with those of the excommunicated who are "tolerated". As to the vitandi, now reduced to the two aforementioned categories, they must be shunned by the faithful as formerly. It is to be noted now that the minor excommunication incurred formerly by these persons has been suppressed; also, that of the major excommunications inflicted on certain definite acts of communion with the vitandi, only two are retained in the Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis" (II, 16, 17): that inflicted on any who have been excommunicated in a crime that has merited nominal excommunication by the pope, and that pronounced against clerics alone for spontaneous and conscious communion in sacris with persons whom the pope has excommunicated by name. Moreover, those whom bishops excommunicate by reason of minor excommunicable vitiandi as are similarly excommunicated by the pope.

(6) Reserved and Non-Reserved.—Finally, excommunication is either reserved or non-reserved. This division affects the absolution from censure. In the forum internum any confessor can absolve from non-reserved excommunications; but those reserved can only be remitted, except through indulg or delegation, by those to whom the law reserves the absolution. There is a distinction between excommunications reserved to the pope (those being divided into two classes, according to which they are either specially or simply reserved to him) and those reserved to bishops or ordinaries. As to excommunications ab homine, absolution from them is reserved by law to the judge who has inflicted them. In a certain sense excommunications may also be reserved in view of the persons who incur them; thus absolution from an excommunication imposed by a bishop is reserved to the pope; again, custom reserves to him the excommunication of sovereigns.

III. Who Can Excommunicate?—Excommunication is an act of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the rules of which it follows. Hence the general principle: whoever has jurisdiction in the forum externum, properly so called, can excommunicate, but only his own subjects. Therefore, whether excommunications be a jury (by the law) or ab homine (under form of sentence or precept), they may come from the pope alone or a general council for the entire Church; from the hierarchies in their ecclesiastical provinces; from the bishop for his diocese; from the prelate nullius for quasi-diocesan territories; and from regular prelates for religious orders. Moreover, anyone can excommunicate who, by virtue of his office, even when delegated, has contentious jurisdiction in the forum externum; for instance, papal legates, vicars capitular, and vicars-general. But a parish priest cannot inflict this penalty nor even declare that it is incurred, i.e. he cannot do so in an official and judicial manner. The subjects of these various authorities are those who fall under their jurisdiction, chiefly on account of domiciliary or quasi-domiciliary crimes, by reason of the offence committed while on such territory; and finally by reason of personal right, as in the case of regulars.

IV. Who Can Be Excommunicated?—Since excommunication is the forfeiture of the spiritual privileges, all those who are not reserved to the pope may be excommunicated. As the baptized cease, at death, to belong to the Church Militant, the dead cannot be excommunicated. Of course, strictly speaking, after the demise of a Christian person, it may be officially declared that such person incurred excommunication during his lifetime. However, the excommunication of the dead cannot be absolved after his death; indeed, the Roman Ritual contains the rite for absolving an excommunicated person already dead (Tit. III, cap. iv: Ritus absolvendi excommunicatum san mortuorum). However, certain excommunications are not only the private wrongs of one against another, but are the moral guilt of the community of the faithful, notably ecclesiastical burial. With the foregoing exceptions, all who have been baptized are liable to excommunication, even those who have never belonged to the true Church, since by their baptism they are really her subjects, though of course rebellious ones. Moreover, the Church excommunicates not only those who abandon the true faith to embrace schism or heresy, but also the members of religious and schismatic communities who have been born therein. As to the latter, however, it is not a question of personal excommunication; the censure is pronounced on the corporate capacity, as members of a community in revolt against the true Church of Jesus Christ.

Catholics, on the contrary, cannot be excommunicated unless for some personal, grievously offensive act. Here, therefore, it is necessary to state with precision the conditions under which this penalty is incurred. Just as exile presupposes a crime, excommunication presupposes a grievous external fault. Not only would it be wrong for a Christian to be punished without having committed a punishable act, but justice demands a proportion between the offence and the penalty; hence the most serious of spiritual chastisements, i.e. forfeiture of all the privileges common to Christians, is inconceivable unless for a grave fault. Moreover, in order to fall within the jurisdiction of the forum externum, which alone can inflict excommunication, this fault must be external. In other words, the offence must be consummated, i.e. complete and perfect in its kind (in genere suo), unless the legislator has ordained otherwise. This, however, is a rule of interpretation rather than a real condition for the incurring of censure, and is tantamount to saying that attempting at a crime does not entail the penalty meted out to the crime itself,
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but that if the legislator declares that he wishes to punish even the attempt, excommunication is incurred (cf. Const. "Apost. Sedis", III, 1, for attempt at marriage on part of clerics in major orders).

Considered from a moral and juridical standpoint, the sentence for the incurring of excommunication implies, first, the full use of reason; second, sufficient moral liberty; finally, a knowledge of the law and even of the penalty. Where such knowledge is lacking, there is no contumacy, i.e., no contempt of ecclesiastical law, the essence of which consists in performing an act known to be forbidden, and for which a certain penalty is incurred. The prohibition and the penalty are known either through the text of the law itself, which is equivalent to a juridical warning, or through admonitions or proclamations issued expressly by the ecclesiastical judge. Hence arise various extenuating causes (causes excusantes), based on lack of guilt, which prevent the incurring of excommunication: (1) Lack of the full use of reason. This excuses children, also those who have not attained the age of puberty, and, a fortiori, the demented. (2) Lack of liberty resulting from grave fear. Such fear impairs the freedom of the will, and while it exists contumacy or rebellion against the laws of the Church cannot be presumed. Evidently, a proper estimation of this extenuating reason depends on the circumstances of each particular case and will be more readily accepted as an excuse for violating a positive law than in pellamation of an offense against the natural or Divine law. (3) Ignorance. The general principle is, that whosoever is ignorant of the law is not responsible for transgressing it; and when ignorance is not the reason, the penalty does not incur it. But the application of this principle is often complicated and delicate. The following considerations, generally admitted, may serve as a guide: (a) All ignorance, both of law and fact, is excusable. (b) The ignorance known as "invincible" always excuses; it may also be called culpable or probable ignorance. (c) There are two kinds of culpable ignorance, one known as crassa or supina, i.e., gross, improvable ignorance, and opposing a grievously guilty neglect in regard to knowledge of the law; the other is affected ignorance, really a deliberate ignorance of the law through fear of its penalty. (d) Ordinarily, gross ignorance does not excuse from punishment. But it does so only when the law formally exacts a positive knowledge of the prohibition. The laws that inflict excommunication contain as a rule two kinds of expressions. Sometimes the offense only is mentioned, e.g. "all apostates, heretics", etc., or "those who absolve their accomplices in a sin against chastity" (Const. "Apost. Sedis", I, I, 10). Sometimes causes are inserted that exact, as a necessary condition, the knowledge of the penalty. "Regulars who have the audacity to administer the Viaticum without permission of the parish priest." (Const. "Apost. Sedis", I, 2; II, 14). Gross ignorance excuses in the second case but not in the first. (e) For many authors, affected ignorance is equivalent to a knowledge of the law, since by it some avoid enlightening themselves concerning a dreaded penalty; these authors conclude that such ignorance never excuses. Other canonists consider that this penal law is to be strictly interpreted; when, therefore, it positively exacts knowledge on the part of the culprit, he is excommunicated for affected ignorance. Such is the case of the uncatechized adult. It is not always easy to establish the shades of difference, it will suffice to remark that in a case of occult excommunication the culprit has the right to judge himself and to be judged by his confessor according to the exact truth, whereas, in the forum externum the judge decides according to presumptions and proofs. Consequently, in the tribunal of conscience he who is reasonably persuaded of his innocence cannot be compelled to treat himself as excommunicated and to seek absolution; this conviction, however, must be prudently established.

V. EFFECTS OF EXCOMMUNICATION.—If we consider only its nature, excommunication has no degrees: it simply deprives clerics and laymen of all their rights in Christian society, which total effect takes on a visible shape in details proportionate to the rights or advantages of which the excommunicated cleric or layman has been deprived. The effects of excommunication must, however, be considered in relation also to the rest of the faithful. From this point of view arise certain differences according to the various classes of excommunicated persons. These differences were not introduced out of regard for the excommunicated, rather for the sake of the faithful. The latter would suffer serious inconveniences if the nullity of all acts performed by excommunicated clerics were rigidly maintained. They would also be exposed to grievous perils of conscience if they were strictly obliged to avoid all contacts with persons so excommunicated. Hence the practical rule for interpreting the effects of excommunication: severity as regards the excommunicated, but mildness for the faithful. We may now proceed to enumerate the immediate effects of excommunication. They are summed up in the following:

Res sacre, ritus, communio, crypto, potestas, praedia sacra, forum, civilia iura vetantur, i.e. loss of the sacraments, public services and prayers of the Church, ecclesiastical burial, jurisdiction, benefices, canonical rights, and social intercourse.

(1) Res Sacrae.—These are the sacraments; the excommunicated are forbidden either to receive or administer them. The sacraments are of course validly administered by excommunicated persons, except those (penance and marriage) for whose administration jurisdiction is necessary; but the reception of the sacraments by excommunicated persons is always illicit. The licit administration of the sacraments by excommunicated ecclesiastics hinges upon the benefit to be derived by the faithful. Ecclesiastics excommunicated by name are forbidden to administer the sacraments except in cases of extreme necessity; a greater degree of severity pertains to those administered by such ecclesiastics are null (Decret. "Ne temere", art. iv). Excommunicated ecclesiastics tolerati, however, may licitly administer the sacraments to the faithful who request them at their hands, and the acts of jurisdiction thus posited are maintained by reason of the benefit accruing to the faithful, most frequently also because of common error (error communes), i.e., a general belief in the good standing of such ecclesiastics. The faithful, on their side, may, without sin, ask tolerated excommunicated ecclesiastics to administer sacraments to them; they would, however, sin grievously in making this request of the vitandus, except in case of urgent necessity.

(2) Ritus.—Hericly are meant the Mass, the Divine Office, and other sacred ceremonies. An excommunicated person may not and should not assist at these ceremonies. If he be a toleratus, his presence need not be taken into account, and the service can be continued. If he be a vitandus he must be warned to retire, and in case of refusal he must be forcibly compelled to withdraw; but if he still persists in remaining, the service must be discontinued, even the Mass, unless the Canon has been commenced (Decret. Privi. V, De sac. Miss. I, p. 117). Nevertheless, since the condition of an excommunicated person, even a vitandus, is no worse than that of an infidel, he may assist at sermons, instructions, etc., venerate images and relics, take holy water, and use privately other sacramentals. The excommunicated cleric is
not released from any of his obligations in regard to the Divine Office and, if bound to it, must recite it, but privately and not in the choir. A toleratus may be admitted to the choir, but a vitandus must be expelled therefrom. All excommunicated clerics are prohibited from exercising Mass and performing all liturgical functions, under penalty of the irregularity ex delicto for violation of the censure; participation in the liturgical acts performed by an excommunicated cleric is a forbidden communicatio in sacris; however, no censure would result from it except in the case of clerics voluntarily communicating in church. Those whose hope had been extirpated by name (Const. "Apost. Sedis" II, 17). In each case the fault should be estimated according to circumstances.

(3) Communio.—These are, properly speaking, the public suffrages of the Church, official prayers, indulgences, etc., in which the excommunicated have no share. But they are not excluded from the private suffrages (i.e. intercessory petitions) of the faithful, who can pray for them.

(4) Cura.—This word signifies ecclesiastical burial, of which the excommunicated are deprived. In chapter vii, de senulitis (lib. II, tit. xvii), Innocent III says: "The canons have established that we should not hold communion after their death with those with whom we did not communicate during their lifetime, and that all those should be deprived of ecclesiastical burial who were separated from the unity of the Church, and at the moment of death were not reconciled thereunto." The Ritual (tit. VI, cap. ii, n. 2) renews this prohibition for those publicly excommunicated, and most writers interpret this as meaning those whose excommunication has been publicly proclaimed (Many, De locis sacris, p. 354), so that, under the ancient canons, the person excommunicated, is no longer amenable, except to the vitandus. However, this does not mean that the tolerati can always receive ecclesiastical burial; they may be deprived of it for other reasons, e.g. as heretics or public sinners. Apropos of this leenuity, it must be remembered that it is not the excommunicated Church wishes to favour, but rather the faithful for whose sake communion with the toleratus is allowed in the matter of burial as well as in other matters. The interment of a toleratus in a consecrated cemetery carries with it no longer the desecration of said cemetery: this would follow, however, in the case of the vitandus. (See also BURIAL.)

(5) Potestas signifies ecclesiastical jurisdiction, of which both the passive and the active use, to speak canonically, are forbidden the excommunicated. Jurisdiction is used passively when a person is the object of one of its acts, of a concession. Now, ecclesiastical authority has no official relations with the exile unless, at his request, it negotiates the conditions for his return to society. Connected with this discipline is the rule forbidding the excommunicated to receive from the pope any kind of rescript (of grace or justice), except in regard to their excommunication, under pain of nullity of such rescript (c. xxi, de rescriptis, lib. I, tit. iii, and c. i, eod., in VI). Hence the custom of inserting in papal rescripts the so-called ad effectum absolution from censures, intended solely to ensure the value of the rescript, but affecting in no wise the excommunication, if already decreed. Jurisdiction is also used actively when exerected by its depositaries. It is easy to understand that the Church cannot leave her jurisdiction in the hands of those whom she excludes from her society. In principle, therefore, excommunication entails the loss of jurisdiction both in foro externo and in foro internum and renders null or without the necessary jurisdiction. However, for the general good of society, the Church maintains jurisdiction, despite occult excommunication, and supplies it for acts performed by the toleratus. But as the vitandus are known to be such, this merciful remedy cannot be applied to them except in certain cases of extreme necessity, when jurisdiction is said to be "supplied" by the Church.

(6) Prædicta sacra are ecclesiastical benefices. The excommunicated ecclesiastic is incapable of acquiring such benefices, and his presentation to it would be legally null. A benefice also becomes null and cannot be re-presented, even when to the censure the law adds privation of benefice: this is carried into effect only through a sentence which must be at least declaratory and issue from a competent (i.e. the proper) judge. Nevertheless, from the very first the excommunicated beneficium is null, and those whose benefice belonging to the choir service, provided he is bound thereunto. Moreover, should he live a year in the state of excommunication, he can be deprived of his benefice through judicial sentence. The aforesaid effects do not result from occult excommunication.

(7) Forum.—The excommunicated person is an exile from ecclesiastical society, consequently from its tribunals; only inasmuch, however, as they would be to his advantage. On the other hand, if he be summoned before them to satisfy a third party he is obliged to appear. Hence he cannot appear as plaintiff or defendant, he may be the defendant, or the party accused. At this point the difference between the vitandus and the toleratus consists in this, that the former must be prevented from introducing any legal action before an ecclesiastical tribunal, whereas the latter can be debarred from so doing only when the judge proves ex delicto the delict which has already incurred. It is a question here only of public excommunication and before ecclesiastical tribunals.

(8) Civilia jura, i.e. the ordinary relations between members of the same society, outside of sacred and judicial matters. This privation, affecting particularly the person excommunicated, is no longer applicable once on the faithful except in regard to the vitandus. The medieval canonists enumerated the prohibited civil relations in the following verse:

Os, orare, vale, communio, mensa negatur,
namely: (a) conversations; (b) exchange of letters; (c) tokens of benevolence (osculum); (b) prayer in common with the excommunicated; (c) marks of honour and respect; (d) business and social relations; (e) meals with the excommunicated. But at the same time they specified the reasons that rendered these relations licit:

Utile, lex humilis, res ignota, necesse,
that is to say: (a) both the spiritual and the temporal benefit of the excommunicated and of the faithful; (b) conjugal law; (c) the submission owed by children, servants, vassals, and subordinates in general; (d) ignorance of excommunication or of the prohibition of a particular kind of intercourse; (e) finally, any kind of necessity, as human law, is not binding to this degree.

Remote Effects.—All the effects that we have just enumerated are the immediate results of excommunication, but it also causes remote effects, which are not a necessary consequence and are only produced when the person censured occasions them. They are three in number: (1) The cleric who violates excommunication by exercising one of the liturgical functions of his order, inures an irregularity ex delicto. (2) The excommunicated person who remains a without making any effort to obtain absolution (insordescencia) becomes suspected of heresy and can be followed up and condemned as guilty of such (Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, cap. iii, De ref.; cf. Ferraris, s. v. "Insordescens"). (3) This neglect makes it the judge's duty to deprive the excommunicated cleric of all benefices, though some judges postpone for three years the fulfillment of this obligation (see Hollweck, Die kirchlichen Strafrecht, art. 1, note 3).

Effects of Invalid or Unjust Excommunication.—An excommunication is said to be null when it is invalid because of some intrinsic or essential defect, e.g. when
the person inflicting it has no jurisdiction, when the motive of the excommunication is manifestly incorrect and inconsistent, or when the excommunication is essentially defective in form. Excommunication is said to be unjust when, though valid, it is wrongfully applied, or when it really involves a just error or guilt. Here, of course, it is a question of excommunication late sentence and in foro interno, but only of one imposed or declared by judicial sentence. It is admitted by all that a null excommunication produces no effect whatever, and may be ignored without sin (cap. 1, de ecclesiis, in VI). But an abuse of unjust excommunication brings about in much a more general way the possibility of conflict between the forum internum and the forum externum, between legal justice and the real facts. In chapter xxviii, de sent. excomm., (Lib. V, tit. xxxi), Innocent III formally admits the possibility of this conflict. Some persons, he says, may be free in the eyes of God but bound in the eyes of the Church; vice versa, some may be free in the eyes of the Church but bound in the eyes of God; for God's judgment is based on the very truth itself, whereas that of the Church is based on arguments and premises which are sometimes erroneous. He concludes that the chain by which the sinner is bound in the sight of God is loosened by remission of the fault committed, whereas that which binds him in the sight of the Church is severed only by removal of the sentence. Consequently, a person unjustly excommunicated in the same state an excommunicated sinner who has repented and recovered the grace of God; he has not forfeited internal communion with the Church, and God can bestow upon him all necessary spiritual help. However, while seeking to prove his innocence, the censured person is meanwhile bound to obey legitimate authority confined to the delinquents under the ban of excommunication, until he is rehabilitated or absolved. Such a case seems practically impossible nowadays.

VI. Absolution from Excommunication.—Apart from the rare cases in which excommunication is imposed for a fixed period and then ceases of itself, it is always removed by absolution. It is to be noted at once that, though the same word is used to designate the sacramental sentence by which sins are remitted and that by which excommunication is removed, there is a vast difference between the two acts. The absolution from excommunication invokes excommunication and has nothing sacramental about it. It reinstates the repentant sinner in the Church; restores the rights of which he had been deprived, beginning with participation in the sacraments; and for this very reason, it should precede sacramental absolution, which it thenceforth renders possible and efficacious. After absolution from excommunication has been given in foro externo, the judge sends the person absolved to a confessor, that his sin may be remitted; when absolution from censure is given in the confessional, it should always precede sacramental absolution, conformably to the instruction in the Ritual and the very tenor of the formula for sacramental absolution. It may be noted at once that the principal effect of absolution from excommunication may be acquired without the excommunicated person being with the confessio in his former position. Thus, an ecclesiastical might not necessarily recover the benefice which he had lost; indeed he might be admitted to lay communion only. Ecclesiastical authority has the right to posit certain conditions for the return of the culprit, and every absolution from excommunication carries for the fulfillment of certain conditions which vary in extent, according to the cases. Excommunication, it must be remembered, is a medicinal penalty intended, above all, for the correction of the culprit; therefore his first duty is to solicit pardon by showing an inclination to obey the orders given him, just as if he were of ecclesiastical authority to receive back the sinner as soon as he repents and declares himself disposed to give the required satisfaction. This satisfaction is often indicated in the law itself; for instance, usurers of ecclesiastical property are excommunicated until such time as they make reparation. Nevertheless, this is not always necessary; these measures are executed prior to absolution, which is frequently granted on the solemn promise of the excommunicated party either to accomplish a specified act, such as coming to an agreement with the Church for the property usurped, or simply to abide by the orders of ecclesiastical authority (standi mandatus ecclesiae). In such cases absolution is not unusually given under pain of "reincidence" (ad reincidendum), i.e., if within a definite period the person censured has not accomplished a certain specified act, he renews the same excommunication; his status is just as if he had never been absolved. Moreover, this clause of reincidence is assumed; when occasion requires, it is inserted in the sentence of absolution or in the indulgences for that purpose.

The formula of absolution from excommunication is not strictly determined, and, since it is an act of jurisdiction, it suffices to make the sentence of absolution in the form of a profane formula. It is very clearly the effect which it is desired to attain. The formula for remitting the excommunication in foro externo should be such as to absolve validly from public excommunication. Similarly, an excommunication imposed by judicial sentence is to be revoked by an absolution in the same form; excommunion may be revoked in the confessional by the sacramental formula. The Roman Ritual (tit. III, c. ii) gives the formula of absolution used in foro externo and states that in foro interno absolution is given in the usual sacramental form.

Who Can Absolve from Excommunication?—The answer is given in the customary rules of jurisdiction. The right to absolve evidently belongs to him who can excommunicate and who has imposed the law. Moreover, to any person delegated by him to this effect, since this power, being jurisdictional, can be delegated. First, we must distinguish between excommunication ab homine, which is judicial, and excommunication a jure, i.e., late sentence. For the former, absolution is given by the judge who inflicted the penalty (or by his successor), in other words by the pope, or the bishop (ordinary), also by the superior of the judge when acting as judge of appeal. As to excommunication late sentence, the power to absolve is either ordinary or delegated. Ordinary power is determined by the law itself, which indicates to what authority the censure is reserved in each case. Delegated power is of two kinds: that granted in the law of jurisdiction and set down in the enactments which excommunicate or remit excommunication by personal act, e.g., by authority (faculties) of the Roman Penitentiary, by episcopal delegation for special causes, or bestowed upon certain priests. Of this second kind of delegation there is no need to speak, as it belongs to each one to verify the power (faculties) that he possesses. Delegation of the first kind carries with it the power to absolve from excommunication without special request or particular faculties. Such power is in this case conferred by the law itself. Nevertheless, this power is subject to the general law that governs delegation and is valid only for the cases and under the conditions mentioned in the concession. Thus faculties granted for the forum internum cannot be extended to the forum externum, nor can those granted for specially reserved excommunications be used for simply reserved cases, and so on. However, the faculties proceeding from
both kinds of delegation may be "cumulated," i.e., may be held and exercised by the same person.

These principles admitted, we must remember that with reference to reservation or the right to absolve, excommunications are divided into four classes: excommunications specially reserved to the pope; excommunications reserved to the bishop (ordinary); and, finally, excommunications that are not reserved (nemini reservato). According to this classification, as a general rule, only the pope can absolve from the first two kinds of excommunication, although his power extends to the others; bishops (ordinaries) have not other priests, can remove excommunications of the third class; finally, those of the fourth class, and those only, can be revoked by any approved priest, without further special delegation. At this point, however, must be considered certain concessions of the law that may be grouped in three categories: the permanent faculties of bishops; concessions for urgent cases; and concessions for the point of death.

(1) The Faculties of Bishops.—The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, c. vi, De ref.) authorizes bishops to absolve their own subjects in their own dioceses from excommunication from personal sins, if subsequently found, reserved to the Holy See, when occult or, rather, not pertaining to the forum externum. They can exercise this power either in person or through a special delegate of their choice, but in the tribunal of conscience only. However, the Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis" (Reprint, Lec. 19, c. xix, de sent. excomm., lib. V, tit. xxxvii.) of Innocent III sets forth the principle that governs such cases: "When it is difficult for the excommunicated person to go to him who excommunicated him, he may be absolved by his bishop or even by his own priest, on promising to obey the orders of him by whom excommunication was pronounced." This is the principle that moralists and canonists formulated as an axiom: Imperdata causa papalis fit episcopalis: in case of one who is prevented from presenting himself to the pope, the excommunication reserved to the pope may be removed by the bishop, but most authors carried the analogy still farther: for him who is prevented from presenting himself to the bishop, the excommunication may be removed by any confessor. In regard to the obligation of submitting to the orders of the pope or the bishop, the moralists and canonists generally taught as follows: First, no one was obliged to apply in writing (correct as to the removal of excommunication, though Innocent III says nothing of this kind concerning a request for information). Then they distinguished between obstacles that were more or less prolonged: perpetual obstacles were such as exceed five years; obstacles of long duration were those lasting over six months; and obstacles of short duration, those continuing for less than six months. When the obstacle was perpetual the bishop or, if he could not be reached, any priest might absolve without appealing to the pope. If this could not be done, but not without obligation of recourse to the superior on the cessation of the obstacle, when the latter was of long duration, provided there were urgency. Finally, the authors drew up a long list of those who were supposed to be unable to present themselves in person to the pope, and almost every one of them was provided with a special faculties. Thus, for example, if one, after having made a serious promise to the pope, was unable to go to Rome, the pope might grant him the faculties to absolve him over the sea; if, however, the penitent was not able to go to the pope, the special faculties were invalid. The Constitution "Constitution de una filia" expresses this principle: "Nullus nobis a peculiaribus servitutibus, et veluti a plebis, non servire pateretur," etc. Henceforth "in urgent cases when absolution cannot be deferred without danger of grave scandal or infancy, which is left to the conscientious appreciation of the confessor, the latter, after having imposed the necessary satisfaction, can absolve, without other faculties, from all censures, even those specially reserved to the Holy See, but under the pain of recursively incurring the same censure if, within a month, the penitent thus absolved does not recur to the Holy See by letters and through the medium of the confessor." This new method has been more precisely explained and even rendered easier by subsequent papal decisions. The absolution thus given is direct (H. P., 19 July, 1891), although recourse to the Penitentiary is obligatory, its object is not to ask a new absolution, but only to solicit the order of the Church, the penitent, as stated above, having had to make a serious promise to conform to them (Stamati monasfis Ecclenii). The power thus granted in urgent cases is valid for all cases, without exception, reserved by law to the pope or the ordinary, even for the absolution of an accomplice (Holy Office, 7 June, 1899).

As to what constitutes a state of urgency, the reply of 15 June, 1897, is very reassuring, since it permits "as soon as the distressed person is not in distressing to the penitent to remain in the state of sin during the time necessary for soliciting and receiving from Rome the power to absolve." Now, according to the moralists it is too much to remain even a day or two in the state of sin, especially for priests.

(2) Absolution for the Dead.—In cases of excommunication of the second kind, the excommunicated person may be absolved by his own priest or by the bishop, if it is not himself or his heir who has incurred the excommunication, or by the pope himself, if the excommunicated person has incurred the excommunication, even though it be only for a short time. In such cases, however, it is necessary that the absolution should be communicated either to the heir of the excommunicated person or to the pope himself, if he does not so desire to communicate it to the heir. If the absolution is not communicated, it is the invalidation of the excommunication, and the law of absolution is not applicable. However, the authority of the Pope or the bishop is not necessary for the absolution of the deceased, unless it is a case of excommunication reserved to the pope.

(3) In Danger of Death.—It is a principle repeatedly set forth in canon law that at the point of death all reservations cease and all necessary jurisdiction is supplied by the Church. "At the point of death," says the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV, c. vii), "in danger of death," says the Ritual (tit. III, cap. i, n. 25), any priest can absolve from all sins and censures, even if he be without the ordinary faculties of confessors, or if he himself be excommunicated; he may do so even in the presence of another priest as soon as it is authorized (Holy Office, 29 July, 1891). The Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis" expressly maintains this merciful concession, merely adding, for the case in which the mortification is restored to health, the obligation of having recourse to the Holy See, if he has been absolved from excommunication specially reserved to the pope, unless he prefers to ask absolution of a confessor provided with special faculties. This recourse, although identical with that of which we have just spoken for urgent cases, nevertheless differs, as one point: it is not imposed for the absolution from excommunications simply reserved, and the short delay
of a month is not counted from the time of receiving absolution, but from the time of recovery.

VII. Excommunications late sententiae now in force.—In the preamble of the Constitution "Apostolica Sedis"; Pius IX stated that during the conciliar era, the number of censures late sententiae had increased inordinately, that some of them were no longer expedient, that many were doubtful, that they occasioned frequent difficulties of conscience, and finally, that a reform was necessary. On this head Pius IX had anticipated the almost unanimous request of the Catholic episcopate at the Vatican Council (Collectio Lacinii, VII, col. 840, 874, etc.). The number of excommunications late sententiae enumerated by the moralists and canonists is really formidable: Ferraris (Prompta Biblioth., s. v. Excommunication, art. ii-i) gives almost 200. The principal ones were destined to protect the Catholic Church, the ecclesiastical hierarchy and its jurisdiction, and figured in the Bull known as "In Curna Domini" read publicly each year in Rome, on Holy Thursday. In time, this document had received various additions (Ferraris, loc. cit., art. ii, the text of Clement XI), and finally, if the Constitution "Apostolica Sedis" derives excommunications especially reserved, except a few, from the Council of Trent; the Constitution of Pius IX deals with no penalties other than censures; it leaves intact all censures ferenda sententiae but suppresses all censures late sententiae that it does not retain. Now, besides those which it enumerates it retains: (1) the censure of denied (and not simply mentioned) by the Council of Trent; (2) the censures of special law, i.e. those in vigour for papal elections, those enforced in religious orders and institutes, in colleges, communities, etc. As to the censures enumerated, they should be interpreted as if pronounced for the first time, and ancient texts should be consulted for them only in so far as such texts have not been modified by the new law.

Thus the excommunications late sententiae enforced to-day by common law in the Catholic Church proceed from three sources: (A) those enumerated in the Constitution "Apostolica Sedis"; (B) those pronounced by the Council of Trent; and (C) those introduced subsequently to the Constitution "Apostolica Sedis", i.e. later than 12 October, 1869. We enumerate them here with a brief commentary.

Excommunications of the Constitution "Apostolica Sedis".—These are divided into four categories: (a) those specially reserved to the pope; (b) those simply reserved to the pope; (c) those reserved to the bishop (ordinary); (d) those not reserved to anyone.

(a) Excommunications specially reserved to the Pope. These are twelve in number and are imposed upon the following persons:

(1) "All apostates from the Christian faith, heretics of every name and sect, and those who give them credence, who receive or countenance them, and generally all those who take up their defence." Strictly speaking, an apostate is one who goes over to a non-Christian religion, e.g. Islam; to such apostates are assimilated those who publicly renounce all religion; this apostasy is not to be presumed; it is evident that both kinds of apostates exclude themselves from the Church. A heretic is one who rejects a Catholic dogma. The first to be considered is the heretic who becomes such of his own volition; who, being in the Catholic Church, obstinately repudiates a真实 of faith. Excommunication is incurred by him, if, with full knowledge, he exteriorly formulates an heretical proposition; and if he seeks to propagate his error he is immediately subject thereto and shall be deprived of the title of the ecclesiastical order to which he belongs. For such a person his heretical membership alone is sufficient to bring him under sentence of excommunication. In his case the penalty is incurred by admission to the heresy, notably by wilful and active participation in sacris (i.e. in public worship) with heretics; hence the excommunication of those who contract a mixed marriage before a heretical minister as such (Holy Office, 25 Aug., 1888). Finally, the penalty extends to those who believe in heretics (credo); to those who receive them, i.e. who give them shelter in their homes, so as to protect them from the pursuit of authority; and to those who countenance or defend them as heretics and in view of the heresy, provided it be a positive and efficacious assistance.

(b) "All those who, knowing well, and without permission of the Apostolic See, books by these same apostates and heretics and upholding heresy, as also the books of any authors whomsoever specifically prohibited by Letters Apostolic, and all who keep, print, or in any way defend these same books. After heretical persons come heretical books. The act that incurs excommunication is, first, reading done to a considerable extent and culpably, i.e. by one who knows the nature of the books and of the excommunication, and who, moreover, has not the necessary permission. The secondary acts punishable with the same penalty are the keeping in their possession (rather than the publishing), and, finally, the defence, by word or by writing of the books in question. These books are of two kinds: first, those written by apostates, or heretics, and which uphold and command heresy, two conditions that must exist simultaneously; second, books specifically prohibited, in any of their parts, by the titles, not by decree of the Index, but by Letters from the pope himself, Bulls or Briefs, and under pain of excommunication (for a list of these books see Higlers, "Der Index der verbotenen Bücher", Freiburg, 1904, p. 96; and "Die Bücherverbote in Papst- bullen", Freiburg, 1907).

(c) "Schismatics and those who elude or obstinately withdraw from the authority of the reigning Roman pontiff." The schismatics here referred to are of two kinds: those who are such because they belong to separated Churches which reject the authority of the pope, and those who, being Catholics, become schismatics by reason of obstinate disobedience to the authority of the pope as such.

(4) "All of no matter what state, rank, or condition, who appeal from the ordinances or mandates of the reigning Roman pontiff to a future ecumenical council, and all who have not gone in aid, countenance to this appeal." The appeal of the command of the pope to a future ecumenical council, not only implies the superiority of the council over the pontiff, but is pre-eminently an act of injurious disobedience to the Head of the Church. Were this appeal efficacious it would render all church government impossible, unless it be accepted that the normal state of the Church is a general council in perpetual session, or at least meeting at short intervals. This extreme Gallicanism is justly punishable with excommunication. The penalty is visited upon all those who have influenced such act of appeal, either by aid, counsel, or support. This excommunication, however, is to be strictly interpreted; it would not be incurred in consequence of an appeal made to a future pope, the Holy See being vacant, or to a general council actually assembled.

(5) "All who kill, mutilate, strike, seize, incarcerate, detain or pursue with hostile intent, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and even the nuncios of the Holy See, or drive them from their dioceses, jurisdictions, estates, or domains, as also those who ratify these measures or further them by aid or countenance." The object of this penalty is to protect the members of the clergy, like the celebrated excommunication of the canon "Si quis suadente diabolo," of which we shall speak below, but rather to safeguard the prelates or superiors in whom the Church has lodged her jurisdiction. The text clearly
indicates the acts punished by excommunication, i.e. all violent attacks on the person of a prelate as such; it likewise provides the culprits, i.e. those who perpetuate such assaults and those who are responsible for them, as also their active accomplices.

Who directly or indirectly prevent the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, either in foro interno or in foro externo, and who, for this purpose, have recourse to the secular tribunal; also those who provoke or deliver the orders of this tribunal or lend it their aid, counsel, or support. The preceding article protects those who are the depositaries of jurisdiction; the present article protects the exercise of said jurisdiction. It punishes any obstacle raised against the delivery or execution of a sentence or decision of the ecclesiastical authority. It is not question here of the power of order (potestas ordinis) or of facts that do not really imply jurisdiction, e.g. a simple contract. Nor is it question of measures taken with prelates so as to influence them into exercising their jurisdiction in a given direction, e.g. to confer a benefice on Caius or withhold one from Titius; this censure is meant to punish any obstacle that really prevents action on the part of a prelate who wishes to perform an act of jurisdiction, to carry it into effect. He is adversely affected when violence is used against him; indirectly, when his subordinates are prevented from acting. The chief opposition here considered is recourse to secular and especially judicial authority. Excommunication is therefore incurred under this head by all who provoke or direct the intervention and provide such intervention actually follow; by all who deliver orders or directions intended to prevent the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; finally, by all who co-operate in these acts with aid, counsel, or support, unless under compulsion. Moralist and canonists exempt from this penalty the clerks and servants of the secular courts.

(7) "Those who directly or indirectly oblige lay judges to judge ecclesiastical persons before their tribunal, except in cases provided for by canonical agreements, also those who enact laws or decrees against the liberty or rights of the Church." The first part of this article has for its object the protection of the privileges of the ecclesiastical forum, i.e. of those ecclesiastics whose right it is to be judged by ecclesiastical tribunals; consequently, those are excommunicated who oblige lay judges to judge subordinates for ecclesiastical tribunal in cases where this ecclesiastical privilege (privilegium fori) should be respected. But the judges themselves, who act by virtue of their office, are not excommunicated (Holy Office, 1 Feb., 1870). Those who thus force lay judges to violate the privilegium fori are of two kinds: namely, those who actually cite ecclesiastics before secular judges, and the legislators or makers of laws detrimental to the rights of the Church. The first are not excommunicated provided they have no other means of obtaining justice, i.e. when the laws of the country in question do not recognize the aforesaid ecclesiastical privilegium fori (Holy Office, 23 Jan., 1886). There remains, therefore, of this censure little more than the second part of the article, which now affects chiefly the legislators responsible for laws and decrees against the liberty and rights of the Church.

The faithful with Rome. The letters in question are: first, Apostolic Letters, in which the pope himself speaks, Bulls, Briefs, Encyclicals, etc.; second, the Acts of the Holy See emanating from Roman Congregations or other organs of the Curia, which constitute but one authority with the pope (Holy Office, 13 Jan., 1782); finally, the acts of the official representatives of the pope, e.g. papal legates and delegates. The excommunication considers not only Letters that concern all the faithful, but also those regarding individuals, e.g. grants of benefices, dispensations, etc. This admitted, the penalty applies to three classes of persons, namely: those who resort to secular power, not only judicial but administrative, to preoccupy letters from being published or from producing their effect; those who, by means of authority, prevent such publication or execution; and finally, those who, on the occasion of these Letters, strike or terrify either the beneficiaries or even third parties who take part in their publication or execution. In the more probable opinion, excommunication is incurred even if these measures of opposition do not produce the intended results.

(9) "All falsifiers of Apostolic Letters, even in the form of a Brief, and all persons committing matters of grace or justice signed by the Roman pontiffs or an ordinal vice-chancellors or those who replace them, or simply by command of the pope; also those who falsely publish Apostolic Letters, even in the form of a Brief; and finally, those who falsely sign petitions of this kind through the name of the pope, as vice-chancellors or of those who replace them." This excommunication punishes what is generally known as forgery, not in all its forms, but in so far as it affects such pontifical letters or grants as are issued through the tribunals known as the "Segnatura Gratiae" and the "Segnatura Justitiae", i.e. when issues of purely benevolent or connected with litigation. It does not therefore attain forgeries affecting the letters of grants of the Roman Congregations or of prelates. It may be somewhat of a surprise to know that this excommunication does not include those who fabricate an entire Apostolic Letter, the definition of falsification (falsum) meaning only a notable alteration of authentic Letters either by suppression, erasures, writing over, or substitution. Petitions addressed to the pope, when granted, are first signed by him, or by other common clergy or by officials, then become official, but the petition thus signed serves as a basis for the wording of Apostolic Letters (Bulls or Briefs) that actually grant the favour requested. In this process three acts are punishable with excommunication: the false signing of a petition; the falsification of Apostolic Letters; and the publication of Letters thus falsified, in order to use them.

(10) "Those who absolve an accomplice in a sin against chastity, and that even at the moment of death, provided another priest, although he be not approved for confession, can hear the confession of the dying person without serious danger of infamy or scandal." This excommunication is not derived from the Bull "In Crem Domini", but from the celebrated Constitution of Benedict XIV, "Sacramentum Poni- tum" (1 June, 1741), completed by its Constitution "Apostolici muneri" (5 Feb., 1745). By these Bulls the pope, with a view to protecting the Sacrament of Penance from sacrilegious abuse, withdraws all jurisdiction from a confessor for absolving from sins against chastity which he may have committed with another person, whether man, or woman; the absolution he might impart for such sin would be null, and the mere attempt to absolve would incur excommunication. The sin thus withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the confessor is any grievous exterior sin against the Sixth Commandment, but it must be such on both sides. The confessor accessory to it cannot pardon it, but,
EXCOMMUNICATION

This article contains two distinct parts. In the first it is not question of all propositions condemned by popes or councils in terms less condemnatory (e.g. rash, offensive, etc.) than the specific stigma heretical (to define heretical propositions being heresy itself and on the occasion of absolution, even if he only feign to absolve (Holy Office, 5 Dec., 1883), thereby allowing the penitent to suppose that he has absolved him or her; or again if he be the cause of the penitent's refraining from accusing himself or herself of this sin (S. Peniten., 19 Feb., 1886). Neither group (1a-8, 9b-16) nor the intention of absolution even if he only feign to absolve (Holy Office, 13 Jan., 1892). There are but two cases in which excommunication is not incurred: first, under absolutely exceptional circumstances where the penitent could not approach another confessor, as the human law does not bind at the cost of such serious disadvantage; again, at the moment of death. But even then Benedict XIV does not restore the power of absolving nor exempt from excommunication, unless it be morally impossible for the dying person, without grave danger of slaughter or scandal, to call in another confessor; this condition, however, should be interpreted broadly.

(11) “Those who usurp or sequester the jurisdiction, property, or revenues belonging to ecclesiastical persons by reason of their churches or benefices.” To usurp is to take as if it legitimately belonged to oneself that which belongs to another; hence it is that this article applies to titles belonging to ecclesiastical persons (Holy Office, 5 March, 1570). To sequester is formally and authoritatively to place in the custody of a third party property withdrawn from the possession of a previous owner. The rights and property protected by this article do not include all church property, but only the rights and property of beneficed clerics as such; they are, as a matter of fact, the principal possessions of the Church. Other property, e.g. that belonging to pious establishments (opera pia) or confraternities and that intended for the maintenance or repair of churches, is protected, indeed, by distinct censures, but its usurpation or sequestration does not incur the excommunication contemplated by this article, which was declared applicable to intruded parish priests in Switzerland (Pius IX, Encyclical of 21 Nov., 1857; S. Cong. of the Council, 23 May, 1874) and in Prussia (25 Feb., 1875). It applies quite certain to governments that despoil the Church of her property.

(12) “Those who themselves or through others, invade, destroy, or detain cities, lands, places, or rights of the Roman Church, those who hold possession of, disturb, or detain its sovereign jurisdiction, and all who give aid, counsel, or countenance to these offenses.” This penalty applies to the authors and accomplices of the invasion and detention of the temporal domains of the Holy See.

1. Excommunication Simply Reserved to the Pope—Before enumerating those it intends to retain, the Constitution “Apostolicae Sedis” speaks only of excommunication as reserved to the pope. It is the first excommunication of this kind against “those who presume to absolve, without the requisite faculties and under any pretext whatsoever, from excommunications that are specially reserved.” This article is directed against those who dare to absolve in bad faith or rashly; a well-founded doubt, however, and even gross ignorance may be pleaded as excuses. Then follow seventeen excommunications simply reserved, declared against the following persons:

(1) “Those who either publicly or privately teach or defend propositions condemned by the Holy See under pain of excommunication, or that those who teach or maintain as lawful the practice of asking the penitent the name of his or her accomplice, a practice condemned by Benedict XIV in his Constitutions ‘Suprema’ (7 July, 1741), ‘Ubi primum’ (2 July, 1746), and ‘Ad eradicandam’ (26 Sept., 1746).”
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article maintains the faculties possessed by bishops and others, such as we have heretofore indicated.

(3) "Those who fight duels, those who challenge or accept challenge thereto, all accomplices, all who help or countenance such combats, all who designedly assist them, finally all who permit duelling or who do whatever it in so far as lies in their power to prevent what their rank or dignity, be it royal or imperial." This severe discipline against duelling dates from the Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, c. xix, De ref.); here, however, only the excommunication in question is considered. It aims at duelling, properly so called, and not at that of religious men with each other, and at other single combats or altercations. University duels, so common in Germany, are included (S. Cong. of the Council, 29 Aug., 1890). The malice of the duel lies in the fact that it makes right depend upon the fate of arms; this penalty is extended to all who take any part whatever in these detestable combats. The excommunication is incurred, first, by the duelists themselves, not only when they actually fight, but as soon as they have proposed or accepted a challenge; next, by the official witnesses or seconds, also by physicians expressly brought upon the scene (Holy Office, 28 May, 1870), and by all spectators not accidentally present; likewise by those who permit these affairs, when such permission is necessary, e. g. in the army, and by those who, although able to prevent duelling, refrain from doing so.

(4) "Those who become members of the Masonic so-called of the Carbonari, or of other similar secret societies that plot either openly or secretly against the Church or legitimate authorities; all who countenance these societies in any way whatever, and finally, all who do not inform against the occult chiefs or leaders, i.e. until they have made such denunciations." Certain associations are prohibited because of their evil or dangerous object; this article deals only with those to which it is forbidden to belong under pain of excommunication later sententiae. These are known by their aim, which is to plot against the Church or legitimate authorities, obviously by illicit or criminal means; this excludes at once purely political groups. It matters little whether or not these societies exist secrecy from their members, though the element of secrecy constitutes an unfavourable presumption. The article names two of these sects, the Freemasons and the Carbonari; to these must add the Fenians (Holy Office, 24 Aug., 1870). There are four productive American societies: the Independent Order of Good Templars (Holy Office, 9 Aug., 1893), the Odd Fellows, the Sons of Temperance, and the Knights of Pythias (Holy Office, 20 June, 1894), but not under pain of excommunication. In regard to the sects of which our article treats, three distinct acts incur excommunication: the inscribing of one’s name as a member, the positive favouring of the sect as such, and failure to denounce the occult leaders. For this last act censure is not incurred if the leaders be not occult, if they be not known with sufficient certainty. The denunciation, if imperative, must be made within a month; once it is made the excommunication is no longer reserved, and one is in a condition to receive absolution from any confessor without further formality.

(5) "Those who command the violation of or who themselves rashly violate the immunity of ecclesiastical asylum." Immunity, or right of sanctuary, protected criminals who took refuge near the altar or within sacred edifices; it was forbidden to remove them from such places of refuge either by public or private force. This immunity, although formally benefited from modern life; the excommunication here retained has hardly more than the value of a principle; it may be noted that the article is cautiously worded. By its terms excommunication would be incurred only by those who rashly, and without being constrained thereto, violate the right of sanctuary as such (Holy Office, 1 Feb., 1871; 22 Dec., 1880).

(6) "Persons of any kind, condition, sex, or age who violate the clausura [i.e. canonical enclosure] of nuns by penetrating into their monasteries, those introducing or admitting along with others at least their clausura, except in the cases and in the manner provided for by the Constitution ‘Decori’ of St. Pius V.

The reader will find in the article Cloister further details; here it suffices to add that the enclosure in question is that of the papal enclosure (clausura papalis), which is that of religious men with a solemn vow. The Constitution ‘Decori’ (24 Jan. 1570) limits the reasons of egress to fire, leprosy, or an epidemic; even in the two latter cases it is necessary for such nuns to have written the authorization of the bishop.

(7) "Women who violate the enclosure [clausura] of male religious and the superiors and others who admit them." Here also it is qutation of religious with solemn vows; moreover, it has not seemed necessary to provide for exceptional cases nor for permission.

(8) "Those who are guilty of real simony [simonia rea] for the obtaining of any favours whatever, and of any of their accomplices." (For this article and the two that follow see SIMONY.)

(9) "Those who are guilty of confidential simony [simonia confidentialis] apropos of any benefice or any dignity whatever.

(10) "Those who are guilty of real simony for the purpose of entering a religious order.

(11) "All who traffic in Indulgences or other spiritual favours are excommunicated by the Constitution of St. Pius V, ‘Quam plenum’ (2 Jan., 1569)." This Constitution enumerates the abuses that the pope wished to remedy. Certain Spanish bishops were accused of having promised indulgences or various other spiritual favours, but in a manner for which they were unauthorized; the abuse consisted mainly in the pecuniary conditions they imposed for obtaining these favours (Indulgences, choice of a confessor for the absolution of reserved cases, Mass and burial in time of interdict, etc.); it is pretended that these abuses of inferior rank were excommunicated. The penalties against bishops have been suppressed; excommunication, however, is retained to punish those who would reap unlawful profit from the publication or granting of Indulgences or of the spiritual favours enumerated.

(12) "Those who collect stipends for Masses and make profits out of them by having the Masses celebrated in places where the stipends are not so high." The object of the penalty is to remedy all shameful traffic in Mass-stipends; to incur it two things are necessary: not only must the stipends be received (referred to as missae manuales) be collected, but a portion of them must be withheld when remitting them to the priests who are to fulfil the obligation of saying the Masses. Despite the wording of the article, it is not necessary that both conditions be fulfilled; the object of the penalties and the celebration of the Masses, occur in different places (Holy Office, 19 Aug., 1891, ad 4).

(13) "All those excommunicated by the Constitutions of St. Pius V, ‘Admonet nos’ (29 March, 1567); Innocent IX, ‘Quo ab hinc Sede’ (4 Nov., 1591); Clement VIII, ‘Ad Romani Pontificis curam’ (26 Aug., 1592); and Alexander VIII, ‘Inter easteras’ (24 Oct., 1660), concerning the alienation and enfeoffment of cities and places belonging to the Holy Roman Church.

This article deals with the temporal domains of the Church and calls here for no special comment.

V.-44
(14) “Religious who, without permission of the parish priest, venture to administer extreme unction or the Eucharist as Viaticum, to ecclesiastics or laymen, except in cases of necessity.” The penalty affects religious with solemn vows and profession, but is not inflicted on persons domiciled in their convents. Those who, without legitimate permission, take relics from the cemeteries or catacombs of Rome or its territory, and who give such persons aid or countenance.” The penalty is to be sought from the Roman Vicariate, and excommunication is incurred only by carrying away from the catacombs genuine relics, not other objects. Relics are the remains, not of anyone happening to be buried in the catacombs, but only of martyrs, or of those regarded as such by reason of the “signs of martyrdom” that distinguish their tombs, notably the phial of blood, according to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 10 April, 1903, 27 Nov., 1893.

(15) “Those who hold communion in criminal crime with a person whom the pope has excommunicated by name, is, those who give him assistance or countenance.” The “criminal crime” (crimen criminosum) is the very one for which the culprit was excommunicated in the article, of course, contaminants in the act, itself, since excommunication by name is necessarily posterior to such an act. The penalty is inflicted for subsequently assisting or countenancing the excommunicated person. This is a survival [see above, II (5)] of the penalties incurred by intercourse with the excommunicated. It must be noted that this censure is not imposed for intercourse with all excommunicated persons, but only with the Catholics, whom the pope has excommunicated by name, not such as have been excommunicated by a Roman Congregation (Holy Office, 16 June, 1897) or by the bishop.

(16) “Clerics who knowingly and wilfully hold communion in divinis with persons whom the pope has excommunicated by name and receive them at Divine service.” The excommunicated in question are the same as in the preceding article, and they cannot be admitted to Divine service; however, the penalty incurred concerns ecclesiastics only, when acting freely and with full knowledge [see above, II (5)].

(c) Excommunications Reserved to the Bishop (Ordinary).—These are three in number and affect the following persons—

(1) “Ecclesiastics in Holy orders and regulars or nuns who dare to contract marriage after having made a solemn vow of chastity, also those who dare to contract marriage with one of these persons.” The ecclesiastics whose marriage is null in consequence of the impediment of Holy orders are subdecons and the inferior orders; the same is true of nuns and monks, religious whose marriage is null through the impediment of vow are members of the great orders. Nevertheless, the impediment does not exist from the time of their first profession that follows the novitiate, but only from the solemn profession made three years later. The penalty is incurred by an attempt at marriage, not by an act of betrothal: such an attempt is recognized in any contract having the figura matrimonii, i.e. which would constitute a marriage if there were no impediment; consequently the penalty is incurred for civil marriage (Holy Office, 22 Dec., 1880), even where other impediments, e.g. concubinage (Holy Office, 16 Jan., 1892).

(2) “Those who efficaciously procure abortion.” The fruitless attempt is not punished with excommunication; authors do not agree as to whether the woman guilty of self-abortion is excommunicated.

(3) “Those who knowingly make use of counterfeit Apostolic Letters or who co-operate in the crime.” [See above, (a) (9).] This article is not directed against forgers but against those who endeavour to profit by falsified letters. Petitions signed by the pope or in his name have all the presumed permission of the parish priest, if they be in ignorance, finally if it be a case of necessity. Those to whom these religious must not administer the sacraments are seculars, ecclesiastics or laymen; they may, however, administer them to persons domiciled in their convents.

(4) “Those who knowingly make use of counterfeit Apostolic Letters or who encourage the giving of ecclesiastical burial to notorious heretics or to persons excommunicated by name or placed under interdict.” The article does consider funeral ceremonies, but only material interment in consecrated ground. Those who admit heretics or others to ecclesiastical burial are not punished, but only those who, by authority or force, compel such an interment, thereby violating the prohibition of the Church. Nor is it questionable here of all who, according to the Ritual, should be deprived of ecclesiastical burial, but merely of the two categories indicated.

(5) “Those who wound or terrify the inquisitors, informers, witnesses, or other ministers of the Holy Office, those who lacerate or burn the writings of this tribunal and all who give to the aforesaid assistance, counsel, or countenance.” This excommunication does not apply in countries where the Holy Office has not the initiatives invested in such countries on the bishop who is protected by the specially reserved excommunications described above, under (a) (5), (6), (8).

(6) “Those who alienate and those who have the audacity to receive church property without Apostolic authorization, according to the terms of the Constitution ‘Ambitiose, de rebus eccles. alienandi.’” The author of this Constitution (Extravagantes, lib. III, tit. iv, inter comm.) was Paul II (1 March, 1467). It forbids under pain of reserved excommunication and of the nullity of the acts, not only alienations (properly so called) of ecclesiastical property, sales, donations, etc., but also all contracts savouring of alienation, such as mortgages, emphyteusis or perpetual lease, long-term leases, etc. For the manifest benefit of the Church these contracts must be authorized by the pope; only objects of small value are excepted (see Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, no. 20).

(7) “Those who, through their own fault, neglect or omit to denounce within a month the confessors or priests by whom they have been solicited to immodest acts, in all the cases set forth by our predecessors Gregory XV in the Constitution ‘Universi’ (20 Aug., 1622) and Benedict XIV in the Constitution ‘Sacramentum poenitentiae’ (1 June, 1741).” This excommunication is not intended to punish those solicited to sin (they are not therefore guilty), but to protect the administration of the Sacrament of Penance. Persons thus solicited are strictly obliged to make known to the inquisitor or the bishop those priests who have solicited them to the aforesaid acts; if, through their own fault, such denunciation is not made within a month they incur excommunication, which ceases only when they have made known in the aforesaid manner the guilty party. The solicitation here alluded to is not any provocation to evil, but to sins against chastity on the part of confessors or priests, and in connection with the Sacrament of Penance, this being the abuse that the legislator especially seeks to punish. Said connexion exists when the solicitation takes place “during the very act of penance, or immediately before or after, on the occasion or under the pretext of confession, or finally, in the confessional.”

B. Excommunications Pronounced by the Council of Trent.—These are eight in number, the first being sim-
ply reserved to the pope and the other seven non-reserved:—

(1) Sess. XXII, c. ii, De ref.: against usurpers, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, of any kind of church property, until the time of restitution and absolution. This protects all ecclesiastical property. This is called, i.e. of which the administration belongs to ecclesiastical authority, such as real and personal property, revenues, etc. Excommunication is incurred by usurpers, namely by those who claim for themselves the ownership of this property, and passes on to the successive acquirers of such property until restitution or composition (compensation) is made. The penalty was applied at the time of the recent spoliations in Italy and France.

(2) Sess. IV, De edictum et usu sacrum librorum.

—The excommunication pronounced by the council was restricted by the Constitution "Apostolica Sedis" to those who, without the approbation of the bishop, print, or have printed, books treating of sacred things; this must here be understood solely of the text of Holy Writ and of notes and commentaries on the same (Holy Office, 22 Dec., 1860).

(3) Sess. XXIV, c. vi, De ref. matr.: against those who willfully and guilty of the crime of abduction, in regard to any woman, with a view to marriage, and all who lend them advice, aid, or countenance.

(4) Sess. XXIV, c. ix, De ref. matr.: against temporal rulers and magistrates who directly or indirectly oppose the liberty of their subjects in the matter of contracting marriage, or in太少 those who unjustly oblige a woman to enter a monastery unwillingly, or to take the habit, or make a profession, and those who thereunto give their counsel, aid, or countenance, as also against those who, without good reason, prevent a woman from taking the veil or making her profession.

(5) Sess. XXV, c. v, De regul.: against secular magistrates who at the request of the bishop, do not give the support of the secular arm in re-establishing the clausura or enclosure of nuns. This excommunication is abrogated in practice or at least is inapplicable.

(6) Sess. XXV, c. xviii, De regul.: against those who unjustly oblige a woman to enter a monastery unwillingly, or to take the habit, or make a profession, and those who thereunto give their counsel, aid, or countenance, as also against those who, without good reason, prevent a woman from taking the veil or making her profession.

(7) Sess. XXV, c. i, De ref. matr.: against "those who deny that clandestine marriages [before the legislation of the council] are true and valid; as also those who falsely affirm that marriages contracted by the children of a family without the consent of their parents are invalid and that parents can make such marriages valid or invalid."

(8) Sess. XIII, can. xi: "This council ordains and declares that sacramental confession, when a confessor may be had, is of necessity to be made before Communion by those whose conscience is troubled by mortal sin, how contrite soever they may think themselves. But if anyone shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately to assert, or even in public disputation to defend the contrary, he shall be thereupon excommunicated.

C. Excommunications Pronounced or Renounced Since the Constitution "Apostolica Sedis".—These are four, in number, the first being specially reserved to the pope, the third to the ordinary; the fourth is non-reserved.

(1) The Constitution "Romani Pontifex" (28 Aug. 1870), besides other penalties, declares specially reserved excommunication: first, against the dignitaries and canons of cathedral churches (or those having the administration of vacant cathedrals) who would dare to concede and transfer the administration of their church with the title of vicar to the person elected, or named as all ecclesiastical property, properly by lay power; second, against those so elected or presented; and third, against all who aid, advise, or countenance the aforesaid offenders.

(2) Excommunication specially reserved against the members of the "Catholic Italian Society for the restoration of the rights of the Christian and especially of the Roman people", and against its promoters, supporters, and adherents (S. Peniten., 4 Aug., 1876; Acta S. Sed., IX, 552). Amongst other rights this society proposed to restore popular participation in the election of the sovereign pontiff.

(3) Excommunication reserved to the ordinary against laymen (for ecclesiastics the penalty is suspension) who traffic in Mass-stipends and trade with priests for books and other merchandise (S. Cong. of the Council, decrees "Vigilanti studio", 25 May, 1893).

(4) Excommunication, non-reserved, against missionaries, both regulars and seculars, of the East Indies (Parther Orient) or the West Indies (America) who devote themselves to commerce or who participate in it, and their immediate superiors, provincial or general, who fail to punish the culprits, at least by removal, and even after a single offence. This excommunication comes down from the Constitutions of Urban VIII, "Ex delicto" (22 Feb., 1633), and Clement IX, "Solluitudo" (17 July, 1669), but was suppressed by reason of non-mention in the Constitution "Apostolica Sedis"; it was re-established, however, at the request of the S. Cong. of the Inquisition, 1 Dec., 1872. This excommunication is non-reserved, but the culprit cannot be absolved prior to making restitution, unless he at the point of death.

Canonists usually treat of excommunication in their commentaries on the Corpus Juris Canonici, at the title De excommunicatione (lib. V, tit. xxix). Moralists deal with it apropos of the treatise on censures (De Censura). One of the chief works is that of D’Annibale, Summa morum (5th ed., Rome, 1908). For details consult the numerous commentaries on the Constitution Apostolica Sedis. Special works by ancient writers: Avela, De censura (Lyons, 1599); Stobae, De censura (Coimbra, 1603); Aldri, De censurae ecclesiasticis (Rome, 1618); Of. Rorens, De censura et inquisitioni (Tbingen, 1597); Idem in Kirchenlex., s. v. Bann, Hollweck, Die kirchlichen Strafgesetze (Mainz, 1899); Hilarius a Sexten, De censura (Mainz, 1898); Muncher, De canonica censura et inquisitione (Cologne, 1783); Starcke, De censura et inquisitione (Cologne, 1874); Taunton, The Law of the Church (London, 1900), s. v. Excommunication; Smith, Elements of Ecclesiastical Law (New York, 1884); Saint-Justes, Rapport. Jur. Canon. (New York, 1905), V, 210-15; Luga, De Justitia Ecc. (Rome, 1906).

A. Boudinon.

Exeat. See Incarceration.

Execution, same as Desecration (q.v.).

Executor, Apostolic, a cleric who puts into execution a papal rescript, completing what is necessary in order that it be effective. The executor is to be discovered from the tenor of the document itself. In matters which regard the government of the regulars, the executor of Apostolic Letters is the superior of the order, namely, the general, the procurator general, or the provincial. Rescripts containing favours are sometimes granted by the Holy See directly to the petitioners; in which case, the executor merely has the office of executing the favour asked for, without any obligation of judicial inquiry into the opportuneness of the grant, or the reasons alleged for seeking it. Nevertheless, if it is notorious that the favour has been surreptitiously obtained, he must abstain from executing the rescript. Rescripts, however, are not usually sent direct to the parties interested, but, in the external forum, to the ordinary, either of the petitioners or of the territory in question, and in the internal forum, to any approved confessor chosen by the persons concerned. In the latter case the grant is remitted entirely to the judgment and conscience of him who is to execute it. He enjoys delegated power, and must act within the limits of his mandate. The Apostolic Letters must first of all be in his hands before he may act; from them he determines whether he is the one delegated, and what are his powers. He must verify the force of the reasons alleged for granting the request, as well as the truth of other statements found in the petition. As a delegate of the Holy See he may, ordinarily, subordinate another to execute the rescript, unless this is expressly
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forbidden in the grant, or unless it is apparent that he is selected by reason of his knowledge or other personal qualities specially fitting him for the office. It is important to know whether an executor is chosen for his personal characteristics, or on account of his office: in the latter case the delegation is personal, and if the latter it is attached to the position, and passes on to the successor of the same office. A rescript given to the ordinary may likewise be executed by the vicar general. An executor must know the rules for interpreting rescripts, also, when they are rendered void, because surreptitiously obtained, or for other causes. Rescripts emanating from the Sacred Penitentiaria are executed in the confessional, and are then destroyed by the confessor, as they treat of matters of conscience. When the rescript pertains to the external forum, a deacon should be drawn up to the effect that all necessary formalities have been observed in its execution; these formalities should be specified. No fee is allowed for the execution of Apostolic Letters, lest the executor's judgment be influenced thereby.


Andrew B. Meehan.

Exeza.—A semicircular stone or marble seat; a rectangular or semicircular recess; the portico of the Greek palestrn, or gymnasium, in which disputations of the learned were held among the ancients; also, in private houses, the place set apart for conversation. The term is sometimes applied to a porch or chapel which projects from a larger building. Also used, as synonymous with cathedra, for a throne or seat of any kind; for a small private chamber; the space between an oriel window and the small chapel between the buttresses of a large church or cathedral.


Thomas H. Poole.

Exegesis (Biblical) is the branch of theology which investigates and expresses the true sense of Sacred Scripture. The exegete does not inquire which books constitute Sacred Scripture, nor does he investigate their genuine text, nor, again, does he study their double authorship. He accepts the books which, according to the concurrent testimony of the church and ecclesiastical authority, belong to the Canon of Sacred Scripture. Obedient to the decree of the Council of Trent, he regards the Vulgate as the authentic Latin version, without neglecting the results of sober textual criticism, based on the readings found in the other versions approved by Christian antiquity, in the liturgical citations of the Fathers, and in the more ancient manuscripts. With regard to the authorship of the Sacred Books, too, the exegete follows the authoritative teaching of the Church and the prevalent opinions of her theologians on the question of Biblical inspiration. Not that these three questions concerning the Canon, the genuine text, and the inspiration of Sacred Scriptures exert no influence on Biblical exegesis: unless a book forms part of the Canon, it will not be the subject of exegesis at all; only the best supported readings of its text will be made the basis of its theological explanation; and the doctrine of inspiration with its logical corollaries will be found to have a constant bearing on the results of exegesis. Still, exegesis, as such, does not deal with these three subjects; the reader will find them treated in the articles CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; CRITICISM, BIBLICAL, SUBTITULAR, CRITICISM, PERIPTETICAL, AND CRITICISM, INTERPRETATION.

The early Reformers were wont to claim that the genuine text of the inspired and canonical books is self-sufficient and clear. This contention does not owe its origin to the sixteenth century. The words of Origen (De principi., IV), St. Augustine (De doctr. christ., I-III), and St. Jerome (ad Paulin., ep. liii, 6, 7) show that similar views existed among the scholastics in the early age of the Church. The exegetical results flowing from the supposed clearness of the Bible may be inferred from the fact that one century after the death of Bossuet could give to the world two volumes entitled, “A History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches”. A Protestant theologian, S. Werenfels, sets forth the same truth in a telling epigram:

Tunc liber est in quo sua quattuor dogmata quiesque,
Inveniet et pariter quattuor quiesque sua,
Et sic est in quatuor commensuris,
Quae in quattuor commensuris quies est. [It may be rendered in an English paraphrase:"
Men ope this book, their favourite creed in mind; Each seeks his own, and each his own doth find. Agreeing with the warning of the Fathers, Pope Leo XIII, in his Enyclic 1, 1 "Providentissimus Deus", insisted on the difficulty of rightly interpreting the Bible. "It must be observed", he wrote, "that in addition to the usual reasons which make ancient writings more or less difficult to understand, there are some which are peculiar to the Bible. For the language of the Bible is employed to express, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, many things that are beyond the power and scope of the reason of man— that is to say, Divine mysteries and all that is related to them. There is sometimes in such passages a fullness and a hidden depth of meaning which the letter hardly expresses and which the laws of grammatical interpretation hardly penetrate. Moreover, the sense itself frequently admits other senses, adapted to illustrate dogma or to confirm morality. Wherefore, it must be recognized that the Sacred Writings are vise in a certain religious obscurity, and that no one can enter into their interior without a guide; God so disposes the Holy Fathers conversely to teach, in order that men may investigate them with greater ardour and earnestness, and that what is attained with difficulty may sink more deeply into the mind and heart; and, most of all, that they may understand that God has delivered the Holy Scriptures to the Church, and that in reading and making use of His word, they must follow the Church as their guide and their teacher."]

But it is not our purpose so much to prove the need of Biblical exegesis as to explain its aim, describe its methods, indicate the various forms of its results, and outline its history. Exegesis aims at investigating the sense of Sacred Scripture: its method is contained in the rules of interpretation; its results are expressed in the various ways in which the sense of the Bible is wont to be communicated; its history comprises the work done by Christian and Jewish interpreters, by Catholics and Protestants. We shall endeavour to consider these various elements under the four heads: I. Sense of Sacred Scripture; II. Hermeneutics; III. Sacred Rhetorics; IV. History of Exegesis.

I. Sense of Sacred Scripture.—In general, the sense of Sacred Scripture is the truth actually conveyed by it. We must well distinguish between the sense of a word and the significance of a word. The former will give us, in the case of most words, a list of their various possible meanings or significations; but no reader will be tempted to believe that a word has all these meanings wherever it occurs. The context or some other restrictive element will determine the meaning in which each word is used in any given passage, and this meaning is the sense of the word. The significance of the word is its possible meaning; the sense of a word is its actual meaning in any given context. A sentence, like a word, may have several possible significations, but it has only one sense or meaning, as intended by the author. Here, again, the distinction denotes the possible meaning of a sentence, while the sense is the meaning which the sentence here and now conveys. In the case of the Bible, it must be kept in mind that God is its author, and that God, the Sovereign Lord of all things, can manifest truth not
merely by the use of words, but also by disposing outward things in such a way that one is the figure of the other. In the former case we have the literal sense; in the latter, the typical (cf. St. Thomas, Quodli., vii, Q vi, a. 14).

(i) Literal Sense.—(i) What is the Literal Sense?—The literal sense of Sacred Scripture is the truth really, actually, and immediately intended by its author. The fact that the literal sense must be really intended by the author distinguishes it from the truth conveyed by any mere accommodation. This latter applies a writer's language, on the ground of analogy, to some thing or other that is not in itself on analogy. The literal sense is actually intended by the writer, it differs from the meaning conveyed only virtually by the text. Thus the reader may come to know the literary capacity of the author from the style of his writing; or he may draw a number of logical inferences from the writer's direct statements; the resultant information is in neither case actually intended by the writer, but it constitutes the so-called derivative or consequent sense. Finally, the literal sense is limited to the meaning immediately intended by the writer, so that the truth mediately expressed by him does not fall within the range of the literal sense. This point is to this point that the literal sense differs from the typical. To repeat briefly, the literal sense is not an accommodation based on similitude or analogy; it is not a mere inference drawn by the reader; it is not an antitype corresponding to the immediate contents of the text as its type; but it is the meaning which the author intends to convey really, not by a stretch of the imagination; actually, not as a syllogistic potency; and immediately, i. e., by means of the language, not by means of the truth conveyed by the language.

(ii) Division of the Literal Sense.—What has been said about the immediate character of the literal sense must not be misconstrued in such a way as to exclude figurative language from its range. Figurative language is really a single, not a double, sign of the truth it conveys. When we speak of the "arm of God," we do not imply that God really is endowed with such a bodily member, but we directly denote his power of action (St. Thomas, Summa, I, Q. i, a. 10, ad 3a). This principle applies not merely in the metaphor, the synecdoche, the metonymy, or the irony, but also in those cases in which the figure extends through a whole sentence or even an entire chapter or book. The fact that the real sense of the expression differs from its usual verbal meaning. In Matt. v, 13 sqq., e. g., the sentence, "You are the salt of the earth," etc., is not to be understood in its nonfigurative sense, and then in the figurative; it does not first class the Apostles among the mineral kingdom, and then among the social and religious reformers of the world, but the literal meaning of the passage coincides with the truth conveyed in the allegory. It follows, therefore, that the literal sense comprises both the proper and the figurative. The fable, the parable, and the example must also be classed among the allegorical expressions which signify the intended truth immediately.

It is true that in the passage according to which the trees elect a king (Judges, ix, 6-21), in the parable of the prodigal son (Luke, xv, 11 sqq.), and in the history of the Good Samaritan (Luke, x, 32), a number of words and of means in order to construct the fable, the parable, and the example respectively; but this does not interfere with the literal or immediate sense of the literal devices. As such they have no meaning independent of, or prior to, the moral lesson which the author intends to convey by them. We are not always entitled to consider such devices as mere contrivance which calls a watch immediately. The more contrivance we call it, the more it shows the time in spite of the subordinate action of its spring and wheels; why, then, should we question the truth that the literary device called fable, or parable, or example, immediately points out its moral lesson, though the very existence of such a device presupposes the use of a number of words and even sentences?

(iii) Ubiquity of the Literal Sense.—The Fathers of the Church were not blind to the fact that the literal sense in some Scripture passages appears to imply certain incongruities, not to say impossibilities. On the other hand, they regarded the language of the Bible as truly human language, and therefore always endowed with a literal sense, whether proper or figurative. Moreover, St. Jerome (in Is., xiii, 19), St. Augustine (De tent. Abrah. serm., ii, 7), St. Gregory (De fide, i, 37) agree, while St. Augustine (ibid., vii, 64, vi, a. 14) in his conviction that the typical sense is always based on the literal and springs from it. Hence if these Fathers had denied the existence of a literal sense in any passage of Scripture, they would have left the passage meaningless. Where the patristic writers appear to reject the literal sense, they really exclude only the proper sense, leaving the figurative. Origen (De princ., IV, xi) may be regarded as the only exception to this rule; since he considers some of the Mosaic laws as either absurd or impossible to keep, he denies that they must be taken in their literal sense. It is probable even in his case, attempts have been made to give to his words a more acceptable meaning (cf. Vincenzi, "In S. Gregorii Nysseni et Origenis scripta et doctrinam novae recessio," Rome, 1864, vol. II, cc. xxv-xxix). The great Alexandrian Doctor distinguishes between the body, the soul, and the spirit of Scripture. The same has been observed (and surpasses) in the three elements its proper, its figurative, and its typical sense respectively. He may, therefore, with impunity deny the existence of any bodily sense in a passage of Scripture without injury to its literal sense. But it is more generally admitted that Origen went astray on this point, because he followed Philo's opinion too faithfully.

(iv) Is the Literal Sense One or Multiple?—There is more solid ground for a diversity of opinion concerning the unicity of the literal sense contained in each passage of Sacred Scripture. This brings us face to face with a double question: (a) Is it possible that a Scriptural passage has more than one literal sense? (b) Is there any Biblical text which actually has more than one literal meaning? It must be kept in mind that the literal sense is taken here in the strict meaning of the word. It is agreed on all hands that a multiple consequent sense or a multiple accommodation may be regarded as the rule rather than the exception. Nor is there any difficulty about the multiple literal sense found in various readings or in different versions of the same text; we ask here whether one and the same genuine Scripture text may have more than one literal sense.

(a) Possibility of a Multiple Literal Sense.—Since a word, and a sentence too, may have more meanings than one, there is no a priori impossibility in the idea that a Scriptural text should have more than one literal sense. If the author of Scripture really intends to convey the truth contained in the various possible meanings of a text, the multiple literal sense will be the natural resultant. Some of the expressions found in the writings of the Fathers seem to emphasize the possibility of having a multiple literal sense in Sacred Scripture.

(b) Actual Occurrence of a Multiple Literal Sense.—The subject becomes more complicated if we ask whether a multiple literal sense is not merely possible, but actually found anywhere in Scripture. There is no good authority for its frequent occurrence, but it does really exist even in the few Scriptural passages which seem to contain it, such as Is. ii, 7; Is., iii, 4, 8; Dan., ix, 27; John, xi, 51; ii, 19? Did God wish in these texts to convey a multiple literal sense? Revelation, as coming down to us in Scripture and tradition, furnishes the only clue to the solution of the question.
(a) Arguments for the Multiple Literal Sense.—The advocates of a multiple literal sense advance the following arguments for their view: First, Sacred Scripture supposes its existence in several passages. Thus Heb., i, 5, understands Ps. ii, 7 (this day have I begotten thee) literally, as referring to the external generation, but Acts, xxii, 33, understands the text of the Resurrection; Heb., v, 5, of the eternal priesthood of Christ. Again, the Latin Vulgate and the Septuagint, together with I Pet., ii, 24, understand Is. lii, 4 (he hath borne our iniquities), of our sins; Matt., viii, 17, understands the words of our bodies, and again, I Mach., i, 57, applies some words of Dan., ix, 27, to his own subject, while Matt., xxiv, 15, represents them as a prophecy to be fulfilled in the destruction of the Holy City. Finally, John, i, 19, was understood by the Jews in a sense different from that intended by Jesus Christ; and John, xi, 51, expresses two disparate meanings, one intended by Caiphas and the other by the Holy Ghost. The second argument is, that tradition too upholds the existence of a multiple sense in several passages of the Bible. Its witnesses are St. Augustine (Conf., XII, xxvi, xxxi, xxxii; De doctr. Christi, etc.); St. Gregory the Great (Ezech., iii, 13, Lib. i, Rom. x, n. 50 sq.). St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Bernard, and, among the Scholastics, St. Thomas (I, q. i, a. 10; “De potent.,” IV, i, “in ii sent.,” dist. xii, q. i, a. 2, ad 7”), Carl. Cajetan (ad I, q. i, a. 10), Melchior Cano (Loc. theol., Lib. vii, ad 7 arg., ad 8 Bezae (ad i, q. i, a. 10). Sylvius (ad id.), John of St. Thomas (I, q. i, disp. ii, a. 12), Billart (De reg. fidei, dissert. i, a. 8), Vasquez, Valenti, Molina, Serrarius, Cornelius a Lapide, and others.

(9) Reasons against the Multiple Literal Sense.—Patristic, Eusebian, Kabbalistic, Reimarus, and the greater number of recent writers deny the actual existence of a multiple literal sense in the Bible; they urge the following reasons for their opinion: First, the Bible is written in human language; now, the language of other books usually presents only one literal sense. Second, the genuine sense of Sacred Scripture must be discovered by means of the rules of hermeneutics. A commentator would render these rules meaningless, if he were to look for a second literal sense of a passage after discovering one true meaning by their means. Third, commentators implicitly assume that the given text of Scripture has only one literal sense; for after finding out the various meanings which are philologically probable, they endeavour to ascertain which of them was intended by the Holy Ghost. Fourth, a multiple literal sense would create equivocation and confusion in the Bible. Finally, the multiple sense in Scripture would be a supernatural fact wholly depending on the free will of God. We cannot know it independently of revelation; its actual occurrence must be solidly proved from Scripture or tradition. The patrons of the multiple literal sense have not thus far advanced any such proof.

(1) Where Scripture, Law, Cornelius, Kabbalabur, Reim- mayr, and the greater number of recent writers deny the actual existence of a multiple literal sense in the Bible; they urge the following reasons for their opinion: First, the Bible is written in human language; now, the language of other books usually presents only one literal sense. Second, the genuine sense of Sacred Scripture must be discovered by means of the rules of hermeneutics. A commentator would render these rules meaningless, if he were to look for a second literal sense of a passage after discovering one true meaning by their means. Third, commentators implicitly assume that the given text of Scripture has only one literal sense; for after finding out the various meanings which are philologically probable, they endeavour to ascertain which of them was intended by the Holy Ghost. Fourth, a multiple literal sense would create equivocation and confusion in the Bible. Finally, the multiple sense in Scripture would be a supernatural fact wholly depending on the free will of God. We cannot know it independently of revelation; its actual occurrence must be solidly proved from Scripture or tradition. The patrons of the multiple literal sense have not thus far advanced any such proof.

(2) The testimony of the Fathers and the Scholastic theologians is not sufficient in our case to prove the existence of a dogmatic tradition as to the actual occurrence of the multiple literal sense in Scripture. There is no trace of it before the time of St. Augustine; this great Doctor propounds his view not as the teaching of tradition, but as a pious and probable opinion. The expressions of the other Fathers, excepting perhaps St. Gregory the Great, urge the depth and weight of thought contained in Scripture, and they refer to meanings which they consider as authentic, typical, derivative, or consequent sense, and perhaps even to mere accommodations of certain passages.

Among the Scholastics, St. Thomas follows the opinion of St. Augustine, at least in one of the alleged passages (De potent., IV, I, 1) and a number of the later Scholastics follow the opinion of St. Thomas. The other early Scholastics maintain rather the opposite view, as may be seen in St. Bonaventure (IV Sent. dist. xxi, I, 1. dub. 1) and Alexander of Hales (Summa, I, q. i., m. 1, a. 2).

(v) The Derivative or Consequent Sense.—The consequent or derivative sense of Scripture is the truth legitimately inferred from its genuine meaning. It would be wrong to identify the consequent sense with the more latent literal sense. This depth of the literal sense may spring from the fact that the predicate changes somewhat in its meaning if it be applied to a morally different subject. The word would be found in the meaning if predicted of God, and quite another if predicted of created beings. Such a variety of meaning belongs to the literal meaning in the strict sense of the word. The consequent sense may be said to be the conclusion of a syllogism whose premises are true. The Holy Ghost often applies the passage to a holy author; but God has foreseen all the legitimate conclusions derived from Biblical truths, so that they may be said, in a certain way, to be His intended meanings. If the Bible itself makes use of such inferences, and if by way of grace He has made a reconciliation, as Paul (I Cor., i, 31) quotes such an inference based on Jer., ix, 23, 24, with the express addition “as it is written”; in I Cor., ix, 10, 11, he derived the consequent sense of Deut., xxv, 4, indicating the second premise, while in I Tim., v, 18, he states the consequent sense of the same passage without adding the second premise. Theologians and ascetical writers have, therefore, a right to utilize dogmatic and moral inferences from the genuine sense of Sacred Scripture. The writings of the Fathers illustrate this principle most copiously.

(27) Accommodation.—By accommodation the writer’s words are applied, on the ground of analogy, to something not originally meant by him. If there be no analogy between the original and the imposed meaning, there is no accommodation of the passage, but rather a violent perversion of its true meaning, such a contorted meaning is not merely outside, but against, the genuine sense. Accommodation is usually divided into two classes: extensive and allusive. Extensive accommodation takes the words of the Bible in their genuine sense, but applies them to a new subject. Thus the words, he “was found perfect, just, in the time of his power,” were regarded as indicating the types of companionship, which Eclesius, xlv, 17, predicates of Noe, are often applied to other saints. Allusive accommodation does not employ the words of Scripture in their genuine sense, but gives them an entirely different meaning; here the analogy does not exist between the objects, but between the verbal expressions. Ps. xvii, 26, 27, “With the holy, thou wilt be holy; and with the innocent man thou wilt be innocent; and with the elect thou wilt be elect: and with the perverse thou wilt be perverted,” expresses originally the attitude of God to the good and the wicked; but by accommodation the words are employed to infer an analogy between the case of companionship. That the use of accommodation is legitimate, may be inferred from its occurrence in Scripture, in the writings of the Fathers, and from its very nature. Examples of accommodation in Scripture may be found in Matt., vii, 23 (cf. Ps., vi, 9), Rom.,...
x, 18 (cf. Ps. xviii, 5), II Cor., viii, 15 (cf. Ex., xvi, 18), Heb., xiii, 5 (cf. Jos., i, 5), Apoc., xi, 4 (cf. Zach., iv, 14). The liturgical books and the writings of the Fathers are so replete with the use of accommodation that it is needless to refer to any special instances. Finally, there is no good reason for interdicting the practice of accommodation, seeing that it is right and proper in itself and that its use does not involve any inconvenience as far as faith and morals are concerned. But two exceptions are to be avoided: first, it cannot be maintained, that all the citations from the Old Testament which are found in the New are mere accommodate—adaptations. Certain passages are found in the writings of those who endeavour to destroy the value of the Messianic prophecies; they are not confined to our days, but date back to Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Sojourners. The Fifth Ecumenical Council rejected the error of Theodore; besides, Christ Himself (Matt., xxii, 41 sqq.; cf. Ps. cix, 1), St. Peter (Acts, iii, 25 sqq.; cf. Gen., xii, 3; xvii, 15; xxi, 18, and St. Paul (Heb., i, 5; v, 5; Acts, iii, 33; cf. Ps. ii, 7) have theological arguments on Old Testament citations, so that these latter cannot be regarded as mere accommodation. Secondly, we must not except the proper limits in the use of accommodation. This we should do, if we were to present the meaning derived from accommodation as the genuine sense of Scripture, or if we were to use it as the premise in an argument, or again if we were to accommodate the words of Scripture to ridiculous, absurd, or wholly disparate subjects. The fourth session of the Council of Trent warns most earnestly against such an abuse of Sacred Scripture.

(2) Typical Sense.—The typical sense has its name from the fact that it is based on the figurative or typical relation of Biblical persons, or objects, or events, to a new truth. This latter is called the antitype, while its Biblical correspondent is named the type. The typical sense is also called the spiritual, or mystical, sense: mystical, because of its more recondite nature; spiritual, because it is related to the literal, as the spirit is related to the body. What we call type is called shadow, allegory, parable, by St. Paul (Rom., x, 14; I Cor., x, 6; Heb., vii, 5; Gal., iv, 24; Heb., ix, 10; once he refers to it as antitype (Heb., ix, 24), though St. Peter applies this term to the truth signified (I Pet., iii, 21). Various other designations for the typical sense have been used by the Fathers of the Church; but the following questions are of more vital importance.

(i) Nature of the Typical Sense.—The typical sense is the Scriptural truth which the Holy Ghost intends to convey really, actually, but not immediately. Inasmuch as its meaning is really conveyed, the typical sense differs from accommodation; inasmuch as its meaning is actually expressed, it differs from the consequent sense; inasmuch as its meaning is not immediately signified, it differs from the literal sense. While we arrive at the latter immediately by way of the literal expression, we cannot know the typical sense only by way of the literal. The text is the sign conveying the literal sense, but the literal sense is the sign expressing the typical. The literal sense is the type which by a special design of God is directed to signify its antitype. Three conditions are necessary to constitute a type: (a) It must be described in the Old Testament. (b) It must be referred to the antitype by its very nature. This prohibits the similitude from serving as a type, of its own likeness to the object. (c) God himself must have established the reference of the type to its antitype; this excludes objects which are naturally related to others. The necessity of these three conditions explains why a type cannot be confounded with a parable, or an example, or a symbol, or a similitude, or a comparison, or a metaphor, or a symbolic prophecy—e.g., the statue seen in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar. It should be added, however, that at times the type may be expressed by the Scriptural representation of a subject rather than by the strict literal sense of Scripture. Gen., xiv, 18; xvi, 14, introduces Melchizedek as the figure of Christ's genealogy; hence Heb., vii, 3, represents him "without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life", and makes him as such a type of Jesus Christ. Thus far we have spoken about the typical sense in its strict meaning. In a wider and looser sense, many of the Old Testament are sometimes considered as types, provided they resemble persons, events, or objects in the New Testament, whether the Holy Ghost has intended such a relationship or not. The Egyptian Joseph is in this way frequently represented as a type of St. Joseph, the foster-father of Christ.

(ii) Division of the Typical Sense.—The division of the typical sense is based on the character of the type and the antitype. The antitype is either a truth to be believed, or a boon to be hoped for, or again a virtue to be practised. This gives us a triple sense—the literal, the analogical, and the typological. The objects of faith in the Old Testament centered mainly around the future Messias and his Church. The allegorical sense may, therefore, be said to refer to the future or to be prophetic. The allegory here is not to be sought in the literary expression, but is to be found in the persons or things expressed. This division of the typical sense was expressed by the Scholastics in two lines:

- Littera gesta docet; quid credas, allegoria; Moralis quid agas; quo tendas, anagoria.
- Jerusalem, e. g., according to its literal sense, is the earthly City; taken allegorically, it denotes the Church Militant; understood topologically, it stands for the just soul; finally, in its anagogical sense, it stands for the Church Triumphant.

(iii) The Existence of the Typical Sense.—Scripture and tradition agree in their testimony for the occurrence of the typical sense in certain passages of the Old Testament. Among the Scriptural texts which establish the typical sense, we may appeal to Col., iv, 16—17; Heb., vii, 5—8; Rom., v, 14; Gal., iv, 24; Matt., vi, 15 (cf. Os., xi, 1); Heb., i, 5 (cf. II K., vii, 14). The testimony of tradition concerning this subject may be gathered from Barnabas (Ep.7, 5, 8, 12, etc.); St. Clement of Rome (I Cor., xiv, 42); St. Irenaeus (Adv. haer., IV, xxv, 3; II, xxiv, 2 sqq.; IV, xxvi, II Tertullian (Adv. Marc., V, vii); St. Jerome (Ep. iii, ad Paulin., 8), St. Thomas (I, Q. i, a. 10), and a number of other patristic writers and Scholastic theologians. That the allegory is ascribed to the Christian writers on this point, may be inferred from Josephus (Antiq., XVII, iii, 4; Procm. Antiq., n. 4; III, vi, 47; De bello Jud., V, ii, 1). The Talmud (Berachot, c. v, ad fn.; Quiddus, fol. 11, col. 1), and the writings of Philo (de Abraham; de migrat. Abraham; de vitæ contempl.), though this latter writer goes excess in the allegorical interpre-
tation. The foregoing tradition may be confirmed by the language of the liturgy and by the remains of Christian archæology (Kraus, "Roma sotterranea," pp. 242 sqq.). Striking instances of the liturgical proof may be seen in the Preface of the Mass for Excommunication of the Devil, in the Divine Office recited on the feast of Corpus Christi. All Catholic interpreters readily grant that in some passages of the Old Testament we have a typical sense besides the literal; but this does not appear to be granted with regard to the New Testament, at least not subsequently to the death of Jesus Christ. Distinguishing between the New Testament as it signifies a collection of books, and the New Testament as it denotes the Christian economy, they grant that there are types in the New Testament books, but only as far as they refer to the pre-Christian economy. For the New Testament has brought us the reality in place of the figure, light in place of darkness, truth in place of shadow (cf. Patrizi, "De interpretacione Scripturarum Sacrarum"., p. 199, Rome, 1544). On the other hand, it is urged that the New Testament is the figure of glory, as the Old Testament was the figure of glory, as the New Testament was the figure of glory. But in the New Testament, the mystical body, and the mystical acts of the Church's members, analogically of their future glory (St. Thom., Quodl. VII, a. 15, ad 5o). Similar views are expressed by St. Ambrose (in Ps. xxx, n. 25), St. Chrysostom (in Matt., hom. ixvi), St. Augustin (in Joh., ix), St. Gregory (in Hom., iv), St. John Damascene (De fide orth., iv, 13); besides, the word of Peter is usually regarded as a type of the Church, the destruction of Jerusalem as a type of the final catastrophe.

(ii) How Everything in the Old Testament a Typical Sense?—If such passages as Luke, xxiv, 14, I Cor., x, xi, be taken out of their context, they suggest the ubiquity of the typical sense in the Old Testament; the context limits these texts to their proper range. If some of the Fathers, e.g. St. Augustin (De doctr. christ., III, xxii) and St. Jerome (Ad Dard., Ep. cxxix, 6), claim for the whole of the Old Testament a typical sense, their language refers rather to the figurative than to the spiritual sense. On the other hand, Tertullian (De resurrect. carn., c. xx), St. Augustin (De civ. Dei, XVII, iii; C. Faust., XXII, xiv), St. Jerome (in Joann., c. i; cf. in Jer. xcvii, c. 9; xxiv, 14), and St. Thomas (Quodl., vii, a. 15, ad 5o), explicitly reject the opinion which maintains that the whole of the Old Testament has a typical sense. The opposite opinion does not appeal to reason; what could be the typical sense, e.g. of the command to love the Lord our God (Deut., vi, 5)?

(iii) How Can the Typical Sense be Known?—In the typical sense God does not merely select an existing person or object as the sign of a future person or object, but he directs the course of nature in such a way that the very existence of the type, however indirect it may be in itself, refers to the antitype. Man, too, can, in one or another particular case, perform an action in order to typify what he will do in the future. But as the future is not under his complete control, such a way of acting would be ludicrous rather than instructive. The typical sense, therefore, properly speaking, cannot be God's own work. Hence it is that, as is already stated, the determination of the precise sense in which the literary expression is employed in any given passage; thirdly, the historical description of the idea thus determined. What has been said in the preceding paragraphs sufficiently shows the difference between the signification and the sense of a word or a sentence. The importance of describing an idea historically may be exemplified by the successive shades of meaning attaching to the concept of Messias, or of Kingdom of God.

(iv) Significations of the Literary Expression.—The signification of the literary expression of the Bible is best learned by a thorough knowledge of the so-called sacred languages in which the original text of Scripture was written, and by a familiar acquaintance with the Scriptural way of speaking.

(a) Sacred Languages.—St. Augustin (De doctr.
chris., II, xi; cf. xvi) warns us that "the knowledge of languages is the great remedy against unknown signs. Men of the Latin tongue need two others for a thorough knowledge of the Divine Scriptures, viz. the Hebrew and the Greek, so that recourse may be had to the older tongues, if the infinite variety of their translators occasions any doubt." Pope Leo XIII, in the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus", agrees with the great African Doctor in urging the study of the sacred languages. "It is most proper," he writes, "that professors of Sacred Scripture and theologians should master these tongues in which the Sacred Books were originally written, and it would seem that church students also should cultivate them, more especially those who aspire to academic degrees. And endeavours should be made to establish in all academic institutions—as has already been laudably done in many—chairs of the other ancient languages, especially the Semitic, and of other subjects connected therewith, for the benefit principally of those who are intended to profess sacred literature." Nor can it be urged that for the Catholic interpreter the Vulgate is the authentic text, which can be understood by any Latin scholar. The pontiff considers this exception in the Encyclical already quoted. "Although the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek is substantially rendered by the Vulgate, nevertheless wherever there may be ambiguity or want of clearness, the 'examination of elder tongues,' to quote St. Augustine, will be useful and advantageous." Recourse to the original text is the only scholarly approach to any work of sacred literature. A translation is never a perfect reproduction of the original; no language can fully express the thoughts conveyed in another tongue, no translator is capable of seizing the exact shades of all the truths contained in any work, and in case of Biblical versions, we have often reason for doubt as to the genuineness of their readings.

(b) Scriptural Language.—The Scriptural language presents several difficulties peculiar to itself. First, the Bible is not written by one author, but presents in almost every book the style of a different writer. Secondly, the Bible was not written at a single period; the Old Testament covers the time between Moses and the last Old-Testament writer, i.e. more than one thousand years, so that many words must have changed their meaning during this interval. Thirdly, the Biblical Greek is not the classical language of the authors with whom we are acquainted; up to about fifteen years ago, Biblical scholars used to speak about New-Testament Greek, they compiled New-Testament lexicons, and wrote New-Testament grammars. The discovery of the Egyptian papyri and other literary remains has broken down this wall of separation between the language of the New Testament and that of the time in which it was written; with regard to this point, our present time may be considered as a period of transition, leading up to the composition of lexicons and grammars that will rightly express the relation of the Biblical Greek to the Greek employed in profane writings. Fourthly, the Bible deals with the greatest variety of topics, requiring a corresponding variety of vocabulary; moreover, its expressions are often figurative, and therefore subject to more frequent changes of meaning than the language of profane writers. How can we be acquainted with the Scriptural language in spite of the foregoing difficulties? St. Augustine (De doctr. Christ., II, ix sqq.) suggests the continual reading of the Bible as the first remedy, so that we may acquire "a familiarity with the language of the Scriptures." He adds this a careful comparison of the Bible text with the language of the ancient versions, a process calculated to remove some of the native ambiguities of the original text. A third help is found, according to the same great Doctor, in the diligent reading of the works of the Fathers, since many of them formed their style by a constant reading of Holy Scripture (loc. cit., II, xiii, xiv). Nor must we omit to study the writings of Philo and Josephus, the contemporaries of the Apostles and the historians of their nation. They are helpful illustrations of the cultured language of the Apostolic time. The study of the etymology of the sacred languages is another means of becoming skilled in languages themselves. For a proper understanding of the etymology of Hebrew words, the knowledge of the cognate languages is requisite; but here it must be kept in mind that many derivatives have a meaning quite different from the signification of their respective individual forms, so that an argument based on etymology alone is open to suspicion.

(ii) Sense of the Literary Expression.—After the foregoing rules have aided the interpreter to know the various significations of the words of the sacred text, he must next endeavour to investigate in what precise sense the inspired writer employed his expressions. He will be assisted in this study by the subject-matter of the book or chapter, to its occasion and purpose, to the grammatical and logical context, and to the parallel passages. Whatever meaning of the literary expressions is not in keeping with the subject-matter of the book, it is necessary to consider the sense in which the writer employed it. The same criterion directs us in the choice of any particular shade of meaning and in the limitation of its extent. The subject-matter of the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, e.g., shows in what sense St. Paul used the expressions law and the spirit of God, wisdom and understanding, which occur in Ex., xxxi, 3, must be determined in the same way. The occasion and purpose of a book or of a passage will often determine whether certain expressions must be taken in their proper or figurative sense, whether in a limited or an unlimited sense. Attention to this point will aid us in explaining ariight such passages as John, vi, 53 sqq.; Matt., x, 5; Heb., i, 5, 7; etc. Thus we shall understand the first of these passages of the real flesh and blood of Christ, not of their figure; we shall see the true import of Christ's command contained in the second passage, "Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles, and into the city of the Samaritans enter ye not"; again, we shall appreciate the full weight of the theological argument in favour of the eternal generation of the Son as stated in the third passage, contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The context is the third aid in determining the precise sense in which each single word is used by the writer. We need not insist on the necessity of explaining an expression in accordance with its grammatical environment. The commentator must make sure of the grammatical connexion of an expression, so as not to do violence to the rules of inflection or of syntax. The so-called poetical parallelism may be considered as constituting part of grammar taken in a wider sense. But the logical context, too, requires attention; a commentator must not explain any expression in such a sense as to make the author contradict himself, being careful to assign to each word a meaning that will best agree with the thought of the sentence, of the chapter, and even of the book. Still, it must not be overlooked that the context is sometimes psychological rather than logical; in lyric poetry, in the words of the Prophets, in the sayings of Christ, and in the apocalyptic visions, the expressions at times brought into juxtaposition, the logical connexion of which is not apparent. Finally, there is a so-called optical context which is found in the visions of the Prophets. The inspired seer may perceive groupings together in the same vision events which are widely separated from each other in time and space.

The so-called real or verbal parallelisms will aid the commentator in determining the precise sense in which the inspired writer employed his words. In case of verbal parallelism, or in the recurrence of the same literary expressions in different parts of the
spired books, it is better to explain the language of Paul by that of Paul, the expressions of John by those of John, than to explain Paul by Matthew, and John by Luke. Again, it is more natural to explain an expression occurring in the Fourth Gospel by another found in the book than by a parallel passage taken from the Apocalypse. Finally, it should be kept in mind that parallelism of thought, or real parallelism, is a more reliable aid in finding the exact sense of a passage than a mere material recurrence of a sentence or a phrase.

(iii) Historical Setting.—The inspired writers connected with their words the ideas which they themselves possessed, and which they knew to be intelligible to their contemporaries. When they spoke of a house, they expressed a habituation to which their contemporaries were accustomed, not a contrivance in use among the barbarians. In order to arrive at the precise sense of a passage, we must therefore bear in mind its historical setting, we must consult the testimony of history. The true sense of the Bible cannot be found in an idea or a thought historically untrue. The commentator must therefore be well acquainted with sacred history and sacred archaeology, in order to know, to certain extent at least, the various customs, laws, habits, natural prejudices, etc. under the influence of which the inspired writers composed their respective books. Otherwise it will be impossible for him to understand the allusions, the metaphors, the language, and the style of the sacred writings. What has been said about the historical-grammatical interpretation of Scripture is synthesized, as it were, in the Encyclical already quoted: "The more our adversaries contend to the contrary, so much the more solicitously we should adhere to the received and approved canon of Scripture. But, by weighing the meanings of words, the connexion of ideas, the parallelism of passages, and the like, we should by all means make use of such illustrations as can be drawn from opposite erudition of an external sort."

(2) Catholic Interpretation.—Since the Church is the one teacher and interpreter of the Bible, her teaching concerning the Sacred Scriptures and their genuine sense must be the supreme guide of the commentator. The inferences which flow from this principle are partly negative, partly positive.

(i) Negative Directions.—The following directions are called negative not because they do not reflect a positive attitude of mind or because they do not lead to positive results, but because they appear to emphasize at first sight the avoidance of certain methods of proceeding which would be legitimate in the exegesis of profane books. They are based on what the Church teaches concerning the sacred character of the Bible.

(a) Avoid Irreverence.—Since the Bible is God’s own book, its study must be begun and prosecuted with a spirit of reverence and prayer. The Fathers insist on this need in many passages. St. Athanasius calls the Scriptures the fountain that quenches our thirst for justice and supplies us with the doctrine of piety (Ep. fest. xxxix; St. Augustine (C. Faust., XIII, xviii) wishes them to be read for a memorial of our faith, for the consolation of our hope, and for an exhortation to charity; Origen (Ep. ad Gregor. Nect. c. iii) considers pious prayer as the most essential means for the understanding of the Divine Scriptures; but he wishes to see humility joined with prayer; St. Jerome (In Mich., I, 30) agrees with St. Augustine (De doctr. christ., III, xxxiv) in regarding prayer as the principal and most necessary aid for the understanding of the Sacred Writings. It might add all these patriarchal writers, if the alleged references were not clear and explicit enough to remove all doubt on the subject.

(b) No Error in Scripture.—Since God is the principal Author of Sacred Scripture, it can contain no error, no self-contradiction, nothing contrary to scientific or historical truth. The Encyclical “Providentissimus Deus” is most explicit in its statement of this prerogative of the Bible: "All the books which the Church receives as sacred and canonical, are written wholly and entirely, with all their parts, at the dictation of God, and so far as it was possible that any error can exist with inspiration, that inspiration not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily, as it is impossible that God Himself, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true."

The Fathers agree with this teaching almost unanimously: we may refer the reader to Sts. Jerome (In Nah., I, iv), St. Irenaeus (C. her., II, xxiii), Clement of Alexandria (Stronn., VII, xvi), St. Augustine (“C. Faust.,” II, ii; cf. "In Ps. xxviii," serm. xxxi, 5: Ad Hier.,” ep. lxxii, 2), Ad Oros. c. Prisc., xi), St. Gregory the Great (Pref. in Job, n. 2). The great African Doctor suggests a simple and radical remedy against apparent errors in the Bible: "Either my codex is wrong, or the translator has blundered, or I do not understand."

But inerrancy is not the prerogative of everything that happens to be found in the Bible; it is necessary for us, to what the inspired writers state as their own, unless they quote the words of a speaker who is infallible in his utterances, the words of an Apostle, e. g., or of a Divinely authorized speaker, whether angel or man (cf. Luke, i, 42; ii, 25; Nuch., vii, 21), or again words regarded as historical. But even those supposed to be historical will be found to be subject to the same kind of a test as a concrete, historical. In the history of the Bible, the test is the historical authorship of the Sacred Scripture (cf. I Cor. iii, 19; Gal. iv, 30) or by the Church (e. g., the Magnificent). Biblical words that do not fall under any of these classes carry merely the authority of the speaker, the weight of which must be studied from other sources. Here is the place to take notice of a decision issued by the Biblical Commission on 13 Feb., 1905, according to which certain Scriptural statements may be treated as quotations, though they appear on the surface to be the utterances of the inspired writer. But this can be done only when there is certain and independent proof that the inspired writer really quotes the words of another without intending to make them his own. Recent writers call such passages "tacit" or "implicit" citations.

The inerrancy of Scripture does not allow us to admit contradictions in its statements. This is understood of the genuine or primitive text of the Bible. Contradictions, we must say, are not encountered to meet contradictions in details of minor importance; in weightier matters such discrepancies have been avoided even in our present text. Discrepancies which may appear to obtain in matters of faith or morals should put the commentator on his guard that the same Biblical expressions are not everywhere taken in the same sense, that various passages may differ from each other as the complete statement of a doctrine differs from its incomplete expression, as a clear presentation differs from its obscure delineation. Thus "works" has one meaning in James, ii, 24, and in those "brothers" denouncing the relationship in Matt., xii, 40, quite a different kind in most other passages; John, xiv, 28, and x, 30, Acts, vii, 12, and Matt., xxviii, 19, are respectively opposed to each other as a clear statement is opposed to an obscure one, as an explicit one to a mere implication. In apparent Biblical discrepancies found in historical passages, the commentator must distinguish between statements made by the inspired writer and those merely quoted by him (cf. I Kings, xxxii, 9, and II Kings, i, 6 sqq.), between a double account of the same fact and the narrative of two similar incidents, between chronologies which begin with different starting-points, finally between a compendium and a detailed report of an event. Lastly, apparent discrepancies which occur in prophetic passages necessitate an investigation, whether the respective texts emanate from the Prophets as Prophets (cf. II Kings, vii, 3, 17),
whether they refer to the same or to similar subjects (the destruction of Jerusalem, e.g., and the end of the world), whether they consider their subject from the same point of view (e.g., the suffering and the glorious Messias), whether they use proper or figurative language.

The Prophet Nathan, in his private capacity, encourages David to build the Temple (II Kings, vii, 3), but as Prophet he foretells that Solomon will build the house of God (ibid., 13).

The inerrancy of Scripture excludes also any contradiction between the Bible and the certain tenets of science. It cannot be supposed that the inspired writers were not familiar with all the works of the greatest thinkers of their time, and with the opinions of scientists assumed to-day and rejected to-morrow; but the commentator will be required to harmonize the teaching of the Bible with the scientific results which rest on solid proof. This rule is clearly laid down by the Encyclical in the words of St. Augustine: "Whatever they can really demonstrate to be true of physical nature, we must show to be capable of reconciliation with our Scriptures, and whatever they assert in their treatises which is contrary to these Scriptures of ours, that is to say, in Catholic faith, we must either prove as well as we can to be entirely false, or at all events without the smallest hesitation, believe to be so" (De Gen. ad litt., I, xxvi, xlii). But the commentator must also be careful "not to make rash assertions, or to assert what is not known as known" (St. Aug., in Gen. op. imperf., ix, 30). The Encyclical appeals here again to the words of the great African Doctor, St. Augustine: "The Holy Ghost who spoke by them [the inspired writers], did not intend to teach men these things [i.e., the essential nature of the things of the visible universe], things in no way profitable unto salvation. The pontiff continues: "Hence they . . . described and depicted with things in more or less figures, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, and which in many instances are in daily use at this day, even by the most eminent men of science. Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses; and somewhat in the same way, the sacred writers—as the Angelic Doctor reminds us (Summa, I, Q. Ixx, a. 1, ad 3°)—‘went by what visibly appeared’, or put down what God, speaking to men, signified in a way men could understand and were accustomed to.’ In Gen., i, 16, e.g., the sun and the moon are called two great lights; in Job, xxi, 12, the sun is commanded to stand still; in Ecl., i, 5, the sun returns to its place; in Job, xxvi, 11, the firmament appears solid and brazen; in other passages the heavens are upheld by columns, and God rides on the clouds of heaven.

Finally, the commentator must be prepared to deal with the seeming discrepancies between Biblical and profane history. The considerations to be kept in mind here are similar to those laid down in the preceding paragraph. First, not all statements found in profane sources can be regarded a priori as Gospel truth; some of these statements are entirely without fabulous or figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, and which in many instances are in daily use at this day, even by the most eminent men of science. Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses; and somewhat in the same way, the sacred writers—as the Angelic Doctor reminds us (Summa, I, Q. Ixx, a. 1, ad 3°)—‘went by what visibly appeared’, or put down what God, speaking to men, signified in a way men could understand and were accustomed to.’ In Gen., i, 16, e.g., the sun and the moon are called two great lights; in Job, xxi, 12, the sun is commanded to stand still; in Ecl., i, 5, the sun returns to its place; in Job, xxvi, 11, the firmament appears solid and brazen; in other passages the heavens are upheld by columns, and God rides on the clouds of heaven.
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Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus", repeats the principles concerning the authority of the Fathers laid down by the Vatican and Tridentine Councils: "The Holy Fathers, to whom, after the Apostles, the Church owes its growth—who have planted, watered, built, or gathered, as the case may be—(1) the Holy Fathers, we say, are of supreme authority whenever they all interpret in one and the same manner any text of the Bible, as pertaining to the doctrine of faith or morals; for their unanimity clearly evinces that such interpretation has come down from the Apostles as a matter of Catholic faith." These conditions are, therefore, required in order that the patristic authority may be absolutely decisive: first, they must interpret texts referring to matters of faith or morals; secondly, they must speak as witnesses of Catholic tradition, not merely as private theologians; thirdly, there must be a moral unanimity in their interpretation. This unanimity is not destroyed by the silence of some of the foremost Fathers, and is sufficiently guaranteed by the consentient voice of the principal patristic writers living at any critical period, or by the agreement of commentators living at various times. Such unanimity is destroyed if some of the Fathers openly deny the correctness of the interpretation given by the others, or if they explain the passage in such a way as to render impossible the explanation given by others. But the Encyclical warns us to treat the opinion of the Fathers with reverence, even if it be adverse: "The opinion of the Fathers is always considered with great respect by the Church, not as a rule which must be rigorously adhered to, any more than the Holy Scriptures. In the judgment of the Church, it is justly elsewhere called the holy pontiff, "is also of very great weight when they treat of these matters in their capacity of doctors, unofficially; not only because they excel in their knowledge of revealed doctrine and in their acquaintance with many things which are useful in understanding the Holy Book, but because they are men of eminent sanctity and of ardent zeal for the truth, on whom God has bestowed a more ample measure of his light."

(c) The Analogy of Faith.—Here again the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" is our guide: "In the other passages it reads, "the analogy of faith should be followed, and Catholic doctrine, as authoritative proposed by the Church, should be held as the supreme law; for, seeing that the same God is the author both of the Sacred Books and of the doctrine committed to the Church, it is clearly impossible that any teaching can be correct which has been decreed by those who shall in any respect be at variance with the latter." This principle has a double influence on the interpretation of Scripture, a negative and a positive influence. First, the commentator cannot admit in Scripture a statement contrary to the teaching of the Church; on the other hand, the agreement of an explanation with the doctrine of the Church does not prove its correctness, since more than one explanation may agree with the ecclesiastical teaching. Secondly, the Catholic interpreter must explain the obscure and partial teaching of the Scriptures by the clear and complete teaching of the Church. Thus, for instance: the glossa ordinaria, a thorough exposition of the glossa interlinearis by Anselm of Laon. (4) The Dissertations.—Origin, Eusebius, and St. Jerome were asked by their contemporaries concerning certain difficult texts of Scripture; a similar need of special elucidations of particular passages has been felt by the faithful of all ages. The answers to such questions we may call dissertations or treatises. It is understood that only really important texts ought to be made the subject of such scholarly explanations. In order to satisfy the inquisitive reader, the essayist should examine the text critically; he should be versed in the various interpretations given by the commentators and weigh them in the light of the principles of hermeneutics; finally, he should give the true solution of the difficulty, prove it by solid arguments, and defend it against the principal exceptions. (5) The Commentary.—The commentary is a continu-
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uous, full, learned, well-reasoned, and complete explanation, touching upon not merely the more difficult passages, but everything that stands in need of elucidation. Hence the commentator must discuss all the variants, state and prove the genuine sense of the text. He explains, add all the necessary personal, geographical, historical, ethirical information, and indicate the sources whence it is drawn, harmonize the single sentences with each other and with the scope of the entire book, consider its apparent contradictions, and explain the sense in which its quotations from the Old Testament must be understood. With a view of securing an orderly exposition, the author should arrange the various historic-critical studies belonging to the whole book; he should divide and subdivide the book into its principal and subordinate parts, clearly stating the special subject of each; he should, finally, arrange the various opinions concerning disputed questions in a neatly distributed list, so as to lighten the work of the reader. What has been said sufficiently shows the qualities which a well-written commentary ought to possess; it must be faithful in presenting the genuine sense of Scripture; it must be complete, and brief; and it ought to show the private work of the commentator by the light it throws on the more complicated questions. The commentaries which consist of mere lists of the patristic views on the successive texts of Scripture are called catene (q. v.). Perhaps the homily may be added to the foregoing methods of Biblical exposition. It is written in a popular way, and, so is of a practical tendency. It is not concerned with the subtle and more difficult questions of Scripture, but explains the words of a Biblical section in the order in which they occur. A more elevated kind of homily seizes the fundamental idea of a Scriptural section, and to the light of it throws the rest in relation to it. The Church has always encouraged such homiletic discourses, and the Fathers have left a great number of them in their writings.

IV. History of Exegesis.—The history of exegesis shows its first beginnings, its growth, its decay, and its restoration. It points out the methods which may be safely recommended, and warns against those which rather corrupt than explain the Sacred Scriptures. In general, we may distinguish between Jewish and Christian exegesis.

Jewish Exegesis.—The Jewish interpretation of the Scriptures began almost at the time of Moses, as may be inferred from traces found both in the more recent canonical and the apocryphal books. But in their method of interpretation the Palestinian Jews differed from the Hellenistic.

(i) Palestinian Exegesis.—All Jewish interpreters agree in admitting a double sense of Scripture, a literal and a mystical, though we must not understand these terms in their strictly technical sense.

(a) The literal exposition is mainly represented by the so-called Chaldee paraphrases or Targumim, which came into use at the time of the Captivity, because few of the returning exiles understood the reading of the Sacred Books in their original Hebrew. The first place among these paraphrases must be given to the Targum Onkelos, which appears to have been in use as early as the first century after Christ, though it has been reduced its present form only about the first century. It explains the Pentateuch, adhering in its historical and legal parts to a Hebrew text which is, at times, nearer to the original of the Septuagint than the Massoretic, but straying in the prohetic and poetical portions so far from the original as to leave hardly recognizable.

(b) The Palestinian Exegesis is the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, or the Jerusalem Targum. Written after the seventh century of our era, it is valueless both from a critical and an exegetical point of view, since its explanations are wholly arbitrary.—The Targum Jonathan, or the paraphrase of the Prophets, began to be written in the first century, at Jerusalem; but it owes its present form to the Jerusalem rabbi of the fourth century. The historical books are a fairly faithful translation from the original text; in the poetical portions and the later Prophets, the paraphrase often presents fiction rather than truth.—The paraphrase of the Haggadot deals with the Book of Job, the Psalms, the Canticle of Canticles, Ruth, the Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, and Paralipomena. It was not written before the seventh century, and is so replete with rabbinic fiction that it hardly deserves the notice of the serious interpreter. The notes on (Cant., Ruth, Lam., Eccles., and Esth.) rest on public tradition: those on the other Hagiographa express the opinions of one or more private teachers; the paraphrase of Par. is the most recent and the least reliable.

(b) The method of arguing employed in the First Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews shows that the Jews before the commence the studied a mystical sense of Scripture; the same may be inferred from the letter of Pseudo-Aristaeas and the fragment of Aristobulus. The Gospel narrative, e.g., Matt., xxiii, 16 sqq., testifies that the Pharisees endeavoured to derive scriptural traditions from the Law by way of the most extraordinary contradictions. The mystic interpretation of Scripture practised by the Jewish scholars was not followed by the time of Christ, may be reduced to the following systems.

(a) The Talmudists ascribed to every text several thousand legitimate meanings belonging either to the Halakah or the Haggadah. The Halakah contained the legal inferences derived from the Mosaic Law, all of which the Talmudists referred back to Moses himself; the Haggadah was the collection of all the material gathered by the Talmudists from history, the primitive, the law, and other extraneous sources, not excluding the most fictitious ones. In their commentaries, these writers distinguished a twofold sense, the proper, or primitive, and the derivative. The former was subdivided into the plain and the recondite sense; the latter, into logical deductions, and inferences drawn on the way in which the Hebrew words were written or on association of ideas. As to the hemicuval rules followed by the Talmudists, they were reduced to seven by Hillel, to thirteen by Ismael, and to thirty-two by R. Jose of Galilee. In substance, the rules of the Talmudists did not differ from those prevalent in our day. The interpreter is to be guided by the relation of the genus to the species, of what is clear to what is obscure, of verbal and real parallelisms to their respective counterparts, of the example to the exemplified, of what is logically coherent to what appears to be contradictory, of the scope of the writer to his literary production. The commentaries written according to these principles are called Midrashim (plural of Midrash); the following must be mentioned: Mekhila (measure, rule, law) explains Ex., xii, 1-26, 30; xxxi, 12-17; xxvi, 1-4, and is variously assigned to the second or third century, or even to more recent times; it gives the Halakah of the ceremonial rites and laws, but contains also material belonging to the Haggadah.—Sipra explains the Book of Leviticus; Sipri, the Books of Numbers and Deuteronomy; Pesiqta, the Sabbath sections.—Rabboth (plural of Rabba) is a series of Midrashim explaining the single books of the Pentateuch and the five Megilloth or the five Hagiographa which were read in the synagogues: the allegorical, anagogical, and moral sense is preferred to the literal, and the fables and sayings of the rabbi are highly valued.—Tanchuma is the first continuous commentary on the Pentateuch; it contains some valuable traditions, especially of Palestinian origin.—Yalqut Simoni contains annotations on all the books of the Old Testament.
ists, as the Sadducees were related to the Pharisees. They rejected the Talmudic traditions, just as the Sadducees refused to acknowledge the authority of the Pharisaic teaching (cf. Joseph., Ant., XVIII, x, 6). The Pharisees derived their origin from Anan, born about A. D. 750; he founded this movement several generations after the Israelites had established the kingdom. From Bagdad, the place of its birth, the sect soon spread into Palestine and especially into the Crimea, so that about A. D. 750 it occasioned what is practically a schism among the Jews. The Pharisees rejected all tradition, and admitted only the Mosaic Law. By means of Israel's thirteen hermeneutical rules, they established the literal sense of Scripture, and this they supplemented by means of the syllogism and the consensus of the Synagogue. Owing to their rejection of authentic interpretation and their claim of private judgment, they have been called by some writers "Jewish Protestants".

(ii) Hellenistic Exegesis.—Generally speaking, the Alexandrian Jews were favourable to the allegorical explanation of Scripture, thus endeavouring to harmonize the inspired records with the principles of Greek philosophy. Eusebius has celebrated "Guide of the Perplexed" of this Hellenistic exegesis in the fragments of Aristobulus (Hist. Eccles., VII, xxxii). Prepar. evang., VIII, x) and in the letter of Pseudo-Aristas (Prepar. evang., VIII, ix), both of whom wrote in the second century B. C. Philo attests that the Essenes adhered to these allegorical principles (d. after 1508), (Hist. Just., i, 23); but Philo (died about 1135) himself is the principal representative of this manner of interpretation. According to Philo, Abraham symbolizes virtue acquired by doctrine; Isaac, inborn virtue; Jacob, virtue acquired by practice and meditation. Egypt denotes the better, China, the worse; the dove, Divine wisdom, etc. (De Abraham, ii).

The Cabbalists exceeded the preceding interpreters in their allegorical explanation of Scripture. Traces of their system are found in the last pre-Christian centuries, but its full development did not take place till the end of the first millennium B. C. In accordance with their name, which is derived from a word meaning "to receive", the Cabbalists claimed to possess a secret doctrine received by way of tradition from Moses, to whom it had been revealed on Mount Sinai. They maintained that all earthly things had their heavenly prototypes; they believed the literal sense of Scripture included the allegorical sense, as the body includes the soul, though only the initiated could reach this veiled meaning. Three methods helped to attain it: Gematria takes the numerical value of all the letters which make up a word or an expression and derives the hidden meaning from the resultant number; Notaricon forms new entire words out of the single letters of a word, or it forms a word out of the initial letters of the several words of a phrase; Temura consists in the transposition of the letters which make up a word, or in the systematic substitution of other letters. Thus they transpose the consonants of mal'akhi (my angel; Ex. xxiii, 23) into Mikha'el (Michael). There is a twofold system of substitution: the first, Athbash, substitutes the last letter of the alphabet for the first, the second last for the second, etc.; the second system substitutes the letters of the second half of the alphabet for the corresponding letters of the first half. The Cabbalistic doctrine has been gathered in two principal works, one of which is called "Yiqra'ah", the other "Zohar".

We may add the names of the more prominent Jewish commentators: Sadaqa Gâon (b. 892; d. 912), in the seventh century, explained the Old Testament into Arabic and wrote commentaries on the same. Moses ben Samuel ibn Chiqilla, of Cordova, explained the whole of the Old Testament in Arabic, between A. D. 1050 and 1090; only fragments of his work remain. Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac, known also under the names Rashi and Yarchi (b. about 1040, at Troyes; d. 1015), explained the whole of the Old Testament, except Par. and Esd., according to its literal sense, though he did not neglect the allegorical; he shows an anti-Christian tendency.—Rabbi Abraham ibn Ezra (b. 1092; d. 1167 on the Island of Rhodes). Among his many other works he left an incomplete commentary on the Pentateuch and other parts of the Old Testament; he renders the literal sense faithfully without excluding the allegorical, e. g. in Cant.—Rabbi David Kimhi (b. 1190 at Narbonne; d. 1230), explained nearly all the books of the Old Testament in the literal sense, without excluding the spiritual; his anti-Christian feeling shows itself in his treatment of the Mesbiahic prophecies.—Rabbi Moses ben Maimon, commonly called Maimonides, or Rambam (b. 1135 at Cordova, Spain; d. 1204 in Egypt), became a convert to Mohammedanism in order to escape persecution, and fled to Egypt, where he lived as a Jew, and where, for the guidance of those who could not harmonize their philosophical principles with the teaching of Sacred Scripture, he wrote his great work "Guide of the Perplexed", and it is in this work that he presents some of the Biblical stories as mere literary expressions of certain ideas.—Rabbi Isaac Abravanel (d. 1508), explained the Pentateuch, the prophethical books, and Daniel, adding often irrelevant matter and arguments against Christian revelation.—Rabbi Elias of Medina (The St. of Troph.), is known as one of the best Jewish grammarians, and as the author of the work "Tradition of Tradition", in which he gives the history of Masoretic criticism.—Among the Cabbalists we must mention: Rabbi Jacob ben Ruben (twelfth century), who wrote brief scholia on all the books of Scripture; Rabbi Aaron ben Joseph (d. 1394), author of a literal commentary on the Pentateuch, the earlier Prophets, Isaiah, the Psalms, and the Book of Job; Rabbi Aaron ben Elia (fourteenth century), who explained the Pentateuch.—Among the Cabbalists, Rabbi Moses Naehamidas, also known as Ram- bian, d. about 1250, deserves mention, and his "Exegetes" of the Pentateuch, which is several times quoted by Paul of Burgos.—The principal Jewish commentaries have been reprinted in the so-called Rabbinic Bibles which appeared at Venice, 1517, Venice, 1525, 1548, 1568, 1617; Basle, 1618; Amster- dam, 1724.

(2) Christian Exegesis.—For the sake of clearness we may distinguish three great periods in Christian exegesis: the first ends about A. D. 604; the second brings us up to the Council of Trent; the third embraces the time after the Council of Trent.

(a) The Patristic Period.—The patristic period embraces three distinct classes of exegetes, the Apostolic and apologetical writers, the Greek Fathers, the Latin Fathers. The amount of exegetical literature produced by these three classes varies greatly; but its character is so distinctively proper to each of the three that we can hardly consider them under the same heading.

The Apostolic Fathers and Apologists. The early Christians made use of the Scriptures in their religious meetings as the Jews employed them in the synagogues, adding however the writings of the New Testament more or less completely to those of the Old. The Apostolic Fathers did not write any professional commentaries; their use of Scripture was incidental and casual rather than technical; but their citations and allusions show unmistakably their acceptance of some of the New Testament writings. Neither do we know of any among the apostolic writings the whole of the New Testament. The only commentary of any professional treatises on Sacred Scripture. St. Justin and St. Irenaeus are noted for their able defence of Christianity, and their arguments are often based on texts of Scripture. St. Hippolytus appears to have been the first Christian theologian who at-
tempted an explanation of the whole of Scripture; his method we learn from the remaining fragments of his writings, especially of his commentary on Daniel. It may be said in general that these earliest Christian writers admitted both the literal and the allegorical sense of Scripture. The latter sense appears to have been favoured by St. Clement of Rome, Barnabas, St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, while the literal seems to prevail in the writings of St. Hippolytus, Tertullian, the Clementine Recognitions, and among the Ghosties.

(b) The Greek Fathers.—The Enchiridion of Origen is addressed mainly to the Greek Fathers when it says: "When there arose, in various sees, catechetical and theological schools, of which the most celebrated were those of Alexandria and of Antioch, there was little taught in those schools but what was contained in the reading, the interpretation, and the defence of the Divine written word. From them came forth numbers of Fathers and writers whose laborious studies and admirable writings have justly merited for the three following centuries the appellation of the golden age of Biblical exegesis."

(a) The School of Alexandria.—Tradition loves to trace to the second half of the third century the Evangelist St. Mark. Be that as it may, towards the end of the second century we find St. Pantaenus president of the school; none of his writings are extant, but Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., V, x) and St. Jerome (De vir. ille., c. xxxvii) testify that he explained Sacred Scripture to Alexandria, and offers him among those who did not write any book (Strömer, I, i); he died before 200. His successor was Clement of Alexandria, who had first been his disciple, and after 190 his colleague. Of his writings are extant "Cohortatio ad Gentiles" ("Pedagogus"), and "Stromata"; also the Liber de Translatio of part of his works (Migne, P. G., IX, 729–740). Clement was followed by Origen (b. 183; d. 254), the principal glory of the whole school. Among his works, the greater part of which is lost, his "Hexapla" and his threefold explanation of Scripture, by way of scholia, homilies, and commentaries, deserve special notice. It was Origen, too, who fully developed the hermeneutical principles which distinguish the Alexandrian School, though they are not applied in their entirety by any other Father. He applied Plato's distinction of body, soul, and spirit to the Scriptures, admitting in them a literal, a spiritual, and a transcendent, or spiritual sense. Not only that the whole of Scripture has this triple sense. In some parts the literal sense may be neglected, in others the allegorical may be lacking, while in others again the three senses may be found. Origen believes that the apparent discrepancies of the Evangelists can be explained only by the means of the spiritual sense, that the whole ceremonial and ritual law must be explained mystically, and that all the prophetic utterances about Judea, Jerusalem, Israel, etc., are to be referred to the Kingdom of Heaven and its citizens, to the good and bad angels, etc. Among the eminent writers of the Alexandrian School must be classed Julius Africanus (c. 215), St. Dionysius the Great (d. 265), St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (d. 270), Eusebius of Cæsarea (d. 340), St. Athanasius (d. 373), Didymus of Alexandria (d. 397), St. Ephraim (d. 403), St. Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), and St. John Cappadocian (d. 480). St. Basil the Great (d. 379), St. Gregory Nazianzen (d. 389), and St. Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394). The last three, however, have many points in common with the School of Antioch.

(b) The School of Antioch.—The Fathers of Antioch adhere to the hermeneutical principles which insist more on the so-called grammatico-historical sense of the Sacred Books than on their moral and allegorical meaning. It is true that Theodore of Mopsuestia urged the literal sense to the detriment of the typical, believing that the New Testament applies some of the prophecies to the Messias only by way of accommoda-

(ii) Second Period of Exegesis, a. d. 604–1546.—We consider the following nine centuries as one period of exegesis, not on account of their uniform productiveness or barrenness in the field of Biblical study, nor on account of their uniform tendency, nor on account of their characteristic dependence on the work of the Fathers. Whether they synthesized or amplified, whether they synthesized or derived new conclusions from old premises, they always started from the patristic premises as their basis of operation. Though during this period the labours of the Greek writers can in no way compare with those of the Latin, still it will be found convenient to consider them apart.

(a) The Greek Writers.—The Greek writers who lived between the sixth and the thirteenth centuries composed partly commentaries, partly compilations. The Bishop of Cæsarea, Andreas and Athanasius, who are variously assigned to the fifth and sixth, or to the eighth and ninth centuries, explained the Apocalypse; Procopius of Gaza (324) wrote on the Oecateuch, Is. and Prov.; Hesychius of Jerusalem wrote probably on the Johannine Epistles; Photius (891), and especially St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (d. 910), and Euthymius (d. 1118) were...
adherents of the Greek Schism, but their exegetical works deserve attention. The above-named compilations are technically called catena. They furnish continuous explanations of various books of Scripture in such a way that they give after each text the various patristic passages either full or by way of synopsis, usually adding the name of the particular Father whom they have copied. Several of these catena have been printed, such as Nicephorus, on the Octateuch (Leipzig, 1775); B. Corderius, on the Jss. (Antwerp, 1643-1616); A. Schottius, on Prov. (Bern, 1632); Angelo Mai, on Dan. (1638), Cramer, on the New Testament (Oxford, 1638-1640).

(b) The Latin Writers.—The Latin writers of this epoch may be divided into two classes: the Pre-Scholastic and the Scholastic. The two are not of equal importance, but they are too different to be treated under the same heading.

(a) The Pre-Scholastic Period.—Among the many writers of this age who were instrumental in spreading the Biblical expositions of the Fathers, the following are deserving of notice: St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636), the Venerable Bede (d. 735), Alcuin (d. 804), Haymo of Halberstadt (d. 855), Maurus (d. 849), Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), who compiled the glossa ordinaria, Anselm of Laon (d. 1117), author of the glossa interlinearis, Rupert of Deutz (d. 1153), Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1141), Peter Abelard (d. 1142), and St. Bernard (d. 1153). The particular writings of each of these great men will be found under their respective names.

(b) The Scholastics.—Without drawing a mathematical line of distinction between the writers of this period, we may say that the works which appeared in its beginning are remarkable for their logical and theological methods; the subsequent ones showed a more philological erudition; and the final ones began to offer material for textual criticism. The first three groups of these writings coincide with the so-called golden age of scholastic theology which prevailed about the thirteenth century. Its principal representatives are well known that we need only mention their names. Peter Lombard hereby heads the list (d. 1164), for he appears to be the first who fully introduced into his exegetical work the scholastic divisions, definitions, and method of argumentation. He was followed by Stephen Langton (d. 1228), archbishop of Canterbury, in his De principiis scholastici in our Bible; Card. Hugh of Saint-Cheir (d. 1260), author of the so-called "Dominican Correctory," and of the first Biblical concordance; Blessed Alberic Magnus (d. 1280); St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274); St. Raymondo Martini (d. 1260), who wrote the polemical work known as "Pugio Fidelis" against the Moors and Jews; a number of other names might be added, but they are of less importance. In 1311 Pope Clement V ordained, in the Council of Vienne, that chairs of the Oriental languages were to be erected in the principal universities, so that the Jews and Mohammedans might be refuted from their own sources. The philological results of this enactment may be seen in the celebrated "Postilla" of Nicholas of Lyra (d. 1340), a work which received notable additions by Paul of Burgos (d. 1455). Alphonso Tosta (d. 1494), Jordan Abulenos (d. 1419), returned to the more scholastic method of interpretation; Laurentius Valla (d. 1557) applied the results of his Greek studies to the explanation of the New Testament, though he is usually opposed to the Latin Vulgate. Not to insist on the less illustrious rogue of this period, we may pass on to those who applied to Scripture not merely their philological erudition, but also their acumen for textual criticism in its inceptive stage. Ang. Justiani edited an Octapla of the Psalter (Genoa, 1316); Card. Ximenez finished his Complutensian Polyglot (1517); Erasmus published the first edition of his Greek New Testament (1517); Card. Cajetan (d. 1535) attempted an explanation of the Scriptures according to the original texts; Santes Pagninus (d. 1541) translated the Old and the New Testament anew from their original texts; a number of other scholars worked in the same direction publishing either new translations of Scripture, or ancient commentaries in which new light was shed on one or more books of the Sacred Scriptures.

(iii) Third Period of Exegesis.—A few decades before the Council of Trent, Protestantism began to make its inroads into various parts of the Church, and its results were felt not only in the field of dogmatic theology, but also in Biblical literature. We shall therefore, have to distinguish after this between Catholic and Protestant exegesis.

(a) Catholic Exegeses.—Catholic exegeses subsequent to the Council of Trent may be divided into three stages: the first may be regarded as the terminus of the Scholastic period; the second forms the transition from the old to the new exegeses; and the third comprises the exegetical work of recent times. The first stage begins about the time of the Council of Trent, and ends about 1660; the second reaches to the beginning of the eighteenth century; and the third deals with our own times.

(b) The Golden Age of Catholic Exegesis, 1546-1660.—We have spoken above of the golden age of Christian exegesis, as distinct from the exegesis of the Jews; the following period is by some writers called the golden age of Catholic exegesis, as distinct from the Biblical work done by Protestants. During this period more than 350 Catholic writers were engaged in Biblical study; we can only classify the work done, and indicate some of the principal writers engaged in it. The revised Clementine edition of the Vulgate appeared in 1592; the Antwerp Polyglot, which was a later revision, appeared in 1569-1572; the Paris Polyglot, in the years 1629-1645. The introductory questions were treated by Sixtus Senensis (d. 1569), Christ. Adrichomius (d. 1588), Flaminius Nobilius (d. 1590), Ben. Arias Montanus (d. 1598), Petrus Morinus (d. 1608), Lucas Brugensis (d. 1619), de Tena (d. 1622), Ioannes Morinus (d. 1659), and Franc. Quaresmius (d. 1660).—All or most of the books of the Scripture were interpreted by Sa (d. 1596), Mariana (d. 1624), Tirinus (d. 1636), a La pole (d. 1637), Gordon (d. 1641), Menochius (d. 1659), de la Haye (1661).—Select books of both the Old and the New Testament were explained by Desmolets (d. 1575), Maldonatus (d. 1583), Ribera (d. 1618), Serarius (d. 1609), and Lorinus (d. 1634).—Certain books of the Old Testament were explained by Andreas Musius (d. 1573), Forerius (d. 1581), Pradus (d. 1585), Villalpandus (d. 1608), Gombrardus (d. 1607), Agellius (d. 1608), Pererius (d. 1610), Card. Bellarmine (d. 1621), Sertinians (d. 1628), Malvenda (d. 1628), de Pineda (d. 1637), Bonifreius (d. 1612), de Muis (d. 1644), Gislerius (d. 1646), de Salazar (d. 1646), and Corderius (d. 1655).—Finally, all or part of the books of the New Testament were explained by Desmolets (d. 1585), Card. Taulerius (d. 1596), Estius (d. 1613), de Alcaraz (d. 1613), and Ben. Justiniyiri (d. 1622).

(c) The Transition Period, 1660-1800.—During this period, historical studies were more cultivated than scholastic. It is here that we meet with the father of the historical and critical introduction, Richard Simon (d. 1712). Fransen (d. 1711) adopts a new exegetical method, but there is no return to the historical in the works of Bern. Cotelier (d. 1715), Daniel Huet (d. 1721), and Nat. Alexander (d. 1722). The bibliography of exegesis was treated by Bartoleo (d. 1687), Imbonatus (d. 1694), Dupin (d. 1719), Lelong (d. 1721), and Desmolettes (d. 1760). Old documents belonging to Scriptural studies were edited by
B. de Montfaucon (d. 1741), P. Sabatier (d. 1742),
and Jos. Blanchinus (d. 1764), while Calmet (d. 1757)
and Bossuet (d. 1704) are noted for their exegetical
work. Burek (d. 1710) has recourse to the original
text in order to explain doubtful or obscure readings.
If one compares this period with that which
preceded, one is struck with its poverty in Biblical
scholars; but textual criticism is fairly well
represented by Houbigant (d. 1784) and de Rossi
d. 1831).

(y) Recent Times.—The perturbed state of
the Church at the beginning of the nineteenth century
introduced, however, to the French a number of
ecclesiastical study. After peace had returned,
the study of Sacred Scripture flourished more lustily than
ever. In three respects, the modern commentary
surpasses that of any past age: First, the interpreter
attends in our times not merely to the immediate
context of a phrase or a verse, but to the whole literary
form of the book, and to the purpose for which it was
written; secondly, he is assisted by a most abundant
wealth of historical information practically unknown
in former days; thirdly, the philology of the sacred
tongues has been highly cultivated during the last
century, and its rich results are laid under contribution
by the modern commentator. It would lead us
far too far here to retrace the history of all the
recent excavations and discoveries, the contents of the
various tablets, papyri, and ostraka, the results of
literary criticism, archaeology, and history of religion; it
must suffice to say that the modern commentator can
leave none of these various sources of information un-
noticed in so far as they bear on his special subject of
investigation. It would be invidious to mention only
some names of modern scholars, excluding others;
still, they cannot all be enumerated. We may draw
attention, however, to the French periodicals of
which the most noteworthy are worthy of mention:
Drusius (d. 1616), de Dieu (d. 1642), Grotius
d. 1645), Vitringa (d. 1722), Cocceius (Koch, d. 1669),
and Clericus (d. 1736). Brian Walton (d. 1638) is celebrated for the edition of
the London Polyglot, which easily surpasses all
previous works of the same kind. The "Cursus
(Born, d. 1660; Frankfort, 1696; Amsterdam, 1695),
collected by John and Richard Pearson's, and the
"Synopsis criticorum" (London, 1669; Frankfort,
d. 1799), edited by Matt. Polus, may be regarded as
fairly good summaries of the exegetical work of the
nineteenth century.

(z) After the Rise of Rationalism.—The Arminians,
Socinians, the English Deists, and the French Ency-
clopedists refused to be bound by the "analogy of
faith" as their supreme hermeneutic rule. They
followed the principle of private judgment to its
corensequences. The first to adhere to the
modern Biblical rationalism was Semler (d. 1791), who denied
the Divine character of the Old Testament, and
explained away the New by his "system of accom-
modation," according to which Christ and the Apostles
were conformed to the tradition of the Jews. In order
to repress the true teaching of Christ, we must first eliminate
the Jewish doctrines, which may be learned from the
books of Josephus, Philo, and other Jewish writers.
—Kant (d. 1804) destroyed the small remnant of super-
natural revelation by his system of "authentic inter-
pretation"; we must seek to find through the words of the
Biblical writers said, but what they should have said in
order to remain within the range of the natural
Jewish religion. —But this did violence to the historical
character of the Biblical records; H. E. G. Paulus (d.
d. 1851) apparently does justice to the historicity of the
Bible, but removes from it all miracles by means of his
"nietologico-philosophical" or "psychological" system
of interpretation. He distinguishes between the fact
or the occurrence to which the witnesses testify, and
the judgment of the fact or the particular view which
the witnesses took of the occurrence. In interpreting
the Old Testament, e. g., we have a record of the views of the
Disciples concerning the events in Christ's life. —This
explanation left too much of Christ's history and doc-
trine intact. Hence David F. Strauss (d. 1857) ap-
plicated to the New Testament the system of Biblical
mythicism, which Semler, Eichhorn, Vater, and de
Wette had employed in their explanation of part of
the Old Testament; about thirty years after its first
appearance, Strauss's system was popularized by
E. Renan. A great many Protestant commentators
now began to grant the existence of myths in the
Sacred Scriptures, though they might adhere to the
general outlines of the Jewish and the Gospel history.
The principles which are at least implicitly maintained
by the mythicists, are the following: First, miracles
and prophecies are impossible; secondly, our religious
soules are not really historical; thirdly, the history
of the religion of all nations begins with myths, the Chris-
tian religion not excluded; fourthly, the Messianic
idea of the New Testament was adopted from the Old,
and all the traditional traits of the Messias were attrib-
uted to Jesus of Nazareth by a really myth-forming
process. But as it was hard to explain the growth of
this whole Christian mythology within the narrow
space of forty or fifty years, Ferd. Christ. Baur (d.
d. 1860) reconstructed the origin of the Christian Church,
making it a compromise between judaizing and uni-
versalistic Christians, or between the Petrine and the
Pauline parties. Only Rom., I and II Cor., Gal.
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authentic; the other books of the New Testament were written during or after the amalgamation of the two parties, which occurred in the second century. The adherents of this opinion form the New Tubingen or the Critical school.—It is true that Baur's theory of the growth of the New Testament has been discredited by the great majority of Protestant commentators who have ranked themselves among the followers of Harnack; but the opinion that the Sacred Books of the New Testament lack historicity in its true sense, is more common than ever.

Of this it is necessary we have to distinguish between the various classes of exegetical works in order to give a true estimate of the value possessed by the numberless recent Protestant contributions to Biblical literature; their philological and historical studies are, as a general rule, of great assistance to the commentaries of the nineteenth century. But, their conclusions are not sound enough to elicit commendation. Some of them adhere so entirely to the principles of the advanced criticism; others belong to the ranks of the conservatists; others again are more concerned with general and philological than theological questions; others, finally, try to do the impossible by combining the conservative with the advanced critical principles.

When we are asked what attitude the Catholic reader ought to maintain with regard to these numerous commentaries, we must remember that Leo XIII, found in the Encyclical Providentissimus Deus: “Though the study of non-Catholics, used with prudence, may sometimes be of use to the Catholic student, he should, nevertheless, bear well in mind—as the Fathers also teach in numerous passages—the sense of Holy Scripture can never be found incorrupt outside of the Church, and cannot be expected to be found in writers who, being without the true faith, only gnaw the bark of the Sacred Scripture, and never attain its pith.”

MAGNUS, Die Verst. des Bibel, s. v. Hermeneutica; SCHESSL, In Kirch. Bib., 2, v. Erklärung, WERTLICHT, Hermeneutik der Bibliothek, historisch, kritisch, und kritisch des latein. (Paris, 1887).—SENN, De divina scriptura, sive interpretatione brevi scriptura (Laybach, 1894).—LEMOYNE, Compendium hermeneuticorum (Paris, 1850).—LOPPE, Compendium hermeneuticorum (Laybach, 1891).—COHES, Introductio in libros Sanctorum (Paris, 1894).—Haber, Compendium hermeneuticorum (Leipzig, 1894).—VAN BiEST, De partibus divinae legis. VINCENT DE LEMIN, Commentariorum in Euchologiam. EUGENIUS, Liber formularum spiritualium intelligentiétatis. COCHRANE, Institutiones literarum literarum. KAINER, Tertullianus, Jus haereticorum, et Jurisdictionis sui problemata (Paris, 1890).—For the Middle Ages consult: RUGGERO MADRIGAL, De generico sanctissimo praestituto, chilii, vi, 4, hs. Calavius, in: n. 4, of the same year, Jean GERMAIN, Proposition de foi et de la Sainte Scriptura en Opera (Paris, 1860), I, p. 315. After the rise of the Reformation: PAGANO, Imagini seu introductionem ad eum Scripturas sanctas libri tres (Lyons, 1528, 1530).—NASSAUS SEVIGNÉ, Bibliotheca sanctorum (Venice, 1666).—The reader will find a number of works belonging to this period in MOISSON, Scriptura, Sacer. Compendium Completo, and several others, in the “Dictionnaire de l'état de l'Église” (1843, 1847).—The reader will find a number of works belonging to this period in MOISSON, Scriptura, Sacer. Compendium Completo, and several others, in the “Dictionnaire de l'état de l'Église” (1843, 1847).—The reader will find a number of works belonging to this period in MOISSON, Scriptura, Sacer. Compendium Completo, and several others, in the “Dictionnaire de l'état de l'Église” (1843, 1847).
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EXEMPTION

is the whole or partial release of an ecclesiastical person, corporation, or institution from the authority of the ecclesiastical superior next higher in rank, and the placing of the person or body thus released under the control of the authority next higher to the former superior, or under a still higher one, or under the highest authority of all, the pope. Originally, according to canon law, all the subjects of a diocese, and all diocesan institutions, were under the authority of the bishop. On account of the oppressive manner in which bishops at times treated the monasteries, these were soon taken under the protection of synods, princes, and popes. The papal protection often developed later into exemption from episcopal authority. The first privilege of this kind was given by Pope Honorius I, in 618, to the old Irish monastery of St. Molaise in Upper Bathy. The Law of the Decretalists, and the Papal Bull of Poppino, in 1442. Since the eleventh century, papal activity in the matter of reforms has been a frequent source or occasion of exemptions; in this way the monks became more closely bound to the popes, as against the bishops, many of whom were often inimical to the reformal power. It thus came about that not only individual monasteries, but also entire orders, obtained exemption from the authority of the local ordinary. Moreover, from the reign of Urban II, the broadly general "protection" of the Holy See (libertas Romana), which many monasteries enjoyed, came to be regarded as exemption from the authority of the bishop. From the twelfth century, it may be said the exemption of orders and monasteries became the rule. Exemptions were also granted to cathedral chapters, collegiate chapters, parishes, communities, ecclesiastical institutions, and single individuals. Under these circumstances the jurisdiction of the bishops was frequently crippled (Trent, Sess. XXIV, De ref. c. xi), consequently the bishops complained of such exemptions, while, on the other hand, the parties exempted were wont to accuse the bishops of violating acquired privileges. The Council of Trent sought to correct the abuses by giving the exemptions, in every case, three years of grace; under the ordinary jurisdiction of the bishops, or at least under the bishops as papal delegates. This provision of the council was never fully executed, owing to the frequent opposition of the monasteries. About the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, many monasteries were suppressed by the process known as secularization, in part accepted by the Holy See. In some countries more recent civil legislation does not permit exemption.

Exemption, as a rule, arises when the privilege is granted by competent authority (exemto dari). It can also rest on immemorial use (exemto praescriptivo). Finally exemption can be original (exemto nationi), when the respective church or monastery has always been free and distinct from the later diocesan organization. The claimant of exemption must prove the fact.

Exemption ceases by the complete or partial withdrawal of the privilege by the giver, customary exercise of a contrary usage, or by extinction of the rightful subject of the privilege.

Another kind of exemption applies to bishops, when released from the authority of the metropolitan, either by their own request or as a gracious act on the part of the Apostolic See, under whose direct control they are then placed. However, to prevent injury to the Church, the bishops, thus made independent of their proper metropolitans, are obliged to attend the synods of the province for which they have opted. Bishops who did not connect themselves with a synod in which their exemption was suppressed, by Benedict XIII, to attend the Roman synod of 1725. Exemption also frequently occurs in connexion with the system of military chaplaincies. In Austria, since 1720, the "Feldbischof" (army bishop), nominated by the emperor, is exempt. In Prussia, since 1803, the "Feldpravost" or army provost, is appointed by the pope after nomination by the German emperor. In France military chaplains who serve permanent garrisons remote from a parish church are exempt. In Spain and elsewhere vicar generals, i.e. army vicars-general, are appointed.

As applied to monasteries and churches, exemption is known as passiva or activa. In the former case the jurisdiction of the monastic or ecclesiastical prelate is confined to the ecclesiastics and layly belonging to his monastery or church. On the other hand, prelates
having “active” exemption may exercise a more extensive jurisdiction. They are (1) those who have certain episcopal rights over a clearly defined territory; and, are known, canonically, as praevati nullius i.e., dioeceses cuius território separato; (2) those who have episcopal jurisdiction over a definite territory entirely distinct from the diocese, and known as praevati nullius cuius territorio separato. The latter are praevati nullius in the proper sense; such, e. g. are the abbots of Monte Cassino, in Italy, and of St. Moritz, and Einsiedeln, in Switzerland. Prelates actively exempted have almost the same privileges and powers as a bishop. They may elect and vote in a general council, make laws within their proper territory, exercise canonical jurisdiction in matrimonial, disciplinary, and criminal matters. They may also grant faculties to hear confessions, reserve to themselves the right of absolving from certain sins, inflect ecclesiastical punishments and censures, grant faculties for preaching, make visits within their jurisdiction, found an ecclesiastical seminary for priests, and appoint a vicar-general. Correspondingly, such a prelate must reside in his district, offer the Holy Sacrament for the people, every Sunday and feast day, or at stated times to visit the Apostolic Visitor or the Apostolic Administrator of the Apostolic Prefecture (visitationis a pontificii a postulorum), and attend the synod of the province, for which option has been declared. He is not, however, obliged to attend the diocesan synod. As a rule, such prelates are not consecrated bishops. They must consequently apply to some bishop, given a known chancery for confirmation of their subjects, and for the consecration of the holy oils; for the ordination of their subjects, however, they must apply to the nearest bishop. When such praevati nullius are also regular abbots they may confer on their subjects the ecclesiastical tonsure, and ordain to the lower orders, or to this effect make dispensations to their subjects (Conc. Trid. Sess. VI, De ref. ch. iii; Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. xiv). Besides the papal confirmation, the consent of the bishop is also necessary for the founding of a monastery (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. iii). The bishop has the right to bless an abbott confirmed by the pope (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. vi). Monasteries of men are subject to episcopal visitation only in respect of parochial work (cura animarum) carried on by them outside of the monasteries (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. xi). The bishop has the right to confer the order on regulars, and to use the pontificalia in their churches. When the regulars have no special privilege the diocesan bishop consecrates their churches; and they must obtain episcopal permission for processes outside the immediate vicinity of such churches. They must also ask the episcopal bishop before they can preach (coram episcopo), and the churches of the order, while, in order to preach in any other than their own churches, canonical authorization (missio canonica) must be obtained from the bishop (Conc. Trid. Sess. V, De ref. ch. ii). To hear the confessions of the laity, and to grant absolution in cases reserved to the bishop, regulars must receive episcopal permission (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXIII, De ref. ch. xv). The writings and books of regulars must be submitted, before publication, to the diocesan censor for the place of issue (Leo XIII, “Officiorum ac numerorum”, 25 January, 1897, no 36). It is also obligatory on members of orders, to observe the resignations of the bishop respecting the Church feast days, church services, and processions (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. xii, and ch. xiii).

The rights of the bishop in respect to exempt orders of women are still more extensive. The bishop, or his representative (commissarius), presides at the election of abbesses, processions, or other superiors (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. vii). The right to visit canonically religious houses of women belongs to the bishop; he is charged in particular, with the entire superintendence of the observance of the clausura or cloister (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. viii). The bishop appoints the confessors, ordinary and extraordinary; for religious houses of women; in cases where such an appointment belongs to some one else the bishop must, at least, give his approbation (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXV, De regul. ch. x). It is the bishop who examines into, either personally, or by representative, the voluntary character of the end, therefore, suitable for promulgation. Modern statesmen draw a distinction between the Exequatur and the Regimen Placit. The latter, according to them, is given to episcopal acts or acts of any other ecclesiastical superior belonging to the nation for which they are approved; while the former is connected to the bispontes of foreign power, that is, to papal Constitutions; the pope, as head of the whole Church, being formally considered as an authority not belonging to any particular country. In both cases, however, state authorities have the power of examining church laws and giving permission for their promulgation, by which permission ecclesiastical decrees acquire legal value and binding force.

As to the origin of this supposed right of the State over the Church, it is now beyond doubt, contrary to the assertions of Gallicans and Jansenists, that no trace of it can be found in the early centuries of the Church, or even as late as the fourteenth century. It is true that during all that period of time general councils, like those of Nicaea and Ephesus, requisitioned the sanction of State authorities for ecclesiastical laws; it was not, however, juridical, but only by papal force that was exercised, as it did not always involve the promulgation of decrees, in order to enforce their execution by the secular arm. Moreover, had such a power in the State been at that time known, rulers of nations who were sometimes anxious to prevent the promulgation and execution of papal Constitutions in their domains would have readily appealed to it, instead of resorting to more difficult and troublesome means, in order to impede in every possible way papal letters from ever being introduced into their dominions, e. g. in the conflicts of Philip the Fair of France with Boniface VIII, and of Henry II of England with Alexander.
III. The Regnum Placentia really dates from the great Western Schism, which lasted from the pontificate of Urban VI to the Council of Constance and the election of Martin V (1378-1417). In order to guard against spurious papal letters issued by antipopes during the so-called Western Schism, and to prevent ecclesiastical superiors the faculty of examining papal Constitutions and ascertaining their authenticity before promulgation and execution. Civil authorities felt bound to adopt the same precautionary measure, though they did not attribute such a power to themselves as a right at the outset of their office: and frequently its use was continued when, after the access of Martin V, he condemned the Regnum Placentia in his Constitution “Quod antidota” (1148). In the fifteenth century, however, it was revived in Portugal by King John II and claimed by him as a right inherent in the crown. In the sixteenth century the Viceroy of Naples, the Duke of Alcalá, made it obligatory by law, and in the seventeenth century it was introduced into France in order to preserve the so-called Gallican Liberties, and afterwards into Spain, Belgium, Sicily, Naples, and other countries.

In theory this supposed right of the State was first proclaimed and defended as a true doctrine by Luther, Pasquier Quesnel, and other heretics who denied the supreme jurisdiction of the pope; later on it was advocated by Gallicans and Jansenists, e. g. Van Espen, Febronius, De Maree, and Stockmans, who attributed this power to the State as a necessary means of defence against possible temptations of the Church to injure the rights of civil society. More recently it has been defended with particular vigour by Italian jurists and statesmen, e. g. Cavallari, Mancini, Piola, appros of particular of the “Law of Guarantees” passed in 1871 by the Italian Government in favor of the Holy See. However, not only is historiographically erroneous, as shown above, that such a right has been exercised from time immemorial, but it is also juridically false that such power naturally belongs to the State, particularly as a necessary means of self-defence. The injustice of that claim and the consequent usurpation of authority by the State appear manifest in the light of Catholic faith. If the binding force of church laws depended on the approval and consent of the State, it would no longer be true that the Church received legislative power directly from her Divine Founder, and that whatever is required by the Church on earth, is approved and bound or loosed in heaven (Matt., xvi, 19). Again the Church would, in that case, immediately cease to be a supreme, self-sufficient, and perfect society, and would be deprived of her characteristics of unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity. Moreover, the use of the Exequatur to prevent possible usurpation of rights is contrary not only to Divine law but also to natural social law and is, therefore, an abuse of power, even if exercised by a State not professing the Catholic religion. A possible conflict of rights of two societies and the fear of a consequent injury to their respective jurisdictions do not entitle one of them to impede the free exercise of its ordinary jurisdiction by the other. Differences, if they arise, may be settled by private mutual understanding or arbitration. It is needless to say that the fear of any usurpation or conflict on the part of the Church is unfounded, as appears from her doctrine and history.

The Church, as a matter of fact, never claimed the power of revising and approving civil laws before promulgation, although, indeed, past experience would justify her in fearing on the part of the State usurpation of her powers. She contents herself with condoning the inapplicable laws as passed by the State. This is injurious to Catholic interests. We need not wonder, then, that the Church has always condemned the doctrine and use of the Regnum Placentia. Boniface IX first condemned it in his Constitution “Intenta Salutis” and after him a great number of pontiffs, down to Pius IX in Propositions 28 and 29 of the Syllabus “Quanta Curam” and in the Allocution “Luctuosissim Exagitati” (12 March, 1877), also the Vatican Council in the Constitution “De Ecclesiâ Christi”. To assert an autonomy contrary to the established practice is another way of seeking concessions from the State as to the exercise of the Regnum Placentia. In some other instances she has tolerated its acknowledgment by ecclesiasties, particularly to enable them to take possession of benefices and other temporalities. At present the Exequatur, or Regnum Placentia, is seldom, if ever, used, least in its strict sense, by modern civil rulers. In the two Sicilies it was abolished by the Concordat of 1818, and in Austria by that of 1855. It must likewise be regarded as abolished in Spain, France, Portugal, and Hungary. According to Aichner, it exists still, but in a mitigated form, in Saxony, Bavaria, and some parts of Switzerland. In Italy the strict Exequatur, i.e., previous to promulgation of papal Constitutions, is not in use, but it is retained in a mild form for the possession of ecclesiastical benefices. According to the Law of Guarantees (13 July, 1871), ecclesiasties which have been provided with benefices must present the Bull of their appointment to the State authorities; after approval the latter concede the Exequatur and put the incumbents of benefices in possession of the temporalities hitherto controlled by the government. In this form the Exequatur is at present tolerated by the Church, though it is not devoid of inconvenience. As Leo XIII complains in a letter written to his Secretary of State Cardinal Nino (27 August, 1878).

Exequatur, De promulgationem legum eccl. (Louvain, 1729); Bouix, De principiis juris (Paris, 1764); Zaccaria, Commentarii de principiis et sententiarum dni. (1763); Calendb. Jur. Publ. Eccl. Innt. (Rome, 1908); Barba, Il Diretto Publ. Eccl. (Naples, 1890); Tarnow, Dittr. dei Sovrani (Rome, 1862); De Dominica, Il Regio Exequatur (Naples, 1869).

S. Luzio.

Exercises, Spiritual. See Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius.

Exeter (Exonia, Isca Dumnnoniorum, Cark Wyrse, Exancker, Ancient Diocese of (Exoniensis), in England, chosen by Leflrié, Bishop of Crediton, as his cathedral city in 1050. Originally Devonshire formed part of the Diocese of Wessex. About 703 Devonshire and Cornwall became the separate Bishopric of Sherborne and in 900 this was divided into the Diocese of Exeter, the Devonshire bishopric of Crediton, and the Bishopric of Devon. The two dioceses were again united when Leflrié became first Bishop of Exeter. The present cathedral was begun by Bishop William de Warelhurst in 1112; the abbey church of St. Mary and St. Peter, founded by Athelstan in 932 and rebuilt in 1019, serving till then as the cathedral church. The transept towers built by Warelhurst still remain, being the only part of the Norman cathedral existing. This Norman building was completed by Bishop Marsh all the close of the twelfth century. The cathedral as it now stands is in the decorated style, being begun by Bishop Quivil (1280-1291), continued by Byton and Stapeldon, and completed by the great Bishop Grandison during his long pontificate of forty-two years, who left it much as it now stands. In many respects it resembles the French cathedrals rather than those of England. The special features of the cathedral are the transeptal towers and the choir. The latter contains much early stained-glass and a magnificent episcopal throne, and is separated from the nave by a choir-screen of singular beauty (1324). The absence of a central tower and a general lack of elevation prevent the building from ranking among the greatest English cathedrals, though the exterior west front is alone sufficient to render it remarkable.

The bishops of Exeter always enjoyed considerable independence and the see was one of the largest and richest in England. "The Bishop of Exeter," writes
EXETER CATHEDRAL.
Professor Freeman, "like the Archbishop of York was the spiritual head of a separate people." The remoteness of the see from London prevented it from being bestowed on statesmen or courtiers, so that the roll of bishops is more distinguished for scholars and administrators than for men who played a large part in national affairs. This was fortunate for the diocese, and gave it a long line of excellent bishops, one of whom, Edmund Lacy, died with a reputation for sanctity and the working of miracles (1455). The result of this was seen in the fidelity with which Devon and Cornwall adhered to the Catholic Faith at the time of the Reformation. The following are the bishops with the dates of their accession:

- Leofric, 1046
- Osbern, 1072
- William Warelawst, 1107
- Robert Chichester, 1198
- Robert Warelawst, 1135
- Bartholomew Icanus, 1161
- John the Chauenter, 1186
- Vacancy, 1191
- Henry Murrell, 1194
- Vacancy, 1206
- Simon de Apulia, 1214
- William Bruerre, 1224
- Richard Blondy, 1245
- Walter Bronescombe, 1257
- John Quivill, 1280
- Thomas de Button, 1292
- Walter de Stapeldon, 1308

The diocese, originally very wealthy, was plundered during the reign of Henry VIII, when Bishop Vesey was induced to surrender fourteen out of twenty-two manors, and the value of the bishopric was reduced to a third. Vesey, though a Catholic at heart, held the see until 1551, when he was made to resign, and the Reformer, Miles Coverdale, was intruded into the see, where he made himself most unpopular. On the accession of Mary, in 1553, Vesey was restored. He died in 1554 and was succeeded by James Turcherville, beloved by Catholics and Protestants alike. He was deprived of the see by Elizabeth in 1559 and died in prison, probably in or about 1570, the last Catholic Bishop of Exeter. The diocese contained four archdeaconries, Ciderbridge, Exeter, Tavistock, and Bideford; the parishes, except Totnes, were in six hundred and four parishes. There were Benedictine, Augustine, Franciscan, Dominican, and Norbertine houses, and four Cistercian abbeys. The cathedral was dedicated to St. Peter, and the arms of the see were: Gules, a sword in pale blade and hilt proper, two keys in saltire or.
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**Excepts.** See **ESSENCE AND EXISTENCE.**

**Exodus**, the second Book of the Pentateuch, second also of the whole Old Testament Canon (see **PENTATEUCH**).
and bound him in the desert of upper Egypt;" and the instruction previously given to young Tobias (VI, 13, and 19), to roast the fish's heart in the bridal chamber, would seem to have been merely part of the angel's plan for concealing his own identity. But in early Jewish literature there are instances of exorcising demons, examples of which may be seen in the Talmud (Schabbath, xiv, 3; Aboda Zara, xii, 2; Sanhedrin, x, 1). These were sometimes inscribed on the interior surface of earthen bowls, a collection of which (estimated to be from the seventh century on) is preserved in the Royal Museum at Berlin; and inscriptions from the collection have been published, and translated, by Wohlestein in the "Zeit-schrift für Assyriologie" (Dec., 1895; April, 1891).

The chief characteristic of these Jewish exorcisms is their naming of names believed to be efficacious, i.e., names of good angels, which are used either alone or in combination with El (=God); indeed reliance on mere names had long before become a superstitious custom with the Jews, and it was considered the most important that the appropriate names, which varied for different times and occasions, should be used. It was this superstition without doubt, that prompted the words of Jesus to the demoniac Sebna, who had witnessed St. Paul's successful exorcisms in the name of Jesus, to try on their own account the formula, "I conjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth", with results disastrous to their credit (Acts, xix, 13). It was a popular Jewish belief, according to a learned commentary like Josephus, that Solomon had received the power of expelling demons, and that he had composed and transmitted certain formulæ that were efficacious for that purpose. The Jewish historian records how a certain Eleazar, in the presence of the Emperor Vespasian and his officers, succeeded, by means of a magical incantation, in driving the demon through the noses of the vestments, which were enclosed in a casket made of a rare and precious wood, and that the demon confessed itself a spirit of the good angel, and that it was exceedingly difficult to obtain the consent of the angel to the demon's departure from the casket. Thus we have an account of a person who was not a disciple of Paul but a demon-caster who was unequal to the task of casting out demons in Christ's name, and whose actions Christ refused to reprehend or forbid.

EXORCISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: Assuming the reality of demonic possession, for which the authority of Christ is pledged (see OBSSESSION, POSSESSION), it is to be observed that Jesus appealed to His power over demons as one of the signs of His Messiahship (Matt., xii, 28; Luke, xi, 20). He cast out demons, He declared, by the finger or spirit of God, not, as His adversaries alleged, by collusion with the prince of demons (Matt., xii, 24, 27; Mark, iii, 22; Luke, xi, 15, 19); and that He exercised no mere delegated power, but a personal authority that was properly His own, is clear from the direct and imperative way in which He commands the demon to depart (Mark, ix, 21; cf. i, 25 etc.): "He cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick" (Matt., viii, 16). Sometimes, as with the daughter of the Canaanean woman, the example was added (Mark, vi, 13; cf. i, 26): "He cast out the spirits with his word, and they were healed at once." Sometimes again the spirits expelled were allowed to express their recognition of Jesus as "the Holy One of God" (Mark, i, 24) and to complain that He had come to torment them "before the time", i.e., the time of their final punishment (Matt., viii, 29 sqq.; Luke, viii, 29 sqq.). If demonic possession was generally accompanied by some disease, yet the two were not confounded by Christ or the Evangelists. In Luke, xiii, 32, for example, the Master Himself expressly distinguishes between the exorcism of evil spirits and the curing of diseases. Christ also empowered the Apostles and Disciples to cast out demons in His name while He Himself was still on earth (Matt., x, 1 and 8; Mark, vi, 7; Luke, ix, 1; x, 17), and to believers generally He promised the same power (Mark, xvi, 17). But the efficacy of this delegated power was conditional, as we see from the fact that the Apostles themselves were not always successful in their exorcisms: certain kinds of spirits, as Christ explained, could only be cast out by prayer and fasting (Matt., xvii, 15, 20; Mark, ix, 27, 28; Luke, ix, 40). In other words the success of exorcism by Christians, in Christ's name, is subject to the same general conditions on which both the efficacy of prayer and the use of charismatic power depend. Yet consistent success was promised (Mark, xvi, 17).

ECCLESIASTICAL EXORCISM: Besides exorcism in the strictest sense, i.e., for driving out demons from the possessed, Catholic ritual, following early traditions, has retained various other exorcisms, and these also call for notice here. (1) Baptismal exorcism. We have it on the authority of all early writers who refer to the subject at all in the first centuries not only the clergy, but lay Christians also were able by the power of Christ to deliver demons or exorcisms, and their success was appreciated by the early Apostles as a strong argument for the Divinity of the Christian religion (Justin Martyr, Apol., 6; P. G., VI, 453; Dial., 30, 85; ibid., 537, 676 sq; Minutius Felix, Octav., 27, P. L., III; Origen, Contra Celsum., I, 25; VII, 4, 47; P. G., XI, 705, 1225, 1516; Tertullian, Apol., 22, 23; P. L., I, 404 sqq., etc.). As is clear from the formulæ, only the names of demons referred to, no magical or superstitious means were employed, but in those early centuries, as in later times, a simple and authoritative aduration addressed to the demon in the name of God, and more especially in the name of Christ crucified, was the usual form of exorcism. But sometimes in addition to words some symbolic action was employed, such as breathing (in宿放) or laying of hands on the subject, or making the sign of the cross. St. Justin speaks of demons flying from the touch and breathing of Christians (I Apol., 6) as from a flame that burns them, says St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat., xx, 3, P. G., XXXIII, 1080). Origen mentions the laying on of hands, and St. Ambrose (Paulinus, Vit. Amb., n. 28, 43, P. L., XIV, 36, 42), St. Ephraem Syrus (Greg. Nyss., De Vit. Ephr., P. G., XLVI, 548) and others used this ceremony in exorcisms; the sign of the cross, that by its simplicity was the simplest way of expressing one's faith in the Crucified and invoking His Divine power, is extolled by all Fathers for its efficacy against all kinds of demonic possession (Lactantius, Inst., IV, 27; P. L., XLVI, 531 sqq.; Athanasius, De Incarn. Verbi., n. 47, P. G., XXVII, 180; Basil, In Isai., XI, 249, P. G., XXX, 537; Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat., XIII, 3 coll. 773; Gregory Nazianzen, Carm. adv. iram, v, 415 sq.; P. G., XXXII, 812). The Fathers further recommend that the adjuration and accompanying prayers should be couched in the words of Holy Writ (Cyril of Jerusalem, Procat., n. 9, col. 346; Greg. Nyss., De Vit. Ephr., P. G., XLVI, 548). The present rite of exorcism as given in the Roman Ritual fully agrees with patristic teaching and is a proof of the continuity of Catholic tradition in this matter.

(2) Baptismal exorcism. At an early age the prac-
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tice was introduced into the Church of exorcising cate-
chumens as a preparation for the Sacrament of Bap-
tism. This did not imply that they were considered to be
obscured, like demons, but merely that they were
in consequence of original sin (and of personal sins in case of adults), subject more or less to the power of
"works" or "pompe" thew, we called upon to renounce, and from whose dominion the
grace of baptism was about to deliver them. Exor-
cism in this connexion is a symbolical anticipation of
one of the chief effects of the sacrament of regenera-
tion; and since it was used in the case of children who
had personal sins, St. Augustine could appeal
against the Pelagians as implying clearly the doctrine
of original sin (Ep. exeq. n. 46, P. L. XXXIII, 890;
C. Jul. III, 8; P. L., XXXIV, 705, and elsewhere).
St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Procat. 14, col. 355) gives a
detailed description of baptismal exorcism, from which
it appears that anointing with exorcised oil formed a
part of this exorcism in the East. The only early
Western witness which treats unction as part of the
baptismal exorcism is that of the Arabic Canons of
Hippolytus (n. 19, 20). The Exsufflificio, or out-
breathing of the demon by the candidate, which was
sometimes part of the ceremony, was, St. Augustine
said, "in the name of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost"
(Par. 47, col. 1198). The baptismal exorcism was
to take part in baptismal exorcism. That catechumens
were exorcised every day, for some time before baptism, may be inferred from canon xc of
the same council, which prescribed the daily imposi-
tion of hands by the exorcists. A further duty is pre-
scribed in canons xxvi, xxvii, xxviii, of supplying the
general way to care for, evangelists who habitually
frequented the Church. There is no mention of pagan
demoners, for the obvious reason that the official
ministrations of the Church were not intended for
them. But even after the institution of this order,
exorcism was not for exorcists, but for the laity, to the
higher clergy; nor did those who exorcised always
use the forms contained in the Book of Exorcisms.
Thus the Apostolic Constitutions (VIII, 26, 27, P. G., I,
1122) say expressly that "the exorcist is not or-
dained", i.e. for the special office of exorcist, but that
if anyone possesses the charismatic power, he is to
be recognized, and if need be, ordained deacon or sub-
deacon. This is the practice which has survived in
the Eastern Orthodox Church.

As an example of the discretion allowed in the West,
in the use of the means of exorcising, we may refer to
what Sulphius Severus relates of St. Martin of Tours
(Dial., III (II), 6; P. L., XX, 215), that he was in
the habit of casting out demons by prayer alone, without
having recourse to the imposition of hands or the for-
mule usually employed by the clergy. After a time,
as conditions changed in the Church, the office of ex-
orcist, as an independent office, ceased altogether, and
was taken over by clerics in major orders, just as
the original functions of deacons and subdeacons have
with the lapse of time passed to a great extent into
the hands of priests; and according to the present disci-
pline of the Catholic Church, it is only priests who are
authorized to use the exorcising power conferred by
ordination. The change is due to the facts that the
catechumenate, with which the office of exorcist was
chiefly connected, has ceased, that infant baptism has
become the rule, and that with the spread of Chris-
tianity and the disappearance of paganism, demonic
power has been curtailed, and cases of obsession have become
much rarer. It is only Catholic missionaries labour-
ing in pagan lands, where Christianity is not yet domi-
nant, who are likely to meet with fairly frequent cases of
possession.

In Christian countries authentic cases of possession
sometimes occur and every priest, especially if he be
a parish priest, or pastor, is liable to be called upon
to perform his duty as exorcist. In doing so, he is to
be mindful of the prescriptions of the Roman Ritual and
of the laws of provincial or diocesan synods, which for
the most part require that the bishop should be consulted, and his authorization obtained before exorcism is attempted. The chief points of importance in the instructions of the Roman Ritual, prefixed to the rite itself, are as follows: 'The exorcism is lightly to be taken for granted. Each case is to be carefully examined and great caution to be used in distinguishing genuine possession from certain forms of disease.' (2) The priest who undertakes the office should be himself a holy man, of blameless life, intelligent, courageous, humble; and he should prepare for the work by special acts of devotion and mortification, particularly by prayer and fasting (Matt., xvii, 20). (3) He should avoid in the course of the rite everything that savours of superstition, and should leave the medical aspects of the case to qualified physicians. (4) He should admonish the possessed, in so far as the latter is capable, to dispose himself for the exorcism by prayer, fasting, confession, and communion, and while the rite is in progress to excite within himself a lively faith in God's goodness, and a patient resignation to His holy will. (5) The exorcism should take place in the Church or some other sacred place; if convenient, on account of the solemnity of the case, or for other legitimate reasons, it takes place in a private house, witnesses (preferably members of the family) should be present: this is specially enjoined, as a measure of precaution, in case the subject is a woman. (6) All idle and curious questioning of the demons should be avoided, and prayers and the like should be read with great faith, humility, and fervour, and with a consciousness of power and authority. (7) The Blessed Sacrament is not to be brought near the body of the obsessed during exorcism for fear of possible irreverence; but the crucifix, holy water, and images, if available, are to be so employed. (8) If expulsion of the evil spirit is not obtained at once, the rite should be repeated, if need be, several times. (9) The exorcist should be vested in surplice, and violet stole.

**Expectation of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Expectatio Partus B. V. M.).** Feast of the, celebrated on 18 December by nearly the entire Latin Church. Owing to the ancient law of the Church prohibiting the celebration of feasts during Lent (a law still in vigour at Milan), the Spanish Church transferred the feast of the Annunciation from 25 March to the season of Advent, the Tenth Council of Toledo (666) assigning it definitely to 18 December. It was kept with a solemn octave. When the Latin Church ceased to observe the ancient custom regarding feasts in Lent, the Annunciation came to be celebrated in Spain and Portugal on 25 March and 18 December, in the calendars of both the Mozarabic and the Roman Rite (Missale Gothicum, ed. Migne, pp. 170, 734). The feast of 18 December was commonly called, even in the liturgical books, "Sancta Maria de la O", because on that day the early Marian chansons were used to this church and protracted "O", to express the longing of the universe for the coming of the Redeemer (Tamayo, Mart. Hisp., VI, 483). The Roman "O" antiphons have nothing to do with this term, because they are unknown in the Mozarabic Rite. This feast and its octave were very popular in Spain, where the people still call it "Nuestra Señora de la O". It is not known what at time the term Expectatio Partus first appeared; it is not found in the Mozarabic liturgical books. St. Ildefonso cannot, therefore, have invented it, as some have maintained. The feast was always kept in Spain and was approved for Toledo in 1573 by Gregory XIII as a double major, without an octave. The church of Toledo has the privilege (approved 29 April, 1634) of celebrating this feast even when it occurs on the fourth Sunday of Advent. The "Expectatio Partus" spread from Spain to other countries; in 1695 it was granted to Venice and Toulouse, in 1702 to the Cistercians, in 1713 to Tuscany, in 1725 to the Papal States. The Office in the Mozarabic Breviary is exceedingly beautiful; it assigns special antiphons for every day of the octave. At Milan the feast of the Annunciation is observed as a double minor, kept on the last Sunday before Christmas. The Mozarabic Liturgy also celebrates a feast called the Expectation (or Advent) of St. John the Baptist on the Sunday preceding 24 June.

**F. G. Holweck.**

**Expectative (from Lat. expectare, to expect or wait for).**—An expectative, or an expectative grace, is the anticipatory grant of an ecclesiastical benefice, usually a vacant one, to an appointee who is not regularly, on the death of its present incumbent. In 1179 the Third Lateran Council, renewing a prohibition already in existence for a long time, forbade such promises or gifts. This prohibition was further extended by Boniface VIII. Nevertheless, during the Middle Ages expectatives were conferred upon applicants to canonical prebends in the cathedral and collegiate chapters. This fact was due to toleration by the Holy See, which even accorded to the chapters the right of nominating four canons in the way of expectatives (cc. ii, viii, De concesionibus, c. III, Lebendge, in cap. ii, 7, 12). The privilege of expecting benefices was conceded also to the delegates of the Holy See, the universities, certain princes, etc., with more or less restriction. This practice aroused grave opposition and gave rise to many abuses, especially during the Western Schism. The Council of Trent suppressed all expectatives excepting the designation of a coadjutor with the right of succession in the case of bishops and abbots; to these we may add the prefects Apostolic. (Sess. XXIV, cap. xix, De ref.; Sess. XXIX, cap. vii, De ref.). Although the papal Council intended to forbid also the collation of expectatives by privileges granted by the pope, still the latter is not bound by such a prohibition. However the only expectatives now in use are those authorized by the Council of Trent.

**A. van Hove.**

**Expeditor, Apostolic (Lat. Expeditionum litterarum apostolicorum, Daturas Apostolicas sollicitore atque expeditor, It. spedizioniario).** Officials who attend to the sending of Bulls, Briefs, and Rescripts, that emanate from the Apostolic Chancery, the Dataria, the Sacred Penitentiaria, and the Secretariate of
Expiation, Feast of. See Atonement, Day of.

Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament is a manner of honouring the Holy Eucharist, by exposing it, with proper solemnity, to the view of the faithful in order that they may pay their devotions before it. We will speak later of the conditions which constitute proper solemnity, but something must first be said of the history of the practice.

History.—There can be no reasonable doubt that the practice of exposition came in the wake of that most epoch-making liturgical development, the elevation of the Host in the Mass. The elevation itself (q. v.), of which we first hear in its present sense about the year 1200, was probably adopted as a practical protest against the teaching of Peter Comestor and Peter the Chanter, who held that the bread was not consecrated in the Mass until the words of institution had been spoken over both bread and wine. Those who refused to accept that when the Host is said "Pons meus" had been pronounced, the bread was at once changed into the flesh of our Lord, supported their opinion by adoring the Sacrament, and holding it up for the adoration of the people, without waiting for the words to be spoken over the chalice. At Paris, this elevation became a matter of synodal precept, probably before the year 1200. Before long it came to be regarded as a very meritorious act to look upon and salute the Body of the Lord. In this way, even before the middle of the thirteenth century, all kinds of fanciful promises were in circulation regarding the sanctifying graces enjoyed by him who, on any day, saw the Body of his Maker. He was believed to be protected from sudden death, or from loss of sight. Further, on that day he would be duly nourished by the food he took, and would grow no older, with many other superannuities. The development of these popular beliefs was also probably much assisted by a legendary element current in the romances of the Holy Grail, then at the height of their popularity. What is certain is, that among all classes the seeing the Host, at the moment it was lifted, was held in the highest of the people, became a primary matter of veneration—various devotions—for example, the hanging of a black curtain at the back of the altar, or the lighting of torches held behind the priest by a deacon or server—were resorted to, to make the looking upon the Body of Christ more easy.

Whether the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi with its procession, an innovation due to the visions of the Flemish contemplative, St. Juliana Corn- nelion, is to be regarded as the case, or rather the effect, of this great desire to behold the Body of Christ is somewhat doubtful. But the evidence points to it as an effect rather than as a cause, for, even before the close of the twelfth century, we find in the authenticated story of the last moments of Maurice de Sully, Bishop of Paris, according to which, being unable on account of sickness to receive Holy Viaticum, he satisfied his devotion by having the Blessed Sacrament brought to him to gaze upon. An exactly similar incident is recorded of St. Juliana herself. This also seems to show that the devout longing of the faithful to gaze upon the Sacred Host was not confined to the time of Mass. Moreover, we find it debated among scholastic theologians, as early as the thirteenth century, whether the looking upon the consecrated Host could be praiseworthy, if it were done with a reverent intention, and was likely to obtain for the sinner the grace of true contrition.

In the fourteenth century, we find the practice of Exposition already established, especially in Germany. The "Septilium" of Blessed Dorothea of Prussia who died a recluse, at an advanced age, in 1394, not only bears witness to the saint's extraordinary desire to see the Blessed Sacrament, a desire which was sometimes gratified as often as a hundred times a day, but also incidentally mentions that in certain churches near Danzig, the Blessed Sacrament was reserved all day long in a transparent monstrance, so that pious persons like Dorothea could come to pray before it. In practice, the practice of exposition was widespread, especially in Germany and the Netherlands. In the fifteenth century, we find numerous synodal decrees passed, prohibiting this continuous and informal Exposition, as wanting in proper reverence. The decree enacted at Cologne in 1432, under the presidency of Cardinal Nicholas de Cues, altogether forbids the reserving, or carrying of the Blessed Sacrament in such monastries, except during the octave of Corpus Christi. An earlier decree passed at Breslau, in 1416, speaks of permission having previously been given for the Body of Jesus Christ, on some few days of the week, to be visibly exposed and shown to public view." But the bishop declares that he has perceived, that, "by this frequent exposition, the devotion of the multitude only becomes greater, and reverence is lessened". It is clear that these prohibitions did not eradicate the custom, but they seem to have led to a curious compromise, by which the Blessed Sacrament, throughout a great part of central Europe, was reserved in "Sakramentshäuschen" (Sacrament houses), often beautifully carved of stone, and erected in the most conspicuous part of the church, near the sanctuary. There the Blessed Sacrament was kept in a transparent vessel, or monstrance, behind a locked metal door of lattice work, in such a way that the Host could still be dimly seen by those who prayed outside. In the convent of Vadstena in Sweden, the motherhouse of the Brigitines, we have a record of the erection of such a sacrament of 1454, in the following terms: "Circa festum Epiphaniae erectum est ciborium, sive columna, pro Corpore Christi, et monstrancia ibi posita cum lampade.

Another custom which seems to have been very prevalent in Germany and the Netherlands, before the close of the fifteenth century, was the practice of exposing the Blessed Sacrament during the time of Mass, apparently to add solemnity to the Holy Sacrifice thus offered. Numerous papal permissions for such Exposition will be found in the "Regesta" of Pope Leo X. (See e. g. 3 Nov., 1514; 20 Nov., 1514,
This practice is still a very favourite one in Belgium, though it seems directly to contravene the spirit of many directions in the official "Ceremonial Episcoporum" prescribing that the Blessed Sacrament should, when possible, be removed from the altar at which Mass is celebrated (Cer. Expos. XII, 8–9). Before the Council of Trent, the abuse of such frequent expositions, in Germany and elsewhere, seems to have been very much checked, if not entirely eliminated. In the sixteenth century and subsequently, the developments of popular devotion in this matter have been much more restrained, and there have always been subject to strict episcopal supervision. The practice of the Forty Hours' Devotion, and the service now known as Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, are treated separately, and the reader may be referred to the articles in question. But a good many other varieties of services, involving Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for a longer or shorter period, began to prevail in the time of St. Philip Neri and St. Charles Borromeo. Of one such variety known as the Oratio sine intermissione, and dating at least from 1574, a full account will be found in the "Liber Ordinariorum" in the "Sacrament-Houses", (Anathema; V. 1906). Not very long after this, we begin to come across various religious institutes founded, with the permission of the Holy See, for the express purpose of maintaining the perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. See the article ADORATION, PERPETUAL, where details are given.

**Conditions Regulating Exposition.** —The Church distinguishes between private and public Expositions of the Blessed Sacrament, and these, though the former practice is hardly known in northern Europe, or in America, it is clearly within the competence of a parish priest to permit such private exposition for any good reason of devotion, by opening the tabernacle door and allowing the ciborium containing the Blessed Sacrament to be seen by the worshippers. There is, however, in this case no enthroneing of the Blessed Sacrament or use of a monstrance. Public Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament may not take place without the permission, express or implied, of the ordinary. In English-speaking countries, a monstrance must always be used, and the Blessed Sacrament is set upon its throne, but in Germany, one frequently sees simply the ciborium, covered of course with its veil. A certain solemnity and decorum in the matter of lights upon the altar, incense, music, and attendance of worshippers is also required, and bishops are directed to refuse permission for public exposition where these cannot be obtained.

When Mass is celebrated, or the Divine Office recited, at the altar upon which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, a new set of rubrics comes into force, birettas are not worn, genuflexions on both knees are made before the altar, and incense used. However, the celebrant's hand is not kissed, etc. The "Ceremoniale" seems only to contemplate the case of Mass before the Blessed Sacrament exposed during the octave of Corpus Christi, and at the Mass of Deposition of the Quaran' Ore, but, as already noticed, in many parts of Europe, local custom has made these Masses before the Blessed Sacrament of very common occurrence. For the candles that ought to burn upon the altar, and for the ritual to be followed the reader may be referred to the articles BENEDICTION, and Forty Hours Devotion. Other rubrical directions dealing with the external extazi, such as the use of a particular arrangement of the throne, etc., are given in detail in manuals like that of Hartmann, or works upon Pastoral Theology such as that of Schultze.

---

**Extension.** See ANATHEMA; DEGRADATION; EXCOMMUNICATION; RELIGIOUS ORDERS; VOW.

Extension (from Lat. ex-tenderre, to spread out).—That material substance is not perfectly continuous in its structure, as it appears to our gross senses, the physical sciences demonstrate. The microscope reveals pores in the most compact matter, while the permeation of gasses and even of liquids through solids indicates that the densest bodies would probably present to a sufficiently penetrating eye a sponge-like structure throughout. This fact, together with the difficulty of explaining how the senses can perceive extension, has led many theorists to deny its objectivity, although, on the other hand, the first of modern philosophers, Descartes, has expressed it. Kant makes extension a subjective form, an original condition of sensuous faculty which when stimulated by the sense-object stamps the impression accordingly. Others, with Leibniz, resolve matter into simple unextended substances, (monads), and the agitation is supposed to produce in us the impression of continuous extension. Others, with Bosovich (d. 1787), sublitize matter into simple forces which some hold to be 'virtually' extended. The Atomists (physical and chemical) dissolve bodies into minute particles (atoms) which are either added or removed by others only physically, indivisible of certain elementary substances, which hitherto have defied further analysis but which may eventually turn out to be merely varying arrangements of some primordial homogeneous maternal, the radical constituent of the universe. The present teaching of Catholic philosophy on the subject may be summarized as follows: Extension is either successive (frequent, as that of a stream and of time), or permanent. The latter may be viewed as either (a) continuous (mathematical), i.e. abstract, as a line, or physical, when the entitative or intersubstantial parts into which the material substance is divided, are united (perfectly or imperfectly) throughout, e.g. a homogeneous wire; (b) contiguous, when the said parts are conjoined only by contact, e.g. a brick wall; (c) interrupted, when those parts are in some degree disjointed, though connected by an intermediate, e.g. a string of beads. We are here occupied with continuous extension only.

Continuous extension may be described as that property in virtue whereof the parts into which material substance is divided are suitably arranged in orderly relation one beyond the other (internal and potential) and hence are not absolutely commensurate with the corresponding parts of the immediately surrounding surfaces (external and actual local extension). Consequent attributes of extension are divisibility, measurability, and impenetrability. Wherein precisely the essence of extension consists, is a controverted question. Probably the more general opinion is that extension radically and essentially consists in the internal distribution of the parts into which matter is divisible, and that external extension, or the correspondence of those parts to the parts of the locating surfaces, is a sequent property of essentially extended parts. Of course this distinction between internal and external extension. Some nearer approach to an explanation and an exposition may be found in the opinion of a recent writer (Peess) who makes extension consist in the expansive and cohesive forces of matter—the former causing the said parts to spread out, the latter keeping them united.
Continuous extension is an objective property of matter, not a mere mental form moulding the sensuous impression produced in the sensory organs by some sort of physical motion. What it is that extension immediately affects—whether the ultimate atoms, the contiguous molecules, or the gross mass of matter—we are unable in the present stage of physical science to decide. Even should it turn out, however, as many conjecture, that the densest solid—to say nothing of a liquid or a gas—is but what might be called an "infinite" complex arrangement of infinitesimal corpuscles—which is the case—then by gravitating in a matrix of ether, continuous extension would still remain (objective), though it would then be the immediate property of the constituent corpuscles and the ether instead of a property of the gross mass. It is experimentally demonstrable that sensuous impressions are aroused in us by bodies as extended and resistant. Now if bodies were constituted of simple, unextended points—monads or forces—these could not stimulate the sensory organs, since such elements, apart from the fact that they would all coalesce and co-penetrate, could not be the subjects of material activity (etherial or aural vibrations, chemical reactions, i.e. the immediate sense-stimuli). Nor could the organs evoke the sensation, since in the hypothesis they too, being made up of unextended elements, would be incapable of material action. Neither will it do to say that the motion of the supposed "points" might evoke sensation, since being unextended they would be imperceptible in motion or at rest.

Extension is an "absolute accident", that is not a mere mode in which substance exists, as, for instance, are motion and rest. It seems to have a certain distinct entity of its own. This, of course, would most probably never have been suspected by the human mind unaided by Revelation; but it is given in the dogma of the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, wherein the extensional dimensions and sensible qualities of bread and wine persist after the conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into His Body and Blood, reason, speculating on the doctrine, discerns some grounds for the possibility of the real distinction and even severance between substance and local extension. In the first place there are motives for inferring a real distinction between substance and extension (actual and local), or, in other words, that extension does not constitute the essence of physical substance (as Descartes maintained that it does): (a) substance is the root principle of action; extension as such is either inactive or at most a proximate principle; (b) substance is the ground of specification; extension as such is indifferent to any species, since shape or figure which is the dimensional termination of extension depends upon the specific form; (c) substance is identical in the entire mass and in each of its parts (e.g. in gold), while extension is not the same in the whole and in each of its parts; (d) substance is the principle of unity; extension is the formal principle of plurality; (e) substance essentially demands three dimensions; extension may be realized in one or two; (f) substance remaining the same, extension may increase or decrease.

Given a real distinction between extension and substance, no intrinsic impossibility can be proven to explain the separation of one from the other; although internal extension naturally demands external, there is no evidence that the demand is so essentially imperative that Omnipotence cannot supernaturally suspend its realization and by other means afford the accidents—extension and the rest—the substance naturally supplies. Since material substance owes the distribution of its integral parts to extension, the question arises whether, independently of extension, it possesses any such parts (it, of course, possesses parts essential to corporeal substance, matter and form), or is simple, indivisible. St.

Thomas and many others maintain that substance as such is indivisible. Suarez and others hold that it is divisible. For this and the other questions concerning the divisibility of extension, and the psychology of the subject, the reader is referred to the works mentioned below.

PALMIRA, Fundamental Philosophy (New York, 1854); FABRIS, L'Idée du Continu (Paris, 1894); NYS, Cosmologie (Louvain, 1900); LANDAU, Psychology Descriptive and Explanatory (New York, 1895); EMERY, Theory of Reality (New York, 1889); GUTSON, Naturphilosophie (Münster, 1894); MAKER, Psychology (New York, 1903); WILLGERS, Institutiones Philosophiae (Trier, 1890); HUGON, Philosophia Naturalis Parisi (1901); SCHAPA, Corpus brevis Philosophia (Estergom, Hungary, 1900).

F. F. SIEGFRIED.
definition of "Corpus Juris Canonici." This explains the favour they enjoyed among canonists. For a critical text of these collections see Friedberg, "Corpus Juris Canonici" (Leipzig, 1879–1881), II. 

III. SACRAMENTAL EFFICACY OF THE RITE. — (A) Catholic Doctrine.—The Council of Trent (Sess. XIV, cap. i, De Extr. Unct.) teaches that "this sacred union of the sick was instituted by Christ Our Lord as a sacrament of the New Testament, truly and properly so called, being insinuated indeed in Mark vii, 13 but commended to the faithful and promulgated" by James [Ep. v, 14, 15]; and the corresponding canon (can. i, De Extr. Unct.) anathematizes anyone who would say that extreme unction is not truly a sacrament instituted by Christ Our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed Apostle James, but merely a rite received from the fathers, or a human invention." Already at the Council of Florence, in the Instruction of Eugene IV for the Armenians (Bull "ExulIatio") 22 Nov., 1442 (A.D. 1443), a prayer was composed in the unction with oil, specially blessed by the bishop, of the organs of the five external senses (eyes, ears, nostrils, lips, hands), of the feet, and, for men (where the custom exists and the condition of the patient permits his being moved), of the loins or reins; and in the case of repeated anointing with oil of the corresponding sense or faculty: "Through this holy unction and His own most tender mercy may the Lord pardon thee whatever sins or faults thou hast committed quid quidem deliquasti" by sight (sight by hearing, smell, taste, touch, walking, carnal delection). The unction of the loins is generally, if not universally, omitted in English-speaking countries, and it is of course everywhere forbidden in case of women. To perform this rite fully takes an appreciable time, but in cases of urgent necessity, when death is likely to occur before it can be completed, it is sufficient to unction with unction (orunction) which Wyeldes and Hustin have in the unmention of the corresponding sense or faculty: "Through this holy unction and His own most tender mercy may the Lord pardon thee whatever sins or faults thou hast committed." By the decree of 25 April, 1906, the Holy Office has expressly approved of this form for cases of urgent necessity.

In the Eastern Orthodox (schismatical) Church this sacrament is normally administered by a number of priests (seven, five, three; but in cases of necessity even one is enough); and it is the priests themselves who bless the oil on each occasion before use. The parts usually anointed are the forehead, chin, cheeks, hands, nostrils, and breast, and at such unmention with oil:

"Holy Father, physician of souls and of bodies, Who didst send Thy Only-Begotten Son as the healer of every disease and our deliverer from death, heal also Thy servant N. from the bodily infirmity that holds him, and make him live through the grace of Christ, by the intercessions of certain saints who are named], and of all the saints." (Goar, Euchologion, p. 417.) Each of the priests who are present repeats the whole rite.

II. NAME. — The name Extreme Unction did not become technical in the West till towards the end of the twelfth century, and has never been used in the East. Some theologians would explain its origin on the ground that this unmention was regarded as the last in order of the sacramental or quasi-sacramental unctions, being preceded by those of baptism, confirmation, and Holy orders; but, having regard to the conditions prevailing at the time when the name was introduced (see below, VI), it is much more probable that it was intended originally to mean "the unmention of those in extremis," i.e. the dying, especially as the corresponding name, sacramentum extirnum, came into common use at about the same time when the sacrament was known by a variety of names, e.g., the holy oil, or unction of the sick; the unmention or blessing of consecrated oil; the unmention of God; the office of the unmention; etc. In the Eastern Church the later technical name is σαρακομνιον (i.e. extreme unmention); but other names have been and still are in use, e.g. ελατον ἱερον (holy), or πηκτωσεν (consecrated), ελαιον, ελατο φρίνον, φρίζον, etc.

The teaching of the Council of Trent is directed chiefly against the Reformers of the sixteenth century.
Luther denied the sacramentality of extreme unction and classed it among rites that are of human or ecclesiastical institution (De Captivit. Babylonici, cap. de extr. unct.). Calvin had nothing but contempt and ridicule for this rite, which he described as a "public hypocrisy" (Instit. IV, xix, 18). He did not deny that the Jacobean rite may have had some authority in the Church, but held that it was a mere temporary institution which had lost all its efficacy since the charisma of healing had ceased (Comm. in Ep. Jacobi, v, 14, 15). The same position is taken up in the confessions of the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches. In the first edition (1531) of the Edwardine Prayer Book for the reformed Anglican Church the rite of unction for the sick, with prayers that are clearly Catholic in tone, was retained; but in the second edition (1532) this rite was omitted, and the general teaching on the sacraments shows clearly enough the intention of denying that extreme unction is a sacrament.

The same is to be said of the other Protestant bodies, and down to our day the denial of the Tridentine doctrine on extreme unction has been one of the facts that go to make up the negative unani- mity of Protestantism. At the present time, however, there has been a reaction among some of the more extreme Anglicans of Catholic teaching and practice.

Some of our clergy," writes Mr. Puller (Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition, London, 1904), "see the plain injunction about unction in the pages of the New Testament, jump hastily to the conclusion that this is the only teaching and practice in regard to unction that is right, and seek to revive the use of unction as a channel of sanctifying grace, believing that grace is imparted sacramentally through the oil as a prepara- tion for death" (p. 307). Mr. Puller himself is not prepared to go so far, though he pleads for the revival of the Jacobean unction, which he regards as the sacrament instituted for the supernatural healing of bodily sickness only. His more advanced friends can appeal to the authority of one of their classical writers, Bishop Forbes of Brechin, who admits (Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles, vol. II, p. 463) that "the unction of the sick is the Lost Pleiad of the Angli- can firmament...There has been practically lost an apostolic practice, whereby, in case of grievous sickness, the faithful were anointed and prayed over, for the forgiveness of their sins, and to restore them, if God so willed, or to give them spiritual support in their maladies".

Previous to the Reformation there appears to have been no definite hereby relating to this sacrament in particular. The Albigensians are said to have rejected it, the meaning probably being that its rejection, like that of other sacraments, was logically implied in their principles. The abuses connected with its administra- tion which prevailed in the twelfth and thirteenth cen- turies and which tended to make it accessible only to the rich, gave the Waldenses a pretext for denouncing it as the ultima superstia (cf. Preger, Beiträge zur Gesch. der Waldenser im M. A., p. 60 sqq.). That the Wycliffites and Hussites were suspected of contemning extreme unction is clear from the interrogatory already referred to, but the present writer has failed to discover any evidence of its specific rejection by these heretics.

**Proof of Catholic Doctrine from Holy Scripture.**—In this connection there are only two texts to be discussed—Mark, vi, 13, and James, v, 14, 15—and the first of these may be disposed of briefly. Some ancient writers (Victor of Antioch, Theophylactus, Euthymius, St. Bede, and others) and not a few Scholastics have a reference to this rite. The majority of them did indeed suppose that they do convey it. A few verses further on the predominating spiritual and eschatological connot- ation of "saving" in S. James's mind emerges clearly in the expression, "shall save his soul from death" (v. 20), and without necessarily excluding a reference to deliverance from bodily death in verse 18.
we are certainly justified in including in that verse a reference to the saving of the soul. Moreover, the Apostle could not, surely, have meant to teach or imply that every sick Christian who was anointed would be cured of his sickness and saved from bodily death; yet the clause most clearly enjoined a permanent liturgical function in the Church for all the sick faithful, and the saying and raising up are represented absolutely as being the normal, if not infallible, effect of its use. We know from experience (and the same has been known and noted in the Church from the beginning) that restoration of bodily health does not as a matter of fact naturally result from the unction, though it does result with sufficient frequency and without being counted miraculous to justify us in regarding it as one of the Divinely (but conditionally) intended effects of the rite. Are we to suppose, therefore, that St. James thus solemnly recommends universal recourse to a rite which, after all, will be efficacious for the purpose intended only by way of a comparatively rare exception? Yet this is what would follow if it be held that there is reference exclusively to bodily healing in the clauses which speak of the sick man being saved and raised up, and if further it be denied that the clause of healing speaks in the following clause, and which is undeniably a spiritual effect, is attributed to the unction by St. James. This is the position taken by Mr. Puller; but, apart from the arbitrary and violent breaking up of the Jacobean text which it postulates, such a view utterly fails to furnish an adequate rationale for the universal and independent character of the Apostolic prescription. Mr. Puller vainly seeks an analogy (op. cit., pp. 289 sqq.) in the absolute and universal expressions in which Christ assures us that our prayers will be heard. We admit that our rightly disposed prayers are always and inevitably efficacious; and the use of the ultimate spiritual good, but not by any means necessarily so for the specific temporal objects or even the proximate spiritual ends which we ourselves intend. Christ's promises regarding the efficacy of prayer are fully justified on this ground; but would they be justified if we were compelled to verify them by reference merely to the particular temporal boons we ask for? Yet this is how, on his own hypothesis, Mr. Puller is obliged to justify St. James's assurance that the prayer-unction shall be efficacious. But in the Catholic view, which considers the temporal boon of bodily healing as being only a by-product and subordinate end of the unitive and its paramount spiritual purpose—to confer on the sick and dying graces which they specially need—may be, and is normally, obtained, not only is an adequate rationale of the Jacobean injunction provided, but a true instead of a false analogy with the efficacy of prayer is established.

But in defence of his thesis Mr. Puller is further obliged to maintain that all reference to the effects of the unction ceases with the words, “the Lord shall raise him up”, and that in the clause immediately following, “and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him”, St. James places an underived subject-matter. All three clauses are connected in the very same way with the unction, “and the prayer of faith... and the Lord... and if he be in sins...”, so that the remission of sins is just as clearly stated to be an effect of the unction as the saying and raising up. Had St. James meant to speak of the prayer of faith as directly and apart from the third clause, he could not have written in such a way as inevitably to mislead the reader into believing that he was still dealing with an effect of the priestly unction. In the nature of things there is no reason why unction as well as absolution by a priest might not be Divinely ordained for the sacramental remission of sin, and that it was so ordained is what every reader naturally concludes from St. James. Nor is there anything in the context to suggest a reference to the Sacrament of Penance in this third clause. The admonition in the following verse (16), “Confess, therefore, and pray one to another”, may refer to a mere liturgical confession like that expressed in the “Confiteor”; but even if we take the reference to be to sacramental confession and admit the genuineness of the connecting “therefore” (its genuineness is not beyond doubt), there is no compelling reason for connecting this admonition closely with the clause which immediately precedes. The “therefore” may very well be taken as referring vaguely to the whole preceding Epistle and introducing a sort of epilogue.

Mr. Puller’s is the latest and most elaborate attempt to evade the plain meaning of the Jacobean text that we have met with; hence our reason for dealing with it so fully. It would be an endless task to notice the many other similarly arbitrary devices of interpretation to which Protestant theologians and commentators have recourse in attempting to justify their denial of the Divine efficacy of the Sacrament of the unction. Mr. Puller’s “confession” is a clear case of this, and it is enough to remark that the principal argument which he offers is one that has been disapproved by the Church in the East and West. The reason which he offers to reject the definition of a sacrament in the strict sense, an agreement which became explicit and formal as soon as the definition of a sacrament in the strict sense was formulated, but which was already implicitly and informally contained in the common practice and belief of preceding ages. We proceed, therefore, to study the witness of Tradition.

(C) Proof from Tradition.—(1) State of the Argument.—Owing to the comparative paucity of extant testimonies from the early centuries relating to this sacrament, Catholic theologians habitually recur to the liturgical prescription as the general argument for the end of the unitive, while its paramount spiritual purpose—to confer on the sick and dying graces which they specially need—may be, and is normally, obtained, not only is an adequate rationale of the Jacobean injunction provided, but a true instead of a false analogy with the efficacy of prayer is established.

But in defence of his thesis Mr. Puller is further obliged to maintain that all reference to the effects of the unction ceases with the words, “the Lord shall raise him up”, and that in the clause immediately following, “and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him”, St. James places an underived subject-matter. All three clauses are connected in the very same way with the unction, “and the prayer of faith... and the Lord... and if he be in sins...”, so that the remission of sins is just as clearly stated to be an effect of the unction as the saying and raising up. Had St. James meant to speak of the prayer of faith as directly and apart from the third clause, he could not have written in such a way as inevitably to mislead the reader into believing that he was still dealing with an effect of the priestly unction. In the nature of things there is no reason why unction as well as absolution by a priest might not be Divinely ordained for the sacramental remission of sin, and that it was so ordained is what every reader naturally concludes from St. James. Nor is there anything in the context to suggest a reference to the Sacrament of Penance in this third clause. The admonition in the following verse (16), “Confess, therefore, and pray one to another”, may refer to a mere liturgical confession like that expressed in the “Confiteor”; but even if we take the reference to be to sacramental confession and admit the genuineness of the connecting “therefore” (its genuineness is not beyond doubt), there is no compelling reason for connecting this admonition closely with the clause which immediately precedes. The “therefore” may very well be taken as referring vaguely to the whole preceding Epistle and introducing a sort of epilogue.

Mr. Puller’s is the latest and most elaborate attempt to evade the plain meaning of the Jacobean text that we have met with; hence our reason for dealing with it so fully. It would be an endless task to notice the many other similarly arbitrary devices of interpretation to which Protestant theologians and commentators have recourse in attempting to justify their denial of the Divine efficacy of the Sacrament of the unction. Mr. Puller’s “confession” is a clear case of this, and it is enough to remark that the principal argument which he offers is one that has been disapproved by the Church in the East and West. The reason which he offers to reject the definition of a sacrament in the strict sense, an agreement which became explicit and formal as soon as the definition of a sacrament in the strict sense was formulated, but which was already implicitly and informally contained in the common practice and belief of preceding ages. We proceed, therefore, to study the witness of Tradition.
several early commentators on St. James’s Epistle (by Clement of Alexandria, Didymus, St. Augustine, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and others) in which briefly we should look for reference to the unction. The earliest accurately preserved commentary is that of St. Bede (d. 735; the passage, as a witness for the sacrament, as is also Victor of Antioch (fifth century), the earliest commentator on St. Mark. Second, it is clear, at the period when testimonies become abundant, that the unction was allotted to penance as a supplementary sacrament, and as such was administered regularly before the Viaticum. We may presume that this order of administration had come down from remote antiquity, and this close connexion with penance, about which, as privately administered to the sick, the Fathers rarely speak, helps to explain their silence on extreme unction. Third, it should be remembered that there was no systematic sacramental theology before the Scholastic period, and, in the absence of this system, the interests of public instruction would call far less frequently for the treatment of this sacrament and of the other offices privately administered to the sick than would subjects of such practical importance as the preparation of catechumens and the administration and reception of those sacraments which were solemnly conferred in the church. If these, and similar considerations which might be added, are duly weighed, it will be seen that the comparative fewness of early testimonies is not after all so surprising. It should be observed, moreover, that charismatic and other unctions of the sick, even with consecrated oil, distinct from the Jacobean unction, were practised in the early ages, and that the vagueness of not a few testimonies which speak of the anointing of the sick makes it doubtful whether the reference is to the Apostolic rite or to some other usage. It should finally be premised that in stating the argument from tradition a larger place must be allowed for the principle of development than theologians of the past were in the habit of allowing. Protestant controversialists were wont virtually to demand that the early centuries should speak in the language of Trent—even Mr. Puller is considerably under the influence of this standpoint—and Catholic theologians have been prone to accommodate their defence to the terms of their adversaries’ demand. Hence they have undertaken in many cases to prove much more than the strictly bound to extant testimony that extreme unction was clearly recognized as a sacrament in the strict sense long before the definition of a sacrament in this sense was drawn up. It is a perfectly valid defence of the Tridentine doctrine on extreme unction to show that St. James permanently prescribed the rite of unction in terms that imply its strictly sacramental efficacy; that the Church for several centuries simply went on practising the rite and believing in its efficacy as taught by the Apostle, without feeling the need of a more definitely formulated doctrine than is expressed in the text of his Epistle; and that finally, when the need had arisen, the Church, in the exercise of her infallible authority, did define for all time the true meaning and proper efficacy of the Jacobean prayer-unction. It is well to keep this principle in mind in discussing the witness of the early ages, though as a matter of fact the evidence, as will be seen, proves more than we are under any obligation to prove.

(2) The Evidence.—(a) Ante-Nicene Period.—The earliest extant witness is Origen (d. 254), who, in enumerating the several ways of obtaining remission of sins, comes (seventhly) to “charismatic” penance, which involves the confession of one’s sins to the priest and the acceptance at his hands of “the salutary medicine”. And having quoted the Psalmist in support of confession, Origen adds: “And in this [in quo] is fulfilled also what St. James the Apostle says: ‘if any one is sick, let him call in the priests of the Church, and let them lay hands on him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and if he be in sins they shall be remitted to him’” (Hom. ii, in Levit., in P. G., XI, 419). We might be content to quote this as a proof merely of the fact that the injunction of St. James was well known and observed in Origen’s time, and that the rite itself was commonly spoken of at Alexandria as “a laying on of hands.” But when it is urged that he here attributes the remission of sins of which the Apostle speaks, not to the rite of unction but to the Sacrament of Penance, it is clear that while it is true the reason alleged for this interpretation of the passage. Some weight must be given to it that Origen is allegorizing, and that he takes the sick man in St. James to mean the spiritually sick or the sinner, thus changing the Apostolic injunction to the following: If anyone be in sins, let him call in the priests, and if he be in sins, they shall be remitted to him. But we cannot suppose the great Alexandrian capable of such illogicalness on his own account, or capable of attributing it to the Apostle. According to Mr. Puller (op. cit., pp. 42 sqq.), Origen, while quoting the whole text of St. James, means in reality to support the rite only to the sacrament of Penance, which would have been very much to the point and could not have caused any confusion? The truth is that the relation the Jacobean rite to penance is very obscurely stated by Origen: but, whatever may have been his views of that relation, he evidently means to speak of the whole rite, uniction, and affixing to it to assert that it is performed as a means of remitting sin for the sick. If it be held on the obscurity of the connexion that he absolutely identifies the Jacobean rite with penance, the only logical conclusion would be that he considered the unction to be a necessary part of penance for the sick. But it is much more reasonable and more in keeping with what we know of the penitential discipline of the period—Christians were admitted to canonical penance only once—to suppose that Origen looked upon the rite of unction as a supplement to penance, intended for those who either had never undergone canonical penance, or after penance might have contracted new sins, or who, owing to their “hard and laborious” course of satisfaction being cut short by sickness, might be considered need just such a complement to absolution, this complement itself being independently efficacious to remit sins or complete their remission by removal of their effects. This would fairly account for the confused grouping together of both ways of remission in the text, and it is a Catholic interpretation in keeping with the conditions of that age and with later and clearer teaching. It is interesting to observe that John Cassian, writing nearly two centuries later, and probably with this very text of Origen before him, gives similar enumeration of means for obtaining remission of sins, and in this enumeration the Jacobean rite is given as an independent place (Collat., XX, in P. L., XLIX, 1161).

Origen’s contemporary, Tertullian, in upholding heretics for neglecting the distinction between clergy and laity and allowing even women “to teach, to dispute, to perform exorcisms, to undertake curial [cura] and laborious [laboriosa] penance,” which involves the confession of one’s sins to the priest and the acceptance at his hands of “the salutary medicine”. And having quoted the Psalmist in support of confession, Origen adds: “And in this [in quo] is fulfilled also what St. James the Apostle says: ‘if any one is sick, let him call in the
to the belief that its administration was reserved to the priests.

St. Aphraates, "the Persian Sage", though he wrote (336–345) after Nicaea, may be counted as an Ante-

Nicene witness, since he lived outside the limits of the great Council, and was not influenced through ignorance of the Arian schism. Writing of the various uses of holy oil, this Father says that it contains the sign of the sacrament of life by which Christians [in baptism], priests [in ordination], kings, and prophets are made perfect; [it] illuminates darkness [in confirmation], anointa the sick; and by its secret anointment restores patients" (Denzinger, No. 223, 3, in Graffin, "Patrol. Syriaca", vol. I, p. iv).

It is hardly possible to question the allusion here to the Jacoeban rite, which was therefore in regular use in the remote Persian Church at the beginning of the fourth century. Its mention side by side with other unctions that are not sacramental in the strict sense is characteristic of the period, and merely shows that the strict definition of a sacrament had not been formulated. As being virtually Ante-Nicene we may give also the witness of the collection of liturgical prayers known as the "Sacramentary of Sarapion" (Sera-

pion, a Bishop of Thymiur in the Nile Delta and the friend of St. Athanasius.) The seventeenth prayer is a lengthy form for consecrating the oil of the sick, in the course of which God is besought to bestow upon the oil a supernatural efficacy "for good grace and remis-
sion of sins, for a medicine of life and salvation, for healthfulness of soul, body, spirit" (see p. 529 of the English translation). Here we have not only the recognition in plain terms of spiritual effects from the unction but the special mention of grace and the remission of sins. Mr. Puller tries to explain away several of these expressions, but he has no refuge from the force of the words. A "good grace and remission of sins" but an hold that they must be a later addition to the original text.

(b) The Great Patriarchic Age: Fourth to Seventh Century.—References to extreme unction in this period are much abundant and prove beyond doubt the universal use of the Jacoeban unction in every part of the Church. Some testimonies, moreover, refer specifically to one or more of the several ends and effects of the sacrament, as the cure or alleviation of bodily sickness and the remission of sins, while some may be said to anticipate pretty clearly the definition of extreme unction as a sacrament, and illustrating the universal use of the Jacoeban unction, we may cite in the first place St. Ephraem Syrus (d. 373), who in his forty-sixth polemical sermon (Opera, Rome, 1740, vol. II, p. 541), addressing the sick person to whom the priests minister, says: "They pray over thee; one blows on thee; another seals thee." The "sealing" here undoubtedly means "anointing with the sign of the cross", and the reference to St. James is clear [see Bickell, Carmina Nisibena, Leipzig, 1866, pp. 223, 4, note, and the other passage (seventy-third carmen) there discussed]. Nor would we call attention to the witness of an ancient Ordo compiled, it is believed, in Greek before the middle of the fourth century, but which is pre-

served only in a fragmentary Latin version made be-

fore the end of the fifth century and recently discov-
ered at Verona ("Didascalie Apostolorum" in "Frag-

menta Veronensia", ed. Hauler, Leipzig, 1900), and in an Ethiopic version. This Ordo in both versions con-

tains a form for consecrating the oil for the Jacoeban rite, the Latin praying for "the strengthening and healing" of those who use it, and the Ethiopic for their "strengthening and sanctification". Mr. Puller, who elsewhere discourses on this Ordo (p. 45 sq.), is once more obliged to postulate a corruption of the Ethiopic version because of the reference to san-

cification. But may not the "strengthening" spoken of as distinct from "healing" be spiritual rather than corporal? Likewise the "Testamentum Domini", compiled in Greek about the year 400 or earlier, and preserved in Syriac (published by Rahmani), and in Ethiopic and Arabic versions (still in MSS.), contains a form for consecrating the oil of the sick, in which, besides bodily healing, the sanctifying power of the oil is referred to in imitation of the "extreme unction of Our Lord", tr. Cooper and Maclean, 1902, pp. 77, 78). From these instances it appears that Sera-

pion's Sacramentary was not without parallels during this period.

In St. Augustine's "Speculum de Spiritu et Agente" (an. 427; in P. L. XXXII, 223), he is moved up to almost entirely of Scriptural texts, without comment by the compiler, and is intended as a handy manual of Christian piety, doctrinal and practical, the injunction of St. James regarding the prayer-unction of the sick is quoted. This shows that the rite was a common-

place in the Christian practice of that age; and we are told by Possidius, in his "Life of Augustine" (c. xxvii, in P. L., XXXII, 56), that the saint himself "followed the rule laid down by the Apostle that he should visit only orphans and widows in their tribulation (James, i, 27), and that if he happened to be asked by the sick to pray for him to the Lord, and since he had done so, he did so without delay". We have seen Origen refer to the Jacoeban rite as an "imposition of hands"; and this title survived to a very late period in the Church of St. Ambrose, who was himself an ardent student of Origen and from whom St. Augustine very clearly borrowed Matt. xxviii, 19, xxix, 19, and xxiv, 33, as well as Origen in St. Athanasius. St. Augustine himself used to administer the Jacoeban unction to the sick. This would be exactly on the lines laid down by Augustine's contemporary, Pope Innocent I (see below). St. Ambrose himself, writing against the Novatians (De Pecc., VIII, in P. L., XVI, 477), asks: "Why therefore do you lay on hands and believe it to be an effect of the blessing [benedic-
tionis opus] if any of the sick happen to recover? Why do you baptize, if sins cannot be remitted by men?" The coupling of this laying-on of hands with baptism and the use of both as arguments in favour of extreme unction, shows that Augustine was in question at least of the charismatic healing by a simple blessing, but of a rite which, like baptism, was in regular use among the Novatians, and which can only have been the unction of St. James. St. Athanasius, in his encyclical letter of 341 (P. G., XXXV, 234), complaining of the evils to religion caused by the intrusion of the Arian Bishop Gregory, mentions among other abuses that many catechumens were left to die without baptism and that many sick and dying Christians had to choose the hard alternative of being deprived of priestly ministrations which they considered a more terrible calamity than the disease itself, "hence the Jacoeban rite to be laid on their heads". Here again we are justified in seeing a reference to extreme unction as an ordinary Christian practice, and a proof of the value which the faithful attached to the rite. Cassiodorus (d. about 570) thus paraphrases the in-

junction of St. James (Complexiones in Epp. Aposto-
lorum, in P. L., LXX, 1380): "a priest is to be called in, who by the prayer of faith [oratione fidei] and the unction of the holy oil which he imparts will save him who is afflicted [by a serious injury or by sickness]." To these testimonies may be added many instances of the use of extreme unction recorded in the lives of the saints. See, e. g., the lives of St. Leobinus (d. about 550; Acta SS., 14 March, p. 348), St. Tresanus (ibid., 7 Feb., p. 55), St. Eugene (Eoghan), Bishop of Ardbracc (modern Ardstraw), in the Diocese of Derry; d. about 618; ibid., 23 Aug., p. 627). One instance
from the life of an Eastern saint, Hypatius (d. about 446), is worthy of particular notice. While still a young monk and before his elevation to the priesthood, he was appointed infirmary physician in his monastery (in Bithynia), and while occupying this office he gradually acquired a great deal of charity in his care of the sick, whom he sought out and brought to the monastery. “But if the necessity arose,” says his disciple and biographer, “of anointing the sick person, he reported to the abbot, who was a priest (ἀρτέρων ἔφη), and had theunction with the blessed oil performed by him. And it often happened that in a few days, by persevering in these efforts, he saved a man home restored to health” (Acta SS., 17 June, p. 251).

It appears from this testimony that the Jacobean unction was administered only to those who were seriously ill, that only a priest could administer it, that consecrated oil was used, that it was distinct from the sacrament of unction (which the saint himself used to perform, while still a layman, using consecrated oil), and finally that bodily healing did not always follow and was not apparently expected to follow, and that when it did take place it was not regarded as miraculous. It is, therefore, implied that other effects besides bodily healing were believed to be produced by the Jacobean unction, and these must be understood to be spiritual.

As evidence of the use of the unction by the Nestorians we may refer to the nineteenth canon of the synod held at Seleucia in 554 under the presidency of the Patriarch of Antioch, and in which St. Cyril of Alexandria, speaking of the fathers who have been addicted to various disoblitative and superstitious practices, prescribes that any such person on being converted shall have applied to him, “as to one who is corporally sick, the oil of prayer blessed by the priests” (Chabot, Synodicon Orientale, 1902, p. 363). Here, besides the Jacobean unction, we have an early instance of an abuse, which prevails in the modern Orthodox (schismatical) church, of permitting the euchelaios to be administered, on certain days of the year, to people who are in perfect health, as a complement of penance and a preparation for Holy Communion (see below VI, (3)).

That the Monophysites also retained the Jacobean unction after their separation from the Catholic Church (451) is clear from the fact that their liturgies (Armenian, Syrian, and Coptice) contain the rite for blessing the oil. There is reason to suppose that this practice has developed, in its present form, from a rite borrowed from, or modelled upon, the Byzantine rite of a later period (see Brightman in “Journal of Theological Studies”, 1, p. 261), but this rite supposes that they already possessed the unction itself. It has nowadays fallen into disuse among the Nestorians and Armenians, though not among the Coptes.

Many testimonies might be quoted in which the Jacobean unction is recommended specifically as a means of restoring bodily health, and the faithful are urged to receive it instead of recurring, as they were prone to do, to various superstitious remedies. This is the burden of certain passages inProcopius of Gaza [c. 465-525; “In Levit.” xix, 31, in P. G. LXXVI (1), 762 sq.], Isaac of Antioch (b. about 380; Opp. ed. Bickell, Pl. i, pp. 187 sq.), St. Cyril of Alexandria (De Adorat. in Spiritu et Veritate, VI, in P. G., LXVIII, 475 sq.), and John Mandakuni (Montagouni), Catholicos of the Armenians from 480 to 487 (Schmid, Reden des Jeanes Mandakuni, pp. 222 sq.). This particular effect of the prayer-unction is the one especially emphasized in the form used to this day in the Orthodox Eastern Church (see above, I).

Mention of the remission of sins as an effect of the Jacobine rite is also fairly frequent. It is coupled with bodily healing by St. Caehistorius in the passage just referred to: the sick person will “receive both health of body and remission of sins, for the Holy Ghost has given this promise through James”. We have mentioned the witness of John Cassian, and the witness of his master, St. Chrysostom, may be given here. In his work “On the Priesthood” (III, vi, in P. G., XLVIII, 475 sq.), St. Chrysostom proves the dignity of the priesthood by showing, among other arguments, that the priests by their spiritual ministry do more than any one of our own parents can do. Whereas our parents only bestow our bodies, which they cannot save from death and disease, the priests regenerate our souls in baptism and have power, moreover, to remit post-baptismal sins. A power which St. Chrysostom proves by quoting the text of St. James. The passage, as orig- gen discussed above, has given rise to no little controversy, and it is claimed by Mr. Puller (op. cit., pp. 45 sqq.) as a proof that St. Chrysostom, like Origen, understood St. James as he (Mr. Puller) does. But if this were so it would be still true that only clinical penance is referred to, and this text of the sick that St. James can be understood to speak; and the main point of Mr. Puller’s argument, viz., that it is inconceivable that St. Chrysostom should pass over the Sacrament of Penance in such a context, would have lost all but hardly any of its force. We know very little, except by way of inference and assumption, about the practice of clinical penance in that age; but we are well acquainted with canonical penance as administered to those in good health, and it is to this obviously we should expect the saint to refer, if he were bound to fill the text so. Mr. Puller is probably aware how very difficult it would be to prove that St. Chrysostom anywhere in his voluminous writings teaches clearly and indisputably the necessity of confessing to a priest: in other words, that he recognizes the Sacrament of Penance as Mr. Puller recognizes it; and in view of this great obscurity in the meaning of the passage, the fundamental importance it is not at all so strange that penance should be passed over here. We do not pretend to be able to enter into St. Chrysostom’s mind, but assuming that he recognized both penance and unction to be efficacious for the remission of post-baptismal sins—and the text before us plainly states this in regard to the unction—we may perhaps find in the greater affinity of unction with baptism, and in the particular points of contrast he is developing, a reason why unction rather than penance is appealed to. Regeneration by water in baptism appears to be of greater importance than the oil from spiritual disease and eternal death to the inability of parents to save their children from bodily disease and death. St. Chrysostom might have added several other points of contrast, but he confines himself in this context to these two; and supposing, as one ought in all cases, to suppose, that he understood the text of St. James as we do, in its obvious and natural sense, it is evident that the prayer-unction, so much more akin to baptism in the simplicity of its ritual character and so naturally suggested by the mention of sickness and death, supplied a much more illustrative point of priestly power of remitting post-baptismal sins than the judicial process of penance. And a single illustrative example was all that the context required.

Victor of Antioch (fifth century) is one of the ancient witnesses who, in the general terms they employ, speak of the Jacobean unction, anticipate more or less clearly the definition of a sacrament in the strict sense. Commenting on St. Mark, vi, 13, Victor quotes the text of St. James and adds: “Oil both cures pains and is a source of light and refreshment. The oil, then, used in anointing signifies both the mercy of God, and the cure of the disease, and the enlightening of the heart. For it is manifest to all that the prayer effected all this; but the oil, as I think, was the symbol of these things” (Cramer, Catena. Grec. Patrum, I, p. 324). Here we have the distinction, so well known in later theology, between the signification
and causality of a sacrament; only Victor attributes the signification entirely to the matter and the causality to the form (the prayer). This was to be corrected in the fully developed sacramental theory of later times, but the attribution of sacramental effects to the form, as the word of the minister, is characteristic of the patristic suggestions of a theory. Victor clearly attributes both spiritual and corporal effects to the prayer—unction; nor can the fact that he uses the imperfect tense (\(\text{\textit{a}}\,\text{\textit{p}}\text{\textit{ere}}\), "effected"); \(\text{\textit{\d{e}}\,\text{\textit{p}}}\text{\textit{ere}}\), "was") be taken to imply that the use of the unction had ceased at Anno. Both the latter day. The use of the present tense in describing the signification of the rite implies the contrary, and independent evidence is clearly against the supposition. In the passage from John Mandakuni, referred to above, the prayer-unction is repeatedly described as "the gift of grace," "the grace of God," Divinely instituted and prescribed, and which cannot be neglected and despised without incurring "the curse of the Apostles"; language which it is difficult to understand unless we suppose the Armenian patriarch to have reckoned the unction among the most sacred of Christian rites, or, in other words, regarded it as that which we describe as a sacrament in the strict sense (cf. Kern, op. cit., pp. 46, 47).

There remains to be noticed under this head the most celebrated of all patristic testimonies on extreme unction, the well-known passage in the Letter of Pope Innocent I (402–17), written in 416, to Decentius, Bishop of the same see, in answer to inquiries for charitable, not allowed by the latter for solution. In answer to the question as to who were entitled to the unction, the pope, having quoted the text of St. James, says:

"There is no doubt that this text must be received or understood of the sick faithful, who may be lawfully anointed with the holy oil of which he has been blessed by the bishop, it is permitted not only to priests but to all Christians to use for anointing in their own need or that of their families." Then he diverges to point out the superfluous character of a further doubt expressed by Decentius: We notice the superfluous addition of a doubt whether a bishop may do what is undoubtedly permitted to priests. For priests are expressly mentioned [by St. James] for the reason that bishops, hindered by other occupations, cannot go to all the sick. But if the bishop is able to do or thinks anyone specially worthy of being visited, he, with the assistance of God, is to consent to the anointing of the sick. Hence, the pope adduced the words, "if he be in sins they shall be remitted to him," after quoting I Cor., xi, 30, to prove that "many because of sins committed in the soul are stricken with bodily sickness or death he goes on to speak of the necessity of confession: "If, therefore, the sick be in sins and shall have confessed these to the priests of the Church and shall have sincerely undertaken to relinquish and amend them, they shall be remitted to them. For sins cannot be remitted without the confession of amendment. Hence the injunction is rightly added [by St. James]: "Confess, therefore, your sins" (op. cit., 59 sq.), omits all reference to the Holy Eucharist, though it is by far the most obvious and important of the "other sacraments" of which Innocent is speaking, and diverts his reader's attention to the eulogia, or blessed bread (\textit{paulo \textit{benedictum}}), a sacramental which was in use in many churches at that time and in later ages, but to which there is not the least reason for believing that the pope meant specially to refer. In any case the reference is certainly not exclusive, as Mr. Puller leaves his reader to infer. What Pope Innocent explicitly teaches is that the "sacrament" enjoined by St. James was to be administered to the sick faithful who were not doing canonical penance; that priests, and a fortiori bishops, can administer it; but that the oil must be blessed by the bishop. The exclusion of sick penitents from this "sacrament" must be understood, of course, as being subject to the same exception as their exclusion from the other sacraments", and the latter are directed to be given before the annual Easter reconciliation when danger of death is imminent: "Quando usque ad desperandum veniit, ante tempus passione relaxandum [est] ne de seculo [agrotus] absque communione discedat." If the words of Innocent—and the same observation applies to other ancient testimonies, e.g. to that of Cassarius of Arles referred to above—seem to imply that the laity were permitted to anoint themselves or members of their household with the oil itself, this is not impossible nor altogether unreasonable to understand the language used by Innocent and others in a causative sense, i.e. as meaning not that the laity were permitted to anoint themselves, but that they were to have the blessed oil at hand to secure their being anointed by the priest according to the prescription of St. James. We believe, however, that this is a forced and unnatural way of understanding such testimonies, all the more so as there is demonstrative evidence of the devotional and charitable use of sacred oil by the laity during the middle centuries.

It is worth adding, as a conclusion to our survey of this period, that Innocent's reply to Decentius was incorporated in various early collections of canon law, some of which, as for instance that of Dionysius Exiguus (P. L., LXVII, 240), were made towards the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century. In this way Innocent's text became known and was received as law in most parts of the Western Church.

(c) The Seventeenth Century and Later.—One of the most important witnesses for this period is St. Bede (d. 735), who, in his commentary on the Epistle of St. James, tells us (P. L., XCIII, 19), that, as in Apostolic times, so now the custom of the Church is that the sick should be anointed by the priests with consecrated oil and through the accompanying prayer restored to health. He adds that, according to Pope Innocent, even the laity may use the oil provided it has been consecrated by a bishop; and commenting on the clause, "if he be in sins they shall be remitted to him," after quoting I Cor., xi, 30, to prove that "many because of sins committed in the soul are stricken with bodily sickness or death," he goes on to speak of the necessity of confession: "If, therefore, the sick be in sins and shall have confessed these to the priests of the Church and shall have sincerely undertaken to relinquish and amend them, they shall be remitted to them. For sins cannot be remitted without the confession of amendment. Hence the injunction is rightly added [by St. James]: "Confess, therefore, your sins" (op. cit., 59 sq.), omits all reference to the Holy Eucharist, though it is by far the most obvious and important of the "other sacraments" of which Innocent is speaking, and diverts his reader's attention to the eulogia, or blessed bread (\textit{paulo \textit{benedictum}}), a sacramental which was in
baptismal sins, a necessity recognized in Catholic teaching, Bede does not deny that theunction also may be efficacious in remitting, or at least in completing their remission, or in remitting the lighter daily sins which need not be confessed. The bodily sickness which the unctio, or intended to heal is regarded by St. Paschasius as being, often at any rate, the effect of sin, and it is interesting to notice that Amalarius of Metz, writing a century later (De Ecclesi. Offic., I, xii, in P. L., CV, 1011 sq.), with this passage of Bede before him, expressly attributes to the unctio not only the healing of sickness due to the unworthy reception of the Eucharist, but the remission of daily châtiments. The unctio saves the sick is manifestly the prayer of faith, of which the sign is the unction of oil. If those whom the unction of oil, i.e. the grace of God through the prayer of the priest, assist are sick for the reason that they eat the Body of the Lord unworthily, it is right that the consecration of the oil of which there is question should be associated with the consecration of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which takes place in commemoration of the Passion of Christ, by whom the author of sin has been eternally vanquished. The Passion of Christ destroyed the author of death; His grace, which is signified by the unction of oil, has destroyed his arms, which are daily sins.

The confusing way in which St. Bede introduces penance in connexion with the text of St. James is intelligible enough when we remember that the unction was regarded and administered as a complement of the Sacrament of Penance. The unction had yet been raised about their respective independent effects. In the circumstances of the age it was more important to insist on the necessity of confession than to discuss with critical minuteness the effects of the unction, and one had to be careful not to allow the text to be misunderstood or to be misunderstood with this necessity for the sick sinner. The passage in St. Bede merely proves that he was preoccupied with some such idea in approaching the text of St. James. Paschasius Radbertus (writing about 831) says from the same standpoint that "according to the Apostle when anyone is sick, recourse is to be had in the first place to confession of sins, then to the prayer of many, then to the sanctification of the unction (or, the unction of sanctification)" (De Corp. et Sang. Domini, c. viii, in P. L., CXX, 1292); and the same writer, in what he tells us of the death of his abbot, St. Adalbert of Corbie, in 821, speaks of the prevalence of an opinion that it was only those in sin who had need of the unction. The assembled monks, who regarded the holy ablution as "free from the burdens of sins", doubted whether they should procure the Apostolic unction for him. But the saint, overhearing the debate, demanded that it should be given at once, and with his dying breath exclaimed: "Now dismiss thy servant in peace, because I have received all the sacraments of Thy mystery" (P. L., CXX, 1547).

As proving the uninterrupted universality during this period of the practice of the Jacobean rite, with a clear indication in some instances of its strictly sacramental efficacy, we shall add some further testimonies from writers, synods, and the precepts of particular bishops. As doubts may be raised regarding the age of any particular expression in the early medieval liturgies, we shall omit all reference to any suggestion is all the less need to be exhaustive as the adversaries of Catholic teaching are compelled to admit that from the eighth century onwards the strictly sacramental conception of the Jacobean rite emerges clearly in the writings and legislation of both the Eastern and the Western Churches. Be this as it may, St. Hilary, Bishop of Lyons (315-367), in his Homily on Luke, ix. (6, P. L., CVIII, 573), and Amulo, Bishop of Lyons (about 841), in his letter to Theobald (P. L., CXLVI, 82), speak of the unction of the sick as an Apostolic practice. Prudentius, Bishop of Treves (about 843-861), tells how the holy virgin Maura asked to receive from his own hands "the Sacraments of the Eucharist and of Extreme Unction" (P. L., CVI, 1374; cf. Acta SS., 21 Sept., p. 272); and Jonas, Bishop of Orleans, in his "Institutio Laicæ" (about 829), after reprobating the popular practice of recurring in sickness to magical observances, ordains that "in sickness to demand, not from wizards and witches, but from the Church and her priests, the unction of sanctified oil, a remedy which [as coming from Our Lord Jesus Christ] will benefit him not only in body but in soul" (III, xiv, in P. L., CVI, 122 sq.). Already the Second Council of Orleans (818) in its first canon, had prescribed as obligatory the unction enjoined by St. James, "since a medicine of this kind which heals the sicknesses of soul and of body is not to be lightly esteemed" (Hardouin, IV, 1040). The Council of Aachen in 830 warns the priest not to neglect giving penance and unction to the sick person (once his illness becomes serious), and when the end is seen to be imminent the soul is to be commended to God "more sacerdotali cum receptione sacri munitionis" (cap. ii, can. v, ibid., 1397). The First Council of Mainz (847), held under the presidency of St. Paschasius Maurus (can. iii), prescribed the order of the administration of penance, unction, and the Viaticum (Hardouin, V, 13); while the Council of Pavia (850), legislating, as seems clear from the wording of the capitulary (viii), according to the traditional interpretation of Pope Innocent’s letter to Germanus, proscribes as those who commit the sins of consecrating the sacred anointing, and the blessed oil, in instructing the faithful regarding “that salutary sacrament which James the Apostle commands . . . a truly great and very much to be desired mystery, by which, if asked for with faith, both sins are remitted and as a consequence corporal health restored” (ibid., I, 27; Denzinger, 1908, no. 415). The statutes attributed to St. Sonnatus, Archbishop of Reims (about 600-631), and which are certainly anterior to the ninth century, direct (no. 15) that “extreme unction is to be brought to the sick person who asks for it”, and “that the priest himself is to visit him often, animating and duly preparing him for future glory” (P. L., LXXX, 445; cf. Hefele, Conciliumgesch., III, 77). The fourth of the canons promulgated (about 745) by St. Boniface, the Apostles of Germany (see Hefele, III, 350 sq.), forbids priests to "order the chalice, without the consecration, and the blessed oil, and the Eucharist", so that in any emergency they may be ready to offer their ministrations; and the twenty-ninth orders all priests to have the oil of the sick always with them and to warn the sick faithful to apply for the unction (P. L., LXXXIX, 382 sq.). In the "Exceptiones" of Egbert, Archbishop of York (732-766), the unction is mentioned between penance and the Eucharist, and ordered to be diligently administered (P. L., LXXXIX, 382). But no writer of this period treats of the unction so fully as, and none more unqualmily regards it as a true sacrament in the strict sense like, Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, and with him we will conclude our list of witnesses. A long section of his second Capitulare, published in 789, is taken up with the subject (P. L., (V, 220 sq.)): "Priests are also to be admonished regarding the unction of the sick, and penance, and the Viaticum, lest any one should die without the Viaticum." Penance is to be given first, and then, “if the sickness allow it,” the patient is to be carried to the church, where the unction and Holy Communion are to be given. Theodulf describes the unction in detail, ordering fifteen, or three times more, crosses to be made with the oil to symbolize the Trinity and the five senses, but noting at the same time that the practice varies as to the number of anointings and the parts anointed. He quotes with approval the form used by the Greeks while anointing, in which re- mission of sins is expressly mentioned; and so clearly is the unction in his view intended as a preparation for
death that he directs the sick person after receiving it
to commend his soul into the hands of God and bid
farewell to the living. He enjoins the unction of sick
children also on the ground that it sometimes cures
them, and that penance is (often) necessary for them.
This teaching is so clear and definite that
Protestant controversialists recognize him as the
originator in the West of the teaching which, as they
claim, transformed the Jacobean rite into a sacrament.
But from all that precedes it is abundantly clear that
no such transformation occurred. Some previous
writers, also, have seen, had explicitly taught an
instrument which claimed the sanctity of Theodore's
doctrine, to which a still more definite expression was
later to be given. The Scholastic and Tridentine doc-
trine is the only goal to which patristic and medieval
teaching could logically have led.

IV. MATTER AND FORM.—(For the technical mean-
ing of these terms in sacramental law see Sacra-
ments.)—(1) The remote matter of extreme unction
is consecrated oil. No one has ever doubted that
the oil meant by St. James is the oil of olives, and in
the Western Church pure olive oil without mixture of any
other substance seems to have been almost always
used. But in the Eastern Church the custom was intro-
duced early of adding in some places a little water,
as a symbol of baptism, in others a little wine, in
memory of the good Samaritan, and, among the Nester-
ian, a little ashes or dust from the sepulchre of some saint.
But that the oil must be blessed or con-
secrated, or that the oil used is the homily oil, has
been the subject of much discussion from the begin-
ing of the ages. Some theologians, however, have held
consecration to be necessary merely as a matter of
precept, not essential for the validity of the sacrament,
E. g. Victoria (Summ. Sacrætorum, no. 219),
Jouin (Comm. hist. et dogm. de Saccram., D. vii, q. iii,
c. 18), Drouin (De Re Sacrætorum, Lib. vii, q. ii, c. 1, 2);
indeed Bertin, while holding the opposite himself, ad-
mitted the wide prevalence of this view among the
recent theologians of his day. But considering the
unchangeable character of the institution, and insist in on the oil being
blessed, and the teaching of the Council of Trent
(Sess. XIV) that “the Church has understood
the matter of this sacrament to be oil blessed by the
bishop,” it is not surprising that by a decree of the
Holy Office, issued 13 Jan., 1611, the proposition as-
serting the validity of extreme unction with the use of
oil not consecrated by the bishop should have been
proscribed as “rush and near to error” (Denzinger,
no. 1628—old no. 1194), and that, to the question whether a parish priest could in case of necessity val-
didly use for this sacrament oil blessed by himself, the
same Holy Office, reafirming the previous sentence,
should have replied in the negative (14 Sept., 1842;
ibid., no. 1629—old no. 1195). These decisions only
settle the dogmatic question provisionally and, so far
as they affirm the necessity of episcopal
consecration of the oil, are applicable only to the Western
Church as is well known, it is the officiating priest
who ordinarily bless the oil in the Western Church,
and there is no lack of evidence to prove the
antiquity of this practice (see Benedict XIV, De Synod.
Dioec. VIII, i, 4). For Italo-Greeks in communion with
the Holy See the practice was sanctioned by
Clement VII in 1535 and by Benedict XIV (see ibid.)
in 1742; and it has likewise been sanctioned for vari-
ous bodies of Eastern Unists down to our own day (see "Collect. Licencias", II, pp. 35, 150, 582, 479 sq.; cf.
Letter of Leo XIII, "De Discipl. Orient. conserv-
anda," in "Acta S. Nobilis", XXVII, pp. 257 sq.). The
reason, therefore, that priests can be dele-
gated to bless the oil validly, and though there is no
evidence on such delegation being given to Western
priests. But it is only the supreme authority
in the Church that can grant delegation, or at least it
may reserve to itself the power of granting it (in case
one should wish to maintain that in the absence of
reservation the ordinary bishop would have this
power). The Eastern Unists have the express appro-
bation of the Holy See for their discipline, and, as
regards the schismatical Orthodox, one may say either
that they have the tacit approbation since the res-
ervation of episcopal power does not ex-
tend to them. In spite of the schism the pope has
never wished or intended to abrogate the ancient
privileges of the Orthodox in matters of this kind.
The prayers for blessing the oil that have come down
to us differ very widely, but all of them bear
reference to the purpose of anointing the sick. Hence,
least in a case of a bishop, whose power is ordinary
and not delegated, no special form would seem to be
necessary for validity, provided this purpose is ex-
pressed. But where it is not at all expressed or
intended, as in the forms at present used for blessing the
chrism and the oil of catechumens, it appears doubtful
whether either of these oils would be valid matter
for extreme unction (cf. Kern, op. cit., p. 131). But in
the nature of things there does not seem to be any
reason why a composite form of blessing might not
suffice to make the same oil valid matter for more than
one of the sacraments.

(2) The proximate matter of extreme unction is
the unction with consecrated oil. The parts anointed
according to present usage in the Western and Eastern
Churches have been stated above (1), but it is to
be observed that even to-day there are differences of
practice in various branches of the Orthodox Church
(see Echos d'Orient, 1899, p. 194). The question is
whether several unctions are necessary for a valid
sacrament, and if so, which are the essential ones.
Arguing from the practice with which they were ac-
quired and which they assumed to have existed
away, the Scholastics and the Traditionalists usu-
ally think that the unctions of the five organs of sense were
essential. This was the teaching of St. Thomas (Suppl.,
Q. xxxii, a. 6), who has been followed pretty una-
niously by the School and by many later theologians
down to our own day (e. g. Billot, De Sacramentis, II,
p. 231) who set the method and tradition of the School
above positive and historical theology. But a wider
knowledge of past and present facts has made it in-
creasingly difficult to defend this view, and the best
theologians of recent times have denied that the un-
cion of the five senses, any more than that of the foot
senses, is essential for the validity of the unction.
The facts, broadly speaking, are these: that no ancient
testimony mentions the five unctions at all, much less
prescribes them as necessary, but most of them speak
simply of unction in a way that suggests the sufficiency
of a single unction; that the unction of the five senses
has never been extensively practised in the East,
and is not practised at the present time in the Orthodox
Church, while those Unists who practise it have sim-
ply borrowed it in modern times from Rome; and
that even in the Western Church down to the eleventh
century the practice was not very widespread, and did
not become universal till the seventeenth century.
This is proved by a number of sixteenth-century Rituals
that have been preserved (for details and sources see
Kern, op. cit., p. 133 sq.). In face of these facts it is
impossible any longer to defend the Scholastic view
except by maintaining that the Church has frequently
changed the essential matter of the sacrament, or that
she has allowed it to be invalidly administered during
the greater part of her history, as she still allows with-
out protest in the East. The only conclusion, there-
fore, is that as far as the matter is concerned nothing
more is required for a valid sacrament than a true un-
ction with duly consecrated oil, and that the unction
may henceforth be regarded as certain by reason of the
recent decree of the Holy Office already referred to
(1), which, though it speaks only of the form, evi-
dently supposes that form to be used with a single
unction. Besides the authority of the Scholastic tradition, which was based on ignorance of the facts, the only dogmatic argument for the view we have rejected is to be found in the instruction of Eugene IV to the Armenians [see above, III (A)]. But in reply to this it is enough to mark that this is not a dogmatic definition but a disciplinary instruction, and that, if it were a definition, those who appeal to it ought in consistency to hold the unction of the feet and hands to be essential. It is hardly necessary to add that, while denying the necessity of the unctions prescribed in the Roman Ritual for the validity of the sacrament, there is no mention of denouncing the grave obligation of adhering strictly to the Ritual except, as the Holy Office allows, in cases of urgent necessity.

(3) The forms of extreme unction from the Roman Ritual and the Euchologion have been given above (1). However ancient may be either form in its substance, it is certain that many other forms substantially different from the present have been in use both in the East and the West (see Martène, "De Antiquis Eccl. Rit.", I, vi, 4; and Kern, op. cit., pp. 142-152); and the controversy among theologians as to what precise form or kind of form is necessary for the validity of the sacrament has followed pretty much the same lines as that about the proximate matter. That some form is essential, and that what is essential is contained in both the Eastern and Western forms now in use, is admitted by all. The problem is to decide not merely whether a form in either case may be omitted without invalidating the sacrament, but whether the words retained as essential must necessarily express a prayer—"the prayer of faith" spoken of by St. James. Both forms as now used are depreciatory, and for the West the Holy Office has decided that words may be omitted in cases of necessity. But the form of the Roman Ritual. That the form, whether short or long, must be a prayer-form, and that a mere indicative form, such as "I anoint thee" etc., would not be sufficient for validity, has been the opinion of most of the great Scholastics and of many later theologians. But not a few Scholastics of eminence, and nearly all later theologians who have made due allowance for the facts of history, have upheld the opposite view. For the fact is that the indicative form has been widely used in the East and still more widely in the West, it is the form we meet with in the very earliest Church Orders preserved, viz., those of the Celtic Church (see Warren, "Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church", e.g. p. 168: "I anoint thee with sanctified oil in the name of the Trinity that thou mayst be saved for ever and ever"; cf. p. 223). Among contemporary theologians Kern (op. cit., pp. 151 sq.), who is followed by Pohle (Lehrbuch der Dogmatik, 3d ed., Paderborn, 1908, III, 534), suggests a compromise by holding, on the one hand, that at least a virtual prayer-form is required by the text of St. James and, on the other hand, that the indicative forms that have been and are virtually depreciatory, if this seems to be only a subtle way of denying the raison d'être of the controversy; one might argue on the same principle that the forms of baptism, penance, and confirmation are virtually prayer-forms. Some of the so-called indicative forms may be reasonably construed in the same way, with Benedict XIV, that "we do not know how a prayer can be discovered in certain other forms published from very many ancient Rituals by Ménard and Martène, in which there is used merely the words "I anoint thee" without any thing else being added from which a prayer can be deduced." (De Sacram. Consecr., VIII, ii, 2).

If it be insisted that prayer as such must be in some way an element in the sacrament, one may say that the prayer used in blessing the oil satisfies this requirement. What has been said in regard to the matter is to be repeated here, viz., that the dogmatic contro-

versy about the form does not affect the disciplinary obligation of adhering strictly to the prescriptions of the Ritual, or, for cases of urgent necessity, to the decree of the Holy Office.

V. MINISTER.—(1) The Council of Trent has defined in accordance with the words of St. James that the proper ministers (ministros) are the priests of the Church alone, that is, bishops or priests ordained by them (Sess. XIV, cap. iii, and can. iv, De Extr. Unct.). And this has been the constant teaching of tradition, as is clear from the testimonies given above. Yet Launoi (Opp., I, 569 sq.) has maintained that deaconary and sub-deaconary can validly administer extreme unction, appealing in support of his view to certain cases in which they were authorized in the absence of a priest to reconcile dying penitents and give them the Viaticum. But in none of these cases is extreme unction once mentioned or referred to, and one may not gratuitously assume that the permission given extended to this sacrament, all the more so as there is not a particle of evidence from any other source to support the assumption. The Carmelite Thomas Waldens (d. 1430) inferred from the passage of Innocent I (see above, under III (C), (b)) that, in essence for the validizing of the sacrament has followed pretty much the same lines as that about the proximate matter. That some form is essential, and that what is essential is contained in both the Eastern and Western forms now in use, is admitted by all. The problem is to decide not merely whether a form in either case may be omitted without invalidating the sacrament, but whether the words retained as essential must necessarily express a prayer—"the prayer of faith" spoken of by St. James. Both forms as now used are depreciatory, and for the West the Holy Office has decided that words may be omitted in cases of necessity. But the form of the Roman Ritual. That the form, whether short or long, must be a prayer-form, and that a mere indicative form, such as "I anoint thee" etc., would not be sufficient for validity, has been the opinion of most of the great Scholastics and of many later theologians. But not a few Scholastics of eminence, and nearly all later theologians who have made due allowance for the facts of history, have upheld the opposite view. For the fact is that the indicative form has been widely used in the East and still more widely in the West, it is the form we meet with in the very earliest Church Orders preserved, viz., those of the Celtic Church (see Warren, "Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church", e.g. p. 168: "I anoint thee with sanctified oil in the name of the Trinity that thou mayst be saved for ever and ever"; cf. p. 223). Among contemporary theologians Kern (op. cit., pp. 151 sq.), who is followed by Pohle (Lehrbuch der Dogmatik, 3d ed., Paderborn, 1908, III, 534), suggests a compromise by holding, on the one hand, that at least a virtual prayer-form is required by the text of St. James and, on the other hand, that the indicative forms that have been and are virtually depreciatory, if this seems to be only a subtle way of denying the raison d'être of the controversy; one might argue on the same principle that the forms of baptism, penance, and confirmation are virtually prayer-forms. Some of the so-called indicative forms may be reasonably construed in the same way, with Benedict XIV, that "we do not know how a prayer can be discovered in certain other forms published from very many ancient Rituals by Ménard and Martène, in which there is used merely the words "I anoint thee" without any thing else being added from which a prayer can be deduced." (De Sacram. Consecr., VIII, ii, 2).

If it be insisted that prayer as such must be in some way an element in the sacrament, one may say that the prayer used in blessing the oil satisfies this requirement. What has been said in regard to the matter is to be repeated here, viz., that the dogmatic contro-

versy about the form does not affect the disciplinary obligation of adhering strictly to the prescriptions of the Ritual, or, for cases of urgent necessity, to the decree of the Holy Office.
centuries by a single priest; this has been indeed at all times the almost universal practice in the West (for exceptions cf. Martène, op. cit., I, vii, 3; Kern, op. cit., p. 290). In the East, however, it has been more generally the custom for several priests to take part in the administration of the sacrament (in especially the number seven, chosen for mystical reasons, was the ordinary number in many parts of the East from an earlier period, it does not seem to have been prescribed by law for the Orthodox Church before the thirteenth century (cf. Kern, op. cit., p. 290). But even those Oriental theologians who with the exception of the so-called St. Bonaventure, “Breviloquium”, P. VI, c. xi; Scotus, “Deo Patre” (1472) for one priest merely to anoint and another merely to pronounce the form, and most theologians deny the validity of the unction in the case of the sick. The see, however, of the thirteenth century is for each priest in turn to repeat the whole rite, both matter and form, with variations only in the non-essential prayers. This brings rise to an interesting question which will best be discussed in connexion with the repetition of the sacrament (below, IX).

(1) Extreme  

(2) Grave or serious bodily illness is required for the valid reception of extreme  

(3) Down to the twelfth century in the Western Church the practice was to give the unction freely to all (except public penitents) who were suffering from any serious illness, without waiting to decide whether danger of death was imminent. This is clear from the three texts quoted above. The practice of giving the unction in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a change of practice took place, and the sacrament came to be regarded by many as intended only for the dying. The causes contributing to this change were: a) the extortiory demands of the clergy on the occasion of administering the unction which might be interpreted as a pretext for moderate means of making a profit, while the number of other theologians that, as the principal effect of the sacrament was the last remission of venial sins, it should not be given except to those who could not recover, and were no longer able or at least likely to fall again into venial sin (St. Bonaventure, “Breviloquium”, P. VI, c. xi; Scotus, “Deo Patre”, dist. xiii, Q. unica). It was doubtless under the influence of this teaching that one or two provincial synods of the sixteenth century described the subject of extreme  

(4) The essential effect of extreme unction is to give, with sanctifying grace or its, in the present state of the sacrament, grace for spiritual and physical needs and temptations which specially beset in person in the  

(5) A careful observation of the above facts, the of several causes, during the disturbances of the thirteenth century, in its total abandonment in many parts of Germany and especially of Bavaria (Knöpfler, “Die Kelchbewegung in Central-Preussen”, p. 29 sqq.), in view of these facts, the repeated accusation of the Eastern schismatics, that the Latins gave the sacrament only to the dying and withheld it from the seriously ill who were capable of receiving it, is without foundation (Kern, op. cit., p. 274); but they were wrong in assuming that the Western Church was incapable of doing this. Church authority earnestly tried to correct the avarice of the clergy and the superstitions of the people, while the regarding the chief effect of the unction, was never generally admitted in the schools, and its post-Tridentine adherents have felt compelled to modify the practical conclusion which St. Bonaventure and Scotus had logically drawn from it. There still lingered in the popular mind traces of the erroneous opinion that extreme unction is to be postponed till a sickness otherwise serious has taken a critical turn for the worse, and the danger of death imminent; and by reason of this idea as strongly as they ought to, with the result that in many cases the Divinely ordered effect of corporal healing is rendered impossible except by a miracle. The best and most recent theological teaching is in favour of a lenient, rather than of
a severe, view of the gravity of the sickness, or the proximity of the danger of death, required to qualify for the valid reception of extreme unction; and this is clearly compatible with the teaching of the Council of Trent and is supported by the traditional practice of the first five centuries.

But if the Easterns have had some justification for their charge against the Westerns of unduly restricting the administration of this sacrament, the Orthodox Church is officially responsible for a widespread abuse of the opposite kind which allows the eucharist to be given to persons in perfect health as a complement of preparation for a possible death. Holy Cenacle, as in the Western Church, but without any outward preparation, the patient is surrounded by friends, and a priest... Many Western theologians, following Gaar (Eucharology, pp. 349 sqq.), have denied that this rite was understood and intended to be sacramental, though the matter and form were employed precisely as in the case of the sick; but, whatever may have been the intention in the past, it is quite certain at the present time that at least in the Constantinopolitan and Hellenic branches of the Orthodox Church the intention is to give the sacrament itself and no mere sacramental to those in sound health who are anointed (Kern, op. cit., 281). On the other hand, in the Russian Church, except in the metropolitan churches of Moscovia and Novgorod on Maundy Thursday each year, this practice is reprobated, and priests are expressly forbidden in their faculties to give the eucharist to people who are not sick (Kern, pp. 279 sqq.; Fortescue, The Orthodox Eastern Church, London, 1907, p. 425). We have already noted (III) that the eucharistic use of the sacrament appears to have been a similar abuse, but in the Orthodox Church till long after the schism there is no evidence of its existence, and the teaching of Eastern theologians down to modern times, to which the Russians still adhere, has been at one with the Western theologians in insisting that the sacrament must be labouring under a serious sickness.

4) Nor will danger, or even certainty, of death from any other cause than sickness qualify a person for extreme unction. Hence criminals or martyrs about to suffer death and others similarly circumstances may not be validly anointed unless they should happen to be seriously ill. But illness caused by violence, as by a dangerous or fatal wound, is sufficient; and old age itself without any specific disease is held by all Western theologians to qualify for extreme unction, i.e. when senile decay has advanced so far that death is imminent. In cases of lingering diseases, like phthisis or cancer, the danger has become really serious, extreme unction may be validly administered even though in all human probability the patient will live for a considerable time, say several months; and the lawfulness of administering it in such cases is to be decided by the rules of pastoral theology. If in the opinion of doctors the sickness will certainly be cured, and all probable danger of death removed by a surgical operation, theologians are not agreed whether the person who consents to undergo the operation can have thereby to be a valid subject for the sacrament. Kern holds that he does so (op. cit., p. 299), but his argument is by no means convincing.

VII. Effects.—The decree of Eugene IV for the Armenians describes the effects of extreme unction briefly as “the healing of the mind and, so far as it is expedient by the body also.” In the teaching of Trent (Sess. XIV, cap. i. De Pœnit.) regarding the absolute and universal necessity of repentance for the remission, even in baptism, of personal mortal sins, Schell has maintained (Kathol. Dogmatik, III, pp. 620 sqq.) that such an effect is not required for the validity of extreme unction, but that the general purpose and intention, which a Christian sinner may retain even when he is sinning, of afterwards formally repenting and dying in the friendship of God, is sufficient; but this view seems irreconcilable with the teaching of Trent, and has the whole weight of theological tradition against it.

Extreme unction likewise remits venial sins provided the subject has at least habitual attrition for them; and, following the analogoy of penance, which with attrition remits mortal sins, for the remission of which outside the sacrament perfect contrition would be required, theologians hold that with extreme unction a less perfect attrition suffices for the remission of venial sins than would suffice without the sacrament. But besides thus directly remitting venial sins, extreme unction also excites dispositions which procure their remission ex opere operantis.
The relics or effects of sin mentioned by the Council of Trent are variously understood by theologians to mean one, or more, or all of the following: spiritual debility and depression caused by the consciousness of having sinned; the influence of evil habits induced by sin; the penalties remaining after the guilt of sin has been forgiven; and venial, or even mortal, sins themselves. Of these only the remission of temporal punishment is distinct from the other effects of which the council speaks; and though some theologians have been loath to admit this effect at all, lest they might seem to do away with the reality, and of prayers and indulgences for the dying and dead, there is really no solid ground for objecting to it, if passing controversial interests are subordinated to Catholic theory. It is not suggested that extreme unction, like baptism, sacramentally remits all temporal punishment due to sin, and the extent to which it actually does so in any particular case may, as with baptism, fall short of what was Divinely intended, owing to obstacles or defective dispositions in the recipient. Hence there is still room and need for indulgences for the dying, and if the Church offers her prayers and applies indulgences for adults who die immediately after baptism, she ought, for instance, to offer them to those who have died after extreme unction. And if temporal punishment be, as it certainly is, one of the reliquia of sin, and if extreme unction be truly what the Council of Trent describes (Sess. XIV, De Exstr. Uecl., introduct.) as “the consummation of the sacrament of Penance, but not of the whole Christian life, which ought to be a perpetual penance”, it is impossible to deny that the remission of temporal punishment is one of the effects of this sacrament.

(2) The second effect of extreme unction mentioned by the Council of Trent is the alleviation and strengthening of the soul by inspiring the sick person with confidence in Divine mercy as will enable him patiently and even cheerfully to bear the pains and worries of sickness, and with resolve courteously to repel the assaults of the tempter in what is likely to be the last and only opportunity for the renovation of the soul. The outlook on eternity is brought vividly before the Christian by the probability of death inescapable from serious sickness, and this sacrament has been instituted for the purpose of conforming the graces specially needed to fortify him in facing this tremendous issue. It is unnecessary to explain here the appropriateness of such an institution, which, were other reasons wanting, would justify itself to the Christian mind by the observed results of its use.

(3) Finally, as a conditional and occasional effect of extreme unction, comes the remission of bodily ills, an effect which is vouched for by the witness of experience in past ages and in our own day. Theologians, however, have failed to agree in stating the condition on which this effect depends or in explaining the manner in which it is produced. ‘When it is expedient for the soul’s salvation’, is how Trent expresses the condition, and not a few theologians have understood this to mean that health will not be restored by the sacrament unless it is foreseen by God that a longer life will lead to a greater degree of glory—recovery being thus a sign or proof of predestination. But other theologians rightly reject this opinion, and of several explanations that are offered (cf. Kern, op. cit., pp. 155 sq.) the simplest and most reasonable is that which understands the condition mentioned not of the future and perhaps remote event of actual salvation, but of present spiritual advantage which, independently of the ultimate result, recovery may bring to the sick person: and under this condition, that this physical effect, which is in itself natural, is obtained mediately through and dependently upon the spiritual effects already mentioned. The fortifying of the soul by manifold graces, by which over-anxious fears are banished, and a general feeling of comfort and courage, and of humble confidence in God’s mercy and peaceful resignation to His Will inspired, react as a natural consequence on the physical condition of the patient, and this reaction is sometimes the factor that decides the issue of certain cases. This mediate and dependent effect of fortifying restoration of health is the way indicated by the Council of Trent in the passage quoted above, and the view proposed is in conformity with the best and most ancient theoretical teaching on the subject and avoids the seemingly unanswerable difficulties involved in opposing views. Nor does it reduce this effect of extreme unction to the level of those perfectly natural phenomena known to modern science as “faith cures”. For it is not maintained, in the first place, that recovery will follow in any particular case unless this result is spiritually profitable to the patient—and of this God alone is the judge—and it is admitted, in the second place, that the spiritual effect, from which the physical concomitantly results, is itself strictly supernatural (cf. Kern, loc. cit.).

(4) There remains the question, on which no little controversy has been expended, as to which of these several effects is the principal one. Bearing in mind the general theory that sacramental graces are...
effect which may be obtained independently: rather should the theory be enlarged and modified, and the primary and essential end of the sacrament so described as to comprehend these effects.

This is the solution of the whole question proposed by Dr. Poth, op. cit., pp. 535, 536) reviews Kern’s suggestion sympathetically. Besides being self-consistent and free from any serious difficulty, it is recommended by many positive arguments, and in connexion with the controverted point we have been discussing it has the advantage of combining and co-ordinating as parts of the principal effect—i.e., perfect spiritual health—not only the remission of venial sins and the invigoration of the soul, for which respectively Scotists and their opponents have contended too exclusively, but also the remission of temporal punishment, which not a few theologians have neglected.

II. Necessary.—Theologians are agreed that extreme unction may in certain circumstances be the only, and therefore the necessary, means of salvation for a dying person. This happens when there is question of a person who is dying without the use of reason, and whose soul is burdened with the guilt of a mortal sin, for which he has not habitual contrition; and for this and similar cases in which the reason in obtaining justification are certainly or even probably unavailing, there is no doubt as to the grave obligation of procuring extreme unction for the dying. But theologians are not agreed as to whether or not a sick person in the state of grave sin, per se, under a grave obligation of seeking the sacrament before death. It is evident ex hypothesi that there is no obligation arising from the need of salvation (necessitate mediis), and the great majority of theologians deny that a grave obligation per se has been imposed by Divine or ecclesial law. The invocation of St. James, It is said, may be understood as being merely a counsel or exhortation, not a command, and there is no convincing evidence from tradition that the Church has understood a Divine command to have been given, or has ever imposed one of her own. Yet it is recognized that, in the words of Trent, “contempt of so great a sacrament cannot take place without an enormous crime and an injury to the Holy Ghost Himself” (Sess. XIV, cap. iii); and it is held to depend on circumstances whether mere neglect or express refusal of the sacrament would amount to contempt of it. The sounder view, however, of the reasons alleged for this common teaching is open to doubt, and the strength of the arguments advanced by so recent a theologian as Kern (pp. 364 sq.) to prove the existence of the obligation which so many have denied is calculated to weaken the same in the mind of the reader.

IX. REPERTORIUM.—The Council of Trent teaches that “if the sick recover after receiving this unction, they can again receive the aid of this sacrament, when they fall anew into a similar danger of death” (Sess. XIV, cap. iii, De Extr. Uect.). In the Middle Ages there were entertained by some ecclesiastics on this subject, as we learn from the correspondence between Abbot (later Cardinal) Godfried and St. Yves, Bishop of Chartres (d. 1117). Godfried considered the custom in vogue in the Benedictine monasteries, of repeating extreme unction, reprehensible on the ground that “no sacrament ought to be repeated” (P. L., CLVII, 87 sq.); but he wished to have St. Yves’s opinion, and the latter quite agreed with his friend (ibid., 88). Not long afterwards Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, was asked by Abbot Theobald to explain “why it was that the unction of the sick was the only unction [out of seven] repeated, and why this took place only at Cluny;” and Peter in reply justified the repetition of the Benedictine practice, his main contention being that the person anointed may recover on recovery have sinned again and be in need of the remission of sins promised by St. James, and that the Apostle himself not only does not suggest that the unction may be given only once, but clearly implies “ut quales quis infirmatus fuert, totes inimputatur” (P. L., CLXXIX, 392 sq.). After this all opposition to the repetition of the sacrament disappears, and subsequent writers unanimously teach, what has been defined by the Council of Trent, that it may under certain conditions be validly and lawfully repeated. It should be noted, moreover, that the practice of repeating it at this period was not confined to the Benedictines or to Cluny. The Cistercians of Clairvaux, for example, were also in the habit of repeating it, but subject to the restriction that it was not to be given more than once within the same year; and the invalidation of the particular Churches dating from the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, have a rubric prescribing the repetition of the unction for seven successive days (cf. Kern, op. cit., pp. 334, 335 sq.).

Coming to the more accurate determination of the circumstances or conditions which justify the repetition of extreme unction, theologians, following the authority of Trent, are agreed that it may be validly and lawfully repeated as often as the sick person, after recovery, becomes seriously ill again, or, in cases of lingering illness where no complete recovery takes place, as often as the probable danger of death, after disappearing, returns. For verification of this latter condition some theologians would require the lapse of a certain interval, say a month, during which the danger would seem to have passed; but there is really no reason for insisting on this any more than on the year which medieval custom in some places was wont to require. St. Bonaventure’s remark, that “it is absurd for a sacrament to be regulated by the motion of the stars” (in IV Sent., dist. xxiii, a. 2, q. iv, ad 2), applies to a month as well as to a year. Not a few recent ones, e.g., De Augustinis, “De Re Sacramentaria,” II, 408) understand, by the new danger of death, proximate or imminent danger, so that, once imminent danger has passed and returned, the sacrament may be repeated without waiting for any definite interval to elapse. The majority of theologians, however, deny the validity of extreme unction repeated while the danger of death remains the same, and they assume that this is the implicit teaching of the Council of Trent. But among contemporary authors, Kern, following the lead of several positive theologians eminent for their knowledge of sacramental history (Ménard, Launois, Martène, Juénin, Drouven, Poignet, Pellarin, Bintzerum, Heinrich. — See references in Kern, op. cit., pp. 337, 538), maintains the probable validity of extreme unction repeated, no matter how often, during the same danger of death; or it will be found easier to ignore, than to meet and answer, the argument by which he supports his view.

He furnishes, in the first place, abundant evidence of the widespread practice in the Western Church from the ninth to the twelfth, and even in some places, to the thirteenth century, of repeating the unction for seven days or indefinitely while the sickness lasted; and he is able to claim the authority of Oriental theologians for explaining the modern practice in the Eastern Church of a sevenfold anointing by seven priests as being due to a more ancient practice of repeating the unction for seven days—a practice to which the Coptic Liturgy bears witness. By admit-
ting the validity of each repeated unction we are able to
give a much more reasonable explanation of the
medieval Western and modern Eastern practice than
can possibly be given by those who deny its validity.
The latter are bound to maintain either that the
proper sacramental effect may not be increased by
repetition, as happens in Penance and Holy Commu-
nication—that is, with an increase of sanctifying grace,
the right to spiritual invigoration may be increased,
and more abundant actual graces become due. And
this, on internal grounds, would suffice to justify
repetition, although the effect of the previous admin-
istration remains. Finally, in reply to the principal
dogmatic reason urged against his view—viz., the teaching
of the Council of Trent—Kern fairly maintains that the intention of the council was merely positive, and not exclusive, i.e., it wished to define, in opposition to the restrictive views that had been held, the validity of extreme unction repeated in the circum-
stances it mentions, but without meaning to deny its validity if repeated in other circumstances not men-
tioned. The exhaustive examination of tradition which is supposed to precede a definition had not, so far as the principal point in question, been brought out at the time of Trent; and the point itself was not ripe for definition. Modern discipline in the Western Church can be explained on other than dogmatic grounds: and if it be urged as dogmatically decisive, this will imply a very sweeping condemnation of much earlier and modern Eastern practice, which the prudent theologian will be slow to pro-
nounce.

X. REVIVISCENCE.—The question of reviviscence arises when any sacrament is validly administered, but is hindered at the time from producing its effect, owing to the want of due dispositions in the recipient. Thus, in regard to extreme unction, the subject may be unconscious and incapable of spiritual invigoration in so far as this requires co-operation with actual grace. Or he may, for want of the necessary attribution, be indisposed to receive remission of sins, or disposed in such manner as to exclude the influence of sanctifying grace. And the want of disposition—the obstacle to the effi-
cacy of the sacrament—may be inexcusable or gravely culpable; in the latter case the reception of the sacra-
ment will be sacrilegious. Now the question is, does extreme unction revive, that is, does it afterwards (during the same serious illness) produce such effects as are hindered at the time of reception, if the obstacle is afterwards removed or the requisite disposition exci-
ted? And theologians all teach that it certainly does revive in this way: that for its reviviscence, if no sacrifice has been committed in its reception, nor any grave sin in the interval, all that is needed is that the impediment should be removed, that conscious-
ness, for instance, should be recovered, or habitual attrition excited; but that, when a grave sin has been committed at or since the reception, this sin must be remitted, and sanctifying grace obtained by other means (e.g. penance or perfect contrition) before ex-
treme unction can take effect. From this doctrine of reviviscence—which is not, however, defined as a dog-
ma—there follows an important practical rule in re-
gard to the administration of extreme unction, viz., that, notwithstanding doubts about the dispositions of a particular subject, the sacrament should be conferred absolutely, never conditionally, since a condition making its validity dependent on the actual dispositions of the recipient would exclude the possibility of reviviscence. The conditional form (sibi capax es) should be used only when it is doubtful whether the person is a valid subject for the sacrament, e.g., whether he is not already dead, whether he has been baptized, and has attained the use of reason, or has the implicit habitual intention of dying in a Christian manner.

Exouctians. See ARIANISM.

Exulter Hibernicus, the name given to an Irish stranger on the Continent of Europe in the time of Charles the Great, who wrote poems in Latin, several of which are addressed to the emperor. He is sometimes identified with Dungal (see DUNGAL). The designation exul is one which the Irish frequently adopted. The poems of this exile show that he was not only a poet but a grammari-
ian and dialectician as well. They also reveal his status as that of a teacher, probably in the palace school of more than ordinary interest are the verses which describe the attitude of the ninth-century Irish teacher towards his pupils. His metrical poem on the seven liberal arts devote two lines to each of the branches, grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, &c., showing the origin, scope, and utility of each in succession. Like the lines on the same subject by Theodulf of Orleans, they may have been incorporated into a set of pictures in which the seven liberal arts were rep-
resented. The style of these poems, while much inferior to that of the classical period, is free from many of the artificialities which characterize much of the versification of the early Middle Ages.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Exultet, the hymn in praise of the paschal candle sung by the deacon, in the liturgy of Holy Saturday. In the missal the title of the hymn is “Praeconium”, as appears from the formula used at the blessing of the deacon: “ut digna et competenter annuntiantes suum Paschalem praecominem”? Outside Rome, the use of the paschal candle appears to have been very ancient in Italy, Gaul, Spain, and perhaps, from the reference by St. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, xiv. 33), in Africa. The “Libri Pontificales” attribute its introduction in the local Roman Church to Pope Zosimus. The formula used for the “Praecominium” was not always the “Exul-
tet”, though it is perhaps true that this formula has survived, where other contemporary formulæ have disappeared. In the “Liber Ordinarii”, for instance, the formula is of the nature of a Benediction, and the Gelasian Sacramentary has the prayer “Deus mundi conditor”, not found elsewhere, but containing the remarkable “praise of the bee”—possibly a Ver-
gilian reminiscence—which is found with more or less modification in all the texts of the “Praecominium” sections to the present day. The requity of the paschal cur-
al from the title of the hymn “Exultet” would lead us to place the date of its composition perhaps as early as the fifth century, and not later than the seventh. The earliest Missæ in which it appears are those of the three Gallican Sacramentaries—the Bobbio Missal (seventh
EXUPERIUS (Exuperius), Saint, Bishop of Toulouse in the beginning of the fifth century, place and date of birth unascertained; d. after 410. Succeeding St. Silvius as bishop, he completed the basilica of St. Saturninus, begun by his predecessor. St. Jerome praises him for his munificence towards the monks of Palestine, Egypt, and Libya, and for his charity to the people of his own diocese, who were then suffering from the depredations of the Vandals, Alans, and Suevi. Of great austerity and simplicity of life, he sought not his own, but gave what he had to the poor. For their sake he even sold the altar vessels and was compelled in consequence to carry the Sacred Host in an oyster basket and the Precious Blood in a vessel of glass. In esteem for his virtues and in gratitude for his gifts, St. Jerome dedicated to him his Commentarius in Psalmodiam. Exuperius was best known in connexion with the Canon of the Sacred Scriptures. He is mentioned in a letter to Innocent I (for instructions concerning the Canon and several points of ecclesiastical discipline. In reply, the pope honoured him with the letter Consulenti tibi; dated February, 405, which contained a list of the canonical Scriptures as we have them to-day, including the deutero- canonical books of the Catholic Canon. The assertion of some writers that the Canon of Innocent I excluded the Apocrypha is not true, if they mean to extend the term Apocrypha to the deutero-canonical books.

The opinion of Barolius, that the bishop Exuperius was identical with the rhetor of the same name, is quite generally rejected, as the rhetor was a teacher of Hannibalarius and Dalmatius, nephews of Constantine the Great, over half a century before the period of the bishop. From St. Jerome's letter to Furia of Rome, in 394, and from the epistle of St. Paulinus to Amandus of Bordeaux, in 397, it seems probable that Exuperius was a priest at Rome, and later at Bordeaux, before he was raised to the episcopate, though it is possible that in both of these letters reference is made to a different person. Just when he became bishop is unknown. That he occupied the See of Toulouse in February, 405, is evident from a reference in Innocent I mentioned above; and from a statement of St. Jerome in a letter to Rusticius it is certain that he was still living in 411. It is sometimes said that St. Jerome reproved him, in a letter to Riparius, a priest of Spain, for tolerating the heretic Vigilantius; but, as Vigilantius did not belong to the Diocese of Toulouse, St. Jerome was probably speaking of another bishop.

Exuperius was early venerated as a saint. Even in the time of St. Gregory of Tours he was held in equal veneration with St. Saturninus. His feast occurs on 29 September. The first martrology to assign to his date was Usuard, who wrote towards the end of the tenth century.

**Acta SS., Sept. VII. 623-30:** St. Jerome, Ep. iv. c. x. lv. 1475. After preliminary studies at Erfurt he went to Italy and devoted himself to humanistic study at the Universities of Pavia and Bologna. He returned to Germany in 1451, having in the meantime been appointed canon at Eichstatt and Bamberg. In 1452 to 1459 he was again a student at Bologna, win-
EYCK

Eyck, Hubert and Jan van, brothers, Flemish illuminators and painters, founders of the school of Bruges and consequently of all the schools of painting in the North of Europe. Hubert was born at Maeseyck (i.e. Eyck on the Meuse in the Diocese of Liége, about 1366, and his brother Jan about twenty years later, 1385). They had a sister named Margaret who was an illuminator.

A document of 1413 makes the earliest mention we have of a painting by "Master Hubert." In 1421 he was living at Ghent, and he died there on the 18th of September, 1426. We have no further definite knowledge concerning the elder of the brothers. Of the younger we know that in 1420 he presented a M. Jhon's head to the Guild of Antwerp, that in 1422 he decorated a paschal candle for the cathedral of Cambrai, and that in 1425 he was at The Hague in the service of Jean Sans Merci. Afterwards he went to Bruges and to Lille to the court of Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, as peintre et voleur de chample. He was already a man of some influence at court, and he travelled in the embassy charged to ask the hand of Isabella of Portugal for Philip, and it was his privilege to paint her portrait "true to life," thereby fixing Philip's choice. This journey lasted from the 16th of October to the end of December, 1429. In 1430 he went to Heidelberg to superintend, for the Duke, the work going on at the castle there; and afterwards he returned to Bruges, which he seldom left again. He married, and a child of his was baptized in 1434. In 1436 he entered once more that he received 720 livres on account of "a certain secret of mastic;" doubtless in connection with some new miniature or journey. He died towards the end of June, 1441.

The most important work of the brothers Van Eyck, and the one that places their names among the great masters of painting for ever, is the famous altar-piece, "The Adoration of the Lamb," of which the central portion is preserved in St-Bavon at Ghent, while the wings have found their way to the Museums of Berlin and of Brussels. It is one of the emblems of art. All the questions bearing on it may, however, be reduced to two: Who was its author? and, What was it commissioned for? All who have looked on an inscription obscure enough, which is to be read on the edge of its frame:

Pictor Hubertus e Eyck major quo nemo repertus
Incept pondus: quod Johannes arte secundus
Susecet letus, Judaei Vyd prcecus tertius
Convers V. V. X. M. V. L. C. L. C. D. C. N. V. A. S. V. L. I. 

The faulty Latin of this cryptic inscription means: "Hubert van Eyck, the greatest painter that ever lived, began this work [pondus], which John, his brother, second only to him in skill, had the happiness to continue at the request of Josce (Josse) Vyd. By this line, on the 6th of May, you learn when the work was completed, i.e., MCCCLXXIII." That it is their joint work is certain, but it is impossible to distinguish which portion belongs to each brother. Very soon Jan began to get all the credit for it. Düer mentions only Jan in his "Journal" of 1521. But the inscription clearly states that Hubert was the artist and asserts that he was the greater artist, his brother being called in only at his death, and in order to complete it. But how far had Hubert progressed with it? How far back had he been commissioned to paint it? In 1426 were portions of it finished, or was it merely the sketch? Or when Jan took charge? Who suggested the subject? Who planned its treatment? Can we believe that a painter of any school living in a fifteenth century atmosphere could have elaborated by himself from a few texts of the Apocalypse (v. 6–14) such a wealth of detail, such sympathy of symbolism and imagery? Who was the theologian who inspired this mighty poem as others had inspired the learned allegories of the 'Chapel of the Spaniards,' and of the Hall of the Segnatura? And again, in the history of painting from the miniatures of the Irish Apocalypse (eleventh century) to the Angers tapestries, what were the artistic sources of this great work?

This moral encyclopaedia of the Middle Ages, if we may call it such, treats of all things in heaven and on earth (there was a predella to it depicting hell, but it disappeared in the sixteenth century); it portrays God and man in all their historical and mystical relations; it tells us of the heavenly paradise, of the earth and the world, of the ages that have followed one another in the flight of time, of the Dogma of the Fall, and of the Redemption, of Adam and Eve, and of the first sacrifices; of the death of Abel (type of Christ); of the years of expectation of the patriarchs and just men of the Old Law; of the mystery of the Incarnation; of the Trinity; of the world subject to the law of Christ; of the life of the Church in its saints, her hermits, her virgins, her martyrs, her pontiffs, her confessors, her warrior princes; of all Christendom in a landscape filled with cathedral spires (Rome, Jerusalem, Utrecht, etc.).

And can we in reason be surprised to see this wonderful pictorial epic arising out from the beginning to the consummation of the world and ending in a glimpse of the eternal life to come as full in conception and as orderly in arrangement as the "Divina Commedia" itself; summing up the Old as well as the New Testament, drawing its inspiration from St. Augustine's "Tivitas Dei," and Vincent of Beauvais' "Speculum Majus," as well as Jacobus de Voragine's "Legenda Aurea," and Dante's "De Monarchia;" a compendium of politics, history, and theology, and which crowns the representation of man's life on earth by a "glimpse of the Infancy," when we are asked to believe that this lofty expression of the ideals of Christendom in the Europe of the Middle Ages sprang Minerva-like, fully formed from the brain of a single artist?

No one can adopt this supposition except for the
purpose of ascribing all the honour of having conceived this painting to the elder of the brothers. As an assumption, however, it is altogether gratuitous. There is not one of the scenes that can be attributed to Hubert with any degree of certainty; and no work that Van Eyck have left us (with the exception of the “Fount of Salvation” in the Prado Museum, Madrid, and this is the work of a school) shows a similar dogmatic and theological character, a like power of design and richness of thought that this “Lamb” does. Taken as a whole the work of the Van Eycks has a totally different quality. It is frankly naturalistic in fact, as well as in intention. So that when Hubert is labelled a thinker, it is for no other reason than the wish to differentiate him, and to separate him from Jan. How futile this distinction is, is made clear if we look into the results obtained by applying it as a criterion to the work of the two brothers. On not a single disputed painting has agreement been reached; and every painting that has been attributed to Hubert by one connoisseur, has been adjudged by others for equally good reasons to Jan.

The catalogue of their work has been reconstructed more than twenty times. The altarpiece of the “Lamb” has been divided in two, and immured in the walls, and each in turn has been given to first one brother and then to the other over and over again. Each year sees a new theory proposed. After Waagen came James T. F. Staerck, after Staerck, Waagen; and we are as far from the solution as we were at the outset. The masterpiece has been attributed to Hubert, to Jan, and to both probably never give it up. In any case, seeing that the whole painting was retouched at least twice during the sixteenth century, all evidence of individual technique must have been buried beneath these restorations, and in all likelihood the little points and peculiarities attributed to Hubert or to Jan have been removed. The scheme of the work of Michael Coxie. But there is a larger and a wider question at issue than such idle wranglings that can never be settled, the question as to the effect and the nature of the artistic revolution to which the brothers Van Eyck have given their names.

What constitutes the altarpiece of the “Lamb” a unique monument in the history of art, and gives it its supreme interest in our eyes, is the fact that it unites in itself the styles and the genius of two opposing epochs. Whereas its general plan belongs to the Middle Ages, its execution, its manner of seeing things and putting them on canvas, are truly modern. The masterpiece has a double nature, so to speak. The genius of the Renaissance for what was concrete and realistic is wedded to the majesty of the Gothic and its love of the abstract. It shows us the wondrous blending of two principles that would seem necessarily to exclude each other, like the past and the future, and that we never meet with again save in opposition. It is this that constitutes the supreme interest of the work, that it contains the noblest expression of the old mystical genius together with the most powerful example of modern naturalism. In the sincerity, breadth, and daring of their naturalism, no one at any time nor of any school has excelled the Van Eycks. Nature, which, prior to their day, men had looked at as through a veil of formulaire and symbols, they seem suddenly to have unveiled. They invented, so to speak, the world of realities. The happenings of all sorts in the world of nature, the sylla rerum, with which they have endowed the art of painting, are always true to life. Landscapes, atmosphere, types, physiognomies, a wealth of studies and sketches of all sorts, rich materials, cloths, cimars (robes), copies, slavishly and brilliancy of pre-civilizations, the goldsmith’s art; all are copied to perfection, and the deference of the work is beyond compare. The masterpiece inaugurates a new era in painting. If the object of the painter’s art is to depict the visible world, if his aim ought to be not so much the expression of a thought as to hold up the mirror to life, then for the first time in its history painting entered into its birthright in this altarpiece, and gave proof of its legitimacy in this first attempt. Life under all its sensible forms and aspects sweeps through this mighty scene like a motif, with all its myriad changes and variety of moods, brushing aside like dusty hieroglyphs and crumbling hieroglyphs of the Middle Ages.

The absolute is abandoned, and the relative brought into fashion. The eye is turned away from the vision of the ideal, but the feet are more firmly planted on the real. The word nature undergoes a change of meaning, since it had been a vague Platonistic idea, a nothing like the nonsensical formulae of the schools, which are understood by the intelligence rather than perceived by the senses. In that lofty plane of thought in which art in the thirteenth century loved to move, the universe existed really in the intellect. Henceforth, however, nature changes her aspect for the painter; he refrains from expressing any opinion as to the essence of things, but delights in all their accidental qualities. The actual, the fact, whether it be positive, complex, capricious, or odd, becomes of more importance than the idea of it. The absolute cause of all things is neglected in favour of the rich and the rich vegetation of nature; principles have less value than their consequences, less importance is given to types than individuals. The vast harvest of phenomena from the ever teeming field of reality and experience is accepted as an object for the expression of the painter’s personality, and to act as the safest confidante of his emotional experiences.

The altarpiece of Ghent marks the triumph of this basic artistic revolution from which all modern art has sprung. Never was a richer shrine of nature and of life got together by a painter. In two hundred figures of every size, sex, race, and costume we behold a résumé of the human race. We see before us all the beauty of the physical world, the woods, the fields, the rocks, the desert places; a geography of earth with its climates, the forms of all the objects of creation (which foolishly has led some to believe that Hubert must have travelled in the East). And the world of art is not forgotten; styles of architecture, towers, cupolas, statues, bas-reliefs, are all brought in. In a word, life out-of-doors and within doors, with all its social activities and moral colouring, is portrayed. There are interiors, such as the room of the Blessed Virgin, a young Flemish maiden, with its prie-Dieu, its nicely tiled floor, its washstand and basin, and its open window looking out on to the pointed roofs of a row of brick houses. There are pictures of a marvellous realism, such as those of the donor and his wife; epic figures, such as God the Father under the guise of Charlemagne crowned with a triple tiara, type of the pontiff-king; and there are figures full of charm and poetry, such as the singing angels (Berlin museum), symbolizing the harmonious paradise, under the form of enthralling minstrelsy, or of the chanting of choir boys. Other figures are fearful in their naturalism, such as the figures of our first parents (Brussels museum) which would suffice alone to immortalize their creator, because of their audacious nudity, their stiff and awkward manner, and their eloquent ugliness.

Such a transformation, of course, exceeds the powers of any one man, or even of two brothers. And like all great works, the altarpiece of Ghent is but the result of the labours of more than one generation. It was not a local movement; its influences were at work up and down throughout Christendom.
In Italy the work of Jacopo della Quercia, of Ghiberti, the frescoes of Masolino and of Masaccio (1428), are contemporary with the labours of the Van Eycks, and bear traces of similar tendencies. But the birthplace of the movement was not on Italian soil. It is in France first that the earliest traces of it, about the beginning of the fourteenth century. A few statues, like the Visitational group in the great doorway at Reims (1310), the tombs of St. Denis, the portraits of King Charles V and his wife Eleanor (in the Louvre), mark the last stages in the victorious progress. The same school that in the fourteenth century had developed the Gothic ideal, was about to produce by a natural evolution the new principles and the new methods. An important factor in this evolution was the creation of the Duchies of Berry and of Burgundy, and the alliance of Flanders and Burgundy by marriage (1364). At the Court of the Valois, the most brilliant in the world, famous for its voluptuousness, its elegance, and its worship of all the arts of life, and under the patronage of its princes, no less famous for their dissolute lives than for their artistic taste and love of luxury, there rapidly grew up a school of painters, sculptors, goldsmiths, and miniaturists, cosmopolitans by birth, but Parisian by education, who were the nucleus of the Renaissance.

The larger part of the paintings, frescoes, and stained glass of this epoch have perished; but the miniatures supply all the proof we need. Especially in the manuscripts of the Duc de Berry there are many rare and valuable miniatures, which are the earliest evidence of the school. It is impossible to prevent the links of this glorious history. Many of the books collected by this incomparable Meeenas have come down to us; some of them illustrated by André Beauneveu, Jacquemart of Hosdin, or Jacques Cohn of Antwerp. But the most important of all is the so-called MS. of the Hours of the Duc de Berry, known as the "Book of Hours of the Duc de Berry." This wonderful book was adorned from 1413 to 1416 by three artists: "the three illuminator-brothers" spoken of by Guillebert de Metz, the brothers of Limbourg or simply the Limpourgs. Nearly all the poetic fancy of the Van Eycks is already outlined in this "Book of Hours," especially on their landscape side; and whereas the Limpourgs kept to the country around Liège, the Van Eycks followed the same route, and doubtless experienced the same influences. But there was nothing more. Another MS., "The Hours of Turin," which was unfortunately destroyed in the fire at the library of that town, 20 January, 1904, belonged successively to the Duc de Berry (d. 1416) and to Duke William IV of Bavaria-Hannaut. And it has been proved that Hubert van Eyck spent some time in the latter's service. Paul Durrieu has given very weighty reasons for attributing the MS. to him, and for believing that he began it for the Duc de Berry. Thus the art of the Van Eycks would be but the culminating point of the great Renaissance movement inaugurated at the Court of the Valois in France, and which reached its apogee in 1400. Perhaps this was what the Italian Bishop Fieschi meant to imply when in 1436 he spoke of Jan van Eyck as Johannes Gallieus.

This is a partial solution of the enigma of the altar-piece. Hubert and Jan van Eyck are but continuators, in a way, of an art that had begun before them, without them. But what was it they added that caused the new style in art to date only from their work? If we are to credit Vasari, Van Mander, and all the historical writers, their great discovery was the art of painting with oils. Painting with oil had been discovered before; the more or less successful recipe for it in the eleventh century. And as we have seen, the new aesthetic had been already formulated in the miniatures of the Limbourgs and of the Van Eycks themselves. Whatever importance in art its material and mechanical methods may have, it would be too humiliating to make it depend entirely on the particular fluid, water, gum, or albumen used in mixing the colours. Moreover, on canvases 500 years old from which all moisture has long since dried up he would be a daring critic who would venture to assert the proportion of oil or distemper used by the artist. Yet in the fifteenth century an artist had discovered the secret of capturing the shape, the colour, of a thing like seeking the scent of the "Roses of Sadi." The real merit of the Van Eycks is elsewhere. By a chain of circumstances (The Battle of Agincourt, the madness of Charles VI, and the minority of Charles VII), France was brought to the edge of ruin, and suddenly lost control of the movement that had been started in Flanders.

Comfort, art, luxury began to cluster around the new fortunes of the Duchy of Burgundy, as the home of wealth in the North. Ghent, Bruges, Brussels, Antwerp became the centres of the new school. In these new towns of little culture and traditional refinement, and lacking in reserve (Taine, "Philosophie de l'Art aux Pays-Bas" — description of the festivities known as the "Veu du Jouvan") Naturalism, freed from the restraints French taste would have imposed on it, was enabled to grow at its ease and spread without restriction. The Germanic element which had already been seen as Beaufremont in the Limbourgs, burst out, and carried everything before it in the work of the Van Eycks. For the first time the genius of the North shook off all those cosmopolitan influences which had hitherto refined it, and gave it its free scope.

We paused not to think of what had gone before, and it was not concerned with such things as taste, nobility, or beauty. Such preoccupations as these, as the antique began to have an influence, became more and more the distinguishing characteristics and limitation of Italian naturalism. It is enough to consider the influence of Adam and Eve by Jan van Eyck, with those by Masaccio in the Brancacci Chapel to be convinced of this. On the one side there is realism, but the painter has scruples, reserves, a sense of modesty; on the other there is absolute cruelty, what we might call naturalism pure and simple. What does this mean, but that painting, which had hitherto been a universal, international art, is beginning to localize itself; and that what had hitherto been a European, or better still, Western, colour-language is about to split up into many dialects and national modes of speech? It is the real glory of the Van Eycks, their triumph which was unfortunately destroyed in the fire at the library of that town, 20 January, 1904, and which gave it its first full expression. During a whole century (1430-1530) the school they founded at Bruges was always producing new works and renewing its own strength. During a century, painters from Flanders, from Holland, and Germany — Crispius, Gérard de St-Jean, Ouywear, Hugo van der Goes, Roger van der Weyden, Memlinek, Gérard David, Martin Schongauer, Dürer, Lucas of Leyden — never ceased to draw their inspiration more or less directly from their work. In 1445 the Catalan Luis Dalmau made a copy of the altar-piece of Ghent. In France, Jean Fouquet, Nicolas Fronten, on the banks of the Loire and of the Rhone, were disciples of Jan van Eyck. Even Italy did not escape their sovereign influence. As early as the middle of the fifteenth century paintings by Jan van Eyck were being treasured at Naples and in Urbino. Antinello of Messina went to study art in Flanders. Ghirlandajo imitated the famous Portinari altar-piece by H. van der Goes, and whenever an Italian painter relaxed a moment his strain register art to snatch a breath of gayety or a lesson in realism, it was always to the Flemish school he turned; after all the triumph of the art of Raphael and Michelangelo, by the constraining revelation of its beauty, had restored for a time the reign of the ideal. Their triumph was, however, short-lived; the pagan and aristocratic ideal of art and life, with all its loftiness and rigidity, began to give way to the
beginning of the seventeenth century, with its new schools at Antwerp and Amsterdam, before the naturalism of the North, before the more homely, heartily, and winning genius of the Van Eycks. It is therefore impossible to exaggerate the importance of the Eycks, whose position throughout the fifteenth century, led the way in the evolution which two centuries later produced such painters as Rubens and Rembrandt.

The following is a list of the signed and dated works of Jan van Eyck: The "Consecration of St. Thomas Aquinas" (1432—1435); The "Madonna" (1432—1435); portraits of two men (1432—1434); National Gallery; "Arnolfini and his Wife" (1434—1435); National Gallery; "Portrait of Jan de Leeuw" (1436—1438); "The Virgin", with kneeling figure of Canon van der Pael (1436—1438); "St. Barbara" (1438); "The Woman in Black" (1439—1440); "The Artist's Wife" (1439—1440); "The Virgin" (1439—1440); "Antwerp". The principal works without date or signature that can be certainly attributed to the brothers Van Eyck are "Portrait of An Old Man" (Vienna); "The Man with the Pinks" (Berlin); "The Man in a Blue Cap" (Frankfort); "The Madonna" executed for Chancellor Rolin (Louvain); "The Virgin" (Burleigh House, Exeter); "The Virgin" (Paris, Rothschild); triptych, not completed (Van Hellenpute collection, Mechlin).

FACETE, De vita illustris (1456, published at Florence, 1748), an account of the life of Jan van Eyck, in the Notizie d'opere di disegno (Bens, 1898); VAZARI, Le Vite (Florence, 1550) (preface and life of Messina); VAN MANÉE, Het Schilderboek (Amsterdam, 1604); WAAGEN, H., and J. VAN EYCK (Breslau, 1862); WEALE, Notes on Jan van Eyck (Bruges, 1864); IDÉM, The date of Jan van Eyck's Death in The Burlington Magazine (London, 1904); DE LABORDE, Les ducs de Bourbogne (Paris, 1847); VAN MEERGEN and ERNEST KERSTEN, Docsours sur l'art des PEINTRES de l'ÉCOLE FLAMANDE au XVIIe siècle (Paris, 1906); CROWE and CAVALLO, The Early Flemish Painters (London, 1857); TAYNE, Philosophie de l'art (Paris, 1872); ECK, Les maîtres d'œuvre de l'Église Flamande (Paris, 1876); KNACKBURG, Hubert and Jan van Eyck (Bielefeld, 1897); COURJARD, Lécons professées à l'école du Louvre (Paris, 1898—1899); DURIEUX, Les origines des Van Eyck (Paris, 1904); LES NEUVES DE TURIN, Photographic reproduction (Paris, 1905); HOLL, Dedication and the Primitives Flamands, an arranged catalogue (Bruges, 1902); DUMONT, Das Büsten der Brüder von Eyck (Berlin, 1908); WURZBACH, Niederländisches Künstlerlexicon (Leipzig, 1906).

LOUIS GILLET.

EYCKEN, JEAN BAPTISTE VAN, painter, b. at Brussels, Belgium, 16 September, 1809; d. at Schaerbeek, 19 December, 1853. He was the son of Cornelle van Eyck and Louise Cordemans, and as a boy was employed in commercial pursuits, but from 1829, when his father died, he gave himself over entirely to the study of art. In 1830 he became a member of the Academy of Belgium, in 1833 gained an important prize with high distinctions, and four years afterwards was appointed professor of drawing and painting. In 1838 he went to Italy, returning in 1839 and resuming his professorship. In that year he exhibited his great picture of "Divine Pity", which was warmly received and brought him a gold medal and a high position in the Société des Beaux Arts of France. He entered in 1840 Julie Noel, who died 11 Feb., 1843. Two of his most important pictures were those representing "Captive Christians" and "St. Boniface", for the church of La Chapelle; but for the same building he carried out no less than fourteen pictures representing the Passion of Christ and these were exhibited in 1844 and gained for him the Order of Leopold. His best-known picture perhaps is entitled "L'Abondance", a replica of which the artist was employed to make for the Prince Consort of England, according to the instructions of Louise Marie, Queen of the Belgians. He was intensely interested in the subject of mural decoration, and, besides working on a series of paintings representing the Beatitudes, in order to exemplify his ideas in this direction. He also gave some attention to sculpture and to designing medalions. He was a very devout man, true to his faith and to his friends, and very much respected by all who knew him. His pictures are marked by considerable religious feeling, grace, tenderness, and delicacy. (For further details, see a life of the artist published privately in Brussels by Emile van Arenberg, no date.)

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

EYMERIC, PIETRE-JULIEN, VENERABLE, founder of the Society of the Blessed Sacrament, and of the Servants of the Blessed Sacrament, b. at La Mure d'Isère, Diocese of Grenoble, France, 4 Feb., 1811; d. there 1 Aug., 1868. From early childhood he表现出 a unique position throughout the fifteenth century, led the way in the evolution which two centuries later produced such painters as Rubens and Rembrandt.

In January of 1851 Père Eymard made a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Fourvières, and there promised Mary to devote his life to founding a congregation of priests whose principal duty should be to honour the Blessed Sacrament. He having obtained the necessary ecclesiastical permission, he procured a small house in Paris, in which he and his single companion took up their abode. Here, on 6 Jan., 1857, the Blessed Sacrament was exposed, and the nascent community of two priests continued the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament as prescribed by their rule. Their founder received his first encouragement for the work in a laudatory Brief, blessing the work and his author, and signed by Pius IX, in 1857. Five years after, in 1862, Père Eymard had enough spiritual sons to open a regular novitiate at the same date the congregation spread rapidly, until now its houses may be found in Rome, Belgium, Holland, Spain, Canada, the United States, and South America. The Servants of the Blessed Sacrament, a congregation of cloistered women who carry on perpetual adoration in their churches, were also founded by him in 1858. Père Eymard's writings have been collected, and form four volumes: "The Real Presence", which has been translated into English; "Retreat at the Foot of Jesus Eucharistic", "La Sainte Communion", and "L'Eucharistie et la Perfection Chrétienne". These writings have received the approbation of the Holy See. The author was declared Venerable, 11 August, 1908, and the process for Père Eymard's canonization is now in progress.

EYRE, the support of Cardinal Legate Guido, Eymeric, in the interest of peace, was removed from office at the general chapter held at Perpignan in 1360. Two years later, at the general chapter held at Ferrara, he was chosen vicar of the Dominican province in England. Shortly afterwards, when a general council was to be elected for the same province, there was a hopeless division among the Dominicans, one party supporting Eymeric, the other Father Bernardo Ernengaudi. Pope Urban V confirmed neither, but appointed a third, Jacopo Dominici. Meanwhile Eymeric showed great activity as a preacher, as well as a writer on theological subjects. Some years later he was again made inquisitor general of Aragon; we find him in this office in 1366, and several tracts on dogmatic subjects date from the years immediately following. He combated in particular Raymond Lully, in whose writings he found numerous errors. He influenced Gregory XI to forbid the faithful to read certain writings of Lully's and to condemn by a special decree (26 Jan., 1376) several theses extracted from his works. Eymeric was in high esteem with King Pedro IV of Aragon, as well as with Pope Clement XI. In 1376 he visited Avignon, and accompanied the pope on his return to Rome. He was still there at the election of Urban VI and the nomination of the antipope Clement VII, whose claims he vigorously championed against those of the Roman pope. Towards the end of 1378 he returned to Aragon, but on the interests of his own grand inquisitor often went to the court of Clement VII at Avignon. Eymeric continued his campaign against the Lullists by word as well as by pen. In his "Tractatus contra doctrinam Raymundi Lulli", dedicated to Clement VII, he indicates 153 heresies, 36 errors, and many misleading statements of Lully. He also composed a "Disputatio contra Lullistas" and other tracts. Lully's partisans, however, won over to their side, soon after his accession, King John I of Aragon. Eymeric was banished and went to the papal court of Avignon, where he was welcomed both by Clement VII and later by Benedict XIII. He wrote numerous theological works and also special tracts defending the legitimacy of the Avignon popes, e.g. his "Tractatus de potestate papali" (1383), which he composed for Clement VII, and two tractates for Benedict XIII. Notwithstanding his sentence of banishment, he still retained his post of grand inquisitor of Aragon. As early as 1376 he had compiled, as a guide for inquisitors, his "Directorium inquisitorum", the only one of his more extensive works that was afterwards printed (Barcelona, 1503; Rome, 1578, ed. Francesco Pegna, with a copious commentary; reissued several times). Towards the end of 1378 Eymeric returned to his native land and his monastery of Gerona, where he died. His epitaph describes him as "predictor veridicus, inquisitor intrepidus, doctor egregius.

Quærte et esquirr, Script. or. ord. (Paris, 1719), I, 709-17, with the titles of thirty-five of Eymeric's works, contained in eleven MSS.; HEBR, Nominat. Insunbruck, 1900; BURTON in his "Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengesch. des M. A.," I, 48 sqq.

J. P. KIRCH.

Eyre, Thomas, first president of Ushaw College; b. at Glaisop, Derbyshire, in 1748; d. at Ushaw, 8 May, 1810. He was the fourth son of Nathaniel Eyre and Jane Broomhead. On 24 June, 1758, he, with his brothers Edward and John, arrived at Esquerrich, near Douai, the preparatory school for the English college. Having passed through school and college alike with credit, he remained after his ordination as general preacher and reader of the English language of rhetoric and poetry. In 1775 Mr. Eyre returned to England to take charge of the Stella mission near Newcastle, on the invitation of his kinsman, Thomas Eyre. While he here brought out a new edition of the works of Gother and also made a collection of materials (now in the Ushaw archives) with the intention of continuing Dodd's "Church History". His scheme for a new edition of Bishop Challoner's Bible was given up at the request of Bishop Thomas Talbot. In 1792 Eyre removed from Stella to Pontop Hall in Durham. In 1794 Bishop Gibson desired him to take charge of the Northern students who had been expelled from Douai, and who were then temporarily at Tudem under Lingard, the famous historian, who had not yet been ordained priest. Mr. Eyre removed these students first to Pontop Hall and in October, 1794, to Crook Hall, where he became president of the new college. Though he was willing to resign this post in favour of Mr. Daniel, president of Douai, this suggested arrangement came to nothing and Mr. Eyre remained president. In 1803 an estate called Ushaw was bought by the bishop, and here, early in 1804, the new college was begun, and in July, 1808, Mr. Eyre began to remove his community thither. On 2 August he himself entered and the transfer of St. Cuthbert's College from Crook Hall to Ushaw was complete. Mr. Eyre died at Ushaw, having secured a considerable sum from his landed property and from numerous benefactions. The foundation was again enlarged by the foundation of the endowed college, together with the works of Gother's other brought out, in separate form, Gother's "Instructions for Confirmation" (Newcastle, 1783), and Gobinet's "Instruction for Youth in Christian Piety".


EDWIN BURTON.

EYTON, Charles, antiquary, b. 1667; d. 5 Nov., 1721; he was a member of the ancient family of Eyton, then and still of East Hendred, their house being one of the few places in England where the Blessed Sacrament has always been preserved. He was eldest son of George Eyton and of Ann, daughter of Robert Dormer of Peterley. On the death of his father in 1691 he succeeded to the family estates, and in 1692 married Winifred Dorothy, daughter of Busil Fitheberth of Swinerton, Staffordshire, by whom he had a large family. He was a good scholar and it was in his antiquarian researches that he became a friend of Thomas Hearne, who wrote of him: "He was a Roman Catholic and so charitable to the poor that he was known by all who saw him. He was a man of a sweet temper and was an excellent scholar and so modest that he did not care to have it at any time mentioned." (Reliq. Hearnianae, cit. inf.) On his death he was succeeded by his son, Charles. It is generally stated that another of his sons joined the Jesuits, but though his son, William George, entered the Society in 1736, he left it almost at once. Several of his daughters became nuns. He wrote: "A Little Monument to The Once Famous Abbey and Borough of Glastonbury", published by Hearne in his "History and Antiquities of Glastonbury" (Oxford, 1722); reprinted by the Rev. R. WOOD in his "Antiquities of the Abbey of Glaston and the town of Glastonbury" (Bath, 1826). There is in the library at Hendred an unpublished MS. entitled "A Poor Little Monument to All the Old Pious Dissolved Foundations of England: or A Short History of Abbies, all sorts of Monasteries, Colleges, Chapels, Churchies, etc." Another MS. mentioned under his name by Gillow was merely his property and not his work; and the same writer corrects Charles Butler's error in ascribing to Eyton a "History of the Reformation", published in 1685.


EDWIN BURTON.
Ezechias (Heb. יְהֹשֵׁע, יְהֹשֵׁעַ = “The Lord strongetheth”); Sept. Ἰσχαίας; in the cuneiform inscriptions Ha-za-qi-ya-hu, King of Judah, son and successor of Achaz. We learn from IV Kings, xviii, that he began his reign in the third year of Osee, King of Israel, that he was then twenty-five years of age, that he reigned twenty-nine years, and that his mother was Abi, daughter of Zacharias. The account of his reign is beset with unsolved chronological difficulties, and there exists a difference of opinion among scholars as to the year in which he ascended the throne. The commonly received computation reckoning his reign from 722 to 697 B.C. is based on an error in the policy. Ezechias was pious and agreeable to God. He took a strenuous civil and religious reformer, and on this account the sacred writer compares him to King David. The events of his reign are related in the Fourth Book of Kings, and also in the parallel account in the Second Book of Paralipomenon, but in the latter, as might be expected, stress is laid chiefly on the religious reforms which he carried out, whereas the earlier account mentions these briefly, and dwells at greater length on the civil and political aspects of his reign.

Among the religious reforms are mentioned the purification of the Temple, which had been closed by Achaz, the irreligious predecessor of Ezechias (II Par., xxviii-xxix), the resumption and proper celebration of the feast of the Passover which had been neglected (II Par., xxx), and in general the extirpation of idolatry and the reorganization of the Hebrew worship (IV K., xviii, II Par., xxxi). In a title prefixed to the twenty-fifth chapter of Proverbs, it is stated that the sayings contained in the following collection (xxv-xxix) were copied out by the “men of Ezechias.” This would seem to indicate, on the part of the king, some interest and activity in the reorganization of the religious cult. The events of Ezechias under the influence of Sennacherib, and the invasion of Sennacherib. The story of the sickness of Ezechias is narrated in IV K., xx, and in Is., xxxvii.

The king having stricken with some mortal disease, the prophet Isaiah comes in the name of Yahweh to him to put his affairs in order, for he is about to die. But Ezechias prays to the Lord, Who sends the prophet back to announce to him that he will recover, and that fifteen years are to be added to his life. As a sign of the fulfillment of this promise, Isaiah causes the shadow to recede a distance of ten lines on the sundial. Connected with this event is the sending of an embassy by Berodach Baladan, King of Babylon, who having heard of the illness of Ezechias, sent messengers to him with presents. The motive of this action on the part of the Babylonian king was probably to enlist the services of Ezechias in a league against Sennacherib, King of Assyria. Ezechias received the envoys with great honour, and exhibited to them his various treasures and armaments of war. This spirit of ostentation was displeasing to the Lord, and Isaiah was sent to announce that the treasures, in which the king had acted to place himself, would be all carried off as plunder to Babylon. Not long after (according to the cuneiform inscriptions, in the year 701), Sennacherib undertook a great campaign against Syria and Egypt. The story of this expedition is told, from the Assyrian standpoint, in the official cuneiform inscription known as the Tamar inscription. The policy of Sennacherib was first, to vanquish the kings of Ascalon, Sidon and Juda who had formed a coalition against him, and then to turn his attention to the land of the Pharaohs.

After subduing Ascalon and Acearon, the Assyrian invader captured and plundered all the fortified towns of Juda, and carried their inhabitants into exile. Then he besieged Jerusalem, and Ezechias, finding himself shut up “like a bird in a cage,” resolved to come to terms with his enemy. Sennacherib demanded thirty talents of gold and three hundred talents of silver, and, in order to supply it, Ezechias was obliged to yield up not only the contents of the royal treasury, but also the silver belonging to the Temple, and the plates of gold which were on the doors thereof (IV K. xvii). But when in addition to this, the Assyrian demanded the surrender of Jerusalem with a view to subduing its inhabitants into exile, in characteristic fashion Ezechias was revived, and he prepared himself for a vigorous resistance. Haughty demands of surrender were repulsed, and the king taking counsel with the prophet Isaiah turned in supplication to Yahweh; he received the assurance that the enemy would soon abandon the siege without doing any harm to the city. This prophecy was shortly verified when the angel of the Lord slaying in the night 185,000 of the besieging forces, the remainder fled with Sennacherib, and returned to Assyria. Ezechias survived this deliverance only a few years, and he was buried with great solemnity in the tomb of the sons of David (IV K. xx, 21; II Par. xxxii, 33).


James F. Driscoll.

Ezechiel, whose name, Yehészqel (בשֶׁךֹל) signifies “strong is God”, or “whom God makes strong” (Ezech., i, 3; iii, 8), was the son of Buzi, and was one of the priests who, in the year 598 B. C., had been deported together with Joachim as prisoners from Jerusalem (cf. Ezech., vi, 17, and in the Acts, xxi, 1, v 1, and in the xxv, 21). With the other exiles he settled in Tell-Abib near the Chobar (Ezech., i, 1; iii, 15) in Babylonia, and seems to have spent the rest of his life there. In the fifth year after the captivity of Joachim, and according to some, the thirtieth year of his life, Ezechiel received his call as a prophet (Ezech. i, 2; 4 etc.) in the vision which he describes in the beginning of his prophecy (Ezech. i, 4; iii, 15). From Ezech. xxix, 17 it appears that he prophesied during at least twenty-two years.

Ezechiel was called to foretell God’s faithfulness in the midst of trials, as well as in the fulfillment of His promises. During the first period of his career, he foretold the complete destruction of the kingdom of Juda, and the annihilation of the city and temple. After the fulfillment of these predictions, he was commanded to announce the future return from exile, the re-establishment of the people in their own country and, especially, the triumph of the Kingdom of the Messiah, the second David, so that the people would not abandon themselves to despair and perish as a nation, through contact with the Gentiles, whose gods had apparently triumphed over the God of Israel. This is the principal burden of Ezechiel’s prophecy, which is divided into three parts. After the introduction, the vision of the calling of the prophet (Ezech., i, 1-21), the first part contains the prophecies against Juda before the fall of Jerusalem (Ezech. xxvii, 22-xxiv). In this part the prophet declares the hope of saving the city, the kingdom, and the temple to be vain, and announces the approaching judgment of God upon Juda. This part may be subdivided into five group of prophecies.

(1) After a second revelation, in which God discloses to the prophet His course of action (iii, 22-27), the prophet foretells by symbolic acts (iv, v) and in words (vi-vii), the siege and capture of Jerusalem, and the banishment of Juda. (2) In a prophetic vision, in the presence of the elders of Israel, God reveals to him the cause of these punishments. In spirit he witnesses...
the idolatry practised in and near the temple (viii); God commands that the guilty be punished and the faithful be spared (ix); God's majesty departs from the temple (x), and also, after the announcement of guilt and punishment, from the city. With this the judgment which the prophet communicates to the exiles ends (xi).

(3) In the third group (xii-xix) many different prophecies are brought together, whose sole connexion is the relation they bear to the guilt and punishment of Jerusalem and Judah. Ezekiel prophesies by symbolic actions the exile of the people, the flight of Se-decis, and the devastation of the land (xii, 1-20). Then follow Divine revelations regarding belief in false prophecies, and disbelief in the very presence of the true prophet. This was one of the causes of the horrors (xiii, 21-xiv, 11), to be visited upon the remnant of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (xiv, 12-23). The prophet likens Jerusalem to the dead wood of the vine, which is destined for the fire (xv); in an elaborate denunciation he represents Judah as a shameless harlot, who surpasses Samaria and Sodom in malice (xvi), and in a new simile, he condemns King Se-decis (xvii). After a discourse on the justice of God (xviii), there follows a further lamentation over the princes and the people of Juda (xix). (4) In the presence of the elders the prophet denounces the whole people of Israel for the abominations they practised in Egypt, in the Wilderness, and in Canaan (xx). For these Juda shall be consumed by fire, and Jerusalem shall be exterminated by the sword (xxi). Abominable is the immorality of Jerusalem (xxii), but Juda is more guilty than Israel has ever been (xxiii).

(5) On the day on which the siege of Jerusalem began, the prophet represents, under the figure of the rusty pot, what was to befall the inhabitants of the city. On the occasion of the death of his wife, God forbids him to mourn openly, in order to teach the exiles that they should be willing to lose that which is dearest to them without grieving over it (xxiv).

In the second part (xxv-xxxii), are gathered together the prophecies concerning the Gentiles. He takes, first of all, the neighbouring peoples who had been exalted through the downfall of Juda, and who had humiliated Israel. The fate of four of these, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Edomites, and the Philistines, is condensed in chapter xxv. He treats Ezechiel as a force at length of Tyre (xxvi, 18-21), after which he casts a glance at Sidon (xxviii, 20-21).

Six prophecies against Egypt follow, dating from different years (xxix-xxxii). The third part (xxxiii-xlv), is occupied with the Divine utterances on the subject of Israel's restoration. As introduction, we have a dissertation from the prophet, in his capacity of authorized champion of the mercy and justice of God, after which he addresses himself to those remaining in Juda, and to the perverse exiles (xxxiii). The manner in which God will restore His people is only indicated in a general way. The Lord will cause the evil shepherds to perish; He will gather in, guide, and feed the sheep by means of the second David, the Messiah (xxxiv).

Though Mount Seir shall remain a waste, Israel shall return unto its own. There God will purify His people, animate the nation with a new spirit, and re-establish in it its former splendour for the glory of His name (xxxv-xxxvii). Israel, though dead, shall rise again, and the dry bones shall be covered with flesh and endowed with life before the eyes of the prophet. Ephraim and Juda shall, under the second David, be united into one kingdom, and the Lord shall dwell in their midst (xxxvii). The invincibleness and un- destructibility of the restored kingdom are then symbolically presented in the war upon Gog, his inglorious defeat, and the annihilation of his armies (xxxviii-xlix). In the last prophetic vision, God shows the new temple (xl-xlii), the new worship (xlili-xlv), the return to their own land, and the new division among the twelve tribes (xlvi-xlvii), as a figure of His foundation of a kingdom where He shall dwell among His people, and where He shall be served in His tabernacle according to strict rules, by priests of His choice, and by the prince of the house of David.

From this review of the contents of the prophecy, it is evident that the prophetic vision, the symbolic actions and examples, comprise a considerable portion of the book. The completeness of the description of the vision, actions and similes, is one of the many causes of the obscurity of the book of Ezechiel. It is often difficult to distinguish between what is essential to the matter represented, and what serves merely to make the image more vivid. On this account it happens that, in the circumstantial descriptions, words are used, the meaning of which, inasmuch as they occur in Ezechiel only, is not determined. Because of this obscurity, a number of controversial questions present them- selves in the text, and that at an early date. Since the Septuagint has some of them in common with the earliest Hebrew text we have. The Greek version, however, includes several readings which help to fix the meaning. The genuineness of the book of Ezechiel is generally conceded. Some few consider chapters xl-xlvii to be apocryphal, because the plan there described in the building of the temple was not followed, but they overlook the fact that Ezechiel here gives a symbolic representation of the temple, that was to find spiritual realization in God's new kingdom. The Divine character of the prophecies was recognized as early as the time of Jesus the son of Sirach (Eccles. xlix, 10, 11). In the New Testament, there are no verbatim references, but allusions to the prophecy and figures taken from it are frequent. Compare St. John x etc. with Ezech. xxxiv. 11 etc.; St. Matthew xxii, 39 with Ezech. xxvii. 23. In particular, The Apocalypse, has often followed Ezechiel. Compare Apoc. xviii-xii with Ezech. xxvii, xxxviii etc., xlvii etc.

Curtis, Ezechiel (London, 1882); Corpus, Ezechiel and Daniel (New York, 1903); Redpath, The Book of Ezechiel (London, 1907); Schmid, Enkomiations in the Text of Ezechiel in Am. Jour-
Eziongeber  See Asiongaber.

Eznik, a writer of the fifth century, b. at Golp, in the province of Taikh, a tributary valley of the Chorokh, in Northern Armenia. He was a pupil of Isaac, the catholicos, and of Mesrop. At their request he went first to Edessa, then to Constantinople to perfect himself in the various sciences and to collect or copy Syriac and Greek manuscripts of the Bible, and the writings of the Fathers of the Church. He returned to Armenia after the Council of Ephesus (431), and is probably identical with Eznik, Bishop of Artashat, who took part in the Synod of Artashat in 449. In addition to his labours in connexion with the new version of the Bible (see Versions of the Bible) and various translations, he composed several works, the principal of which is his remarkable treatise "Against the Sects". It was written between 441 and 449, and contains four books or chapters. In the first, against the heathens, Eznik combats the eternity of matter and the substantial existence of evil. In the second he refutes the chief doctrines of Parseism. The third is directed against the Greek philosophers (Pythagoreans, Platonists, Peripatetics, Stoics, and Epicureans), the writer taking his arguments from the Bible rather than from reason. The fourth book is an exposition and refutation of Marcionism. In the work Eznik displays much acumen and an extensive erudition. He was evidently as familiar with Persian as with Greek literature. His Armenian diction is of the choicest classical type, although the nature of his subject-matter forced him to use quite a number of Greek words. The work "Against the Sects" was first published at Smyrna in 1762; again, much more correctly and from several manuscripts, by the Mechitarists at Venice in 1826 and in 1865. An indifferent French translation was made by Le Vaillant de Florial, "Réfutation des différentes sectes", etc. (Paris, 1853). A good German translation is that by J. M. Schmidt, "Eznik von Kolb, Wider die Sekten" (Leipzig, 1900). Langlois published a general introduction to the whole treatise and a translation of part of book II (section 5, 1-11, containing Magism) in his "Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie", II, pp. 371 sq. Eznik is also the author of a short collection of moral precepts, printed with his more important treatise.

NIEUMANN, Versuch einer Geschichte der armenischen Literatur, nach den Werken der Mechitaristen freizuarbeitet (Leipzig, 1835), 42 seq.; FINCK, Geschichte der armenischen Literatur in Geschichte der christlichen Literaturen des Orients (Leipzig, 1897), 65 sq.; BARDENHEUER, Patrology, tr. SHAHAN (Freiburg, 1908), 593; WIEBKE, Die Katholische Kirche in Armenien (Freiburg im Br., 1909), 50.

H. HYVERNAT.

Ezzo, a priest of Bamberg in the eleventh century, author of a famous poem known as the "Song of the Miracles of Christ" (Cantilena de miraculis Christi), or the "Angenge" or "Beginning". The poem was found by Burack in a Strasbourg MS. of the eleventh century, but only a few strophes are given. The whole song, thirty-four strophes, is preserved, though in a later version, in the Vorau MS. The "Vita Altmanni" relates that in 1065, when rumours of the approaching end of the world were rife, many people started on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem under the leadership of Bishop Gunther of Bamberg, and that Ezzo composed the poem on this occasion. The opening strophe of the Vorau MS. does not mention the pilgrimage, but simply states that the bishop ordered Ezzo to write the song. The effect, we are told, was such that everybody hastened to take monastic vows. The poem is written in the East Franconian dialect; it relates in earnest language the Creation, Fall, and Redemption of mankind. It was edited by P. Piper (op. cit. infra) and Steinmayer (in Müllenhoff and Scherer "Denkmäler deutscher Poesie und Prosa aus dem VIII-XII Jahrhundert", Berlin, 1892).


ARTHUR F. J. REMY.
Faa di Bruno, Francesco, an Italian mathematician and priest, b. at Alexandria, 7 March, 1825; d. at Turin, 26 March, 1888. He was of noble birth, and held, at one time, the rank of captain-of-staff in the Sardinian Army. Coming to Paris, he resigned his commission, studied under Cauchy, an admirable type of the true Catholic savant, and Leverrier, who shared in the discovery of the planet Neptune, and he became intimate with Abbé Moigno and Hermite. On his return to Turin, he was ordained, but the remainder of his life was spent as Professor of Mathematics at the University. In recognition of his achievements as a mathematician, the degree of Doctor of Science was conferred on him by the Universities of Paris and Turin. In addition to some ascetical writings, the composition of some sacred melodies, and the invention of some scientific apparatus, Faa di Bruno made numerous and important contributions to mathematics. These include about forty original articles published in the "Journal de Mathématiques" (Liouville), Crolle's "Journal", "American Journal of Mathematics" (Johns Hopkins University), "Annali di Tortolini", "Les Mondes", "Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences", etc.; the first half of an exhaustive treatise on the theory and applications of elliptic functions which he planned to complete in three volumes, "Théorie générale de l'élimination" (Paris, 1859); "Calcolo degli errori" (Turin, 1867), translated into French under the title of "Traité élémentaire du calcul des erreurs" (Paris, 1869); and most important of all, "Théorie des formes binaires" (Paris, 1876), translated into German (Leipzig, 1881). For a list of the memoirs of Faa di Bruno, see the "Catalogue of Scientific Papers of the Royal Society" (London, 1869, 1877, 1891), t. II, viii, and ix.

Paul H. Linehan.

Faa di Bruno, Joseph. See Pious Society of Missions.

Faber, Felix, German writer, b. about 1441 at Zurich, of a famous family commonly known as Schmid; d. in 1502 at Ulm, Germany. He made his early studies under the Dominicans at Basle and Ulm, where he spent the greater part of his life. He became a master of sacred theology, was head preacher at Ulm during 1477-78, became provincial of the German province in 1486, attended two general chapters of his order in 1480, and made a pilgrimage to Palestine and Syria in 1483-4. He wrote two accounts of his travels, one in German (Ulm, 1556); the other in Latin. The former is rather brief; the other is very complete and accurate in its descriptions of the places visited, and is of great value to students of Palestinian topography, who recognize Faber as the most distinguished and learned writer of the fifteenth century. This work was republished by the Stuttgart Literary Society in three octavo volumes (1843-49) under the title, "Fr. Felixis Fabri Evagatorium in Terrae Sanctae, Arabiae et Egyptiae peregrinationem". He was also the author of a verified pilgrim's book, edited by Brilinger (Munich, 1861). In 1489 Faber completed a history of the Swiss (Historia Suevorum) down to the death of Godolphin, 1488, in his Latin, and presented it to the Frankfort edition of 1604 (later ed., Ulm, 1727), says of him that he was praised by few but copied by many. Faber translated a life of Blessed Henry Suso from the Latin. Some of his manuscripts are still unpublished.

Quintus and Euchard, Scriptores Ord. Pred., I, 871; Haebel- lin, Dissert. scient. vienn., t. iv, scripta Fr. F. Faber (Göttingen, 1742); cf. also preface to the Stuttgart ed. of the Enumeri.

Arthur L. McMahon.

Faber, Frederick William, Oratorian and devotional writer; b. 28 June, 1814, at Calverley, Yorkshire, England; d. in London, 26 Sept., 1883. After five years at Harrow School he matriculated at Bulloll in 1832, became a scholar at University College in 1834, and a fellow of that College in 1837. Of Huguenot descent Faber was divided in his university days between a tendency to Calvinism, in the form of individual piety, and the Church theory then being advocated by Newman. Eventually the latter triumphed, and Faber threw himself unreservedly into the Tractarian movement and cooperate in the translation of the works of the Fathers then in progress. He received Anglican ordination in 1839, and took work as a tutor, till, in 1843, he was appointed Rector of Elton, Northamptonshire. During the years 1839-1843 Faber made two continental tours, and his letters give strikingly poetic descriptions of the scenes he visited; they glow with enthusiasm for Catholic rites and devotion. On his return to Elton in 1844, he established the practice of confession, preached Catholic doctrine, and wrote the life of St. Wilfrid, openly advocating the claims and supremacy of Rome. In October 1845, Newman was received into the Church at Littlemore; in November, Faber was also received by Bishop Waring, at Northampton. In 1846, Faber established a religious community, the "Brothers of the Will of God" or "Wilfridians," as they were called from St. Wilfrid, their patron, at Cotton Hall, near Cheddle, Staffordshire, the gift of the Earl of Shrewsbury. In 1847 Faber was ordained priest and with his zealous community, now forty in number, converted the whole parish, except "the parson, the pew-opener, and two drunken men." In 1848, Newman arrived from Rome with his new congregation of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, and established himself at Old Oscott, Birmingham, then renamed Maryvale. With singular disinterestess, Faber placed himself under Newman as a simple novice, taking with him all his community who were willing to follow his example. In 1849 he was sent by Newman to found the Oratory at King William Street, London, and was appointed its superior. In the poor chapel there, once a tavern, Faber laid the foundation of his future works. Poor schools, nightly services, and sermons with hymns and procession of the Blessed Sacrament, till then unknown, formed its chief...
characteristics. Faber's hymns, composed especially for these services, display a combination of accurate theological doctrine, fervent devotion, musical rhythm, and true poetical talent. As a preacher he was remarkable for his delivery, choice of expression, absence of calculation, and personal exhortations of surpassing force.

In 1847 Faber began the publication of "Lives of Modern Saints," not as biographies, but as showing the growth of sanctity under the operation of grace and the supernatural perfection attained. The series of forty-nine Lives supplied a want of the time and, after some opposition, met with full approval. His knowledge of the spiritual life and the extent of his theological and ascetic reading were seen in the eight works that now came from his pen: "All for Jesus, 1853; Growth in Holiness, 1854; The Blessed Sacrament, 1855; The Creator and the Creature, 1858; The Foot of the Cross, 1858; Spiritual Conferences, 1859; The Precious Blood, 1860; Bethlehem, 1860. The many foreign translations of these works, their circulation now maintained for more than fifty years, their constant quotation by successors, and the殊作 of a master in mystical theology. He wrote also two volumes of "Notes on Doctrinal Subjects" (1866), giving the skeleton of various sermons and of two projected works, "Calvary" and "The Holy Ghost." A volume of poems, various essays, and other minor works are also from his pen. The fascination and grace of his presence rendered him personally attractive, while as confessor his sympathy with souls in trouble, his spiritual insight, and his supernatural unworldliness, gave to his counsel a lifelong and force.

The Oratory removed to South Kensington in 1854, and there Faber spent the remaining nine years of his life, occupied primarily in establishing his community on the strict observance of St. Philip's Institute, being convinced that fidelity to its Roman model was its one vital principle. The sacraments, prayer, including the reverent performance of the ecclesiastical functions, and the daily Word of God were St. Philip's weapons, and Faber would never engage in other external works, however good. Unswerving loyalty to the Holy See was his watchword, and devotion to the Mother of God, was for him the safeguard of faith and the support of twofold.


Henry S. Bowden.

Faber, Johann, theologian, b. at Leutkirch, in Swabia, 1478; d. in Vienna, 21 May, 1541. He studied theology and canon law at Tubingen and Freiburg; was made doctor of sacred theology in Freiburg; became in succession minister of Lin- dul, Utkirch, Vicar-General of Constance, 1518; chaplain and confessor to King Ferdinand I of Austria, 1524; was appointed Bishop of Vienna, 1530. While a canon of the cathedral of Basle he formed a friendship with Erasmus that lasted throughout his life. Erasmus persuaded Faber to take up the study of the Fathers. Like others of his time Faber was at first friendly with the Reformers, Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Oecolampadius, sympathizing with their efforts at reform and opposing certain abuses himself; but when he realized that neither dogmas nor the Church herself were spared by the Reformers, he broke with them and became their most consistent opponent. He wrote his first polemic against Luther, "Opus adversus novam quaedam dogmata Martini Lutheri" (1522). This was soon followed by his "Mallev Hereticorum, sex libri ad Hadrianum VI summum Pontificem" (Cologne, 1524; Rome, 1509). From this latter work he is some-
times called the "hammer of heretics." He entered into public debate with Zwingli at Zurich; was prominent in all the diets held to restore peace to the Church; and was one of the committee appointed to draw up a refutation of the Confession of Augsburg. On some points, e. g. the celibacy of the clergy, he was willing to recognize certain of the errors of the Reformers if an agreement could be reached to prevent similar conditions in the future, but no agreement was possible. He was sent by Ferdinand to Spain and then to Henry VIII in England to seek aid against the invading Turks. Ferdinand also had him enlist the services of the University of Vienna to defend the doctrines of Luther in Austria. As bishop his zeal was unbounded; he protected his flock by frequent preaching and numerous writings, and he held regular conferences with his clergy. He founded twelve scholarships for boys who wished to become priests but did not have the means to realize their ambition.

His works (German and Latin) are homiletical and polemical in character. Besides those already mentioned he wrote treatises on faith and good works, on the Sacrifice of the Mass; an instruction and answer to questions of the King of England, on the Middle Ages against the more recent tenets of Luther; a comparison of the writings of Hus and Luther; the power of the pope in the case of Luther; an answer to six articles of Zwingli; defence of Catholic belief against the chief Anabaptist, Balthasar of Friedberg; a book on the sacraments on the Russian Empire, and on the Blessed Sacrament; sermons of consolation and courage while the Turks were besieging Vienna. His works in three folio volumes (Cologne, 1537-40) do not contain his polemical writings; these are found in "Opuscula quaedam Joannis Fabri, Episcopi Viennensis" (Leipzig, 1520).

Quétif and Echard, Scriptores Ord. Pred. (Paris, 1721), tom. II; Dolen, Scriptores Unitarii Viennenses, pars II (Vienna, 1836); Ketten, De Jeannel in Faber, op. cit.; Jansen, History of the German People (Freiburg, 1865); Roth in Kirchenl. IV, 172-175.

M. Schumacher.

Faber, Johann, of Heilbronn, controversialist and preacher; b. 1504, at Heilbronn in Wittenberg; d. at Augsburg, 27 Feb., 1558. At the age of sixteen he entered the Dominican Order and made his ecclesiastical studies at Wimpfen; the earliest missionary labours little is known. In 1534 he was charged with the duty of preaching in the cathedral of Augsburg, but owing to the Lutheran heresies and the bitter attitude of the heretics towards the Church, in consequence of which he was forbidden to preach, his usefulness there was of short duration. Thence he went to the University of Cologne, where he devoted himself for several years to the higher clerical studies. Here he published in 1535 and 1536 several unedited works of the English mystic, Richard Rolle. Returning to Wimpfen he engaged in the work of preaching and refuting the errors of the Reformers, which had already taken deep root among a large portion of the people. His unwarred zeal, however, in upholding the ancient faith and the marvellous results attending it, caused his enemies to turn against him with such bitterness that he was forced to leave the city. In 1539, at the solicitation of the citizens of Colmar, he proceeded to that city, where the new doctrines had by this time gained considerable ground. On 2 Sept. of the same year he matriculated at the University of Freiburg as "unfortunate." It was at this time, in all probability, that he received the baccalaureate. In 1545 he was elected prior of the convent in Schlettstadt, but he had served only two years in this capacity when he was again appointed to take charge of the pulpit in the cathedral of Augsburg. Being compelled to accept this appointment, in 1552, he proceeded to the University of Ingolstadt, where he received the degree of Doctor of Theology
under the presidency of Peter Canisius, who succeeded him later in the pulpit of Augsburg. In the following year he returned again to Augsburg, where he died. 

Faber was a man of vast theological erudition. His zeal to stem the tide of heresy and the invincible courage he displayed in exposing the prevailing errors brought him into conflict with many heretical leaders. He is the author of a number of excellent works, including the following: (1) "Quod fides esse positum sit caritate, exposito pia et catholica" (Augsburg, 1548); (2) "Testimonia Scripturae et Patrum B. Petri in fuisse" (Antwerp, 1553); (3) "Gründliche und christliche Anzeigungen aus der heiligen Schrift und kirchlichen Kirchenlehren was die evangelische Messe sei" (Dillingen, 1558); (4) "Enchiridion Bibliorium concionatorum in popularibus declamationibus utile" (Cologne, 1568); (5) "Precaitiones Christianae ex sacris litteris et D. Augustino singulario studio concinnatia et selecta" (Cologne, 1568).

**Quintin and Echard, Scriptores Ord. Pred., II, 161; Hunter, Nomenclator, 3rd ed., II, 1431; Paulus, "Die deutschen Dominikaner im Kampfengegen Luther" (Freiburg, 1868), 292-313.**

**Arthur L. McMahon.**

**Faber, Matthias**, writer and preacher, b. at Altomünster, Germany, 24 Feb., 1586; d. at Tyrunau, 26 April, 1653. He embraced the ecclesiastical state, became curé of the parish of St. Maurice at Ingolstadt, and was a professor at the University of that city. He succeeded in winning for him a reputation as a sacred orator when he entered the Society of Jesus at Vienna. He was then fifty years old. The sermons which he has left are remarkable for soundness of doctrine, and learning. He is even more a controversialist than an orator in the ordinary sense of the word. His object in preaching was, before everything, either to convert heretics, or to safeguard Catholics from the false doctrines of the Reformation. According to the custom of the times he made extensive use of Scriptural texts, which crowed his instructive sermons and render the reading of them difficult. They are all written in Latin, and have been published in modern editions.

**Sommervogel, Bibl. de la c. de J.** (Brussels, 1891), III; FABER, Concionum Opus praeface.

**Louis Lalande.**

**Faber, Peter.** See Peter Faber, Saint.

**Faber (FABRIL), Philipp, theologian, philosopher, and noted commentator of Duns Scotus; b. in 1564, at Spinaia di Braghiella, district of Faenza, Italy, and d. at Padua, 28 Aug., 1630. In 1582 he entered the Order of St. Francis (Conventuals), at Cremona. After completing his studies, he taught in various monastic schools till he was appointed professor of philosophy in 1603, and in 1606 professor of theology, at the University of Padua, where he was highly successful as a lecturer. In 1625 he was elected provincial of the order, and he again took up his work as professor, expounding the teachings of Duns Scotus with ability and judgment, and abandoning the superlative style of other commentators. His important works are: "Philosophia naturalis Scoti in theorematum distributa" (Parma, 1601, revised at Venice, 1606, 1616, 1622, and at Paris, 1622). "Commentaria in quatuor libros sententiarum Duns Scoti" (Venice, 1613; 3rd ed. Paris, 1622). "De Predicatione" (Venice, 1623), a supplement to the first book of the "Sentences"; "De restitutione, et extrema unione" (Venice, 1624), an addition to the fourth book of the Sentences; "A treatise de Sacramento Ordinis, parvis et censuris ecclesiasticis" (Venice, 1628). His "Preface to the Primata" and "Roma Pontificum" and "His Commentaries on the Metaphysics of Aristotle" were published, after Faber's death, by his friend Matthew Ferechius, O.F.M., who prefaced the "Commentaries", with a biography of the author.

**Franchini, Bibliotheca monastica et ab urbe Francor. Franciscanorum Conventualium (Modena, 1688), 204-218; Warding, Script. Ord. Min. (Rome, 1906), 196; Sbaralea, Supplementum ad Scriptores (Rome, 1806), p. 67.**

**Michael Bilh.**

**Faber Stapulensis.** See Leefevre d'Estaples, Jacques.

**Fabin (FABIANUS), Saint, Pope, 236-250, the extraordinary circumstances of whose election is related by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., VI, 29). After the death of Anterus he had come to Rome, with some others, from his farm and was in the city when the new election began. While the names of several illustrious and noble persons were being considered, a dove suddenly descended upon the head of Fabian, of whom no one had even thought. To the assembled court-proceedings the "Liber Pontificalis" says that he divided Rome into seven districts, each supervised by a deacon, and appointed seven subdeacons, to collect, in conjunction with other notaries, the "acta" of the martyrs, i.e. the reports of the court-proceedings on the occasion of their trials (Eus. Hist., VI, 34). The practice of having the pope divide the city into districts is a tradition that he instituted the four minor orders. Under him considerable work was done in the catacombs. He caused the body of Pope St. Pontianus to be exhumed, in Sardinia, and transferred to the catacomb of St. Callistus at Rome. Later accounts, more or less trustworthy, attribute to him the consecration (245) of seven bishops as missionaries to Gaul, among them St. Denis of Paris (Greg. of Tours, Hist. Franc., I, 28, 31). St. Cyprian mentions (Ep., 59) the condemnation by Fabian for heresy of a certain Privatus (Bishop of Lambessa) in Africa. The praebens Origens did not hesitate to declare Fabian, the orthodoxy of his teaching (Eus. Hist. Eccl., VI, 34). Fabian died a martyr (20 Jan., 250) at the beginning of the Decian persecution, and was buried in the Crypt of the Popes in the catacomb of St. Callistus, where in recent times (1850) de Rossi discovered his Greek epitaph (Roma Sotteranea II, 59): "Fabin,
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bishop and martyr.” The decreals ascribted to him in Pseudo-Isidore are apocryphal.


P. Gabriel Meir.

Fabiola, Saint, a Roman matron of rank, d. 27 December, 399 or 400. She was one of the company of noble Roman women who, under the influence of St. Jerome, gave up all earthly pleasures and devoted themselves to the practice of Christian asceticism and to good works. At the time of St. Jerome’s stay at Rome (382-84), Fabiola was not one of the ascetic circle which gathered around him. It was not until a later date, that, upon the death of her second consort, she took the decisive step of entering upon a life of renunciation and labour for others. Fabiola belonged to the patrician Roman family of the Fabia. She had been married to a man who led so vicious a life that to live with him was impossible. She obtained a divorce from him according to Roman law, and, contrary to the ordinances of the Church, she entered upon a second union before the death of her first husband. On the day of Easter, following the death of her second consort, she appeared before the gates of the Latran basilica, dressed in penitential garb, and did penance in public for her sin, an act which made a great impression upon the Christian population of Rome. The pope received her formally again into full communion with the Church.

Fabiola now renounced all that the world had to offer her, and devoted her immense wealth to the needs of the poor and the sick. She erected a fine hospital at Rome, and waited on the inmates herself, not even shunning those afflicted with repulsive wounds and sores. Besides, she gave large sums to the churches and religious communities at Rome, and at other places in Italy. All her interests were centred on the needs of the Church and the care of the poor and suffering. In 395, she went to Bethlehem, where she lived in the hospice of the convent directed by Paula and applied herself, under the direction of St. Jerome, with the greatest zeal to the study and contemplation of the Scriptures, and to ascetic exercises. An incursion of the Huns into the eastern provinces of the empire, and the quarrel which broke out between St. Jerome and Bishop John of Jerusalem, respecting the teachings of Origen, made residence in Bethlehem unpleasant for her, and she returned to Rome. She remained, however, in correspondence with St. Jerome, who at her request wrote a treatise on the priesthood of Aaron and the priestly dress. At Rome, Fabiola united with the former senator Pammachius in carrying out a great charitable undertaking; together they erected at Porto a large hospice for pilgrims coming to Rome. Fabiola also continued her usual personal labours in aid of the poor and sick until her death. Her funeral was a wonderful manifestation of the gratitude and veneration with which she was regarded by the Roman populace. St. Jerome wrote a eulogistic memoir of Fabiola in a letter to her relative Oceanes.


Fabre, Joseph, second Superior General of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, b. 14 November, 1824, at Cuges, Bouches-du-Rhône, France; d. at Royaumont near Paris, 26 October, 1892. He first studied at the Lycée of Marseilles, then entered the Grand Séminaire of the same city, and made his novitiate in the Congregation of the Oblates, pronouncing his final vows 17 February, 1845. After teaching philosophy for some time, he was ordained priest, 29 May, 1847. He was Director of the Grand Séminaire of Marseilles when, in 1850, a general chapter elected him procurator of the whole Institute. The Bishop of Marseilles, who was also the superior and founder of the Oblates, made him his trusted confidant; and when that prelate died Father Fabre was unanimously elected to succeed him (5 Dec., 1861) as Superior General of his congregation, in which capacity he from time to time addressed to the members of his congregation, encyclical letters which have remained models of spiritual direction. He instituted collective retreats for the superiors, and other foundations for the simple religious, and insisted on the observance of charity and humility, which Bishop De Mazenod had made the cardinal virtues of his Institute.

He introduced his missionaries into Italy, Spain, and Holland, established new houses in France, Great Britain, and Canada, and, in 1883, canonically erected into a separate province the houses already existing in the United States. Their activities in the missions of Ceylon, South Africa, and the extreme North, as well as the far West, of America, were no less remarkable during his tenure of office.

In the time of his Superior General, when he had been superior for thirty-one years, the roll of members had more than doubled in numbers, and the Oblates counted in their ranks ten bishops who were at the head of as many vicariates Apostolic. If Bishop De Mazenod had founded and consolidated the congregation, the last touches to the good work were given by his immediate successor. In addition to being their superior general, Father Fabre was the Director-General of the Association of the Holy Family, a religious institute composed of seven congregations of nuns founded at Bordeaux in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Notices saceroliques des Oblates de Marie Immaculée (Bar-le-Duc, 1899); BENOIT, Vie de Mgr. Tauché (Montreal, 1904).

A. G. Morice.

Fabri (LEFÈVRE), Honoré, Jesuit, theologian, b. about 1607 in the Department of Ain, France; d. at Rome, 8 March, 1688. He entered the Society of Jesus at Avignon, in 1626, and distinguished himself by a life of continuous mental work. He excelled especially in mathematics and physics, but he was also a formidable controversialist. For twenty-five years he taught philosophy and for six years mathematics in the Jesuit college at Lyons, attracting many pupils by the fame of his learning. Called to Rome, he became the theologian of the court of the papal penitentiary in the Vatican Basilica, a position he held for thirty years. His duties did not prevent him from writing a number of learned works on various subjects in keeping with the needs of his time. Sommervogel mentions thirty-one titles of published works in connexion with Fabri’s name; besides, there are fourteen of his productions in MS., now kept in the Library of Lyons.

The following are the more important of his publications: “Pithanophilus, seu dialogus vel opusculum de opinione probabilib,” etc. (Rome, 1683). This work was attacked by Stephanus Gradus, Prefect of the Vatican Library; in his “Disputatio de opinione probabilib” (Rome, 1678; Mechin, 1679). “Honoriati Fabri, Societatis Jesu, apologeticus doctrinae moralis ejusdem Societatis” (Lyons, 1670; Cologne, 1672). This treatise, in eleven dialogues, of probabilism, explaining its true nature, and refuting the charges of its opponents. The Cologne edition was considerably enlarged but did not meet with ecclesiastical approbation; it was placed on the Index of forbidden books soon after its appearance. “Una fides unius Ecclesiae Romanae contra indifferentes hujus saeculi tribus libros facile methodo asserta” (Rome, 1687). “Summula theologica in quinque questiones imennes aliquus momenti, qua Scholasticis agitati
solent, breviter descuntutur ac defunctor" (Lyons, 1669). The principles on which this work constructs its theological conclusions are far different from those of Aristotle. "Euphodieran seu vir ingeniosus", a little book, which may be useful to the student of literature (Lyon, 1669; Budapest, 1703). Most of Fabri's other works deal with philosophy, mathematics, physics, astronomy, and even zoology. In his treatise on man he claims to have discovered the circulation of the blood, prior to Harvey; but, after investigating this question, Father Fabri arrives at the conclusion that, at best, Father Fabri may have made the discovery independently of Harvey (cf. Bellamy, Cours de Zoologie, 1864, p. 23). Sommervogel, *Bibl. de la C. de J.* (Brussels and Paris, 1892), III, 511-523; Hunter, *Nomenclator Literarius* (Hannover, 1893), tom. II, 598-600.

A. J. MAA.

Fabriano and Matelica, Diocese of (Fabriano- nien-sis et Matelicensis). Fabriano, a city in the province of Macerata, Central Italy, is noted for its paper manufactories and its trade in salted fish. It is said to have been founded in the ninth century A.D. by refugees from the ancient Attidium (the modern Atti- ggio); even as late as 1351 the baptismal font of Fabriano was in the church of San Giovanni Battista in Attigio. The history of Fabriano is closely connected with that of the Marches. In the church of San Benedetto, of the Silvestrine monks, is the tomb of Blessed Giovanni Bonelli, a Silvestrine (d. 1290). St. Silvestro Guzzoli, the founder of this order, is buried at Monte Fino, not far from Fabriano, where Blessed Giuseppe dei Conti Atti and Blessed Ugo Laioco, both Silvestrines, are also buried. The relics of St. Romuald were transferred to the church of SS. Biagio and Romualdo in 1180. The city was under the jurisdiction of Camerino until 1785, when Pius II re-establish- ed it as see of Matelica and united it to the prince- pality with Fabriano.

The town of Matelica possesses some ancient in- scriptions. A Roman colony was established there in 89 B.C. In 487, Bishop Equitius of Matelica was at Rome; and in 531, Bishop Florentius accompanied Pope Viglius to Constantinople. No other bishops of the ancient see are known. Until 1755 Matelica was under the jurisdiction of Camerino. Mention may be made of Blessed Gentile da Matelica, a Franciscan, martyred in Egypt in 1351, and buried in Venice (ai Prati), where also is buried Mattia Lazaro, a Benedictine, also of Matelica, buried in the church of Santa Maria Maddalena. The diocese is immediately subject to the Holy See, and has 32,000 inhabitants, 42 parishes, 1 male and 2 female educational institutions, 6 religious houses of men and 4 of women. The painter, Gentile da Fabriano (q. v.), is one of the most famous of the natives of Fabriano. He worked at Foggia and Bari, and later in the palace of the doges at Venice, in the Strozzi chapel at Florence, and finally at Rome.


U. BENIGNI.

Fabrica Ecclesiae, a Latin term, meaning, etymologically, the construction of a church, but in a broader sense the funds necessary for such construction. This expression may also be applied to the fund for the repairing and maintenance of churches, the daily expenses of worship, and to the amount requisite for covering these expenses. In this particular con- nexion, the term expression is first met with in the law of Pope Simplicius to Gaudentius, Bishop ofAuxina (Nov. 475); however, even then it was not new, being borrowed from profane usage. During the first Christian centuries the temporalities intended to meet the expenses incurred by the religious services carried on throughout a diocese be- longed entirely to the cathedral church, and constituted a common fund which the bishop used, at his option, in defraying the expenses of religion, supporting its ministers, and caring for the poor. But in the fifth century, particularly in Italy, this fund was set aside for the *fabrica ecclesiae*. In Sicily, however, in 494, no portion was especially reserved for the fabric, and in Gaul, such an allotment seems to have been unknown. In Spain, a third of the ecclesiastical revenues was assigned to the *luminare* (lights), a term synonymous with fabrica. The rise of Christianity in the rural districts brought with it a change of discipline, according to which each church obtained a separate patrimony. In fact, benefactors no longer bestowed their gifts on the entire diocese, but on one particular church, frequently in honour of some saint specially venerated there. The common fund itself was divided among the churches of the diocese. Some writers maintain this division was owing to the establishment of ecclesiastical benefits; others claim that it followed the canonical recognition of the private ownership of churches. After vainly endeavouring to re- store the exercise of public worship to the church, the ownership had been completely renounced by the founders, the canon law eventually permitted public worship in churches that remained the private property of an individual, a monastery or even the episcopal *mena*, or estate. The owner, however, was obliged to set apart a special fund for the church (pro sertis tectis, or for the luminare). Hence- forth, when a bishop established a new parish, he was bound to provide for its needs by a specified income to be deducted from the common diocesan estate or fund—of course, if no benefactor had otherwise en- dedowed the parish. Some hold that in consequence of the principles governing feudal society all medieval churches and their revenues became private property, and that the conflict of Gregory VII and his successors against lay investitures was in reality an effort to restore its lost posessions to the ecclesiastical for the use of secular clergy. The result of so much strife was the transformation of former proprietary rights into the right of patronage (*Jus patronatus*).

While ecclesiastical ownership was going through these phases, the canon law decided who must contribute to the maintenance of the churches, to which those revenues must be applied, and to the fund for the church's ownership, and all recipients of its revenues (Synod of Frankfort, 794); under pain, therefore, of forfeiting his right of patronage, the patron of a church must share the burden of its maintenance; so too the incumbent of the ecclesiastical benefice and those to whom the tithes have been granted (decemvires), when the resources of the church were insufficient, the faithful themselves were bound to contribute to the expenses of Divine worship. These provisions were sanctioned by the Decretals of Gregory IX (cc. i and ii de ecclesia adiutornalis, III, 48); and by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXI, de ref. c. vii); they represent in this matter the common ecclesiastical law (see BUILDINGS, ECCLESIASTICAL). The *fabrica ecclesiae* means also the persons charged with the administration of church property, usually laymen. The origin and historical development of this institution has not yet been studied very closely. Their organization, moreover, has differed from one country to another; now there are generally organized in the same country. Churches subject to the right of patronage and those incorporated, frequently for temporal administration, with monasteries, were more closely affected than other churches by this condition of dependency. In such churches the patron occasionally appointed an officer to administer the temporalities. It is commonly believed, however, that "church fabrics" do not antedate the twelfth century. In the first ages of the Church the bishop administered church property with the aid of deacons and priests, but during the
fourth century there appeared in the Orient and in certain countries of the West, bursars (aeconomi), who, subject to the direction of the bishop, managed the temporal affairs of churches; in other countries the bishop continued to administer the church property with the assistance of some trustworthy man of his choice. When each church came to have its own particular patrimony, the bishop was naturally obliged to turn over the administration of such property to the local clergy, reserving nevertheless a right of control. During the long Investitures conflict this right, it may be, was completely annihilated; when peace was restored some property was often allowed to appeal to the inhabitants of the parish to defray the expenses of religion. In France and England especially, the assembled parishioners established the portion of expenses that ought to be borne by the community; naturally, therefore, this assembly was henceforth consulted in regard to the most important acts connected with the administration of the parish temporalities. For that purpose it selected lay delegates who participated in the ordinary administration of the ecclesiastical property set aside for parochial uses. They were called vestrymen, churchwardens, procurators (procuraturs), menorhauri, annatores, gossers, provisores, utilis, operarii, alitarniani, etc.

In the councils of the thirteenth century frequent mention is made of laymen, chosen by their fellow laymen to participate in the administration of temporal affairs; at the same time the rights of the parish priest and of ecclesiastical authority were recognized. A reaction is visible in the councils of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries which undertake to check the tendency towards an exclusively lay administration of the parochial property. Eventually the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII de ref. c. ix) admitted lay participation in the administration of ecclesiastical property, but demanded that at all times and in all places the lay administrators render an annual account to the bishop or to his delegate. As no general law has determined either the competency or the composition of fabric committees (conseils de fabrique) there has been in this respect very great variations. In modern times secular power has frequently interfered in the administration of ecclesiastical property set apart for purposes of worship, and in the organization of church fabrics. Even now, in most European countries, the State regulates the administration of ecclesiastical property and the proceedings of the fabric. (See under BUILDINGS, ECCLESIASTICAL, an outline of the regulations actually in force.)


A. VAN Hove.

**Fabricius, Andrew.** See Lefèvre, Family of.

**Fabricius, Hieronymus** (surnamed AB AQUAPENDENTE), a distinguished Italian anatomist and surgeon, b. in the little town of Aquapendente (Aqua-Pendente) in the province of Terni from Orvieto, in 1537; d. at Padua, 21 May, 1619. He is known by the name of his birthplace to distinguish him from his contemporary, the great German surgeon, Fabricius Hildanus. In English medical literature Fabricius is best known as the teacher of Harvey, who gives him the entire credit for the discovery of the valves in the veins which meant so much for Harvey's own discovery of the circulation of the blood. Some valves in the veins, however, had been seen and described by investigators before this, probably even by Erasistratus in ancient times. It was Fabricius' merit that he recognized the existence of a system of valves.

Sent by his parents to the University of Padua, Fabricius succeeded admirably in Greek, Latin, and philosophy. When he took up medicine he became the favourite pupil of Fallopius, being his demonstrator at Padua when only seventeen years of age. Though he was only twenty-five when Fallopius died, Fabricius was chosen his successor and a little later became professor of surgery, occupying both chairs for nearly half a century (1562-1609). His abilities were properly appreciated by the Senate of Venice, which built for him at Padua a spacious anatomical theatre bearing his name. He was created a Knight of St. Mark, and his annual salary was a thousand crowns, which was continued for ten years after his resignation. A statue was erected to his memory in Padua after his death. Fabricius was indifferent to money, refused regular fees, and never presents as wealthy patients forced on him. His work on anatomy (300 fol. pp.) is illustrated by hundreds of figures on sixty-one full-page plates, some of the best ever made. A monograph on the speech of brutes and a study of the comparative anatomy of the appendices are suggestive even for modern readers. His work on surgery is scarcely less valuable than that on anatomy and has gone through twenty editions in many languages. His principal works are: "De visione, voce, auditu," (Venice, 1600); "De brutorum loculibus" (Padua, 1609); "De formatio fetu," (Venice, 1627); "Traiectus anatomici triplex" (Frankfort, 1614). All his other works were reprinted at Frankfort shortly after this time, and all his works at Leipzig in 1587.


**Fabyan, Robert,** English chronicler, d. 25 Feb., 1513. He was a London clothier, a member of the Drapers' Company, and an alderman. He held several responsible positions, but resigned his aldermanship in 1502, probably to escape the financial burdens of the mayoralty. Fabyan belongs to the class of City chroniclers, men interested mainly in municipal life, but he is the first to take a wider view and to attempt to combine his London history with that of the country. He was not a very successful. His "Concordance of Histories" begins with Brutus and goes down to the death of Richard III, but his effort to harmonize different chroniclers is made without art or historical judgment. The work is of value mainly for its reference to London. The second edition (1533) contains a number of pithy scattered notes on municipal history under Henry VII. De Busch considers that these must be an abridgment of a lost chronicle of that reign. The best edition of Fabyan is that published by Ellis in 1811.


**Façade,** the face or front of any building. In ecclesiastical architecture the term is generally used to designate the west front; sometimes the transept fronts. For ritualistic reasons, the church architect was everywhere compelled to treat the end wall of the nave as the grand façade.

**EARLY CHRISTIAN PERIOD.** The façades of the
churches of the early period were generally built on the model of the old Roman basilicas, and were constructed according to Roman methods, and largely formed of columns and other features taken from Pagan buildings. Their interest is principally from a historical point of view. The façades of the early Roman basilicas were exceedingly simple in their upper surfaces. There were but two types; the central gable, following usually the outline of the structure behind it, and the screen façade, usually made to overhang for purposes of protection, and formed by a gradual projection of the cornice and brick both of the nave and aisles. In the more important churches the entire surface was concealed by a mosaic composition extending from summit to portico. Such were St. John Lateran’s, St. Peter’s, St. Paul’s, St. Mary Major’s, etc. This converted the façade above the porch into a blaze of colour. Toward the close of the Middle Ages more windows were sometimes opened in the façade. At St. Peter’s, in the thirteenth century, beside the wheel window in the gable, there were two rows of three tall mullioned windows, the lower row being flanked by two more. The lower part of the façade was always covered by a projecting pediment, consisting either of one side of the quadrangular atrium, or of an independent arcade or colonnade. The wall space underneath was usually broken by as many doors as there were aisles to the church, normally three, sometimes five. In the minor basilicas there was but a single door, and in exceptional cases, as at St. Peter’s, there was a supplementary door for special occasions.

Byzantine façades as a rule were left comparatively plain, partly, no doubt, on account of their location and surroundings. A Byzantine church usually stood apart in a cloister, and when possible terraces were planned about to give shade. In towns, the church, its grounds, etc., were generally surrounded with walls. It was entered through a cloistered forecourt or atrium, in the centre of which stood the phiale, or fountain, where the required ablutions were made. Across the lower portion of the front of the church stretched the narthex or vestibule, which sometimes had a porch or portico in front of it. Many churches had a double vestibule, the outer one being called the esonarthex, generally appointed for women. The narthex communicated with the church by means of three large doors in the centre of the columns and the profile of the arch is usually richly ornamented. The two others, situated one on each side, were small and not remarkable. The central door was called the Beautiful Gate, sometimes the royal or basilican gate.

In the larger churches, above the narthex there was often an enclosed upper gallery for the accommodation of women, called the gallery. This gallery was enclosed partly by the outside wall or walls and partly by grilles, and was reached by a staircase for the use of women only. From the outside it was lighted by a series of narrow windows, generally covered by round arches, or one or more objects were placed to give light through a certain extent. Especially in the Neo-Byzantine style, there are occasionally porches, balconies and machicolations, which give relief to the general flatness. These features are well marked with the grace peculiar to the Byzantines. Examples at Constantinople, S. Porcarius and Baechus (352–353), and Santa Sophia (353–357). The church of the Virgin at Mistra and the Catholicon, at Athens (both uncertain, 11th to 13th century), and St. Mark’s, Venice (1100–1350). Examples of Italian Byzantine are the cathedrals at Palermo and Cefalu. The present façade of St. Mark’s, Venice, is a later casing upon the original Byzantine façade and stands alone as regards its style, although generally classed as Byzantine. The first appearance of the Byzantine in Italy was the church of San Vitale, at Ravenna. The façades of the Italian Byzantine churches, in Russia, the cathedrals of Moscow, Kiev, and Novgorod, are among the best known examples.

Lombardic (sometimes called Lombard Romanesque) façades were the most unfortunate part of Lombard churches. The design of façades to the basilical plan and sections was much troubled to many different schools of architecture, but by none it was treated with such signal failure as by the Lombards. In declining to attach the campaniles to the church, the Italians rejected what apparently was the only possible solution. The use of the façade as a raised surface, like that of San Michele Maggiore, resulted in designs that obviously belied the basilican section. Even before this, it had been the custom, where the three aisles had been expressed, to raise the façade more than the actual roof of the church, perhaps with a view to make the church appear externally larger than it really was. This fraud continued to be practised in the churches of Verona, and indeed throughout Italy, so that it finally became characteristic of Italian church façades. On the false façade thus obtained, ornament, utterly irrelevant for the most part, was spread with a more or less lavish hand. The façade of S. Ambrogio, Milan, with its great open arches is, perhaps, the most successful one the Lombards ever erected.

Romanesque façades. Their characteristics, as a whole, may be summed up as follows: Buttresses formed as pilaster strips of slight projection, connected at the top by horizontal mouldings, or by a row of semicircular arches resting on a corbel-table projecting from the wall. Semicircular arches, resting on rudely formed capitals, also occur. Door and window openings are very characteristic. The principal, upon which the jambs were formed, was in receding planes, or rectangular recesses, known as “orders”, in which were placed circular columns or shafts. The arches followed the same method, being built in concentric rings. A continuous abacus often occurs over the doors and windows. The profile of the arch is called round the semicircular portion of the arch. The characteristic rose (or wheel) window occurs over the principal doorway of the façade. Mouldings were often elaborately carved. The carving and ornamentation was derived from many types of the vegetable and animal kingdom, and treated in a conventional way. Local influences were instrumental in producing different local characteristics.

In Central Italian Romanesque, beauty in detail was more sought after than completeness of style. Byzantine influence was strong, especially in Venice, Ravenna, Florence, and Pisa, the latter possessing a distinct style of its own, sometimes called Tuscan. San Miniato’s, in Florence, is interesting as marking the period of transition, in the eleventh century, from the Basilian to the Romanesque type. In Northern Italian Romanesque, arcades are restricted to the tops of galleries. The general character is less refined, owing to the use of stone and brick instead of marble. Details show a breaking away from Classical precedent. In sculpture, hunting and other scenes reflecting the life of the northern invaders are frequent, and in these grotesque elements is prevalent. S. Antonio’s, in Piacenza, is an example. Southern Italian Romanesque shows Byzantine and Mohammedan influence, as instanced in Monreale Cathedral, and the Martorana Church, in Palermo. The detail of these buildings is always refined and graceful, which may be due to some extent to the Greek descent.
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FAÇADES
of the inhabitants of this part of Italy. Southern French Romanesque is remarkable for its rich decorative façades. Buttresses are generally mere strips, of slight projection, and the façades were arranged in storied, with window lights in pairs or groups. Imposing windows are characteristic of this style. The west fronts of the churches of the Charente District, in Aquitania, were elaborately treated with carved ornament representing foliage or figures of men and animals. On the ground story the capitals so treated were often continued as a rich, broad frieze. German Romanesque bears a strong resemblance to that of North Italy. In the façades the most richly ornamented parts are the doorways and capitals; there is also a wealth of circular and octagonal turrets and arcaded galleries. Examples: The church of the Apostles, at Cologne, the cathedrals of Worms, Mainz, Trier, and Speyer.

Gothic façades.—The first in point of dignity is undoubtedly that of Notre-Dame de Paris; in richness, those of Amiens and Reims. The façade of Amiens, of which only the three lower stories are of the thirteenth century, would doubtless have been the noblest of all Gothic façades, had it been finished according to the original design. The great French Gothic façades are all characterized by the fact that they somewhat disguise the true character of the edifice which they enclose; and it is, perhaps, true that an entirely satisfactory design for a western façade was hardly ever realized in a large Gothic church. As a rule, the façade merely wholly expresses the form of the building which it encloses, and is a mere covering of its mass, except in buildings of a very simple character. In the façades of smaller churches where the towers are omitted, as at Ncaster, Auvers, Heronville, and champagne, the whole structural form of the building is expressed as fully as it can be. The west fronts of Sens, Paris, Amiens, and Reims sufficiently illustrate the development and the characteristics of the French Gothic western façade.

In England, the Anglo-Norman western façade was, as a rule, both inappropriate as a termination to the building, and ill-composed as an independent architectural feature. Yet early façades were remarkable. The most important extant fronts of the thirteenth century are those of Lincoln, Salisbury, Wells, and Peterborough. The façade of Lincoln exhibits four different styles of architecture—the work of as many different periods of construction. The portals of English churches are in general insignificant and diminutive, and those of Wells are especially so. The façade of Peterborough is entirely unrelated to the building which it encloses. As a rule, the west front in England is devoid of Gothic character; but among exceptions is the western façade of Ripon cathedral. In the pointed architecture of England, western towers, when they occur, are less imposing than those of the Gothic churches of France.

The western Gothic façades in Germany call for no extended remarks. The façade of the Lorenzkirche of Nuremberg, dating probably from the second half of the thirteenth century, exhibits a strange combination of Romanesque and Gothic features. Towards the close of the thirteenth century, in Germany, the west front began to receive more elaborate and peculiar treatment. Acute open gables over the portals, free-standing mullions and tracery over the face of the wall above, and tall open gallery in front of the openings of the second stories of the towers, are among the new features. Entrances are often north or south, instead of being at the west end. Towers with spires were much used, open-work tracery in the spires is very characteristic. The typical examples of German Gothic are those of Strasburg, Fribourg, Ratisbon, Cologne, and Vienna cathedrals.

Italian Gothic façades show the influence of Roman tradition in their classic forms of construction and decoration, which was so great that the verticality which marks the Gothic architecture in the north of Europe does not pervade the Italian examples, to anything like the same extent. From the absence of vertical features and shadows in the façade, flatness is the predominating characteristic. There was a general absence of pinnacles. Stone or marble of different colours, carried in systematic hand-courses or patterns throughout the design, give a special charm to the cathedrals of Siena, Orvieto, Verona, etc. A large central circular window was a general feature. Windows are often semicircular-headed, and have shafts with square capitals of Corinthian type, often twisted and inlaid with mosaics known as "cosmatesque". The Spanish Gothic façades exhibit a variety of treatment; but in few cases is the French form closely followed. The front of the early church of San Pedro de Avila is an entirely logical design of simple character. The façade of Burgos is composed in the French manner. Toledo is a mixture of Gothic and Renaissance, and the west front of Leon dates from the thirteenth century, the later work being characterized by extreme, and even wild, ornamentation. Traowered open-work spires, as in Germany, were favoured, those at Burgos being worthy of attention.

Renaissance façades agree essentially in architectural treatment, growing out of a close contact with ancient monuments, though with no strict conformity to them. Examples in Italy: S. Lorenzo and Santo Spirito, in Florence; Santa Maria della Pace, S. Andrea's, The Gesù, S. Peter's, St. John Lateran's, in Rome; S. Maria dei Miracoli, S. Zaccaria and S. Maria della Salute, in Venice; Milan cathedral; and the Certosa of Pavia. French Renaissance: St. Eustache, St. Etienne du Mont, the church of the Sorbonne, the Pantheon and the Madeleine, at Paris. German Renaissance: St. Michael's at Munich and the Frauenkirche at Dresden. Spanish Renaissance: Santo Domingo at Salamanca; the cathedrals of Granada, Valladolid, Santiago, Malaga, and Carmona. English Renaissance: St. Paul's, London.

Thomas H. Poole.

Facciolati, Jacopo, lexicographer and philologist, b. at Torreglia, near Padua, Italy, 4 Jan., 1682; d. at Padua, 26 Aug., 1769. He was educated in the seminarv at Padua, and later was made professor of logic and regent of the schools in the university of that city, continuing in this position for forty-five years. In 1719 he brought out a revised edition of the "Lexicon Septem Linguarum," a Latin dictionary in seven languages, called the "Calepinus", from the name of the monk Ambrogio Calepio. In this work Facciolati was assisted by his pupil, Forecellini. Their labours on the "Calepinus" convinced them of the need of a totally new Latin lexicon. Therefore, putting aside all other works, they undertook the compilation of a lexicon which should be the most comprehensive vocabulary of the Latin language that had ever been made. For forty years, under the supervision of Facciolati, Forecellini laboured, reading through the entire body of Latin literature, as well as the whole collection of Latin inscriptions, including those on coins and medals. Their great lexicon, which bore the title, "Totius Latinitatis Lexicon", was published in four volumes, at Padua in 1771, after the death of both the editors. This monumental work, on which all Latin lexicons now in use are based, gives every Latin word, with its Italian and Greek equivalents and copious citations illustrating the various meanings. Subsequent editions are the English one of Bailey in two volumes (London, 1828), and that of De Vit (Prato, 1858-87). Facciolati also published a new edition of the "Thesaurus Ciceronianus" of Nolusius. He left a collection of the best of their elegant Latin, which were afterwards published. (See Forecellini.)

Fassari, Vita Jacobi Facciolati (Padua, 1798); Gennari, Vita di Jacopo Facciolati (Padua, 1818).
Faculties. Canonical (Lat. Facultates).—In law, a faculty is the authority, privilege, or permission, to perform an act or function. In a broad sense, a faculty is a certain power, whether based on one's own right, or received as a favour from another, of validly or lawfully performing some action or function. In a more restricted sense, it means the conferring on a subordinate, by a superior who enjoys jurisdiction in the external forum, of certain ecclesiastical rights which are denied him by common law; to act, namely, in the external or internal forum validly or lawfully, or at least safely. Faculties, then, will be classified, first of all, by reason of the object to which they relate, inasmuch as (1) jurisdiction is granted to absolve from sins and ecclesiastical censures, to dispense in vows, in irregularities relating to the reception of orders, in matrimonial impediments; (2) permission or licence is given to do something which would be otherwise forbidden, as the reading of prohibited books, saying two Masses on the same day; ordaining clerics under the prescribed age; (3) to avoid worry and qualms of conscience a precautionary dispensation or permission is granted to proceed in certain cases in relation to which the ordinary channels of the Sacred Congregation are opened for validity, even though they be episcopal; if the power or privilege conferred proceeds from a diocesan bishop, by virtue of his own power or ordinary jurisdiction, as for instance, the faculties of the diocesan, to hear confessions, say Mass, preach, etc., granted to priests who labour in a diocese for the salvation of souls. Faculties are regular when they proceed from superiors of the regular clergy by reason of their ordinary jurisdiction, or by virtue of extraordinary powers or privileges conceded to them by the Holy See. Lastly, faculties are general or particular: general, when granted for indeterminate periods, though they may be limited by time; particular, when granted to designated persons or for particular cases. General faculties conceded to bishops and other ordinaries are also called indults.

The distance of dioceses from Rome, together with peculiar local conditions render the granting of these faculties a matter of necessity, and in 1687 certain new grants or lists of faculties were drawn up by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, and since then have been communicated by the Holy See, through the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, to bishops, vicars and prelates of Apostolic throughout the world, according to their various needs. These indults are given for a definite period, e.g. five years (facultates quinquennales), or for a definite number ofcases, and are ordinary and extraordinary; the former being issued in favour of grants under the previous formulae (Formula I, II, III), and the latter under capital letters (Formula A, B, C, etc.), others under small letters (Formula a, b, c), while others, finally, without special designation, begin: "In an audience with His Holiness". Formulae V, VII, VIII, IX are no longer in use, as they had been the practice in the United States grants I, C, D, and E. Of late, however, C, D, and E, with certain modifications, are combined in form T. Favours and privileges are granted likewise by the congregations in keeping with the Constitution "Sapienti Consilio" (1908), and are classified consequently in accordance with the Congregations from which they proceed. The authority of the Propaganda is not so ample in this matter as formerly, and this too in relation to countries still subject to it. Questions pertaining to the Papal Privilege fall in every case under the sole competency of the Holy Office, while diocesan faculties, including the portions of the Western Church under its jurisdiction, the Propaganda is obliged to confer with the Congregation of the Sacraments (Cong. of the Consistory, 7 Jan., 1909). Especially through the Sacred Penitentiary does the pope communicate faculties for the internal forum to bishops, and to other persons, conferring on certain confessors, in definite forms or leaflets (paggelle).

Graces thus received from the Holy See do not restrict the prerogatives which the one favoured may already enjoy by virtue of ordinary jurisdiction or other title (gratia non necat gratiam). The purpose of the Holy See is to make a concession, not to lessen one's authority. Hence, for example, a bishop is authorized by the Council of Trent to dispense his subjects from the observance of the intervals prescribed in the reception of orders; consequently he is not obliged to observe the condition laid down in Form I, art. one, to reject, for example, the faculties of a cleric actually outside the bishop's territory. While the recent legislation of the Church has sought to prevent conflict of authority between the various Roman Congregations, tribunals and offices, yet it will happen at times that two or more of these bodies will have jurisdiction in the same case.

A petition which has been rejected by one of the congregations may not be presented lawfully to another; a favour granted by another congregation, the previous refusal of the grant being concealed, is null and void. A petition in writing is not required for the grant of dispensation, but is usually exacted; the same may be said of application by telegraph or telephone. The form of the supplication is not prescribed except in so far as requisite data must be expressed. Petitions addressed to the Propaganda (the same is true of most of the congregations, at least to expedite matters), should be in Latin, Italian, or French. The Sacred Penitentiary will accept communications in any modern tongue. The supplication is made out in the name of the petitioner, but the rescript is sent to the ordinary. The diocesan chancery of the petitioner usually deals directly with the rector of the parishes concerned.

Faculties can only be used in favour of members of the Church who are not disqualified by ecclesiastical penalties or censures. Hence in marriage cases where one of the contracting parties is a non-Catholic, the dispensation is given directly to the Catholic. Hence also in Apostolic rescripts absolution from penalties and censures, as far as necessary for the rescript to be effective, is first given. Apostolic faculties granted to a bishop, which imply an act of jurisdiction in using them, can be communicated and applied only to the subjects of the bishop, and to such determinate persons as are capable of receiving spiritual benefits by means of this faculty. Ordinary faculties may be exercised in behalf of a subject, while both he and the bishop, or other person making the concession, are outside their own territory. When the use of faculties is prohibited (as in Forms I and C), it means that the subject, not the bishop, must be in the diocese when the indulgence is made use of in his behalf. In the United States any matrimonial dispensation may be conceded to one actually outside his own diocese, if he has not acquired at least a quasi-domicle elsewhere (Holy Office, P. Propaganda, 20 Dec., 1874). To dispense validly and lawfully, a grave and just cause existing at the time of the dispensation is required. He who possesses general delegated power may apply it to himself, e.g. dispensing himself from fasting. There is an obligation, especially in dispensations, to be measured by the greater or lesser urgency of the case,
of using faculties possessed. It might be noted that the Apostolic Delegate at Washington, in common with the bishops of the United States, has possessed the Propaganda Forms I, C, D, and E, together with some others, applicable of course throughout the United States. His Eminence, aside from territorial extension, possesses no greater powers in regard to matrimonal dispensations than these diocesan bishops.

A bishop cannot dispense without a special faculty, when two or more matrimonal impediments, diriment or otherwise, exist in the same case, or affect the same persons, though by reason of indults he can dispense separately in each of the impediments involved. The restriction, however, holds good only when the impediments in question are generically different, e.g. consanguinity and affinity, or where the power to dispense is given in different indults. The special faculty covering the cumulation of matrimonal impediments is usually granted with the renewal of faculties and is effective during the duration of the same. The form of this special faculty is not always identical, greater or more restricted powers being contained therein. Moreover, a bishop cannot employ this faculty when he is granting by virtue of an indult a retroactive dispensation to render a marriage valid exterritorialiter (capere, radice). This question of cumulation affects dispensations only, not absolutones: a dispensation inflicts a wound on the law, not so an absoluton. It is necessary for validity that the concession of a favour be made known to the one benefited; and it ought to be made known to the authority in question in such manner as law has established. As faculties depend upon the will of the grantor, the terms of the indult must be carefully studied, and obscure passages rightly interpreted. In this matter the general rules for the interpretation of laws are to be observed with some additional ones. Herein the use of faculties is most important; it must be noted that power to dispense is granted for matrimonal alliances already contracted, or not yet contracted, or for both. A faculty granted for the internal forum only, particularly if jurisdictional, cannot be used in the external forum, and vice versa. Faculties are not to be extended to persons or cases not included in the same. The existing practice, especially of the Roman Curia (stilus curiae Romanae), will serve as a guide in this matter.

Faculties expire by the death of the grantor, his removal from office or loss of jurisdiction (certain disabilities, however, are to be born in mind, as below); by the death of the privileged one; by lapse of time when they are granted for a definite period; when they have been used for the number of cases specified in the grant; by revocation; by renunciation duly accepted; by the completion of the business for which one has received special authorization; by cessation of the formal cause on which the favour was based. Faculties granted absolutely (not revocable at will) by one possessing ordinary jurisdiction, and gratia facie (i.e., the delegate is a necessary executor), do not expire at the death of the grantor; gratia facie (i.e., the delegate is a voluntary executor, viz., commissioned to act, if he judge it expedient) cease at the death of the grantor, when no steps have as yet been taken leading to the concession requested (re adhuc integri); otherwise they do not cease. Faculties granted by one enjoying delegated power cease at the death of the one delegating, unless the Holy See expressly provides their continuance, or unless the matter in question has already been begun (re non integri). The power given personally to a delegate, or subordinate, expires at his death, which is not the case if he is chosen by reason of his dignity or office. When it is stated that faculties are "in" or "of" the Holy See, a diocese, etc., they continue in force after the death of the pope, bishop, etc. Indults consequently found in the Propaganda forms or other general grants as above, since they are gratia factae, do not become ineffective at the death of the pope: the same is true of the faculties conceded by the Sacred Penitentiary, when the prefect of that tribunal loses his jurisdiction through death or other cause. Jurisdiction granted by a bishop to hear the confession of an individual ceases, re adhuc integerr, when the bishop dies, is transferred, or resigns: the contrary is true, when jurisdiction is given to hear causes; in general. Notwithstanding the revocation of faculties, a case already begun may be completed; and by a general revocation of faculties special faculties do not expire. Neglect to use a favour does not destroy its force, as for example, a person dispensed from fasting or the recitation of the Holy Office does not lose the grace, if he meanwhile fast or recite the Office, even for a considerable time.

All special faculties granted habitually (habitualiter), by the Holy See to bishops and others enjoying ordinary jurisdiction within definite territorial limits, remain in force notwithstanding the loss of jurisdiction through death or other cause of the individual to whom they are granted (Cong. Holy Office, 24 Nov., 1897), but pass on to his successor in the same office. They are considered not personal but real favours, granted for the ordinary of the diocese or place, and by the ordinary are understood bishops, their vicars, Apostolic, prelates or prefects Apostolic ruling over territory not subject to a bishop, vicars capillar or other legitimate administrators of vacant sees (Cong. Holy Office, 20 Feb., 1888). It is to be noted that since these indults are granted to the ordinary at his request, the appeal is included in the vicar-general of a diocese, said vicar-general uses these faculties, grants dispensations and other graces contained therein, by virtue of authority received directly from Rome, equivalent to that extended to the bishop himself. The bishop may find these powers, but notwithstanding the prohibition, the vicar-general would act validly, were he to use said faculties, provided nothing else were wanting to render his action invalid. (See JURISDICTION; DELEGATION; RESCRIPTS; EXECUTOR, APOTOLIC; DISPENSATION.)

TAUNTON, The Law of the Church (London, 1900); Königspützer, Commentary in Facultates Apostolici (New York, 1900).

Andrew B. Meehan.

Faculties of the Soul.—I. MEANING.—Whatever doctrine one may hold concerning the nature of the human soul and its relations to the organism, the following points are beyond the possibility of doubt. (1) Consciousness is the scene of incessant change; its processes appear, now in one sequence, now in another; and, normally, the duration of each is brief. (2) All do not present the same general features, nor affect consciousness in the same manner. They differ on account both of their characters as manifested in consciousness, and of the organ, either external or internal, on which their appearance depends. Yet the features they have in common under this twofold aspect, together with their differences, make it possible and necessary to group mental states in certain more or less comprehensive classes. (3) There is more in the mind than is actually manifested in consciousness; there are latent images, ideas, and feelings, which under given conditions emerge and are recognized even after a considerable interval of time. By reason of their innate or acquired aptitudes, minds differ in capacity or power. Hence, even if it were possible for two minds to experience processes perfectly similar, they would nevertheless differ greatly because one is capable of experiences impossible to the other. (4) Notwithstanding their variety and their intermittent character, these processes belong to one and the same conscious subject; they are all referred naturally and spontaneously to the self or me.

These facts are the psychological basis for admitting faculties (from facere, to do), capacities (capax, from capere, to hold), or powers (from posse, to be able;
the Scholastics generally use the corresponding Latin term *potentia*).

Any attempt, however, to define with greater precision the meaning of faculties, is sure to call forth vigorous protest. In fact, few psychological questions of equal importance have been the subject of so many animated discussions, and it may be added, of so many misunderstandings. One extreme view looks upon faculties as real, though secondary agents, exercising an active influence on one another, and as being scientific explanations of psychological facts. Why does man see and reason? Because he has the faculties of vision and reasoning. The will acts, is free; there is an interaction of the intellect, the will, the senses, the feelings, etc. Sometimes, however, such expressions are understood with the understanding that they are metaphors, and with the explicit or implicit warrant that they must not be taken literally.

At the other extreme are found psychologists—and they are numerous to-day—who refuse to concede any kind of reality whatever to faculties. Processes alone are real; faculties are simply general terms used to label certain groups of processes. Like all abstractions, they will never be looked upon as having any reality outside of the mind, which uses them as logical substitutes to facilitate the classification of mental facts.

That the faculty theory has no essential connexion with Catholic dogma is sufficiently evidenced by the fact that it is found, and still finds, opponents as well as advocates among Catholic theologians and philosophers.

Judging, therefore, the question on its own merits, it may be said that the doctrine of St. Thomas avoids both extremes mentioned above, and is at least free from the absurdities with which the Scholastics, so frequently charge the faculty theory. His expressions, taken apart from their context, and translated without a sufficient acquaintance with Scholastic terminology, might easily be given a wrong interpretation. It is the knowledge of the nature of the soul and its faculties, according to St. Thomas, is partly negative, and, in its positive aspect, analogical, it is necessary to use expressions taken from things which are known more directly. But we are given some principles which must always be kept in mind; for instance, "without the a priori principles, there is in the mind nothing of the intellect but what we have experienced in the body of the soul" (Summa, I, Q. 13, xiiii; I-II, xi: De Veritate, xxviii; I-II, xi: De Malo, vi). This shows that when a real distinction is admitted between the soul and its faculties, or between the faculties themselves, the meaning is not that of a distinction between substances or agents. In Scholastic terminology, distinction does not always mean separation nor even the possibility of separation. And the distinction between a substance and its qualities, attributes or modes, was called a real distinction.

If the soul can originate or experience states which, as everybody admits, may be widely different, it is because there are in the mind various modes of energy or faculties. Since minds differ not only by the actual contents of consciousness, but also, and chiefly, by the power which they have of experiencing different processes, it is clear that if this constitutes a real difference, it must itself be something real. So unavailable is the conclusion, that some of the strongest opponents of faculties are at the same time the strongest defenders of the theory of psychical dispositions, which they postulate in order to explain the facts of memory, mental habit, and in general, the utilization, conscious or unconscious, of past experience. And yet, what is a psychical disposition but an acquired power or faculty? Stuart Mill's "background of possibilities" or Taine's "permanent possibility" are certainly less clear and more objectionable than faculties, for the faculty is not a mere possibility, but a real power of an agent, a *potentia* (see *actus et potentia*).

Psychical dispositions are in the strictest sense psychical facts than are faculties, if by explanation is meant the assigning of an antecedent better known than, or known independently of, the facts to be explained. In both cases, the whole knowledge of the faculty, or the disposition, is derived from the processes themselves, for neither can fall under direct observation. The possibility of an experience or action, if known, is always known by direct inference or by analogy from past experiences or actions. Yet without being a scientific explanation, and without substituting itself for scientific explanations, the faculty, like the disposition, trace, subconscious activity, etc., is a legitimate postulate.

II. Classification.—Plato admits three parts, forms, or powers of the soul, perhaps even three distinct souls: the intellect (nous), the nobler affections (bouleusis), and the appetites or passions (epistimoeis). Aristotle, the soul is one, but recognizes five groups of faculties (*dunameis*): the "vegetative" faculty (peristimoeis), concerned with the maintenance and development of organic life; the appetite (epistimoeis), or the tendency to any good; the faculty of sense perception (adothymoeis); the "locomotive" faculty (koniastikoeis), which controls various bodily movements; and reason (dunastikoeis). The Scholastics generally follow Aristotle's classification. For them body and soul are united in one complete substance. The soul is the *forma substantialis*, the vital principle, the source of all activities. Hence the soul, the general science of which is called theology, is considered as in the provinces of biology and physiology. In more recent times, however, especially under the influence of Descartes, the mind has been separated, and even estranged, from the organism. Psychology deals only with the inner world, that is, the world of consciousness and its conditions. The nature of the mind and its relations to the organism are questions that belong to philosophy or metaphysics. As a consequence, also, modern psychology fails to distinguish between the spiritual faculties of the soul, i.e. those which act only by the use of the powers of the soul, without the intrinsic co-operation of the organism, and the faculties of the *compositum*, i.e. the soul and organism united in one complete principle of action, or of one special animating organ. This distinction was also an essential point in the Aristotelian and Scholastic psychology.

Finally, the Scholastics reduced affective life to the general faculty of appetitus, whereas to-day, especially since Kant, a tripartite division is more commonly accepted, namely into cognitive, affective, and conative faculties. Some, however, still hold a bipartite division. Others, finally, reject both as unsatisfactory, and follow the order of development, or base their classification both on objective conditions and subjective characteristics. Without entering into the discussion, it may be said that, however useful and justifiable the tripartite classification may prove in psychology, the Scholastic reduction of feelings to appetitus seems only to be deeper and more philosophical. For feelings and emotions, pleasurable or painful, result from an agreement or conflict between certain experiences and the mind's tendency.

Faundus of Hermiane, a sixth-century Christian author, Bishop of Hermiane in Africa, about whose career very little is known. His place in history is due entirely to the spirited and protracted opposition which he offered to the condemnation (by the edict of Justinian in 543 or 544) of the "Three Chapters" at the council of Carthage. The three scribes of the "Three Chapters" were condemned to death. Faundus also had two other works at the request of his fellow-bishops, in response to reproaches of insubordination ("Liber contra Mocianum Scholasticum") and "Epistola Fidei Catholici in defense of trium capitulorum". The works of Faundus are in P. L., XVII, 527-878; see Hefele, "Church of the Councils", IV, 229-286.

Patrick J. Healy

Faenza, Diocese of (Faventina), in the province of Ravenna (Central Italy), suffragan of Ravenna. The title for this church is in the report of the victory of Sulla (82 B. C.) over the consul Cæsarius Papirius Carbo, who was compelled to flee from Italy. In A. D. 728 it was seized by the Lombard king, Liutprand, who later restored it to the exarchate. But the same king again attacked it, while the people were assembled in the church of Santa Maria Foris Portas for the services of Holy Saturday; the bishop himself was among the slain. With the exarchate Faenza passed under the authority of the Holy See. About 1000 it was made a commune and from 1100 was governed by the counts of Modigliana. During the struggle of Frederick II against the popes, the city belonged to the Guelph league; in 1241 the emperor took possession of it after a siege of eight months. During the thirteenth century different families, the Accuris, the Manfredi, the Lombartz, the Nor- digi, and others, disputed the possession of Faenza. In 1294 it was governed by the Manfredi. Several times the Avignon popes had to summon these lords to render service as vassals, as in 1328 through Cardinal Bertrand Pogetto and in 1356 through Cardinal Gil d'Albornoz. In 1375 the city was de- stroyed by the famous English condottiere Sir John Hawkwood. In 1501 Caesar Borgia put to death the Manfredi brothers, Astorgio and Giovanni Evangelista. On the death of Cesar Borgia, Francesco Manfredi, a brother of Astorgio and Evangelista, attempted to return to Faenza, but was compelled to flee by the Venetians. In 1509 Julius II brought the city under the direct rule of the Holy See. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries Faenza was renowned for its pottery (whence the French faience). The celebrated physicist, Torricelli, was a native of Faenza. Domitia Lucia, a martyr, the widow of Antoninus Pius, is also said to have been born there. The first historically certain bishop is Constantius, present at a council in Rome (313), at

The Cathedral, Faenza

Fagnani, Prospero, canonist, b in Italy, place and date of birth uncertain; d in 1678. Some writers place his birth in 1598, others in 1587 or 1588. It is certain that he studied at Perugia. At the age of twenty he was a doctor of civil and canon law; at twenty-two, secretary of the Congregation of the Council. He held this office for fifteen years. He fulfilled the same functions in several other Roman Congregations. It is not certain that he ever lectured on canon law at the Roman University (Sapienza). He became blind at the age of forty-four. This affliction did not prevent him from devoting himself to canonical studies and from writing a commentary on the Decretals of Gregory IX, which gained for him the title of "Doctor Crescis Oculatisimus", i.e. the blind yet most far-sighted doctor. This commentary includes interpretations of the texts of the most difficult of the Decretals of Gregory IX. It is distinguished by the clearness with which the most complex and disputed questions of canon law are explained. The work is also of great value for the purpose of ascertaining the prac-
tice of the Roman Congregations, especially that of the Congregation of the Council, of which the author quotes numerous decisions. Benedict XIV gave this work the highest praise, and its authority is still continually appealed to in the Roman Congregations. It is included among the Decretals in the Decretalium (Codex Iuris Canonici). The first edition was published at Rome, in 1619, under the title of "Jus canonice seu commentaria absolutissima in quibus libros Decretalium". It has been reprinted several times. Fagnani is reproached with excessive rigor in his commentary on this work, but in fact his work is often justly appreciated by modern historians; in his appreciation of Bishop Laval and of the Jesuits. On the other hand, he is credited for giving prominence to persons and events of Villemarie, less elaborately treated by the Jesuit "Relations" and later histories. 

BERTRAND, Histoire littéraire de la Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice (Paris, 1900); ROBERT, Les Etablissements de la Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice a Frasne (Paris, 1896); MORGAN, Bibliotheca Canadensis (Ottawa, 1867); J. M. LIBRENO in Trans. of Roy. Soc. of Canada (1882). 

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Faith (πίστις, πίστες, fides).—I. The Meaning of the Word.—In the Old Testament, πίστις means essentially steadfastness, of Exod., xxi, 12, where it is used to describe the strengthening of Moses' hands; hence it comes to mean faithfulness, whether of God towards man (Deut., xxxii, 4) or of man towards God (Ps., cvii, 30). As signifying a trustful attitude towards God, it means trustfulness or fiducia. It would, however, be illogical to conclude that the word cannot, and does not, mean "belief" or "faith" in the Old Testament, for it is clear that we cannot put trust in a person's promises without previously assenting to or believing in them; that a person's claim to such confidence, even if it could be proved that the word πίστις does not in itself contain the notion of belief, it must necessarily presuppose it. But that the word does itself contain the notion of belief is clear from the use of the radical πίστ-, which in the causative conjugation, or Hipil', means "to believe", e.g. Gen., xv, 6, and Deut., xi, 32, in which latter passage the two ideas—viz. of believing and of trusting—are combined. That the noun itself often means "faith" or "belief", is clear from Hab., ii, 4, where the context demands it. The witness of the Septuagint is decisive; they render the verb by πιστεύω, and the noun by πίστις; and here again the two factors, faith and trust, are connoted by the same term. But that even in classical Greek πιστεύω was used to signify "believe", is clear from Euripides (Helen, 710), λόγος ἐκποιήσας πίστευνε τάδε, and that πίστις could mean "belief" is shown by the same dramatist's θεόν ὄφεινα τίποτα πίστευσε (Medeia, 414; cf. Hipp., 1007). In the LXX, the same word occurs (αὐτός, xiv, 21; xxvi, 21), and again in the New Testament, viz. in Matt., vi, 10, where it is translated "faith" (cf. Matt., vi, 10). In Acts it is used objectively of the tenets of the Christians, and is often to be rendered "belief" (cf. xvii, 21; xx, 21; xxvi, 18). In Romans, xiv, 23, it has the meaning of "consience"—"all that is not of faith is sin"—but the Apostle repeatedly uses it in the sense of "belief" (cf. Rom., iv, and Gal., iii). How necessary it is to point this out will be evident to all who are familiar with modern theological literature; thus, for example, Haldane, "Aids to the Christian Life", Oct., 1907, says, "From one end of the Scripture to the other, faith is trust and only trust", it is hard to see how he would explain I Cor., xiii, 13, and Heb., xi, 1. The truth is that many theological writers of the present day are given to very loose thinking, and in nothing is this so evident as in their treatment of faith. In the article just referred to we read: "Trust in God is faith, faith is belief, belief may mean creed, but creed is not equivalent to trust in God." A similar vagueness was especially noticeable in the "Do we believe?" controversy; one correspondent says: "We believe," another says: "We have lost faith, cling more closely to hope and—by the grace of God the greater of these—charity." ("Do we believe?" p. 180, ed. W. L. Courtney, 1905). Non-Catholic writers have repudiated all idea of faith as an intellectual assent, and consequently they fail to realize that faith must necessar-
ily result in a body of dogmatic beliefs. "How and by what influence," asks Harnack, "was the living faith transformed into the creed to be believed, the surrender to Christ into a philosophical Christology?" (quoted in Hibbert, Journal, loc. cit.).

Faith is considered both objectively and subjectively.—Objectively, it stands for the sum of truths revealed by God in Scripture and tradition, and which the Church (see Faith, Rule of) presents to us in a brief form in her creeds; subjectively, faith stands for the habit or virtue by which we assever to those truths. It is with this subjective aspect of faith that we are here primarily concerned. Before we proceed to analyse the term faith, certain preliminary notions must be made clear.

(a) The twofold order of knowledge.—"The Catholic Church," says the Vatican Council, III, iv, "has always held that there is a twofold order of knowledge, and that these two orders are distinguished from one another not only in their principle but in their object; in one we know by natural reason, in the other by Divine faith; the object of the one is truth attainable by natural reason, the object of the other is mysteries hidden in God, but which we have to believe and which cannot be known to us by natural reason.

(b) Now intellectual knowledge may be defined in a general way as the union between the intellect and an intelligible object. But a truth is intelligible to us only in so far as it is evident to us, and evidence is of different kinds; hence, according to the varying character of evidence, we shall have to distinguish between varying kinds of knowledge. Thus a truth may be self-evident—e.g., the whole is greater than its part—in which case we are said to have intuitive knowledge of it; or the truth may not be self-evident, but deducible from premises in which case it is contained—such knowledge is termed reason knowledge; or again a truth may be neither self-evident nor deducible from premises in which it is contained, yet the intellect may be obliged to assent to it because it would else have to reject some other universally accepted truth; lastly, the intellect may be induced to assent to a truth for none of the foregoing reasons, but solely because, though not evident in itself, this truth rests on grave authority—for example, we accept the statement that the sun is 90,000,000 miles distant from the earth because competent, venerable authorities vouch for the fact. This last kind of knowledge is termed faith, and is clearly necessary in daily life. If the authority upon which we base our assent is human and therefore fallible, we have human and fallible faith; if the authority is Divine, we have Divine and infallible faith. If to this be added the medium by which the Divine authority for certain statements is put before us, viz., the Catholic Church, we have Divine-Catholic Faith (see Faith, Rule of).

(c) Again, evidence, whatever its source, may be of various degrees and so cause greater or less firmness of adhesion on the part of the mind which assents to a truth. Thus arguments or authorities for and against a truth may be either wanting or evenly balanced; in that case the intellect does not give in its adherence to the truth, but remains in a state of doubt or absolute suspension of judgment; or the arguments on one side may predominate; though not to the exclusion of those on the other side; in this case we have not complete adhesion of the intellect to the truth in question, but only opinion. Lastly, the arguments or authorities brought forward may be so convincing that the mind gives its unqualified assent to the statement proposed and has no fear whatever of making a mistake; this is termed certitude, and is the perfection of knowledge. Divine faith, then, is that form of knowledge which is derived from Divine authority, and which consequently begets absolute certitude in the mind of the recipient.

(d) That such Divine faith is necessary, follows from the fact of Divine revelation. For revelation means that the Supreme Truth has spoken to man and revealed to him truths which are not in themselves evident to the human mind. We must, then, either reject revelation altogether, or accept it by faith; that is, we must submit our intellect to truths which we cannot understand, but which come to us on Divine authority.

(e) We shall arrive at a better understanding of the habit or virtue of faith if we have previously analysed an act of faith; and this analysis will be facilitated by examining an act of ocular vision and an act of reasoning or intellect knowledge. In ocular vision we distinguish three things: the eye, or visual faculty, the coloured object, and the light which serves as the medium between the eye and the object. It is usual to term colour the formal object (objectum formale quod) of vision, since it is that which precisely and alone makes a thing the object of vision; the individual object seen may be termed the material object, e.g. this apple, that man, etc. Similarly, the light which serves as the medium between the eye and the object is termed the formal reason (objectum formale quod) of our actual vision. In the same way, when we analyse an act of Divine faith, we distinguish the intellect faculty which elicits the act, the intelligible object towards which the intellect is directed, and the evidence whether intrinsic to that object or extrinsic to it, which moves us to direct it. None of these factors can be omitted, each contributes in a special way to the act, whether of ocular vision or of intellectual assent.

(f) Hence, for an act of faith we shall need a faculty capable of eliciting the act, an object commensurate with that faculty, and evidence—not intrinsic but extrinsic to the object—which shall serve as the link between faculty and object. We will commence our analysis with the object:—

III. Analysis of the Object or Term in an Act of Divine Faith.—(a) For a truth to be the object of an act of Divine faith, it must be itself Divine, and this not merely as coming from God, but as being itself concerned with God. Just as in ocular vision the formal object must necessarily be something coloured, so in Divine faith the formal object must be something Divine—in theological language, the objectum formale quod of Divine faith is the First Truth in Prima Veritas in dicendo. Now, we could not make an act of Divine faith in the existence of India.

(b) Again, the evidence upon which we assent to this Divine truth must also be itself Divine, and there must be as close a relation between that truth and the evidence upon which it comes to us as there is between the coloured object and the light; the former is a necessary condition for the exercise of our visual faculty, the latter is the cause of our actual vision. But no one but God can reveal God; in other words, God is His own evidence. Hence, just as the formal object of Divine faith is the First Truth itself, so the evidence of that First Truth is the First Truth declaring itself. To use scholastic language once more, the objectum formale quod, or the motive, or the evidence, of Divine faith is the Prima Veritas in dicendo.

(c) There is a controversy whether the same truth can be an object both of faith and of knowledge. In other words, can we believe a thing both because we are told it on good authority and because we ourselves perceive it to be true? St. Thomas, Scotus, and others hold that once a thing is seen to be true, the adhesion of the mind is in no wise strengthened by reasoning of one who states that it is so; but the majority of theologians maintain, with De Lugo, that there may be a knowledge which does not entirely satisfy the mind, and that authority may then find a place, to complete its satisfaction. — We may note here the absurd expression Credo quae impossibile, which has provoked many sneers. It is not an axiom of the scholastics, as was
stated in the "Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale" (March, 1896, p. 169), and as was suggested more than once in the "Do we believe?" correspondence. The expression is due to Tertullian, whose exact words are: "Natus est Dei Filius; non pudet, quid pudendum est; Dominus, quia inemptum est; et sepultus, resurrection; certum est, quia impossibile." (De Carne Christi, cap. v.) This treatise dates from Tertullian's Montanist days, when he was carried away by his love of paradox. At the same time it is clear that the writer only aims at bringing out the wisdom of God manifested in the humiliation of the Cross; he is perhaps paraphrasing St. Paul's words in I Cor., i, 25.

(d) Let us now take some concrete act of faith, e.g., "I believe in the Most Holy Trinity." This mystery is the material or individual object upon which we are now exercising our faith, the formal object is its character as being a Divine truth, and this truth is clearly invidious as far as we are concerned; it in no way appeals to our intellect, on the contrary it rather repels it. And yet we assent to it by faith, consequently upon evidence which is extrinsic and not intrinsic to the faith assenting. But evidence commensurate with such a mystery save the Divine testimony itself, and this constitutes the motive for our assent to the mystery, and is, in scholastic language, the obiectum formuale quo of our assent. If, then, we are asked why we believe with Divine faith and not with the only adequate answer must be, because God has revealed it.

(e) We may point out in this connexion the falsity of the prevalent notion that faith is blind. "We believe," says the Vatican Council (III, iii.), "that revelation is true, not indeed because the intrinsic truth of the mysteries is clearly seen by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Who reveals them, for God can neither deceive nor be deceived." Thus, to return to the act of faith which we make in the Holy Trinity, we may formulate it in syllogistic fashion thus: Whatever God reveals is true, but God has revealed the mystery of the Holy Trinity; therefore this mystery is true. The major premise is indubitable and intrinsically evident to reason; the minor premise is also true because it is declared to us by the infallible Church (cf. FAITH, RULE OF), and also because, as the Vatican Council says, "in addition to the assistance of grace, promulgating of the same doctrine, the Holy Spirit, is pleased God to give us certain external proofs of His revelation, viz. certain Divine facts, especially miracles and prophecies, for since these latter clearly manifest God's omnipotence and infinite knowledge, they afford most certain proofs of His revelation and are suited to the capacity of all." Hence St. Thomas says: "A man would not believe unless he saw the things he had to believe, either by the evidence of miracles or of something similar." (I I, Q. i, a. 4, ad 1o.) The saint is here speaking of the motives of credibility.

IV. MOTIVES OF CREDIBILITY.—(a) When we say that a certain statement is incredible we often mean merely that it is extraordinary, but it should be borne in mind that this is a misuse of language, for the credibility or incredibility of a statement has nothing to do with its intrinsic probability or improbability; it depends solely upon the credentials of the authority who makes the statement. Thus the credibility of the statement that a secret alliance has been entered into between England and America depends solely upon the authoritative position and the veracity of our informant. If he be a clerk in a government office it is possible that he may have picked up some general information, but if our informant be the Prime Minister of England, his statement has the highest degree of credibility because his credentials are of the highest.

When we speak of the motives of credibility of revealed truth we mean the evidence that the things asserted are revealed truths. In other words, the credibility of the statements made is correlative with and proportionate to the credentials of the authority who makes them. Now the credentials of God are indubitable, for the very idea of God involves that of a superior or extraordinary authority, and God says is supremely credible, though not necessarily supremely intelligible for us. Here, however, the real question is not as to the credentials of God or the credibility of what He says, but as to the credibility of the statement that God has spoken. In other words, who or whom is the authority for this statement, and what credentials does this authority show? What are the motives of credibility of the statement that God has revealed this or that?

(b) These motives of credibility may be briefly stated as follows: in the Old Testament, considered not as an inspired book, but merely as a book having historical value, we find detailed the marvellous dealings of God with a particular nation to whom He repeatedly revealed Himself; we read of miracles wrought in their favour and as proofs of the truth of the revelation He makes; we find the most sublime teaching and the repeated announcement of God's grace that there can be no reconciliation of the world from sin and its consequences. And more than all we find throughout the pages of this book a series of hints, now obscure, now clear, of some wondrous person who is to come as the world's saviour; we find it asserted at one time that He is man, at others that He is God Himself. When we turn to the New Testament we find that the book records the birth, life, and death of One Who, while clearly man, also claimed to be God, and Who proved the truth of His claim by His whole life, miracles, teachings, and death, and finally by His triumphant resurrection. We find, moreover, that He founded a Church which should, so He said, continue to the end of time, which should serve as the repository of His teaching, and should be the means of applying to all men the fruits of the redemption He had wrought. When we come to the subsequent history of this Church we find it speedily spreading everywhere, and this in spite of its humble origin, its unworthiness, and the cruel persecution which it meets at the hands of the rulers of this world. And as the centuries pass we find this Church battling against heresies, schisms, and the sins of her own people—nay, of her own rulers—and yet continuing ever the same doctrine of the Holy Spirit, teaching before men the same mysteries of the life, death, and resurrection of the world's Saviour, Who had, so she taught, gone before to prepare a home for those who while on earth should have believed in Him and fought the good fight. But if the history of the Church since New-Testament times thus wonderfully confirms the New Testament itself, and in the New Testament so marvellously completes the Old Testament, these books must really contain what they claim to contain, viz. Divine revelation. And more than all, that Person Whose life and death were so minutely foretold in the Old Testament, and Whose story, as told in the New Testament, so perfectly corresponds with its prophetic delineation in the Old Testament, must be what He claimed to be, viz. the Son of God. His work, therefore, must be Divine. The Church which He founded must also be Divine and the repository and guardian of His teaching. Indeed, we can truly say that for every truth of Christianity which we believe Christ Himself is our testimony, and we believe in Him because the Divinity He claimed rests upon the concurrent testimony of His miracles, His prophecies, His personal character, the development of His doctrine, and the prophetic agreement with the Old Testament. His teaching in spite of its running counter to flesh and blood, the united testimony of thousands of martyrs, the stories of countless saints who for His sake have led heroic lives, the history of the Church herself since the Crucifixion, and, perhaps more remarkable than
any, the history of the papacy from St. Peter to Pius X.

(c) These testimonies are unanimous; they all point in one direction, they are of every age, they are clear and simple, and are within the grasp of the humblest intellect. And, as the Vatican Council has said, "the Church herself, is, by her marvellous propo-
nition, her wondrous sanctity, her inexhaustible fruit-
fulness in good works, her Catholic unity, and her enduring stability, a great and perpetual motive of credibility and an irrefragable witness to her Divine commission" (Const. "Dei Filiius"). "The Apostles," says Suarez, "saw the divine Body; we see the Body, let us believe in the Head" [Sermo cxiiii, 8 (al. cxiii), de temp., P. L., V, 1143]. Every believer will echo the words of Richard of St. Victor, "Lord, if we are in error, by Thine own self we have been deceived; for these things have been con-
formed by such signs and wonders in our midst as could only have been done by Thee!" (de Trinitate, I, cap. ii).

(d) But much misunderstanding exists regarding the meaning and office of the motives of credibil-
ity. In the first place, they afford us definite and certain
knowledge of Divine revelation; but this knowledge pro-
ceeds from faith; it is not the final motive for our assent to
the truths of faith; as St. Thomas says, "Faith has the
character of a virtue, not because of the things it
believes, for faith is of things that appear not, but be-
cause it adheres to the testimony of one in whom
truth is infallibly found" (De Veritate, xiv, 9); this
knowledge by which we believe which precedes faith
is not beget human faith, it is not even the cause of
Divine faith (cf. Suarez, De Fide, disp. iii, 12), but is
rather to be considered a remote disposition to it. We
must insist upon this because in the minds of many
faith is regarded as a more or less necessary conse-
quence of a careful study of the arguments; a view which the Vatican Council condemns expressly:
"If anyone says that the assent of Christian faith is
not free, but that it necessarily follows from the argu-
ments which human reason can furnish in its favour;
or if anyone says that God's grace is only necessary
for that living faith which worketh through charity,
let him be anathema" (Sess. IV). Nor can the mot-
ives of credibility make the mysteries of faith clear in
themselves, for, as St. Thomas says, "the arguments
which induce us to believe, e. g. miracles, do not prove
the faith itself, but only the truthfulness of him
dwelling in our souls, and consequently they do not
beget knowledge of faith's mysteries, but only faith"
(II Sent., XIII, xxiv, Q. 1, art. 2, sol. 2, ad 4o). On
the other hand, we must not minimize the real proba-
itive force of the motives of credibility within their
true sphere; "Reason declares that from the very
outset the Gospel teaching was rendered conspicuous
by signs and wonders which gave, as it were, definite
proof of a definite truth" (Leo XIII, "Eterni Patris").

(e) The Church has twice condemned the view that
faith ultimately rests on an accumulation of probabili-
ties. Thus the proposition of the "assent of supernat-
rural faith is consistent with merely probable
knowledge of revelation", was condemned by Inno-
cent XI in 1679 (cf. Denzinger, Enchiridion, 10th ed.,
No. 1171); and the Syllabus "Lamentabili sane" (July,
1907) condemns the proposition (XXV) that "the assent
of supernatural faith is an accumulation of probabili-
ties". But since the great name of Newman has been dragged into the controversy regarding this
last proposition, we may point out that, in the "Gram-
mar of Assent" (chap. x, sect. 2), Newman refers
solely to the proof of faith afforded by the motives of
credibility, and he rightly concludes that, since these
are "a demonstrative, this line of proof may be
termed "an accumulation of probabilities". But it
would be absurd to say that Newman therefore based
the final assent of faith on this accumulation; as a
matter of fact he is not here making an analysis of an
act of faith, but only of the grounds for faith; the
question of authority does not come into his argument
121-122).

V. Analysis of the Act of Faith from the Sub-
jective Standpoint.—(a) The light of faith.—An
intellect understands truths which are beyond man's
comprehension; if then a man were called upon to as-
sent to a truth beyond the ken of the human intellect,
but within the grasp of the angelic intellect, he would
require for the time being something more than his
natural light of reason, he would require what we may
call the "angelic light". If, now, the same man were
called upon to assent to a truth beyond the ken of both men and angels, he would clearly need a still
higher light, and this light we term "the light of
faith"—a light, because it enables him to assent to
those supernatural truths, and the light of faith be-
cause it does not so illuminate those truths as to make
them no longer obscure, for faith must ever be the
substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of
things that appear not" (Heb., xi, 1). Hence St.
Thomas ("De Veritate", xiv, 9, ad 2o) says: "Al-
though the Divinely infused light of faith is more
powerful than the natural light of reason, so, too, assent
in our present state we only imperfectly participated in
it; and hence it comes to pass that it does not beget in us
real vision of those things which it is meant to teach
us; such vision belongs to our eternal home, where
we shall perfectly participate in that light, where, in
fact, "in God's light we shall see light" (Ps. xxi, 10).

(b) The necessity of such light is evident from what
has been said, for faith is essentially an act of assent,
and just as assent to a series of deductive or inductive
reasonings, or to intuition of first principles, would be
impossible without the use of the motives of credibility,
so, too, assent to a supernatural truth would be inconceivable
without a supernatural strengthening of the natural light;
"Quid est enim fides nisi credere quod non vides?"
(i. e. what is faith but belief in that which thou seest
not?) asks St. Augustine, but he also says: "Faith
has its eyes by which it, in some sort sees that to be
true which it does not yet see; and by which, too, it
most surely sees that it does not see what it believes"[
Ep. ad Consent., ep. cxx 8 (al. cexxii), P. L., II,
456].

(c) Again, it is evident that this "light of faith" is a
supernatural gift and is not the necessary outcome of
assent to the motives of credibility. No amount of
study will win it, no intellectual conviction as to the
credibility of revealed religion nor even of the claims
of the Church to be our infallible guide in matters of
faith, will produce this light in a man's mind. It is
the free gift of God. Hence the Vatican Council
(III, iii) teaches that "faith is a supernatural virtue by which
we, with the inspiration and assistance of God's
grace, believe those things to be true which He has
revealed". The same decree goes on to say that
although the assent of faith is in no sense blind, yet
no one can assent to the Gospel teaching in the way
necessary for salvation without the illumination of
the Holy Spirit, Who bestows on all a sweetness in be-
lieving and consenting to the truth". Thus, neither as regards the truth believed nor as regards the motives for
believing, nor as regards the subjective principle by
which we believe viz. the infused light—can faith be
considered blind.

(d) The place of the will in an act of faith.—So far
we have seen that faith is an act of the intellect assen-
ting to a truth which is beyond its grasp, e. g. the mys-
tery of the Holy Trinity. But to many it will seem
almost as futile to ask the intellect to assent to a propor-
tion which is not intrinsically evident as it would be
to ask the eye to see a sound. It is clear, however,
that the intellect can be moved by the will either to
study or not to study a certain truth, though if the
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truth be a self-evident one—e. g., that the whole is greater than its part—the will cannot affect the intellect’s adhesion to it; it can, however, move it to think of something else, and thus distract it from the contemplation of that particular truth. If, now, the will moves the intellect, the under- lying phenomenon of the intellect’s adherence or rejection of any given proposition is not dependent on the intellect’s ability to give its partial adherence to one of these views, it must always be precluded from absolute assent by the possibility that the other view may be right. The fact that men hold much more tenaciously to one of these than the arguments warrant can only be due to some extrinsic consideration, e. g. that it is absurd not to hold what the vast majority of men hold. And here it should be noted that, as St. Thomas says repeatedly, the intellect only assents to a statement for one of two reasons: either because that statement is immediately or meditately evident in itself (a first principle), or because the will moves it to do so. Extrinsic evidence of course comes into play when intrinsic evidence is wanting, but though it would be absurd, without weighty evidence in its support, to assent to a truth which we do not grasp, yet no amount of evidence can make any intellect in certain cases show that the statement in question was credible, our ultimate actual assent could only be due to the intrinsic evidence which the statement itself offered, or, failing that, due to the will. Hence it is that St. Thomas repeatedly defines the act of faith as the assent of the intellect determined by the will (De Veritate, xiv, 1; II-II, Q. ii, a. 1, ad 3\(^3\); c.; ibid., iv, 1, c., and ad 2\(^{m}\)). The reason, then, why men cling to certain beliefs more tenaciously than the arguments in their favour would warrant, is to be sought in the will rather than in the intellect. Authorities are to be found on both sides, the extrinsic evidence is not convincing, but something is to be gained by assenting to one view rather than the other, and this appeals to the will, which therefore determines the intellect to assent to the view which promises the most. Similarly, in Divine faith the credentials of the authority which tells us this or that only make certain decretals be binding, for they are always extrinsic to the proposition, “God has revealed this or that”, and consequently they cannot compel our assent; they merely show us that this statement is credible. When, then, we ask whether we are to give in our free assent to any particular statement or not, we feel that in the first place we cannot do so unless there be strong extrinsic evidence in its favour, for to believe a thing merely because we wished to do so would be absurd. Secondly, the proposition itself does not compel our assent, since it is not intrinsically evident, but there remains the fact that the condition of our salvation is what the human soul naturally yearns for, viz., the possession of God, Who is, as both reason and authority declare, our ultimate end; “He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved”, and “Without faith it is impossible to please God.” St. Thomas expresses this by saying, “The disposition of a believer is that of one who accepts another’s word for some statement, because it seems fitting or useful to do so. In the same way we believe Divine revelation because the reward of eternal life is promised us for so doing. It is the will which is moved by the prospect of this reward; and what is said, the intellect is not moved by something which it understands. Hence St. Augustine says (Tract. xxvi in Joanne, 2): “Cetera potest homonulos credere, nonnisi volens? [i. e., other things a man can do against his will, but to believe he must will]” (De Ver., xiv, 1).

(e) But just as the intellect needed a new and special light in order to assent to the supernatural truths of faith, so also the will needs a special grace from God in order that it may tend to that supernatural good which is eternal life. The light of faith, then, illumines the understanding but the truth itself remains obscure, since it is beyond the intellect’s grasp; but supernatural grace moves the will, which, having now a supernatural good put before it, moves the intellect to assent to what it does not understand. Hence it is that faith is described as “bringing into captivity every thought and understanding unto the obedience of Christ” (II Cor., x, 5).

VI. DEFINITION OF FAITH.—The foregoing analyses will enable us to define an act of Divine supernatural faith as “the act of the intellect assenting to a Divine truth owing to the movement of the will, which is itself moved by the grace of God” (St. Thomas, II-II, Q. iv, a. 2). And just as the light of faith is a gift supernaturally bestowed upon the understanding, so also this Divine grace moving the will is, as its name implies, an equally supernatural and an absolutely gratuitous gift. Neither gift is due to previous study, nor is either of them a condition of either of them being acquired by human efforts, but “Ask and ye shall receive.”

From all that has been said two most important corollaries follow: (a) That temptations against faith are natural and inevitable and are in no sense contrary to faith, "since", says St. Thomas, “the assent of the intellect, if it is not the result of the will, is not the assent of the intellect to the object to which the intellect thus assents: it is the assent of free will, and free will is not moved by the grace of God” (St. Thomas, II-II, Q. iv, a. 2). And just as the light of faith is a gift supernaturally bestowed upon the understanding, so also this Divine grace moving the will is, as its name implies, an equally supernatural and an absolutely gratuitous gift. Neither gift is due to previous study, nor is either of them a condition of either of them being acquired by human efforts, but “Ask and ye shall receive.”

(b) It also follows from the above that an act of supernatural faith is meritorious, since it proceeds from the will moved by Divine grace or charity, and thus has all the essential constituents of a meritorious act (cf. II-II, Q. ii, a. 9). This enables us to understand St. James’ words when he says, “The devils also believe and tremble” (ii, 19). “It is not willingly that they assent”, says St. Thomas, “but they are compelled thereto by the evidence of those signs which prove that what believers assent to is true, whereas devils do not believe anything of faith so evident as to afford what is termed vision of them” (De Ver., xiv, 9, ad 4\(^{m}\)); nor is it faith Divine, but merely philosophical and natural. Some may fancy the foregoing analyses superfluous, and may think that they savour too much of Scholasticism. But if anyone will be at the pains to compare the teaching of the Fathers, of the Scholastics, and of the divines of the Anglican Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with that of the non-Catholic theologians of to-day, he will find that the Scholastics merely put into shape what the Fathers taught, and that the divines of the Scholastic school gave their ideas solidity and genuine worth to their vast patristic knowledge and their strictly logical training.
VII. The Habit of Faith and the Life of Faith.

(a) We have defined the act of faith as the assent of the intellect to a truth which is beyond its comprehension, but which it accepts under the influence of the will moved by grace; and from the analysis we are now making of the virtue of faith as a supernatual habit by which we firmly believe those things to be true which God has revealed. Now every virtue is the perfection of some faculty, but faith results from the combined action of two faculties, viz., the intellect which elicits the act, and the will which moves the intellect to do so: consequently, the perfection of faith will depend upon the perfection of both, and with which each of these faculties performs its allotted task; the intellect must assent unhesitatingly, the will must promptly and readily move it to do so.

(b) The unhesitating assent of the intellect cannot be due to intellectual conviction of the reasonableness of faith, whether we regard the grounds on which it rests or the actual truths we believe, for “faith is the evidence of things that appear not” (1 John 3:4); it must, then, be referred to the fact that these truths come to us on Divine infallible testimony. And though faith is so essentially a “life unassailable” it may be that the peculiar function of the light of faith, which we have already stated to be so necessary, is in some sort to afford us, not indeed vision, but an instinctive appreciation of the truths which are declared to be revealed. St. Thomas seems to hint at this when he says: “As by other virtue a man sees what accords with what he has heard, so by the habit of faith a man’s mind is inclined to assent to those things which belong to the true faith and not to other things” (II-II, q. iv, a. 3).

In every act of faith this unhesitating assent of the intellect is due to the motion of the will as its efficient cause, and the same must be true of the actual virtuous habit of faith when we consider it as a habit or a virtue, moral virtue, for, as St. Thomas insists (I-I, q. iv, a. 3), there is no virtue, properly so called, in the intellect except in so far as it is subject to the will. Thus the habitual promptitude of the will in moving the intellect to assent to the truths of faith is not only the efficient cause of the intellect’s assent, but is precisely what gives to this assent its virtuous, and consequently meritorious, character. Lastly, this promptitude of the will can only come from its unsparing tendency to the Supreme Good. And at the risk of repeating what must again call attention to the distinction between faith as a purely intellectual habit, which as such is dry and barren, and faith resident, indeed, in the intellect, but moved by charity or love of God, Who is our beginning, our ultimate end, and our supernatural reward. “Every true motion of the will” says St. Augustine, “proceeds from true love” (de Civ. Dei, XIV, ix), and, as he elsewhere beautifully expresses it, “Quid est ergo credere in Eum? Credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in Eum ire, et Eius membris incorporari. Ipsa est ergo fides quam de nobis Deus exigit, et non invent quod exigit, aduersum quod invent, seu voluit Deus quod invent.” (Tract. xxix, in Joannem, 6.) “What, then, is to believe in God? It is to love Him by believing, to go to Him by believing, and to be incorporated in His members. This, then, is the faith which God demands of us; and He does not want what He demands of us as a virtue, but what He has found.” This then is what is meant by “living” or “true” faith, or as theologians term it, fides formativa, viz., “informed” by charity, or love of God. If we regard faith precisely as an assent elicited by the intellect, then this bare faith is the same habit numerically the same as when the informing principle of charity is added to it, but it is not the true character of a moral virtue and is not a source of merit. If, then, charity be dead—if, in other words, a man be in mortal sin and so without the habitual sanctifying grace of God, which alone gives to his will that due tendency to God as his supernatural end which is requisite for super-

natural and meritorious acts—it is evident that there is no longer in the will that power by which it can, from supernatural motives, move the intellect to assent to supernatural truths. The intellectual and Divinely infused habit of faith remains, however, and when charity returns this habit acquires anew the character of “living” and meritorious.

(c) Again, faith being a virtue, it follows that a man’s promptitude in believing will make him love the truths he believes, and he will therefore study them, not indeed in the spirit of doubting inquiry, but in order the better to grasp them as far as human reason will allow. Such a man will render his faith more robust, because, at the same time that he is brought face to face with the intellectual difficulties which are involved, he will necessarily exercise his faith and repeatedly “bring his intellect into submission.” Thus St. Augustine says, “What can be the reward of faith, what can its very nature mean, if you wish to see now what you believe? You ought not to see in order to believe, you ought to believe in order to see; you ought to believe so long as you do not see, lest when you do see you may be put to the blush” (Sermon, xxxvii, 2, P. L., V, 230). And it is in the same sense we must understand his other dictum, “Crede ut intelligas” (Believe that you may understand). Thus, commenting on the Septuagint version of Isaiah, vii, 9, which reads: “nisi credideritis non intelligetis”, he says: “Proficicet ergo nostrum intellectum ex agendorumque agitata credidisse, et fides proficet ad credendum quae a intelligeantur, et eadem ipsa ut magis magisque intelligantur, in ipsa intellectu proficet mens. Sed hoc non fit propriis tanquam naturalibus viribus, sed Deo donante atque adjuvante” (Enarr. in Ps. cvviii, Sermon xviii, 3). “Our intellect therefore is of use to understand whatever things it believes, and faith is of use to believe whatever it understands; and in order that these same things may be more and more understood, the thinking faculty [mens] is of use in the intellect. But this is not brought about as by our own natural powers, but by the gift and the aid of God.” (Ibid. Sermon 3, in Is., iv, 9; P. L., V, 235).

(d) Further, the habit of faith may be stronger in one person than in another, “whether because of the greater certitude and firmness in the faith which one has more than another, or because of his greater promtitude in assenting, or because of his greater doxology of faith, or because of his greater confidence” (II-II, q. v, a. 4).

(e) We are sometimes asked whether we are really certain of the things we believe, and we rightly answer in the affirmative; but strictly speaking, certainty can only be looked for in two standpoints: if we look at its cause, we have in faith the highest form of certainty, for its cause is the Essential Truth; but if we look at the certitude which arises from the extent to which the intellect grasps a truth, then in faith we have not such perfect certitude as we have of demonstrable truths, since the truths believed are beyond the intellect’s comprehension (II-II, q. iv, a. 8; de Ver., xiv, and i, ad 7).

VIII. The Genesis of Faith in the Individual Soul.—(a) Many receive their faith in their infancy, to others it comes later in life, and its genesis is often misunderstood. With the help of the preceding article, we may describe the genesis of faith in the adult mind somewhat as follows: Man being endowed with reason, reasonable investigation must precede faith; now we can prove by reason the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the origin and destiny of man; but from these facts there follows the necessity of religion, and true religion must be the true worship of the true God not according to our ideas, but according to what He Himself has revealed. But can God reveal Himself to us? And, granting that He can, where is this revelation to be found? The Bible is said to contain it; does in-
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vestigation confirm the Bible's claim? We will take but one point: the Old Testament looks forward, as we have already seen, to One Who is to come and Who is God; the New Testament shows us One Who claimed to be the fulfillment of the prophecies and to be God incarnate in the flesh. He teaches us to keep faith in His life, death, and resurrection, by His teaching, miracles, and prophecies. He further claimed to have founded a Church which should enshrine His revelation and should be the infallible guide for all who wished to carry out His will and save their souls. Which of the numerous existing Churches claims His? It must have certain definite characteristics or "notes". It must be One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic; it must claim infallible teaching power. None but the Holy, Roman, Catholic, and Apostolic Church can claim these characteristics, and her history is an irrefragable proof of her Divine mission. If, then, she be the true Church, her teaching must be infallible and must be accepted.

(b) Now what is the state of the inquirer who has come thus far? He has proceeded by pure reason, and, if on the grounds stated he makes his submission to the mystery of the Catholic Church and believing her doctrines, he has only human, reasonable, fallible faith. Later on he may see reason to question the various steps in his line of argument, he may hesitate at some truth taught by the Church, and he may withdraw the assent he has given to her teaching authority. In this case, he has not done faith at all. Divine faith is supernatural both in the principle which elicits the acts and in the objects or truths upon which it falls. The principle which elicits assent to a truth which is beyond the grasp of the human mind must be that same mind illumined by a light superior to the light of reason, viz. the light of faith; and since, even with this light of faith, the intellect remains human, and the truth to be believed remains obscure, the final assent of the intellect must come from the will assisted by Divine grace. as seen above. But both this Divine light and this Divine grace are pure gifts of God, and are consequently only bestowed at His good pleasure. It is here that the heroism of faith comes in; our reason will lead us to the door of faith, but there it leaves us; and God asks of us that earnest wish to believe for the sake of the reward: "I am thy reward exceeding great"—which will allow us to practise the virtues of the new man, and to believe, Lord, help Thou my unbelief." As St. Augustine expresses it, "Ut deficiat ratiocini, uti est fidei velificatio" (Sermon cxlvii, P. L. V, 1157—"Where reason fails, there faith builds up").

(c) When this act of submission has been made, the light of faith floods the soul and is even reflected back upon those very motives which had to be so laboriously studied in our search after the truth; and even those preliminary truths which precede all investigation, e.g. the very existence of God, become now the object of our faith.

X. FAITH IN RELATION TO WORKS.—(a) Faith and no works may be described as the Lutheran view. "Ego peccator, peccavit fortiter sed fortius fide" was the heresiarch's axiom, and the Diet of Worms, in 1521, condemned the doctrine that good works are necessary for salvation.

(b) Works and no faith may be described as the modern view, for the modern world strives to make the worship of humanity take the place of the worship of the Deity "Do we believe?" as issued by the Rationalist Press, 1904, ch. x: "Cred and Conduct" and ch. xv: "Rationalism and Morality". Cf. also "Rationalism and Religious Faith" (Hibbert Journal, July, 1906, p. 727).

Agnostics, again, take refuge in the unknowableness of truths beyond reason, but their argument is fallacious, for surely knowledge has its degrees. I may not fully comprehend a truth in all its bearings, but I can know a great deal about it; I may not have demonstrative knowledge of it, but that is no reason why I should reject that knowledge which comes from faith. To listen to many Agnostics one would imagine that appeal to authority as a criterion was unscientific, though perhaps nowhere is authority applied so unscientifically as by modern science and modern critics. But, as St. Augustine said, "If God's providence govern human affairs we must not despair or doubt but that He hath ordained some certain authority, upon which staying ourselves upon a certain ground or step we may be lifted up to God".
(De uttiate credendi); and it is in the same spirit that he says: "Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholiche Ecclesie commoveret auctoritas" (Contra Ep. Fund., V, 6—"I would not believe the Gospel if the authority of the Catholic Church did not oblige me to believe").

Naturalism, which is only another name for Materialism, rejects faith because there is no place for it in the naturalistic scheme; yet the condemnation of this false philosophy by St. Paul and by the author of the Book of Wisdom is emphatic (cf. Rom., i, 18–23; Wis., xiii, 1–19). Materialists fail to see in nature what the greatest minds have always discovered in it: "ratio cujusdam artis, selicite divina, indita rebus, quaa ipsae res moventur ad finem determinat"—"the manifestation of a Divine plan whereby all things are directed towards their appointed end" (St. Thomas, Lect. xiv, in II Phys.). Similarly, the vaugaries of Humanism blind men to the fact of man's essentially finite character and hence preclude all idea of faith in the infinite and the supernatural (cf. "Naturalism and Humanism" in "Hibbert Journal", Oct., 1907).

XII. FAITH IS NECESSARY.—"He that believes and is baptized, said Christ, shall be saved; but he that believes not shall be condemned" (Mark, xvi, 16); and St. Paul sums up this solemn declaration by saying: "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb., xi, 6). The absolute necessity of faith is evident from the following considerations: God is our beginning and our end and has supreme dominion over us; we owe Him, consequently, due service which we express by the term religion. Now true religion is the true worship of the true God. But it is not for man to fashion a worship according to his own ideals; none but God can declare to us in what true worship consists, and this declaration constitutes the body of vital truths, whether natural or supernatural. To these, if we would attain the end for which we came into the world, we are bound to give the assent of faith. It is clear, moreover, that no one can profess indifference in a matter of such vital importance. During the Reformation period no such indifference was professed by those who quitted the fold; for them it was not a question of faith or unfaith, so much as of the medium by which the true faith was to be known and put into practice. The attitude of many outside the Church is now one of absolute indifference; faith is regarded as an option, as if by this means each individual were at liberty to regulate his own spiritual life by no known psychological laws. Thus Taine speaks of faith as "une source vive qui s'est formée au plus profond de l'âme, sous la poussée et la chaleur des instincts immédiats"—"a living fountain which has come into existence in the lowest depths of the soul under the impulse and the warmth of the immanent instincts." Indifference in all its phases was condemned by Pius IX in the Syllabus "Quanta cura!"—"In Prop. XV, 'Any man is free to embrace and profess whatever form of religion he reason approves of'; XVI, 'Man can find the way of salvation and can attain to eternal salvation in any form of religious worship'; XVII, 'We can at least have good hopes of the eternal salvation of all those who have never been in the true Church of Christ'; XVIII, 'Protestantism is only another form of the same true Christian religion, and men can be as pleasing to God in it as in the Catholic Church.'

XIII. THE OBJECTIVE UNITY AND IMUTABILITY OF FAITH.—Christ's prayer for the unity of His Church, the highest form of unity conceivable, "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee" (John, xvi, 21), has been repeatedly disregarded by the unifying forces of a bond of faith such as that which binds us together as members of the Church. "All Christians have been taught to be "careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, one body and one spirit, as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptis-
Faith, Protestant Confessions of. — That the Catholic Church, which claims the prerogative of teaching revealed truth with infallible certitude, should have drawn up articles of faith and demanded for them the internal assent and outward confession of her members, was logical and legitimate; but it was difficult to understand with what logic or consistency Protestantism, which proclaimed the Bible, as interpreted by the private judgment of the individual, to be the sole and sufficient rule of faith, could follow her example. It is said that Protestants look upon their doctrinal standards as authoritative only in so far as they agree with the "word of God"; but each sect so imbues its members from early childhood with its peculiar tenets, that long before they are able to read the Bible intelligently, their religious views are fixed. Stray individuals may change their religion and may be able to gather a sufficient number of followers to form a separate communion; but the bulk of the population remain true to the faith of their parents, or of their native land. In the palmy days of Protestantism, it was not the reading of the Bible that held the denominations together, but their respective Confessions of Faith, inculcated and enforced under severe penalties by the civil power. As a practical result, the "word of God" was interpreted in accordance with formulae devised by men; the Anglican read into his Bible the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Lutheran the Augsburg Confession, the "Reformation" the Heidelberg Catechism. Each sect was obliged to prove its raison d'être by showing just how far it differed from others, a very large number of Confessions appeared, varying in size from a few articles to long theological treatises. As a rule, the later Confessions are merely modified copies of the older ones, altered to suit local circumstances or personal views.

Tyros.—Since the Protestant revolts originated almost independently, and simultaneously, in Germany and in Switzerland, there has been, from the beginning, a sharp distinction between the Lutheran and the "Reformed" tenets of Zwingli, afterwards merged into Calvinism. The cleavage between Lutheranism and Calvinism goes deeper than the divergence of views concerning the real presence in the Eucharist. Luther drifted into heresy gradually. In spite of his hatred of the pope, he preserved a lingering reverence for the Church in which he had been a monk and a pious youth for many years. He inherited ancient beliefs and liturgy as could be made to fit into his peculiar views on sin and justification. So adroitly and tentatively were the changes made in Catholic phraseology and worship, that but few of the Lutheran common people felt they had drifted away from the Church of their fathers. Luther himself, in a famous passage, boasted that the eye of the ordinary layman could detect little or no difference between the Lutheran service and the Catholic Mass. As to the theological opinions, the layman was equally deceived; for it was not new for him to be taught that we are saved, not by the grace of God through the merits of Christ's Blood. That the temporal rulers were zealous in the extirpation of "abuses" rather edified than shocked the common man, for a certain jura reformandi had always been claimed, and had frequently been exercised, by Catholic German princes. Quite different was the case with Zwinglians and Calvinists. Lying no claim to identity or continuity with the ancient Church, the "Reformed Churches" began, generally amidst iconoclastic riots, by rooting out the entire fabric of Catholicism. After the futile attempt of Philip of Hesse, at the Marburg Conference (1-4 Oct., 1525), to reconcile the reformers, these went their several ways, hating and reviling each other little less than they hated and reviled the Church of Rome. It is scarcely needless to add that since the collapse of dogmatic Protestantism, its conflicting creeds possess little more than an historical interest. Even where subscription to a Confession is still exacted as a condition for holding office, the ceremony is regarded as a mere formality.

The Lutheran Confessions. — (1) The oldest and most authoritative of the Lutheran creeds was the Augsburg Confession, drafted at the Diet at Augsburg in 1530, on the basis of Luther's Marburg, Schwabach, and Torgau articles, and bore the signature of seven German princes, Elector John of Saxony, his son John Frederick, Ernest and Francis, Dukes of Lüneburg, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Welfang, and prince-electors of Anhalt, and of the representatives of the two imperial cities, Nuremberg and Reutlingen. On 25 June, 1530, copies of it, in Latin and German, were presented to Charles V, at the diet of Augsburg, and the German version was read aloud before the secular and ecclesiastical Estates of the Empire. Charles retained the Latin copy which he brought with him to Spain, giving the other into the custody of the Archbishop of Mainz. Both seem now to be irretrievably lost. The document ought to have retained its original title of Apologia, for it is an artful attempt to persuade the Emperor and the Estates that in the Reformed doctrine, nothing is by the preaching, or the Scriptures, or with the Catholic Church, or with the Roman Church, so far as that Church is known from its writers".

The Luthers teach (Art. I) the Nicene belief in God and the Trinity; (Art. II) Original Sin; (Art. III) The Incarnation; (Art. IV) Justification by Faith. By leaving out the obnoxious word sola (alone), the article might be glossed in a Catholic sense. They believe furthermore (Art. V) in a Divinely appointed ecclesiastical ministry, no mention being made of Luther's universal priesthood of believers. They teach (Art. VI) that "faith should bring forth good works, and that men ought to do the good works commanded by God, because it is God's will, and not on any confidence of meriting justification before God by their works", as if any one had taught differently. In Articles VII and VIII, "On the Church", instead of asserting the heresy of an invisible Church, they define it to be "the congregation of saints [the German version has it the assembly of all the faithful], in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments rightly administered". They condemn the Donatists and Arians, and the ministry of the laity as useless and inefficacious. In Article IX, "On Baptism", they teach that it is necessary to salvation, and that infants are to be baptized. The famous Article X reads as follows: "Of the Lord's Supper they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to those who eat of the Lord's Supper, and they reject the contrary teaching." Here Luther's theory of compunction is sedulously slurried over. Art. XI teaches that private absolution must be retained, though in confession it is not necessary to enumerate all sins committed.

Art. XII, "On Penance", teaches that those who fall, after Baptism, may obtain the remission of sins, whenever they repent, and that it is the duty of the Church to absolve the repentant. Penance, they teach, consists of two parts, confession and faith. In the hazy Article XIII, "On the use of the Sacraments" they condemn those who teach that the Sacraments justify ex opere operato, without teaching that faith in the remission of sins is requisite in the use of the Sacraments", which statement shows how scant was Melancthon's acquaintance with Catholic doctrine. Art. XIV, "On Ecclesiastical Orders", extends itself to the persons holding the power of the Keys, and should publicly teach in the Church, or administer the Sacraments, unless he be rightly called." Art. XV, "On Ecclesiastical Rites", retains such rites "as may be observed without sin", instanceing "fixed holydays, feasts and such like", but "consciences are not
to be burdened by such things, as if necessary to salvation." Art. XVI inculcates the duty of obedience to civil rulers. Art. XVII deals with the Last Judgment. Art. XVIII, "On Free Will," is a bold departure, on the part of Melanchthon, from Luther's fundamental heresy of the enlaved will of fallen man. ""It is absurd to suppose that man's will is limited to work a civil righteousness, and to choose such things as reason can reach unto; but that it hath no power to work the righteousness of God or a spiritual righteousness, without the Spirit of God." This sounds Catholic enough. Art. XX repels the accusation that the ""slight and bloody of the Coarse"", and especially accuses the Catholics of relying on good works for justification. Art. XXI teaches that we should honor the memory of the Saints, but not invoke their aid.

They conclude the doctrinal part of the Confession with the words: "This is about the sum of our doctrine," with the protest of agreement with the Roman Church given above. "We have no dogmas," Melanchthon wrote to the papallegate, 6 July, "which differ from the Roman Church. Moreover, we are ready to submit to the Roman Church, if Rome, with the leniency she has at all times shown to all nations, will consent to overlook and keep silence on the slight matters which we cannot alter, even if we wished to do so. We reverence the authority of the Pope of Rome," etc. Meanwhile Luther was denouncing "the Pope and his crew" as "veritable devils," and Melanchthon styled the pope "an Anti-Christ, under whose rule the Jews would be like the Jews under Pharaoh in Egypt." (Janssen, History of the German People, tr. St. Louis, 1903, V, 254). The "slight matters," which Rome was asked to connive at, are enumerated in seven articles in Part II of the Confession, with such probity that we can scarcely but admire the emperor if during the heading on a horn he fell into a slumber. They are grouped under the headings of (1) Communion under both kinds; (2) The Marriage of Priests; (3) The Mass; (4) Compulsory Confession; (5) Distinction of Meats, and Traditions; (6) Monastic Vows; and (7) The Authority of Bishops. To any one who had followed the course of the Lutheran revolution, it must have been amusing to read the following statement: "Our churches are wrongfully accused to have abolished the Mass. For the Mass is retained still among us, and celebrated with great reverence, yea, and almost all the truth remains, save the omission of the Canon was a slight matter—saving that with the things sung in Latin we mingle certain things sung in German."

We have given this synopsis of a document often spoken of, but seldom read, to show the spirit in which it was drawn up. It has been aptly termed a political campaign document, calculated to impress the Estates that the Lutherans, themselves supremely intolerant towards Catholics, should be permitted to proceed in peace in the uprooting of the ancient Faith. The Confession was accompanied with a Preface, written by Chancellor Bruck of Saxony, in which the engagement was made that should the controversy not be settled at the Diet, the signers were "ready to compare views and defend their cause in a general, free, and Christian Council". While the engagement amounted to was made more test on the when the council convened at Trent. The studied moderation, not to say disingenuousness, of the Augsburg Confession is said to have deceived some members of the Diet, as to the importance of the issue at stake between Catholics and Lutherans; but it could not deceive such men as Eick, Wingenroth, Cochleus, and the other theologians to whom Charles referred the document for discussion.

In a remarkably calm and able "Answer", afterwards called "Conciliation", they analyze the Confessions, giving praise and censure where either is due. Melanchthon retorted with an "Apologia" which Lutherans generally regard as their second symbolic book; Charles refused to accept it, because of the violent language used against the Catholic Church. Since Melanchthon looked on the "Confessio Augustana" as his private property, he continued ever after to commend it on it, and resist any effort to take it from him. Most notorious, and the source of endless controversies amongst Lutherans, was the altered edition of 1540, issued at a time when Melanchthon was under the spell of Calvin. Art. X lost its Catholic tone and was made to read that "the bread and wine are truly exhibited to those who eat in the Lord's Supper," a statement to which a Calvinist might subscribe. We must not, however, throw too much blame on Melanchthon and other preachers; the political magnates have to be considered.

The Smalcald Articles.—Any hopes of a reconciliation which were founded on the studied moderation of the Augsburg Confession were rudely dispelled seven years later when the Protestant Estates, assembled at Smalcald, spurned the pope's offer of that General Council for which, with more than dubious sincerity, they had clamored so long, and condemned the articles. The articles which the Catholics had differed from the Roman Church. Following the general lines of the Augsburg Confession, Luther, by injecting his strongest anti-papal virus into the document, changed it from an olive-branch into an open declaration of war with the Catholic Church. The-ms were identical: the Mass is the dragon's tail, producing all sorts of abominations and idolatries; purgatory is a Satanic delusion, etc., etc. When asked to affix his signature to this insane effusion, Melanchthon did so, with the proviso that "if the pope would admit the gospel, we might permit him, for the sake of peace, to exercise his jurisdiction over the bishops, who are now or may hereafter be under his authority." The princes, resenting this covert attack upon their spiritual sovereignty, compelled the weaker to write a pamphlet denouncing the pope as anti-Christ.

The Formula of Concord.—Scarcely were Luther's remains placed in the tomb than, as he had foreseen, fierce contentions broke out among the preachers, which shook the Lutheran Churches to their foundations. The earliest of these theological battles raged about the person of Melanchthon, who in his later years departed more and more openly from the two most important tenets of his master; on the subject of free will in fallen man, he approached closely to the Catholic position; regarding the Eucharist, he became ever more Calvinistic. He also incurred the reproaches of the orthodox by accepting, with modifications, the "Interim Religion" of Charles V. In course of time, new topics of controversy rose to divide the theologians, until, in 1570, Jacobus Andreae could write that "there were scarcely a couple of preachers among them who did not disagree about some article or other of the Augsburg Confession" (Janssen, op. cit., VIII, 403). Tired of their endless wranglings, which were as destructive of moral and social as of religious order, the Elector Augustus of Saxony proposed to cut the knot "by princely edict." He suggested to the Lutheran princes to convene an assembly to which each would bring his own code of doctrine. From all these different volumes they would then, with the help of a few amiable theologians, construct a general code, which should be considered binding on the whole body of preachers. This convention was held at Torgau, in June, 1576. In addition to twelve Saxony divines, whom the Elector had cowed into submission, there were present, Andreae, Chemnitz, Chytraeus, Musculus and Koeper. A new "Formula of Concord", known as the "For-
gau Book’, was drawn up entirely in the spirit of Luther, eliminating Calvinism and Philippianism. This book not being favourably received by several princes, Augustus summoned a fresh convention in the monastery of Bergen, near Magdeburg, where several alterations were made. The revised confession was sent to the princes to be promulgated and enforced. Augustus of Saxony, John George of Brandenburg, and other princes, gathered their preachers together and compelled them publicly to subscribe to their signatures, “not only with their hands, but with their hearts. Many of the princes repudiated the book; the King of Denmark threw his copy into the fire. The only Lutherans at the present day who attach any importance to it are in Missouri. The "Formula" is divided into two parts (1) the Epitome, and (2) the Solida Declaratio. The Epitome sums up Luther’s ‘pure doctrine’ in succinct form; the second part goes over the same ground more at large. Although the "Formula" begins with the stereotype Protestant declaration that the Bible is "the only rule and norm" of faith, yet, as Dr. Schaff remarks, it quotes Dr. Luther’s "as freely, and with at least as little deference to his authority, as Roman Catholics quote the Fathers.”

Confessions of the "Reformed" Churches.—The so-called Reformed creeds, of which thirty or more are extant, are based on the radical tenets of Zwingli and Calvin. We can only notice the most important of them. The Confession of Strasbourg, Bucer and Capito, inclined to the Zwinglian view of the Eucharist, they were shunned by the Lutherans at the Diet of Augsburg (1530), and were not allowed to sign the Augustana. They therefore drew up a separate Confession, following the general lines of the Lutheran document, a copy of which had been given to them by Philip of Hesse. Bucer touches upon several topics that Melanchthon had cautiously avoided, among them “the invisible church”, the rejection of tradition and of images. The Mass is denounced as "an intolerable abomination." Art. 18, "On the Eucharist" is given so enigmatically that it is impossible to discover the real meaning. After great trouble the Strasburgers were able to secure the adhesion of three Southern German towns, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau. From these four cities the Confession obtained the name of the "Lindau." It was delivered to the Diet in July. Charles refused to permit it to be read at the Diet, and commissioned the Catholic theologians to confute it. It was printed in the autumn of 1531 at Strasbourg, together with a "Vindication." It did not long remain in authority, for the towns subscribed to the Augsburg Confession in order to join the Smalcald League. Zwingli himself was sent to the Diet, July 1530, a Confession of Faith in which he openly denied the Real Presence, and denounced purgatory as "an injurious fiction which sets Christ's merits at naught." He also, shortly before his death, sent a Confession to France.

The First Confession of Basle, also called of Mühlhausen because adopted by that city, was drafted in 1531 by Ecelampsius and after his death elaborated by his successor, Oswald Myconius. It was promulgated by the city authorities of Basle, 21 Jan., 1534. It is a brief document, moderate in tone and calculated to conciliate the Lutherans. The text, as we now possess it, was revised in a Calvinistic sense in 1561. Of more importance is the Second Confession of Basle, known also as the "Helvetic Prior." In the "Wittenberg Concord" Luther had forced his peculiar views upon the Eucharist, and through Bucer and other mediating preachers. The formula was reluctantly accepted by the Southern German towns, whose only protection was to be admitted into the Smalcald League; but it was rejected by the independent瑞士. At the same time, it was recognized that some means should be devised of healing the dissensions among the Protestants, now that the convening of a General Council was in prospect. It was resolved to draft a new Confession which should be presented to the council as the national creed of the Protestants. On 30 Jan. 1536, composed of the most prominent Swiss preachers and delegates from Zurich, Bern, Basle, Schaffhausen, St. Gall, Müllhausen, and Biel. A committee consisting of Henry Bullinger, Oswald Myconius and Simon Grynæus, was commissioned to draw up the document. It was written in Latin, and a first German translation made by Leo Judá was adopted by the meeting. Its tone is decidedly Zwinglian, but on the disputed points of the sacraments and the Lord’s Supper there is an evident effort to approach as near as possible to the Lutheran phraseology. A copy of the Confession was brought to Luther by Bucer; and it was a great surprise to the Swiss that the Wittenberg reformer declared himself satisfied with it. Luther’s change of attitude was due partly to the political needs and wishes of the Smalcalde princes, and partly to the altered phraseology of the Confession on the subject of the sacraments, due to the influence of Calvin. Whereas the Zwinglian flatly denied the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Calvin preached His "spiritual presence," which really amounts to the same thing. The "Helvetic Prior" remained for some years the national creed of the Swiss. As an example it was superseded in 1566 by the "Helvetic Posterior" This latter document was originally the private confession of Henry Bullinger of Zurich; but it was formally accepted as a symbolic book by nearly all the Reformed Churches of Europe. It follows the main lines of the earlier confessions, but is much lengthier, and more in the nature of a theological treatise. It is the storehouse from which later framers of Reformed Confessions have copiously drawn. These documents of Calvin have been looked upon as of dogmatic authority, viz. “The Catechism of Geneva" (1541), the “Consensus of Zurich" (1549), which in twenty-six articles expounds Calvin’s views on the sacraments, and the “Consensus of the pastors of the Church of Geneva” (1552), which proclaims the Calvinistic dogma of absolute predestination.

The Gallican, for the use of the French Protestants, was the first of the purely Calvinistic Confessions. It was the result of a conjunction of Calvin himself. It was revised in various synods, from the first of Paris (1559), to the seventh National Synod at La Rochelle (1571), from which latter town it drew its popular name of “the Rochelle Confession." Its Calvinism is undiluted, and it offers all the peculiar doctrines of that innovator. The Roman Church comes in for a fair share of vituperation, for its "corruptions," "superstitions," and "idolatries." "Nevertheless," it says, "as some trace of the Church is left in the papacy . . . we confess that those baptized in it do not need a second baptism." This concession does not imply that "idolaters" are to be tolerated; for it adds, "but just government "has put the sword into the hands of magistrates, to suppress crimes against the first as well as against the second table of the Commandments of God." This Confession remained in authority among French Protestants, until the Voltairianism and Rationalism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries deprived it of all value. In the thirteenth General Synod of the Reformed Church of France (6 June to 10 July, 1872), the only approach to a Confession of Faith that could be made was the adoption by the slender majority of sixteen votes of the following words:

"The Reformed Church of France, on resuming her synodical action, which for so many years had been interrupted, desires, before all things to offer her thanks to God, and to testify her love to Jesus Christ, her Divine Head, who has sustained and comforted
her during her successive trials. She declares, through the organ of her representatives, that she remains faithful to her principles of faith and freedom on which she was founded. With her fathers and her martyrs in the Confession of Rocheille, and with all the Churches in the Reformation in their respective counsels, she proclaims the sovereign authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of faith, and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, who died for our sins, and was raised again for our justification. She preserves and maintains, as the basis of her teaching of her worship and her discipline, the grand Christian facts represented in her received creeds, solemnities, and set forth in her liturgies, especially in the Confession of sins, the Apostles' Creed, and in the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper.

The Heidelberg Catechism, published in 1563 by order of the Elector Palatine, Frederick III, was generally accepted by Calvinists throughout the world as a faithful and authoritative exposition of the faith of the Reformed Churches. It was written by two professors at the Heidelberg university, Zachary Bär (commonly known as Ursinus) and Caspar Olevig (Oleum). It was drawn up with the twofold purpose of furnishing a manual of Christian doctrine as a service of public profession of faith. In 129 questions and answers, it treats of man's sin and misery (3–11), the redemption by Christ (12–85), and the grudge of the redeemed (86–129). The second part in the explanation of the creeds and the sacraments. The third part deals with the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. The general tone of the document is moderate, with the exception of the trueness of the 79th question, for which the professors are not responsible; for it did not appear in the first edition and was later inserted, by the fanatical Ester. Since it has been in no small measure the source of Protestant anti-Catholic intolerance, it is worth while to lay it before the reader.

"What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass? The Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have full forgiveness of all our sins by the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that by the Holy Ghost we are engraven into Christ, who with his true body and soul is now in heaven at the right hand of the Father, and is to be worshipped for ever. But the Mass teaches that the living and the dead have not forgiveness of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is still daily offered for them by the priests; and that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and is therefore to be worshipped in them. And thus the Mass, at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and passion of Jesus Christ, and an accused idolatry."

Dr. Schaff doubts the "wisdom of inserting controversial matter into a catechism"; but strangely enough pronounces, that "it must be allowed to remain as a solemn protest against idolatry" (Credo of Christendom, I, 536). If the central dogma of the Catholic worship is really idolatrous, what is the harm in proclaiming it as such in a Confession of Faith? The Heidelberg Catechism was translated into all the languages of Europe, and into several European tongues. It obtained great authority in Scotland and England; but during the following century it was supplanted by the Westminster Confession. It was introduced into America by the Dutch and German Reformed churches, and is said to be more prized by the American Reformed Churches than by the Germans in the Fatherland.

The Confesseo Belgica is venerated as of symbolic authority, together with the Heidelberg Catechism, by the Reformed Churches in Belgium, Holland, and their offshoots throughout the world. This document, consisting of thirty-seven articles, was written in French about 1561, by Guy de Bray, assisted by other preachers. The intentions of the authors, we are told by one of themselves, was not to issue a new creed, but to prove the truth of their belief from the canonical writings. They follow closely the Confesseo Galilana, seeking to support their theses by texts of Scripture. Translations were made into Dutch and Latin, and the document was submitted to Calvin and many other Reformed divines. In 1562 a copy was transmitted to Philip II with a letter protesting the innocence of the innovators from crime and rebellion. In the opinion of Calvinists, the wrecking of churches and maladministration of priests and nuns were not crimes but imperative duties. Art. 36 admonishes of their obligation "to remove and prevent all idolatry and false worship; that the kingdom of anti-Christ (i.e., popery) may be destroyed." The Confesseo Belgica was revised and adopted by the successive synods in the Netherlands, until finally the Synod of Dort, in its 159th session (29 April, 1619), subscribed to it as the public creed of the Reformed Churches. The Synod of Dort, the most representative gathering of the Calvinists, was convened by the authority and at the expense of the States-General. It opened its sessions at Dort, or Dordrecht, 1615, and concluded its labours after 144 sessions, 9 May, 1619. In addition to the Dutch and Belgians, there were delegates from Great Britain, the Palatine, Hesse, and Switzerland. The delegates chosen by the French Huguenots were forbidden by the crown to leave France. The occasion of this international gathering was the defection from pure Calvinism of the Remonstrants (see ARMINIANISM). Since the members of the synod were orthodox on the subject of predestination absolute, the condemnation of the Remonstrants was a foregone conclusion. The canons were framed in the most binding form, and 200 ministers who refused to subscribe were deposed. Although the foreign delegates attached their names to the canons of Dort, yet, outside of the Netherlands, these were never regarded as authoritative. In England, especially, there was fierce opposition, and from rival pulpits the pros and cons of God's (or Calvin's) eternal decree were thundered into the ears of the bewildered people.

The numerous Minor Reformed Confessions, such as the Mariloch (Brandenbourg), the Hungarian, the Bohemian, and the Polish, being of a local and for the most part an ephemeral nature, need not detain us. For an account of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church the reader is referred to the article ANGLICANISM. When the American colonists had achieved their independence, the Presbyterian Church of America, until then subject to the Bishop of London, formed themselves into "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America" and, after lengthy debates, in a General Convention held at Trenton, New Jersey, 8–12 Sept., 1801, adopted the Thirty-Nine Articles, omitting in Art. 8 the Athanasian Creed and making such other alterations as were demanded by the changed political conditions. They retained the offensive coda to Art. 31, in which "the sacrifices of Masses" (i.e., the public worship of the vast majority of Christians) are denounced as "blasphemous sacrifices and dangerous deceits"; but in later editions the milder statement is substituted, that Transubstantiation "hath given occasion to many superstitions". Episcopalians, also, have not yet eliminated from their articles the calumny (Art. 22), that the "Roman Church" sanctions the "Adoration, as well of Images as of Relics."

The Scottish Confession.—By the year 1560, Protestantism in Scotland, through the aid of English gold and troops, had gained complete ascendency. Losing no time, the Protestant Lords of the Congregation, convened a revolutionary Parliament of the estates of the realm, at Edinburgh, 1 Aug., whose first act was to
repudiate the Catholic religion, and commission John Knox and other preachers to compile a new creed. Familiar with the Swiss Confessions, Knox performed his task in four days. The document, amended by the leaders, was submitted to Parliament and with ven. "Confessio Sco- lland and the exercise of the ancient worship was for- bidden under penalty of confiscation, exile, and death. "Confession of the the" arises in "Confession of the Faith and Doctrine beleev't and professit be the Pro- testants of Scotland", begins with a brief preface, in which the writers "take God to reocde in our con- science, that fra our hearts we abhorre all sects of heresie and all teachers of erroneous doctrine." They do not claim to be infallible. "Gif onie man shall note in this our Confession omie Article or sentence re- pugnand to God's halie word" they "do promise unto him satisfaction fra the mouth of God, that is, fr my haly scriptures, or else reformation of that quhile he saul proove to be amisse. This hypothetical admission of one remarkable in a Calvinistic document, was practically harmless; for no one ever convinced John Knox that he was in error.

The Confession presents, in twenty-five articles, a summary of the Christian Faith as held by the Scot- tish Protestants. The articles follow broadly the lines of the Scotch Confession of 1567, and the Confession of the Holy Mass are denounced and misrepresented: "The notes, signs, and assured tokens whereby the innaque Spouse of Christ Jesus is knowen fra the horrible harlot, the Kirk maugnent, we affirme, are nouter Antiquitie, Title usurp. lineal Descence, Place appointed, nor multitude of men approving ane error."

In addition to the usual Protestant notes of the true Church, viz. "the trew preaching of the Word of Grv. the right administration of the Sacri- ments", the Confession assigns a third element peculiar to the Scottish Kirk, i.e. "Ecclesiastical discipline uprichtly ministered, as Godda Wordle prescribes, whereby vice is repressed, and vertu nourished."

The development of Presbyterianism was a lucid commentary on the new principle herein tentatively prop-ounded. In Art. 24, "of the Civil magistrate", the Confession proclaims openly the duty of suppressing the Catholic religion. To Kings, Princes, Rulers and Mgmstaries, wee affirme that most chieflie and most principalie the conservation and purgation of the Re- ligion is apponned, so that ony power appointed for Civil poltie, but also for maintenance of the trew Religion, and for suppressing of Idolatrie and Superstition whatsoever."

After the forced abdication of Queen Mary in 1567, Parliament again proclaimed the Confession as the creed of "the true and holy Kirk of Jesus Christ within this realm"; and it remained the doctrinal standard of the Scots, until superseded by the Westminster Confession. In the estimation of the Presby- terian preachers, the Confession of Knox was sadly defective; it had failed to denounce with sufficient vigour the "Roman Antichrist". This omission was deemed particularly unfortunate about 1580, when the young King James VI had fallen under the spell of his French kinsman, Esme Stuart, upon whom the king had bestowed the earldom of Lennox, and who reigned supreme in his counsels. It was probably at the sug- gestion of this able and unscrupulous politician, that James commissioned the preacher John Craig to draw up the most violent condemnation of Papistry that ever issued from a Calvinistic pen. It is known to historians as the King's Confession, sometimes as the "Confessio Secunda", among others, as the "Confession of the "Catholic religion, and commission John Knox and other preachers to compile a new creed. Familiar with the Swiss Confessions, Knox performed his task in four days. The document, amended by the leaders, was submitted to Parliament and with ven. "Confessio Sco- lland and the exercise of the ancient worship was for- bidden under penalty of confiscation, exile, and death. "Confession of the the" arises in "Confession of the Faith and Doctrine beleev't and professit be the Pro- testants of Scotland", begins with a brief preface, in which the writers "take God to reocde in our con- science, that fra our hearts we abhorre all sects of heresie and all teachers of erroneous doctrine." They do not claim to be infallible. "Gif onie man shall note in this our Confession omie Article or sentence re- pugnand to God's halie word" they "do promise unto him satisfaction fra the mouth of God, that is, fr my haly scriptures, or else reformation of that quhile he saul proove to be amisse. This hypothetical admission of one remarkable in a Calvinistic document, was practically harmless; for no one ever convinced John Knox that he was in error.
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ere condemning the proposed assembly, annulling beforehand all its proceedings, and prohibiting his subjects from taking any part in it. This had the consequence of keeping nearly all the Episcopalians away, thus placing the Puritans in supreme control. The assembly was summoned in King Henry VII's chapel in the historic abbey; but since no matter for discussion was submitted to the divines by the Parliament, and they were inhibited from taking the initiative, an adjournment was taken until the following week, when, as its first task, the assembly was ordered to revise the Anglican "Thirty-nine Articles," "for the purpose of simplifying, organizing, and remoulding the doctrines therein contained." Ten weeks were devoted to this work; the divines had remoulded the first fifteen, when they were ordered to lay aside the "Articles and engage in matters of more pressing importance to the Parliament. The war with King Charles was proceeding with disastrous results to the Parliamentary party. Success seemed possible only through the aid of the Scots.

Now the Scots demanded, as an indispensable condition of alliance, "the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, and government," as the Word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches." In other words, they insisted upon the adoption by the English Presbyterians in its integrity, a system repugnant to the national instincts and traditions of Englishmen. But there was no attempt to discountenance the collision. A "Solemn League and Covenant," framed by the Presbyterian preacher, Henderson, was sworn and subscribed by the Scottish and English Parliaments, by the General Assembly of Scotland, and by the Westminster divines, after an afterthought, for the purpose of the lords and the members of both nations. To aid the inexperienced English divines in drawing up Presbyterian formularies, six Scottish commissioners, four preachers and two laymen, were sent to Westminster, with authority to take part in the discussions, but without votes. On 12 Oct., 1643, the Assembly received an order from the Lords and Commons to forthwith confer and treat among themselves, of such a discipline and government as may be most agreeable to God's Holy Word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland and other reformed Churches.

Also, "touching and concerning the Directory of Worship, or Liturgy, hereafter to be in the Church." This order was the signal for protracted and at times bitter disputes between the Presbyterian majority and the Scottish commissioners on the one side, and the Independents and the Erastians, the former of whom argued for the complete independence of each separate congregation (see Congregationalism) while the latter opposed any kind of jurisdiction independent of the civil power. Although the Independent members numbered scarcely a dozen, and the Erastians were fewer still, their influence was vastly in excess of their numerical strength; for the Independents were in close touch with Cromwell's army, and the Erastians could count on the sympathy of the King and his party. Into the details of this debate, we need not enter. While it was still raging, an order was sent down to the Assembly "to frame a Confession of Faith for the three kingdoms, according to the Solemn League and Covenant." This task presented the task presenting the puritans with extraordinary difficulties; all the Puritans divided, of doctrine, more or less strictly Calvinistic, and there was not one Arminian in the assembly. Moreover, the Westminster divines had copious material to work upon in the numerous Reformed symbols already in existence. The Confession occupied their attention from 29 Aug., 1644, until 25 Sept., 1646, when the first nineteen chapters were sent to the Commons, and a few days later a duplicate copy was presented to the House of Lords. The Lords gave their assent to "The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines," so the title ran; but the Commons demanded further revision until they had the complete Confession before them. This took place in Dec., 1646. A limited number of copies was printed for the use of the Parliament and the assembly; but the House of Commons, probably to gain time, demanded that each assertion should be supported by Scriptural texts. This was promptly done by the divines (29 April, 1647), when an order was sent for 600 copies, "and no more," to be printed. This edition was received as authoritative by the Scottish Church and Parliament, and was regarded by Presbyterians generally as their authentic Confession of Faith.

But in the eyes of the Erastian Parliament of England, it was simply "The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines," convoked by its authority, and valueless without its sanction. After intermittent discussions, which extended above a year, the Parliament, 20 June, 1648, ordered an expurgated edition to be printed by its authority, in which every reference to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church is carefully eliminated.

As to its contents, the Westminster Confession of Faith, is the most elaborate, as it is the latest of the Reformed creeds. In thirty-two chapters, divided into sections, it labours to give a full exposition of Christian doctrine as understood by the Reformed Churches. Chap. i., "Of the Holy Scripture," gives a list of the inspired books, including the deuterocanonical books of the New Testament and rejecting the "Apocrypha" of the Old. The authority and the infallibility of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the authority of any man or church, but wholly upon God.

"The Supreme Judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Ghost speaking in the Scripture."

Chap. ii. repeats the ancient doctrine "Of God and of the Holy Trinity." Chap. iii., "Of God's Eternal Decree," teaches that God from all eternity did by the eternal counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass. The divines strive to ward off the obvious objection to this fatalistic tenet by denying that it makes "God the author of sin," or that violence is offered to the will of the creature. Yet, in the same breadth, they insist, that "He hath not decreed anything because He foresaw it as future," and that "by decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death."

The elect, who fell in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, effectually called and eternally saved; but "neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified and saved, but the elect only. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth grace as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice." The "Confession" judiciously warns the preachers that "the doctrine of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care." In Chap. v., "Of Providence," we find the unintelligible utterance, evidently having in view the Supralapsarians, that God's providence "extendeth itself even to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men, and the future permission, but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding." Chap. x., "Of Effective
Calling" teaches that "all those whom God hath predestined unto life, and those only" are effectually called and saved. "Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet their nature turns them unto death, and therefore not saved." Chapter xxi, "Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day," differs from the Continental creeds by adding the injunction that the Sabbath is to be kept holy by observing "a holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and their daily business." A man be "taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy." Chapter xxii, "Of the Civil Magistrate" (one of the chapters expounded by the Parliament), states that the "civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the Word and the Sacraments or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty to preserve that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed." In the American revision, this is made to read that "as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the Church of our common Lord and Saviour, giving the preference to the communication of Christians above the rest." Chap., xxiv, "Of Marriage and Divorce," "as professing the true reformed religion" are denounced that they "should not marry with infidels, Papists, or other idolaters." Divorce is permitted on grounds of "adultery, or such willful desertion as can no way be remedied by the Church or civil magistrate." Chap. xxi, "Of the Church," speaks in complimentary terms of the "Pope of Rome," who is denounced as "that Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalts himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God." The doctrine of the Sacraments differs in nothing from the earlier Calvinistic creeds. Chap. xxix, "Of the Lord's Supper," proclaims that "the Popish Sacrifice of the Mass," as they call it, "is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice;" but the doctrine of transubstantiation is "repugnant to Scripture, and a common sense and reason; overthrowing the nature of the sacrament; and hath been and is the cause of manifold superstitions, yea, of gross idolatries." These are the main features of the "Westminster Confession of Faith," which are of interest to a Catholic. For generations, the "Westminster Standards," viz., the Confession and the Catechisms, have been used as textbooks and controlled the conduct of the Presbyterians of Scotland, Ulster, and America. They were also accepted, with modifications of various sorts, by the Congregationalists, the Regular Baptists, and other newer sects.
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J. F. Loughlin.

Faith, Hope and Charity. Saints, the names of two groups of Roman martyrs around whom a considerable amount of legendary lore has gathered; though the extent of sound historical data possessed concerning them is so slight, that until very recent times the most eminent scholars failed to distinguish between them. However, the extent and antiquity of their cult and the universality with which their names are found not only in the various early martyrologies of the Western Church, but also the Rituums and Menologies of the Greeks, render the fact of their existence and martyrdom unquestionable. Setting aside the purely legendary, and therefore not authenticated, and the entire information we have down to us (see Migne, P. G. CXV, 497; Mombrius, Vitae Sanctorum, II, 204), we find that in the reign of Hadrian, a Roman matron Sophia (Wisdom), with her three youthful daughters, Pistas, Elpis, and Agape (Faith, Hope and Charity), underwent martyrdom for the Faith, and were speedily buried on the Aurelian way, where their tomb in a crypt beneath the church afterwards erected to St. Pancrasius was long a place of resort for pilgrims, as we learn from various indubitable documents of the seventh century, such as an Itinerarium (or guide to the holy places of Rome compiled for the use of pilgrims) still preserved at Salzburg, the list, preserved in the cathedral archives of Monza, of the oils gathered from the tombs of the martyrs and sent to Queen Theodelinda in the time of Gregory the Great, etc.

Later surely than the reign of Hadrian, but at what time is uncertain, another band of martyrs, Sapientia (Wisdom) and her three companions, Spes, Fides and Caritas (Hope, Faith and Charity), suffered death and were buried near the tomb of St. Cecilia in the cemetery of St. Callistus on the Appian Way. Despite the meagreness of these authentic details, the explicit references in the documents cited to a band of martyrs, the mother and daughters, whose names are always given in Greek, and who are buried on the Aurelian Way, and to another band of four martyrs, interred on the Via Appia, whose relationship is not indicated and whose names, though the same as those of the martyrs of the Aurelian Way, are yet always in Latin, certainly point to distinct groups. Nor is the coincidence in names remarkable, seeing that the early Christians so often (according to de Rossi) took in baptism mystical names indicative of Christian virtues, etc. Thus Sophia, Sapientia, Fides and the like are common names in early Christian inscriptions and martyrlogies. The Roman martyrlogies, on 1 Aug., "the holy virgins, Faith, Hope and Charity, who won the crown of martyrdom under the Emperor Hadrian" and, on 30 Sept., "St. Sophia, widow, mother of the holy martyrs, Faith, Hope and Charity," in Rome, places, are fixed, but even Aug. is also celebrated; but generally, owing to the confusion of the two groups, none of the second group receives special recognition. In the Eastern Church the feast is kept on 17 Sept.

Popper, s. c. XCV, 16: De Rossi, Roma Sotterranea, I, 182; II, 171 (Rome, 1894); Allard, Histoire des persécutions pendant les deux premiers siècles (Paris, 1885, 221).

JNO. F. X. MURPHY.

Faith, The RULE OF.—The word rule (Lat. regula, Gr. ἐκλαθή) means a standard by which something can be tested, and the rule of faith means something established as normative to our faith, and serves as a measure. Since faith is Divine and infallible, the rule of faith must also be Divine and infallible; and since faith is supernatural, the rule of faith is authoritative, the ultimate or remote rule of faith must be the truthfulness of God in revealing Himself. But since Divine revelation is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions (Vatican Council, I, ii), the Bible and the Divine tradition must be the rule of our faith; since, however, these are only silent witnesses and cannot interpret themselves, they are commonly termed "proximate but inanimate rules of faith." Unless, then, the Bible and tradition are to be professed, we must look for some proximate rule which shall be animate or living.

I. PRIVATE JUDGMENT AS THE RULE OF FAITH.—The Reformed Churches were unanimous in declaring the Bible to be the sole rule of faith. "We believe
that the only rule and standard by which all dogmas and all doctors are to be weighed and judged, is nothing else but the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments” (Form. Concordie, iii). But men had already perceived that the Bible could not be left to interpret itself, and the Convocation had put forward what was, perhaps unwittingly, a double rule of faith: “preachers”, they say, “shall see that they never teach anything . . . except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have decreed out of that doctrine” (Wilkins, “Concilia”, iv, 267). Convocation thus not only laid down that the Bible was the rule of faith, but insisted upon its inanimate character as a witness to the Faith, for they declared the early Church to be its acknowledged interpreter; moreover, they were themselves exercising church authority.

A somewhat different doctrine appeared in the Westminster Confession of Faith (1643–7), which declared that the “Books of the Old and New Testaments are . . . given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life” (art. ii), but that the “authority of the Holy Scripture doth not upon the testimony of any man or church” (art. iv). They add: “We may be moved by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverent esteem of the Holy Scripture . . . yet our full persuasion of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts” (art. v). This is a clear enunciation of the principle that the judgment of each individual, moved by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, is the proximate living rule of faith. But apart from its solvent effect upon any true view of the Church, it is in itself a rule which could never serve as an infallible interpreter of the inanimate rule, viz., the Bible. For where does the Bible ever testify to the inspiration of certain books? And what limits does it assign to the canon? Moreover, the inward work of the Holy Spirit, being purely subjective, can never be a decisive and universal test of doctrinal diversions or critical views; thus Luther himself termed St. James’s Epistle an “epistle of straw”.

The fruits of this principle are everywhere apparent in Protestant Biblical criticism. “The Reformation theologians treated Paul as if he were one of themselves,—if recent writers of the genera
ter and Godet Paul is a pectoral theologian, in Rückert a pious supernatinalist, in Baur a Hegelian, in Luthardt orthodox, in Ritschl a genuine Ritschelian” (Expository Times, 1904, p. 304). In practice, however, the Reformed Churches have never acted up to the principle of private judgment, but have, in one form or another, urged the authority of the Church in deciding the contents of the Bible, its inspiration, and its meaning.

II. THE CHURCH AS THE RULE OF FAITH.—This follows necessarily from any adequate view of the Church as a Divinely constituted body, to whose keeping is intrusted the deposit of faith, but the grounds for this doctrine may be briefly stated as follows:

1. New Testament.—Christ gave His disciples no command to write, but only to teach: “going therefore, teach ye all nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you” (Matt. ii, 20). As the Father hath sent me, I also send you” (John, xx, 21). And in accordance with this, the Church is everywhere presented to us as a living and undying society composed of the teachers and the taught. Christ is in the Church, and is He? What has God promised that should be with it and abide in it. “He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I have said to you” (John, xiv, 26). Hence St. Paul calls the Church “the pillar and ground of the truth” (1 Tim., iii, 15; cf. Mark, xvi, 16; Rom., x, 17; Acts, xv, 28).

2. Tradition.—The same doctrine appears in the writings of the Fathers of every age; thus St. Ignatius (ad Trallii, vii), “Keep yourselves from heretics. You will be able to do this if you are not puffed up with pride, and (so) separated from (our) God, Jesus Christ, and from the bishop, and from the precepts of the Apostles. He who is clear, he who is without is not clear; that is, who acts any way except without the bishop, the priestly body, and the deacons, is not clean in conscience.” And St. Ireneaus (“Adv. Haer.”, III, ii) says, of heretics, that “not one of them but feels no shame in preaching himself, and thus depraves the truth” (τὰς διαθήκας κατωτάτας) and again (III, iv), “it is not right to seek from others that truth which it is easy to get from the Church, since the Apostles poured into it in fullest measure, as into a rich treasury, all that belongs to the truth, so that whosoever desires may drink hence the draught of life”. A little further on, he speaks (V, xx) of the “true and sound preaching of the Church, which offers to the whole world one and the same way of salvation”. Such testimonies are countless; here we can only refer to the full and explicit teaching which is to be found in Tertullian’s controversy against Marcion and in his “De Haeresibus” and St. Vincent of Lérins’ famous “Commontorium”. Indeed St. Augustine’s well-known words may serve as an epitome of patristic teaching on the authority of the Church: “I would not believe the Gospels unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me themselves; It should be noted that the Fathers, especially Tertullian and St. Ireneaus, use the term tradition not merely passively, viz., of orally bestowed Divine teaching, but in the active sense of ecclesiastical interpretation. And this is the only way to understand the rule of faith in the form of sound words which thou hast heard from me” (II Tim., i, 13). It is in this sense that the various formulæ of faith, of which we have the earliest sample in I Cor., xv, 3–4, became the rule of faith.

3. Theologians.—The teaching of the Church’s Doctors on this point has ever been the same, and it will suffice if we quote two passages from St. Thomas, who, however, has no set treatise on a question which he took for granted. “The formal object of faith”, he says, “is the First Truth as manifested in Holy Scripture and in the Church’s teaching. Hence if anyone does not adhere as to an infallible and Divine rule to the Church’s teaching, which proceeds from the Church’s truth manifested in Holy Scripture, such an one has not the habit of faith, but holds the truths of faith by some other principle” (II-II, Q. v, a. 3). And still more explicitly when (Quodl., ix, art. 16) he asks whether canonized saints are necessarily in heaven, he says, “it is certain that the judgment of the universal Church cannot possibly err in matters pertaining to the faith; hence we must stand rather by the decisions which the pope judicially pronounces than by the opinions of men, however learned they may be in Holy Scripture.”

4. Reason.—If faith is necessary for all men at all times and in all places, and if a true saving faith demands a clear knowledge of what we have to believe, it is clear that an infallible teaching Church is an absolute necessity. Such a Church alone can speak to men of all classes and at all times; it alone can, by reason of its perpetuity and ageless character, meet every new difficulty by a declaration of the sound form of the faith as always held. If the teaching of Christ and His Apostles is distorted, none but the Church can say “This is its true meaning, and not that; I know that it is as I say because the Spirit which assists me is One with the Spirit which rested on Him and on them”; the Church alone can say, “Christ truly rose from the tomb, and I know it, because I was there, and saw the stone
rolled back." The Church alone can tell us how we are to interpret the words "This is My Body," for she alone can say, "He Who spoke those words speaks through me, He promised to be with me all days, He pledged Himself to safeguard me from error at all times.

III. IN WHAT SENSE IS THE CHURCH THE RULE OF FAITH?—(1) All non-Catholic systems have felt the need of some such authoritative rule as that which they regard as having been set up by the Church at the Council of Trent. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, regards the Holy Scriptures alone as having such authority, and it is for this reason that the Church alone is able to interpret the Scriptures. In so doing, the Church has always been guided by the principles laid down in the New Testament, and has been careful to avoid any interpretation that would contradict the clear teaching of the Bible.

(2) Modernism.—There has been a tendency among some modern thinkers to question the authority of the Church, and to hold that the Church is not infallible. This is a dangerous doctrine, for it would tend to undermine the faith of the Church and to lead to a division of the Church. The Church is not a mere organization, but is the body of Christ, and its teachings are the teachings of Christ. The Church has always been guided by the Scriptures, and it is for this reason that the Church is able to interpret the Scriptures correctly.

(3) The Catholic Doctrine Touching the Church as the Rule of Faith.—The Church, in this connection, is not only the teacher, but also the interpreter, of the passages already quoted from the New Testament and the Fathers. But the teaching Church may be regarded either as the whole body of the episcopate, whether scattered throughout the world or collected in an ecclesiastical council, or it may be synonymous with the successor of the Apostle Peter, the Vicar of Christ. Now the teaching Church is the Apostolic body continuing to the end of time (Matt., xxviii, 19–20); but only one of the bishops, viz., the Bishop of Rome, is the successor of St. Peter; he alone can be regarded as the living Apostle and Vicar of Christ, and it is only by his union with himself that the rest of the episcopate can be said to possess the Apostolic character (Vatican Council, Sess. IV, Proemium).

Hence, unless they be united with the Vicar of Christ, it is futile to appeal to the episcopate in general as the rule of faith. At the same time, it is clear that the Church may derive from the teaching of the Pope and the episcopate the knowledge of the Deposit of Faith committed to her, as for St. Augustine pointedly asked, when treating of the re-baptism question, "how could a question which had become so obscured by the dust raised in this controversy, have been brought to the clear light and scope of the present day, if it had not been discussed throughout the world in disputations and conferences held by the bishops?" (De Baptismo, ii, 5).

Thus the appeal of the Ritualist to a future council, that of the Modernist to the conscience of the universal Church, and that of the High-Churchman to the primitive Church, are, besides being mutually exclusive, destructive of the true idea of the Church as the "pillar and ground of truth." If the Church is to exercise her prerogative, she must be able to decide promptly and infallibly any question touching faith or morals. Her conciliar utterances are rare, and though they are weighty with the majesty of ecumenical testimony, the Church's teaching is by no means confined to them. The Vicar of Christ can, whenever necessary, exercise the plenitude of his authority, and when he does so we are not at liberty to say, with the Jansenists, that he has not done justice to the Church of the early Church or to the Church of the Reformation. (Cf. Clement XI, "Vineum Dominii," 1734; and "Lamentabili Sane," 1907, prop. v.) When Newman was received into the Church, he penned those famous lines which form the conclusion of the "Essay on Development." "For not from you who have here found; regard it not as mere matter of present concern; but as from the past, from the future, and from the present, and looking out for the best way of doing so; seduce not yourself by the imagination that it comes of disappointment, or disgust, or restlessness, or wounded feeling, or undue sensibility, or other weakness. Wrap not yourself round in the associations of years past, nor determine that to be truth which you wish to be so; nor make an idol of cherished anticipations. Time is short, eternity is long."

Patriotic Writers.—TRENKUS, Adversus Heres., ed. MOINE, P. C., VII, TERTULLIAN, De prescriptionibus Haereticorum, ed. HURST, Orléans, 1870; CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, C; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, Second Letter to Marcianus, ed. HUMILLER, Paris, 1878; JOHN XXIII, Canon VI of the Council of Trent, ed. HURST, See also SCHOUX, Apologia, tr. (New York, 1892); HAYWICK, History of Doctrine, tr. (New York, 1890).

Writers of the Scholastic Period.—MELCHIOR CANUS, De locis theologicos (Rome, 1900); NOBEL, Defensio Fidelis Catholicae et Apostolicae, ed. VIVAR, Paris, 1878; HELLARMINE, Disputationes de controversiis fidelis (Innsbruck, 1396).
Catholic Writers of the Reformation Period in England.—

CAMPION, Decem Rationes etc.; BRISTOW, Motives (Antwerp, 1583); St John of Matha; A short and plain way to the Faith and Church (1688), reprinted by DOLMAN (1844).


But the most interesting is that of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.—THORNHILL, On the Principles of Christian Truth, ed. PARKER (Oxford, 1843); PEARSON, Exposition of the Creed (1865); BELL, On the Principles of Christian Truth, ed. BULL (Oxford, 1827); D. I. E. BURLE (said to have died a Catholic), Analogia of Religion, II, DURRIEZ, The Nineteenth Century—NEWMAN, The Via Media of the Roman Church (revised edition), The Ideal of a Christian Church (1844); R. I. WILDERFORD, An Elementary Manual of Catholic Doctrine (1854); Newman, An Enquiry (Oxford, 1865); J. MANNING, The Rule of Faith (a sermon at Chichester, 1838); L. MUNDI, Art. 9, The Church (Christian Oratory); The Catholic Religion for Members of the Anglican Church; GORE, The Incarnation of the Son of God in Bampton Lectures (1891). See also references under Faith.

HUGH POPE.

Faithful (Lat. fideles, from fides, faith), THO, those who have bound themselves to a religious association, whose doctrine they accept, and into whose rites they have been initiated. Among Christians the term is applied to those who have been fully initiated by baptism and, regularly speaking, by confirmation. Such have engaged themselves to profess faith in Jesus Christ, from Whom they received it as a gift; henceforth they will proclaim His teachings, and live according to the principles of the Church. Hence the term is frequently used in the papal documents, Christi fideles, "the faithful of Jesus Christ". The distinction between Christians and faithful is now very slight, not only because adult baptism has become the exception, but also because liturgically the rite of the catechumenate and that of baptism have merged into one another. On the other hand, in the Latin Church at least, confirmation and first Communion have been separated from the baptismal initiation. In the primitive Church it was otherwise; initiation into the Christian society consisted in two distinct acts, often accomplished years apart from one another. First, one became a catechumen by the imposition of hands and the sign of the cross; this was a kind of preliminary profession of Christian faith—"eos qui ad primum fidei creditulitatis accedit" (Council of Elvira, about 300, can.xiii), which authorized the catechumen to call himself a Christian; and, secondly, by the act of initiation, by baptism itself, was he authorized to call himself one of the faithful, and to participate immediately in all the Christian mysteries, including the Eucharist.

Strictly speaking, therefore, the term faithful is opposed to catechumen; hence, it is not met with in the writings of those early Christian Fathers who flourished before the organization of the catechumenate. It is not found in St. Justin nor in St. Irenaeus of Lyons; Tertullian, however, uses it, and reproaches the heretics for obliterating all distinction between catechumens and the faithful: quasi catechumenus, quasi fideles taceamus (De praescriptione haereticae, c. xii; P. L., II, 56). Henceforth, in the patristic writings and the canons of councils we meet quite frequently the antithesis of catechumens and baptized Christians, Christians and faithful. Thus St. Augustine (Tract. in Joannis Evang., xiv, 2; P. L., XXXV, 17, 18): "Ask a man: are you a Christian? If he be a pagan or a Jew, he will reply: I am not a Christian. But if he say: I am a Christian, ask him again: are you a catechumen, or one of the faithful?" Similarly the Council of Elvira considers the case of a "faithful" Christian baptizing a catechumen; in case of necessity (can. xxxvii); again, of sick persons asking for the imposition of hands of the catechumenate, and thus becoming Christians (can. xxxix); of participation in an idolatrous sacrifice on the part of a Christian, and again by one of the faithful (can. lxx); of betrayal to the pagan magistrate (delato), to which a difference of guilt is attached according as the crime was perpetrated by one of the faithful or by a catechumen (can. lxxiii).

The title fideles was often carved on epitaphs in the early Christian period, sometimes in opposition to the title of catechumen. Thus, at Florence, a master (patronus) dedicates to his catechumen servant (alunno) the following inscription: "Ecce audiendori patronus fideles", i.e. "her master, one of the faithful, to Sozomenes, his servant and a hearer", by which term he means one of the well-known degrees of the catechumenate (Martigny, Dict. des antiq. chrét., Paris, 1857). Even now the baptismal rite provides for a voluntary request of baptism on the part of a non-Christian, i.e. a non-Christian (see INFIDEL); it exhibits venerable vestiges of the primitive scrinium or preliminary examination, the guarantors (sponsors) or godfather and god-mother, the rites of the catechumenate, the communication of the Creed (traditio symboli) and the Our Father, the renunciation of Satan and evil, the adhesion to Jesus Christ, and the triple profession of faith. The candidate for baptism is still asked at the entrance to the baptismal font: "Wilt thou be baptized?" It was voluntarily, therefore, and is so yet, that one entered the ranks of the faithful through the principal initiatory rite of baptism.

Naturally enough, even in Christian antiquity, attention was drawn to the analogous ceremonies of circumcision (the sign, if not the rite, of the admission of proselytes to the profession of Judaism) and of baptism by water; and the Church eagerly adopted them. Thus it was that the faithful of Mithra were initiated (Cumont, Les Mystères de Mithra, Paris, 1902). The obligations of the faithful Christian are indicated by the preparatory rites of his reception and by his actual baptism. He begins by asking for faith (in Jesus Christ) and, through that faith, for eternal life. The Creed is then delivered to him, and he returns it (reddiditio symboli), i.e. repeats it aloud. At the baptismal font he recites solemnly the profession of faith. From all this it is clear that his first duty is to believe (see Faith). His second duty is to regulate his life or conduct with a new Christian faith, i.e., having renounced Satan and evil, he must avoid all sin. "So behave", was it said to him, "that henceforth thou mayest be the temple of God." St. Gregory I says (Hom. in Evang. xxx, 3; P. L., LXXVI, 1215): "Then only are we truly the faithful when by our acts we realize the promises made with our lips. On the day of our baptism, indeed, we promised to renounce all the works and all the pomp of the ancient enemy." Finally, since the faithful have voluntarily sought membership in the Christian society they are bound to submit to its authority and obey its rules. As to the rights of the faithful, they consist chiefly in the fullest participation in all the Christian mysteries, so long as one does not become unworthy of the same. Thus the faithful Christian is entitled to take part in the Holy Sacrifice, to remain in the assembly of the faithful; to receive the Body and Blood of Christ, and to receive the other rites and sacraments. He may also aspire to the highest rank of the clergy. In a word, he is a full member of the Christian Church, and in his spiritual promises, he will obtain eternal life, i.e., his original petition at the moment of baptism. See BAPTISM; CATECHUMEN.

A. BOUDINHON.

Faithful Companions of Jesus, Society of the, a religious institute of women founded by the Viscountess de Bonnaud d'Houet in 1820 at Amiens,
France. It was solemnly approved by Gregory XVI, 5 Aug., 1, 377.

The Faithful Companions of Jesus are devoted to the education of all classes, adapting themselves to the special educational needs of each country. In 1903 the society possessed forty-one convents in France, Italy, Switzerland, England, Ireland, Scotland, Australia, Canada, and the United States. The religious persecution in France, with the consequent closing of the French houses, has been the cause of new foundations in Belgium (at Brussels, Graty, and Namur), also in the S. of Germany and Switzerland. The society is governed by a superior general, who, up to the time of the religious persecution in France, resided at the mother-house in Paris; the home of the superior general is at present in Namur, Belgium. The society numbers about 1,200 religious, who in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Australia, conduct about 60 grammar and high schools, technical schools, science and art schools. The new training college for teachers at Sedgley, near Manchester, England, has met with great success. In the United States the sisters have charge of about one thousand children attending six parochial schools. They also have academy where high school branches are taught. A small foundation has recently been made at Gilbertville, Mass. In the United States there are 46 sisters, 4 novices, 2 schools, and 1 high school. The society now possesses thirty-two convents. The novices are at Namur, Belgium, Upton Hall, near Liverpool, England, Limerick, Ireland, and Fitchburg, Mass.

Sister Mary Philomena.

Falco, Juan Conchillos, painter, b. at Valencia of an ancient noble family in 1614; d. 14 May, 1711. He was a pupil of Esteban March, the eminent but eccentric Valencian painter, and was one of the first Spanish artists to start and maintain a school of design, gathering about him various youthful artists and insisting upon their working in charcoal in order to obtain freedom of draughtsmanship. He was a brilliant sketcher and in his journeys through his native country made some clever and humorous pencil drawings of scenes which took place on the road. Falco is almost the only Spanish artist of whom it can be said that he had a keen sense of humour, but he is further described by his contemporaries as "the most amiable of sages, humble, modest, a model of virtue, and altogether of the stuff whereof angels are made". Two of his most important works were those executed for the church of San Salvador in Valencia; others are the "Immaculate Conception", painted for the Franciscans in the same city, the frescoes in the church of San Juan, and the two altar-pieces of the Cistercian monastery of Valdivia. The close of his life was full of sadness. He was suddenly struck with palsy and became a confirmed cripple. Soon after that he lost his sight and died completely blind.

De Castro y Velasco, El Museo Pictorico y Escuela (Madrid, 1724); Quilleroy, Peintres Espanols (Paris, 1810); Bremond, Dictionnaire de Biographies des Artistes en Espagne (Paris, 1800); Stirling, Annales of the Artists of Spain (London, 1891).

George Charles Williamson.

Falconieri, Juliana, Saint. See Juliana Falconieri, Saint.

Faldistorium (Faldstoolium). See Faldstool.

Faldstool (Lat. faldistorium; also facistorum, fadestolus, fadestool), a movable folding chair used in parochial functions by prelates and churchmen, or within if it is not at his throne or cathedral. Other prelates enjoy the privilege of full pontificates also use it. The rubrics prescribe it as a seat in the confessing of baptism and Holy orders, in the consecration of ols on Maundy Thursday; at the ceremonies of Good Friday, etc. It is prescribed as a genuflexorium at the door of the church at the solemn reception of a bishop, at the altar of the Blessed Sacrament, and before the high altar. Red, green, and violet cloths are ordered as a covering to correspond to the season or the rank of the prelate. It may have once been something like a campstool and it accompanied the bishop in his journeys. Materials, even the most costly, were employed in its construction; one wrought of gold and jewelled was presented to Pope Clement IV by Charles, King of Naples. Some were made of silver, of gilt metal, of ebony, or of wood. They were sometimes elaborately carved, ending in clawlike feet, the four corners at the top representing the neck and head of animals. Cloths of silk of a rich texture with gold and silver served to cover them. A faldstool is prescribed by the old English Ritual in the consecration of a bishop. Of Hugh Pudsey, Bishop of Durham (d. 1195), we are told that on taking the cross for the holy war he had a faldstool made among other things to carry along with him a magnificent silver chair.

Rock, Church of our Fathers (London, 1904), II, 202-213; Schmid in Kirchenlex., s. v. Faldistorum; Martene, De antiquis Ecclesiae rubibus, i, 616.

Francis Mershman.

Faleri, Diocese of. See Civita Castellana, Orte, and Gallesie.

Falkenberg, John of. See John of Falkenberg.

Falkner, Thomas, b. 6 Oct., 1707; d. 30 Jan., 1794. He was the son of Thomas Falkner, a Manchester apothecary, and obtained his education at the Manchester grammar school. Later on, having studied medicine under the well-known Dr. Richard Mead, he became a surgeon and practised at his native place. In the year 1730, he was invited to take a sea-voyage, and being acquainted with a ship captain on board the "Assiento", a vessel trading with Guinea and carrying slaves thence to Buenos Aires, he accepted an invitation to accompany the vessel as surgeon. This was in or about 1731. On reaching Buenos Aires he was so ill that the captain was compelled to leave him there in the care of Father Mahoney, the superior of the Jesuit College. Here he not only recovered his health, but was received into the Church, and on 15 May, 1732, entered the Society of Jesus, becoming a member of the Paraguay province. Having spent some time at the Jesuit College of Cordoba de Tucuman, he went as a missionary to the Puelches, near Rio Legundo. His knowledge of medicine and mechanics procured for him considerable influence among the Indians, and in 1740 or soon after he was sent to assist Father Nobile in his successful mission to the Patagonian Indians at Cape San Antonio. For more than thirty years he laboured among the Patagonians until 1768 when the Jesuits were expelled from South America. He then returned to England where, in 1771 or 1772, he joined the English province of the Society. He was appointed chaplain to Mr. Berkeley, outside of his ordinary duties, in addition to his priestly labours, he wrote an account of his Patagonian experiences, which was published at Hereford in 1774 under the title "A Description of Patagonia and the adjoining parts of South America, with a grammar and a short vocabulary, and some particulars relating to Falkland's Islands." The book as published was not.
his original work, but a compilation by William Combe, who used Falkner's papers. Kirk (see below) quotes a remark by Rev. Joseph Berington: "Mr. Falkner was a man of a vigorous mind, well exercised in various points of science, and had he been able to tell his story in his own way, stores of principles which were incidental to his mind was with anecdotes and incidents, on which he delighted to dwell, we should have had from him an amusing and interesting performance. But his papers were put into the hands of the late Mr. Robert Berkeley of Spetchley, who extracted from them the whole spirit of the original. He made them what they are."

But though Mr. Berkeley wrote the preface, the responsibility for the taming process must rest with Combe. Even in its emasculated form the book was successful, and was translated into German, French, and Spanish. Another account of the Putagonians due to Father Falkner is found in the works of Thomas Pennant, who described his essay as "formed from the relation of Fr. Falkner, a Jesuit, who had resided among them thirty-eight years". On leaving Spetchley, he became chaplain to Mr. Berington of Winsted in Herefordshire, and afterwards to the Flowdens of Powick in Shropshire. After his death, which occurred at the latter place, the Spanish Jesuits, who had known him in South America, were very anxious to obtain his unpublished works, which included treatises on the botanical and mineral products of America, and American distemper as cured by American doctors. This is stated by Fr. Caballero, S.J., that he had also edited "Volumina duo de anatomia corporis humani".


Edwin Burton.

**Fall, The.** See Sin.

**Fall River.** Diocese of (Riveromensis). U.S.A., a suffragan see of the province of Boston, comprises the counties of Bristol, Barnstable, Dukes, and Nantucket, with the towns of Marion, Mattapoisett and Wareham in Plymouth county, Massachusetts, an area of 1184 square miles. It was created 12 March, 1904, by a division of the Diocese of Providence, of which Rhode Island and a portion of south-eastern Massachusetts, and has the distinction of being the first diocese erected by Pope Pius X. The total population of the diocese is 309,438, of which 151,633 are Catholics. Among the latter are Americans, Irish, French-Canadians, Portuguese, Poles, and Italians, with some few Greeks and Syrians.

The heavy immigration in years past of the Irish and French-Canadian people has caused them to far outnumber the Catholics of other nationalities; but this immigration is now at a standstill, while that of Portuguese and Poles is steadily on the increase. The diocese, by reason of recent creation, has no history of its own, its records being included in the history of the Dioceses of Boston, Hartford, and Providence (q.v.), in each of which its territory has successively been included.

**William Stang**, the first bishop, was born in 1854 in Langenbrücken, in the Grand Duchy of Baden, Germany. His early education was received in the gymnasium of his native land and the petit séminaire at Saint-Nicolas, Belgium. In October, 1875, he began the study of theology at the American College, Louvain, Belgium, where he was ordained priest in 1878. In September of the same year he emigrated to America, to labour in the Diocese of Providence, where his first assignment was to the cathedral. In 1884 he assumed charge of St. Ann's parish, Cranston, Rhode Island. Shortly after he was named rector of the cathedral and chancellor of the diocese, positions which he ably filled until 1895. In April of that year he went to Louvain to become vice-rector of the American College, Georgetown University, in 1887, had conferred upon him the degree of doctor of theology; but a greater recognition awaited him. In August, 1898, the Belgian bishops named him their candidate for the see of Louvain, to which the American College is affiliated, named him professor of fundamental moral theology in the schola minor of the university. In April, 1899, he returned to Providence, to become head of the diocesan Apostolate Band. While still head of the latter, in 1904, he was awarded the S.T.D. at St. Edmund's College, Oxford, and on 12 March, 1904, he was appointed bishop of the newly erected see of Fall River. His consecration took place in the cathedral, Providence, 1 May, 1904. In the short space of two years and nine months he proved himself to be a zealous, indefatigable worker, and charitable to an extreme. He died 2 February, 1907, in St. Mary's Hospital, Rochester, Minnesota. Bishop Stang was the author of a number of works, notably: "Pastoral Theology" (1896); "Historiographia Ecclesiastica" (1897); "Business Guide for Priests" (1899); "Pepper and Salt" (1901); "Christian and Catholic" (1905); "Fundamentals Theologie Moralis" (1906). He also left many pamphlets and essays and contributed frequently to the "American Ecclesiastical Review".

**Daniel Francis Feehan**, the second incumbent of the see, was b. in 1855, at Athol, Massachusetts. His classical and philosophical studies were pursued in St. Mary's College, Montreal, Canada, from which he was graduated in June, 1876. During the three following years he studied theology at St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, New York, where he was ordained priest 20 December, 1879. Parish work in West Brighton and Fall River in the Diocese of Springfield engaged his energies until 1889, when he was made permanent rector of St. Bernard's, Fitchburg. He was in charge there when, on 2 July, 1907, he was appointed second Bishop of Fall River, and consecrated 19 September following.

The diocese has a well-equipped educational system. There are 28 parochial schools with a staff of 191 teachers and an enrolment of 10,451 pupils, 4464 boys and 5987 girls. There are three convent boarding schools conducted by the Religious of the Holy Union in Providence, the Sisters of the Sacred Hearts, and the Sisters of Jesus and Mary, respectively. A boarding college for boys and young men pursuing classical and commercial courses is under the guidance of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart. The Christian Brothers have a well-established commercial day school system, and there is a small orphan asylum directed by the Sisters of Mercy, the Sisters of Charity (Grey Nuns), and the Sisters of St. Francis, respectively, shelter 600 orphans. In connection with one of these asylums is maintained a home for the aged. Admirable work has also been done by the Sisters of Providence.

There are 108 secular and 20 regular priests labouring in the diocese. Of the secular clergy 57 are English-speaking, 30 French-speaking, 15 Portuguese, 5 Poles, and 1 Italian. The Dominican Fathers of the Sacred Hearts and the Christian Brothers are the chief numerical communities, as also the Sisters of Charity (Grey Nuns), Dominican Sisters of Charity of the Presentation, Sisters of St. Dominic, Felician Sisters, Franciscan Missionaries of Mary, Sisters of the Holy Ghost, Sisters of Holy Cross and Seven Dolors, Religious of the Holy Union of the Sacred Hearts, Sisters of Notre Dame, and Mary, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of St. Joseph (Le Puy), and Sisters of St. Francis.
Fallope, GABRIELLO, anatomist, "one of the most important of the many-sided physicians of the sixteenth century" (Haeser): b. at Modena, Italy, 1523; d. 9 October, 1562, at Padua. Some writers have placed his birth as early as 1490, but contemporary authority is for the date mentioned. His family was noble but very poor and it was only by a hard struggle he succeeded in obtaining an education. He studied medicine at Ferrara, at that time one of the best medical schools in Europe. After taking his degree he worked at various medical schools and then became professor of anatomy at Ferrara, in 1540. He was called the next year to Padua, then the most important university in Italy. In 1551 Fallope was invited by Cosmo I, Grand Duke of Tuscany, to occupy the chair of anatomy and surgery at Padua. He held also the professorship of botany and was superintendent of the botanical gardens. Though he died when less than forty, he had made his mark on anatomy for all time. This was the golden age of anatomy and Fallope's contemporaries included such great anatomists as Vesalius, Eustachius, and Columbus. It has sometimes been asserted that he was jealous of certain of the great discoverers in anatomy and that this is the reason for his frequent criticisms and corrections of their work. Haeser, whose authority in medical history is very high, declares that Fallope was noted for his modesty and deference to his fellow-workers and especially to Vesalius. His purpose in suggesting corrections was the advance of the science of anatomy. Fallope's own work dealt mainly with the anatomy of the head. He added much to what was known before about the internal ear and described in detail the tympanum and its relations to the ossicous ring in which it is situated. He also described minutely the canal of the cochlea and its branches in the temporal bone and the corresponding parts in the audience. His contributions to the anatomy of the bones and muscles were very valuable. It was in myology particularly that he corrected Vesalius. He studied the organs of generation in both sexes, and his description of the canal of the ovary led to the uterus. He added his name to the structure. At first he proposed a canal with a diameter of the facial canal through which the facial nerve passes after leaving the auditory canal, and he was followed after him the aqueductus Fallopian. It was much more a discoverer in anatomy. His contributions to practical medicine were important. He was the first to use an auricular speculum for the diagnosis and treatment of diseases of the ear. His writings on surgical subjects are of interest. He published two treatises on ulcers and tumors; a treatise on surgery; and a commentary on Hippocrates' book on wounds of the head. His treatise on syphilis is wonderful in its anticipation of what is sometimes thought most modern in this subject. Fallope was also interested in every form of therapeutics. He wrote a treatise on baths and thermal waters, another on simple purgatives, a third on the composition of drugs. None of these works, except his anatomy (Venice, 1561), was published during his lifetime. As we have them, they are from the manuscripts of his lectures and notes of his students. They were published by Koyter (Nuremberg, 1575).

Opera Omnia (Venice, 1584); TRIBULATION. Biblioteca degli Storti Moderni, Fasc. 91, Annales of the Anatomical and Surgical Society (Brooklyn, 1886).

JAMES J. WALSH.
account of ill-health, the law bears his name, and rightly, for it was his work.

The aim of this law was twofold. It dealt with both primary and secondary education. In the first case, to conduct a primary school, a Frenchman had to be at least twenty-one years of age, with ten years’ experience in an elementary school, or a certificate from a commission appointed by the Minister of Education. For members of religious congregations in girls' schools the le\'tres d'ob\'edience took the place of this certificate. In the second case the law required the candidate to be twenty-five years of age, to have had five years of experience, and a degree of Bachelor of Letters, or a diploma from a ministerial commission.

The new council of the university represented the leading philosophical opinions of France; besides a commission composed of university men proper it included 3 bishops, 1 rabbi, 1 Protestant minister, 3 councillors of the high court of appeals (cour\'e de cassation), 3 councillors of state, 3 members of the institute, and 3 members of the board of free education. In two years' time 25 free schools sprang up, and it is from this law, the last remnants of which the French Pope is now (1908) preparing to abrogate, that dates the development of the Catholic teaching orders in France. In a consistorial address (20 May, 1850) Pius IX praised it as a measure of progress. Those Catholics who opposed, as a matter of principle, all State education were disappointed at the passage of the law; and an ardent exponent, Louis Veuillot. In the Constituent and in the Legislative Assembly, as minister and as deputy, de Falloux always maintained that France was obliged to protect Pius IX as a temporal ruler; he was one of the prime movers of the expedition de Rome. During the Second Empire he withdrew from public life. In 1866 he was elected to the French Academy. In the discussions which took place in royalist circles during the early years of the Third Republic, de Falloux invariably declared in favour of the national flag (the tricolor) and in an article in the "Correspondant" (1873) he insisted that neither as a policy nor as a party cry should the monarchists put forth the idea of a counter-revolution. Spuller, however, declared that because of his conspicuous ability as a statesman de Falloux was one of the most dangerous opponents of the Revolutionary party had he lived in the nineteenth century. It was on the basis of liberty that de Falloux desired to combat the false principles of the Revolution. He believed that politics should take into consideration not only the "thesis" or principle, but also the "hypothesis" or actual conditions, and that certain too extreme formulas or too exacting claims were sure to prejudice rather than help the cause of the Church and the monarchy. The posthumous publication of his "Memoirs" (1888) revived earlier controversies between the "Correspondant" and the "Univers" and provoked a sharp reply from Eugène Veuillot.

De Falloux, Mémoires d'un ropposant (Paris, 1888); De Ma- zade, L'opposition ropposante: Bertrier, Vallée, Falloux (Paris, 1874); De Lacombe, Les débats de la loi de 1860 (Paris, 1874); Veuillot, Le comte de Falloux et ses mémores (Paris, 1888).

Georges Goyau.

False Decretals, or the Decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore, is a name given to certain apocryphal papal letters contained in a collection of canon laws composed about the middle of the ninth century by an author who uses the pseudonym of Isidore. This collection was used as an opening prefatory section to the collection. For the student of this collection, the best, indeed the only useful edition, is that of Hinschius, "Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae" (Leipzig, 1863). The figures in parenthesis occurring during the course of this article refer the reader to the edition of Hinschius. The name "False Decretals" is sometimes extended to cover not only the papyra letters forged by Isidore, and contained in his collection, but the whole collection, although it contains other documents, authentic or apocryphal, written before Isidore's time.

The Collection of Isidore falls under three headings: (1) A list of sixty apocryphal letters or decrees attributed to the popes from St. Clement (67-3), to the anonymous Decretals (311-314) inclusive. Of these sixty letters fifty-eight are forgeries; they begin with a letter from Aurelius of Carthage requesting Pope Damasus (360-384) to send him the letters of his predecessors in the chair of the Apostles; and this is followed by a reply in which Damasus assures Aurelius that the desired letters were being sent. This correspondence was meant to give an air of truth to the false decreals, and was the work of Isidore. (2) A treatise on the Primum Church and on the Council of Nicaea, written by Isidore, and followed by the authentic canons of fifty-four councils. It should be remarked, however, that among the canons of the second Council of Seville (page 438) canon vii is an interpolation aimed against chorepiscopi. (3) The letters mainly of thirty-three popes, from Silvester (314-335) to Gregory II (715-731). Of these about thirty letters are forgeries, while all the others are authentic. This is based on the description of their contents and touches only on the more salient points of a most intricate literary question.

Their Apocryphal Character.—Nowadays every one agrees that these so-called papal letters are forgeries. These documents, to the number of one hundred, appeared suddenly in the ninth century and are nowhere mentioned before that time. The most ancient MSS. of them that we have are from the ninth century, and their method of composition, of which we shall treat later, shows that they were made up of passages and quotations of which we know the sources; and we are thus in a position to prove that the Pseudo-Isidore makes use of documents written long after the times of the popes to whom he attributes them. Thus it happens that popes of the first three centuries are made to quote documents that did not appear until the fourth or fifth century; and later popes up to Gregory I (590-604) are found employing documents dating from the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, and the early part of the ninth. Then again there are endless and unrecorded changes. The Church was deceived by this huge forgery, but during the Renaissance men of learning and the canonists generally began to recognize the fraud. Two cardinals, John of Torquemada (1468) and Nicholas of Cusa (1464), declared the earlier documents to be forgeries, especially those by Clement V and Gregory XII. Then suspicion began to grow. Erasmus (d. 1536) and canonists who had joined the Reformation, such as Charles du Moulin (d. 1568), or Catholic canonists like Antoine le Conte (d. 1580), and after them the Centuriators of Magdeburg, in 1539, put the question squarely before the learned world. Nevertheless the official edition of the "Corpus Juris", in 1580, upheld the genuineness of the false decreals, many fragments of which are to be found in the "Decretum" of Gratian. As a partial explanation of this it is enough to recall the case of Antonio Agustin (d. 1580), the greatest canonist of that period. Agustin seriously doubted the genuineness of the documents, but he never formally repudiated them. He felt he had not sufficient proof at hand, so he simply shirked the difficulty. And it is also to be remembered that, owing to the irritating controversies of the time, anything like an impartial and methodical discussion of such a subject was an utter impossibility. In 1628 the Protestant Blondel published his decisive study, "Pseudo-Isidortus et Turrianus vapulantes". Since then the apocryphal nature of the decreals is an established historical fact. The last of the false decreals that had escaped the keen criticism of Blondel
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were pointed out by two Catholic priests, the brothers Ballerini, in the eighteenth century. The Forgery was done.—Isidore was too clever to invent these documents in toto out of his own head. For the most part he plagiarized them in substance, and often, as he confessed before 852, he made the background he needed for certain data such as the "Liber Pontificalis," a chronicle of the popes from St. Peter onward, which was begun at Rome during the first twenty years of the sixth century. For instance, in the "Liber" it is recorded that such a pope issued such a decree that had been mistaken for a genuine papal bull, or perhaps never existed at all. Isidore seized the opportunity to supply a pontifical letter suitable for the occasion, attributing it to the pope whose name was mentioned in the "Liber." Thus his work had a shadow of historical sanction to back it up. But it was especially in the form of the letters that the forger played the plagiarist. His work is a regular mosaic of phrases stolen from various works written either by clerics or laymen. This network of quotations is computed to number more than 10,000 borrowed phrases, and Isidore succeeded in stringing them together by that logic of his, in which the many forgeries perpetrated either by him or his assistants have an undeniable family resemblance. Without doubt he was one of the most learned men of his day. From Blondel in the seventeenth century to Hinschius in the nineteenth, even up to quite recently, every one who has written of the documents of the Decretals has been forced to use, even if he be an editor, of the false Decretals. They make up quite a library. It is clear that the forger could not have had at hand the entire text from which he drew. He must have had content with extracts, selections, florilegia. But thereon we can only fall back on conjecture.

Isidore who have united the hundred documents he had forged in one single homogeneous collection, which would have been exclusively his work, and then secured its circulation, but, clever man that he was, he chose a different plan. He invented the Breviary and interpolated all his forgeries in an already existing collection. There was a genuine canonical collection which had been drawn up in Spain about 633, and was known as the "Hispana," or Spanish. It contained (cf. Migne, P. L., LXXXIV, 93-348) first of all the texts of the councils from that of Nicaea; secondly the decretals of the popes from Damascus (596-384). Isidore took the volume of manuscripts containing the first sixty of his forged decretals from Clement to Militadias inclusive; these now became the first part of the collection of Isidore. As part II of his collection he retained part I of the Hispana collection, i.e. the genuine collection of councils since Nicaea (520-325). And as part III of his new volume added part II of the old Hispana, i.e. the genuine pontifical letters since Pope Damascus, but he inserted here and there among them the letters he had forged under the names of the various popes between Damascus and Gregory I (590-604). He was not yet, however, so in order to give a more imposing appearance to the work, he inserted other documents not forged by him, but borrowed bodily from other collections of canon laws. Besides all this he interpolated many additions to authentic documents and added several prefaces to complete the fraud. To simplify this description it has been assumed that the forger made use of the undated text of the Hispana. But as a matter of fact he used a French edition, and a very incorrect one at that, of the Hispana, and which was known on that account as the "Hispana Gallica," or French Hispana, which had never been edited, and which is to be found in the MS. 411 of the Latin Decretals in the library of Vienna. Furthermore, the forger tampered with the text of this French Hispana, so that his copy becomes, so to speak, a third edition or revision of the old Hispana. This is known as the "Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis," or "of Autun," so called because the Latin Ms., 1341, of the Vatican, which contains it, came from Autun. This collection likewise has remained unedited.

The Isidorian collection was published between 847 and 852. On the one hand it must have been published after 852, because the decretal of Stephen I (p. 183) among the statutes of a council (Migne, P. L., CXCV, 775), and on the other hand it cannot have been published before 847, because it makes use of the false capitularies of Benedict Levitas, which were not concluded until after 21 April, 847. As to the place where the Decretals were forged, critics are all agreed that it was somewhere in France. The documents used by the forger, and especially those relating more nearly to his own epoch, are nearly all of French origin. And, as we have already pointed out, the frame chosen for the forgeries was the French edition of the Hispana. He also makes use of the "Dionysio-Hadriana" collection, which was the code of the Frankish Church, and of the Quo Vadis collection, which had a French origin. Moreover, he refers to the Councils of Meaux and of Aachen of 836, and to that of Paris of 829, etc. On legal matters he quotes Quo Vadis. When he refers to foreign affairs it is those of France he illustrates by. Lastly, it was in France that his work was first quoted, and therein it had its greatest vogue. But while critics are all agreed that the forgery was done in France, they differ very widely as to the facts of the text. Some incline towards the province of Marseilles, others to the province of Tours; others incline towards the province of Reims. We shall have occasion to refer to these differences later on; for the present we may be satisfied that the false Decretals were forged in the North of France between 847 and 852.

Now, what was the nature of the condition of the Church in France at that time? It was but a few years after the Treaty of Verdun (843), which had put a definitive close to the Carolingian empire by founding three distinct kingdoms. Christendom was a prey to the onslaught of Normans and Saracens; on the other hand the era of civil strife was over. In ecclesiastical circles Church reform was still spoken of, but hardly hoped for. It was especially after the death of Charlemagne (814) that reform began to be considered, but the abuses to be corrected dated from long before Charlemagne's time, and went back to the very beginnings of the Frankish church under the Merovingians. The personal government of the king or emperor had many serious drawbacks on religious grounds. In the mind of the bishops reform and ecclesiastical liberty were identical, and this liberty they required for their persons as well as for the Church. Doubtless Charlemagne's government had been advantageous to the Church, but it was none the less an oppressive protection and dearly bought. The Church was frankly subject to the State. Initiatives which ought to have been the proper function of the spiritual power were usurped by Charlemagne. He summoned synods and confirmed their decisions. He disposed largely of all church benefices. And in matters of importance ecclesiastical tribunals were presided over by him. While the great emperor lived these inconveniences had their compensating advantages and were tolerated. The Church had a mighty supporter at her back. But as soon as he died the Carolingian dynasty began to show signs of ever-increasing debility, and the Church, bound up with, and subordinate to, the political power, was dragged into the ensuing civil strife and disunion. Church property excited the rapacity of the various factions, and many of them were eager to use it as sources of income, and when defeat came the bishops on the vanquished side were exposed to the vengeance of their adversaries. There were charges brought against them, and sentences passed on them, and not canon law, but political exigencies, ruled in the synods. It was the triumph of
the lay element in the Church. Success, even when it came, had its drawbacks. In order to devote themselves to political questions the bishops had to neglect their spiritual duties. They were to be seen more on the forum than on visitations. As supplies in their dioceses they had to call in auxiliaries known as choroepiscopi.

What wonder, then, that these abuses gave rise to complaints? Especially after 829 the bishops were clamouring for ecclesiastical liberty, for legal guarantees, for immunity of church property, for regularity of church administration, for the destruction of the number of choroepiscopi and of their privileges. But all in vain; the Carolingian nobles, whose profited by these abuses, were opposed to reform.

Powerless to better itself, could the Frankish Church count on Rome? At this very time the situation of the papacy was by no means inspiring; the Church at Rome was largely subject to the lay power in the hands of the imperial miss. Sergius II (844-857) has not escaped the reproach of Simony. Leo IV (847-855) had to defend his person just like any simple Frankish bishop. In the face of such a wretched situation the juridical prescriptions of Isidore are ideal.

Can Law According to the FALSE DECRETALS.

We are not here concerned with the whole collection, but only with the laws contained in the forged documents.

At the outset, let it be noted that Isidore’s prescriptions have to do with a very limited number of cases and recur over and over again under slightly varying forms. Yet the forger’s legal system is far from having any perfect cohesion. Inconsistencies and even contradictions, are to be met within it. In the following synopsis, which is necessarily short, no notice is taken of these legal stumbldings of Isidore; we are content to simply sum up the teachings of the false documents under their principal headings.

In matters concerning the relations of the political and ecclesiastical powers, Isidore sets forth the ordinary ideas of his time as to the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal authority. Of his own authority alone, the ruler cannot assemble a regular synod; he must have pontifical authorization to do so (p. 228).

That is a new requirement. A bishop may be neither accused nor condemned before a secular tribunal (pp. 98, 485). The Theodosian Code, from which the forger borrows in this matter, granted the praetorium fori only for minor faults. In such matters the Frankish law was not less lenient and was open to various interpretations. What is novel in Isidore is the general character of the law withdrawing bishops from the secular courts. Then again he recognizes in bishops a certain jurisdiction in secular matters. Roman law had already recognized this.

He goes on to deal with the immunity of church property, which cannot be divested from its original purpose without sacrilege. The evangelization of Christendom is a complex story which modern criticism has retold for us, by showing the slow onward march of the Faith. But Isidore’s ideas thereon were those of his time, and therefore for the most part legendary.

According to him, the organization of parishes was laid down by Clement of Rome, as early as the close of the first century, and was to be modeled on the ecclesiastical divisions of Rome and of the catacombs. This means that the number of choroepiscopi and that metropolitan divisions also existed in primitive times. The Apostles were thought to have accepted the territorial divisions of the Roman Empire, which had been handed down since then as ecclesiastical provinces. There is not much historical foundation for this. It stands to reason that in Isidore we must clearly distinguish between this fantastic view of history and his explanation of an hierarchical organization. On all essential points the forger reproduces the current ideas of his time. But he deserves attention when he speaks of choroepiscopi, or those auxiliary bishops we have already referred to.

According to him they are usurpers; so far as power of order goes, they have priestly orders and nothing more. Every episcopal function exercised by them is null; all their sacramental acts ought to be reiterated. As a matter of fact, Isidore was wrong; choroepiscopi had full power of order and might validly administer confirmation and ordination. Isidore forged theology as well as letters. He strongly affirms the authority of the bishops. That is his great concern. With him nothing else counts (pp. 77, 117, 145, 243).

The bishop is monarch in his own diocese, but he does not stand alone; bonds unite him to his neighbours, and thus we have the metropolitan idea. The capital of each ecclesiastical province has a judicial function or title to be a centre of assembly for the bishops; this right is derived from the primitive division made by the popes. The province is to be governed by the provincial council, presided over by the metropolitan.

The prerogatives of this dignitary Isidore reproduces the prescriptions of the ancient law prior to the eighth century. After the middle of the eighth century the metropolitans had increased their prerogatives, and Isidore tries to ignore this de facto situation; for him nothing counts but canonical texts; the metropolitans are inferior popes, and he can do nothing without the consent of his colleagues. The forger goes on to mention higher jurisdictions, those of primates and of patriarchs. But on these matters he shows but a slight knowledge of church government in Africa and in the East, and we have one of the most glaring examples of this.

The Authority of the Pope.—In the many texts where the pope is in question Isidore is true to his task of plagiarizing. Very often he copies passages borrowed from ancient sources. This fact alone helps in a great measure to explain his insistence on the rights of the papacy. In many cases Isidore is the mouthpiece repeating the sayings of the earlier popes, and we know how clear and uncompromising those early popes were on the question of their prerogatives. For example, call to mind the popes between Innocent I (401-417) and Hormisdas (514-523) and the series of their declarations. All that was well known in the ninth century, at least in theory. And it was all embodied by Isidore. But on the relations between pope and bishops he shows a certain inconsistency. Following the traditional teaching, he declares that the Apostolate and the episcopate were directly instituted by Jesus Christ. Yet at times he seems to be on the point of denying the potestas ordinaria of the bishops. He makes Pope Vigilius (p. 712) say: "Ipsa namque ecclesia que prima est in eis reliquis ecclesiis vices suas credidit largius ut in partem simplicis sollicitudinis non in plebisdum potestatem."

Taking this passage strictly and by itself, it would seem to deny the potestas ordinaria of the bishops. But nevertheless the sentence is not an intentional forgery; it is merely another case where Isidore is a plagiarist. He had got hold of a famous text by St. Leo (Migne, P. L., LIV, 671), addressed to the Bishop of Thessalonica. From the end of the fourth century this bishop had been named by the popes as their representative in the province of Illyricum. Hence the Bishop of Thessalonica exercised by delegation certain rights both in the popes in these countries by reason of their title of Patriarch of the West. About 446, St. Leo had to find fault with the Bishop of Thessalonica, not in his character of bishop, but as legate, or vicar, of the Holy See. And on that point he says in his treatise De potestate that he had received merely a partial delegation, not a plenitude of power. It is clear, then, that the text in question referred to a peculiar relation between the pope and a special bishop. Addressed to the vicar of Illyricum, St. Leo’s words are quite accurate; but, applied to all bishops, they cease to be so, and might easily create much confusion. Isidore further de-
mands that provincial councils be held at regular intervals. He asserts for the pope the right to authorize the calling of all councils and to approve their decisions. Laid down in this general and imperative manner, these claims were something new. Nothing like it had ever been written before. The laying down of the rules of provincial councils; as for approving the decrees of councils, it was a common occurrence in antiquity. When matters of serious importance were in question the pope claimed the right of approval, but there was no formal or general precept asserting such right. And, in any case Isidore's legislation thereon never became the practice.

Ecclesiastical Trials.—The procedure to be followed in the trial of ecclesiastics is of special interest to Isidore. According to him, the judging of clerics of all ranks up to and including the priesthood belongs as a last resource to the provincial councils and the priates. He says nothing about priests appealing to Rome, and in this he agrees with the fourteenth canon of the Council of Sardica. Apropos of the trials of bishops he shows some inconsistency in his legislation. On the one hand, he upholds the law as it existed in his time, and on the other, he draws down a new law. Hence we find two series of texts which it is not easy to reconcile. The first series agrees with the existing law. A provincial council is the ordinary judge of bishops. The pope intervenes only on appeal made to him by one of the interested parties. However, in the case where the competence of the judge is seriously doubtful, the bishop need not wait for the council to pass sentence, but may take his case straight to Rome. Stated in this general way, the latter provision is new. But as it is based on the idea of plain justice, it is not altogether foreign to the ancient ecclesiastical law. It is mentioned in Roman law, from which Isidore borrowed it. How may the pope set about hearing an appeal? The ancient law did not exclude, but did not make provision for, sentence being passed at Rome itself. It recognized the pope's right to appoint a court of appeal composed of bishops from the neighbourhood of the accused; furthermore, he had the right to be represented there by a legate, who would naturally have a preponderating rôle at the trial. Such were the rulings of the Council of Sardica. But as a matter of fact, from the fifth century we have cases where the pope summoned episcopal appeal courts to Rome itself. So it is not a great surprise that Isidore should leave the pope free to decide where the final trial should take place. But, as we pointed out, side by side with this first series of decisions along the lines of the ancient law, we find another series which lays down a new law. Therein it is said that in the trial of bishops, the function of the provincial council is limited to hearing both sides of the case and referring it to the pope for judgment. Sentence can only be passed with his approbation. This is a new legislation. But once more Isidore is not really inventing; he is merely giving clear and direct expression to the tendencies of his day. In face of the dangers created for the bishops by political disturbances, by the fear of being condemned for party feeling or through motives of revenge, the bishops themselves were eager that charges against them should not be decided without the approval of the pope.

One of the most characteristic peculiarities of the false decreals is the procedure laid down for the trial of bishops. Isidore declares over and over that it was the will of the Apostles that there be as few charges as possible made against bishops, and that, when there are several, a single trial should be held for the finding of proof possible. This is a point worth remembering. The accusation of bishops will be a difficult thing, their defence an easy matter. Isidore's legislation on this head, when systematized, so efficaciously hindered any judicial action against a bishop that the reader is almost inclined to treat it as a joke. However, we must be just; it was not all an invention on Isidore's part. His procedure in the main reproduces the requirements of Roman law; it draws on the decisions of the Roman apocrisapha of the time of Symmachus and Synesius of Cyzicus, and on the laws of the Barbarian kingdoms. In a case of this kind, anything like a careful and thorough criticism requires that great attention be paid to the question of the sources employed. Isidore piles up obstacles against the accusation of bishops, but the obstacles are not all of Isidore's own devising. Any bishop dispossessed of his see by violence, and who is summoned to the courts, has a right to raise the plea of actio spoli, i.e. to fall back on the fact of disposition in order to avoid trial, until he has been provisionally restored to his possessions and dignities. This appeal before trial is one of the main points in the Isidorian procedure. The only one who is competent to bring a charge against a bishop is the council of his province. Foreign tribunals are excluded, and the provincial council must have a full quorum. The charge must be made in the presence of accused and accusers. If one of the interested parties is absent, the whole judicial machinery comes to a standstill.

The following are the rules governing accusations. A layman can bring no charge against a bishop. This rule, which occurs also in the Roman apocrisapha of the time of Symmachus, may be explained by the different judicature and laymen at that time. Clerics were judged according to Roman law, whereas many laymen were subject to Germanic law, and the procedure under these two laws was different and even hostile. Moreover, at times laymen would not recognize clerics as having the rights to accuse them. In the courts thus the clerics may well declare laymen incompetent in their courts. Then, too, it must not be lost sight of that Isidore's principle was never observed in practice; a modus agendi was always found. Isidore's second principle was that a cleric could never bring a charge against his superior. It is evident that thus the number of possible accusers became very restricted. The accusation must be made not in writing, but by word of mouth. Only those might bring charges who fulfilled exceptional conditions in respect to rank and standing. In this way it was easy to get rid of a troublesome accuser. The normal merit with which it took seventy-two witnesses to condemn a bishop. This again is not an invention of Isidore's. It was an old custom that a bishop might only be condemned by a council of seventy or seventy-two bishops. The numbers are an allusion either to the seventy elders of the Jewish people or to the Seventy-Two Disciples. But Isidore managed to complicate the situation by applying the number to the witnesses; though even if it were applied to the judges, the difficulty would not be lessened in practice. It was no easy matter to get together so numerous a tribunal. In the sixth century Photius declared that in his time the two hundred and seventy numbers were not necessary; in any case Isidore's legislation was never enforced. The hearing of the charge follows Roman law, and minute regulations were drawn up to secure all the necessary scope and impartiality to the arguments for and against. Any admission of guilt had to be absolutely spontaneous, and no signature obtained by force was valid.

In his preface Isidore declares the purpose of his work. His aim is to build up a collection of canons more complete than any other by uniting together all the canons dispersed among the various existing collections. What makes his work so difficult? What is the purpose? Isidore's collection is on a character all its own by the fact that it includes a hundred documents forged in Isidore's workshop. He might easily have made that more complete collection, without having recourse to forging documents for it.
And, as a matter of fact, is his collection more complete than any other? Even a summary examination soon shows that there are many lacunae in this collection of canon law. It omits all mention of many important matters, governing of rural parishes, ecclesiastical tithes, simplicity, the monastic life, questions concerning the matrimonial laws, privileges and dispensations, and the pallium. The governing of parishes and the question of benefices were of vital interest when Isidore lived. Though not quite so acute as during the tenth and eleventh centuries, these policies of law became occasional between the Church and the feudal society in progress of formation. They were already preoccupying men's minds, and as Isidore does not refer to them he can hardly claim to have wished to supply a complete ecclesiastical code. So we are driven to conclude that he had a very special object in view in composing his partial code. How are we to discover what this object was? Evidently by examining the documents he forged. There, if at all, are to be found his dominant ideas. And such an examination is by no means difficult after what we have just said concerning the legal side of the false decreals. Isidore's object is so clearly defined that it cannot be very falsely analyzed. His chief aim is to assure the dignity and fruitfulness of the episcopal office. In his view the diocese is the life-giving centre of the whole ecclesiastical organism, and the vitality of this centre is his chief concern. All his legislation has the same object. But perhaps it may be said that, while he was at pains to safeguard the authority of the bishops, he is even more careful to increase that of the pope. This was a view long in favour among both Gallicans and Protestants, but it is no longer the fashion. In our day existing laws are, on the whole, accepted as those of the pope. He touches on the prerogatives of the pope, it is never in the interests of Rome, but always in those of the bishops. It was for this that he tried to facilitate appeals to Rome. But in his idea the rôle to be played by the pope would not restrict the rights of the bishops. It has been observed that Isidore does not mention the temporal power of the popes, and that he never thinks of turning to profit Constantine's pretended donation to the Church of Rome, nor does he seem to aim at increasing the French protectorate at Rome. But, if his object was to assure the Holy See, how differently would he have gone to work. Now, if we compare these aims of Isidore with the actual situation of the Frankish Church when the forger was at work, between the years 847 and 882, it will be evident that false decreals are directly opposed to the chief abuses of which the bishops were the victims at that time: condemnations of a political character, neglect of the episcopal office, and the establishment of chorepiscopi. This explains the lacunae in Isidore's ecclesiastical code. He was fighting against urgent and glaring abuses. A contemporary is always in a disadvantage forming a clear opinion of his age, of those deep causes of which the slow but measured action must inevitably transform society. And hence it was that Isidore confined himself to things that were more or less on the surface in the everyday life around him. The forger, save in the case of the Church, he certainly made no attempt to provide against them.

It remains true, however, that Isidore was a forger. But there are forgers and forgers. Let us not forget that the false decreals are from the same work as those that forged the capitulaires of Angilramus (Angilram, A.D. 910) and the false capitulaires of Benedictus Leviata. When the capitulaires had been forged it was but a natural step to the forging of pontifical letters. For this new work Isidore owed much to the "Liber Pontificalis", or chronicle of the popes. Thus when the Liber tells us that such a pope issued such a decree long since lost, the forger noted the fact and set to work to invent a decree for his collection along the lines hinted at by the "Liber". This is a method well known in diplomatic work, and one that has left us the acta rescripta, of which we have many specimens in theolingua charters. These acta rescripta are documents which, at a date long subsequent to their issue, and because the originals or ancient copies of them had been damaged or lost, were drawn up by the aid of the remnants of the originals, or from extracts therefrom, or analyses of them, or at times from mere tradition concerning their contents (cf. Giry, "Manuel de diplomatie", Paris, 1894, pp. 12, 867, etc.). To this opinion many of the false decreals were merely such acta rescripta. It was not a very honest proceeding, and Isidore was far from being scrupulous. With a faint modification it might be said of him as of another forger in the seventeenth century, the crafty Father Jérôme Vignier, "He was the greatest liar in Paris." But men of the ninth century must not be judged according to modern ideas of literary morality. Neither can the false decreals be looked at as a purely literary work. They are a landmark in the evolution of law. In every society law develops or evolves itself like other things under conditions, and step by step with the social life it regulates, and which it must keep pace with in order to regulate. The state of society, the ensemble of its customs, change more or less according to time and place, and are never stationary. And slight changes, when multiplied to any degree, and by causing a change between the former legislation and the newly born needs of a changed society. The written laws no longer meet the requirements of the social state they ought to regulate, and a readjustment of legal provisions becomes necessary. History shows us that this may take place in many ways, according to the nature of the desired change and the surroundings in which it takes place. It may be effected by the gradual substitution of new laws for those that have grown antiquated or, less courageously, by what is known as a creative interpretation of existing laws, of which we have many examples in Roman law; and again, in desperate cases, the change may be brought about by forgeries, when no other means seems practicable. Now, in the middle of the ninth century, the rules of canonical legislation did not seem to be the best possible, and they had to be improved. The reform councils of the ninth century had tried to bring about the new laws demanded by the situation, but the lay power had blocked the way. And thus the evolution of law, finding an obstacle to its growth on one side, was constrained to seek freedom and further to advance in normal fashion, a canonist whose intentions were more commendable than his acts bethought him of calling in the aid of the forger. It is impossible to condone such forgeries, but the history of the case puts us in a better position to judge them, and even to discover extenuating circumstances in their favour, by emphasizing the powerful forces at work in the society of the period, and which were acting with what one may call historical fatalism. Moreover, the false decreals are the work of private enterprise and have no official character. The theory that they were confined in Italy has been long since abandoned. They are of purely Gallican origin, and if they deceived the Church, the Church accepted them in good faith and without any complicity.

The Spread.—We saw above, in the case of Hincmar, that Isidore's forgeries were known among the Franks as early as 852. In Germany we hear of them a little later. We find traces of them in the Acts of the councils of Germany dating from that of Worms in 898, but in Spain we find no reference to them, and they seem to have been hardly known there. They found their way into England towards the close of the eleventh century, probably through Lanfranc, Arch-
bishop of Canterbury. Their reception in Italy is of greater importance. It occurred probably during the pontificate of Nicholas I (858-867). It seems certain that he knew of the decreals, and it is possible that he may have even possessed a copy of them, and showed copies of them to his successors. If we are to believe the statement of the time, the decreals were used by him in his correspondence, but this is not certain. The authenticity of the decreals is more difficult to establish, and there is no certain evidence of their existence.
Council of Soissons in 863, he wishes to assert his right to intervene in the trials of bishops, even when there was no question of an appeal to Rome. This amounted to an assertion of the absolute power of the Holy See, a claim he might have supported by many solid arguments, which is our object to find him doing in support thereof the canons of the Council of Sardica, which say nothing of the sort. The Council of Sardica (343) intended very particularly to safeguard the legal rights of bishops who were being persecuted; that was its main object, and it by no means intended to define the rights of Rome in matters of the kind. These canons mark one of the early steps in the question of church discipline.

The claim of Nicholas I ought to have been supported by texts from the fifth and sixth centuries; and in the case in question his object was much more creditable than the reasons he gave in support of it. On the whole, then, from the beginning of his pontificate, and before he knew of the Isidorian texts, Nicholas I was in full sympathy with the ideas expressed therein. Acquaintance with those texts did not seriously affect him. Yet, in his letter to the Frankish bishops, dated 26th May, 865, apropos of the canons, he puts the argument on appeals much after the manner in which Isidore had put it; so much so, that one writer speaks of the par juris isidori that letter exhales (Fournier). If the letters of the early popes (i.e. the decretals of Isidore) are not explicitly quoted, they are at least alluded to, and from all that has been said we feel free to conclude that Nicholas I took none of his essential ideas from Isidore, and that any influence he did exercise on that pope was too insignificant to be taken into account in a pontificate so filled with enterprises of daring and of moment. And this conclusion in Nicholas's case gives us more or less the answer to the further question as to how far the apocrypha influence the subsequent history of the Church. As we have seen, even without Isidore, Nicholas I would have brought about the same mode of government. And it has been well said that the principles of Nicholas I were those of Gregory VII and of the great popes of the Middle Ages; that is to say, Isidore or no Isidore, Gregory VII and Innocent III would not have acted otherwise than they did. As a matter of history, such a conclusion is quite justifiable, and as far as apologetics is its question is quite sufficient answer. In the domain of theology and canon law, Isidore's forgeries never had any serious consequences.

Having said this, we are free to confess frankly that in lesser spheres than those of theology and law, the false decreals have not always exercised a fortunate influence. On history, for instance, their influence was beneficent. No doubt they do not bear all the blame for the distorted and legendary view the Middle Ages had of ecclesiastical antiquity. During the Middle Ages it was almost an impossibility to consult all the sources of information, and it was difficult to check and control those at hand. It was not easy to distinguish genuine documents from apocryphal ones. And this difficulty, which was the great stumbling-block of medieval culture, would have been always an obstacle to the progress of historical study. It must be admitted that Isidore's forgeries increased the difficulty till it became almost insurmountable. The forgeries blurred the whole historical perspective. Customs and methods proper to the ninth century stood out in relief side by side with the discipline of the first centuries of the Church. And, as a consequence, the Middle Ages knew very little concerning the historical growth of the rights of the papacy during those centuries. Isidore's view of antiquity was a very simple one, and perhaps it was just as well for the systematizing of theology. In the main, it was no easy matter to develop a historical sense during the Middle Ages. The absence of such a sense is all the more remarkable when we consider what civilization owes the Middle Ages in the realms of philosophy, theology, and architecture.

PLACE OF ORIGIN.—We have purposely reserved this question for the end. In the first place, it is of lesser importance than the others; and in the second, of the decreals are for the most part in agreement concerning the questions we have been treating, they are divided into two parties on this final question. For a time the decreals were thought to have been forged at Mainz, but that theory has been altogether abandoned, and now the disputed honour lies between Reims and Le Mans in the province of Tours. Here are the arguments put forth by each of the authorities of German critics and a section of those in France favour Reims as the place where the decreals originated. According to them, Isidore's legislation concerning the trial of bishops was intended to support the cause of Eibbon, Archbishop of Reims, and to facilitate the retrial of that dignitary. Eibbon had been deposed in 832 for political reasons. He was re-instated at Reims in 840; he had to leave his see in 845 and ended his career in 851 as Bishop of Hildesheim. According to the critics, a comparison between the case and Isidore's procedure at trials shows such agreement that it must have been intentional; thus, for instance, the provisional restoration of the accused and dispossessed bishop, the arrest of the bishop, the possibility of a translation from one see to another (from Reims to Hildesheim). Besides this, it was in the province of Reims that forgeries first appeared, and from there they were carried to Rome by Rothade of Soissons; then, too, it was in this diocese that, ever since Eibbon's time, the struggle against chorepiscopos was most intense. Isidore's opposition to archiepiscopal authority is also very marked; and, in the province of Reims was the birthplace of that opposition during the years that intervened between Eibbon's deposition (838-841) and Hincmar's nomination (845); hence the conclusion that the forgeries were committed between 847 and 852 by partisans of Eibbon, and probably by clerics ordained by him in 841, and against whose ordination Hincmar, Eibbon's successor, raised objections soon after his election. This cumulative mass of argument is impressive; but to be really conclusive it would be necessary to prove that Isidore's legislation was involved by these clerics against their archbishop; or, that he was deposed in 851 or at least before 853, when the Council of Soissons was held, in which the ordinaries held by Eibbon at Reims in 841 after his restoration were declared invalid. No such proof is forthcoming. The documents in favour of Eibbon in which is discovered a similarity to the texts of the decreals are later than 853. At that time Isidore's work had begun to spread. That it was known and used at Reims after 853 is not at all surprising and is no proof of its having been composed in the Province of Reims. Furthermore, if these apocrypha had been composed in favour of Eibbon and of the clerics he ordained, then the question of the validity of ordinances performed by a deposed bishop ought to have been treated of. Yet not a word is said concerning it; though, on the other hand, Isidore submits all questions concerning clerics up to and including priests to the metropolitan and to the priates. No mention is made of an appeal by priests to Rome, an omission that is inexplicable if the documents were written in favour of the clerics ordained by Eibbon, and who are supposed to have been the actual writers. Add to this that the text of the forgery was committed, was for the clerics of Reims, Eibbon's partisans, a period pending appeal and a time of entente with Hincmar. For the moment, they had no reason to need such a weapon against the archbishop. Lastly, P. Fournier points out that the theory which makes Reims the scene of the forgery in opposition to Hincmar is at variance with what we know of Hincmar's attitude.
If Hincmar had the faintest suspicion that the decretales were aimed at him, he would have treated them differently. Though he had a suspicion that one or other document had been forged in part, he offered no objection to the collection as a whole. But it is certain that he made no moves to discard the code or use it as a weapon against him. On the whole, then, this theory is an attractive one; but while no solid proof can be brought in its favour, many solid arguments can be brought against it.

There is another set of critics who fix the province of Toulouse and the north-eastern part of Le Mans as the scene of the forgery. The principal among these critics are Langen, Döllinger, M. S. Simon, Violet, J. Havet, F. P. Fournier, and J. Duchesne. According to them, the forged legislation on the trial of bishops and the organization of dioceses and ecclesiastical provinces aim at a state of things existing in Brittany after 845, when Noménoë, Duke of Brittany, gained a victory over Charles the Bald. At that time Brittany was eager for independence, in the ecclesiastical as well as in the civil order. The bishops in Brittany were subject to the metropolitan of Tours, and theCONNEXOBSERVATION OF THE PREPARATION OF THE DECRETALES AS A PLEDGE OF POLITICAL SUBORDINATION.

On the other hand, the Duke of Brittany was anxious to get rid of four bishops whom he suspected of favouring the Franks. He gave them a quick trial and expelled them from his domains. The affair was carried to Rome about 847. Leo II wrote to the Duke of Brittany reminding him of the claims of canon law. The whole thing caused much commotion among the Franks and at Rome. As it was a matter of public knowledge, and more or less contemporaneous with the appearance of the decretales, nearly all the critics are agreed that Hincmar had this affair in his mind when he wrote, and that many of his laws presupposed such some state of affairs as existed in the province of Tours and the Church of Brittany. These are only appearances, however, and we want precise proofs, something more definite. Now the critics in question think they recognize a family likeness between two documents which were certainly written at Le Mans and the decretales of Isidore. The first of these is the apocryphal Bull of Pope Gregory IV (827–844) in favour of Alfric, Bishop of Le Mans. In this letter (Migne, P. L., CXV, 831) the pope recognizes the authority of the Bishop of Le Mans in Rome whenever a charge is brought against him. The letter is supposed to have been written on 8 July, 833. It is quite after Isidore’s own heart; and its style is wonderfully similar to that of the forger. The forged Bull of Gregory IV is a mosaic of authentic texts, and very often they are texts which Isidore used over and over again.

The critics are all agreed that this forged Bull and the decretales are independent documents; that is, that neither makes use of the other. But the critics we are now considering maintain that both come from the same workshop; that they form a family by methods of composition. They further point out the closeness of their dates. The forged Bull was certainly drawn up at Le Mans, they say, about 850, when Le Mans was in the hands of the Duke of Brittany. The bishop, who favoured the Franks, was in a sorry plight; and to protect him the Bull of Gregory IV was forged. We are certainly very near now to the date of the decretales, and the family likeness between the documents would be explained by the identity of their origin. The same critics argue in the same way in the case of a memoir or story of a dispute that took place in 838 between Alfric, Bishop of Le Mans and the Abbey of St. Calais (Migne, P. L., CXV, 81–2). During the course of the trial the authority of the canons is quoted after the manner of Isidore, i.e. in mosaic fashion made up of those fragmentary passages Isidore was so fond of using. And this docu-

ment belongs to the years between 842 and 846. We are still at Le Mans and about the period when the decretales appeared. Moreover, it is a fact that there were chiroepiscopi at Le Mans at this time. Now, what are we to think of these arguments? They are quite without value unless we discard the theory of a code intended as a weapon against him. On the whole, then, this theory is an attractive one; but while no solid proof can be brought in its favour, many solid arguments can be brought against it.

Thus, we have no proof that the forged Bull of Gregory IV was written during the lifetime of Aldric. The present writer is of the opinion that it was after his time and as a support to Robert of Le Mans, successor to Aldric, in his quarrel with the monks of the monastery. As the question as to the date of the Bull is merely a secondary one. The most important argument is the existence at Le Mans, about the very time when the decretales were forged, not of a document, but of two documents concocted in the very style of the forger Isidore. And there seems reason to believe that Le Mans has most claim to being the scene of the forgery of the decretales. In the interests of fairness we must, however, say one thing. As we have seen, the knowledge of the decretales shown by Pope Nicholas I dates from the visit to Rome of his representative in 864. It is a matter, for us, of some surprise, that the forgery was carried on without the knowledge of Nicholas I. But there is no reason for supposing that the Pope was not fully acquainted with the forgery.

MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS.—The MSS. of the false decretales belong to many classes, but we shall speak of them only three of these MSS. which serve to show the way they spread. The first class comprises twenty-five MSS. All of them are incomplete, yet we are able to restore the full text from them, i.e. the text of the canonical collection described above, and restored in the edition of Hinschius. A second class of MSS. contains only a part of Isidore’s work. This class comprises eighteen MSS., which give Part I of the collection, i.e. the apocryphal decretales up to Melchiades, but omit Part II, and give only a portion of Part III. These MSS. cease at page 508 of the edition of Hinschius. Everything leads to the belief that these MSS. of this second class are taken from manuscripts of the first. A third class of MSS. is represented only by number 1311 of the Latin MSS. in the Vatican Library. This MS. contains the “Collectio Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis”, of which we have already spoken. This collection may be looked on as a first edition, a trial edition of the false decretales. It does not contain Part I, i.e. the apocryphal decretales from Clement to Melchiades, but only those parts which correspond to the genuine Hispana, namely the councils and the decretales of the popes from Damascus. In this latter part the forger has interpolated some of his apocrypha which later were inserted in the completed edition of the false decretales. The principal of these apocrypha are to be found on pages 501–508 and 509–515 of the edition of Hinschius. It should be remembered that the Hinschius edition is a critical edition; i.e. one edited after a thorough study of the manuscripts of the forged texts. The text of the genuine documents has not been subjected to any criticism, the editor contenting himself with reproducing it just as he found it in already extant collections, that is to say, existing previous to Isidore’s treatment of them.

LOUIS SALTET.
Falsity (Lat. Falsitas), a perversion of truth originating in the deceitfulness of one party, and culminating in the damage of another party. Counterfeiting money, or attempting to coin genuine legal tender without due authorization; tampering with wills, codicils, or such-like legal instruments; poisoning the correspondences of others to their prejudice; using false weights and measures; adulterating merchandise, so as to render saleable what purchasers would otherwise never buy, or so as to derive larger profits from goods otherwise marketable only at lower figures; bribing judges or public officers; suborning perjuries; advancing false testimony; manufacturing spurious seals; forging signatures; padding accounts; interpolating the texts of legal enactments; and sharing in the pretended birth of supposititious offspring are among the chief forms which this crime assumes. The punishment determined by the laws of former times for those convicted of it could scarcely savour of greater severity, awaken a deeper horror of the crime itself. In the first place, the Roman law inflicted the death penalty on such evil-doers as were found guilty of falsifying imperial rescripts. Traces of this kind of legislation are to be found in the ‘Bull of Pius IX, Apostolicae Sedis’, wherein the Holy See promulgates the sentence of excommunication specially reserved to the sovereign pontiff against all who dare to forge or interpolate Bulls, Briefs, and Rescripts of all kinds formulated in the name of the Holy Father, and signed of the pope personally, by his vice-chancellor personally, or by his vice-chancellor’s proxy, or by some other individual specially commissioned thereunto by the sovereign pontiff himself.

Moreover, whosoever are guilty of publishing surreptitious or supposititious papal Bulls, Briefs, or Rescripts, of the kind already specified, render themselves amenable to the same ecclesiastical penalty. This sentence of excommunication takes effect as soon as the work of falsification becomes an accomplished fact, even though the false letters never pass into actual use. At the same time it must be noted, in passing, that as often as there is question of forgery of Apostolic Letters, the censure is not incurred prior to the actual publication of such letters. Those who are guilty, not of falsifying Apostolic Letters, but of deliberately using such as are already forged or interpolated in the course of their traffic, incur the censure of excommunication reserved to the ordinary of the diocese. According to D'Annibale (Commentary on the Constitution “Apostolicae Sedis”, n. 81) those who retain forged or interpolated Apostolic Letters in their possession, those who order the production of such letters, their advisers, abettors or co-operators, are not liable to the sentence of excommunication.

In cases other than those here outlined, the enormity of the crime was emphasized by the civil law in confiscating the property of culprits and condemning them to perpetual exile. Though time has by no means lessened the intrinsic heinousness of the crime itself, it has witnessed considerable mitigation in the penalty thereunto attached; the discretion of the judge hearing the case is now the chief factor in determining the nature and the extent of punishment. While vicissitudes of time and place may suggest the expediency of modifications in the exiguities of the preceptive law, there still remains an obligation which conscience always imposes on those guilty of this crime, an obligation founded in justice, and therefore quite independent of changes occurring in time or place. For this reason it is right to claim that as soon as the accomplice ceases to exist; suborning perjuries against another party, the perpetrator of such damage is strictly bound in conscience to make good all such losses caused, or occasioned, by his fraud or deceit. This teaching meets with the unstinted approbation of moralists, notwithstanding the plausibility of a theory purporting to incapacitate those who advance false testimony, but lifting from their shoulders the burden of repairing damages due to such false evidence. (See Forgery.)

Taunton, Law of the Church (London, 1906); D'Annibale, Commentarium in Constitutione Apostolica Sedis: Qüntt. Synopses Rerum Moralisium de Juris Pontificii (Prato, 1904); Baldini, Opus Theologicum Morale (Prato, 1901); Lehmkühler, Theologia Moralis (Freiburg, Juris Canonici Privati, Institutiones (Rome, 1901); Laymann, Theologiae Moralis (Padua, 1733); Sporer, Theologia Moralis (Venice, 1716).

J. D. ONeill.

Faltonia Proba. See Proba Faltonia.

Famagusta, a titular see in the Island of Cyprus. The name appears to be derived from the Greek Ἀβδομικώρ (a sandy point) rather than from Fama Augusta, the traditional etymology. The history of the city cannot be traced beyond the eighth century of our era. It is not certain, Lequien to the contrary notwithstanding (II, 1605), that it occupies the site of Arsinoe. Famagusta prospered through the destruction of the neighbouring Salamis, the former capital of the island. By the twelfth century its importance was such that Guy de Lusignan chose to be crowned there (1191) King of Jerusalem and Cyprus. The French princes fortified the town, and in the thirteenth century built the beautiful Cathedral of St. Nicholas, transformed since then into a mosque. Famagusta was the seat of a Latin diocese from the sixteenth century and had residential bishops till the end of the sixteenth century. The list is given by Lequien, III, 1219-24; Ducange, “Les familles d’outre-me”, 861-864; Eubel, I, 253-54, II, 108; Hackett, “History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus”, London, 1901, 577-87.

The prosperity of Famagusta was not affected by the fall of Acre. In 1342, a German writer described it as one of the richest and most beautiful cities of the world, its wealth surpassing that of Constantinople and Venice. (See Mas-Latrie, L’lle de Chypre, Paris, 1919, 234-40.) St. Bridget of Sweden, in her revelations, compares it to Sodom and Gomorrah. Captured by the Genoese in 1374, it fell, in 1389, into the hands of the Venetians, who retained it till 1571. Finally, after a siege of ten months, which cost the enemy 50,000 men, the city surrendered to the Turks, who, despite their treaty, massacred the citizens, burned alive the brave governor, Bragadino, and completely sacked the city. Famagusta, which formerly numbered 70,000 inhabitants, was reduced to a mere village. It is known to-day as Mankosta (1000 inhabitants) and is the chief town of one of the six departments of the island. Its harbour is choked with sand; its palaces, dwellings, highways, ramparts, and churches are all in ruins.

Fame. See Reputation.

Familiars, strictly speaking, seculars subject to a master’s authority and maintained at his expense. In this sense the idea embodies service rendered to masters, as well as wages, board, and lodging provided by the masters. In canon law the term usually signifies seculars residing in monasteries and other religious houses, actually employed therein as servants and subject to the authority of the regular prelate to the same extent as servants are subject to their masters. Many of the privileges and exemptions granted to religious are accorded their familiars. For this reason familiars validly receive absolution from a confessor approved by the regular prelate, or from one approved by the ordinary of the place where the house is located. In like manner, familiars actually dwelling in a monastery in the order of their Easter Communio in the church or chapel of the monastery. Extreme unction and Viaticum may also be administered to them in the monastery. Boys boarding in colleges or academies supervised by religious or by diocesan clergy, and girls boarding in convents conducted by sisterhoods, practically enjoy the same privileges as familiars. Accord-
ing to the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, cap. ix, De Reformatione), "a bishop may not ordain one of his own household who is not his subject unless he has lived with him for the space of three years, and he shall really and without fraud of any kind, straightforwardly confess, 1st, that the law of his own household is to be observed and, 2nd, that no contrary custom even immemorial"

TAUNTTON, Law of the Church (London, 1906); SMITH, Elements of Ecclesiastical Law (New York, 1887); BACHOFEN, Geschicht der Familie und des Privatheims (2d ed., New York, 1903); LUBBOCK, Jus primae nocesta (Rome, 1903; London, 1885); LACROIX, Jus primae nocesta (Paris, 1888); BOURG, Traité de la famille (Paris, 1893); NOLDE, De Sacramentis (Leipzig, 1893); LYNN WHITE, Theologia Moralis (Freiburg, 1898); MULLER, Theologia Moralis (Vienna, 1892).

J. D. O'NEILL.

Family, a term derived from the Latin, famulus, servant, and famillia, household servants, or the household (cf. Ocean, famill, servant). In the classical Roman period the familia rarely included the parents or the children. Its English derivative was frequently used in former times to describe all the persons of the domestic circle, parents, children, and servants. Present usage, however, commonly excludes servants, and the word familia refers to that fundamental social group formed by the more or less permanent union of one man with one woman, or of one or more men with one or more women, and their children. If the heads of the group comprise only one man and one woman we have the monogamous family, as distinguished from those domestic associations which could not be called familials in conditions of polygamy, polyandry, or promiscuity.

Certain anthropological writers of the last half of the nineteenth century, as Bachofen (Das Mutterrecht, Stuttgart, 1861), Morgan (Ancient Society, London, 1877), McLemore (The Patriarchal Theory, London, 1883), Laqueur (Custodia, London, 1885), and Lubbock (The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man, London, 1895), created and developed the theory that the original form of the family was one in which all the women of a group, and perhaps a tribe, were promiscuously united with the men of the community. The heading of Engels (The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, tr. from the German, Chicago, 1902), some socialist writers have adopted this theory of the family as a materialistic and progressive interpretation of history. The chief considerations in its favor are: 1. The assumption that the property of the family is common, and that this condition necessarily led to community of women; 2. Historical statements by ancient writers like Strabo, Hecataeus, and Strabo, and the practice of promiscuity, as a comparatively late date, by some uncivilized peoples, such as the Indians of California and a few aboriginal tribes of India; 3. The system of tracing descent and kinship through the mother, which prevailed among some primitive people; 4. Certain abnormal customs of ancient races, such as religious prostitution, the so-called jux prima nocesta, the lending of wives to visitors, and the so-called Law, before marriage, etc.

At no time has this theory obtained general acceptance, even among non-Christian writers, and it is absolutely rejected by some of the best authorities of to-day, e. g., Westermarck (The History of Human Marriage, London, 1901) and Letourneau (The Evolution of Marriage, tr. from the French, New York, 1888).

In reply to the arguments just stated, Westermarck and others point out that the hypothesis of primitive communism has by no means been proved, at least in its extreme form; that common property in goods does not necessarily lead to community of women, since family marriage remains restricted to the offspring of a man and a woman; that common property in goods is not necessarily the result of economic conditions; that the family of classical historians in the matter is inconclusive, vague, and fragmentary, and refer to only a few instances; that the modern cases of promiscuity are isolated and exceptional, and may be attributed to degeneracy rather than to primitive survivals; that the practice of tracing kinship through the mother finds ample explanation in other facts besides the assumed uncertainty of paternity, and that it was not universal; that the absence of sexual relations cited the act (in most cases) as unnecessary, as well as more satisfactorily explained, by other circumstances, religious, political, and social, than by the hypothesis of primitive promiscuity; and, finally, that evolution, which, superficially viewed, seems to support this hypothesis, is actually against it, inasmuch as the unions between the male and the female of many of the higher species of animals exhibit a degree of stability and exclusiveness which bears some resemblance to that of the monogamous family.

The utmost concession which Letourneau will make to the theory under discussion is that "promiscuity may have been adopted by certain small groups, more probably by certain associations or groupings under certain circumstances."

The family was either polygamy or polyandry; it was even less worthy of credence or consideration. In the main, the verdict of scientific writers is in harmony with the Scriptural doctrine concerning the origin and nature of the family. "When therefore he shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh" (Gen., ii, 24). "Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt., xix, 6). From the beginning, therefore, the family was supposed the union of one man with one woman.

While monogamy was the prevailing form of the family before Christ, it was limited in various degrees among many peoples by the practice of polygamy. This practice was universal among the Semitic races, among the Aryans, it was very frequent among the Jews, the Egyptians, and the Medes, among the people of India, the Greeks, or the Romans. It existed to a greater extent among the uncivilized races, although some of these were free from it. Moreover, even those nations which practised polygamy, whether in primitive or civilized form, or both, restricted it to a small minority of the population, as the kings, the chief, the nobles, and the rich. Polyandry was likewise practised, but with considerably less frequency. According to Westermarck, monogamy was by far the most common form of marriage among the ancient peoples of whom we have any direct knowledge" (op. cit., p. 459). On the other hand, divorce was in vogue among practically all peoples, and to a much greater extent than polygamy.

The ease with which husband and wife could dissolve their union constitutes one of the greatest blot upon the civilization of classic Rome. Generally speaking, the position of woman was very low among all the nations, civilized and uncivilized, before the coming of Christ. Among the barbarians she very frequently became a wife through capture or purchase; among even the most advanced peoples the wife was generally her husband's property, his chattel, his labourer. Nowhere was the husband bound by the same law of marital fidelity as the wife, and in very few places was she compelled to concede to her equal rights in the matter of divorce. Infanticide was generally practised, and the patris pecus of the Roman and the other nations was often offered in sacrifice over even his grown-up children. In a word, the weaker members of the family were everywhere inadequately protected against the stronger.

The Christian Family.—Christ not only restored the family to its original type as something holy, per-
manent, and monogamous, but raised the contract from which it springs to the dignity of a sacrament, and thus placed the family itself upon the plane of the supernatural. The family is holy inasmuch as it is to cooperate with God by procreating children who are destined to be the adopted children of God, and by instructing them for His kingdom. The union between husband and wife is to last until death (Matt., xix, 6 sq.; Luke, xvi, 18; Mark, x, 11; 1 Cor., vii, 10; see Marriage, Divorce). That this is the highest form of the conjugal union, and the best arrangement for the welfare both of the family and of society, will appear to anyone who compares dispassionately the moral and material effects with those flowing from the practice of divorce. Although divorce has obtained to a greater or less extent among the majority of peoples from the beginning until now, "there is abundant evidence that marriage has, upon the whole, become more durable in proportion as the human race has risen to higher degrees of cultivation" (Westermarck, op. cit., p. 535).

While the attempts that have been made to show that divorce is in every case forbidden by the moral law have not been convincing on their own merits, to say nothing of certain facts of Old Testament history, the absolute indissolubility of marriage is nevertheless the ideal to which the natural law points, and consequently is to be expected in an order that is supernatural. In the family, as re-established by Christ, there is likewise no such thing as polygamy (see the references already given in this paragraph). Polygamy is, too, in accord with nature’s ideal. Polygamy is not, indeed, condemned in every instance by the natural law, but it is generally inconsistent with the reasonable welfare of the husband and children, and the proper moral development of the husband. Because of these qualities of permanence and unity, the Christian family implies a real and definite equality of husband and wife. They have equal rights in the matter of the conjugal relation, equal claims upon mutual fidelity, and equal obligations to make this fidelity real. They are equally guilty when they violate these obligations, and equally deserving of pardon when they repent.

The wife is neither the slave nor the property of her husband, but his consort and companion. The Christian family is supernatural, inasmuch as it originates in a bond of love. Through the dispensation of matrimony, husband and wife obtain an increase of sanctifying grace, and a claim upon those actual graces which are necessary to the proper fulfillment of all the duties of family life, and all the relations between husband and wife, parents and children, are supernaturally and sanctified. The end and the ideal of the Christian family are likewise supernatural, namely, the salvation of parents and children, and the union between Christ and His Church. "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it," says St. Paul (Eph., v, 25). And the institution of the conjugal union, the identification, almost, of husband and wife, is seen in the injunction: "So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself" (Eph., v, 28).

From these general facts of the Christian family, the particular relations existing among its members can be readily deduced. Since the average man and woman are not normally complete as individuals, but are rather the two complementary parts of one social organism, in which their material, moral, and spiritual needs receive mutual satisfaction as a primary requisite of the union, it is mutual love. This includes not merely the love of the senses, which is essentially selfish, not necessarily that sentimental love which anthropologists call romantic, but above all that rational love or affection, which springs from an appreciation of qualities of mind and heart, and which impels each to seek the welfare of the other. As the intimate and long association of husband and wife necessarily brings to the surface their less noble and lovable qualities, and as the rearing of children involves great trials, the need of disinterested love, the ability to sacrifice self, is obviously grave.

The obligations of mutual fidelity have been sufficiently stated above. The particular functions of husband and wife in the family are determined by their different natures, and by their relation to the primary end of the family, namely, the procreation of children. Being the provider of the family, and the superior of the wife both in physical strength and in those moral and material qualities which are appropriate to the exercise of authority, the husband is naturally the family’s head, even "the head of the wife," in the language of St. Paul. This does not mean that the wife is the husband’s slave, his servant, or his subject. She is his equal, both as a human being and as member of the conjugal society, save only that when a disagreement arises in matters pertaining to domestic government, she is, as a rule, to yield. To claim for her completely equal authority with the husband is to treat woman as man’s equal in a matter in which nature has made them unequal and has distributed the details of household management of the affairs of the household belong naturally to the wife, because she is better fitted for the obvious tasks than the husband.

Since the primary end of the family is the procreation of children, the husband or wife who shirks this duty incurs the disfavor of the other. All intellectual or moral weakness endangers the family. It can introduce the family to an unnatural and unchristian level. This is emphatically true when the absence of offspring has been effected by any of the artificial and immoral devices so much in vogue at present. When the conjugal union has been blessed with children, both parents are charged, according to the respective functions, with the duty of sustaining and educating those undeveloped members of the family. Their moral and religious formation is for the most part the work of the mother, while the task of providing for their physical and intellectual wants falls chiefly upon the father. The extent to which the different wants of the children are to be supplied will vary with the ability and resources of the parents. Finally, the children are bound, generally speaking, to render to the parents implicit love, reverence, and obedience, until they have reached the majority of age, and improve and respect the family’s authority.

The most important external relations of the family are, of course, those existing between it and the State. According to the Christian conception, the family, rather than the individual, is the social unit and the basis of civil society. To say that the family is the social unit is not to imply that it is the end to which the individual is a means; for the welfare of the individual is the end both of the family and of the State, as well as of every other social organization. The meaning is that the State is formally concerned with the family as such, and not merely with the individual. This distinction is of great practical importance; for while the State ignores or neglects the family, keeping in view only the welfare of the individual, the result is a strong tendency towards the disintegration of the unit in the family. The family is the basis of civil society, inasmuch as the great majority of persons ought to spend practically all their lives in its circle, either as subjects or as heads. Only in the family can the individual be properly reared, educated, and given that formation of character which will make him a good man and a good citizen.

Inasmuch as the average man will not put forth his full productive energies except under the stimulus of its responsibilities, the family is indispensable from the purely economic viewpoint. Now the family cannot rightly discharge its functions unless the parents
have full control over the rearing and education of the children, subject only to such State supervision as is needed to prevent grave neglect of their welfare. Hence it follows that, generally speaking, and with due allowance for particular conditions, the State except for Chief effects it when it prevents the marriage of children, the wants of the child, removes him from parental influence, or specifies the school that he must attend. As a consequence of these concepts and ideals, the Christian family in history has proved itself immeasurably superior to the non-Christian family. It has exhibited greater fidelity between husband and wife, greater reverence for the parents by the children, greater protection of the weaker members by the stronger, and in general a more thorough recognition of the dignity and rights of all within its circle. Its chief glory is undoubtedly its effect upon the position of woman. Notwithstanding the disabilities—for the most part with regard to property, education, and a practically recognized double standard of morals—under which the Christian woman has suffered, she has attained to a height of dignity, respect, and authority for which we shall look in vain in the conjugal society outside of Christianity. The chief factor in this improvement has been the Christian teaching on chastity, conjugal equality, the sacredness of motherhood, and the supernoatural end of the family, together with the Christian model and ideal of family life, the Holy Family at Nazareth.

By intimidation of some writers that the Church's teaching and practice concerning virginity and celibacy, make for the degradation and deterioration of the family, not only springs from a false and perverse view of these practices, but contradicts the facts of history. Although she has always held virginity in high honor, she has never, under any circumstances, sanctified the extreme view, attributed to some ascetical writers, that marriage is a mere concession to the flesh, a sort of tolerated carnal indulgence. In her eyes the marriage rite has ever been a sacrament, the married state a holy state, the family a Divine institution, and family life the normal condition for the great majority of mankind. Indeed, her teaching on virginity, and the spectacle of thousands of her sons and daughters exemplifying that teaching, have in every age constituted a most effective exaltation of chastity in general, and of chastity within as well as without the family. To her it has been combined to convince the wedded, not less than the unwed, that purity and restraint are at once desirable and practically possible. To-day, as always, it is precisely in those communities where virginity is most honoured that the ideal of the family is highest, and its relations pure.

DANGERS FOR THE FAMILY.—Among these are the exaltation of the individual by the State at the expense of the family, which has been going on since the Reformation (cf. the Rev. Dr. Thwing, in Bliss, "Encyclopedia of Social Reform"), and the modern facility of divorce (see Special Report of the U. S. Census, "Women at Work"). This condition implies an increased proportion of the married to the single, that is, an increased proportion of women who are less capable physically of undertaking the burdens of family life, a smaller proportion of marriages, an increase in the proportion of women who, owing to a delusive idea of independence, are disinclined to marry, and a weakening of family bonds and domestic authority. "In 1890, 1 married woman in 22 was a bread-winner; in 1900, 1 in 18" (ibid.). Perhaps the most striking evil result of married women in industry is the high death-rate among infants. For infants under one year the rate in 1900 over the whole United States, was 100 per 1000, but it was at the same rate in the Fall River, where the proportion of married women at work is greatest. As the supreme cause of all these dangers to the family are the decay of religion and the growth of materialistic views of life, so the future of the family will depend upon the extent to which these forces can be checked. And experience shows that there can be no permanent middle ground between the materialistic ideal of divorce, so easy that the marital union will be terminable at the will of the parties, and the Catholic ideal of marriage absolutely indissoluble.

In addition to the authorities cited in the text, the following deserve particular mention: Devas, Studies in Family Life (London, 1880); Riche, The Family, tr. SADDLER (New York, 1896); Contigane, The Ancient City, tr. B. A. Thring, London, 1900); Bousquet, The Family (London, 1906); Thring, The Family (Boston, 1897); Encyclopedia of Social Reform (New York, 1907); Stöckel in Kirchenlexicon.
Fano, Diocese of (Fanensis).—Fano, the ancient Fanum Fortunae, a city of the Marches in the province of Pesaro, Italy, took its name from a celebrated temple of Fortune, which also served as a lighthouse, but the site now occupied by the church of Santa Lucia. Near this city, in 207 a. C., Claudius Nero defeated Hasdrubal; Augustus founded a colony there called Julii Fanens; and, in 371, Aurelian annihilated the Alamanii. Ruins of the Temple of Fortune are still visible, also of a temple of Jupiter, the basilica designed and described by Vitruvius (De aedificiis, VI), and a triumphal arch of Augustus, enlarged by Constantine II in 340. Fano was part of the Pentapolis and with it passed in the eighth century under the domination of the Holy See. The Albeghetti governed it as magistrates during the thirteenth century. From 1306 the Malatesta ruled over it, but in 1465 Federigo di Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino, after having almost destroyed the city, expelled Rodolfo Malatesta. Later the Comneni held almost independent sway.

St. Paternarius is venerated as the first Bishop of Fano and is supposed to have been appointed by Pope Sylvester I. St. Vitalis flourished in the time of Pope Symmachus (498-514). Eusebius accompanied Pope John I to Constantinople (526). Leo and St. Fortunatus belong to the period of St. Gregory the Great. The date of St. Orsus is uncertain. Among the later bishops were Riccardo (1214), persecuted by the magistrates Albeghetti; and the Dominican Pietro Bertano (1537), a distinguished orator and advocate at the Council of Trent. Fano is an exempt diocese (see DIOCES) and has 55,775 inhabitants, 45 parishes, 1 educational institution for girls, 6 religious houses of men, and 8 of women.

Cappellani, Le Chiese d'Italia (Venice, 1844), II, 321-43; Amani, Memorie storiche di Fano (Fano, 1721).

U. BENIGNI.

Fanon, a shoulder-cape worn by the pope alone, consisting of two pieces of white silk ornamented with narrow woven stripes of red and gold; the pieces are made two in number, somewhat unequal in size, and the smaller is laid on and fastened to the larger one. To allow the head to pass through is made in the middle a round opening with a vertical slit running down farther. The front part of the fanon is ornamented with a small cross embroidered in gold.

The fanon is like an amice; it is, however, put on under but above the alb. The pope wears it only when celebrating a solemn pontifical Mass, that is, only when all the pontifical vestments are used. The manner of putting on the fanon recalls the method of assuming the amice universal in the Middle Ages and still observed by some of the older orders (see AMICE). After the deacon has vested the pope with the usual amice, alb, the cinctulum and sub-cinctorum, and the pectoral cross, he draws on, by means of the opening, the fanon and then turns the half of the upper piece towards the back over the pope’s head. He now vests the pope with the stole, tunicle, dalmatic, and chasuble, then turns down that part of the fanon which had been placed over the head of the pope, draws the front half of the upper piece above the tunicle, dalmatic, and chasuble, and finally arranges the whole upper piece so that it covers the shoulders of the pope like a collar.

The fanon is mentioned in the oldest known Roman Ordinal, consequently its use in the eighth century can be proved. It was then called analogiogium (anogoglium), yet it was not at that period a vestment reserved for the pope but the use of the papal fanon did not appear until the other ecclesiastics at Rome began to put the vestment on under the alb instead of over it, that is, when it became customary among the clergy to use the fanon as an ordinary amice. This happened, apparently in imitation of the usage outside of Rome, between the tenth and twelfth centuries; however, the exact date cannot be given. But it is certain that as early as the latter part of the twelfth century the fanon was worn solely by the pope, as is evident from the express statement of Innocent III (1198-1216). The vestment was then called an orale; the name of fanon, from the late Latin fanum, derived from fanus, pater, cloth, woven fabric, was not used until a subsequent age. Even as early as the eighth century the pope wore the fanon only at solemn high Mass. The present usage, according to which the pope is vested, in addition to the fanon, with an amice under the alb, did not appear, at the earliest, until the close of the Middle Ages.

As to the form of the fanon and the material from which it was made in early times no positive information exists. Late in the Middle Ages it was made of white silk, as is shown by the inventory of the year 1295 of the papal treasure, as well as by numerous works of art; the favourite ornamentation was one of narrow stripes of gold and of Ochre color, especially red, woven into the silk. Up into the fifteenth century the fanon was square in shape; the present collar-like form seems to have appeared about the sixteenth century or even later.

Faraud, Henri, titular Bishop of Anémour and first Vicar Apostolic of Athabasca-Mackenzie, Canada; b. 17 March, 1823, at Gigondas, France; d. at St. Boniface, Manitoba, 26 September, 1890. After admission to the juniorate of the Oblates of the Good Shepherd, he was sent to the missions of Northern America, and ordained priest, 8 May, 1847, at St. Boniface, Manitoba. Then he replaced Father (afterwards Bishop) Lafleche at Ile-ala-Crosse, and in 1849 he proceeded further North, establishing the mission of Lake Athabasca, which he inaugurated 8 September, 1851. The following year, he visited Great Slave Lake, where no missionary had ever been, and ministered to the Indians of Peace River (1858-59). On the 13th of May, 1862, he was made titular of the newly created Vicariate Apostolic of Athabasca-Mackenzie; but such was his isolation from the civilized world, that he did not know of it before July of the following year.

Mgr. Guilbert, of Tours, consecrated Bishop of Anémour, 30 Nov., 1864, a title he bore for twenty-five years, during which he evidenced considerable administrative abilities, founding missionary posts as far as the Frozen Ocean, on the one side, and the Peace and Liard Rivers, on the other. In 1835 he repaired to France, for the General Chapter of his Congregation. In 1889 he was one of the Fathers of the Provincial Council of St. Boniface, at the termination of which his growing infirmities prevented him from returning to his distant missions in the North.

Le Manitoba (3 October, 1890), files; Fernand Michel, Dix ans chez les Sauvages (Paris, 1886). A. G. MORICE.

Farfa, Abbey of, situated about 26 miles from Rome, not far from the Faraf Sabina Railway station. A legend in the "Chronicon Farfense" relates the foundation of a monastery at Farfa in the time of the Emperors Julian, or Gratian, by the Syrian St. Laurentius, who had come to Rome with his sister, Susanah, and had been made Bishop of Spoleto. The legend goes on to say that he afterwards became enangoured of the monastic life, and chose a wooded hill near the Fara stream, a tributary of the Tiber, on which he built a church to Our Lady, and a monastery.
Archeological discoveries in 1888 seem to prove that the first monastic establishment was built on the ruins of a pagan temple. This first monastery was devastated by the Vandals in the fifth century, doubtless about the year 457.

In the eleventh century, a wave of monasticism from the North spread over Italy. The foundation of Bobbio by St. Columbanus, and the foundation of Farfa by monks from Gaul, about 681, heralded a revival of the great Benedictine tradition in Italy. The "Consecrato Monasterii Farfense", a writing which dates probably from 857, relates at length the story of its principal founder Thomas de Maurienne; he had made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and spent three years there. While in prayer before the Holy Sepulchre, Our Lady in a vision warned him to return to Italy, and restore Farfa; and the Duke of Spoleto, Faroaldo, who had also had a vision, was commanded to aid in this work. At a very early date we find traces of this legend in connexion with the foundation by three nobles from Beneventum of the monastery of St. Vincent on the Volturino, over which Farfa claimed jurisdiction. Thomas died in 720; and for more than a century Farfa was ruled by prelates from Beneventum.

The Lombard chiefs, and later the Carolingians, succeeded in withdrawing Farfa from obedience to the Bishops of Rieti, and in securing many immunities and privileges for the monastery. If we may credit the "Chronicon Farfense", Farfa was at this period the most important monastery in Italy from the point of view of worldly possession and ecclesiastical dignity, with the exception of Nonantula. It had one large basilican church and five smaller ones, rich in masterpieces of religious orfevrerie. The greed of the Saracens was excited; and about 890, during the government of Abbot Peter, they swooped down on the place. Peter held out against them for seven years, and then resolved to abandon the monastery. He divided his monks into three sections and shared the abbey's wealth among them—one section he sent towards Rome, one towards Rieti, and one towards the county of Fermo. The Saracens preserved Farfa as a stronghold, but some Christian robbers set fire to it by mistake.

Between 930 and 936, it was rebuilt by Abbot Ratfredus, who was afterwards poisoned by two wicked monks, Camano and Hildebrand, who divided the wealth of the abbey between them, and ruled it until Alberic, Prince of the Romans, called in Odo of Cluny to reform Farfa and other monasteries. Campo was driven out; and a holy monk named Dagibert took his place. At the end of five years, he also died by poison—and the moral condition of Farfa was once more deplorable. The monks robbed the altars of their ornaments, and led lives of unbridled vice.

Abbot John III, consecrated, about 967, by the pope, succeeded, owing to the protection of the Emperor Otto, in re-establishing a semblance of order. But the great reformer of Farfa was Hugues (996-1010). His nomination as abbot was not secured without sinomy—but the success of his government palliates the vice of his election. At this instance, Odo, Abbot of Cluny, and William, Abbot of Dijon, visited Farfa, and re-established there the love of prayer which were the fruits of his labors.

Two of Hugues's successors, Berard, Abbot from 1019 to 1089, made the abbey a great seat of intellectual activity. The monk, Gregory of Catino (b. 1060) arranged the archives. To substantiate Farfa's claims, and the rights of its monks, he edited the "Regesto di Farfa", or "Consuetudines archivi Farfensis" composed of 1324 documents, all very important for the history of Italian society in the eleventh century. Ugo Balzani praised the accuracy and exactness of this work published in 1103, Gregory wrote the "Largitorium", or "Liber Notarius sive emphementricus", a lengthy list of all the concessions, or grants, made by the monastery to its tenants. Having collected all this detailed information, he set to work on a history of the monastery, the "Chronicon Farfense"; and when he was 70 years old, in order to facilitate reference to his earlier works, he compiled a sort of index which he styled "Liber Floriger Chartarum cenobi Farfensis". Gregory was a man of real learning, remarkable in that, as early as the eleventh century, he wrote a history with accuracy of every point, and a great wealth of information.

The monks of Farfa owned 683 churches or convents; two towns, Centumcellae (Civitavecchia) and Alatri; 132 castles; 7 sea-ports; 8 salt-mines; 14 villages; 82 mills; 315 hamlets. All this wealth was a hindrance to the religious life once more, between 1119 and 1171. And Farfa was fragmented by the rivalries between Abbot Guido, and the monk Berard who aimed at being abbot. During the Investiture conflict, Farfa was, more or less, on the side of the Ghibellines. The "Orthodoxa defenso imperialis", written in support of the Ghibelline party, is, according to Bethmann, the work of Gregory, and that of one of his disciples, according to Balzani. The collection of canonical texts contained in the "Regesto", which has been studied by Paul Fournier, seems to omit purposely any mention of the canonical texts of the reforming popes of the eleventh century. But when, in 1262, the victory of the popes over the last of the Hohenstaufen put an end to Germanic sway in Italy, Farfa sought the protection of Urban IV, as we learn from a privilege granted on 23 Feb., 1262, and published by Jean Guiraud. At the end of the fourteenth century the Abbey of Farfa became a cardinalia

Fargo (Farqus), Diocese of (Farquensis), suffragan of St. Paul, U.S.A., embracing the whole of the State of North Dakota, an area of 70,195 square miles. It was established in 1889.

The first Mass, in the territory now comprised in the Diocese of Fargo, was celebrated in Pembina, September 22, 1818, by Rev. Sévere Joseph Norbert Dumoulin, who was one of the missionaries sent to the Selkirk colony by Bishop Plessis of Quebec. Father Dumoulin was born on Montreal, 5 Dec., 1793, ordained priest in the Nicolet Seminary, 23 Feb., 1817, left Quebec for the Selkirk colony, 19 May, 1818, and arrived at Fort Douglas (now St. Boniface, Manitoba), 16 July, 1818. In August, 1823, Father Dumoulin returned to Can-
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in the dominion the which title was suppressed by the Holy See, 6 April, 1897, and changed to Fargo in accordance with the bishop's request. At its formation the diocese contained a population of 19,000, of whom 8000 were Indians and half-breeds. The population (1908) is about 70,000.

With the creation of the diocese the Rev. John Shanley was named its first bishop. He was born at Albion, New York, 4 Jan., 1852, and ordained priest 30 May, 1874, at Rome. His consecration as bishop took place at St. Paul, 27 Dec., 1889. Thereafter he was in the diocese 30 priests, 40 churches, an academy for girls, a hospital, and 3 parochial schools. There are now (1909) in the diocese a mitred abbot, 110 priests, 215 churches, 15 parochial schools, 4 Indian schools, 3 hospitals, an orphanage, a college for boys, and 6 academies for girls. In eighteen years the number of priests quadrupled and the number of churches more than quintupled.

The Benedictine Fathers have an abbey at Richardson, and a priory at Devil's Lake, from which points they attend several missions. Connected with the Pothole Abbey is a college for boys. The Benedictine Sisters are in charge of several schools, and the Presentation Nuns in charge of schools and orphanages. Other communities are: Sisters of Mercy (hospital and schools); Sisters of St. Joseph (hospitals and school); Sisters of Charity, or Grey Nuns (Indian school); Sisters of Mercy of the Presentation (schools).


JOHN SHANLEY.

Faribault, George-Barthelemy, archeologist, b. at Quebec, Canada, 3 Dec., 1789; d. 22 Dec., 1866. He was a first cousin of Jean-Baptiste, founder of the city of Faribault, Minn., U. S. A. After attending a school taught by a Scotch veteran of Wolfe's army, he completed his course preparatory to the study of law and was admitted to the Bar in 1811. In 1812 he served as a militiaman during the invasion of Canada by the Americans. In 1822 he entered the civil service, attaining in 1832 the rank of assistant clerk of the Legislative Assembly, an office he continued to hold after the union of the Canadas (1841) until 1855, when ill-health forced him to resign. Passionately fond of his country and of its past glories, he spent all his leisure in collecting documents and books pertaining to Canadian history. His fine collection (1700) of rare books and original manuscripts perished at the burning of the Parliament House in Montreal (1849). He courageously began a second collection, which he bequeathed to Laval University. Faribault published no original works, merely reproducing and annotating a series of rare historical papers in the transactions of the Quebec Literary and Historical Society, of which he was one of the chief promoters and benefactors. His principal publication is the "Catalogue of Works" relating to the history of America, with bibliographical, critical, and literary notes (Quebec, 1837), which, although superseded by a few later catalogues, ranks among the best. In 1839 he realized the long-postponed plan, conceived in 1761 by Montcalm's companions in arms, of erecting a monument near the spot where nearly 8000 were Indians and half-breed, written by the French Academy at the time the subject was first brought up and approved by William Pitt, was duly inscribed. In private life Faribault was the type of the Christian gentleman, modest, hospitable, and charitable. He counted none but friends, and left his record of a blameless career, devoted to the service of God and country.

MORGAN, Bibliotheca Canadensis (Ottawa, 1867); CABRIN, Œuvres complètes (Quebec, 1873).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Faribault, Jean-Baptiste, trader with the Indians and early settler in Minnesota, U. S. A.; b. 19 October, 1774, at Berthier, Lower Canada; d. at Faribault, Minnesota, 20 August, 1860. His father Barthélemy Faribault, a lawyer of Paris, France, settled in Canada towards the middle of the eighteenth century, and served as military secretary to the French army in America. After the occupation of the country by the English he retired to private life in Beauce and held the office of notary public. Young Jean-Baptiste received a good school education, and after several years of mercantile employment at Quebec, entered the service of the Northwest Fur Company. In May, 1795, he went with others to the island of Michilimackinac or Mackinac, one of the depots of the company. For over ten years he traded with the Potowatomie Indians at Kankakee, with the Dakota or the Sioux Indians at Redwood, on the Des Moines river, and at Little Rapids, on the St. Peter or Minnesota river. During his residence at Little Rapids, in 1806, he was married to Pelagia Hanse, a half-breed daughter of Major Hanse. In 1809, he settled in the small village of Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, and commenced trading, on his own account, with the Indian tribes of the Winnebagoes, Foxes, and Sioux. In addition to this, he conducted an exchange of lead with Julien Dubuque, at the post the company occupied under that name. During the war with England (1812-14) Faribault refused to enlist in the English army, and suffered imprisonment and the loss of all his goods in consequence. After the conclusion of the war, in 1816, he became a citizen of the United States, and recommenced his trade at Prairie du Chien. In 1819 he removed to Pike Island in the Mississippi River, and in 1826 to the village of St. Peter, or Mendota, Minnesota, opposite the military post of Fort Snelling. There he remained until the last years of his life, which was spent in the city of Faribault, Minnesota. A county in southern Minnesota was named after him, and the city of that name after his eldest son. Faribault was always kind and generous to the Indians, and tried to elevate them by teaching them the useful arts of life, and by instilling into them the principles of Christianity. He was much attached to the Catholic faith of his childhood and presented a house for a chapel to Father Lucien Galtier, the first resident missionary in Minnesota (1840).

M. PH. DE LIPAYS, Memoire de Jean Baptiste Faribault en Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society (St. Paul, 1880), III; TASSY, Les Canadiens de l'Ouest (Montreal, 1879), I; Encyclopédie de la Bible;辽宁省Minnesota (Chicago, 1899); Kirkup, History of Faribault County, Minnesota (Minneapolis, 1896).

FRANCIS J. SCHLEEF.

Farinato, Paolo, an Italian painter, b. at Verona, 1524; d. there, 1606. He belonged to the old Florentine family of Farinato degli Uberti, the famous head of the Ghibelline party, whom Dante placed in his Inferno. When the Guelfs triumphed, the Uberti were expelled and part of the family settled at Verona; it was to this branch that this painter belonged. In his native town Paolo was a pupil of Giosino, who was carrying on there the artistic tradition of Liberale, the greatest perhaps of Italian miniatiursts, whose wonderful illuminations in the choir books of the Libreria di Siena (1470-1476), his blustering Boreas, his Mass of which the celebrant is his father, and the angelic figure of St. Gabriel, the magician's, his startling view of the Castle of Sant' Angelo, are well known.

It thus came about that in Verona, a town without any great artistic past, a really original school was being formed, unstrammled by traditions and therefore all the more free to indulge in those novel colour schemes in painting which had already found startling expression in the mausoleums of Cane Grande della Scala, and the barons of his family. Towards the close of the fifteenth century, in the neighbourhood of Verona, the Venetian masters, Giovanni Bellini, Giorgione, and Titian, had just brought about a great artis-
tie revolution. They had invented colouring as an essential branch of the painter’s art. But great masters that they were, they were also men of intellectual genius and cared too much for the idea and its expression to give themselves up utterly to the purely sensuous. Only Braida, and not Farinati, had discovered the pure material colourings.

The Veronese School, on the contrary, less concerned with the higher walks of art, and untrained in the quest of lofty ideals, seized straightforwardly on colouring as the language best suited to express its own temperament. Colouring soon became its unique preoccupation and it was from this school the greatest colourist and painter of all time was to come forth, if the measure of greatness among painters is their ability to speak in colouring, Paolo Caliari, of Verona, known as Veronese. It is on this account that Gismondo and his pupils, Brusasorci and Farinati, are of such interest in the history of art. It is in their works that we note the blending of the two styles, and the use of colouring as an exclusive source of pleasure in painting: they were the heralds of Veronese and his immediate precursors. More than one sketch by Brusasorci is even now masquerading as a Veronese. Much later, however, the use of these artist’s paintings generally loses its moral purpose and becomes merely one of the decorative arts, giving promise already of that gaudy evolution that was to end in Tiepolo.

In this transformation Farinati played a very important part. He had a decided talent for fresco, and like his brother he was largely occupied on the decorations of the façades of the houses in Verona, which give that town and its famous Piazza dell’Erbe so winsome and engaging an appearance. Unfortunately, Farinati did not remain faithful to his native genius. At Mantua he fell under the influence of Giulio Romano, who, with his own captivation and his vulgar faults, had inherited all the prestige of the divine Raphael. It was under this influence that Paolo executed his “St. Martin” in the Blessed Sacrament Chapel of the cathedral at Mantua: and from this time onward his works betray for the most part a hybrid compromise between the corrupt Roman style and the light impressionist colouring of Veronese. In Mantua also his principal works are preserved. In Santa Maria in Organo, a “Massacre of the Innocents” (1556), and a “Christ Walking on the Waters” (1558); in San Tommaso, a “Glorification of the B. Virgin” (1569); in Sant’ Anastasia, a “Pentecost” (1598), and in San Giorgio in Braida, a “Multiplication of the Loaves” (1603).

Though four years older than Veronese, Farinati survived him by nearly twenty years, and was over eighty when he died. He was a most prolific painter and many of his works have found their way to other lands. In the United States there are two or three, one at Cleveland, in the Holden Collection, an allegory of “Autumn”; one at New Haven in the Jarvis Collection, “Christ Appearing to Some Saints”; and one at the Historical Society in New York, an “Abraham Driving away Hagar.” The famous painting in the Louvre, representing “The Council of Trent”, and generally attributed to Titian, has been assigned to Farinati by Berenson.

LOUIS GILLET.

Farrati, Daniele, ecclesiastical historian, b. at San Daniele del Friuli in the present Italian province of Udine, 22 February, 1690; d. 25 April, 1773. After having been a priest at Gorizia he entered the congregation of Jesus at Bologna. He was for five years teacher of classics at the Jesuit college in Padua, and then went to Rome, where he completed his theological studies, was ordained priest, in 1722, and was soon sent to Padua, to assist Father Filippo Riceputi in the latter’s historical labours. Riceputi intended to write a complete ecclesiastical history of Illyria, and in 1720 had issued, at Padua, a prospectus of this monumental enterprise. During twenty years they both searched and unwearedly industry in all the libraries and archives of ancient Illyria, for the material for their work; the matter they collected filled three hundred MS. volumes. In 1742, just as two of the larger divisions, the martyrology of Illyria and the life of San Pietro Orsoco, were about completed, Riceputi died. Thus Farrati was left alone to work into presentable shape the prodigious amount of material collected. As co-labourer he chose Father Jacopo Coleti. The first volume of “Illyricum Sacrum” appeared at Venice, in 1751; it contained the history of the Church of Salona up to the fourth century. Three further volumes appeared in rapid succession; while the fifth was in press Farrati died. His assistant Coleti finished the fifth volume, which appeared in 1775, and issued three more, the last being completed in 1818. The whole work fills eight well-executed folio volumes.

J. P. Kirsch.

Farley, John M. See New York, Archdiocese of.

Farmer, Ferdinand. See Steinmetz, Ferdinand.

Farnese, Alessandro, the name of two cardinals. For the elder Paul III, pope. The younger, Alessandro Farnese, eldest son of Pier Luigi, first Duke of Parma and brother of Pope Paul III, was born 7 Oct., 1520, and died at Rome, Feb., 1589. While yet a student at Bologna, in 1534, Clement VII appointed him administrator of the Diocese of Parma; Jan. 18 Dec. of the same year, his uncle, Paul III, created him Cardinal-Deacon of the Title of S. Angelo, and conferred on him numerous offices and benefices. Thus, he was Vice-Chancellor of the Holy Roman Church, Governor of Tivoli, Archpriest of St. Mary Major’s, Archpriest of St. Peter’s, Administrator of Jaen, Spain, of Viseu, Portugal, of Wurzburg, Germany, and of Avignon, France. In 1536 he was made Bishop of Monreale, Sicily, where, in 1552, he founded a Jesuit College, and, in 1559, convoked a synod. He was also Bishop of Massa (1558), and Archbishop of Tours (1559), later exchanging this see for that of Cahors, from which he resigned in 1557. Bishop of Parma (1556); of Montefiascone (1571); finally Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia and Velletri (1580). He was papallegate for the province of the Patrimony, and afterwards of the county of Avignon, where he displayed great administrative ability, especially during the plague of 1541.

He was very zealous in behalf of the poor. Farnese was employed by the popes on various legations and embassies. In 1539, he was legatus a latere of Paul III at the court of Charles V, to make peace between the emperor and the King of France, and to sever the alliance with England, as also to arrange for a general council. In 1543 he went again to the court of Charles V, and later to that of Francis I, and was present at the meeting of the two sovereigns in Paris, returning with Charles to Flanders. In the war between his brother Ottavio, Duke of Parma, and Pope Julius III, he prudently held aloof, first at Florence and then at Avignon. In 1545 he went on a special embassy to Charles V in reference to the council, and in 1546 he accompanied the pontifical troops sent to the aid of Charles V against the Smalkald League. In 1580, he was one of the candidates for the papacy. Charles V greatly esteemed his sagacity. Farnese was an ardent promoter of the Tridentine reforms. Above all he was a lover and patron of literature, science, and art, especially ecclesiastical. He used to say that “there is nothing more despicable
than a cowardly soldier or an ignorant priest." He patroonized the architect Vignolo, to whom he entrusted the construction both of the church of the Gesù in Rome, of which he laid the corner-stone in 1568, and of the superb Farnese palace of Caprarola near Viterbo. He restored the monastery of Tre Fontane, where he had the chapel of Santa Maria. Scala Codii erected; and he had the ceiling of San Lorenzo in Damaso magnificently decorated. He was buried in front of the high altar in the church of the Gesù.

CLAESONER, VITA Pontificum, III, 558 sqq.; EHRE, Concilium Tridentinum, Diario, etc. (Freiburg, 1901), 1; (1904), IV.

U. BENIGNI.

Faro, Diocese of (Pharennis), suffragan of Evora, Portugal, and extending over the province of Algarve. The see was founded at Ossenoba in 306, which place falling into the hands of the Moors, in 688, the see was suppressed. It was re-established in 1188 at Siloes, and in 1218 was made suffragan to Braga, then to Seville, in 1393 to Lisbon and finally, in 1540, to Evora. The title was transferred to Faro, 30 March, 1577. Faro is the chief seaport town of the province, and is located on the Rio Pernoso, near its mouth. The cathedral, an imposing structure, with nave-vaulting springing from lofty cylindrical columns, is anterior by a Roman basilica altered by the Carolingian. Several convents, a hospital, and charitable institutions are well appointed. There are 66 parishes, 214 churches, 112 priests and 228,384 Catholics in the diocese.

WERNER, Orbis Terrarum (Freiburg im Br., 1890); BUCHERGER, Kirchliches Handlex. (Munich, 1907).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Faro Islands.—Geography and Statistics.—A group of Danish islands rising from the sea some four hundred miles west of Norway and almost as far south of Iceland. It embraces fourteen inhabited and several uninhabited islands with an area of 300 square miles. Of this one-third belongs to Strömö. This archipelago is divided by a number of small sounds and consists of dark grey rocks which form plateaux usually about 300 yards high. These plateaux slope towards the sea, are fissured by streams and are here and there surrounded by lofty peaks (Slattaretind, or rock peaks). The sky is usually cloudy, squalls and storms are frequent. The surging waters make navigation dangerous especially in winter. The climate is oceanic, but as the summer heat rarely rises above 10° and the soil is poor, agriculture is possible only in sheltered spots. Trees are few in number, but shrubs flourish in more abundance. The chief wealth and attraction of the islands are found in their flowery pastures, while the herds of sheep which graze upon them have given their name to the archipelago. Upwards of 100,000 of these animals live always in the open air and are famous for their superior quality and wool. A few small, raw-boned horses are employed solely as beasts of burden, for roads are unknown, nor is any shelter provided for them. More attention is paid to the horned cattle, which number about 5000. Besides the above-mentioned quadrupeds, rats and mice are the only land animals or mammals to be found. Many species of birds and in great numbers haunt the islands. The surrounding waters abound in delicious fish and whales and dolphins rich in blubber. The yearly catch of the round-headed dolphin alone (the Grind) amounts to a thousand. Reptiles and frogs are unknown, and there are but few insects.

The 16,000 inhabitants of the Faroe Islands are all Lutherans. They speak a dialect akin to the Old Norse, but Danish is used in public life, the schools, and the churches. The fisheries, cattle-breeding, and the more perilous bird-catching are the chief sources of income. The few local industries scarcely suffice for the needs of the natives. Turf is used for fires, there being no coal. There is considerable commerce. The export are fish, blubber, meat, wool, feathers, and down; the imports are wood, coal, and large quantities of cereals and fruit. Thorshavn on Strömö is the capital and seat of government, and has a real-schule, or technical school. Throughout the rest of this island there are only wooden huts covered with turf.

POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS HISTORY.—From the work of Dicuil, an Irish monk, "De Mensurâ orbis terre" (ed. Parthey, Berlin, 1872), written in the ninth century, we learn that the islands were discovered by Irish monks. Not long after, the island was colonized by Normans. Harold Schônhaar (872-930) united them with the Kingdom of Norway and this was their political condition during 1814. Olaf Tryggvason converted the people to Christianity; as early as 1076 they had a bishop of their own. The bishops of the Faroe Islands were usually chosen from the canons of Bergen, and were originally suffragans of Hamburg-Bremen, later of Lund (1104), finally (since 1152) of the Primate of Norway in Trondheim. There were in all twenty-three Catholic bishops, from Gudmund to Amund Olafson. The latter was forced to yield to the Lutheran bishop who also took over the episcopal title. Later on only "provosts" were elected. The Catholic clergy remained steadfast in their faith, but were unable to resist the advance of Protestantism. By the end of the sixteenth century the Catholic Faith had disappeared; all late attempts to revive it proved vain. The mission founded some years ago in Thorshavn was abandoned and the few (mostly transient) Catholics on the islands were attended once a year from Copenhagen. In the Catholic epoch, at least, no little attention was paid to the construction and adornment of churches, as may be seen from the ruins of the unfinished cathedral of Kirkebø. The thick basaltic walls broken by high, massive windows are evidence that the original builders meant to erect a noble Gothic church. It remained unfinished because under the "new Gospel" the generosity of the faithful was soon extinguished. A small stone church of the twelfth century serves yet for Protestant worship. It contains sculpture belonging to pre-Reformation times.

LOFFLER, Dänemarks natur und Volk (Copenhagen, 1905); S. SKANDER, Gesch. der dänischen Skanderker; STYVRE, Skandinavien under Unionstiden (Stockholm, 1890); H. BIHLANDER, Hist. taf. skrifter om Norge og norske Lande (Oslo, 1895); BAUMGARTNER, Nordische Fakten (Freiburg, 1889), 1; Katholische Missionen (Freiburg, July-Dec., 1873); "Faroer" in Kirchenlex. s. v. Provisor, Jefferison, The Faroe Islands (London, 1897).

Pius Wittman.

Fast, in general abstinence from food or drink, a term common to the various Teutonic tongues. Some derive the word from a root whose primary signification means to hold, to keep, to observe or to restrain one's self. The Latin term ijetium denotes an animal intestine which is always empty. Such abstinence varies according to the measure of restriction circumscribing the use of food and drink. Hence it may denote abstinence from all kinds of food and drink for a given period. Such is the nature of the fast prescribed by the Church before Holy Communion (natural fast). It may also mean such abstinence from food and drink as is dictated by the bodily or mental dispositions peculiar to each individual, and is then known as moral or philosophical fast. In like manner the term compunctiones are common to various religious communities in the Church. Finally, in the strict acceptance of the term, fasting denotes abstinence from food, and as such is an act of temperance finding its raison d'être in the dictates of natural law and its full perfection in the requirements of positive ecclesiastical legislation.

In Christian antiquity the Eustathians (Sozomen,
Hence, Christians, of the Church fasts; they were condemned (380) by the Synod of Gangra (can. xiv), which also asserted incidentally the traditional antiquity of the ecclesiastical fasts (Hefele-Leclercq, Hist. def. of Church, tr. P. J. Fitzpatrick, 1908, 1, p. 1041). Contrary to the groundless assertions of these sectaries, moralists are one in maintaining that a natural law inculcates the necessity of fasting because every rational creature is bound to labour intelligently for the subjugation of concupiscence. As a consequence, rational moralists are logically commensurate with the attainment of this end (see MORIFICATION). Amongst the means naturally subserving this purpose fasting lays claim to a place of primary importance. The function of positive law is to intervene in designating days on which this obligation is to be observed, as well as the manner in which the same obligation is to be discharged on days authoritatively appointed.

What pertains to the origin as well as to the historical development of this obligation in the Church may be gleaned easily from the articles on Abstinence (327) and Fasting (328), in Black's CATECHISM, and Black's FAST. The ecclesiastical in its genius, is unwritten in its origin, and consequently must be understood and applied with due regard for the customs of various times and places. See the corresponding historical-archeological articles in the various modern dictionaries and encyclopaedias. The Christian Archeologist, Kraus, Smith and Cheetham, Cabrol and Leclercq. Details will be found under ADVENT; LENT; FRIDAY, SATURDAY; VIGIL; EMBER DAYS.

In the United States of America all the days of Lent; the Fridays of Advent (generally); the Ember Days; the Dormition of the Virgin; and the Assumption; of all Saints, are now fasting days. In Great Britain, Ireland, Australia and Canada, the days just indicated, together with the Wednesdays of Advent and (28 June) the vigils of Sts. Peter and Paul, are fasting days. Fasting essentially consists in eating but one full meal in twenty-four hours and that about midday. It also implies the obligation of abstaining from flesh meat during the same period, unless legitimate authority grants permission to eat meat. The quantity of food and drink that the meal has never been made the subject of positive legislation. Whosoever therefore eats a hearty or sumptuous meal in order to bear the burden of fasting satisfies the obligation of fasting. Any excess during the meal militates against the virtue of temperance, without jeopardizing the obligation of fasting.

According to general usage, noon is the proper time for this meal. For good reasons this hour may be legitimately anticipated. Grievous sin is not committed even though this meal is taken a full hour before noon without sufficient reason, because the substance of fasting, which consists in taking but one full meal a day, is not imperilled. In like manner, the hour for the midday meal and the collation, may for good reasons be conscientiously inverted. In many of our larger cities this practice now prevails. According to D'Annibale (summulæ Theologicae Moralis, 4 ed., 1812, 134) and Noldin (Syllabus Theologiae Moralis, 674) good reasons justify one in taking a collation in the morning, dinner at noon, and the morning allowance in the evening, because the substance of fasting still remains intact. Nothing like a noteworthy interruption should be admitted during the course of the meal, because such a break virtually forms two meals instead of one. Common sense, taking into consideration individual intention and the duration of the interruption, must finally determine whether a given interruption is noteworthy or not. Ordinarily an interruption of one half hour is considered slight. Nevertheless, an individual, after having commenced the midday meal and meeting with a bona fide interruption lasting for an hour or more is fully justified in resuming and finishing the meal after the termination of an interruption. Finally, unless special reasons suggest the contrary, it is not allowed to give immediate reparation both to the quantity and the quality of viands allowed at this repast. In the first place, about eight ounces of food are permitted at the collation even though this amount of food would fully satisfy the appetites of some persons. Moreover, due attention must be paid to each person's temperament, duties, length of fast, etc. Hence, much more food is allowed in cold than in warm climates, more to those working during the day than to those at ease, more to the weak and hungry than to the strong and well fed. As a general rule whatever is deemed necessary in order to enable people to give more attention to their duties must be allowed. Moreover, since custom first introduced the collation, the usage of each country must be considered in determining the quality of viands permitted thereat. In some places eggs, milk, butter, cheese and fish are prohibited, whilst bread, cake, fruit, herbs and vegetables are permitted. In other places, milk, eggs, cheese, butter and fish are permitted, owing either to custom or to Indult. This is the case in the United States. However, in order to form judgments perfectly safe concerning this point, the Lenten regulations of each diocese should be carefully read. Finally, a little tea or coffee, or water, (14 Aug.) of the Assumption; (31 Oct.) of All Saints., are now fasting days. In Great Britain, Ireland, Australia and Canada, the days just indicated, together with the Wednesdays of Advent and (28 June) the vigils of Sts. Peter and Paul, are fasting days. Fasting essentially consists in eating but one full meal in twenty-four hours and that about midday. It also implies the obligation of abstaining from flesh meat during the same period, unless legitimate authority grants permission to eat meat. The quantity of food and drink that the meal has never been made the subject of positive legislation. Whosoever therefore eats a hearty or sumptuous meal in order to bear the burden of fasting satisfies the obligation of fasting. Any excess during the meal militates against the virtue of temperance, without jeopardizing the obligation of fasting.

According to general usage, noon is the proper time for this meal. For good reasons this hour may be legitimately anticipated. Grievous sin is not committed even though this meal is taken a full hour before noon without sufficient reason, because the substance of fasting, which consists in taking but one full meal a day, is not imperilled. In like manner, the hour for the midday meal and the collation, may for good reasons be conscientiously inverted. In many of our larger cities this practice now prevails. According to D'Annibale (summulæ Theologicae Moralis, 4 ed., 1812, 134) and Noldin (Syllabus Theologiae Moralis, 674) good reasons justify one in taking a collation in the morning, dinner at noon, and the morning allowance in the evening, because the substance of fasting still remains intact. Nothing like a noteworthy interruption should be admitted during the course of the meal, because such a break virtually forms two meals instead of one. Common sense, taking into consideration individual intention and the duration of the interruption, must finally determine whether a given interruption is noteworthy or not. Ordinarily an interruption of one half hour is considered slight. Nevertheless, an individual, after having commenced the midday meal and meeting with a bona fide interruption lasting for an hour or more is fully justified in resuming and finishing the meal after the termination of an interruption. Finally, unless special reasons suggest the contrary, it is not allowed to give immediate reparation both to the quantity and the quality of viands allowed at this repast. In the first place, about eight ounces of food are permitted at the collation even though this amount of food would fully satisfy the appetites of some persons. Moreover, due attention must be paid to each person's temperament, duties, length of fast, etc. Hence, much more food is allowed in cold than in warm climates, more to those working during the day than to those at ease, more to the weak and hungry than to the strong and well fed. As a general rule whatever is deemed necessary in order to enable people to give more attention to their duties must be allowed. Moreover, since custom first introduced the collation, the usage of each country must be considered in determining the quality of viands permitted thereat. In some places eggs, milk, butter, cheese and fish are prohibited, whilst bread, cake, fruit, herbs and vegetables are permitted. In other places, milk, eggs, cheese, butter and fish are permitted, owing either to custom or to Indult. This is the case in the United States. However, in order to form judgments perfectly safe concerning this point, the Lenten regulations of each diocese should be carefully read. Finally, a little tea or coffee, or water, (14 Aug.) of the Assumption; (31 Oct.) of All Saints., are now fasting days. In Great Britain, Ireland, Australia and Canada, the days just indicated, together with the Wednesdays of Advent and (28 June) the vigils of Sts. Peter and Paul, are fasting days. Fasting essentially consists in eating but one full meal in twenty-four hours and that about midday. It also implies the obligation of abstaining from flesh meat during the same period, unless legitimate authority grants permission to eat meat. The quantity of food and drink that the meal has never been made the subject of positive legislation. Whosoever therefore eats a hearty or sumptuous meal in order to bear the burden of fasting satisfies the obligation of fasting. Any excess during the meal militates against the virtue of temperance, without jeopardizing the obligation of fasting.

According to general usage, noon is the proper time for this meal. For good reasons this hour may be legitimately anticipated. Grievous sin is not committed even though this meal is taken a full hour before noon without sufficient reason, because the substance of fasting, which consists in taking but one full meal a day, is not imperilled. In like manner, the hour for the midday meal and the collation, may for good reasons be conscientiously inverted. In many of our larger cities this practice now prevails. According to D'Annibale (summulæ Theologicae Moralis, 4 ed., 1812, 134) and Noldin (Syllabus Theologiae Moralis, 674) good reasons justify one in taking a collation in the morning, dinner at noon, and the morning allowance in the evening, because the substance of fasting still remains intact. Nothing like a noteworthy interruption should be admitted during the course of the meal, because such a break virtually forms two meals instead of one. Common sense, taking into consideration individual intention and the duration of the interruption, must finally determine whether a given interruption is noteworthy or not. Ordinarily an interruption of one half hour is considered slight. Nevertheless, an individual, after having commenced
obligation incumbent on all baptized individuals capable of assuming obligations provided they have completed their twenty-first year and are not otherwise excused. This doctrine is merely a practical application of a universally accepted principle of moralists and theologians that whereby the character of obligation, as human legislation is deemed serious or light in so far as the material element involved in the law bears or does not bear a close and intimate relation to the attainment of a prescribed end. Inasmuch as fasting considered as a function of the virtue of temperance bears such a relation to the promotion of man's salvation, or even to the needs of the soul, it certainly embodies an obligation generally serious. To this a priori reason may be added what Church history unfolds concerning the grave penalties attached to transgressions of this law. The sixty-ninth of the Apostolic Canons (see Canons, Apostolic) decrees the degradation of bishops, priests, deacons, lectors or chanters, failing to fast during Lent, and the excommunication of laymen, who fail in this way. The fifty-sixth canon of the Trullan Synod (692) contains similar regulations. Finally Alexander VII (24 Sept., 1665) condemned a proposition lowering the fasts: “Whoever violates the ecclesiastical law of fasting to which he is bound does not sin mortally unless he acts through contempt or disobedience (Denzinger, op. cit., no. 1123). Though this obligation is generally serious, not every infraction of the law is mortally sinful. When, however, transgressions of the law fallad into the spiritual part of the law, venial sins are committed. Inability to keep the fast and incompatibility with fasting are due to one’s state in life suffice by their very nature, to extinguish the obligation because as often as the obligation of positive law proves extreme burden or inconvenience, the obligation is forthwith lifted. Hence, the sick, the infirm, convalescents, delicate women, persons sixty years old and over, families whose members cannot have the necessities for a full meal at the same time, or who have nothing but bread, vegetables or such like viands; those whom fasting brings loss of sleep or severe headaches, wives whose fasting incurs their husbands’ indignation, children whose fasting arouses their parents’ wrath; in a word, all who cannot comply with the obligation of fasting without undergoing more than ordinary hardship are excused on account of their incapacity to fulfill the obligation. In like manner unusual fatigue or bodily weakness experienced in discharging one’s duty and superinduced by fasting lifts the obligation of fasting. However, not every sort of labor, but only such as is hard and protracted, exhausts from the obligation of fasting. These conditions are not confined to manual labor, but may be equally verified with regard to brain work. Hence bookkeepers, stenographers, telegraph operators, legal advisers and many others whose occupations are largely mental are entitled to exemption on this score, quite as well as daily laborers or tradesmen. While these two causes begetting exemption by their very nature, do not exist, lawfully constituted superiors may dispense their subjects from the obligation of fasting. Accordingly the Sovereign Pontiff may always and everywhere grant valid dispensations from this obligation. His dispensations will be licit with sufficient reasons underlie the grant. In particular cases and for good reasons, bishops may grant dispensations in their respective dioceses. Unless empowered by Indult they are not at liberty to dispense all their subjects simultaneously. Let it be noted that usually bishops issue just before Lent circulars or pastores ioannes, which are read to the faithful or otherwise made public, and in which they make known, on the authority of the Apostolic See, the actual status of obligation, dispensations, etc. Priests charged with the care of souls may dispense individuals for good reason. Superiors of religious communities may dispense individuals of their respective communities provided sufficient reason exists. Confessors are not qualified to grant these dispensations unless they have been explicitly delegated thereunto. They may, however, decide whether sufficient reason exists to lift the obligation.

Those who have permission from the Holy See to eat meat on prohibited days, may avail themselves of this concession at their full meal, not only on days of abstinence but also on fasting days. When age, infirmity or labour releases Christians from fasting, they may at liberty to eat meat as often as they are justified in taking food, provided the use of meat is justified. For this reason a general indult of their bishop (Sacred Penitentiaria, 16 Jan., 1834). Finally, the Holy See has repeatedly declared that the use of lard allowed by Indult comprehends butter or the fat of any animal.

No student of ecclesiastical discipline can fail to perceive that the obligation of fasting is rarely observed in its integrity nowadays. Conscious of the conditions of our age, the Church is ever shaping the requirements of this obligation to meet the best interests of her children. At the same time, no measure of leniency can eliminate in the least the positive and divine positive law imposing mortification and penance on man on account of sin and its consequences.

(Council of Trent, Sess. VI, can. XX.)


Fast among Mohammedans. See Ramadan.

Fasti Siculi. See Chronicon Paschalae.

Fatalism is in general the view which holds that all events in the history of the world, and in particular, the actions and incidents which make up the story of each individual life, are determined by fate. The theory takes many forms, or, rather, its essential feature of an antecedent force rigidly predetermining all occurrences enters in one shape or another into many. Sometimes in the entire course of the world fate was conceived as an iron necessity in the nature of things, overlooking and controlling the will and power of the gods themselves. Sometimes it was explained as the inexorable decree of the gods directing the course of the universe; sometimes it was personified as a particular divinity, the goddess or goddesses of destiny. Their function was to secure that each man’s lot, “share”, or part should infallibly come to him.

Ancient Classical Fatalism. The Greek tragedians frequently depict man as a helpless creature borne along by destiny. At times this destiny is a Nemesis which pursues him on account of some crime committed by his ancestors or himself; at other times it is to compensate for his excessive good fortune in order to educate and humble him. With Eschylus it is the necessity of an unpitiable destiny; with Sophocles, that of an overruling personal will. Still, the most important feature is that the future life of each individual is so rigorously predetermined in all its details by an antecedent external agency that his own volitions or desires have no power to alter the course of events. The action of fate is blind, arbitrary, relentless. It moves inexorably onwards, effecting the most terrible
catastrophes, impressing us with a feeling of helpless consternation, and harrowing our moral sense, if we venture upon a moral judgment at all. Fatalism in general has been inclined to overlook immediate antecedents and to dwell rather upon remote and external events as the agency which somehow moulds the course of events. Socrates and Plato held that the human will was necessarily determined by the intellect. Though this view seems incompatible with the doctrine of free will, it is not necessarily fatalism. The mechanical theory of Democritus, which explains the universe as the outcome of collision of material atoms, logically imposes a fatalism upon human volition. The 
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FATALISM the problem of fatalism thus becomes in Christian theocracy the problem of Divine predestination and the harmonizing of Divine prestation and providence with human liberty. (See Free Will; Predestination; Providence.)

Mohammedan Fatalism.—The Mohammedan conception of God and His government of the world has the vindication of His unity and the absolverence of the method of His rule, as well as the Oriental tendency to belittle the individuality of man, were all favourable to the development of a theory of predestination approximating towards fatalism. Consequently, though there have been defenders of free will among Mohammedan teachers, yet the dominating view which has prevailed most widely among the followers of the Prophet has been that all good and evil actions and events take place by the eternal decrees of God, which have been written from all eternity on the prescribed table. The faith of the believer and all his good actions have all been decreed and all the bad actions of the wicked though similarly decreed have not been approved. Some of the Moslem doctors sought to harmonize this fatalistic theory with man's responsibility, but the Oriental temper generally accepted with facility the fatalistic presentation of the creed; and this appealed to many as the only way to prevent predestination and privation of free choice as a justification for the denial of personal responsibility. Whilst the belief in predestined lot has tended to make the Moslem nations lethargic and insensible to the ordinary industries of life, it has developed a recklessness in danger which has proved a valuable element in the military character of the people.

Modern Fatalism.—The reformers of the sixteenth century taught a doctrine of predestination little, if at all, less rigid than the Mohammedan fatalism. (See Calvin; Luther; Free Will.) With the new departure in philosophy and its separation from theology since the time of Descartes, the ancient pagan notion of an external fate, which had grown obsolete, was succeeded by or transformed into the theory of Necessarianism. The study of physics, the increasing knowledge of the reign of uniform law in the world, as well as the reversion to naturalism initiated by the extreme representatives of the Renaissance, stimulated the growth of rationalism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and resulted in the popularization of the old objections to free will. Certain elements in the mechanical philosophy of Descartes and in the occasionalism of his system, which his followers Malebranche and Gauvinex developed, combining a real action to God, obviously tend towards a fatalistic view of the universe.

Modern Pantheistic Fatalism.—Spinoza's pantheistic necessarianism is, however, perhaps the frankest and most rigid form of fatalism advocated by any leading modern philosopher. Starting from the idea of substance, which he so defines that there can be but one, he deduces in geometrical fashion all forms of being in the universe from this notion. This substance must be infinite. It evolves necessarily through an infinite number of attributes into an infinity of modes. The seemingly individual and independent beings of the world, minds and bodies, are merely these modes of the infinite substance. The whole world-process of actions and events is rigidly necessary in every detail; the notions of contingency, of possible beings other than those which exist, are purely illusory. Nothing is possible except what actually is. There is free will in neither God nor man, though revolutions and decisions follow with the same inexorable necessity from man's nature as geometrical properties from the concept of a triangle. Spinoza's critics were quick to point out that in this view man is no longer responsible if he commits a crime or deserves a raise in recompense for his good deeds, and that God is the author of sin. Spinoza's only answer was that rewards and punishments still have their use as motives, that evil is merely limitation and therefore not real, and that what is real is good. Vice,
however, he holds, is as objectionable as pain or physical corruption. The same fatalistic consequences to morality are logically involved in the various forms of recent pantheistic monism.

Modern Materialistic Fatalism.—Modern materialism in the notion of matter as the sole original cause of all things, endeavours to elaborate a purely mechanical theory of the universe, in which its contents and the course of its evolution are all the necessary outcome of the original collocation of the material particles together with their chemical and physical properties and the laws of their action. The more thoroughgoing advocates of the mechanical theory, such as Clifford and Huxley, frankly accept the logical consequences of this doctrine that mind cannot act upon matter, and teach that man is "a conscious automaton", and that thoughts and volitions exercise no real influence on the movements of material objects in the present world. Mental states are merely by-products of material changes, but in no way modify the latter. They are also described as subjective aspects of nervous processes, and as epiphenomena, but however conceived they are necessarily held by the disciples of the materialistic school to be incapable of interfering with cause or of entering in any way as efficient causes into the chain of events which constitute the physical history of the world. The position is in some ways more extreme than the ancient pagan fatalism. For, while the earlier writers taught that the incidents of man's life were under the inescapable and whelming power against which it was useless as well as impossible to strive, they generally held the common-sense view that our volitions do direct our immediate actions, though our destiny would in any case be realized. But the materialistic scientist is logically committed to the conclusion that while the whole series of our mental states are rigidly bound up with the nervous changes of the organism, which were all inexorably predetermined in the original collocation of the material particles of the universe, these mental states themselves can in no way alter the course of events or affect the movements of a single molecule of matter.

The Refutation of Fatalism of all types lies in the absurd and incredible consequences which they all entail. (1) Ancient fatalism implied that events were determined independently of their immediate antecedents. It implied free will, or that free will could affect the course of our lives. Logically it destroyed the basis of morality. (2) The fatalism resting on the Divine decrees (a) made man irresponsible for his acts, and (b) made God the author of sin. (3) The fatalism of materialistic science not only annihilates morality but, logically reasoned out, it demands belief in the incredible proposition that the thoughts and feelings of mankind have had no real influence on human history.

Mill distinguished: (a) Pure or Oriental fatalism, which, he says, holds that our actions are not dependent on our desires, but are overruled by a superior power; (b) modified fatalism, which teaches that our actions are determined by our will, and our will by our character and the motives acting on us—our character, however, having been given to us; (c) finally determinism, which, according to him, maintains that not only our conduct, but our character, is amenable to our will: and that we can improve our character. In both forms of fatalism, he concludes, man is not responsible for his actions. But logically, in the determinist theory, if we reason the matter out, we are driven to precisely the same conclusion. For the volition to improve our character cannot arise unless as the necessary outcome of previous character and present motives. Practically there may be a difference between the conduct of the professed fatalist, who will be inclined to say that as his future is always inflexibly predetermined there is no use in trying to alter it, and the determinist, who may advocate the strengthening of good motives. In strict consistency, however, since determinism denies real initiative to the individual man, the consistent view of life and morality should be precisely the same for the determinist and the most extreme fatalist (see Determinism).

For bibliography see Fate Will. Michael Maher.

Fate (Lat. fatum, from fari, to tell or predict). This word is almost redundant in the vocabulary of a Catholic as such, for its meaning as the prime cause of events is better expressed by the term Providence, while, as a constant force at work in the physical universe, it is nothing more nor less than natural law. Hence St. Augustine says (De Civit. Dei, c. i.): "If anyone calls the influence or the power of God by the name of Fate, let him keep his opinion, but send his speech." Fate, in its popular meaning, is something opposed to chance, in so far as the latter term implies a cause acting according to no fixed laws. The unseen power that rules the destinies of men was personified by the ancient Greeks under the name of Moira, or, more generally, as three sister Moiras, or Fates, whose names were Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos. Sometimes fate is described as having unlimited sway over gods and men, while at other times the gods, especially Zeus, are described as the rulers of human destiny, or as having the power to change the course of fate. With the Moiras the Romans identified their own Parcae or Fates.

The idea of fate as a power in the world came, as St. Thomas tells us (C. G., III, xcliil), from the attempt to find a cause for events which appeared to follow no definite law and to be the result of mere chance. Many, who were not satisfied with the explanation of Providence that the ancient mythologists, turned their thoughts to the heavenly bodies, which, acting according to definite and unchanging laws themselves, were supposed to impress their influence upon events in the lower world (see Astrology). St. Thomas, who was no believer in astrology, evidently supposes that, while Providence acts according to fixed laws in the sidereal system, there is no such uniformity in the case of natural phenomena on earth. These latter are therefore often the result of chance, as far as secondary causes are concerned, though not so in their relation to God's Providence.

Early Speculations.—The Greek Philosopher Diodorus of Iassus tried to prove the universality of fate by an argument from the truth of possibilities (τηλετάτα εξισιívων). The contention was that no event can happen unless it was eternally true that it was going to happen. The truth of such a proposition cannot be changed, and therefore the event to which it refers must necessarily take place. It is something like the argument which St. Augustine employs to demonstrate the eternal intellect of God; but the fallacy of it as regards Fate is pointed out by Cicero (De Fato IX, 18, 19), who shows that the truth of the proposition depends on the actuality of the event. The definition which Cicero puts into the mouth of his brother Quintus identifies Fate with the necessity of natural law (De Divinatione, I, 55, par. 125). His words are: "Alum autem id appello quod Greci ἐπανακύκλωσιν, id est, ordinem semelque causarum, quum causa cause nesm ex se gignat", or, as we should say, fate is the result of natural law in the physical world. Cicero himself, however, says further on (ibid., II, 3, par. 6), "What is the use of maintaining the existence of Fate when, without Fate, an explanation of everything may be found in Nature or Fortune?"

The doctrine of fate held an important position in the monistic system of the Stoics. Its universal existence was a logical consequence of their assumptions with regard to the physical universe; for they recognized nothing that was not ultimately reducible to
matter and natural law. In their ethical system, however, the problem of determinism presented greater difficulties; for their favourite commandment, of living according to nature, seemed to imply that "men at some time are masters of their fates," and hence a placing of their actions to that eternity with Nature in which virtue was supposed to consist. The Epicureans stoutly denied the existence of fate, and the unaccountable "swerve" of the atoms, as postulated by the founder of their sect, was intended to preclude the law of necessity, not only in the case of the human will, but even in the elementary movements of primordial matter.

**Fate in the Koran.**—The idea of fate among orthodox Mohammedans is founded on the doctrine of God's absolute decree, and of predestination both for good and for evil. The prophet encouraged his followers to fight without fear, and even with desperation, by assuring them that no timidity or caution could save their lives in battle or avert their inevitable destiny. Disputes about this doctrine have given rise to various sects among the Mohammedans, some explaining away and others denying the absolute nature of the Will. The Koran itself does not convey the impression that Mohammed's own views on the subject were either clear or consistent.

**Buddhism.**—Though Free Will is not entirely ignored in Buddhism (q. v.), it is, at any rate, practically suppressed. According to this system, which is called the Teaching of the Buddha, "during the whole of his life under the weight, not precisely of fatality, but of an ineluctable series of former existences" (The Buddha and His Religion, p. 126).

**Materialism.**—In the theory of those who provide a purely materialistic explanation of the universe, and who regard the Will as just as much subject to unchanging and necessary laws as are all other phenomena, the universal sovereignty of fate is implied in the absolute reign of physical law.

**Catholic Teaching.**—According to Catholic teaching, God, who is the Author of the universe, has made it subject to fixed and necessary laws, so that, where our knowledge of these laws is complete, we are able to predict physical events with certainty. Moreover, God's absolute decree is irrevocable, but, as He cannot will that which is evil, the abuse of free will is in no case predetermined by Him. The physical accomplishment of the free act of the will, as well as its consequences, are willed by God conditionally upon the positing of the act itself, and all alike are the object of His eternal foreknowledge. The nature of this foreknowledge is a matter still in dispute between the opposing schools of Bañez and Molina. Hence, though God knows from all eternity everything that is going to happen, He does not will everything. Sin He does not will in any sense; He only permits it. Certain things He wills absolutely and others conditionally, and His general supervision, whereby these decrees are carried out, is called Divine Providence. As God is a free agent, the order of nature is not a consequence of the sense that it could not have been otherwise than it is. It is only necessary in so far as it works according to definite uniform laws, and is predetermined by a decree which, though absolute, was nevertheless free.

Moreover, in the case of miracles, God interferes with the ordinary course of nature; and the supposition that, at certain periods of the world's evolution, such, for instance, as when man first appeared on the earth, there have been other providential interpositions involving new departures in the world-process, provides for certain facts in the region of organic life and human culture which are not less the conclusions of the materialists. St. Thomas distinguishes fate from Providence, and calls it the order or disposition of secondary causes according to which they act in obedience to the First Cause. It follows from what has been said that, in the Catholic view, the idea of fate—St. Thomas dislikes the word—must lack the note of absolute necessity, since God's decrees are free, while it preserves the character of relative necessity inasmuch as such decrees, when once passed, cannot be altered. Moreover, God knows what is going to happen because it is going to happen, and not vice versa. Hence the futurity of an event is a logical, but not a physical, consequence of God's foreknowledge. See Free Will, God, Miracles, Providence.

**Fathers of the Church.**

**Fathers of the Church,** the congregation of missionary priests first established at Lyons, France, in 1808, and at Paris, in 1814, and finally approved by Pope Gregory XVI, 18 February, 1834. The General Founder, Very Rev. Jean-Baptiste Rauzan, was born at Bordeaux, 5 December, 1757, and died in Paris, 5 September, 1817. After completing his ecclesiastical studies, he taught theology and sacred eloquence, and later was chosen Vice-General of Bordeaux. Here he inaugurated a missionary movement to save the Faith in France. On the recommendation of d'Aviau, Archbishop of Bordeaux, Cardinal Fesch, Archbishop of Lyons, who was especially interested in the project, invited Father Rauzan to Lyons, where, in 1808, he gathered around him a number of zealous and noted preachers. So effective was their preaching that in 1814 they won the favour of Napoleon I, and received from the Government, unsolicited, subsidies to defray the expenses of their missions. This favour, however, was short-lived, for, owing to Napoleon's quarrel with Pius VII, the society, which was called the Missionaries of France, was suppressed. In 1818, at the suggestion of Cardinal Fesch, Father Rauzan rallied his co-labourers, adding others, among whom were the young Vice-General of Chambéry, de Forbin-Janson, afterwards Bishop of Nancy, the Abbé Fraysseinsou, who founded St. Stanislaus's College and instructed the young missionaries in sacred eloquence, Legris Duval, the St. Vincent de Paul of Italy, Le Vasseur, the St. Vincent de Paul of France, and others.

Starting with renewed zeal, the Missionaries of France not only evangelized the cities of Orléans, Poitiers, Tours, Rennes, Marseilles, Toulouse, Paris, and many other places, but established the works of St. Geneviève and the Association of the Ladies of Providence, who still exist in many parts of France, rendering valuable services to the pastors. Father Rauzan founded the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Clotilde for the education of young ladies. He was befriended by the royal family, who not only assisted him financially, but gave him the celebrated Mount Valerian, at that time the centre of piety, and a later one of the principal forts protecting the capital.

In 1830 during the second Revolution the Missionaries of France were dispersed and exiled, and their house in Paris sacked. Father Rauzan went to Rome, where he received a paternal reception from Gregory XVI, who encouraged and authorized him to found a new society, to be known as the Fathers of Mercy. The Brief of approbation, which also contains the constitutions, was given 18 February, 1834, and on the 15th of March of the same year a second Brief, affording the new society to the Propaganda, and the former Missionaries of France accepted these constitutions on the 8th of December following. Among its members have been such influential and eloquent preachers as Mgr. Failllet, Bishop of Orléans, Mgr. Duquesnay, Archbishop of Cambrai, Mgr. Bernadou, Archbishop of Sens, who later became a cardinal. The Fathers of...
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Mercy resumed their missionary labours in France, only to meet again the disasters which befell all religious societies through the decree of expulsion in 1880. However, through the influence of their many friends in Paris, and claiming the enforcement of the authorization given to the society by Louis XVIII in 1816, the Fathers of Mercy retained their mother-house in Paris until the separation of Church and State in 1905, when they moved to Belgium.

In 1839, at the suggestion of Bishop Hughes, of New York, Mgr. Forin-Janson introduced the Fathers of Mercy into the United States, their first field of labour being in the Diocese of New Orleans. Bishop Potiers, of Mobile, Alabama, then invited them to take charge of Spring Hill College. Two years later, Fathers Lafont and Aubril were sent to look after the increasing French population in New York City, where the Fathers of Mercy now have charge of the parishes of St. Vincent de Paul, Manhattan, and of Our Lady of Lourdes and St. Frances de Chantal, Brooklyn. They also have a house of studies in Rome, houses in Belgium, France, and other places. By a decree of Propaganda (August, 1906), the Very Rev. Theophile Wucher was named Vicar General of the Institute for three years and took up his residence in New York. In their activities the Fathers of Mercy embrace all works of apostolic zeal. One of their chief characteristics is, that they must at all times consider themselves auxiliaries of the secular clergy, and in every way conform to the will of the bishop in whose diocese they may labour. The end and mode of life the congregation imposes upon its members differs little from that of every good secular priest.

Fathers of the Christian Doctrine. See Bous, César de; Christian Doctrine, Confraternity of.